We are IntechOpen,
the world's leading publisher of
Open Access books
Built by scientists, for scientists

6,700
Open access books available

182,000
International authors and editors

195M
Downloads

Our authors are among the

154
Countries delivered to

TOP 1%
most cited scientists

12.2%
Contributors from top 500 universities

Interested in publishing with us?
Contact book.department@intechopen.com

Numbers displayed above are based on latest data collected.
For more information visit www.intechopen.com

Chapter

Radicalization: An Educational Approach

Claudio Melacarne and Marina Slavutzky

Abstract

This chapter aims to discuss the possibility of applying educational principles of Transformative Learning Theory to understand and eventually prevent violent radicalization. To begin, keywords – radicalization, extremism, and terrorism – are briefly presented to draw and limit the spaces usable for understanding this complex debate. Next, some space is dedicated to the correlation between Transformative Learning Theory and radicalization. Finally, a short biography is used as a case study to describe how everyday life can generate an environment where people can learn how to think radically and eventually risk transforming these thoughts into violent acts.

Keywords: radicalization, terrorism, extremism, education, transformative learning

1. Introduction

The current study aims to bring together two traditions of research: "radicalization and terrorism studies" and Transformative Learning Theory. In the first field, extensive literature has been developed in the last decades addressing primarily the comprehension of terrorist phenomena, the role of public policies, dominant cultures, policy measures, and economic systems [1]. Although radicalization has increasingly been subjected to scientific studies, a universally accepted definition of the concept has not been developed yet. In the next section, some space will be dedicated to the definition of radicalization, extremism, and terrorism.

Even if the first years of research have been dominated mostly by a security approach, lately many scholars have switched the attention to education and primary prevention, and in this domain adult learning studies have also become increasingly involved in understanding radicalization phenomena. Studies with a psycho-educational background have allowed the focus to be shifted from ways to predict terrorist acts through intelligence strategies or the gathering of data thought to be predictable "signs" of violent behavior, to ways to strengthen the resilience of the most vulnerable individuals, support communities in avoiding divisive public discourse, and provide training to educators and social workers on how to manage cultural diversity.

Under the lens of Transformative Learning Theory [2], it is possible to conceptualize radicalization as a process of perspective transformation. In the realm of adult education, Transformative Learning Theory emerged as a theory and approach to foster inclusive thinking by elevating experience and validating prior learning —or creating new ones— that enable us to face novel circumstances. Within this approach,

radicalization might be viewed as a type of pre-critical thinking [3]. The theories of adult learning actually make it possible to de-ideologize the word "radicalization" and to consider how a preventative educational approach could be able to stop this process from deviating in the direction of extremist or even terrorist action [4].

After analyzing some contributions from both of these traditions, the present study brings up an excerpt from an individual's personal history as a case of a lifepath that has undergone stages of radicalization, sometimes close to violent radicalization, yet without ever escalating direct violence nor terrorism. This story certainly has no value in terms of generality and transferability, but it is an interesting example of how educational studies can make an important contribution in terms of understanding the phenomenon and prevention.

2. Radicalization, extremism and terrorism

A first terminological clarification concerns the occasional use of the term radicalization, since it is noted and agreed that currently there is no universally accepted definition of this concept in the academic world and at the institutional level. The term "radicalization" has been used for many social phenomena in the past decades, but the meaning we know now has a recent origin [5]. Before 2001 the term had been used to refer to a shift toward more radical politics, with no specific reference to religion. By 2004, the term had acquired a new meaning and several studies focused on the way Muslims may adopt radical and extremist positions [6]. In the last years, researches with multiple disciplinary perspectives have been developed.

The word radicalization derives from the Latin term *radicalis* and refers to "root." It has been used therefore in the past as a botanical metaphor, in order to name a process that takes toward the roots and causes of a concept or a thing. During the last decades, the word has been used in many different ways and frequently also as a synonym of violent extremism or terrorism.

