

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

EDURAD: Educational Responses to Extremism

Full Title: EDURAD: ADDRESSING VIOLENT RADICALISATION: A MULTI-ACTOR RESPONSE THROUGH EDUCATION

Project Acronym: EDURAD

Project Number: 871110 (ISF-P)

Work Package 2

Output 2.3

Team Information:

Work Package 2.3
Maynooth University (NUIM)

Aislinn O'Donnell, Claire Hamilton, Anthony Malone and Brian Melaugh

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

EDURAD: EDUCATIONAL RESPONSES TO EXTREMISM	1
DESCRIPTION OF FIELD WORK.....	3
<i>Ethical Review</i>	3
<i>Ethical Consent</i>	3
<i>Rationale for Selection and Recruitment of Participants</i>	3
<i>Methodology</i>	4
<i>Limitations</i>	4
SHORT SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS (QUESTIONNAIRE).....	4
PARTICIPANTS.....	5
<i>Defining Extremism</i>	6
<i>Defining Violent Extremism</i>	7
EDUCATIONAL RESPONSES TO EXTREMISM.....	7
<i>Useful Pedagogical Strategies</i>	7
<i>Characteristics of good practice in engaging with extremist ideas or extremism.</i>	8
<i>Successful Outcomes in Engaging with Extremism</i>	9
<i>Strengths and Expertise brought by Participants</i>	10
<i>Sources of Resources and Information</i>	10
<i>Characteristics of Educational Responses</i>	11
<i>The Role of Training/Professional Development in supporting respondents to address extremism.</i>	11
<i>Extremism and Professional Role</i>	12
<i>Guidance and Support</i>	12
<i>Successful Outcome for other Relevant Stakeholders</i>	13
<i>Gaps, needs and constraints in addressing issues related to extremism.</i>	13
<i>Useful Resources</i>	14
<i>Current Interaction with Stakeholders</i>	15
<i>Potential Connections with other stakeholders.</i>	15
SHORT SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS (FOCUS GROUPS).....	15
<i>Policy, History, and Defining Extremism</i>	16
<i>Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging</i>	17
<i>Controversial and Sensitive Issues</i>	19
<i>Self-Reflection and Engaging with Young People</i>	19
CONCLUSION OF NATIONAL REPORT.....	21



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

Description of Field Work

Ethical Review

This phase of the project was submitted for Ethical Review to the Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee (SRESC) at Tier 2 level which means that it did not involve vulnerable participants. The proposal was submitted in late June 2020 and was given approval in early September 2020. The reason for the delay was because the SRESC committee does not read proposals during the summer months. The committee reviewing the proposal is a cross-disciplinary Faculty Committee. Ethical Review was approved shortly after the committee met. This phase of the project targeted only adults over 18.

Ethical Consent

Ethical consent was obtained for this first phase of the project which involved both a questionnaire and focus groups. In the questionnaire, a description of the project was provided in the overview summary of the questionnaire and participants were advised that their responses would be anonymous and gave permission for the use of the data provided by ticking the relevant box. Where any personal information was provided inadvertently, this was removed prior to the analysis of the data. It should be noted that a number of participants had questions about the aims of the project and expressed concerns about whether it was concerned with education or with security, and also flagged concerns about the funding source of projects as it was felt this determines the agenda for the project. One participant noted that they were warned not to engage in a project on extremism because there is often an alternative motive, either overt or covert. In response, the PIs on the project explained the purpose of the project and its educational remit, as well as providing supplementary resources explaining the issue..

Participants in both the focus groups and questionnaires were contacted first by a personal email to ascertain interest and to answer any questions that participants raised. Participants in the focus groups were provided with a comprehensive information sheet, contact details for follow up questions, and an ethical consent form which they signed prior to the focus groups. The focus groups were recorded using Teams and a copy of the MP4 file was downloaded immediately afterwards to a secure server and the original Stream permissions were deleted so that participants could not access it. Participants agreed that the conversations would remain confidential under Chatham House Rules and that they would not cite one another afterwards. Further individual requests for follow up contact would be supported by the EDURAD Maynooth University Team.

Rationale for Selection and Recruitment of Participants

The EDURAD project aims to engage with a diverse range of stakeholders. Participants for the questionnaire were selected using purposive sampling in order to reach out to the selected cohorts. This was followed up with snowball sampling where participants recommended other interested stakeholders. The focus group participants were drawn from the cohort approached in the questionnaires. In focus group 1, policy makers were identified who represented different target groups. These included Youth Work, Education, Children’s Ombudsman, National Curriculum and Assessment Agency, Department of Justice, Garda Síochána (police). In focus group 2, participants were drawn from education (schools) and youth work, professional development bodies, and Department of Justice.

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

Methodology

The methodological design was informed by the purposes and aims of the project, specifically WP3 and WP4, which will develop pedagogical modules and hubs. Since each country is operating in a very different context both in respect of PVE-E policy and in respect of both extremism and violent extremism, the questionnaire and focus groups were tailored to the local context. In Ireland, the questionnaire was comprised of 32 questions, a number of which invited the respondent to reflect on their knowledge, attitudes, skills, experience, and connections with other stakeholders. The focus groups involved a restorative practice framework whereby participants were invited to reflect without interruption for 3-4 minutes. Introduce yourself and offer a short 3-4 minute reflection on “How you think about the question of "extremism" from your professional perspective and context”, and “how you see the role of education (if any) is in responding to this question of "extremism"”. Participants were invited to feel free to respond to this in the way that makes most sense to them. This part was constructed as a listening exercise in which participants learn from one another. Once everyone had spoken, a brief summary of the primary themes was provided by the team, and the dialogue was opened for further discussion. Each focus group lasted approximately 1.5 hours.

The analysis of the questionnaires was framed by the questionnaire design. This focused on definitions of extremism and violent extremism, educational responses to extremism, and resources, gaps and skills. Thematic analysis was used to analyse the focus groups. In both cases, all PIs reviewed the questionnaires and focus groups independently, then met to discuss the findings, and the final analysis was based on the shared analysis.

