EDICIONES
COMPLUTENSE

The risk of radicalization among young immigrants. Guidelines for its prevention through social intervention

María de las Olas Palma García[1], Rafael Arredondo Quijada[2], Rosario Castilla Mora[3]

Abstract. The phenomenon of extremist radicalization is a constantly fluctuating reality and a concern for our societies, driving numerous studies concerning the circumstances of groups of minors in vulnerable environments, such as young immigrants, who are exposed to real risks of recruitment. The aim of this paper was to use a Delphi study to develop a better understanding of how these young people are radicalized. Thirteen panelists participated, selected in a discretionary manner from professional experts in social intervention with young immigrants and academics and researchers recognized as leading experts in radicalization processes. Using the VERA-2 tool, the experts expressed their degree of agreement regarding the significance and presence of factors associated with the radicalization process in young immigrants, in terms of both opinion and action. In general, the results showed higher levels of agreement regarding the significance for radicalization of the presence of attitudinal factors among this group of young people, such as hate, frustration, rejection of society and its values, collective identity problems and perception of injustice. These factors were identified as more influential when young people first have contact with the extremist world, again in terms of radicalizing both opinion and action. They were considered capable of acting as clear indicators for the detection of possible recruitment processes. The results can offer new guidance in terms of practices and policies that can support the prevention of violent extremism among young immigrants.
Keys word: Youth, Terrorism, Radicalization, Inmigration, Delphi

[es] El riesgo de radicalización entre jóvenes inmigrantes. Orientaciones para su prevención desde la intervención social

Resumen. El fenómeno de radicalización extremista constituye una realidad en continuo cambio y preocupación entre nuestras sociedades, alertando numerosos estudios sobre la situación de colectivos de menores pertenecientes a entornos vulnerables, como los jóvenes inmigrantes, que se encuentran expuestos a su captación y reclutamiento. Se realiza el presente trabajo a través de un estudio Delphi con la finalidad de ofrecer una mayor comprensión del proceso de radicalización en estos jóvenes. En el estudio participan trece panelistas, seleccionados de manera discrecional entre personas profesionales expertas en intervención social con jóvenes inmigrantes y académicas e investigadoras de reconocida relevancia en procesos de radicalización. Tomando como referencia la herramienta VERA-2, los expertos muestran su grado de acuerdo respecto a la relevancia y presencia de los factores asociados al proceso de radicalización en jóvenes inmigrantes tanto de opinión como de acción. En general, los resultados alcanzan mayores niveles de acuerdo respecto a la presencia de factores actitudinales tales como el odio, frustración, rechazo hacia la sociedad y sus valores, problemas de identidad colectiva y percepción de injusticia. Se identifica que dichos factores aparecen con mayor fuerza en los momentos iniciales en los que los jóvenes comienzan a relacionarse con el mundo extremista, tanto en la radicalización de la opinión como de la acción, pudiéndose establecer a partir de ellos indicadores para la detección de posibles procesos de captación. Con los resultados obtenidos se espera sumar nuevas orientaciones en las prácticas y políticas que favorezcan la prevención del extremismo violento entre los jóvenes inmigrantes.
Palabras clave: Juventud, Radicalización, Extremismo, Inmigración, Delphi

[1] Universidad de Málaga
mpalma@uma.es
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1271-5604
[2] Universidad de Málaga
rafarrqui@uma.es
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4301-3376
[3] Universidad de Málaga
mcmora@uma.es
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4727-8814

Sumario: Introduction. Method. Participants. Phases of the study. Results. Discussion and conclusions. Bibliographical references.

Introduction

The phenomenon of extremist radicalization is one of the main social and political concerns of recent years among European societies. Among them, Spain was the country with the most victims due to the terrorism that characterized the period from 2000 to 2018, in which a total of 268 people were killed in different attacks such as the one carried out on 11th May 2004 in Madrid and those claimed by the Islamic State in Barcelona and Cambrils (Pagazaurtundúa, 2017).

In addition to the victims, the current concern in the field of research and social intervention is directed towards the prevention and explanation of this phenomenon and its relationship with young people, having found that most of those arrested for terrorist crimes in the European Union during 2018 belong to this age demographic (EUROPOL, 2019). This pattern is repeated in other European countries, where a significant proportion of those involved in these terrorist acts are young people born and raised in the country of the attack, and who act without outside help in many cases (Doosje, Loseman and Van den Bos, 2013). Along these lines, the European Union's Integration and Inclusion Action Plan 2021-2027 is being promoted as a strategy for social cohesion and prevention of radicalization, mainly of young people (Ruiz, 2021).

