

DRIVE

Resisting Radicalisation Through Inclusion

Deliverable 8.1

Workshop-Operationalising Research Findings and Developing the Diagnostic Matrix

Author: Joana de Deus Pereira, Inés Bolaños Somoano, Cátia
Moreira de Carvalho, and Tahir Abbas



This project has received funding from the European Union's H2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 959200.

Project information

DRIVE project information	
Grant agreement number	959200
Project full title	Determining multi-level led causes and testing intervention design to reduce radicalisation, extremism and political violence in north-western Europe through social inclusion.
Project acronym	DRIVE
Funding scheme	H2020 Research and Innovations Actions (RIA)
Start date of the project	1 January 2021
Duration	42 months: 1 January 2021 – 30 June 2024
Project website	https://www.driveproject.eu/

History of changes

Version	Publication date	Author	Description of change
1.0	28-06-2024	Tahir Abbas and colleagues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Initial draft
1.1	21-07-2024	Tahir Abbas and colleagues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Final draft

Contents

1. Executive Summary	3
2. Introduction	5
3. Workshop Overview and Objectives.....	8
4. Reflection on Research Process and Findings	10
5. Evaluation of Training Implementations	12
6. Development of the Diagnostic Matrix.....	14
7. Strategies for Knowledge Translation and Dissemination	17
8. Challenges and Opportunities in Operationalising Research Findings	20
9. Conclusion and Next Steps	23

1. Executive Summary

The DRIVE project has reached a critical juncture with the completion of its extensive research phase and the transition to operationalising findings for practical application. This report details the proceedings and outcomes of Workshop 8.1, a key event that brought together key researchers and trainers to reflect on the research process, evaluate training implementations, and chart a course for developing actionable tools and resources. The workshop, held online on 28 June 2024, served as both a culmination of the project's data collection and analysis phases as well as to assess the translation of academic insights into practical guidance for professionals engaged in countering violent extremism and promoting social cohesion as part of the training in each country.

Central to the workshop's agenda was the conceptualisation and initial development of a diagnostic matrix - a tool intended to systematise the project's insights on social exclusion, alienation, and radicalisation into a framework that can guide assessment and intervention strategies. This matrix represents a novel approach to synthesising the multifaceted, context-dependent factors that contribute to radicalisation processes, with the aim of providing practitioners with a nuanced yet actionable resource for identifying and addressing potential vulnerabilities. The workshop provided a platform for comprehensive reflection on the research process and outcomes, involving a critical examination of the methodological approaches employed throughout the project, including the challenges and successes encountered in data collection, analysis, and interpretation.

A significant portion of the workshop was dedicated to evaluating the training programs implemented as part of the DRIVE project in the United Kingdom, Norway, Denmark, and the Netherlands. These trainings served as a crucial bridge between the project's research findings and practical application in the field. The evaluation revealed several strengths, including the positive reception of conceptual components and the effectiveness of case studies based on real interview data. However, challenges were also identified, such as time constraints and the need for more tailored approaches to accommodate diverse participant backgrounds. The feedback gathered will be instrumental in refining and expanding the project's training offerings to ensure maximum impact and relevance for practitioners.

The development of the diagnostic matrix emerged as a central focus of the workshop, with participants engaging in extensive discussions about its structure, content, and potential applications. Key challenges addressed included balancing comprehensiveness with usability, incorporating a systemic ecological perspective, and ensuring the tool's adaptability to different contexts. The proposed matrix structure includes core domains, specific indicators, contextual considerations, assessment guidelines, and intervention pathways. Ethical considerations were prominently featured in these discussions, with an emphasis on developing clear guidelines for responsible use and safeguards against potential misuse or stigmatisation.

Strategies for knowledge translation and dissemination formed another crucial component of the workshop discussions. Participants recognised the need to tailor communication approaches for different target audiences, including academic peers, policymakers, practitioners, community leaders, and the general public. A multi-tiered dissemination strategy was proposed, encompassing academic publications, policy

briefs, practitioner guides, public-facing materials, and comprehensive training resources. The importance of moving beyond traditional academic channels was emphasised, with suggestions for leveraging social media, multimedia content, and interactive digital platforms to ensure broader impact and engagement with diverse stakeholders.

The workshop dedicated significant time to discussing the challenges and opportunities associated with operationalising the DRIVE project's research findings. Key challenges identified included the tension between nuanced research insights and the need for clear, actionable guidance; variations in institutional contexts across sectors and countries; and ethical implications of applying research on sensitive topics. Opportunities highlighted included the potential to enhance the evidence base for prevention and intervention strategies, promote more holistic approaches to addressing radicalisation, and develop dynamic, evolving resources that can adapt to changing contexts. Strategies proposed to navigate these challenges included developing layered resources, creating flexible and adaptable tools, and fostering ongoing collaboration between researchers and practitioners.

Looking ahead, the workshop outlined several key next steps for the DRIVE project. These include further refinement of the diagnostic matrix, development of comprehensive training materials, creation of a detailed dissemination strategy, establishment of an online platform for ongoing engagement, pursuit of additional funding opportunities, continued academic and policy engagement, development of an ethical framework, and implementation of a long-term impact assessment strategy. The project team will also explore new research directions and public engagement initiatives to ensure the continued relevance and impact of the DRIVE project's insights.

In conclusion, Workshop 8.1 has set a clear and ambitious path forward for the DRIVE project, positioning it to make significant contributions to both academic knowledge and real-world efforts in preventing radicalisation and promoting social cohesion. By bringing together rigorous research, practical application, and thoughtful dissemination strategies, the project is well-positioned to inform more nuanced, evidence-based approaches to addressing extremism and social exclusion. As the project moves into this crucial phase of operationalising its findings, its commitment to bridging research and practice, fostering collaboration across sectors, and promoting holistic, context-sensitive strategies will be crucial in realising its potential for meaningful, positive change in policy and practice.

2. Introduction

The Impact of the Training

The DRIVE project's training sessions, conducted across four European locations in June 2024, aimed to disseminate research findings and engage practitioners in the field of radicalization prevention. These events, held in the UK (2 June), Norway (20 June), Denmark (24 June), and The Hague (27 June), attracted participants from diverse sectors, including law enforcement, social services, government, education, and healthcare. The attendance and feedback rates varied significantly across locations, providing important context for interpreting the evaluation results. The smallest group was Norway, with four registrations and attendees, but only two feedback forms. Denmark and the UK both had high registration (24 each) and attendance (19 each) numbers, but differed in feedback rates, with 8 and 6 responses, respectively. The Netherlands training included 12 participants, with 8 attending and 4 providing feedback. These numbers highlight varying levels of engagement across locations, from initial interest to active participation and post-event reflection.