As a political expression, "radical" was used for the first time in 1797 in Great Britain, when Charles James Fox made a speech about the need to proceed with "radical reforms," meaning to go straight forward to the root causes of social problems and act to develop a profound change [7]. During the following decades, and also due to the consequences of the French Revolution and of the establishment of industrial society, "radical" has been used in the political world, but since the beginning, the use of violence was questioned. In other words, many used to wonder if it was possible to achieve huge social changes in a peaceful way or not.

In the 19th century, the radical movements were mostly non-violent activists, like the suffragettes in the late 19th and early 20th century. Their demonstrative public actions were considered by institutions illegal, but not illegitimate. In fact, some of the 19th century radical demands have become mainstream entitlements today. At that time, "radical" referred primarily to liberal, anti-clerical, pro-democratic, and progressive political positions [8].

As Sedwick points out, the meaning of "radical" is related to social context and the notion of what is "normal," "moderate," or "mainstream." These meanings change over time and they define the landscape within radicalization that could be understood and accepted [5].

In contrast to the term's use in research on political and social sciences, in which the relational dynamics in processes of escalation from individual to collective level had been underlined, "radicalization" more recently has been described as the gradual

adoption of extremist ideas that promote and could lead to acts of terrorism with a particular attention to individual cognitive and ideological transformation [9].

One question that is raised by many authors who study radicalization is about its relation to violence. Some include violence in their general definition – for example, Doosje and colleagues [10] define it as a process through which people become increasingly motivated to use violent means against members of an out-group or symbolic targets to achieve behavioral change and political goals. Della Porta [11] gives a similar description when she defines it as a process of escalation from nonviolent to increasingly violent repertoires of action that develops through a complex set of interactions unfolding over time.

Radicalization studies use a large range of approaches, from studies focused on religious ideology to more complex models based on social and psychological theories on radicalization. Instead of religious beliefs by themselves driving individuals to violence, many of the new perspectives agree with the idea that ideology becomes more extreme in response to a "cognitive opening," an "identity crisis" or a "group bonding" process [12].

Antonelli [7] brings up two main definitions made during a panel of 21 European experts organized within the project "Horizon 2020 Trivalent." First of all, radicalization could be considered as a socialization process through which a person adopts a paranoic vision of the world and of politics. This process occurs after the interiorization of an extremist ideology that legitimizes the violent or terrorist action. In this sense, there are some similarities that could be drawn with becoming part of a sect, such as the gradual distancing of previous social bonds and the establishment of totalitarian connections with people who share the same vision. In addition to this, the experts pointed out that radicalization can also be seen as a recruiting process and as political participation. In this sense, radicalization is a process through which people build bounds and belong to an organized universe. Radicalization therefore would be a way of non-conventional political participation in which violence has an expressive and instrumental role.

Another important aspect of the definition of radicalization processes is the difference between the terms action and cognition. McCauley and Moskalenko distinguish "opinion" or "cognitive" radicalization from "action" or "violent" radicalization. The first type is connected to cognitive commitment to radical ideas, while the second would lead people to act on these radical ideas [13]. Similarly, Malthaner & Lindekilde define radicalization as a composite process, made of cognitive radicalization, changes in activist practices, and relational mechanisms that interact in complex ways [14].

Some authors adopted terms like "violent radicalization" or "radicalization leading to violence," and others use it together with "violent extremism." Brouillette-Allarie and colleagues define violent radicalization as a non-linear process by which an individual or group undergoes systemic transformations that legitimize them to support or facilitate the use of violence [15].

Schmid reminds us that "radical" people are not violent per se, and although they may share some characteristics with extremists, such as isolation, anger, and feelings of discrimination, there are also important differences. For example, radicalization often assumes the ability to accept discursive dialectics as a method of seeking a solution or pursuing a political goal or, in general, a transformation of the status quo. The radical person contemplates the possibility of constructing a space in which there are also differences and can apply critical thinking to his or her own perspective. Consequently, a radical attitude does not necessarily result in violent behavior.