In parallel, numerous studies warn about a situation in which groups of European minors belonging to vulnerable environments are exposed to violent propaganda and at real risk of recruitment and recruitment (e.g. Gómez, et al., 2021; Lobato, et al., 2021; Moyano and González, 2021). The reality of the social exclusion of these groups, including young immigrants, makes them potentially vulnerable as they feel uprooted in a hostile environment (Holguín, 2014). They present greater vulnerability to the extent that they consider that society has little to offer them; they are young people who feel uncomfortable within their social context or are starting a new life as part of their migratory experience (Sageman, 2004). For young immigrants, access to employment, housing or participation in the host society may become experiences of coexistence and social integration or, alternatively, if they do not succeed, of cohabitation and confrontation. Thus, young immigrants and their risk of extremist radicalization constitute a key binomial for the study and approach of this phenomenon.

Over time, extremist practice adopts different profiles, objectives, methods, reasons and results (Linde and Duin, 2011) showing a continuously changing reality that explains in part the heterogeneity of the available definitions of radicalization. Authors such as McCauley and Moskalenko (2008) define radicalization as a process of extreme changes in cognition, emotions and behavior conducive to intergroup conflict and violence. This process occurs through different individual, group or mass mechanisms that can lead to radicalization. Among these mechanisms, individual motivations of a political nature or personal experiences of victimization that justify and lead young people to revenge have been identified. In turn, it is also possible to identify strategies of group change, which emerge out of the extreme cohesion that young people develop in the face of threat and loneliness, together with those of mass radicalization in the face of perceived attacks by the out-group (Alberda et al., 2021). These are mechanisms that combine to construct an interactive process of radicalization, in such a way that individual actions do not disappear when a subject joins a group, and nor are the group mechanisms of radicalization annulled when the group moves its action to the masses or to organizations of greater scope. Within this approach it is possible to differentiate a dual model of radicalization of opinion and action (McCauley and Moskalenko, 2017), upon finding that radicalization does not necessarily imply the use of violence (Moyano, 2019; Moyano and Trujillo, 2013). This model is the only one that takes into account the existence of the different paths and mechanisms that lead to extremism, highlighting that ideology does not always have to be involved in the radicalization process (Lobato, 2019). This paper uses this model as a framework from which to explore the factors present in this phenomenon among young immigrants.

According to this model, at the start of the process of radicalization of *opinion* are neutral individuals, those who do not have a specific political position; these are followed by the sympathizers, those who believe that their political cause does not justify violence; at a higher level are those who justify violence in defense of their cause and at the apex of the pyramid are those who come to feel a moral obligation to accept violence in defense of their cause. On the other hand, the process that leads to the radicalization of *action* identifies first those people who remain inactive, without taking any action in favor of a political group or cause; next are the activists, those who begin to engage in lawful political action for a cause; followed by subjects called radicals, who already participate in illegal action favorable to the cause; and at the top of the pyramid are the terrorists, people who actively participate and carry out illegal action targeted at civilians. Although these processes are defined in a pyramidal fashion, in neither of them do the changes experienced by young people towards radicalization occur exclusively in a linear manner; individuals

can move from one level to another dynamically (Leuprecht, et al., 2010). In fact, although the evidence for this pyramidal approach is clear, the connection between thoughts, attitudes and actions in the radicalization process is also evident, as explained by the Attitudes-Behaviors Corrective Model (ABC model). This model suggests that the process leading up to extreme radical action is built along two axes: one of attitudes, which represents the degree of sympathy for ideologies that defend violent action as a means for social change, and one of behaviors, which would imply implementation of such violence to a greater or lesser degree (Khalil, et al., 2022).

Therefore, any approach to the reality of radicalization in young immigrants must be based on a processual and multidimensional approach open to the many factors that influence its development (Emmelkamp, et al., 2020; Moyano, 2019; Wolfowicz, et al., 2019). According to Páimes, et al. (2021) there is no single causal root that allows us to explain the process of violent radicalization in a reductionist way. Instead, everything points to the fact that the causes that give rise to radicalization are due to the changing and circumstantial factors with which young people coexist throughout their socialization experiences. We are faced with individual factors, but also with contextual factors, since risk is something dynamic related to the environment in which people live or to the ideology of their family and friends in the real or virtual world (Bermejo, 2021; Linde and Duin, 2011). From this perspective, radicalization risk assessment instruments have been developed by analyzing the different domains related to individuals and their reality, such as beliefs and attitudes (e.g., rejection of society and its values); their social and cultural contexts (e.g., users of extremist websites or direct contact with violent extremist individuals); their backgrounds (e.g., early exposure to violence); and other elements that offer protection from exposure to risk (e.g., a support network and the rejection of violence to achieve goals) (Pressman, 2008). Exploring all these domains allows us to approach the study of this process in a comprehensive manner, incorporating the essential indicators of promotion and mitigation that can affect whether people engage in violent extremism and terrorism (Pressman and Flockton, 2012).