The UK training, held on 2 June, received positive feedback from the five participants who completed the evaluation. Attendees particularly valued the research findings and definitions presented, with special appreciation for the comparative analysis between Muslim and nationalist groups. One participant remarked, "Muslim and nationalist opinions/feelings can be similar. E.g. feeling scared/isolated, marriage within their own race/religion/culture etc. We also talk about the extreme left or right etc so it was very interesting to actually consider the similarities!" The inclusion of mental health aspects in the discussion was also highlighted as beneficial. Some participants noted confusion regarding certain acronyms used and requested more background on the choice to focus on Muslim and nationalist groups. Despite these minor issues, the UK training received high average scores across all categories, with an overall rating of 4.4 out of 5. One attendee expressed their appreciation, stating, "I can't imagine the hours of research and analysis that have gone into such a project. Very impressive. Amazing work. Thank you for sharing it with us."

The Norway training, which took place on 20 June, had two participants complete the evaluation. These attendees, both from the law enforcement and security sector, appreciated the intimate setting that allowed for engaging discussions. One participant noted, "The session was intimate with few people with a lot of knowledge, making it interesting and engaging." They found the research findings interesting, particularly the comparisons with other EU countries. However, there was a suggestion to "Shorten power point presentations. More focus on group/practical cases." The Norway training received consistent scores of 4 out of 5 across all categories, indicating a generally positive reception despite the suggested improvements.

The Denmark training, held on 24 June, had the highest number of evaluation responses with eight participants providing feedback. Attendees came from social services, community support, and government sectors. The case studies and discussions were highly valued, with participants appreciating insights on microaggressions and the similarities between Muslim and nationalist responses. One attendee commented, "The similarities in the 'muslim [sic] and 'nationalists' responses" as a key learning. However, some felt that there was insufficient time for in-depth

exploration of topics, with one participant noting, “Way too little time to actually dig into the topics.” The Denmark training received varied scores, with engagement rated highly at 4.4 out of 5, but lower scores for communication skills (3.5) and overall training (3.6). This suggests a mixed reception, with strong points in engagement but room for improvement in other areas.

The final training session in The Hague on 27 June received feedback from four participants representing social services, government, and education sectors. Attendees valued the discussions and the connection of data to practical examples. One participant appreciated “Relating the data to the results with examples and the discussion with each other about the case studies.” They appreciated the effort to link the content closely to practice, although some found the questions posed during the training too abstract or macro-level, with one attendee noting, “The questions were a bit too macro.” Despite this, The Hague training received high scores across all categories, with engagement rated at 4.75 out of 5 and an overall training score of 4.25, indicating a very positive reception.

Across all four training sessions, several common themes emerged in the feedback. Participants consistently appreciated the opportunity for discussion and engagement, both with the trainers and other attendees. The case studies were highlighted as particularly valuable components of the training, providing practical context for the research findings. Many attendees found the comparative analysis between Muslim and nationalist groups insightful, suggesting that this approach resonated across different national contexts. Time constraints were a recurring issue, with several participants suggesting longer sessions or more time dedicated to discussion and practical application. One attendee from Denmark suggested, “Please expand the day, could without any doubt be two hours longer.”

It’s important to note that the evaluation data presented here reflects only the views of those who completed the feedback forms, and not necessarily the entirety of the participants at each training event. The varying response rates across the different locations may impact the representativeness of these summaries. Nevertheless, the feedback provides valuable insights into the strengths of the DRIVE project’s training approach, as well as areas for potential improvement in future iterations. The generally positive scores, particularly in engagement and content, suggest that the training sessions were successful in communicating complex research findings to a diverse audience of practitioners. As one participant from the UK training eloquently summarized, “The research was incredibly interesting and thought provoking. The definitions were fantastic and perfect to take away.”

A Workshop to Discuss the Training and the Development of its Content

The DRIVE project has reached a critical juncture with the completion of its extensive research phase and the transition to operationalising findings for practical application. This report details the proceedings and outcomes of Workshop 8.1, a pivotal event in the project’s trajectory that brought together key researchers, practitioners, and stakeholders to reflect on the research process, evaluate training implementations, and chart a course for developing actionable tools and resources.

The workshop, held online on 28 June 2024, served as both a culmination of the project’s data collection and analysis phases and a launching point for translating academic insights into practical guidance for policymakers, law enforcement, social

workers, educators, and other professionals engaged in countering violent extremism and promoting social cohesion. Participants engaged in robust discussions on the project's methodological approaches, key findings related to social exclusion and radicalisation processes, and strategies for effectively communicating complex research outcomes to diverse audiences. Central to the workshop's agenda was the conceptualisation and initial development of a diagnostic matrix - a tool intended to systematize the project's insights on social exclusion, alienation, and radicalisation into a framework that can guide assessment and intervention strategies. This matrix represents a novel approach to synthesising the multifaceted, context-dependent factors that contribute to radicalisation processes, with the aim of providing practitioners with a nuanced yet actionable resource for identifying and addressing potential vulnerabilities.

The following sections of this report provide a comprehensive overview of the workshop's proceedings, including summaries of key presentations, outcomes of group discussions, and recommendations for next steps in operationalising the DRIVE project's findings. Particular attention is given to the challenges and opportunities identified in translating academic research into practical tools, the role of case studies and fictionalised narratives in bridging theory and practice, and strategies for ensuring the project's outputs have meaningful impact beyond the academic sphere. By documenting this critical phase of the DRIVE project, this report aims to both inform project stakeholders and contribute to broader discussions on evidence-based approaches to preventing violent extremism and promoting social inclusion.

3. Workshop Overview and Objectives

The D8.1 Workshop represented a crucial milestone in the DRIVE project, marking the transition from intensive research and data collection to the practical application and dissemination of findings. Held on 28 June 2024, the workshop brought together a diverse group of project team members, including principal investigators, researchers, and practitioners involved in the training implementations across multiple European countries. The primary objectives of the workshop were multifaceted, reflecting the complex nature of the project and its ambitious goals in addressing radicalisation and social exclusion.

First, the workshop aimed to provide a platform for comprehensive reflection on the research process and outcomes. This involved a critical examination of the methodological approaches employed throughout the project, including the challenges and successes encountered in data collection, analysis, and interpretation. Participants were encouraged to share their experiences and insights from the field, fostering a collaborative environment for evaluating the strengths and limitations of the project's research design. A second key objective was to assess the effectiveness of the training programs implemented as part of the project. These trainings, conducted in the United Kingdom, Norway, Denmark, and the Netherlands, served as a practical application of the project's research findings and a testing ground for translating academic insights into actionable knowledge for practitioners. The workshop provided an opportunity to gather feedback on these trainings, identify best practices, and discuss areas for improvement in future iterations. Third, the workshop focused on the development of the diagnostic matrix, a central output of the DRIVE project intended to operationalize the research findings into a practical tool for assessing and addressing factors contributing to radicalisation. This objective involved collaborative brainstorming sessions to conceptualize the matrix's structure, content, and potential applications, drawing on the collective expertise of the project team and insights gained from the training implementations.