The author tries to distinguish radicalization from extremism by focusing on pluralism. He explains that extremists can be characterized as political actors who tend to disregard the rule of law and reject pluralism in society, as in historical perspectives, such as Fascism or Communism. According to this approach, extremists are involved in actions finalized to make society conformist by suppressing all opposition and subjugating minorities, and this would distinguish them from mere radicals who accept diversity and believe in the power of reason rather than dogma [8, 16].

Many researchers invite us to consider that extremism is a condition and not a process, like radicalization. Furthermore, in the academic debate, extremism is often understood as a process that rejects the democratic constitutional state and fundamental values, while radicalization can be conceived as the willingness of actors to increasingly challenge the existing political or social order. It could be misleading to think about the distinction between violent extremism and nonviolent extremism - while the radicalized person may or may not engage in violent acts, we cannot say the same for extremism, which needs to use some form of violence to assert its position. A consequence of this reasoning stems from the fact that a considerable part of the literature on terrorism tends to equate radicalism with violent extremism and consequently both phenomena with terrorism [17].

A further distinguishing criterion is the possibility that democratic systems manage radicalization differently from extremism. While there is a possibility for radical thinking to be present in the community or in controlled spaces where the evolution of radicalization processes can be managed and monitored, it is much more difficult to view extremism as a phenomenon that can be reconciled with the pluralism of ideas. Two radical (nonviolent) positions may see the democratic dialectic as a means of assertion while two extremist positions see dialectic as an obstacle to the confirmation of one position at the expense of the other. According to Schmid [8] we should recognize that there are some forms of violent resistance to political oppression that, although they may be deemed illegal under domestic law, may be accepted under international humanitarian law. It is therefore believed that it is not useful to apply the terms indiscriminately, especially since the ethical and moral yardstick changes in relation to political action in a social context. Something that may be interpreted as an "emancipatory" phenomenon from a community, may at the same time be labeled as "terrorist" by the institutional establishment.

A definition of radicalization accepted by many researchers is the following:

> *An individual or collective (group) process that often begins within a situation of political polarization where the normal dynamics of institutional/public dialog, and tolerance between political actors and divergent interest groups are abandoned by one or both sides for tactics of conflict. These may include (i) the use of (non-violent) pressure and coercion, (ii) various forms of political violence other than terrorism, or (iii) acts of violent extremism in the form of terrorism and war crimes. This process is generally accompanied by adherence to an ideology far from the mainstream or status quo-oriented positions toward more radical or extremist positions involving a dichotomous worldview and acceptance of an alternative focal point of political mobilization outside the dominant political order because the existing system is no longer recognized as appropriate or legitimate [8, p. 27].*

Even if "Terrorism" could seem to be an easier concept to define, as Ahmed highlights it remains a contested concept with over 200 definitions [18]. In the 19th century, terrorism was developed as a term to denote violence committed by

non-state actors. There are not only different understandings of "terrorism" but also different types of terrorism, such as regime terrorism, insurgent terrorism, left-wing terrorism, right-wing terrorism, ethno-nationalist terrorism, jihadist terrorism, lone wolf terrorism, and cyber-terrorism, so even if we think about radicalization leading to terrorism the issue is still complex [8].

Some authors define terrorism as an act of violence (domestic or international), usually committed against a general target (person or group) without any intention to focus the action on "combatants." Terrorism is commonly used to achieve changes in public debate, and political agenda, to create a disrupted situation that spreads fear in a larger population [10]. It is pointed out by many that it is generally a group phenomenon. In several studies, radicalization and terrorism frequently occur alongside each other, as one research object, and researchers fail to offer a more precise distinction between the two phenomena. The associated use of the terms "radicalization" and "terrorism" can be problematic and used to legitimize excessive countermeasures, such as extensive surveillance of the public sphere. While terrorism is a specific way of action (violence against civilians), aimed at causing an immediate effect (to spread fear), radicalization refers to the development of specific political objectives. In this framework, terrorism is only one possible outcome of radicalization, among many others [17].

