

University of Groningen

Resilience in radicalization prevention

Gruber, Barbara

DOI:
[10.33612/diss.675764944](https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.675764944)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2023

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Gruber, B. (2023). *Resilience in radicalization prevention: a study about resilience as a norm in primary and secondary prevention in Germany and the Netherlands*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. University of Groningen. <https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.675764944>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Interview List

Interview 1, NL, 18/03/2019
 Interview 1/2, NL, 16/04/2020, online questionnaire
 Interview 2, NL, 03/04/2019
 Interview 3, NL, 12/04/2019
 Interview 4, NL, 12/04/2019
 Interview 5, NL, 16/04/2019
 Interview 6, BE, 30/04/2019
 Interview 7, BE, 30/04/2019
 Interview 8, BE, 02/05/2019
 Interview 9, BE, 27/04/2019, online questionnaire
 Interview 10, GE, 17/09/2019
 Interview 11, GE, 18/09/2019
 Interview 12, GE, 23/09/2019
 Interview 13, GE, 23/09/2019
 Interview 14, GE, 24/09/2019
 Interview 15, GE, 24/09/2019
 Interview 16, GE, 24/09/2019
 Interview 17, GE, 24/09/2019
 Interview 18, GE, 25-9-2019;
 Interview 19, GE, 25/9/2019
 Interview 20, GE, 27/09/2019
 Interview 21, GE, 18/10/2019, online
 Interview 22, NL, 03/02/2020
 Interview 23, NL, 06/02/2020
 Interview 24, NL, 26/02/2020
 Interview 25, NL, 09/03/2020
 Interview 26, NL, 30/03/2020, phone
 Interview 27, NL, 09/04/2020, online
 Interview 28, NL, 21/04/2020, online (2 persons)
 Interview 29, NL, 23/04/2020, online (2 persons)
 Interview 30, NL, 29/05/2020, phone
 Interview 31, NL, 24/06/2020, online
 Interview 32, NL, 17/07/2020, online
 Interview 33, NL, 22/07/2020, online
 Interview 34, GE, 13/10/2020, online (2 persons)
 Interview 35, GE, 14/10/2020, online

Interview 36, GE, 16/10/2020, online
Interview 37, GE, 11/11/2020, online (2 persons)
Interview 38, NL, 25/11/2020, online
Interview 39, GE, 09/12/2020, online questionnaire
Interview 40, NL, 22/01/2021, online

Email correspondence with the author Gemeente Rotterdam 17.2.2020

Police Counter Extremisme and Terrorisme Training (CETR) participation, NL, 12-13/02/2020

Annex 1: PhD Outline send to Interviewees

The Radicalization-Resilience Complex
Barbara Gruber (b.a.gruber@rug.nl)



rijksuniversiteit
 groningen

The conceptualization of radicalization as being a linear process that might end in violence has led to widespread radicalization prevention measures. The same measures such as resilience building for early prevention, through psycho-social trainings for youngsters and the installation of multi-agency panels to screen for the signals of radicalization, are introduced throughout Europe. But those measures have different consequences depending on the context they are embedded in.

The current networking between the social sector (youth and social work as well as health care), the security sector (police and law enforcement) and the local administration in the field of radicalization prevention has led scholars to argue that a “securitization of social policy” is taking place. Securitization means in this context, that the social sector and the local administration are increasingly working with the methods and practices towards the objectives of the security sector. This has a negative impact on the work and the objectives of the social sector. But increasingly also the social sector develops its own methods and practices to prevent radicalization and to deal with the allegedly radicalized. This leads to the question if there is also a socialization of the security sector.

This dissertation asks, how radicalization prevention following a resilience approach leads to a securitization of social policy, or might lead to a socialization of security policies. Through interviews with practitioners, in four sites, insight is gained into what resilience building actually entails and means. Four cities were chosen: two in the Netherlands (Den Haag and Groningen) and two in Germany (Augsburg and Duesseldorf) to compare the approaches of resilience building through two practices: psycho-social trainings (e.g. Bounce – resilience training for youngsters) and multi-agency panels in which the social and the security sector are working together to screen and evaluate radicalization processes. The cities were chosen according to their radicalization risk level: two of them have a high risk level, two have a comparatively low risk level.

The aim is to show a) how security-driven and how social-driven approaches to prevention can be characterized and b) how this changes the meaning of resilience.