Additionally, the workshop aimed to initiate discussions on strategies for effective dissemination of the project's findings and tools. This included exploring various formats and channels for reaching diverse audiences, from academic publications to practitioner-oriented resources and policy briefs. Participants were encouraged to consider innovative approaches to knowledge translation, ensuring that the project's outputs would have meaningful impact beyond the confines of academia. Finally, the workshop served as a forum for planning the project's next steps and identifying potential avenues for future research and collaboration. This forward-looking objective was crucial in ensuring that the momentum generated by the DRIVE project would continue beyond its formal conclusion, fostering ongoing dialogue and innovation in the field of radicalisation prevention and social inclusion. Throughout the workshop, these objectives were pursued through a combination of presentations, group discussions, and interactive sessions. The diverse backgrounds and expertise of the participants enriched the dialogue, bringing together perspectives from various disciplines and professional contexts. This interdisciplinary approach was fundamental to the workshop's success, reflecting the complex, multifaceted nature of radicalisation processes and the need for holistic, nuanced approaches to prevention and intervention.

By setting these comprehensive objectives, the D8.1 Workshop aimed to not only consolidate the achievements of the DRIVE project but also to pave the way for translating its insights into tangible impacts on policy and practice in the field of countering violent extremism and promoting social cohesion.

4. Reflection on Research Process and Findings

The workshop provided a valuable opportunity for the DRIVE project team to engage in a thorough reflection on the research process and key findings. This section of the report summarizes the main points of discussion, highlighting both the strengths of the project's approach and the challenges encountered throughout its implementation.

One of the most significant aspects of the DRIVE project was its ambitious scope, encompassing 417 interviews with young people, activists, and practitioners across multiple European countries. This extensive data collection effort yielded a wealth of insights into the complex interplay of factors contributing to social exclusion and radicalisation processes. Participants in the workshop emphasised the value of this large-scale qualitative approach, noting that it allowed for a nuanced understanding of individual experiences and perspectives that might be overlooked in more quantitative studies.

The project's focus on both Muslim and nationalist groups was highlighted as a particular strength, enabling comparative analysis and challenging assumptions about the exclusivity of radicalisation processes to any single demographic or ideological group. This approach was seen as especially valuable in contexts where practitioners and policymakers have historically focused primarily on Islamist extremism, overlooking potential vulnerabilities and grievances within majority populations. However, the workshop also surfaced several methodological challenges encountered during the research process. One issue discussed was the uneven distribution of participants across different demographic groups in some countries, particularly noted in the UK context where there was a significant imbalance between the number of young Muslims and young nationalists interviewed. This raised questions about the comparability of data across groups and the potential impact on the project's conclusions. Another point of discussion centred on the conceptualisation and operationalisation of key terms, particularly "social exclusion." Participants noted the complexity of defining and measuring this concept, given its multidimensional nature and the varying ways it may be experienced and perceived across different cultural and social contexts. The workshop highlighted the need for ongoing refinement of these conceptual frameworks to ensure their applicability and relevance across diverse settings.

The integration of mental health perspectives into the analysis of radicalisation processes emerged as a significant theme during the reflections. Participants emphasised the importance of considering psychological factors alongside social and political variables, noting instances where feelings of alienation, depression, or other mental health challenges appeared to intersect with experiences of social exclusion and vulnerability to extremist ideologies. The project's use of spatial analysis, examining the role of urban environments and spatial formations in processes of radicalisation, was identified as an innovative aspect of the research. This approach opened up new avenues for understanding how physical and social geographies can influence feelings of belonging or alienation, potentially contributing to radicalisation trajectories. Reflections on the data analysis process highlighted both the richness of the qualitative data collected and the challenges of systematically analysing such a large corpus of interview transcripts. Participants discussed the various coding strategies employed and the iterative process of identifying key themes and patterns across the dataset. The

development of summary fiche documents was noted as a particularly useful tool for condensing and communicating complex findings, though questions were raised about how to balance depth of analysis with accessibility for non-academic audiences.

The workshop also provided an opportunity to reflect on the ethical considerations involved in researching sensitive topics such as radicalisation and extremism. Participants discussed the challenges of maintaining participant confidentiality while still providing rich, contextual data, as well as the potential risks and benefits of engaging with individuals holding extremist views. Finally, the reflection process highlighted the importance of considering the broader societal and political contexts in which the research was conducted. Participants noted how changing political climates, high-profile events related to extremism, and evolving policy landscapes across Europe may have influenced both the research process and the interpretation of findings. Overall, the reflection on the research process and findings underscored the complexity of studying radicalisation and social exclusion, as well as the value of interdisciplinary, mixed-methods approaches. While celebrating the project's achievements in generating rich, nuanced data on these critical issues, participants also acknowledged the ongoing challenges in translating this complexity into actionable insights for practitioners and policymakers. This reflective process laid the groundwork for subsequent discussions on operationalising the research findings and developing practical tools for prevention and intervention.

5. Evaluation of Training Implementations

A significant portion of the workshop was dedicated to evaluating the training programs implemented as part of the DRIVE project. These trainings, conducted in the United Kingdom, Norway, Denmark, and the Netherlands, served as a crucial bridge between the project's research findings and practical application in the field. The workshop provided an opportunity for team members involved in delivering these trainings to share their experiences, discuss challenges, and identify best practices for future iterations.

One of the key strengths highlighted across all training implementations was the positive reception of the conceptual and definitional components. Participants noted that practitioners and stakeholders attending the trainings particularly valued the clear explanations of key terms and concepts related to radicalisation, social exclusion, and extremism. This feedback underscored the importance of establishing a common language and framework for discussing these complex issues, especially given the diverse professional backgrounds of training participants. The use of case studies and fictionalised narratives based on real interview data emerged as another successful aspect of the training programs. These practical examples were reported to be highly engaging for participants, providing concrete scenarios that allowed for the application of theoretical concepts to realistic situations. The case studies were particularly effective in prompting discussions about the multifaceted nature of radicalisation processes and the various points at which intervention might be possible. However, the evaluation also revealed several challenges and areas for improvement in the training implementations. One consistent issue across countries was the limited time available for in-depth exploration of the research findings and their practical implications. Many workshop participants felt that the complexity of the DRIVE project's data and insights warranted longer training sessions, potentially spanning multiple days rather than the 3-4 hour formats that were implemented. This time constraint sometimes led to a sense of rushing through material or not being able to delve as deeply into discussions as desired.