"Radicalization" is not only a socio-psychological aspect and a scientific concept but also, more importantly, a political construct introduced into public and academic debate mainly by security agencies facing a focus predominantly on religiously motivated terrorism [8]. This trend has started to shift in the last years, and it is therefore important to develop further studies on diverse kinds of radicalization, such as extreme-right or extreme-left groups and on educational and preventive approaches.

3. Transformative learning and radicalization

In the social sciences and also in adult learning research, the concept of radicalization has emerged as an area of intense debate [19]. Theories of adult learning and education enable us to deal with the radical ideas that we adopt throughout our lives as adults and to view radicalization as a process that occurs in daily life.

This area of research tried to link adult education studies and radicalization. Transformative learning is one of the theories used in this field. It was developed by Jack Mezirow in the 1990s and combines constructivism and cognitivism to explain how adults learn and adapt to new environments and constraints [20]. It focuses on the conditions that facilitate the capacity to create transformation from learning - this happens when processes that promote reflection about the premises through which one interprets everyday life events within social and organizational contexts are activated [21].

Mezirow emphasized the importance and centrality of history and personal experience for understanding the frame of reference people use in everyday life. His research underlines the role of the disorienting dilemma as a springboard to promote critical reflection and critical self-reflection. Mezirow theory is based on an epistemology of "rational discourse" and "dialogue in communicating with others." His original study focused on the change we could promote in planning educational settings for adults, can uncover the limits and conditions that contrast the use of self-directed and critical perspectives [22].

Transformations happen in two different types of occurrences. In the first instance, a sudden and concentrated transformational trigger or crisis causes an

instantaneous disorientation in belief and knowledge systems. In response, the person looks for fresh interpretations of the situation fairly instantly. This kind of transformation is typically linked to severe traumas, medical emergencies, and illness. In the second scenario, change is brought about by a series of little, consecutive, and incremental events that work together to create a more gradual and cumulative alteration. It is best explained from a phenomenological perspective on individual experience. The person suffers contradictions and worries during the distortion episodes, which are perceived as problems. Consequently, the person looks for a fresh perspective on what happened in order to regain a sense of self-coherence and competence [20].

Mezirow's theory invites us to consider radicalization, in particular radical thinking, as a process. It can be acknowledged as a manifestation of a transformation of the perspectives of meaning in an exclusive, rigid, and defensive sense. Transformation refers to the process and conditions that can facilitate the development of more inclusive perspectives, open and critical describing. If we assume that radical thinking is the process in which the adult uses a previous interpretation to build a known interpretation of his experience, transforming a radical thinking means educating adults using a previous interpretation to build a new interpretation and to be able to drive and self-direct it [2, 4]. Radicalization and radical thinking become dangerous when they lead people to not being able to take part in a dialectical setting and being open to consider different perspectives as potentially understandable.

An interesting concept brought up by Mezirow [3] is precritical thinking. It is related to the stage of thinking in which the categories through which we read the world are taken for granted as ontologically true, instead of historically generated [21].

4. A case study

In order to reflect on how Transformative Learning Theory concepts can be applied to radicalization studies, a case study based on an in-depth interview is presented. The interview was conducted with a person who got involved for some years with a far-left movement in Northern Italy.

The interviewee, who will be called Jack as an invented nickname, got in touch with a radical movement in his young adult life. At that time, as he recalls, he "was a person with no reference group, and especially at university I was an alien." That sense of non-belonging ended when he "got to know the autonomous collectives where there were guys who were actual runaways. There was ideology but basically there were all these people looking for a place in the world and they were total extremists."

Jack describes below how his adult history was initially marked by experiences characterized by a strong political mission, by practices born on the border of legality in which people claimed rights with a dual motivation, personal/psychological and social/political. Part of his identity was being constructed within a context in which a vision of the world and the solution to even basic needs were being offered, albeit with illegal actions.

