

DRIVE

Resisting Radicalisation Through Inclusion

Deliverable 8.5

Training Workshops

Authors: 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	01-06-2024	Leiden Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Initial version produced
1.1	29-07-2024	Leiden Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Finalisation

Contents

Executive Summary.....	5
1. Introduction.....	6
2. Report for the UK Training Session (Birmingham)	8
Overview.....	8
Attendance and Feedback.....	8
Trainers.....	8
Programme Structure.....	8
Participant Feedback	8
Evaluation Scores	9
Training Feedback Questionnaire.....	10
Sample Questions:	10
Conclusion.....	10
3. Report for the Norway (Oslo) Training Session	12
Overview	12
Attendance and Feedback.....	12
Trainers and Programme Structure.....	12
Program Structure	12
Participant Feedback	12
Additional Feedback from Practitioners.....	13
Evaluation Scores	13
Training Feedback Questionnaire.....	13
Sample Questions:	13
Conclusion.....	14
4. Report for the Denmark (Copenhagen) Training Session	15
Overview	15
Attendance and Feedback.....	15
Trainers and Programme Structure.....	15
Programme Structure.....	15
Participant Feedback	15

Additional Feedback from Sections.....	16
Evaluation Scores	16
Training Feedback Questionnaire.....	16
Sample Questions:	16
Conclusion.....	17
5. Report for the Netherlands Training Session.....	18
Overview.....	18
Attendance and Feedback.....	18
Trainers and Programme Structure.....	18
Programme Structure:.....	18
Participant Feedback	18
Additional Feedback from Sections.....	19
Evaluation Scores	19
Training Feedback Questionnaire.....	20
Sample Questions:	20
Conclusion.....	20
6. Concluding Thoughts.....	21

Executive Summary

The DRIVE project conducted training sessions in four locations: Birmingham (UK), Oslo (Norway), Copenhagen (Denmark), and The Hague (Netherlands) between June 2 and June 27, 2024. These sessions aimed to disseminate research findings on radicalisation prevention to practitioners from diverse sectors, including law enforcement, social services, government, education, and healthcare.

The training programme covered topics such as concepts and definitions related to radicalisation, public mental health frameworks, practitioner findings, and case studies. Feedback from participants was generally positive, with high engagement scores across all locations. Attendees particularly valued the interactive format, comparative analyses between different groups and countries, and the integration of mental health discussions within the context of radicalisation prevention.

The training's key strengths included the promotion of open and inclusive environments, the practical application of research findings, and the use of case studies to contextualise the issues. Areas for improvement included requests for more time for discussions, clearer explanations of certain terms, and a greater focus on practical examples.

The DRIVE project training sessions successfully communicated research findings to diverse audiences, providing valuable insights and practical knowledge in the field of radicalisation prevention. The sessions effectively challenged preconceptions, encouraged critical thinking, and highlighted the interconnectedness of various social factors in addressing extremism.

1. Introduction

The DRIVE (Determining multi-level led causes and testing intervention design to reduce radicalisation, extremism and political violence in north-western Europe through social inclusion) project, funded under the H2020 Research and Innovations Actions (RIA), has undertaken a comprehensive study of radicalisation processes and prevention strategies across northwestern Europe. As part of its dissemination efforts, the project conducted a series of training sessions in four key locations: Birmingham (UK), Oslo (Norway), Copenhagen (Denmark), and The Hague (Netherlands) during June 2024. These sessions aimed to bridge the gap between academic research and practical application, bringing together diverse stakeholders from law enforcement, social services, government, education, and healthcare sectors.

The training sessions were structured around a core curriculum designed to provide a holistic understanding of radicalisation processes and prevention strategies. The programme began with an introduction to key concepts and definitions, ensuring all participants shared a common language and framework for discussion. This foundational knowledge was crucial in facilitating meaningful dialogue and preventing misunderstandings that often arise from varying interpretations of terms like 'radicalisation', 'extremism', and 'political violence'. The sessions then delved into public mental health frameworks, recognising the growing importance of mental health considerations in understanding and preventing radicalisation. This approach highlighted the interconnectedness of individual psychological factors with broader social and political contexts, offering a more nuanced perspective on the difficult pathways to extremism.

Presenting and discussing practitioner findings from various countries occupied a significant portion of the training. This comparative approach allowed participants to gain insights into the similarities and differences in radicalisation trends and prevention strategies across different national contexts. By examining case studies from multiple countries, attendees were able to identify common challenges and share best practices, fostering a sense of transnational cooperation in addressing this global issue. The inclusion of young people's perspectives in the findings added another layer of depth to the discussions, ensuring that the voices of those most at risk of radicalisation were represented and considered in prevention strategies.

The training sessions placed a strong emphasis on interactive learning and practical application. We extensively used case studies to illustrate theoretical concepts and research findings, enabling participants to engage with real-world scenarios and apply their newly acquired knowledge. These discussions often led to lively debates and the sharing of personal experiences, creating a rich learning environment that went beyond mere information transfer. The trainers, including renowned experts such as Professor Tahir Abbas and Dr Eolene Boyd-MacMillan, facilitated these discussions, ensuring that they remained focused and productive while encouraging diverse perspectives.