Limitations

Whilst the questionnaires and focus groups reached a diverse range of participants, these were very much a targeted cohort of interested participants and are not necessarily representative, even of their own professions. The analysis of the questionnaires and the focus groups was completed with the aim of supporting the next phase of the project and it is clear that there are further opportunities for exploring these questions with participants, however the analysis can only be seen as indicative. However, given the design of the EDURAD project, it is hoped that there will be a continued engagement with these cohorts of practitioners through the next phases of the project building on this first phase.

Short Summary and Analysis of Findings (Questionnaire)

Whilst research participants understood a variety of issues to constitute (non-violent) extremism, when asked about how they sourced resources in order to engage with these issues, approximately half of the participants did not name any resources. Gaps in terms of resources and engagement with other stakeholders were highlighted. The overwhelming majority of participants believed that engaging with extremism was part of their role as educators, broadly understood. The primary areas of focus were dialogue and relationships, critical thinking, and CPD. Participants were keen to engage with the issues directly, should they arise, but some noted issues with “cancel culture” amongst students, including “cancel culture” directed toward teachers, the need to engage and educate other educators rather than solely students. The issue of extremism was broached broadly speaking either in terms of ignorance or in an anticipatory preventative manner, responsive to wider global societal trends. Issues that did not arise significantly were how to support students to learn to express their

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

views. Overall, despite participants’ concerns about extremism, there was little evidence to support widespread extremist attitudes amongst students (or educators) and no reference to violent extremism, however racism was a matter of concern. Of note is that the focus was on far-right extremism, rather than specifically racism, but this was informed by global trends. There was no reference to ongoing political violence on the island in the form of paramilitarism.

Participants

Fifty-nine respondents completed the online questionnaire (one after this element of the research was completed). Participants came from a range of professional backgrounds, including 18 teachers, 15 social/youth workers, eight school leaders and four policy makers (Figure 1). Nearly three quarters of the respondents (74 per cent) had over ten years of experience in their practice, with only three having less than five years of experience (Figure 2). Nearly 90 per cent (52 out of 58) worked either exclusively in an urban setting or in both an urban and rural setting (Figure 3).

Figure 1: Professional background of survey respondents




Figure 2: Professional experience of survey respondents

4. How many years experience do you have in this area

[More Details](#)

1-2	0
3-5	3
5-10	12
10+	43



2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

Figure 3: Survey respondents by location of work/practice

7. Is the main location of your work/engagement/practice

[More Details](#)

Urban	21
Rural	6
Both	31




Respondents reported encountering a range of different forms of intolerance in their practice (Figure 4), with the three most common being racism (47 per cent), homophobia (43 per cent) and sexism (43 per cent). ‘Alt-right’ and ‘far-right extremism’ were the least commonly reported at 9 per cent and 13 per cent respectively.

Figure 4: Survey respondents’ experience of intolerance in practice

9. In your practice, do you ever encounter the following?

[More Details](#)

Racism	47
Islamophobia	25
Hate speech	23
Far-right extremism	13
Alt-right	9
Fundamentalism/Dogmatism	16
Homophobia	43
Sexism	43
Religious intolerance	33
Other	12



Defining Extremism

With regard to what is seen as extremism, there was a strong consensus among respondents that the characteristics of an extremist position included dogmatism, intolerance, an unwillingness to listen and a lack of empathy for others. These views were also reflected in responses to the question concerning the ‘extremist mindset’ with respondents identifying intolerance of difference, a closed or ‘fixed’ mindset and the failure to approach debate rationally or logically as key features. Interestingly, in line with Quassim Cassam’s (2021) arguments about the core elements of an ‘extremist mindset’ a significant number of respondents (12) identified anger, fear/insecurity and/or a sense of victimisation as important reasons for extremism. As one respondent argues, ‘Extremism is virtually always rooted in early life experiences or the unquestioning adoption of parental or other attitudes. These attitudes almost invariably see a threat (usually imagined) somewhere and the target of their

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

anxieties become projected upon’ (survey respondent #7). Another offered the view, ‘I believe this mindset comes from a place of hurt or anger’ (survey respondent #9).

Overall, a number ways of understanding extremism emerged in response to the question of what is seen as extremism: 1. Systems and environments that normalise different forms of extremism, including prejudice, xenophobia, and intolerance; 2. Positional extremism on a spectrum of social behaviour or norms; 3. Dehumanisation, intolerance, hatred, disrespect and degradation of others on the basis of minority or group identity with an emphasis on harm and even potential violence to others; 4. Ignorance and lack of awareness, in particular for adolescents, where upbringing and frustration may play a role.

However respondents also underlined that in the case of young people, there are a number of motivations and factors for engagement in language and attitudes that appear extremist, and were unwilling to categorise young people as extremist. A number of responses framed instances of extremism (for example, racism, sexism and homophobia) as an expression of individual personal prejudice rather than due to systemic structure.

Defining Violent Extremism

In relation to the question of violent extremism, the majority took a broad interpretation of ‘violence’ to include not just physical harm, but also verbal threats and emotionally abusive behaviour. A similarly broad view was also taken of the types of behaviours that can be understood as ‘extremist’, with a slight majority (51 per cent) of those who answered the question expressing the view that all of the behaviours listed in Figure 4 constituted a form of extremism. For these participants it would therefore appear that conceptions of extremist should not be confined to extremist actions. A strong majority of respondents (34 out of 51) also believed that their view of extremism had changed over time. Notable comments in this regard included the fact that hate speech was now more easily communicated via the internet and social media and that extremism had become more ‘normalised’. As one respondent put it, *“I see extremism as a more worrying issue now because it has moved into a mainstream place. It is openly accepted to a much greater degree”* (R. 36). In similar vein, another respondent (R. 11) pointed to a tendency towards *“cancel culture”* among young people as an example of extremist behaviour, even when espousing supposedly ‘liberal’ views. Significant numbers also identified structural factors as relevant here as extremist violence can often arise from the absence of legitimate avenues for expression: *“racism and extremism can only be understood in the context of the historical and power dynamics at play”* (R. 18).