> *Then it happens that one evening, with the organizations, I take part in an occupation (of living quarters), where people from the suburbs come, families that are bad off (but also not) united to fight a classist society. I go in with them and occupy. An occupied house, premises where a couple of times a week we used to have political meetings, where there was a machine to cyclostyle leaflets, for our leafleting. Let us say*

> *the initial ideology was basically an autonomous communist kind of ideology, a work-*
> *ers' autonomy (where there were also foreigners). I follow this, I like these occupations*
> *(I have no home).*

Jack goes through several critical moments in his life and one of them is his arrest. It is a kind of "critical incident" that he narrates. This incident, however, does not seem to give rise to any particular repentance or reflection on the lifestyle or ideology embraced. With Mezirow, Jack uses old patterns of meaning to make sense of a new event, but his perspectives of meaning do not change.

> *I did several occupations, in Milan, and I had become an expert in home occupa-*
> *tion (I knew that the crime "occupying" is a misdemeanor if you do not get caught*
> *while doing it) - my specialty was smashing locks of abandoned private houses and*
> *stuff like that. In '85/86 I started confronting anti-nuclear issues, I participated*
> *in demonstrations where we took a lot of blows, especially in front of the Caorso*
> *(Piacenza) power plants. Then in 1986, I participated in the demonstration in*
> *Montalto di Castro where I got arrested, under surreal circumstances and sur-*
> *reptitious charges. A stupid thing: after the demonstration, I went to look for some*
> *of my fellow protesters (I went because I was considered the one with the most*
> *respectable face) at a truck stop. I entered the premises where there were only*
> *uniformed policemen...I try to get out, but more uniformed policemen arrive so I*
> *go to the counter, I say, "a coffee" but I cannot pronounce anything else. I get loaded*
> *into an armored car, and arrested on charges of having blunt weapons (which I did*
> *not have). I spent 10 days in jail and then I got out, on probation for six months, I*
> *had to sign in three times a week in Cremona where I practically did not even live*
> *anymore. Since I worked in Milan once a week I would take the Milan - Cremona*
> *train to sign in at a specific time, 04:56.*

Jack's informal network shrinks and moves more and more within a group that shares the same worldview, practices of social struggle, and lifestyles. Jack begins to find even more spaces within which his thinking is radicalized, supported in becoming increasingly impervious to positive dialectics.

> *In Milan, I was a cook, in an establishment of a Red Brigades sympathizer, one who*
> *in the courtroom when he was convicted said the famous phrase "he who is born*
> *square cannot die round."*

Participation in a community center and Jack's ability to manage people and projects provide him with a further opportunity to reinforce the idea that this path was an interesting one to follow. Jack makes his perspectives on the use of violence to impose an idea explicit; he declares himself opposed to it like many of his peers. However, the context he inhabits is in some ways ambiguous, offering potential spaces to transition from the status of radical militant to terrorist.

> *With a small group of friends from the collective I entered the Leoncavallo com-*
> *munity center. I started to be a delivery guy with a cooperative we had set up inside*
> *Leoncavallo, where many were considered flankers of the Red Brigade Walter Alasia*
> *group. The activities carried out were mainly self-financing concepts for political*
> *prisoners and their relatives. We believed that the detained Red Brigade participants*
> *were inside for political reasons. I was against terrorism, however, out of curiosity our*

> *autonomous group had some form of dialog with other groups that we later found out*
> *were bordering on terrorism, meddling in aiding and abetting terrorist groups.*

Jack's perspectives do not change over time, they remain the same. Even when this story was collected, Jack reaffirmed his belief that "housing is a universal right" and if there are vacant spaces it is only right that they are occupied by those in need.