Annex 2: Anonymity and Confidentiality Information Sheet

Anonymity and Confidentiality Information



rijksuniversiteit
 groningen

I can guarantee Confidentiality:

- No third parties will have access to the interview
- That the interviews will only be used for my dissertation and possible publications
- Instead of referring to you by name I can quote the interview as “Interview 14, date, place”
- Instead of naming your profession I can refer to you as “policy expert”, “social worker”, “security expert” etc.
- Instead of naming your organization I can call the organization “Organisation Z”

But I cannot guarantee full Anonymity

- full anonymity means to erase all identity markers, so that the collected data can under no circumstances be traced back to an individual and/or an organisation

Because:

- that means no location identity marker – but I write a country and city comparison, therefore the location is important
- because you are not part of a random sample, but part of a specific sample
- To exemplify: due to for example the particular focus (religion, extremism, radicalization etc.) of your organization it might be possible to get an inclination about which organization I am talking about – thus for people with enough knowledge of the field it is possible to detect the organization.
- However, it should be hard to find out who you are as an individual

Of course, it is also an option to give either your name or organization or both!

You can of course change your opinion after the interview or make your decision afterwards!

Annex 3– Primary Prevention Questionnaire

Kick-off	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do you define the goals of your work? What is the purpose of a youth centre? 2. How did you come to participate in a radicalisation prevention training? 3. Was it voluntary? 4. How is the training relevant for your work? Do you use it to prevent radicalisation? Or is it also useful for other problems or areas?
Prevention	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Do you consider prevention to be part of your work and What does prevention mean for you?
Radicalisation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Is radicalisation actually a problem in your area of work? 7. How can you recognise a process of radicalisation? How does a radicalisation process look like? 8. Did you take part in a ,recognising the signs of radicalisation' training? 9. Was this part of BOUNCE? 10. Do you remember what were the signs and did you find the training useful? (or do you think something could be improved, or do you disagree about some parts because of your own experiences?) 11. Are you aware that you are supposed to be alert and recognize the signs of radicalisation? And that you are supposed to report them? 12. Would you know what are the next steps if you have a suspicion? Would you know where to get information from? Or whom to call? Or would you talk first to the person in question? 13. Are you using a database? Are you using databases on a general basis or is it just for radicalisation? Do you know who else has access to those databases?)
Trust	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. Do you have an opinion to that procedure? Do you think that this has a negative impact on your relation of trust with your clients? Do you think this has a negative impact on the idea that a youth centre is a safe space? 15. Do you feel comfortable about being part of the counter-terrorism effort? Why do you think it is your responsibility as a social worker to

prevent radicalisation – or do you think it is actually not your task? Is this something abnormal for you, or does radicalisation prevention fit into your normal stream of work? Or is radicalisation prevention rather something you would want the police to carry out?

16. Theoretically speaking, what happens if there is a youngster in your care and he or she plans an attack – who is responsible? Might be you be held responsible for not recognising the signs?

Resilience

17. What is your idea of resilience? How does resilience look like?
18. How can you make someone resilient? How can you teach resilience?
19. Why is it important in relation to radicalisation prevention? Or is resilience in general an important characteristic to have?
20. In your opinion, is resilience an individual quality or do people need support in order to be resilient?
21. Why is it positive to be resilient?

End

22. Do you want to add something that you think is important?
-

Annex 4 – Secondary Prevention Questionnaire

Kick-Off

Veiligheidshuiz 1. Since when and why is the Veiligheidshuis responsible for radicalisation prevention?

Radicalisation 2. What was your role in radicalisation prevention?

Prevention

3. Just approximately how many radicalisation cases do you have and since when?

4. Why did you take on this new field – how does it differ from your other areas of work?

5. How are you collaborating with the local government?

Prevention

6. What does prevention mean for you?

7. Did you come across resilience? What does resilience mean for you?

8. Why is resilience relevant for your work?

Entering the case approach

9. How does a case become a case?

10. Who assesses the signals? Do you have an advisory role?

11. How do individuals formally enter the case approach?

12. Are they informed about being a case?

Assessments

13. Which signals would you say are really significant? How do you assess radicalisation?

14. Do you use a specific assessment instrument like the IR 46 or VERA 2R?

15. What is your opinion of using assessment tools in multi-disciplinary settings? Do different professions assess cases differently and if so how?