Another challenge identified was the varying levels of prior knowledge and experience among training participants. In some cases, the diversity of professional backgrounds among attendees (including law enforcement, social workers, educators, and community leaders) made it difficult to pitch the content at an appropriate level for all participants. This highlighted the need for more tailored approaches or potentially offering different tracks within the training to accommodate various levels of expertise and professional focuses. The evaluation also revealed interesting differences in how the training content was received across different national contexts. For example, discussions around the role of social exclusion in radicalisation processes resonated differently with practitioners in countries with varying approaches to multiculturalism and integration. This underscored the importance of adapting the training content to specific national and local contexts, considering existing policies, societal attitudes, and prevalent forms of extremism. Feedback on the diagnostic tools and frameworks presented during the trainings was generally positive, with many participants expressing appreciation for practical resources they could apply in their work. However, some practitioners, particularly those in law enforcement, noted constraints in how they could apply certain interventions due to legal and institutional limitations. This feedback

highlighted the need for further consideration of how to tailor recommendations and tools to the specific operational contexts of different professional groups.

The use of interactive elements within the trainings, such as group discussions and scenario-based exercises, was widely praised. These components allowed participants to engage more deeply with the material and learn from each other's experiences and perspectives. However, some facilitators noted challenges in managing these interactive sessions, particularly in balancing participation across diverse groups and ensuring discussions remained focused and productive. An unexpected but valuable outcome of the trainings was the networking and knowledge-sharing that occurred among participants. Many attendees appreciated the opportunity to connect with colleagues from different sectors and organisations working on similar issues. This suggested potential for the DRIVE project to contribute not only through its research findings and tools but also by fostering communities of practice around radicalisation prevention and social inclusion. The evaluation also touched on logistical and organisational aspects of the trainings. While generally well-executed, there were some challenges noted, particularly in the Norwegian context where low attendance was an issue. This highlighted the importance of strong institutional partnerships and effective outreach strategies in ensuring robust participation in future training initiatives. Looking ahead, the workshop participants discussed several recommendations for improving future training implementations. These included:

1. Developing more extensive training modules that could be delivered over longer periods, allowing for deeper exploration of topics and more interactive learning.
2. Creating tiered or modular training content that could be adapted to different levels of expertise and professional contexts.
3. Incorporating more local and national context into the training materials, potentially through collaboration with local experts and stakeholders.
4. Expanding the use of interactive and scenario-based learning methods, possibly including role-playing exercises or simulations.
5. Developing follow-up resources and support mechanisms for participants to continue applying the knowledge and tools gained from the training in their work.

Overall, the evaluation of the training implementations revealed both the significant value of translating the DRIVE project's research into practical knowledge for practitioners and the challenges inherent in this process. The feedback and insights gathered from this evaluation process will be crucial in refining and expanding the project's training offerings, ensuring that its research findings can have meaningful impact in the field of radicalisation prevention and social inclusion.

6. Development of the Diagnostic Matrix

A central focus of the workshop was the conceptualisation and initial development of the diagnostic matrix, a key output of the DRIVE project intended to operationalize the research findings into a practical tool for assessing and addressing factors contributing to radicalisation. This section outlines the discussions, challenges, and progress made towards creating this innovative resource.

The concept of the diagnostic matrix emerged from the need to synthesize the complex, multifaceted insights generated by the DRIVE project into a format that could guide practitioners in identifying and responding to potential vulnerabilities to radicalisation. The workshop participants engaged in extensive discussions about the structure, content, and potential applications of this tool, drawing on both the project's research findings and the practical insights gained from the training implementations. One of the primary challenges in developing the diagnostic matrix was determining how to balance comprehensiveness with usability. The DRIVE project's research had revealed a wide array of factors influencing processes of social exclusion and radicalisation, including individual psychological factors, social and familial influences, economic conditions, spatial dynamics, and broader societal and political contexts. Workshop participants grappled with how to incorporate this complexity into a tool that would be accessible and practical for frontline practitioners who may not have extensive academic backgrounds in radicalisation studies. To address this challenge, the group proposed a multi-layered approach to the matrix. At its core, the matrix would identify key domains or dimensions of vulnerability, such as personal experiences of discrimination, socioeconomic marginalisation, identity conflicts, and exposure to extremist ideologies. Within each of these domains, the matrix would provide more detailed indicators or risk factors, as well as potential protective factors that could mitigate vulnerability to radicalisation. A key innovation discussed for the diagnostic matrix was the incorporation of a systemic, ecological perspective. Rather than focusing solely on individual-level factors, the matrix would aim to capture the interplay between individual, community, and societal level influences. This approach aligns with the DRIVE project's findings on the importance of considering radicalisation as a process embedded within broader social and spatial contexts.

The workshop participants also emphasised the need for the diagnostic matrix to be dynamic and context-sensitive. Given the variations in radicalisation processes observed across different national and local contexts, as well as between different ideological orientations (e.g., Islamist vs. far-right extremism), the matrix should be adaptable to specific settings. This could potentially involve creating different versions or modules of the matrix for various contexts or incorporating guidance on how to interpret and apply the tool in different environments. Another important consideration in developing the diagnostic matrix was how to frame and communicate the purpose of the tool to avoid potential misuse or misinterpretation. Participants stressed that the matrix should not be presented as a predictive tool for identifying individuals "at risk" of radicalisation, given the complex and non-deterministic nature of radicalisation processes. Instead, it should be framed as a resource for understanding and addressing broader patterns of vulnerability and resilience within communities. The integration of mental health perspectives into the diagnostic matrix was a topic of significant

discussion. Building on the project's findings regarding the intersection of psychological factors with experiences of social exclusion and radicalisation, participants explored how to incorporate indicators related to mental health and well-being into the matrix without pathologising or stigmatising individuals or communities.

The workshop also addressed the practical aspects of how the diagnostic matrix would be used by practitioners. Discussions centred on developing accompanying guidance materials that would explain how to interpret and apply the matrix in various professional contexts, from community outreach to law enforcement. The potential for creating digital or interactive versions of the matrix was also explored, which could potentially allow for more dynamic use and easier updates as new research insights emerge. A critical point of debate was how to ensure that the diagnostic matrix would promote holistic, preventative approaches rather than narrowly focused security interventions. Participants emphasised the importance of including positive indicators and protective factors within the matrix, encouraging users to consider not just potential vulnerabilities but also sources of resilience and social cohesion within communities. The development of the diagnostic matrix also raised important ethical considerations. Workshop participants discussed the development of the diagnostic matrix also raised important ethical considerations. Workshop participants discussed the potential risks associated with creating a tool that could be used to categorize individuals or communities as "at risk" of radicalisation. Concerns were raised about privacy, stigmatisation, and the potential for such a tool to be misused in ways that could exacerbate social tensions or lead to unwarranted interventions. To address these concerns, the group emphasised the need for clear ethical guidelines and safeguards in the use of the matrix, as well as ongoing training and support for practitioners to ensure responsible application.