Educational Responses to Extremism

Useful Pedagogical Strategies

Some participants explained that their pedagogic strategies were derived from policy guidelines and published teacher guides published by Irish teacher support agencies. *Teaching Controversial Issues at Key Stage 3*; and two resources from the Council of Europe - *Teaching Controversial Issues* and *Managing Controversy: Developing A Strategy for handling controversy and teaching controversial issues in schools*. These responses were principally minority views with many respondents indicating

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

proactive and progressive strategies rooted in discussion, debate and dialogue. Walking debates, jigsaw methodology, role plays and other empathic pedagogic strategies, including restorative listening exercises, were the primary means through which contentious issues were surfaced. These included narrative-biographical methodologies such as storytelling-as-pedagogy, memoir, song-writing and other arts-based approaches. One youth-worker respondent framed their approach within a peace-building framework which ‘encourages dialogue among young people on a range of contentious or controversial issues but where difference of opinion is valued.’ Others emphasised the necessity of preparatory context building exercises before engaging in any PVE-E exercises. They outlined a belief a ‘need to understand the groups and their positioning before you can fully address, engage and explore their ideas/ideology. Some pedagogical approaches can create a sense of being patronised and create a lack of trust which can be unhelpful in building a relationship of mutual appreciation for the standpoints and discussion that needs to happen.’ Such views were common throughout the questionnaire responses with notable emphasis on scaffolding such exercises as a means through which to build group identity and avoid risks of shame-based approaches which serve to diminish and patronise. These indicate a notable shared preference among respondents for restorative pedagogies associated with established principles of transformative justice, i.e. ‘healing justice, community accountability and compassionate work.’

Characteristics of good practice in engaging with extremist ideas or extremism.

A number of educational responses emerged which can broadly be categorised in five distinct ways – critical-dialogic, relational-restorative, cognitive/affective; multi-perspective/differentiated and person-centred/organisational. Together these offer a constructive means to further consider PVE-E appropriate pedagogies. A developmental approach was evident in most of the responses, arguing that addressing issues early, broadly, and educationally is the most effective.

The dominant pedagogic approach outlined by respondents was complex and nuanced and not solely or even primarily skills/knowledge based. The significance of a rights based, values-based approach which taps into personal and collective attitudes has merit. In these spaces there is clear and unambiguous valuing of human dignity and rights; valuing cultural diversity; justice, fairness and equality. There is also an attitudinal value towards openness to cultural-political otherness, respect, civic mindedness, self-efficacy and tolerance. Certain responses alluded to a pedagogic styles which aim to interrupt conventional socialisation patterns therein prompting community members to embrace a broader range of interpretive possibilities. Emphasis in a number of responses was on the need to pedagogically support students’ substantiation of viewpoints through verifiable evidence. Most striking perhaps was the clear, significant, and in some cases urgent appetite for PVE-informed pedagogic discussions. Neither the questionnaires nor the focus groups revealed any sense of pushback from teachers based on unwieldy workloads, though there was some acknowledgement of time pressures, and there was no sense of this a task that should be delegated to others.

Certain respondents identified the important role of the teacher as facilitator. Conceptualisations of extremist viewpoints, where identified and explained by respondents, were often times viewed in contested and ambivalent ways. Some respondents outlined views where particularly extremist, polarised stances must be challenged, resisted so they are not normalised and therefore viewed as acceptable (‘Not being silent and speaking out. Engaging these views so that they are not normalised conflict and polarised viewpoints’). Others recognised the opportunity for potential growth which is

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

necessary in any democratic society. Supporting peaceful protest and civil disobedience on matters of oppression and inequality ('Healthy dialogue between those with divergent perspectives to increase understanding and to consider approaches to work for social change'). Not explicitly referenced in the questionnaires was the issue of power and agency. 'Othering' was noted but more so in ways where the other was perceived as a uniform member of a homogenous out-group. Also evident in certain responses, whether intended or otherwise, were particular assumptions regarding ability of individuals to capably articulate their viewpoints and/or their willingness to share. Despite that many respondents outlined keen levels of sensitivity towards creating cultures that are open and invitational rather than cultures which are more likely to silence rather than invite. Many respondents saw the creation of such cultures, and the necessity for facilitating and surfacing polarised viewpoints, as real and important pedagogic opportunities for growth and community building. Focus here was principally on the actions of the teacher and the necessity of incorporating strategies that develop skills of communication, conflict resolution, community building, resilience, critical thinking, etc...

Successful Outcomes in Engaging with Extremism

Responses were eclectic ranging from a focus on the highly individualised to broader collective, cultural and organisational aspects. Some framing in responses focused on identifying, targeting and, where possible, effecting positional shifts in individual epistemic rigidities. In these there was a clear sense of polarisation and empowering others to resist claims of extremist others who were often framed as a uniform member of a homogenous out-group. Some respondents outlined a view of success where those expressing what they deemed as extremist viewpoints came to see the impact of their extremist viewpoints and behaviours (*"That their extremist viewpoints and actions can hurt others without reason but also those they care about and love"*).

The role of education was one of socialisation and developing competencies – skills, knowledge, values and attitudes. The focus such aspects as dialogue, tolerance and empathy typically reflects what is found in policy documents where priority is given to providing young people with the knowledge and skills to engage with others in the rejection of harmful ideologies. Other responses were framed within a spirit of collective endeavour through community-building approaches. Much significance was given to building trusting pedagogic relationships, listening and facilitating 'reasoned discussion without aggression/shaming/dismissing.'

Perhaps not surprisingly, responses reflected a spectrum of ambition and expectation that ranged from high level to low level. Typical viewpoints included *"Acceptance and tolerance of others"* as a clear sign of success whereas another aimed for *"A win-win situation, allowing for moderation and compromise"*. Others were more tempered and in their expectations noting 'You will be very fortunate to succeed in engaging with extremism, but it doesn't mean that it cannot be done, but to me the success will be to start and engage.' For many, pedagogically achieving successful outcomes was fundamentally more complex and less assured. For many of these 'Young people having a better understanding of the complexity of issues intertwined with violent extremism' was a sought after successful outcome.