Data

16. Do you use databases? Which one?

17. Who has access to the data? Do all parties have access to the data?

Case Tables

18. How do radicalisation cases differ from other cases?

19. Which professions are on radicalisation prevention tables?

20. What is the role of the NCTV/AIVD?

21. Can you elaborate on how joint assessment works? How do you decide on interventions?

Approaches and	22. What are Taylor made approaches?
Interventions	23. What forms can interventions take?
	24. Why is resilience important? How is resilience part of these interventions?
	25. (Do you make a difference between minors and adults?)
	26. Are people aware they are in the case approach? How are they informed? How do they react? Can they object?

End	27. What is the end of case management? When is an individual dismissed?
	28. How do you measure success? Does resilience play a role?
	29. Who is responsible if violence occurs? – although this individual is in case management?

Problems	30. From what I have gathered from the methods and approach of social work, the relationship and trust are important – if people are involuntarily entered into case management does that generate an obstacle for your work? How does that impact resilience?
----------	--

END	31. Do you want to add something that you think is important?
-----	---

English Summary

Resilience made its entrance into security studies around the mid-2000s and was thoroughly discussed in relation to counter-terrorism, disaster management, cyber security and national security (Walker and Cooper, 2011; Joseph, 2013; Collier and Lakoff, 2015; Zebrowski, 2016). More recently resilience became a topic in relation to radicalisation prevention, putting scholars in front of the same problem as in the aforementioned security fields: the meaning of resilience is elusive (Wimelius *et al.*, 2018; Jore, 2020; Stephens and Sieckelinck, 2020). I argue that resilience in relation to radicalisation prevention is serving as a norm. Resilience and radicalisation are two ends of a continuum in which resilience marks individuals who are not radicalised and hence normal, and radicalised marks those who are deviant. Accordingly, radicalisation prevention tries to normate individuals and normalize populations to prevent deviance from emerging by pre-emptively constructing an ideal – the resilient subject. In contrast to the above mentioned contexts in which resilience was studied, resilience in radicalisation prevention introduces a different disciplinary background, psychology, which changes the mode and meaning of normalisation (cf. Hardy 2015).

This dissertation is a focused analysis of psychological resilience in the realm of security governance. I offer a reading of resilience which is not emphasizing the similarities of ecological, engineering and psychological resilience, but rather the differences. In this regard, I trace the productive role of the psy-sciences in governmentality to show how the psy-sciences, nowadays through resilience, order and discipline the mentalities of populations and individuals in relation to radicalization prevention in the Netherlands and Germany. I analyze the governance through resilience in radicalization prevention through the lens of “affective governmentality” (Penz and Sauer, 2020). Affective governmentality allows me to show the micro-regulation through psychological resilience and that it targets the emotions and psychological states of subjects. I illustrate that the governance through psychological resilience forms part of Foucault’s conception of “social defence” (Foucault, 2003). Social defence designates that society must be defended from dangerous individuals, inextricably linking the psy sciences to security (cf. Howell, 2011). Enhancing resilience and correcting individuals who are not resilient are ordering practices not only to ensure security, but to enhance security (Howell, 2011, p. 48).

The Critical Security Studies literature about resilience so far argued mainly that resilience is a replacement of security, because the state shifts the responsibility of security onto the citizen (Walker and Cooper, 2011; Joseph, 2013; Zebrowski, 2016) and societalizes security (Chandler, 2013). Regarding resilience in radicalization prevention, I inquire this claim

because potentially dangerous subjects cannot be left to govern themselves, rather they are woven into a tight administration of social control, care and surveillance to normalize them. Security concerns thereby spilled over more intensely into policy fields usually outside the realm of counter-terrorism, such as social and youth work, health care, and education which was dubbed “the securitization of social policy” (Mythen, Walklate and Peatfield, 2017; Ragazzi, 2017; Jukschat and Leimbach, 2019). Rather than only outsourcing the responsibility of governing the radicalized, these professions become more tightly integrated to security, and rendering resilience into a governance of increased social control, to “regulate social deviance” and “to create risk-averse citizens who are also virtuous” (Amery, 2019, p. 364) through administrations of care. Therefore, the role of resilience is ambiguous in this process: as much as it is an enhancement of security in state policies, as much it is used to counteract a threat perspective from these professions who suddenly found themselves as part of the counter-terrorism effort. Hence, the question if security is replaced through psychological resilience in this context warrants an investigation.