Understanding such a complex, dynamic and multidimensional phenomenon is a crucial challenge for research and social intervention. To better appreciate the processes involved, avoid stigmatization of Muslim communities and minimize the inclination of young people towards radicalization, micro-level approaches to the psychosocial variables of radicalization in the context of the city, municipal districts and neighborhoods are needed (Sarma, 2017). From an applied point of view, it is still necessary to broaden our understanding of the ways the different factors present in the radicalization process interact, in order to guide us towards practices and policies that favor the prevention of violent extremism in the youth collective.

Committed to this aim, the present study uses the framework of the research project *Psychosocial factors in the radicalization and extremism of young immigrants*, funded by the National R+D+I Plan (PSI2017-85941-R) and the FEDER R+D+I project (UMA18-FEDERJA-071). Its aim is to approach the phenomenon of radicalization from the perspective of experts from both the academic field and professional practice, who work in direct contact with immigrant populations and/or within the framework of institutions linked to the fight against terrorism (Security Forces, Penitentiary Institutions, etc.), in order to understand the relevance and presence of the factors associated with the radicalization process of these young people and to recommend possible ways to approach the issue within professional practice.

Method

In order to understand the process of radicalization that occurs among young immigrants, a Delphi study was carried out to obtain "a reliable group opinion from a group of experts" (Landeta, 1999: 39). This method was chosen because of its value in the face of complex issues, in which expert judgment expands knowledge over individual judgment (Hsu and Sandford, 2007).

Participants

According to Konow and Pérez (1990), the universe of possible participants is conditioned by the objective of the study, and must consist of people who are either experts or scholars, and either interested in or directly affected by the study. In this study, the panel of experts was put together on a discretionary basis, taking into account their level of specialization in the research context and their experience and knowledge of the subject of the study. Specifically, the participants of the present study were selected from two prominent groups: professional experts in social intervention with young immigrants, and academics and researchers recognized for their work on radicalization processes. For each profile, both national and international experts were selected.

The selection criteria were threefold:

– Possess knowledge and/or experience in the field of study and work related to the radicalization of young people. In this criterion the experts were categorized according to their profile: academic/researcher or professional/interventionist.

- Have a background in different related disciplines. In this criterion experts were categorized according to their background: legal (from different branches, such as criminal law, international law, criminology) and social (psychology, education, social work, etc.).
- Be broadly representative in their field of development. In this criterion, experts were categorized according to their scope: micro/local/national - macro/international.

The identification of professional experts was based on representatives of organizations and institutions related to security and social care (penitentiary institutions, security forces and specialized social entities), while the academic experts were selected from leading researchers with publications of note on this topic in the last five years. For this purpose, the databases of the International Observatory for Terrorism Studies, the Elcano Royal Institute and Google Scholar were used as sources of information.

Initially, with the intention of ensuring a sufficiently large group, adjusted to the recommended range of between seven and thirty panelists (Camisón, et al., 2009), an invitation was sent to a total of 49 potential experts. In this first round of the study 17 experts responded: 2 foreign academics, 3 Spanish academics, 2 foreign professionals and 10 Spanish professionals. After several rounds we were left with 13 final participants: four with an academic profile and nine professionals. Numerous precedents confirm the validity of the Delphi study based on panels composed of ten experts (Hsu and Sandford, 2007), which situates our study within the acceptable range. Indeed, it has been shown that small panels are more likely to remain intact throughout the process and can achieve a reliable result, especially, as in this case, when the experts have been selected for their prestige and scope according to strict inclusion criteria (Atkins, et al., 2005).