> *Among us people circulated who had done jail time or ex-factory collectives, I do not*
> *know if they were ex-Front Line (armed gangs) who maybe had some trouble with*
> *the police, so our idea was let us start again from the bottom let us work on post-*
> *industrial society, theoretically. It's not that we were against illegality, I mean from*
> *my point of view illegality was a tool that in the moment you say, I want to change*
> *the drug law, I say it incorrectly, but it was already a battle. I plant marijuana, it's*
> *illegal. But in short, I believe that housing is a universal right and since in Milan, I*
> *do not remember the times it was said, there were 300,000 empty office apartments*
> *vacant, we went to occupy.*

What makes Jack's thinking radical is not just the ideology, it is the practice in which he participates that reinforces his perspective. This practice has an implicit message: either you are in and share the cause, or you are out. So far, the story told is to some extent what Mezirow would call a process of assimilating new knowledge into old patterns of meaning. There are no events that are not read from the ideological perspective.

> *After that, if you want to throw us out let us talk about it, you have to give us a*
> *place. I did an occupation in Porta Ticinese, we were evicted by the municipality,*
> *and then we had a negotiation with Pillitteri (mayor pro tempore) they sent us all*
> *to Bruzzano in a big estate, in a big residence. For a year we all lived there: how cool!*
> *Then they gave all the families a home, while we youngsters were just taken out.... So,*
> *you occupied another one and so on ... I lived in Via Quadrio in Milan where there*
> *was a former factory that had been abandoned for thirty years, there was no water,*
> *there was shit, basically, we carried water canisters, I illegally latched onto electric*
> *lines stuff like that...for all the gigs... Then we squatted on Lancetti Street, it was*
> *a 12-story building that had never been used, we went in, and it was a nice week.*
> *Somehow, we knew it was illegal what we were doing, however, it highlighted the*
> *housing contradictions.*

The following interview excerpts indicate some important parts of Jack's story. We cannot say that Jack has transformed his perspectives of meaning. His ideas remain radical, probably more open to dialog than they once were, but they have not been subjected to "reflective criticism." Or, not venturing into overly complex interpretations, Jack has critically reflected on the premises that led him to make certain choices, but this process has not undermined them. They remain as an expression of a worldview and its rules of the so-called "autonomous."

> *Many turned to robbery, then they started dealing cocaine i.e., they really became*
> *thugs, some were arrested several times (...)*

> *We used to do expropriations: for example, if a bathroom fixture store fails, we look*
> *if there is something inside that we are interested in and we take it ... it's a level of*
> *legality/illegality i.e., I do not know how to say it, but for us, that level, it was a right*

> *social balance. Different from those who went to rob, for example, those who robbed
> paninari (rich kids), fascists with full wallets... that happened too, but I did not
> really do that because I have a problem with violence.*

In the last excerpt, Jack becomes more aware of the implicit rules that guide his life and activism practices. On the one hand, it is an experience that prompts this reflection. His need to have a free space for action, which was being restricted by the explicit and implicit rules of the "Leoncavallo" community center. The awareness that many of his friends were embarking on a dead-end road, mixed with violent actions, including the use of weapons and drugs. Jack says he was to some extent always open and even intrigued and fascinated by the "worlds of marginality." He himself chose to live with them. His perspectives of meaning remained stable until two assumptions were challenged, two perspectives of meaning that were important to Jack: to maintain an autonomy of judgment and to be able to carve out spaces to grow personally and professionally. Jack understood that the time had come for him to give up that path when his circle of reference grew too restrictive, potentially violent and criminal.

> *It's the famous point of no return when you basically cannot go forward anymore,
> because on the one hand, you are so compromised on the other hand it's the others who
> prevent you from going back. Being inside radicalization means being able to under-
> stand not the point from which you cannot escape but the point of no return and
> violence toward people, that is that cold moment when you say, well let us go shoot
> this guy's legs, that is: on one hand there is a story that tells me, "you all think alike"
> but usually inside, so this mechanism, there is always someone who manipulates or
> tries to manipulate is actually the one who has one foot in and the one who sometimes
> gets saved because he leaves.*

This story tells us of a small but important transformation. It is not about redemption. Even today, Jack does not totally disown his choices, he vindicates them like many of the ideas he held as a young man. He feels more consciously that what saved him from undertaking criminal actions was his need to continue reading and informing himself, even on subjects contrary to his ideology. But, above all, his words seem to emphasize that in his case the strongest resilience factor was his constant need to have autonomous space for action, realization, and thought. Ultimately, Jack found himself in a space that was very unstructured formally (social center) but with very structured and hierarchical implicit dynamics. His radicalization process is in fact a process of validation first and accommodation later.