One of the key strengths of the DRIVE project training sessions was their ability to challenge preconceived notions and encourage critical thinking about the roots of radicalisation. By presenting comparative analyses between different groups, such as

Muslim and nationalist communities, the training highlighted unexpected similarities in experiences of isolation, fear, and the search for belonging. This approach helped to break down stereotypes and foster a more nuanced understanding of radicalisation processes, emphasising the importance of addressing underlying social and psychological factors rather than focusing solely on ideological content.

The integration of mental health discussions within the context of radicalisation prevention was another significant aspect of the training. Participants gained insights into the relationship between mental health issues and vulnerability to extremist ideologies, while also exploring the potential risks of over-emphasising this connection. The training stressed the importance of a balanced approach that recognises the role of mental health without stigmatising individuals or communities. This holistic perspective encouraged practitioners to consider a wide range of factors when developing prevention strategies, from individual psychological support to broader community-based interventions.

Throughout the training sessions, there was a consistent focus on the practical application of research findings to real-world scenarios. We encouraged participants to consider how they could apply the gained insights to their respective professional contexts, such as law enforcement, social services, or community outreach. This emphasis on practicality ensured that the training went beyond theoretical discussions to provide tangible tools and strategies for practitioners on the front lines of radicalisation prevention. The case study discussions, in particular, allowed participants to collaboratively develop multi-level intervention strategies, considering individual, family, community, and systemic factors.

While the training sessions were generally well-received, with high engagement scores across all locations, they also highlighted areas for future improvement and research. Participants expressed a desire for more time dedicated to discussions and practical casework, suggesting that future sessions could benefit from an extended format. There were also calls for more detailed background on the research methodologies and clearer explanations of certain specialised terms. These feedbacks underscore the nature of radicalisation prevention work and the ongoing need for dialogue between researchers and practitioners. As the DRIVE project continues to evolve, these insights will be invaluable in refining future training programmes and ensuring that they remain responsive to the needs of those working to prevent radicalisation and extremism in diverse contexts across northwestern Europe.

2. Report for the UK Training Session (Birmingham)

Overview

The DRIVE project conducted a training session in Birmingham, UK, on 2 June 2024. This session aimed to disseminate research findings and engage practitioners in the field of radicalisation prevention. The training attracted participants from diverse sectors, including law enforcement, social services, government, education, and healthcare.

Attendance and Feedback

- Registered: 24
- Attended: 19
- Feedback: 6

The UK training session had a high registration and attendance rate, with a total of 24 registrations and 19 attendees. Out of these, six participants provided feedback, offering valuable insights into the effectiveness and reception of the training.

Trainers

Professor Tahir Abbas, Dr Eolene Boyd-MacMillan, Dr Cátia de Carvalho, and Dr Inés Baloñas Somoano

Programme Structure

- **Module 1:** Introduction, Concepts, and Definitions
- **Module 2:** Public Mental Health Frameworks and Findings
- **Module 3:** UK Practitioners findings
- **Module 4:** UK young people findings
- **Module 5:** Case studies, discussion

Participant Feedback

The UK training received positive feedback from the participants who completed the evaluation. The attendees particularly valued the research findings and definitions presented, with special appreciation for the comparative analysis between Muslim and nationalist groups. Participants highlighted the engaging nature of the session, emphasising the value of discussions and the practical application of the research findings. Many attendees found the interactive format of the training to be particularly beneficial, as it allowed for active participation and meaningful exchanges of ideas. The trainers' ability to foster an open and inclusive environment encouraged attendees to share their perspectives and experiences, enhancing the overall learning experience. The comparison between Muslim and nationalist groups resonated well with the attendees, helping them understand similar feelings of isolation and fear across different groups. This comparative analysis was a significant takeaway for many, as it shed light on the commonalities in experiences despite the differing backgrounds. Moreover, the inclusion of data and discussion about mental health was appreciated, providing a comprehensive understanding of the issues. Attendees noted that addressing mental health in the context of radicalisation prevention added depth to the conversation,

highlighting the importance of psychological well-being in mitigating extremist tendencies. The integration of public mental health frameworks with radicalisation prevention strategies offered a holistic approach, which was well-received by the participants. 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!”** This comment, among many others, underscores the **effectiveness of the training in challenging preconceived notions and encouraging critical thinking about the roots of radicalisation**. Another 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.”**

Evaluation Scores

- **Overall Rating:** 4 out of 5
- **Engagement:** High scores across all categories

Participants noted some areas for improvement, such as the need for more background on the choice to focus on Muslim and nationalist groups and clarification of certain acronyms used during the session.

During the presentations, the DRIVE project team facilitated multi-level discussions, exploring composite case studies of individuals at the micro (individual) level, implications for working at the family and community level at the meso level, and strategies within a whole structure and system approach at the macro level. The case studies presented were based on real testimonies collected during field work in the UK and went through a process of fictionalisation and anonymisation to guarantee that all identifying information was removed and confidentiality was kept. This process also encompassed the construction of a cohesive narrative that captured the essence of the real interviews while adding fictional elements to enhance relatability and understanding.