Phases of the study

The study was carried out between December 2020 and July 2021. It began with the first round, for which an online questionnaire was designed using Google Forms and composed of 39 psychosocial factors that influence the radicalization process. The development of this questionnaire was based on the VERA-2 (risk assessment approach associated with radicalization) tool (Pressman, 2008; Pressman and Flockton, 2012) and other contextual factors provided by related research (Linde and Duin, 2011). The VERA instrument builds on other structured professional judgment tools developed to assess the risk of violence in adolescents and adults by establishing four blocks of factors: attitudinal factors, contextual factors, historical factors, and protective factors.

Before the launching of this first round, and in order to check the validity and clarity of the questionnaire, a pilot test was carried out with two experts selected by the research group, and whose comments were considered in the design of the final instrument. In this way, the adequacy of the factors included in the questionnaire was checked, and a broad description of each one of them proposed in the VERA-2 tool was incorporated.

In this round, the participants were asked to select the factors they consider predominant in the radicalization process of young immigrants, allowing them, in turn, to incorporate other factors not included in the questionnaire offered to them. Specifically, by agreement of the experts, a factor called "Cultural Intelligence" was incorporated, described as a person's ability to integrate effectively in multicultural contexts (is aware of cultural diversity; knows the norms, legal and economic systems, religious beliefs and rules of social interactions of other cultures; enjoys interacting with people from different cultures, etc.). According to Ang and Van Dyne (2008), this construct refers to the ability to act effectively in diverse cultural contexts, and its inclusion in prevention programs would enable young people to develop flexible and appropriate behavior patterns for interaction in complex contexts.

A total of 25 predominant factors in the radicalization process were selected and grouped, as shown in Table 1, into four dimensions (attitudinal factors, contextual factors, historical factors and protective factors) according to the proposal of the VERA-2 tool, and used to progress through the following rounds.

Table 1. Predominant factors in the radicalization process of young immigrants

	Hatred, frustration
	Need to belong to a group
	Moral justification of violence
	Rejection of society and its values
Attitudinal factors	Collective identity problems
	Dehumanization of an identified "other" (individual or group) as a source/cause of injustice
	Perception of injustice
	Cultural intelligence

Contextual factors	Direct contact with violent extremists
	Use of extremist/radicalized websites.
	Community support for the development of violent actions
	Politicization of Islam
	Anger/anger towards government decisions/actions.
	Inequalities in human rights.
	Influence of the media
	Social and cultural tensions and "east/west" confrontation.
Historical factors	Glorification of violent action
	Family/friends involved in violent actions.
	Early exposure to violence in origin.
	Prior criminal behavior/experience
Protective factors	Support network with other community members
	Rejection of violence in pursuit of goals/targets
	Change in view of the "enemy"
	Improvement in the satisfaction of needs
	Active social inclusion

We then continued with a second round, for which a second questionnaire was designed with the same online tool, in which experts were asked for their opinion on two topics:

– The relevance of each factor in terms of the radicalization process, with a graduation from none to very relevant (1-5).
– The positioning of these factors within the sequence of the radicalization process for both opinion and action.

Based on the results of this second round, a new questionnaire was sent to the panelists offering them a comparison of their score with the general score of the rest of the participants and asking whether or not they would maintain the degree of relevance they gave to the different factors, as well as their degree of agreement with the positioning of the different factors in relation to the sequence of the radicalization process. Based on this third round, final agreement was obtained in relation to the relevance of the different factors and the sequence of the radicalization process for opinion and action.

The statistical package SPSS (version 20) and Microsoft Office's Excel program were used to analyze the results. The determination of consensus among participants was calculated using the Kappa coefficient, establishing 60% as an acceptable level of agreement and values greater than 80% as high levels, according to Góngora, et al. (2009). After the analysis of this third round, the decision was made to finalize the Delphi, based on the assumption that a greater number of rounds does not guarantee higher quality results as an almost unmodifiable equilibrium point is reached in a few rounds (Gordon and Helmer, 1964). With the results obtained, contact was maintained with the participants in order to share the results and close the study. This contact was developed in a complementary way through e-mail and an online group session, planned as a closing phase of information collection. At this point, and in accordance with Hsu and Sandford (2007), group communication was used beyond its diagnostic purpose, to conceptualize how an approach aiming to understand the reality of young people related to radicalization processes should be developed in the future.