Despite clear ideas as to what they would consider a successful outcome of engaging with extremism few if any respondents provided concrete examples for how these might be pedagogically achieved or indeed what a pedagogical response might come to look like.

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein. 9

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

Strengths and Expertise brought by Participants.

Not surprising responses reflected the varied backgrounds, experiences and roles fulfilled by respondents. As stated fifty-eight respondents completed the pedagogic section of the questionnaire. Participants came from a range of practices, including 18 teachers, 14 social/youth workers, eight senior school leaders, four ITE/CPD facilitators and three policy makers (Figure 1). Almost three-quarters (74%) of the respondents have over ten years of experience in their practice, with only three having between three and five years of experience.

Given the diverse nature of the respondent group experience here was framed in three distinct ways. The first of these was facilitator experience at a macro and often national level involving 'empowering others in the use of appropriate methodologies for exploring controversial issues in ways that are as 'safe' as possible for all concerned.' Another noted 'Long term voluntary and professional expertise in working with social injustice, disadvantaged and marginalised communities.'

Many identified key personal and communicative strengths grounded in principles and practices of social, restorative justice as well as pedagogies associated with trauma informed practice. These included "*participatory and dialogical pedagogical approaches and anthropological sensitivity to cultural difference and its imperative for democratic pluralism*". Ability to listen was the most common strength identified by respondents followed by empathy and patience.

Within the responses only two noted actual hand-on experience of dealing with extremism in their teaching. A youth worker noted 'I've challenged many extremist ideas with facts, and dialogue and engaging in the conversation about it but also supporting the victims of extremism.' A school teacher noted their own first experience of extremist treatment, "*Belonging to a minority group and being the 'target' of extremist comments, actions ...*"

Sources of Resources and Information

Responses in this domain were less surefooted with many respondents acknowledging that while they get most of their information from colleagues, advocacy groups and online websites (e.g. development education websites), approaches here were more 'ad hoc' and 'not easy.' One respondent noted "*my heart is the honest answer*" while another stated "*life experience*". The general viewpoint was capably captured in one respondent who stated "*Not very many available...or else I don't know where to look for them?*" These responses indicate that these are not issues with which over half the participants engage on a regular basis. Whilst participants had a range of ideas about pedagogical strategies that might address the issue, the issue of extremism is not one which many of the respondents felt they had to face on a regular basis.

Not surprisingly greater levels of confidence were expressed by those few respondents who were actively engaged in resource design and publication. These individuals identified the *Manifesto for Schools* (RAN) and *No Hate Speech* (NYCI). Others identified the support of agencies such as HETI, INAR, Council of Europe, PDST, Educate Together, IIRP, LSP, UNESCO, Amnesty International and Stop Racism. Print and digital media were commonly cited although specific details were not provided. A

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

spectrum of individuals were cited as influential with a number of respondents highlighting the importance of fiction writers, films and docuseries. One respondent highlighted how *“Louis Theroux’s documentaries are really good”*. Others cited writers such as Joseph Conrad, Nadine Gordimer, and films and television series such as ‘I Daniel Blake, Tsotsi, 12 Angry Men, Rabbit Proof Fence, Pavee Lackeen, Shooting Dogs, Selma, Amistad, The Boy in the striped pyjamas, Cry Freedom, Mississippi Burning’ and ‘wife swap.’ In the main responses here indicated widely varied levels of confidence and clarity.

Characteristics of Educational Responses

Of all such questions this one returned the most unanswered with just less than one in five choosing not to answer. In the main, those that answered reflected a view that unlike other responses educational responses were participatory and dialogical and required anthropological sensitivity to difference. For some a relevant educational response provided proactive opportunities for ‘difficult conversations.’ It invites a structured approach to understanding topic through the lens of differentiated, multiple perspectives. The role of constructive confrontation as a valid educational response revealed significantly muted responses with only two respondents naming it. These both leaned towards a view of conflict as best avoided and unnecessary. The majority of respondents communicated a preference for educational responses that sought consensus and a ‘middle ground.’ Many respondents outlined keen levels of sensitivity towards creating cultures that are open and invitational rather than cultures which are more likely to silence than to invite. Many respondents saw the creation of such cultures, and the necessity for facilitating and surfacing polarised viewpoints, as real and important pedagogic opportunities for growth and community building. Focus here was principally on the actions of the teacher and the necessity of incorporating strategies that develop skills of communication, conflict resolution, community building, resilience, critical thinking, etc. The pedagogic emphasis reflected in questionnaire responses expressed a preference for facilitative and highly collaborative engagements with tight, horizontal interpersonal binding.

Pedagogically the view of conflict as unnecessary and best avoided is at odds with published research and therefore is one that offers much scope for further exploration within the scope of this project.

The Role of Training/Professional Development in supporting respondents to address extremism.

In regards to training and development respondents reflect a wide repertoire of training areas, including undergraduate education, (arts and social science) professional training (teaching/youth work/social work) and CPD. For the majority of respondents there is the view that their training and development does not support them to address extremism. A theme summarised by a respondent who stated ‘there is not much CPD on this topic and it certainly wasn’t taught to me in college’ (R 40). There is evidence of an ‘eclectic’ approach with respondents drawing on knowledge from their academic/professional and wider life experience to inform pedagogy. A flavour of these areas include: anti-oppressive practice, anthropological imagination, critical analysis, restorative practice, strategies to promote safe environments for learning. In terms of supports that respondents availed of to address extremism in order to gain an understanding of ‘extremist views’ included study visits to N. Ireland as part of youth work training. Ways to ‘deal with bullying’ covered in teacher education are supportive because as one respondent shared ‘bullying is the most common way in which extremism

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

takes expression in the class room'. Engagement and CPD opportunities offered by organisations including, for example, the Professional Development Service for Teachers (PDST), Corrymeela Community and the Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN) are named as offering training/development that support respondents to address extremism.