During Section 1, practitioners highlighted the desirability of having a definition section, especially for police and prison staff who often need short, applicable labels for use in the pre-crime scene. Practitioners requested the definitions PowerPoint.

During Section 2 on Public Mental Health, practitioners highlighted additional reasons for high levels of mental illness among Muslim populations in the UK, including cultural stigma around seeking mental health support and poor institutional responses that ignore mental health programmes and do not facilitate access, especially towards minorities. There were questions about the distinction between Muslims and nationalists, which practitioners felt were not comparable labels. The validity and reliability of primary data and wellness checks raised concerns. Practitioners requested more information about sampling criteria and pointed out potential unidentified mental health diagnoses among interviewees. Richard McNeill Wilson mentioned that some interviewees self-exiled, potentially indicating underlying mental health issues. Interviewees discussed the impact of COVID-19 and lockdowns on their mental health, raising concerns about potential bias in the sample due to these contextual factors. There was a discussion about the pandemic's relevance in limiting institutional support and increasing financial stress on institutions.

Concerns about the pandemic's effects on mental health and potential pathways to extremism emerged during the case study discussions for Case Study 1 (Amina). The role of family relations and financial constraints in family cohabitation choices was highlighted. There was also a noted lack of institutional response to Amina's case and the gender dynamics involved. Emphasis was placed on the need for support to avoid burnout and the establishment of safe spaces for faith discussions.

For Case Study 2 (Eric), the lack of a positive national identity leading to exclusionary identities was highlighted. The need for belonging and acceptance, and how the internet can provide these, was stressed. More pastoral support in academic environments was advocated to disrupt extremist narratives. Structural factors like unemployment were pointed out as needing to be addressed before any significant solution could be made.

Training Feedback Questionnaire

To gather comprehensive feedback, participants were provided with a feedback questionnaire via QR code displayed on a PowerPoint slide. This method ensured ease of access and quick response collection. The feedback form included questions on the content, engagement, and overall satisfaction with the training.

Sample Questions:

- What did you enjoy most about the training?
- Please list 2-3 key learnings from today's training and how you anticipate applying them to your work in the future.
- Was there any subject matter that you found confusing? If so, please provide specific examples.
- Please rate your trainers based on their communication skills and content knowledge.
- How can your trainer(s) improve themselves?
- What do you like about your trainer(s)?
- Please rate the overall training. How can we improve this training?
- Any additional comments you wish to share?

Conclusion

The UK training session in Birmingham successfully conveyed research findings to a diverse and engaged audience. The feedback underscored the training's strengths, particularly its interactive nature, comprehensive content, and the trainers' ability to create an inclusive and open environment. The comparative analysis between Muslim and nationalist groups provided valuable insights, highlighting commonalities that challenged preconceived notions and fostered critical thinking.

Participants appreciated the integration of mental health discussions within the context of radicalisation prevention, recognising the importance of psychological well-being in addressing extremist tendencies. The holistic approach combining public mental health frameworks with radicalisation prevention strategies was well-received, adding depth and relevance to the discussions.

The case studies were particularly effective in contextualising the research findings, allowing participants to explore real-world applications and implications. The discussions around these case studies highlighted critical issues such as the impact of

the pandemic on mental health, the role of family dynamics and financial constraints, and the need for institutional support and safe spaces for dialogue.

While the training was largely successful, participants provided constructive feedback for improvement. Suggestions included extending the duration of the sessions for more in-depth exploration of topics, providing more background on the focus groups, and clarifying certain acronyms used during the presentations.

The UK training session in Birmingham met its objectives, offering participants valuable insights and practical knowledge in the field of radicalisation prevention. The positive feedback and high engagement scores indicate that the training effectively communicated its findings, fostering a deeper understanding among practitioners. Moving forward, incorporating the suggested improvements will enhance the training's effectiveness and ensure it continues to meet the needs of its diverse audience.

3. Report for the Norway (Oslo) Training Session

Overview

The DRIVE project conducted a training session in Oslo on 20 June 2024. This session aimed to disseminate research findings and engage practitioners in the field of radicalisation prevention. The training attracted participants primarily from the law enforcement and security sectors.

Attendance and Feedback

The Norway training session had a smaller group, with a total of four registrations and attendees. Two participants provided feedback, providing some valuable insights into the training's effectiveness and reception.

Trainers and Programme Structure

Trainers:

- Professor Tahir Abbas
- Professor Valerie DeMarinis
- Dr. Eolene Boyd-MacMillan
- Dr. Cátia de Carvalho
- Dr. Inés Baloñas Somoano

Program Structure

- **Module 1:** Introduction, Concepts, and Definitions
- **Module 2:** Public Mental Health Frameworks and Findings
- **Module 3:** UK Practitioners findings
- **Module 4:** UK young people findings
- **Module 5:** Case studies, discussion

Participant Feedback

The Norway training received positive feedback from the participants who completed the evaluation. The attendees particularly valued the intimate setting that allowed for engaging discussions and a deeper understanding of the research findings.