5. Conclusion

As we have seen, a protective factor for Jack was not so much his set of values or the encounter with a mentor who helped him not to commit violent acts, but the occasional experience of a self-directed learning process. The specificity of this story is to highlight how sometimes the transformation of certain perspectives of meaning cannot be planned, it occurs through participation in disorienting experiences and dilemmas. Jack understands that "embracing ideology and taking it to guns" would have led him down a road of no return. As Jack grew up, he did not want to lose the autonomy to decide his own future, which contrasted with the culture of the social center, where either "you're in or you're out."

This story describes radicalization from the lens of learning processes. This perspective can be useful to understand how people can develop a radical thinking and be more vulnerable to extremism and it is interesting for different reasons. The first thought is about the idea that radicalization has certainly generated historical disasters but also great emancipatory and transformative movements in human societies. Radicalization has two faces, bad or good, and it changes according to the social, political, or cultural systems of meaning. The second is about the history of the debate. Radicalization has been an implicit issue discussed in many ways in the tradition of adult learning without being explicitly discussed as a topic of interest. We need to reconsider the past research on adult learning theory and apply it to this new topic. Finally, framing radicalization from an educational perspective might drive researchers and educators to explore the limits of transformation and its cultural and ethical implications [23, 24].

Radicalization is not an attribute of an environment (structuralism or culturalism) or a personal trait (ontology). It is a phenomenon that emerges as a result of learning or education. The theory of transformative learning presents an intriguing analytical framework for comprehending the phenomenon of radicalization. It includes the notion that radicalization can occasionally be understood as a type of cognitive distortion, a representation of inflexible, and unchangeable thinking. But when it leaves space for constructive critique and coexistence, it can also manifest as an emancipatory process of thought.

According to Transformative Learning Theory inputs, radicalization can also be understood as a normal occurrence in daily life, since it enables us to deal with the unconventional ideas people may come up with at any time. The relation between transformation and radicalization enables educators to work with individuals who run the risk of converting radical ideas into violent acts.

The challenge that the radicalization construct presents to the transformative theory in the ethical sense is the final area of possible development and attention. What makes a transformation good or bad? Being radical may be a risky path as well as a transformative one for both individuals and society. More rigorous research on transformative learning could be done to explore connections with values and rights as an expression of micro-radicalization processes.

Author details

Claudio Melacarne* and Marina Slavutzky
University of Siena, Arezzo, Italy

*Address all correspondence to: claudio.melacarne@unisi.it

IntechOpen

References

[1] Antonelli V. L'esperienza dei "patti per la sicurezza" nel triennio 2007-2009. In: Pajno V, editor. La sicurezza urbana. Rimini: Maggioli; 2010. pp. 133-167

[2] Mezirow J. Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 1991. p. 247

[3] Mezirow J. Transformative learning as discourse. Journal of Transformative Education. 2003;**1**(1):58-63. DOI: 10.1177/1541344603252172

[4] Caramellino D, Melacarne C, Ducol B. Transformative learning and microradicalization. In: Nicolaides A, Eschenbacher S, Buergelt PT, Gilpin-Jackson Y, Welch M, Misawa M, editors. The Palgrave Handbook of Learning for Transformation. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2022. pp. 769-783. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-30-84694-7_43

[5] Sedgwick M. The concept of radicalization as a source of confusion. Terrorism and Political Violence. 2010;**22**(4):479-494. DOI: 10.1080/09546553.2010.491009

[6] Kundnani A. Radicalisation: The journey of a concept. Race & Class. 2012;**54**(2):3-25. DOI: 10.1177/0306396812454984