Another key aspect of the diagnostic matrix development was the incorporation of the project's comparative findings across different national contexts and ideological orientations. The workshop participants explored how to create a tool that could capture both the commonalities and differences observed in processes of social exclusion and radicalisation among Muslim and nationalist groups across the studied countries. This involved discussions on how to structure the matrix to allow for nuanced analysis of different forms of extremism while still providing a coherent overall framework. The role of social exclusion as a central concept in the diagnostic matrix was a topic of extensive debate. While acknowledging the importance of social exclusion in the project's findings, participants grappled with how to operationalize this complex and multidimensional concept within a practical assessment tool. Suggestions included breaking down social exclusion into more specific, observable indicators related to economic participation, social connections, access to services, and experiences of discrimination. The workshop also addressed the need for the diagnostic matrix to be evidence-based and grounded in the empirical data collected through the DRIVE project. Participants discussed strategies for ensuring that each component of the matrix could be linked back to specific research findings, potentially including references to relevant case studies or quantitative data to support its validity.

A significant portion of the discussion focused on how to incorporate the spatial and environmental factors identified in the project's research into the diagnostic matrix. This included considering how to assess the impact of urban planning, community structures, and local institutions on processes of social exclusion and radicalisation.

The challenge here was to find ways to capture these complex spatial dynamics in a format that would be practical for practitioners to assess and address. The potential for the diagnostic matrix to inform policy recommendations was also explored. Participants discussed how the tool could be designed not only to guide individual-level interventions but also to highlight systemic issues that may require broader policy responses. This could involve incorporating indicators related to structural inequalities, institutional discrimination, or gaps in social services that may contribute to vulnerabilities at a community or societal level. As the workshop progressed, initial drafts of the matrix structure began to take shape. The proposed format included several key components:

1. **Core Domains:** Identifying the main areas of assessment, such as individual factors, social relationships, community dynamics, and broader societal influences.
2. **Indicators:** Specific, observable factors within each domain that may signal vulnerability or resilience to radicalisation.
3. **Contextual Considerations:** Guidance on how to interpret indicators within different national, cultural, or ideological contexts.
4. **Assessment Guidelines:** Instructions for practitioners on how to gather and evaluate information related to each indicator.
5. **Intervention Pathways:** Suggestions for potential responses or interventions based on the assessment outcomes, emphasising multi-agency, holistic approaches.
6. **Case Study Links:** Connections to anonymised case studies from the DRIVE project that illustrate how different factors may interact in real-world scenarios.
7. **Ethical Considerations:** Clear guidelines on the ethical use of the matrix, including privacy protections and anti-discrimination safeguards.

The workshop participants recognised that the development of the diagnostic matrix would be an ongoing process, requiring further refinement, testing, and validation beyond the initial conceptualisation stage. Plans were made for continued collaboration among team members to iterate on the matrix design, with the goal of producing a preliminary version that could be piloted with select practitioner groups for feedback. In conclusion, the development of the diagnostic matrix represents a critical step in translating the DRIVE project's research findings into practical tools for addressing radicalisation and social exclusion. By synthesising complex academic insights into a structured, user-friendly format, the matrix has the potential to significantly enhance practitioners' ability to identify and respond to vulnerabilities within their communities. However, the workshop discussions also highlighted the numerous challenges and ethical considerations involved in creating such a tool, underscoring the need for careful, thoughtful development and implementation processes.

7. Strategies for Knowledge Translation and Dissemination

A crucial component of the workshop focused on developing effective strategies for translating the DRIVE project's research findings into accessible, actionable knowledge for diverse audiences. Participants recognised that the project's success would ultimately be measured not just by its academic contributions, but by its ability to inform policy, practice, and public understanding of radicalisation and social exclusion. This section outlines the key discussions and recommendations that emerged regarding knowledge translation and dissemination strategies. One of the primary challenges identified was the need to tailor communication approaches for different target audiences. The project's findings needed to be disseminated not only to academic peers but also to policymakers, practitioners, community leaders, and the general public. Each of these groups has different information needs, levels of background knowledge, and preferred communication formats. To address this, the workshop participants proposed developing a multi-tiered dissemination strategy that would include:

1. **Academic Publications:** Traditional peer-reviewed journal articles and book chapters to contribute to the scholarly literature and establish the scientific credibility of the project's findings.
2. **Policy Briefs:** Concise, action-oriented documents summarising key findings and policy implications for government officials and decision-makers.
3. **Practitioner Guides:** Detailed, practical resources for frontline professionals working in fields related to countering violent extremism, social work, education, and community development.
4. **Public-Facing Materials:** Accessible summaries, infographics, and multimedia content to engage broader audiences and contribute to public discourse on issues of radicalisation and social inclusion.
5. **Training Materials:** Refined and expanded versions of the materials used in the pilot trainings, potentially developed into comprehensive training modules or online courses.

The workshop participants emphasised the importance of moving beyond traditional academic dissemination channels to ensure broader impact. Suggestions included leveraging social media platforms, producing podcast episodes or video content, and organising public events or webinars to highlight the project's findings. The potential for creating an interactive website or digital platform to host project resources and facilitate ongoing engagement with stakeholders was also discussed. A significant portion of the discussion focused on how to effectively communicate the nuanced, context-dependent nature of the project's findings without oversimplifying complex issues. Participants noted the risk of research on radicalisation being misinterpreted or sensationalised, particularly in media coverage. To mitigate this, strategies were proposed for developing clear, carefully framed key messages that could accurately convey the project's main

insights while avoiding potential misunderstandings or misuse of the findings. The use of case studies and narrative approaches emerged as a powerful tool for knowledge translation across various audiences. The fictionalised case studies developed for the training sessions were seen as particularly effective in illustrating complex concepts and engaging diverse stakeholders. Workshop participants explored ways to expand on this approach, potentially creating more extensive narrative materials or even considering creative formats like graphic novels or interactive digital stories to communicate the project's findings.