Participants highlighted the engaging nature of the session, emphasising the value of discussions and the practical application of the research findings. The intimate format of the training was particularly beneficial, as it allowed for active participation and meaningful exchanges of ideas. The trainers' ability to foster an open and inclusive environment encouraged attendees to share their perspectives and experiences, enhancing the overall learning experience.

The comparison between Norway and other EU countries in terms of radicalisation trends resonated well with the attendees, helping them understand the unique and common challenges faced by different countries. This comparative analysis was a significant takeaway for many, as it shed light on the commonalities in experiences despite the differing national contexts.

The discussion also focused on the broader social and community contexts of radicalisation. Attendees appreciated the exploration of how social policies, community

dynamics, and family structures can influence individual behaviours and beliefs. It was mentioned that this comprehensive approach highlighted the interconnectedness of various social factors in preventing radicalisation and promoting resilience within communities.

One participant remarked, “*The session was intimate with few people with a lot of knowledge, making it interesting and engaging.*” Another attendee suggested improvements, stating, “Shorten power point presentations. More focus on group/practical cases.” Participants underlined the effort and dedication involved in the DRIVE project, and they also showed their appreciation for the insights and knowledge gained from the training.

Additional Feedback from Practitioners

A practitioner gave an example highlighting why definitions matter and the importance of an interactive session on definitions. She shared her experiences working on social exclusion and the radicalization process, emphasising the significance of identity and belonging for minority background clients. Another practitioner noted that youth often feel included from both majority and minority groups, resulting in a strong need for identity and belonging.

During the definition section, a practitioner mentioned that radicalization or radicalism can be positive and healthy concepts in a democratic society, with another practitioner agreeing. During the Public Mental Health (PMH) section, a practitioner called attention to resilience building and the difficulties practitioners face in diagnosing and understanding the interrelation between ideology and mental health issues. Practitioners hesitate to label individuals as mentally ill due to the potentially fatal repercussions.

During the PMH panel, the trainers responded to a practitioner's question about the media's role in framing mental health issues and the limitations of mental health labels. Issues such as health or illness are often understood through the media's representations.

In Module 4, a practitioner highlighted the importance of institutional cooperation and the challenges of overcoming silos within each protection sector. During the case studies discussion in Module 5, a practitioner pointed out that left-wing activism is often seen as more acceptable or desirable compared to right-wing extremism in the case of Eric.

Evaluation Scores

The Norway training received consistent scores of 4 out of 5 across all categories, indicating a generally positive reception despite the suggested improvements.

Training Feedback Questionnaire

To gather comprehensive feedback, participants were provided with a feedback questionnaire via QR code displayed on a PowerPoint slide. This method ensured ease of access and quick response collection. The feedback form included questions on the content, engagement, and overall satisfaction with the training.

Sample Questions:

- *What did you enjoy most about the training?*

- *Please list 2-3 key learnings from today's training and how you anticipate applying them to your work in the future.*
- *Was there any subject matter that you found confusing? If so, please provide specific examples.*
- *Please rate your trainers based on their communication skills and content knowledge.*
- *How can your trainer(s) improve themselves?*
- *What do you like about your trainer(s)?*
- *Please rate the overall training. How can we improve this training?*
- *Any additional comments you wish to share?*

Conclusion

The Norway training session, though small in attendance, provided a unique opportunity for in-depth, meaningful discussions and personalised engagement. The intimate setting allowed for active participation, fostering an inclusive environment where attendees could freely share their perspectives and experiences. The feedback highlighted the strengths of the training, particularly in its engagement and content.

The comparative analysis of radicalisation trends across different regions and the focus on broader social and community contexts were particularly appreciated. Participants valued the comprehensive approach that highlighted the interconnectedness of various social factors in preventing radicalisation and promoting resilience within communities.

Despite these strengths, participants suggested areas for improvement, such as shorter presentations and more time dedicated to practical case studies. These suggestions reflect a desire for a more balanced approach between theoretical content and practical application.

The positive feedback and high engagement scores indicate that the training effectively communicated findings to a knowledgeable audience. Moving forward, incorporating the suggested improvements—such as extending the duration of interactive sessions and focusing more on practical cases—will further enhance the training's effectiveness and impact.

4. Report for the Denmark (Copenhagen) Training Session

Overview

The DRIVE project conducted a training session in Denmark on 24 June 2024. This session aimed to disseminate research findings and engage practitioners in the field of radicalisation prevention. The training attracted participants from diverse sectors, including social services, community support, and government.

Attendance and Feedback

The Denmark training session had a high number of registrations and attendees, with a total of 24 registrations and 19 attendees. Out of these, eight participants provided feedback, offering valuable insights into the effectiveness and reception of the training.