Extremism and Professional Role

The dominant view is that addressing extremism should be part of one's role, aptly summarised as 'I think it should be part of every educator's role' (R.41). Various ways of addressing extremism include providing knowledge of extremism, with the aim of promoting understanding and 'debunking myths'. For some respondents, there is an acceptance that role of educator requires a proactive stance of working to 'positively influence' and open the minds of young people by challenging extremist beliefs and opinions. As one respondent writes: *"I have the responsibility to give my students knowledge but also to challenge them why we believe or hold opinions and what impact these beliefs have on others"* (R.33). In terms of finding ways to 'open their students minds' teaching of the values of tolerance, respect, truth and acceptance and belonging are identified as important. Educators, are constructed as 'facilitators' tasked with the role of creating a safe learning space for complex, confusing and indeed contentious views to be heard. When challenging the thinking of young people there is the view for this to work it needs to be balanced and reciprocal. If not there is a veiled concern about educators moving out of role, in the words of a youth worker, *"I think there is a balance, we are not the police"* (R.20).

The themes of confidence to intervene and awareness are named by respondents as qualities/skills that support the role of educator. The role of insight and awareness as a way to understand the lived experience of young people offers an interesting approach. With reference to the teaching of English, a teacher writes: *"There is no point teaching To Kill a Mocking Bird if a teacher has no understanding of what a child of colour might feel listening to this story"* (R.58). Again a youth worker writes on the need for educators to understand *"how people in pain can be instrumentalised to carry out violent acts"* (R.21).

With regards to other perspectives, there is a minority view that addressing extremism is the role of parents and wider society. From the perspective of teaching there is debate about incorporating learning about extremism into the wider curriculum with a relevance for all teachers. There is also the 'partial' view that extremism is best addressed as part of specific modules (CSPE, Wellbeing classes) and addressed by teachers when necessary. For youth work, there are concerns about how to manage the boundary between 'prevention and intervention' with young people engaged in violent extremism.

Guidance and Support

Colleagues are identified as the main group that respondents will turn to for guidance/support when dealing with extremism. Colleagues are defined as primarily current and former work colleagues, peers and people in other organisations. Other forms of support include line managers and management teams, professional networks (teaching, youth work), working groups (e.g. wellbeing committee, violent extremism), NGO's, academics, people of colour and friends and family,

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

supervision. Resources including: trusted media (Irish Times, NY Times) ‘Teaching Controversial Issues’ and ‘Podcasts’ on how to manage defiant extremism/defiant behaviour (Gabor Mate, OnBeing podcast) are named as potential sources of support.

Successful Outcome for other Relevant Stakeholders

Responses were diverse, with ‘success’ defined in terms of what it means for students/young people to reflections on what successful outcome/s mean for schools, communities and wider society. However, a recurrent theme that unites these perspectives is the theme of ‘change’. In regards to young people, respondents define success as finding ways to run *“programmes with young people who are associated with extremism”* (R.30) and students turning from *“violent extremism to become mentors/ambassadors for their communities”* (R.14) These perceptions that successful outcomes are linked to *“avoiding harm to self or others”* (R.34) or *“no further violence”* (R.37) may reflect how extremism is constructed and understood. However, the responses, should be contextualised by the fact that the association of extremism with violence was not an overarching theme in the responses to this question.

While at the personal level success is about ‘resilient’ students who can hold their own views and respect the views of others. At the wider level success is envisaged as a commitment to certain values (e.g. tolerance, respect, understanding) that allow for the development of a *“safe and comfortable school environment”* (R. 22) and *“a more open and tolerant society”* (R.21), ‘respectful of people’s beings and beliefs’ (R.15). At the structural level, successful outcomes are envisaged as responding to factors (e.g. poverty) that act to marginalise young people, placing them at risk of radicalisation. The need to employ collective approaches to confront marginalisation was identified as central to success. A view summarised by a respondent: *“If we are working with same young people, and their children and their grandchildren, then we are not solving the structural issues, we are too focused on the individual and not the collective”* (R.44).

Gaps, needs and constraints in addressing issues related to extremism.

Gaps respondents face in addressing extremism include a lack of specified training, lack of opportunities for CDP and a deficit in the availability of relevant and useful resources. For some, gaps in level/s of knowledge on what constitutes extremism can generate a lack of confidence and concerns about not having ‘the expertise’ to address extremism. Gaps in funding and staffing are mentioned with a subsequent impact on resources and overreliance, in the words of one respondent ‘the energised few’ (R.6). There is a perception that gaps at the level of policy and a lack of a unified approach between different stakeholders is creating a climate for ‘securitisation’ (R.30), the ‘avoidance of controversial issues amongst those in educational leadership’ (R.28) and overall, is impeding ‘a holistic’ approach to addressing extremism’ (R.30).

In terms of constraints, there is evidence of a ‘tension’ when it comes to an educational approach to addressing extremism. A tension that arises from a desire to address extremist ideas and behaviours with fears about making mistakes, hurting young people and or concerns about discussions falling into ‘racism or Islamophobia’. A tension reflected in this respondents concerns about making an intervention and ‘not ... demonize young people for their ill-informed opinions. They could come

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

from their parents/their culture. You don't want them to feel ganged up on. This could make them withdraw more' (R.50).

In regards to needs, the recurring theme is for 'training, education and resources' (R.32). For some respondents the tendency by educators to deny or avoid extremism can 'lead to the normalisation of attitudes that could lead to extremism' (R.1). In this context there is a need for educators to find the confidence and moral courage to address extremism. Finally, for one respondent to address extremism there is a need for curriculum development (e.g. inclusion of philosophy to promote understanding as opposed to knowledge) and wider diversity of 'race and religion' among teachers in schools (*note this is R.42 – only one person but interesting perspectives in line with ideas that emerged in focus groups*)

Useful Resources

The responses can be summarised into the following areas:

Resources

Class/educational settings: worksheets, case studies, and scenario based solutions, lesson plans, 'examples of how we can engage problem in educational settings' (R. 2) 'A designed programme that can be implemented in class' (R.3.2). 'Youth work programme to deliver with young people' (R.50).