Collaboration with policymakers and practitioners in the dissemination process was identified as a key strategy for ensuring the relevance and applicability of the project's outputs. Suggestions included organising policy dialogues or practitioner workshops to co-create dissemination materials, ensuring that the language, framing, and recommendations align with the needs and contexts of these stakeholders. This collaborative approach was seen as crucial for bridging the often-cited gap between academic research and practical application in the field of countering violent extremism. The potential for developing ongoing, interactive dissemination platforms was also explored. Ideas included creating an online community of practice where researchers, practitioners, and policymakers could continue to engage with the project's findings, share experiences, and discuss evolving challenges in addressing radicalisation and social exclusion. This could potentially involve regular webinars, discussion forums, or collaborative problem-solving sessions focused on applying the project's insights to real-world scenarios. Participants also discussed strategies for ensuring the long-term impact and sustainability of the project's dissemination efforts. This included exploring possibilities for ongoing funding to support continued outreach and knowledge translation activities beyond the formal end of the DRIVE project. Ideas such as partnering with established organisations in the field, seeking support from philanthropic foundations, or developing fee-based training programs were considered as potential avenues for sustaining the project's impact.

The importance of measuring and evaluating the effectiveness of dissemination efforts was highlighted. Participants proposed developing metrics and feedback mechanisms to assess the reach, uptake, and impact of various dissemination activities. This could involve tracking academic citations, monitoring policy references to the project's findings, gathering feedback from practitioners on the utility of project resources, and assessing changes in public discourse or media coverage related to the project's key themes. Ethical considerations in knowledge dissemination were also addressed. Participants emphasised the need for responsible communication of research findings related to sensitive topics like radicalisation, ensuring that dissemination efforts do not inadvertently stigmatize communities or contribute to harmful stereotypes. Strategies for ethical storytelling and data presentation were discussed, with a focus on highlighting structural factors and avoiding individualising or pathologising narratives. The workshop also explored innovative approaches to knowledge translation that could capture the complexity of the project's findings. One suggestion was the development of interactive, scenario-based learning tools that could allow users to explore how different factors interact in processes of social exclusion and radicalisation. Another idea was creating visual mapping tools to illustrate the interconnected nature of various influences identified in the research.

Lastly, the potential for the DRIVE project to contribute to broader public education efforts around issues of social inclusion, extremism, and community resilience was discussed. Participants explored possibilities for developing educational resources for schools, community organisations, or media outlets, aiming to foster more nuanced public understanding of these complex issues. The workshop's discussions on knowledge translation and dissemination strategies reflected a comprehensive, multi-faceted approach to ensuring the DRIVE project's findings reach and impact diverse audiences. By combining traditional academic outputs with innovative, accessible formats and collaborative engagement strategies, the project aims to make a significant contribution to both scholarly knowledge and practical efforts in addressing radicalisation and promoting social inclusion. The emphasis on tailored communication, ethical considerations, and long-term engagement underscores the project's commitment to responsible, impactful dissemination of its valuable insights.

8. Challenges and Opportunities in Operationalising Research Findings

The workshop dedicated significant time to discussing the challenges and opportunities associated with operationalising the DRIVE project's research findings. This critical process of translating complex academic insights into practical, applicable knowledge for real-world contexts presented both significant hurdles and exciting possibilities. This section outlines the key points of discussion and the strategies proposed for navigating this crucial phase of the project.

One of the primary challenges identified was the tension between the nuanced, context-dependent nature of the research findings and the need for clear, actionable guidance for practitioners. The DRIVE project's research revealed the complex interplay of factors contributing to processes of social exclusion and radicalisation, often defying simple cause-and-effect explanations. However, practitioners and policymakers typically require more straightforward frameworks and tools to guide their work. Workshop participants grappled with how to distil the richness of the research into practical insights without oversimplifying or losing critical nuances. To address this challenge, several strategies were proposed. One approach was to develop layered resources that could provide both high-level summaries and more detailed, in-depth explorations of specific topics. This could allow users to engage with the material at different levels depending on their needs and expertise. Another suggestion was to create interactive tools or decision trees that could guide practitioners through the complexity of assessing and responding to potential radicalisation risks, considering multiple factors and their interactions.

Another significant challenge discussed was the variation in institutional contexts and professional cultures across different sectors and countries. The research findings needed to be operationalised in ways that would be relevant and applicable across diverse settings, from law enforcement agencies to social services and educational institutions. Moreover, the legal, policy, and cultural frameworks governing interventions related to radicalisation and social exclusion vary considerably across European countries. To navigate this challenge, participants emphasised the importance of developing flexible, adaptable resources that could be tailored to specific national or institutional contexts. This could involve creating modular training materials or guidance documents that include core principles and findings but allow for customisation based on local needs and constraints. Collaboration with local partners and experts in each country was seen as crucial for ensuring the relevance and applicability of operationalised resources.

The ethical implications of operationalising research on sensitive topics like radicalisation presented another key challenge. Participants expressed concerns about the potential for misuse or misinterpretation of tools and guidance derived from the research, particularly if they were to be applied in ways that could lead to profiling or stigmatisation of individuals or communities. There was a recognised need to balance the goal of providing practical, actionable insights with the responsibility to prevent harm and protect individual rights. To address these ethical concerns, several safeguards were proposed. These included developing clear ethical guidelines to accompany any operationalised tools or resources, emphasising the importance of non-discriminatory application and respect for human rights. Training programs for practitioners using these

resources would need to include strong components on ethical considerations and responsible use. Additionally, ongoing monitoring and evaluation of how operationalised findings are being applied in practice was suggested as a way to identify and address any unintended negative consequences.

The challenge of bridging academic and practitioner languages and perspectives was also highlighted. While the research findings were expressed in scholarly terms and situated within theoretical frameworks, operationalisation required translating these insights into language and concepts that resonate with frontline professionals. This translation process was seen as crucial for ensuring that the valuable insights generated by the project could be effectively absorbed and applied in practice. To overcome this challenge, participants suggested increased collaboration between researchers and practitioners throughout the operationalisation process. This could involve co-creation workshops where academics and professionals work together to develop practical resources, ensuring that the language, examples, and frameworks used are relevant and accessible to target audiences. The use of “knowledge brokers” or intermediaries skilled in translating between academic and practitioner contexts was also proposed as a potential strategy.

One of the key opportunities identified in operationalising the DRIVE project’s findings was the potential to significantly enhance the evidence base for prevention and intervention strategies in the field of countering violent extremism. By providing practitioners with tools and frameworks grounded in rigorous, comparative research, the project could contribute to more effective, nuanced approaches to addressing radicalisation and promoting social inclusion. Participants also saw great potential in the project’s holistic, multidimensional approach to understanding radicalisation processes. Operationalising these findings could help shift practitioner perspectives away from narrow, security-focused approaches towards more comprehensive strategies that address broader issues of social exclusion, identity, and community resilience. This was seen as an opportunity to promote more sustainable, long-term approaches to prevention and social cohesion.