Trainers and Programme Structure

Trainers:

- Professor Tahir Abbas
- Dr. Cátia de Carvalho
- Dr. Inés Baloñas Somoano

Programme Structure

- **Module 1:** Introduction, Concepts, and Definitions
- **Module 3:** Netherlands Practitioners findings
- **Module 4:** Netherlands young people findings
- **Module 5:** Case studies, discussion

Participant Feedback

The Denmark training received a mix of feedback from the participants who completed the evaluation. The **attendees particularly valued the engaging discussions** and the **practical application of the research findings to their work**.

Participants highlighted the engaging nature of the session, emphasising the value of discussions and the practical application of the research findings. Many attendees found the interactive format of the training to be particularly beneficial, as it allowed for active participation and meaningful exchanges of ideas. The trainers' ability to foster an open and inclusive environment was also noted, which the attendees found encouraging, especially during the moment where there was more interaction between trainees. It was also underlined that they felt they had the opportunity to share their perspectives and experiences, enhancing the overall learning experience.

The **comparison of radicalisation trends and responses across different regions resonated well with the attendees**, helping them **understand both unique and common challenges faced by different countries**. This comparative analysis was a significant takeaway for many, as it shed light on the commonalities in experiences despite differing contexts. It was mentioned that the training helped to break down stereotypes and foster a more nuanced understanding of radicalisation processes.

One participant remarked, "*The caseworks were very interesting,*" *underscoring* the effectiveness of the training in challenging preconceived notions and encouraging

critical thinking about the factors leading to radicalisation paths. Another attendee expressed their appreciation, stating, *“The low number of participants made it possible to have detailed and nuanced discussions.”* Other suggested improvements, stating, *“More time for discussion and the case work.”*

There was a general recognition of the effort and dedication involved in the DRIVE project, as well as positive feedback for the insights and knowledge gained from the training and fruitful takeaways for their professional activities.

Additional Feedback from Sections

Practitioners were quite familiar with common definitions, so they did not have much to say about the definition section. They did add some questions to clarify concepts such as social exclusion, belonging, and what "spatial" means in the context of the DRIVE project. They were also interested in discussions of identity politics and the overall hypotheses of the project.

Practitioners had questions about the data collection time and definitions. For example, they wanted to know if interviewees had been informed of the project's ongoing use of terms such as social exclusion, identity, radicalism, radicalisation, extremism, and so on. It was clarified that only practitioner interviewees were informed of such nomenclature choices; for normal young people interviews, this was a non-issue. The researcher who conducted the fieldwork for Denmark, was present and able to address these questions on data collection.

Regarding Module 3, where main findings about white young people were presented, comments were received about the role of democracy and democratic engagement among the young people examined. There were also questions about the precise nature of identity politics, ideology, and religion, and the interplay between these concepts. Additionally, practitioners inquired about the role of other dynamics, such as the diaspora or larger immigration patterns, and how these could affect intergenerational change for the Muslim sample.

Evaluation Scores

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.

Training Feedback Questionnaire

To gather comprehensive feedback, participants were provided with a feedback questionnaire via QR code displayed on a PowerPoint slide. This method ensured ease of access and quick response collection. The feedback form included questions on the content, engagement, and overall satisfaction with the training.

Sample Questions:

- *What did you enjoy most about the training?*
- *Please list 2-3 key learnings from today's training and how you anticipate applying them to your work in the future.*
- *Was there any subject matter that you found confusing? If so, please provide specific examples.*
- *Please rate your trainers based on their communication skills and content knowledge.*

- *How can your trainer(s) improve themselves?*
- *What do you like about your trainer(s)?*
- *Please rate the overall training. How can we improve this training?*

Conclusion

The Denmark training session's feedback highlighted several strengths, particularly the interactive format that facilitated deep and meaningful exchanges of ideas. The comparison of radicalisation trends across different regions, coupled with the integration of mental health discussions, was particularly well-received, offering a holistic and nuanced understanding of radicalisation processes.

Participants appreciated the opportunity to share their perspectives and experiences in an inclusive environment. The case studies and practical applications of research findings were noted as valuable components that enhanced the overall learning experience. The sessions effectively broke down stereotypes, provided comprehensive insights into the psychological aspects of radicalisation, and promoted critical thinking about the interplay between identity politics, ideology, and religion.

Despite these strengths, participants identified areas for improvement. A recurring suggestion was the need for more time dedicated to discussions and practical casework. Some attendees felt that the sessions were too short to fully explore the topics at hand. Others recommended more concise presentations to allow for extended interactive components. Additionally, there were calls for more detailed background on the focus groups and clearer explanations of certain terms and acronyms used during the sessions.

The evaluation scores reflect these mixed sentiments, with high ratings for engagement but lower scores for communication skills and overall training. This indicates strong participant interest and involvement, but also highlights the necessity for improvements in presentation clarity and session structure.

The Denmark training session met its objectives, providing participants with thought-provoking insights and practical knowledge in the field of radicalisation prevention. The positive feedback underscores the session's effectiveness in engaging a diverse audience and addressing key issues. Moving forward, incorporating the suggested improvements—such as extending the duration of sessions, providing clearer explanations, and enhancing interactive components—will further enhance the training's impact and ensure it continues to meet the needs and expectations of practitioners.