Manuals/resource packs offering information on extremisms and guidance on how to address extremism (R.33), 'guidelines on how to deal with potential issues' (R.9). A guide covering factual information, advice and resources (R.16).

Videos/Stories: Aimed at teens, worksheets that go with film clips/extracts from novels/short stories.

Speakers: Guest speakers, meeting international experts,

Training: Professional development training and awareness programme, key readings.

Translators: To support diversity.

Online: Website covering information on extremism and how to address issues/ideas

Curriculum Development

Initial Teacher Education student programme for Junior and Senior level, with support for teachers.

Workshops/collaboration

Workshops: Shared dialogue forums across youth sector and other educational spheres (R.11). Meeting other involved with groups associated with extremism (R1). Support systems by way of shared discussion groups.

Systematic/structural

Policy: Anti-racist policy and training in all organisations.

Role of EAL Teachers: Developing the role of EAL teachers towards becoming a credible, respected and knowable group within teaching.

Support/Monitoring Structures: A dedicated support service to support training on extremism (e.g. within PDST). Develop an organisation that monitors and educates in area of extremism.

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

Current Interaction with Stakeholders

Colleagues: Teachers (student/practicing), peers, youth workers

Other Professionals/Actors: Principals, gardaí, politicians, educationalists, psychologists, policy makers, Academics, people working in criminal justice area, Human rights activists, Theologians

Community: Parents, students, victims of extremism **Informal** – friends who are teachers, loved ones

Organisations Statutory/Professional: Department of Education, NCCA, NCSE, ETBs, HSE Migrant Organisations, TUSLA, Educational Welfare Officers, universities, professional bodies.

School: Management bodies.

Voluntary/Civic society (NGO): Fantifa, Anti-Racism Network, National Youth Council of Ireland (NYCI), parents' representative groups, Interfaith conferences, Sport Against Racism Ireland, Irish Refugee Council, Pavee Point

Conferences: RAN

Potential Connections with other stakeholders.

A wide range of potential connections were noted by participants, in particular building greater connections between teachers and youth workers.

PDST/Department of Education: To provide training for teachers and also to build an inter-departmental approach.

Grassroots/vulnerable/marginalised groups: To build collective approaches and increase success.

Initial Teacher Education: To support development of students and connect with schools

Aid Agencies: To gain an understanding of issues on ground in other environments.

Online Platforms: To engage with PVE and CVE specialists to understand online platforms used by recruiter/promoters of extremism and also to engage with online developers

Hopes for Engagement: Development of a forum allow honest exploration of extremism and explore what we can do. Conference/online connection

Short Summary and Analysis of Findings (Focus Groups)

As part of WP2 two focus groups were held to explore the 'question of extremism' from diverse professional perspectives and the 'role of education' as a response to extremism. The first, larger group (ten people) comprised mainly practitioners, including principals, teachers, youth-workers and academics involved in teacher education. The second group was smaller (six people) and had more of a policy focus, including stakeholders from a leading teachers' union, a representative body for youth organisations, the Department of Justice, and An Garda Síochána (the Irish police). Both were conducted using a restorative practice framework, which allowed participants

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which 15 reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

to speak uninterrupted to the questions that had been circulated previously for a number of minutes. This involved sharing their experience and understanding of extremism and the role of education followed by a series of prompts on the project themes. What was most striking was the diversity of lenses, values, approaches and concerns that participants brought to the conversation, with each participant opening up a different dimension of the question, both in relation to pedagogical practice and values, and in respect of the level of analysis, with some focusing on the individual young person and others identifying the need for systematic analysis in order to understand the trajectories of young people's lives. As one participant underlined it is important to respond to the young person in their situated uniqueness rather than to look at these issues through the lens of group identity.

Policy, History, and Defining Extremism

Participants approached the issues of 'extremism' from a wide range of perspectives, many of which introduced a critical lens to the concept itself. One participant who was a member of the Garda Síochána asked *"Radical in comparison to what? Some "normal" Irish could be seen as ultra-extremist.* In this respect, the importance of being cognisant of *"how the language we use and how we frame out discussion dictates the outcomes"*. In this respect, a representative from an education trade union, approached the question of extremism by examining the rise of populism and other threats to democracy in Europe and beyond, whereby states were creating coalitions to support the far right. This participant noted how instances of racism tended to be individualised as bullying or prejudice, rather than understood at a macropolitical level. This participant noted the intersection of misogyny, sexism, and right wing extremism.

Given the absence of a 'Prevent' policy in Ireland or any national policy on the prevention of violent extremism/radicalisation, there was some discussion in the second focus group in particular on the 'values' that could be said to underpin the Irish approach to these issues. Responses from the two Department of Justice representatives were slightly mixed, but both emphasised inclusion as a key value and need to regard security-based initiatives as part of a broader spectrum or 'continuum' of responses. Nonetheless, one noted that in the Department of Justice these issues have to be approached with a "security lens". Both agreed that there was a very important role to be played by education in preventing extremism, albeit one that would (putatively) not be suitable for 'ringleaders' and those operating at the 'sharp end' of extremism.

In relation to young people who are regarded as susceptible to extremism the Department sees little difference in the profiles of those who are being targeted by organised criminal groups and those who may be attracted to extremist groups. It is therefore pursuing policies that would apply learnings from research into the diversion of young people from organised crime networks to the extremism and radicalisation context. This is evidenced in the draft Youth Justice Strategy which anticipates legislative measures to address grooming of children for criminal purposes as well as other initiatives 'to support those who are most vulnerable to becoming involved in serious offending, or at risk of radicalisation' (IYJS, 2020). In this respect, the approach in respect of education was framed by the lens of "vulnerability". Participants from both education and youth work tended to approach young people through strengths based lenses, including creating opportunities for empowerment and agency.