Results

In the first place, we analyzed the levels of agreement reached with respect to the relevance given by the experts to each factor in the radicalization process. As can be seen in Table 2, the participants showed the highest levels of agreement (above 60%) in those factors that they considered to be quite relevant in the radicalization process of young immigrants (Hatred and frustration; Rejection of society and its values; Problems relating to collective identity; and Perception of injustice), all which belonged to the group of attitudinal factors. With the highest degree of agreement (73.3%), the hate, frustration and collective identity problems that the experts recognize in young immigrants stood out. For the rest of the factors, the experts did not reach an acceptable

level of agreement on their relevance, although one factor stood out with the highest scores (53.3%) for each dimension: Use of websites with extremist/radicalized content (contextual factor); Glorification of violent action (historical factor); and Improvement in the satisfaction of needs (protective factor). In relation to the use of websites with extremist content, its consideration as a risk factor which it is necessary to address was noted in the closing group session with the experts,. According to the participants, young immigrants "are very agile and digitally active children and even when they use these websites only occasionally, they always represent a high risk factor".

Table 2.   Percentages of agreement on the degree of relevance of factors in the radicalization process

Factors	None	A little	Some	Quite a lot	A lot
Hatred, frustration				73,3%	
Need to belong to a group					46,7%
Moral justification of violence					40%
Rejection of society and its values				66,7%	
Collective identity problems				73,3%	
Dehumanization of an identified "other" (individual or group) as a source/cause of injustice				40%	
Perception of injustice				66,7%	
Cultural intelligence				33,3%	
Direct contact with violent extremists				33,3%	
Use of extremist/radicalized content websites				53,3%	
Community support for the development of violent actions				33,3%	
Politicization of Islam			40%		
Anger at government decisions/actions				46,7%	
Human rights inequalities			33,3%		
Media influence			40%		
Social and cultural tensions and "east/west" confrontation			33,3%	33,3%	
Glorification of violent action				53,3%	
Family/friends involved in violent actions			40%		
Early exposure to violence in origin		40%			
Previous criminal behavior/experience	26,7%	26,7%			
Support network with other community members				46,7%	
Rejection of violence in pursuit of goals/goals			40%		
Change in view of the "enemy"			46,7%		
Improved satisfaction of needs			53,3%		
Active social inclusion policies			46,7%		

Next, the positioning of these factors in the process of radicalization of opinion and action was analyzed based on the sequence of the radicalization pyramid proposed by Leuprecht, et al., (2010). In the first place, as shown in Table 3, the experts did not reach agreement on the positioning of any factor in the phase of the radicalization process of opinion, in which young people feel a moral obligation to accept violence in defense of their cause. On the other hand, there was greater agreement (over 60%) in the identification of factors present in the initial phases of this process, among neutrals and sympathizers. There was also greater agreement regarding those referred to as followers. Factors related to the context (direct contact with violent extremists) and to the history of each young person (family or friends involved in violent actions) were associated with this stage of the process.

Table 3. Percentage of experts' agreement on the position of factors along the process of radicalization of opinion

Factor	Neutral	Supporters	Followers	Moral obligation
Rejection of society and its values		66,7%		
Direct contact with violent extremists			60%	
Anger at government decisions/actions		66,7%		
Family/friends involved violent actions			60%	
Active social inclusion policies	60%			
Cultural intelligence	66,7%			

Following on from this, we looked at the positioning of factors in the process of radicalization of action (see Table 4). In this case, the experts did not show agreement on the position of any factor in the last two phases of the process (radicals and terrorists), though they did reach a level of agreement above 60% for different factors among those who do nothing for a political group or cause (inactive) or are involved in legal political action for the cause (activists). Again, there was greater agreement in the identification of factors present in the initial phases of the process of radicalization of action.

Table 4. Percentage of experts' agreement on the position of the factors along the process of radicalization of the action

Factor	Inactive	Activists	Radicals	Terrorists
Hatred/frustration		66,7%		
Anger at government decisions/actions		60%		
Rejection of violence in pursuit of goals/goals	66,7%			
Improved satisfaction of needs	60%			
Active social inclusion policies	66,7%			
Cultural intelligence	66,7%			

In general, the results show that there were higher degrees of agreement among experts in the early stages of the radicalization process, both in terms of opinion and action (neutral-inactive), while in the later stages (moral obligation-terrorist) no relevant factors were identified.

For both processes (see Table 5), active social inclusion policies and cultural intelligence stand out as factors positioned in the initial moments in which young immigrants are exposed to radicalization, thus acquiring a crucial value in terms of preventative actions. Other protective factors present in these first moments are those pointed out by the experts, such as an improvement in the satisfaction of needs and the rejection of violence for the achievement of objectives. From these, according to the results provided by the experts, factors of an attitudinal and context-related nature, such as anger towards government decisions/actions, enter the process for subsequent phases, as activists and sympathizers.