Following Joseph’s (2018) argument about “varieties of resilience”, I argue that country contexts matter regarding an investigation into the meaning and governance through resilience. In this dissertation I engage with how resilience emerged in the Netherlands and Germany as a governance of radicalization. In addition to a policy analysis focusing on the emergence of resilience in relation to radicalization and extremism prevention policies of both countries, I also conducted 40 interviews with practitioners and policy makers in the field of primary and secondary prevention. To my knowledge, this is the first study composed of field research and policy analysis engaging with resilience in radicalization prevention.

I chose the Netherlands and Germany as cases to show varieties of resilience. While resilience in relation to radicalization prevention derives from a psychological norm, radicalization and extremism prevention policies imbue resilience with further meaning. In this dissertation I engage with how resilience emerged in the Netherlands and Germany as a governance of radicalization. In both countries, radicalization hinges on what is constituted as societal norm, as a particular standard of what is still permissible in a liberal democratic society. Thus, the conditions under which these regimes of practices emerged were different.

In the Netherlands, radicalization is understood against the backdrop of a growing disquietude with multiculturalism, and the perceived threat this constitutes for societal cohesion. Particularly in relation to the UK’s Counter-terrorism policies, radicalization as a deviancy from British values (Martin, 2019). I contribute to this debate by showing through the Dutch case, that psychological resilience is part of a more disciplinary governance. In this disciplinary governance, resilience is particularly targeting the affective relationship of supposedly radicalizing subjects to Dutch society and its values. Simultaneously, the

governance through resilience also works through affects, as concern and worry are proposed to be the main drivers for governing supposedly radicalizing subjects in a disciplinary fashion.

Germany provides a contrasting approach, to both the UK and the Netherlands as Joseph (2018, p. 49) notes with regards to Germany: “it is noticeable there is none of the ‘our values’ rhetoric or ‘resilience of the nation’ characteristic of US, British and French national security discourse”. Rather, Germany is oriented towards its distinct past and radicalization prevention forms part of a defense of its constitution (Berczyk and Vermeulen, 2015). Radicalization is understood as a deviation from democracy, threatening the constitution of the state against which the state must be protected. As such radicalization is a failure of proper democratization of the individual and society alike, and must be addressed on the societal as well as on the individual level. The radicalization discourse of the UK and the Netherlands was only introduced in 2016, and was adapted for this particular understanding of failed democratization. I contribute through the Germany case, that a governance through resilience can correspond to democratization, addressing the individual and society alike. Nonetheless, also in relation to Germany, a governance through resilience particularly targets the affective relations of supposedly radicalizing subjects.

Against the backdrop of these two countries, I engage with two practices of how subjects are governed through resilience. These practices correspond to primary and secondary prevention. Primary and secondary prevention are differentiations indicating that radicalization prevention is based on public health models of prevention, differentiating between the temporal aspect and the target group of prevention (Heath-Kelly, 2017). Primary prevention aims to prevent the outbreak of a disease before it occurs and targets the whole population (e.g. vaccination campaigns). Secondary prevention aims at reducing the impact of a disease for at-risk groups and tries to intervene in the process to prevent long-term issues. Regarding primary prevention I engage with a program called “Bounce – Resilience Training for Youngsters” which was implemented both in Germany and the Netherlands. Regarding secondary prevention I engage with individual case management for subjects assessed to be in a process of radicalization in the respective countries. The research objectives with regard to these two practices are a) to show how resilience is enacted and if the resilient subject as envisioned by practitioners corresponds to the resilient subject envisioned in the respective policies and b) to inquire the ambiguous role of the enhancement or contestation of security through resilience.

Regarding primary prevention, I followed the program “Bounce – Resilience Training for Youngsters” to two places of its implementation, namely Augsburg and Groningen (located in Germany and the Netherlands). This training is relevant for the research objective of