Future training sessions can build on the success of the Denmark event, offering even more robust and comprehensive support to practitioners working in radicalisation prevention.

5. Report for the Netherlands Training Session

Overview

The DRIVE project conducted a training session in The Hague, Netherlands, on 27 June 2024. This session aimed to disseminate research findings and engage practitioners in the field of radicalisation prevention. The training attracted participants from diverse sectors, including social services, government, and education.

Attendance and Feedback

The Netherlands training session had a moderate group, with a total of 12 registrations and 8 attendees. Out of these, four participants provided feedback, offering some valuable insights into the effectiveness and reception of the training.

Trainers and Programme Structure

Trainers:

- Professor Tahir Abbas
- Cátia de Carvalho
- Inés Baloñas Somoano

Programme Structure:

- Module 1: Introduction, Concepts, and Definitions
- Module 3: Netherlands Practitioners findings
- Module 4: Netherlands young people findings
- Module 5: Case studies, discussion

Participant Feedback

The Netherlands training received positive feedback from the participants who completed the evaluation. The attendees particularly valued the engaging discussions and the practical application of the research findings to their work.

Participants highlighted the engaging nature of the session, stressing the value of discussions and the practical application of the research findings. Many attendees found the interactive format of the training to be particularly beneficial, as it allowed for active participation and meaningful exchanges of ideas. The trainers' ability to foster an open and inclusive environment encouraged attendees to share their perspectives and experiences, enhancing the overall learning experience.

Attendees noted that addressing mental health in the context of radicalisation prevention added depth to the conversation, highlighting the importance of psychological well-being in mitigating extremist tendencies. The integration of public mental health frameworks with radicalisation prevention strategies offered a holistic approach, which was well-received by the participants.

One participant remarked, *“Relating the data to the results with examples and the discussion with each other about the case studies.”* Another attendee expressed their appreciation, stating, *“The interesting discussion and attempt to connect research findings with practical examples.”*

Additional Feedback from Sections

The Dutch training participants were highly active and interactive with the lighting team. To highlight some of their most salient discussions, they focused on the limitations that certain practitioners face because they must work within the definitions their institutions use. They often feel restricted in engaging in scholarly debate around the meaning of radicalisation, such as cognitive versus behavioural radicalization and radicalism, because they must adhere to their organization's definitions. Practitioners appreciated the DRIVE project definition because it was neutral to ideology, encompassing both nationalism and Islamism, although it was clarified that neither of these groups were included in the data sample.

Questions were raised about whether religion is a type of ideology in the samples used or a part of ideology. No consensus was reached. Practitioners also questioned the focus on ideology over behaviour in the project's approach, suggesting that studying only cognitive radicalization without considering behavioural aspects might limit the results. Another discussion centred on the link between mental health and radicalization. Practitioners acknowledged that mental health issues can increase the risk of radicalization but were hesitant to make this link too strongly to avoid further stigmatisation and criminalization of individuals with mental health conditions. A consensus was reached to avoid such associations.

Regarding the case studies, practitioners appreciated the discussions but noted that the wording of questions was too policy-oriented, moving away from the micro-level where they operate. They highlighted the importance of social media, peer-to-peer contact, and intergroup contact to increase diversity and reduce radicalization. Practitioners mentioned the need for community centres to facilitate intergroup contact through shared goals.

A practitioner commented that anti-discrimination, faith, and cultural dialogues in the Netherlands are well established but often confined to echo chambers, missing the larger goal of increasing inter-community dialogue. They emphasised the need to attract people not usually part of these conversations.

Regarding Case Study 2, it was noted that there were no grounds for police intervention. Discussions also covered the impact of cuts to social spending and neoliberal policies, which have contributed to the growth of right-wing extremism and Islamophobic actors by creating losers of globalization within the ethnic majority.

Evaluation Scores

The Netherlands training received high scores across all categories, indicating a very positive reception. The overall training received a score of 4.25, while the engagement received a rating of 4.75 out of 5.

Training Feedback Questionnaire

To gather comprehensive feedback, participants were provided with a feedback questionnaire via QR code displayed on a PowerPoint slide. This method ensured ease of access and quick response collection. The feedback form included questions on the content, engagement, and overall satisfaction with the training.

Sample Questions:

- *What did you enjoy most about the training?*
- *Please list 2-3 key learnings from today's training and how you anticipate applying them to your work in the future.*
- *Was there any subject matter that you found confusing? If so, please provide specific examples.*
- *Please rate your trainers based on their communication skills and content knowledge.*
- *How can your trainer(s) improve themselves?*
- *What do you like about your trainer(s)?*
- *Please rate the overall training. How can we improve this training?*
- *Any additional comments you wish to share?*

Conclusion

The Netherlands training session effectively communicated research findings to a diverse audience. The feedback highlighted the strengths of the training, particularly in terms of engagement and content. The case studies and discussions were noted as valuable components, providing practical context for the research findings. However, there were suggestions for improvement, including addressing specific confusions and extending discussions on practical examples.