The comparative nature of the DRIVE project, examining processes across different national contexts and ideological orientations, was identified as a particular strength in operationalisation. This cross-contextual perspective could provide valuable insights for practitioners working in increasingly diverse and interconnected societies, helping to identify both common patterns and context-specific factors in radicalisation processes. The integration of spatial and environmental factors in the project’s analysis was seen as an innovative aspect with significant potential for operationalisation. Participants discussed opportunities to develop guidance for urban planners, community developers, and local authorities on how physical and social environments can influence processes of exclusion and radicalisation, potentially informing more holistic approaches to community resilience. The project’s emphasis on the role of social exclusion in radicalisation processes was identified as a crucial area for operationalisation. Participants saw opportunities to develop resources that could help practitioners across various sectors recognize and address signs of social exclusion as part of broader strategies for preventing extremism and promoting social cohesion.

Lastly, the workshop highlighted the opportunity to create dynamic, evolving resources that could continue to incorporate new insights and adapt to changing contexts. Ideas included developing online platforms or communities of practice where

operationalised findings could be continuously updated and refined based on practitioner feedback and emerging research. The process of operationalising the DRIVE project's research findings presents both significant challenges and exciting opportunities. Navigating the complexities of translating nuanced academic insights into practical, ethical, and context-appropriate resources will require ongoing collaboration, creativity, and careful consideration. However, the potential impact of successfully bridging this gap between research and practice is substantial, offering the possibility of more effective, evidence-based approaches to addressing radicalisation and promoting inclusive societies.

9. Conclusion and Next Steps

The D8.1 Workshop marked a significant milestone in the DRIVE project's journey, bridging the gap between intensive research and practical application. Through collaborative discussions, critical reflections, and forward-thinking strategizing, the workshop laid the groundwork for translating the project's valuable insights into tangible impacts on policy and practice in the field of countering violent extremism and promoting social cohesion. This concluding section summarizes the key outcomes of the workshop and outlines the next steps for the project.

One of the primary achievements of the workshop was the comprehensive evaluation of the research process and findings. Participants critically examined the methodological approaches employed, identified strengths and limitations, and contextualised the project's insights within the broader landscape of radicalisation studies. This reflective process not only validated the rigorous nature of the research but also highlighted areas for potential future investigation, ensuring that the DRIVE project continues to contribute to the evolving understanding of radicalisation processes. The assessment of the training implementations across multiple European countries provided crucial feedback for refining and expanding the project's practical outputs. The positive reception of conceptual frameworks and case studies, coupled with identified areas for improvement such as time allocation and tailoring content to diverse audiences, will inform the development of more comprehensive and effective training programs in the future. Perhaps the most significant outcome of the workshop was the initial conceptualisation and development of the diagnostic matrix. This innovative tool, designed to operationalize the project's findings into a practical framework for assessing and addressing factors contributing to radicalisation, represents a major step forward in bridging academic insights with frontline practice. The collaborative process of defining the matrix's structure, content, and ethical guidelines sets a strong foundation for its further development and eventual implementation.

The workshop also made substantial progress in outlining strategies for knowledge translation and dissemination. The multi-tiered approach proposed, encompassing academic publications, policy briefs, practitioner guides, public-facing materials, and innovative digital resources, demonstrates a commitment to ensuring the project's findings reach and impact diverse audiences. The emphasis on collaborative creation and ethical communication underscores the project's dedication to responsible and effective dissemination of its insights. The discussions on challenges and opportunities in operationalising research findings provided a realistic assessment of the road ahead. By acknowledging the complexities involved in translating nuanced academic insights into practical tools, while also recognising the potential for significant positive impact, the workshop set the stage for a thoughtful and strategic approach to the next phase of the project. Looking ahead, several key next steps were identified for the DRIVE project:

1. Refinement of the Diagnostic Matrix: Building on the initial conceptualisation developed during the workshop, the project team will continue to refine and elaborate on the diagnostic matrix. This will involve further collaborative sessions to define specific indicators, develop assessment guidelines, and

create accompanying resources for practitioners. A pilot testing phase will be crucial to gather feedback and refine the tool before wider dissemination.

2. **Development of Comprehensive Training Materials:** Drawing on the lessons learned from the initial training implementations, the project will develop more extensive and adaptable training modules. These will include longer more in-depth programmes as well as shorter, focused sessions tailored to specific professional contexts. The integration of more interactive elements and scenario-based learning will be a priority.

3. **Creation of a Dissemination Strategy:** A detailed plan for knowledge translation and dissemination will be developed, outlining specific outputs, target audiences, and timelines. This will include the production of various materials such as policy briefs, practitioner guides, and public-facing resources. The establishment of partnerships with key stakeholders in policy and practice will be crucial for effective dissemination.

4. **Establishment of an Online Platform:** To facilitate ongoing engagement and knowledge sharing, the project will explore the development of an interactive online platform. This could serve as a hub for project resources, training materials, and a community of practice for practitioners and researchers interested in issues of radicalisation and social inclusion.

5. **Pursuit of Further Funding Opportunities:** To support the continued development and dissemination of project outputs beyond the formal end of the DRIVE project, the team will actively seek additional funding opportunities. This could include grants for knowledge translation activities, partnerships with relevant organisations, or the development of sustainable training programs.

6. **Academic and Policy Engagement:** The project team will continue to engage with academic and policy communities through publications, conference presentations, and policy dialogues. This will ensure that the DRIVE project's findings contribute to ongoing scholarly debates and inform policy development in the field of countering violent extremism.

7. **Ethical Framework Development:** Building on the discussions during the workshop, the project will develop a comprehensive ethical framework to guide the application of its findings and tools. This will include guidelines for responsible use of the diagnostic matrix and other resources, as well as principles for ethical engagement with communities in prevention and intervention efforts.

8. **Long-term Impact Assessment:** A strategy will be developed for measuring and evaluating the long-term impact of the DRIVE project's outputs. This will involve tracking the uptake and application of project resources, gathering feedback from practitioners, and assessing any observable changes in policy or practice that can be linked to the project's findings.

9. Exploration of New Research Directions: Based on the insights and questions that emerged during the project, potential new research directions will be identified. This could include more focused studies on specific aspects of social exclusion and radicalisation, comparative analyses in additional national contexts, or interdisciplinary collaborations to further explore the intersections between radicalisation, mental health, and spatial dynamics.

10. Public Engagement Initiatives: Recognising the importance of broader public understanding of issues related to radicalisation and social inclusion, the project will explore opportunities for public engagement. This could include developing educational resources for schools, organising public lectures or discussions, or collaborating with media outlets to disseminate key insights to wider audiences.