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

There are inherent dangers in adopting such a bifurcated approach, not least the ability to distinguish between those in need of ‘protection’ from those who are deemed to be beyond the reach of such policies. Moreover, the failure of the Department, and the Irish government more generally, to implement policies of inclusion *“on the ground”* was highlighted by a number of participants: *“what policies come out isn’t (sic) necessarily the practices on the ground, and the whole concept of integration and social inclusion, words that I feel sometimes have no meaning for young people”*. This was echoed very strongly by one youth worker, *“let’s be clear, they [the Department] are not operating from a human rights framework. ...The Department of Justice itself is perpetrating extremely, extremely racist structures and systems”*.

The problematic nature of the term *“extremism”* and the connotation of terrorism that often accompanies it was noted by other participants. This participant further problematised the concept by asking *“who decides something is extreme or radical? Is it that it runs against the norm?”* In response, the approach of youth work is one that supports young people in evaluating and questioning dominant norms, as indeed would be the position of many educators. By positioning young people as the problem fails to examine systems of oppression and the gaps between policy and reality on the ground in respect of inclusion and equality. Moreover, it was questioned whether what was at play in Irish was integration, or whether it was asking *“the other side to make an effort to assimilate”*, where, for example, there seemed to be little evidence that the institution sought *“to understand the difference of [for example] the Traveller community, and to bring empathy around that and to say there are differences how can we work with it”*. A representative from the Children’s Ombudsman Office noted the ways in which the anonymity of social media afforded a platform for racism and anti-immigration voices. Ensuring that young people and their families did not become disenfranchised, isolated and were supported was vital, and was clear from the work that the Office had done with young people in Direct Provision (asylum seeker accommodation). In this respect, the issue of Irish racism was raised as a problem, and something that these young people had also experienced in schools from their peers and teachers.

Finally, it was important to critically examine how the broad nationalistic discourses create forms of exclusion, and to adopt a justice framework in addressing these issues. A number of participants described how quickly conversations turned to nationalism in the Irish context and discussed the need to be open about *“our own history”*, and that this is something that *“we need to deal with”*, as described by participant involved in the professional development of educators. Whilst at policy and strategy level, discourses of integration were privileged, on the ground, practices were viewed as closer to assimilation, in particular given this lack of critical interrogation of Irish nationalism in all spheres of life, including education, and of educators’ and students’ commitments to a particular understanding of *“Irishness”* that was often exclusionary. One participant noted that when the Black Lives Matter movement emerged, young people started at a grassroots level talking about their lack of belonging, *“in the way they look, the way they are represented, the way their accent is, and the way that they are identified as the “different other”*. Noted by participants in both focus groups was the lack of diversity in the educators that they encounter, despite super-diverse and multi-cultural classrooms, and the need to educate educators about diversity, inclusion and belonging.

Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

One participant flagged the importance of learning from one another, and learning from other contexts in terms of how best to approach these issues in all their complexity. A key element of this involves seeing young people in their diversity, *“their hopes and aspirations as different aspects of their life”*, saying that *“we need to understand where they are situated in their lives, why they take certain pathways because they move in different directions, who influences them, who are their echo-chambers”*. However, it was noted *“you cannot start pinpointing a group and saying that is where the problem lies”*. Both focus groups also examined the ways in which groups are ‘othered’ in Ireland and the lack of interrogation of Ireland’s post-colonial history. Participants identified as a problem the construction of Irishness in the dominant narrative that serves to ‘other’ those who do not fit that construction. In this respect, Said’s conceptions of ‘otherness’ and the idea of ‘imagined communities’ was referred to at a number of points, alongside who is excluded from that imaginary.

This issue was also described through the language of belonging, asking whether someone feels they belong, and whether others believe they belong. Building on this, it was suggested that an ecological approach that approaches questions and instances of extremism as part of a process that needs to begin with reflection on one’s own identity, values, blind-spots and prejudices as educator and person before seeking to engage in dialogue and discussion with students. However such reflections and dialogue needed to be situated at a collective level that offered a critical evaluation of racism, including in terms of State policies, in order to move from a focus on individual and psychological resilience toward developing socio-ecological resilience. In short, if you wish to have a democratic life, you need to put in place the conditions that don’t push people to the margins.

A key theme cutting across both focus groups concerned the role of teacher education and the need to strengthen cultural competence at this level to ensure teachers are themselves educated about identity, diversity, inclusion, and belonging. However, a number of participants in both groups highlighted included a lack of diversity among teachers and youth workers, resulting in a lack of representativeness and lack of suitable role models: *“principals talk openly about the fact that their classrooms are multi-cultural, but their staff rooms are not”*. Another teacher, who was responsible for inclusion in her school, suggested *“teachers do not represent multiculturalism ... to try to counteract that I’ve been trying to make links with the wider community, bringing people in, guest speakers and all that”*. This raised questions about whether the educational sector, as a *“system, within a system, within a system”*, as one participant put it, and therefore imbued with its own flaws, was sufficiently well equipped to respond to the complex problem of extremism. The very limited space afforded citizenship education, which ends at 15-16 in Ireland, together with the strong ‘meritocratic ideological framework’ around which the system is framed, was highlighted as particularly problematic in this regard by one respondent in the second focus group.

Another participant underlined the importance of building on the knowledge and skills of people in community. The value of tolerance was underlined by one of the representatives from the Department of Justice, whilst a representative from the NCCA underlined the democratic values and inclusive practices that needed to underpin curriculum design.

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

Controversial and Sensitive Issues

Participants agreed that it is important to engage with controversial and sensitive issues, including those within the Irish context, the island of Ireland and Irish and Northern Irish history. There was a variety of perspectives in response to this with a small number of participants from both schools and youth work arguing that this is an area that requires specific expertise, whilst others felt that these issues can arise in any subject teaching and that teachers need to be equipped to engage with them. The Educate Together approach is a permeated one that seeks to ensure that the ethical education curriculum permeates all subjects, and that when issues arise teachers should address them immediately using a restorative approach, however, it was noted that there are challenge given the priority placed on “*academic*” subjects. This participants reflected on how what really matters can be forgotten at times in education. Other participants underlined the need for critical thinking, in particular in relation to controversial issues, to be approached through a more “*rational*” lens.