this dissertation, because it is indicative of a psychological understanding of resilience. I analyze the program through a lens of affective governmentality because it works through emotions and on emotions. Bounce teaches young people emotional literacy, because self-esteem, self-efficacy and the potential for emotional self-regulation is supposed to render young people able to psychologically withstand radicalization. In studies about resilience, resilience was often critiqued for being responsabilizing (Joseph, 2016; Altermark and Nilsson, 2018). While I also show that in this instance psychological resilience is meant as responsabilization of young people to care for their own resilience to withstand radicalization, the field research illustrates that this responsabilization is contested. First, my interviews with Bounce practitioners in both locations show that resilience is used to contest the growing securitization of the social sector (in this case social and youth work) through radicalization prevention. Bounce practitioners use resilience to push for their own understanding of prevention, which focuses on relational engagement, support and care for the Bounce training participants. This relational understanding of resilience contests the responsabilization critique. Second, I relate the interviewees perspectives to the national policies, illustrating that resilience as democratization is prevalent in Germany, while in the Netherlands there is critique towards the responsabilization of individuals with regards to resilience in radicalization prevention. Both local settings illustrate that country contexts matter, but also that practitioners contest and critique their respective prevention policies.

Regarding secondary prevention, I inquired into the respective country programs dealing with supposedly radicalizing individuals. In recent years so called early intervention programs emerged especially in Europe (for an inquiry into the origins see Heath-Kelly and Shanaáh, 2022). Scholars scrutinize these programs suspiciously because they operate in the so called “pre-crime space”, as no punishable offence has occurred. Multi-agency settings, for example consisting of the police, social services, and psychiatry are now also engaged with finding appropriate measures for individuals to be assessed as at-risk of radicalizing (Hardyns *et al.*, 2021; Sivenbring and Malmros, 2021). I contribute to these studies through a) inquiring into the role of psychological resilience in these settings, and b) inquiring into the question of securitization. Resilience in this context aims at the correction and rehabilitation of individuals to restore order and security. Resilience serves as a correction, meaning that potentially dangerous individuals are intervened upon not only to protect them, but to protect society. In this regard, resilience unfolds its full disciplinary-normative effect, it serves as a prescriptive norm through which individuals can be qualified and assessed, and serves as a standard to which these individuals shall be restored (Foucault, 2003a, p. 50). In this individualized engagement with deviating subjects, resilience is administered through disciplinary and pastoral power. Again, country contexts show varieties of resilience, as in the Netherlands resilience is more aligned with self-sufficiency, while in Germany resilience is more aligned with democracy. Nonetheless, in both settings, resilience unfolds its normating

potential through the recurrence to health. Resilience must be restored in order to render subjects into healthy members of society again. In this instance of a governance through resilience, resilience serves as an enhancement of security, because it justifies a corrective intervention through the recurrence to restoring health, as these interventions are taking place in the pre-crime space.

To conclude, liberal governments is put in front of a paradox: how to govern deviating individuals, within a liberal setting? Blunt coercion, like re-education is hardly an option, without betraying the very fundamentals of a liberal society. While criminals are supposed to be rehabilitated, juvenile delinquents corrected, the mentally abnormal treated and cured, the radicalizing pose a somewhat different problem to liberalism, as they are a threat to the political order, in which freedom of thought and speech are fundamental cornerstones. I show in this dissertation how these populations and individuals were turned into a matter of care and discipline. The current conceptualization of radicalization enables a psychologization of political dissent and rather than engaging with radicalization on a political, structural or societal level, radicalization can be reduced to a matter of the individual psyche, to affective relations to society and the self. I show how in both countries psychological resilience emerged as an answer to this conceptualization of radicalization. Furthermore, I engage with these processes of subjectivation in detail, because field research allows to engage with these processes on a deeper level, exhibiting the micro-regulation of social control generated through resilience. This exposes the normating and normalizing character of these interventions, and illustrates how security is enhanced through resilience. While particularly the policy analysis illustrates that this is a considerable enhancement of security, enabling more intense surveillance of the pre-crime space, the field research also shows how practitioners take up resilience, how they appropriate and re-signify resilience, to counter this securitization.

Biography

Barbara Gruber studied International Development at the University of Vienna. Her MA thesis was about the Colombian conflict. She spent four months of field research in Colombia and published her findings, together with Jan Pospisil, in *Small Wars & Insurgencies*. From 2015-2017 she was a research fellow at the Austrian Institute for International Affairs. Subsequently she became a PhD candidate at the International Relations and Security Studies Department at the University of Groningen. In 2022 she also worked as a docent at the University of Groningen and as a Teach@Tübingen Fellow at the University of Tübingen. Currently, she works at the research cluster “Counter-Terrorism, Prevention of Violent Extremism and Intelligence” at the University for Continuing Education Krems. She is editor, together with Charlotte Heath-Kelly, of “Vulnerability: Governing the social through security politics”.