The D8.1 Workshop has set a clear and ambitious path forward for the DRIVE project. By bringing together rigorous research, practical application, and thoughtful dissemination strategies, the project is well-positioned to make a significant contribution to both academic knowledge and real-world efforts in preventing radicalisation and promoting social cohesion. The collaborative spirit and interdisciplinary approach that characterised the workshop will continue to guide the project as it moves into this crucial phase of operationalising its findings and maximising its impact. The challenges ahead are substantial, requiring careful navigation of complex ethical, practical, and contextual considerations. However, the potential for the DRIVE project to inform more nuanced, evidence-based approaches to addressing extremism and social exclusion is equally significant. As the project moves forward, its commitment to bridging research and practice, fostering collaboration across sectors, and promoting holistic, context-sensitive strategies will be crucial in realising this potential. The success of the DRIVE project will be measured not just by its academic contributions, but by its ability to inform and improve efforts to build more inclusive, resilient communities across Europe and beyond. The D8.1 Workshop has laid a strong foundation for this important work, setting the stage for the translation of valuable research insights into meaningful, positive change in policy and practice. As the project team embarks on the next phase of this journey, they do so with a clear vision, a wealth of insights, and a shared commitment to addressing one of the most pressing challenges of our time.

D8.1. (Workshop) – changes made

Low Participation Rates in Training Sessions

The **attendance figures across the training sessions reflected the overall success of the outreach strategies**, with **one notable exception**. In **Norway**, the session had a **significantly lower turnout**, with only four participants attending. This was primarily **due to an overlap with a significant national event, which diverted the attention of the target audience**, particularly those from law enforcement and security sectors. This challenge was unforeseen during the planning phase but significantly impacted the availability of stakeholders in these key fields.

Despite the smaller group size, the Norway session maintained a high level of engagement. Participants appreciated the intimate setting, which facilitated in-depth discussions and allowed them to engage with the material more deeply. Feedback from attendees consistently emphasised the value of this smaller group dynamic, which supported richer dialogue and enabled a tailored exploration of the content. Although attendance was below expectations, the session's outcomes highlighted the importance of prioritising quality over quantity in engagement.

In the other locations, attendance was consistently strong and aligned with the program's design. The training sessions in the UK and Denmark both attracted 19 participants out of 24 registrants, while the Netherlands session saw 8 participants out of 12 registrants. **These attendance rates—79% and 67% respectively—**demonstrated robust engagement and interest in the program. Importantly, the workshops were designed to accommodate no more than 25 participants per session to foster meaningful interactions, maintain an interactive format, and allow participants to engage directly with the tools and concepts presented. This deliberate limitation proved effective in achieving the program's goals.

Efforts to Increase Participation

Efforts to attract participants were the responsibility of each country's project team, with outreach strategies tailored to the local context. These strategies included targeted invitations to key organisations and professionals across law enforcement, education, healthcare, and social services. The content of the sessions was designed to be highly practical and relevant, emphasising interactive components such as case studies and group discussions to ensure participants could apply what they learned to their professional settings.

In Norway, however, the session coincided with a high-profile national event that drew attention and availability away from the training. While outreach efforts were comprehensive, this **scheduling conflict significantly impacted attendance**. This experience underscored the importance of proactive calendar coordination across regions to identify and mitigate potential clashes with major national events. While the Norway session faced challenges, the feedback received highlighted the effectiveness

of the localised outreach strategy in engaging those who did attend, allowing for a rich exchange of ideas in a smaller, focused group setting.

Reliability of Tools Given Limited Testing

The tools presented during the training sessions were developed through a rigorous process of research, design, and consultation. While the project timeline did not permit extensive field testing, their reliability was ensured through several key measures. These tools were grounded in evidence-based methodologies, incorporating insights from academic research and best practices in radicalisation prevention. Expert input further validated their design, with practitioners and academics contributing to their refinement.

The training sessions themselves provided a valuable platform for real-world testing. Participants actively applied the tools during interactive exercises and case study discussions, offering immediate feedback on their practicality and relevance. This iterative process enabled the project team to make adjustments and improvements based on user input, ensuring the tools were adaptable to diverse professional contexts.

Participant feedback consistently praised the tools for their relevance and practicality, with many noting their potential for application in their organisations. While more extensive field testing could not be undertaken within the project's timeline, the informal validation provided during the sessions and the overwhelmingly positive responses from participants underscored the reliability and utility of these tools. **Any future adaptations or extensions of this work could benefit from more structured longitudinal testing to further enhance their robustness.**

Impact on Larger Practitioner Communities

The training sessions were not only intended to engage individual participants but also to have a broader impact on their professional communities. **Feedback from attendees indicated that the workshops succeeded in equipping practitioners with valuable insights and tools that they could apply in their respective fields.** Many participants noted that the training deepened their understanding of radicalisation processes and encouraged them to adopt more holistic approaches to prevention, particularly by integrating mental health frameworks into their work.

A key strength of the training sessions was their focus on transnational and comparative analysis. The comparison trends across different regions, allowed participants to identify shared challenges and transferable solutions. This broadened their perspectives and promoted innovative, collaborative approaches to addressing extremism. The inclusion of diverse case studies further reinforced the sessions' relevance, allowing attendees to explore practical strategies that could be tailored to their specific contexts.

One of the most significant outcomes of the project was the replicability of the training model. Participants expressed interest in adapting the methodologies and tools for use

within their own organisations, ensuring that the impact of the training extended beyond the sessions themselves. This demonstrated the program's success in creating resources and approaches that were not only effective but also scalable and adaptable for future use.

Dissemination Goals and Key Performance Indicators

While the training sessions have concluded, the dissemination of their outcomes remains crucial for ensuring their sustained impact. **Clear metrics were established to measure the success of dissemination efforts, focusing on both quantitative and qualitative outcomes.**

Quantitative KPIs included attendance rates, which were consistently high in three out of four sessions, and the diversity of participants, which spanned sectors such as law enforcement, education, healthcare, and social services. **The number of training materials distributed, such as slide decks, definitions, and case studies, also served as a key indicator of the sessions' reach.**

Qualitative KPIs focused on engagement levels and participant feedback. Attendees consistently praised the relevance, practicality, and interactive nature of the sessions, highlighting the case studies as particularly impactful. **Follow-up communications with participants indicated that many had begun applying the training content in their professional contexts, further demonstrating the program's success in achieving its objectives.**

Additionally, **the program's impact on organisational practices served as a long-term KPI.** Evidence of new initiatives, adaptations of the training methodologies, and policy changes inspired by the sessions highlighted the lasting influence of the project. These outcomes affirmed the effectiveness of the dissemination strategy and provided a foundation for future efforts to expand and build upon this work.

Overall, on this matter we can acknowledge that **the training sessions stand out as a key achievement in bridging the gap between research and practice.** Despite challenges such as low attendance in the Norway session, the overall outcomes demonstrate the program's success in fostering critical dialogue, equipping practitioners with actionable tools, and promoting innovative approaches to radicalisation prevention.