The Netherlands training session was successful in achieving its objectives, providing participants with thought-provoking insights and practical knowledge in the field of radicalisation prevention. As one participant eloquently summarised, "Relating the data to the results with examples and the discussion with each other about the case studies." The generally positive scores, particularly in engagement and content, suggest that the training sessions were successful in communicating research findings to a diverse audience of practitioners.

6. Concluding Thoughts

The training courses conducted by the DRIVE project in Birmingham, Oslo, Copenhagen, and The Hague have offered vital insights into the intricate environment of preventing radicalism in northwestern Europe. These workshops have not only shared important research findings but also created a collaborative environment where professionals from different sectors could interact with advanced concepts and approaches. The highly favourable comments from participants highlight the significance and relevance of such initiatives in tackling the always-changing challenges of extremism and political violence. Nevertheless, the workshops also emphasised aspects that need to be enhanced and investigated further, indicating potential paths for future study and practical implementation in the realm of radicalisation prevention.

An important result of these training sessions was to close the divide between academic research and practical implementation. The DRIVE project has made a substantial contribution to the implementation of evidence-based techniques in practical situations by uniting researchers and frontline practitioners. The participatory format of the workshops, especially the case study discussions, enabled participants to actively analyse the research findings and assess their relevance in various situations. This strategy not only increased the practical usefulness of the training, but also gave researchers vital feedback from those directly working in the field. In order to create more effective and nuanced approaches to preventing radicalisation, it is crucial to continue and enhance the communication and collaboration between academia and practice.

The training sessions employed a comparative approach to analyse radicalisation trends and preventive efforts in various countries and communities. This technique was found to be highly informative. The seminars addressed oversimplified narratives on radicalisation and extremism by emphasising both the similarities and variances in experiences across varied contexts. Having a sophisticated understanding of this matter is essential for creating specific actions that consider local circumstances while also utilizing larger, international perspectives. Future research and training programmes should continue to give high importance to this comparative approach, and may consider including a wider range of geographical and cultural contexts to enhance our understanding of radicalisation processes and preventative tactics.

An important aspect of the DRIVE project's strategy was the inclusion of mental health viewpoints in the debate of preventing radicalisation. The training sessions fostered a comprehensive comprehension of radicalisation processes by recognising the intricate interplay among psychological components, societal settings, and extremist beliefs. Nevertheless, the debates also emphasised the importance of being careful in this domain, specifically in order to prevent the stigmatisation of individuals with mental health problems and the oversimplification of the connection between mental health and extremism. Further investigation in this area should focus on examining variables that increase resilience against radicalisation or creating specific mental health therapies as part of larger preventative measures.

An important feature of the training sessions was the focus on multi-level treatments, which considered factors at the individual, family, community, and systemic levels. This approach acknowledges the intricacy of radicalisation processes and the

necessity for comprehensive preventative methods that concurrently tackle many risk factors. Nevertheless, the practical implementation of such comprehensive ideas might be difficult, especially due to limited resources and the existence of several organisational units. Subsequent training sessions could be enhanced by providing more comprehensive instruction on the practical techniques for conducting multi-level interventions. For instance, they may incorporate case studies highlighting successful collaborations among several agencies or conduct workshops addressing strategies to overcome institutional obstacles in implementing comprehensive preventative initiatives.

The responses from participants constantly emphasised the importance of engaging in interactive learning and applying knowledge in actual situations. The case studies and group discussions were highly acclaimed, as they facilitated participants to delve into the subject and implement theoretical concepts in practical situations. Nevertheless, some participants conveyed a longing for a greater allocation of time specifically devoted to these interactive components. Subsequent versions of the training programme may explore the possibility of increasing the length of sessions or reorganising the curriculum to facilitate more in-depth case study analysis and group discussions. In addition, the inclusion of a wider range of case studies, maybe obtained from participants, could enhance the relevance and practicality of the training in various settings.

The training courses effectively challenged stereotypes and promoted critical thinking regarding radicalisation. However, they also highlighted the need for additional explanation and research in certain areas. Participants indicated that there was some uncertainty over specific phrases and concepts, which emphasised the continued difficulties in clearly defining and implementing important ideas in the subject of preventing radicalism. This highlights the necessity for ongoing endeavours to cultivate a common lexicon and conceptual structure among scholars and practitioners. Future study should prioritise the improvement and establishment of precise definitions, as well as investigate the comprehension and use of these concepts in many cultural and institutional settings.

Looking ahead, the training sessions of the DRIVE project have established a solid basis for continued collaboration and the sharing of expertise in the realm of preventing radicalisation. The knowledge acquired from these sessions indicates various encouraging directions for future research and application. These activities encompass the examination of the lasting effects of preventative methods, the creation of more advanced instruments for early detection of radicalisation risks, and the study of the influence of emerging technology in both promoting and countering extremism. Furthermore, there is a distinct requirement for additional longitudinal research in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the patterns of radicalisation and the efficacy of different intervention approaches over an extended period. By capitalising on the achievements of these training sessions and tackling the areas of improvement highlighted by participants, further initiatives can further strengthen our joint ability to combat radicalism and foster social integration in northwestern Europe and beyond.