Table 5. Summary on group of factors positioned in processes of radicalization of opinion and action

Group	Factor	Phase			
Attitudinal factors	Hatred/frustration		A2		
	Rejection of society and its values		O2		
	Cultural intelligence	O1/A1			
Contextual factors	Direct contact with violent extremists			O3	
	Anger at government decisions/actions		O2 / A2		
Historical factors	Family/friends involved violent actions			O3	
Protective factors	Rejection of violence in pursuit of goals/targets	A1			
	Improved satisfaction of needs	A1			
	Active social inclusion policies	O1/A1			

Radicalization of the Opinion: O1: Neutrals / O2: Sympathizers / O3: Followers / O4: Moral Obligation
Action Radicalization: A1: Inactive / A2: Active / A3: Radicals / A4: Terrorists

Discussion and conclusions

Although there is no single definition, radicalization refers to a process of changes developed at the individual, group or mass level (McCauley & Moskalenko, 2008) that direct people towards support and sacrifice for a certain cause. This process is influenced by various contributing factors (Emmelkamp, et al., 2020) such as unmet needs, perceived conflict, perceived injustice or sensation seeking, especially among younger people. There are also other factors that could act as protectors against the potential recruitment of such young people, among which numerous studies highlight social inclusion policies, social support, development opportunities, critical thinking, cultural intelligence and a moral education anchored in values of coexistence, tolerance and respect (e.g. Moyano, 2019, 2020).

In the present study, the analysis of all these factors through the opinion of experts allowed us to identify their relevance and presence in the radicalization process in which many young immigrants are immersed. Specifically, the beliefs and attitudes of young people play a relevant role in this process, and especially their experiences of hatred, frustration, rejection and injustice in the reality that surrounds them, and in the context of which they develop a hostile identity towards the collective identity where they live. According to the experts consulted, all these experiences of social exclusion create in these young people an identity that is vulnerable to recruitment by violent extremists (Moyano and González, 2021). However, according to the present results, these attitudes and beliefs appear with greater force in the initial moments in which young people begin to have contact with the extremist world, both in the radicalization of opinion and action, and clear indicators can be established from them for the detection of possible recruitment processes.

Other research suggests that previous juvenile criminal activity as well as problematic personal histories may contribute to an increased risk of future involvement in violent extremist actions, especially when combined with other social and contextual factors present in individuals' lived circumstances (Dudenhoefer, et al., 2021; Meloy and Gill, 2016). In the present study, the participating experts consider that factors associated with the youths' prior history are not particularly relevant to the radicalization process. Specifically, their own criminal behavior or early exposure to violence are not initially identified as conditioning factors for the development of later radicalized behavior. Rather, the dynamic approach and extreme changes that underlie the radicalization process (Bermejo, 2021) are emphasized, in which current circumstances and beliefs hold greater risk for these young people than situations associated with their past histories.

Finally, the importance of certain factors identified by the participating experts as protective in the radicalization process should be highlighted. Making young immigrants feel that they are active members of society is a clear strategy for protecting them from the radical motivations they may encounter. In particular, the scope of active social inclusion policies and the capacity for cultural intelligence among young people are considered decisive elements in the prevention of radicalization. Clearly, the field of prevention is an opportunity to promote an inclusive ideology and a set of healthy and comprehensive alternatives for those young people exposed to extremist practices. Prioritizing the integration and social inclusion of young people of foreign origin – as well as being a basic issue of protection and promotion of human rights – seems to be one of the fundamental elements for the prevention of radicalization. The related public services play a fundamental role in this process, especially social services and child protection services (Massa, 2019).

Based on these results and within the framework of recommendations offered by different specialized organizations (AIVD, 2007; Precht, 2007), it is considered necessary to develop preventive strategies through social measures and actions that counteract the risk of radicalization and strengthen community participation. Such actions must focus on all the phases and subjects present in the radicalization process, young people and the general population, and focus on, among others, the following actions:

– Avoiding polarization and inaccurate perceptions regarding the phenomenon of radicalization. Both overly relativistic and pessimistic perceptions distort an adequate definition of the potential threat posed by radicalization and hinder its prevention, especially among young immigrants in vulnerable situations.
– Supporting initiatives arising from young people themselves that offer a moderate counterpoint to radicalism, as well as those that help to renew their public confidence in active policies of social inclusion.
– Using the networks and platforms offered by the Internet to counteract the extremist proposals and content that reach young people through them.