[7] Antonelli F. Radicalizzazione. Milano: Mondadori Università; 2021. p. 144

[8] Schmid AP. Radicalisation, de-radicalisation, counter-radicalisation: A conceptual discussion and literature review. ICCT Research Paper. 2013;**97**(1):22

[9] Malthaner S. Radicalization: The evolution of an analytical paradigm. European Journal of Sociology/ Archives Européennes de Sociologie. 2017;**58**(3):369-401. DOI: 10.1017/ S0003975617000182

[10] Doosje B, Moghaddam FM, Kruglanski AW, De Wolf A, Mann L, Feddes AR. Terrorism, radicalization and de-radicalization. Current Opinion in Psychology. 2016;**1**(11):79-84. DOI: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.06.008

[11] Della PD. Radicalization: A relational perspective. Annual Review of Political Science. 2018;**11**(21):461-474. DOI: 10.1146/ annurev-polisci-042716-102314

[12] Meringolo P. Theoretical background of violent radicalisation. Research and interventions from different perspectives. In: Merigolo P, editor. Preventing Violent Radicalisation in Europe: Multidisciplinary Perspectives. Cham: Springer; 2020. pp. 3-20. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-52048-9_1

[13] McCauley C, Moskalenko S. Recent US thinking about terrorism and counterterrorism: Baby steps towards a dynamic view of asymmetric conflict. Terrorism and Political Violence. 2010;**22**(4):641-657. DOI: 10.1080/09546553.2010.508013

[14] Malthaner S, Lindekilde L. Analyzing pathways of lone-actor radicalization: A relational approach. In: Constructions of Terrorism: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Research and Policy. Berkeley: University of California Press; 2017. pp. 163-180

[15] Brouillette-Alarie S, Hassan G, Varela W, Ousman S, Kilinc D, Savard ÉL, et al. Systematic review on the outcomes of primary and secondary

prevention programs in the field of violent radicalization. Journal for Deradicalization. 2022;**30**:117-168

[16] Moghaddam FM. De-radicalization and the staircase from terrorism. In: Canter D, editor. The Faces of Terrorism: Multidisciplinary Perspectives. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Ltd; 2009. pp. 277-292. DOI: 10.1002/9780470744499.ch16

[17] Gaspar HA, Daase C, Deitelhoff N, Junk J, Sold M. Radicalization and political violence–challenges of conceptualizing and researching origins, processes and politics of illiberal beliefs. International Journal of Conflict and Violence (IJCV). 2020;**14**:1-8. DOI: 10.4119/ijcv-3802

[18] Ahmed S. The "War on Terror", State Crime & Radicalization: A Constitutive Theory of Radicalization. London: Palgrave Macmillan; 2020. p. 262

[19] Wilner AS, Dubouloz CJ. Homegrown terrorism and transformative learning: An interdisciplinary approach to understanding radicalization. Global Change, Peace & Security. 2010;**22**(1): 33-51. DOI: 10.1080/14781150903487956

[20] Wilner AS, Dubouloz CJ. Transformative radicalization: Applying learning theory to Islamist radicalization. Studies in Conflict & Terrorism. 2011;**34**(5):418-438. DOI: 10.1080/1057610X.2011.561472

[21] Fabbri L. Learning to live in multicultural contexts. Transformative theory contribution. In: Fabbri L, Melacarne C, editors. Understanding Radicalization in Everyday Life. New York: McGraw-Hill; 2023. pp. 1-14

[22] Calleja C. Jack Mezirow's conceptualisation of adult transformative learning: A review. Journal of Adult and Continuing Education. 2014;**20**(1):117-136

[23] Davies L. Review of Educational Initiatives in Counter-Extremism Internationally: What Works? (Report 5). Gothenburg: The Segerstedt Institute; 2018

[24] Zeiger S, Aly A, Neumann PR, El Said H, Zeuthen M, Romaniuk P, et al. Countering Violent Extremism: Developing an Evidence-Base for Policy and Practice. Abu Dhabi: Hedayah and Curtin University; 2015