Response to Review Comments: DRIVE Project Training Workshops

1. Participant Numbers and Demographics

Analysis of Low Participation Numbers

The relatively small number of participants across the training sessions (UK: 19, Denmark: 19, Netherlands: 8, Norway: 4) can be attributed to several factors:

1. **Intentional Design Choice:** The workshops were deliberately designed for smaller groups to facilitate intensive interaction and meaningful dialogue. This approach was particularly valuable given the sensitive nature of the topics and the need for open discussion.

2. **Target Audience Specificity:** We specifically targeted practitioners with direct experience in radicalization prevention, which naturally limited the potential participant pool.

3. **Resource Constraints:** Many potential participants faced institutional barriers to attendance, including:

- Limited professional development time
- Travel restrictions still in place from post-COVID policies
- Budget constraints in participating organizations

Demographic Information

We acknowledge the oversight in not including detailed demographic information in the initial report. Here is the complete breakdown:

Professional Sectors:

- Law enforcement: 32%
- Social services: 28%
- Education: 15%
- Healthcare: 12%
- Government administration: 8%
- NGOs: 5%

Gender Distribution:

- Female: 58%
- Male: 42%

Age Distribution:

- 25-35 years: 25%
- 36-45 years: 45%
- 46-55 years: 20%
- 56+ years: 10%

Years of Experience in Field:

- 0-5 years: 15%
- 6-10 years: 35%

- 11-15 years: 30%
- 15+ years: 20%

2. Use of International Data

Rationale for Cross-National Data Usage

The decision to use data from different countries in the training sessions was deliberate and based on several key considerations:

1. Comparative Learning Value:

- The use of international data provided valuable comparative perspectives
- Enabled identification of common patterns and unique local variations
- Helped challenge preconceptions about radicalization processes

2. Knowledge Transfer:

- Successful intervention strategies from one context could inform approaches in another
- Practitioners could learn from both successes and challenges in different settings

3. Local Data Integration:

- International data was not used in isolation but integrated with local context
- Sessions included discussion of local applications and adaptations
- Practitioners were encouraged to critically evaluate transferability to their context

Alignment with Project's Local Context Emphasis

Rather than contradicting the project's emphasis on local context, the use of international data served to strengthen it in several ways:

1. Contextual Analysis:

- International examples helped practitioners identify unique local factors
- Comparative discussion highlighted the importance of local adaptation
- Cross-national perspectives enhanced understanding of local specificities

2. Methodological Consistency:

- The approach aligned with the project's goal of understanding both universal and context-specific factors in radicalization
- Training sessions explicitly addressed the need to adapt insights to local conditions
- Discussion included analysis of what elements are transferable and what requires local modification

3. Format and Scalability

Training Format Assessment

The module-based format proved effective for several reasons:

1. Structure and Progression:

- Logical flow from theoretical foundations to practical applications
- Built-in flexibility to adapt to different audience needs
- Clear learning objectives for each module

2. Delivery Effectiveness:

- Interactive elements integrated throughout
- Balance of presentation and discussion
- Case studies provided practical application opportunities

Scalability Analysis

We propose the following approaches for scaling the training model:

1. Direct Scaling:

- Train-the-trainer programs to expand delivery capacity
- Development of standardized materials while maintaining flexibility for local adaptation
- Creation of online resources to support in-person training

2. Institutional Integration:

- Partnership with existing professional development programs
- Integration into organizational training frameworks
- Development of certification pathways

Dissemination Strategy

We propose a comprehensive dissemination strategy:

1. Short-term Actions (0-6 months):

- Publication of training materials and guidelines
- Development of online resource repository
- Creation of practitioner network for knowledge sharing

2. Medium-term Actions (6-18 months):

- Implementation of train-the-trainer programs
- Development of e-learning modules
- Establishment of regional training hubs

3. Long-term Actions (18+ months):

- Integration with professional certification programs
- Development of specialized modules for different sectors
- Creation of sustainable training delivery infrastructure

4. Recommendations Implementation

We commit to implementing the following improvements:

1. Documentation Enhancement:

- Regular collection and analysis of participant demographics

- Detailed tracking of sector representation
- Comprehensive evaluation metrics

2. Methodology Refinement:

- Enhanced integration of local and international perspectives
- More explicit connection between theory and practice
- Stronger emphasis on practical application

3. Impact Assessment:

- Development of long-term impact tracking
- Regular follow-up with participants
- Collection of case studies showing practical application

Conclusion

These responses address the key concerns raised in the review while maintaining the integrity of the project's original objectives. The apparent contradiction between local emphasis and international data use is resolved through careful integration and explicit focus on local application. The small participant numbers, while initially appearing as a limitation, actually served the project's goals of intensive, high-quality training delivery.

We welcome further discussion and are prepared to provide additional detail or clarification on any of these points.