This study is not without limitations. The fact that there was a greater level of participation by professional experts in social intervention with young immigrants compared to renowned academic experts and researchers in radicalization processes, means that the results were directed more towards content related to areas of prevention and social care and less to violent extremism already displayed by these young people. Even so, the contributions made should be considered complementary to specialized research, adding new perspectives to practices and policies that favor the prevention of violent extremism among young immigrants.

Bibliographical references

Atkins, R. B., Tolson, H., & Cole, B. R. (2005). Stability of response characteristics of a Delphi panel: application of bootstrap data expansion. *BMC medical research methodology*, *5*, 37. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-5-37

Alberda, D., Duits, N., Van den Bos, K., Ayanian, A., Zick, A., & Kempes, M. (2021). The European Database of Terrorist Offernders (EDT): Development, Usability and Options. *Perspectives on Terrorrism*, *15*(2), 77-99.

Algemene Inlichtingen-en Veiligheidsdienst, AIVD. (2007). *The Radical Dawa in Transition: The Rise of Islamic Neoradicalism in the Netherlands*. General intelligence and security service https://books.google.es/books?id=9XpauAAA-CAAJ.

Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (2008). *Conceptualization of Cultural Intelligence: Definition, Distinctiveness, and Nomological Network*. En S. Ang, & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Applications (pp. 3-15). Armonk, M. E. Sharpe.

Bermejo Casado, R. (2021). Hacia una detección de los procesos de radicalización: entre las instituciones y la gestión comunitaria. En J. Pámies y S. Carrasco (Coords.), *Una aproximación a los procesos de radicalización y extremismo violento (PREDEIN)*, 42-48. Universitat Autónoma de Barcelona https://ddd.uab.cat/record/247467

Camisón, C., Camisón Habas, C., Fabra, M.E., Flores, B. & Puig, A. (2009). ¿Hacia dónde se dirige la función de calidad?: la visión de expertos en un estudio Delphi. *Revista Europea de Dirección y Economía de la Empresa, 18*(2), 13–38.

Doosje, B., Loseman, A., & Van den Bos, K. (2013). Determinants of Radicalization of Islamic Youth in the Netherlands: Personal Uncertainty, Perceived Injustice, and Perceived Group Threat. *Journal of Social Issues, 69* (3), 586–604. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12030

Dudenhoefer, A., Niesse, C., Görgen, T., Tampe, L., Megler, M., Gröpler, C., y Bondü, R. (2021). Leaking in terrorist attacks: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 58*, 101582. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2021.101582.

Emmelkamp, J., Asscher, J. J., Wissink, I. B., y Stams, G. J. (2020). Risk Factors for (Violent) Radicalization in Juveniles: A Multilevel Meta-Analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *55*, 101489.

EUROPOL. (2019). European Union Terrorism Situation and Trend Report (TE-SAT). https://www.europol.europa.eu.

Góngora-Castillo, C., Hernández-Díaz, M., García-Fariñas, A. y Sánchez-Delgado, Z. (2009). Propuesta de competencias laborales para médicos que brindan servicios de atención médica en hoteles cubanos. *Revista Cubana de Educación Médica Superior*, *23*(3), 15-26.

Gómez, A., Martínez, M., Martel, FA, López-Rodríguez, L., Vázquez, A., Chinchilla, J., Paredes, B., Hettiarachchi, M., Hamid, N. y Swann, WB. (2021). Por qué la gente ingresa y adopta grupos violentos. *Psicología de Fronteras, 11*, 614-657. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.614657

Gordon, T.J. y Helmer, O. (1964). *Informe sobre un estudio de predicción a largo plazo.* Rand.

Holguín Polo, J. (2014) Indicadores transversales en el proceso de radicalización de la segunda generación de inmigrantes de procedencia musulmana en España. *RDUNED: revista de derecho UNED*, *15* (2º semestre), 293-320.

Hsu, Chia-Chien and Sandford, Brian A. (2007). The Delphi Technique: Making Sense of Consensus, *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, *12,* 10. https://doi.org/10.7275/pdz9-th90.

Khalil, J., Horgan, J & Zeuthen, M. (2022). The Attitudes-Behaviors Corrective (ABC) Model of Violent Extremism, *Terrorism and Political Violence, 34*(3), 425-450. https://doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2019.1699793

Konow, I. y Pérez, G. (1990). *Método Delphi. En Métodos y técnicas de investigación prospectiva para la toma de decisiones*. Universidad de Chile. http://geocities.com/Pentagon/Quarters/7578/pros01-03.html.

Landeta, J. (1999). *El método Delphi: una técnica de previsión para la incertidumbre.* Ariel.

Leuprecht, C., Hataley, T., Moskalenko, S., & McCauley, C. (2010). Containing the narrative: Strategy and tactics in countering the storyline of global jihad, *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism*, *5*(1), 42-57.

Linde, P. y Duin, P. (2011) The Delphi method as early warning Linking global societal trends to future radicalization and terrorism in The Netherlands. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change, 78*, 1557–1564.

Lobato, R.M. (2019). En busca de los extremos: tres modelos para comprender la radicalización. *Revista de Estudios en Seguridad Internacional*, *5*(2), 107-125. http://dx.doi.org/10.18847/1.10.7.

Lobato, R.M., Moyano, M., Bélanger, J.J., & Trujillo, H.M. (2021). El papel de los entornos vulnerables en el apoyo al terrorismo local: trabajo de campo utilizando el modelo 3N. *Comportamiento agresivo*, *47*(1), 50-57.

Massa Arranz, E. (2019). Retos en la lucha contra el terrorismo y la radicalización desde el respeto a los derechos humanos. *Revista Saber Y Justicia*, *2*(16), 43–56.

McCauley, C. y Moskalenko, S. (2008). Mechanisms of political radicalization: hatchways toward. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, *20*(3), 415-433. https://doi.org/10.1080/09546550802073367

McCauley, C. y Moskalenko, S. (2017). Comprensión de la radicalización política: el modelo de dos pirámides. *Psicólogo estadounidense*, *72*, 205-216. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000062

Meloy, J.R. y Gill, P. (2016). El terrorista actor solitario y la TRAP-18. *Revista de evaluación y gestión de amenazas, 3*(1), 37–52. https://doi.org/10.1037/tam0000061

Moyano, M. (2019). *Radicalización terrorista. Gestión del riesgo y modelos de intervención.* Síntesis.

Moyano, M. (2020). *La radicalización violenta. Gobierno de España.* Centro Memorial Víctimas del Terrorismo y Fundación Víctimas del Terrorismo.

Moyano, M. y González, I. (2021). Jóvenes y radicalización violenta: la encrucijada de la prevención. En J. Pámies y S. Carrasco (Coords.), *Una aproximación a los procesos de radicalización y extremismo violento (PREDEIN)*, 36-41. Universitat Autónoma de Barcelona https://ddd.uab.cat/record/247467

Moyano, M. y Trujillo, H.M. (2013). *Radicalización islamista y terrorismo. Claves psicosociales*. Editorial Universidad de Granada.

Pagazaurtundúa, M. (2017). *Libro Blanco y Negro del Terrorismo en Europa*. Parlamento de Europa.

Pàmies Rovira, J., et al. (2021). Una aproximación a los procesos de radicalización y extremismo violento (PREDEIN). Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. CER MIGRACIONS. https://ddd.uab.cat/record/245234

Precht, T. (2007). *Home Grown Terrorism and Islamist Radicalization in Europe: From Conversion to Terrorism*. Danish Ministry of Defense.

Pressman, D. E. (2008). Exploring the sources of radicalization and violent radicalization: Transatlantic perspectives. *Journal of Security Issues*, *2*, 1-20.

Pressman, D. E. y Flockton, J. (2012). Calibración del riesgo de terroristas y extremistas políticos violentos: la evaluación estructurada VERA 2. *The British Journal of Forensic Practice*, *14*(4), 237-251. https://doi.org/10.1108/14636641211283057

Ruiz, L.J. (2021). Migraciones y Asilo: Análisis y perspectivas: Entre apoyo a la integración y prevención de la radical- ización. Una mirada crítica al Plan de Acción de Integración e Inclusión de la Unión Europea. *Revista Española de Derecho Internacional, 73* (2), 147-160.

http://dx.doi.org/10.17103/redi.73.2.2021.1a.09

Sageman, M. (2004). *Understanding terror networks*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Sarma, K.M. (2017). Evaluación de riesgos y prevención de la radicalización de la no violencia al terrorismo. *Psicólogo estadounidense, 72*(3), 278-288. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000121

Wolfowicz, M., Litmanovitz, Y., Weisburd, D. y Hasisi, B. (2020). Una revisión sistemática y un metanálisis de todo el campo del riesgo putativo y los factores protectores para los resultados de la radicalización. *Revista de criminología cuantitativa, 36*(3), 407–447. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-019-09439-4