It was noted that a lot of teachers don’t feel comfortable in engaging in critical dialogue , critical thinking, and critical consciousness, and in navigating controversial issues. Moreover, when discussing extremism it is important to look at conspiracy theories as it can become a “rabbit hole to an echo chamber”. In order to discuss these question, the need for a “safe space” for both student and teacher was emphasised by a number of participants, with one noting that it needed to be “*safe and challenging*”. Some participants noted that certain subjects, like Politics and Society, are particularly discursive and can support these difficult conversations. The concept of “*multi-perspectivity*” was viewed as important, as were the critical thinking skills that would permit engagement with extremist views. This work requires reflection on “*bias, values, and stereotypes*”, a point reiterated by a number of participants and further outlined in the next section.

A further issue noted by participants was the need for upskilling in facilitation of difficult conversations, and a number of participants felt that initial teacher education programmes could also support students in developing these skills. However, another participant who had been engaged in a cross-border project noted how long identity change and capacity building takes, even in a supportive community of practice. It was important, one participant noted, to “*educate the people who will educate young people*”.

Self-Reflection and Engaging with Young People

In terms of the specific role of education in responding to extremism, one respondent working in the youth work context felt very strongly that her role was not to *prevent* extremism, but rather to ‘unpack’ what is going on. “*My work is not to prevent something but to bring it to discussion*”. A similar position was also taken by another participant who felt strongly that youth work should not be coopted as another means of ‘oppression’ of young people. Outside of this, ‘critical thinking’ seemed to be very much to the fore of practitioners’ minds in the first focus group when considering an educational response to the problem. This term was employed by participants in two, quite different ways, however, with one group tending towards the development of critical skills or ‘critical consciousness’ as a way of building up resistance to extremism and the other more concerned with what Stephens *et al* (2019: 7) have termed, ‘promoting political voice as prevention’. Some participants also reflecting on the level of investment involved in recruitment (to criminality and

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

violent extremism) and grooming, asking what kinds of investments society is prepared to make in these young people.

Restorative practices were mentioned by a diverse range of participants as ways of supporting a safe space and as mechanisms to repair harm. One participant described a youth work resource called *Transforming Hate* as a set of tools to enable reparation of harm and engage in *“healing justice”*. This means making sure that education and youth work are seen as separate from policing.

Consistently in the discussion, participants underlined the importance of self-reflection and awareness of practitioners in this space in order to create the conditions to be able to engage with young people. This was seen as a necessary condition for engagement. As one participant says *“deep reflection”* is needed *“and self-reflection work has to happen first”*. This required reflecting on how the system *“is manifesting in you”* as noted by the union representative who underlined the importance of understanding discrimination as systemic and of fostering teacher professional identities that supported questioning of *“who they are in the world”* and to become *“more articulate about their own identity”*. One youth worker described this in terms of *“me-other-third space which is where the us can emerge”*. One participant said that there is a gap between policy and practice and the language of integration and inclusion is not what matters to young people. The key issue is belonging, and *“belonging is what young people lack when they feel they are not part of the big picture and they don’t have those hopes and aspirations that fit in with the bigger picture”*. The questions that can support reflection include asking oneself and young people, *“Where do I belong? How do I belong? Who believes I belong”*. Part of this self-reflective process, noted one participant, involved deep reflection on purpose, including the purpose of education, and the ability to explore questions openly.

A significant number of focus group participants highlighted the timeliness of the research given the impact of the Covid 19 pandemic on extremism. On this view, the pandemic and lockdown have provided, not only plentiful material for right-wing conspiracy theories, but have also resulted in increased levels of fear, social isolation, uncertainty, anger and more time being spent alone for young people. As one participant put it, *“that isolation, exacerbated by the fear, brings [out] not necessarily the best in us”*. Participants highlighted the importance of critical thinking, critical media literacy and critical digital literacy as important tools in addressing mis- and dis-information, fake news, and the role of social media.

In relation to the former group, it is important to note that the type of dialogue envisaged by participants did not involve the silencing or condemnation of radical viewpoints: *“we have got to create ways in which students can engage with extremist views but in an educated way, in a critical way. In other words, we don’t rubbish the extremist views, we give them capacity and ability to be able to engage in that”*. There was a sense that this should be embedded across the curriculum rather confined to subjects such as history and politics and society. One participant noted in respect of polarisation that teenagers are susceptible to extremism, which can be manipulated, because they have *“a strong sense of justice”* and issues are *“often black and white and there are no grey areas”*. It was suggested that it’s important to support young people in engaging with the complexity of these issues and *“opinions that differ from their own in a responsible way”* in order to support forms of agency in response to injustice.

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

This latter, more politically oriented, form of critical thinking, was strongly articulated particularly by those participants coming from a youth work background: *“it’s about empowerment of young people, it’s about equality, it’s about inclusion, it’s about social justice, it’s about mutual respect, involving young people in the decision making”*. This (teacher) respondent likened this to opening up that *“slow process of change”* for students, thereby providing an avenue for what she termed young people’s *“strong sense of justice”*. Respondents saw this relationship as being built on trust and (structured) critical dialogue, which allowed those working with young people to raise *“social awareness”* and *“provoke thought”*. One pedagogical strategy advanced in this regard was the need to *“learn together”* about these difficult and controversial issues which, as one respondent argued, can be quite empowering for young people.

One youth worker respondent noted that since COVID there had been an increased focus on anti-mask protest, anti-lockdown and anti-government all related to the far right. The purpose of youth work is to engage with social education and social awareness and *“it’s great to see people learn together”* from the different perspectives of youth work and teaching, and the opportunities for non-formal education in the school curriculum.

However, another youth worker participant said that we need to re-frame prevention and reconnect with where the tradition is coming from people keeping the duty of care at its heart. This means asking *“How do we keep young people safe, able to grow, and to meet their potential”*. The Children’s Ombudsman and representative from the NCCA noted that rather than only focusing on vulnerability when discussing child protection, it’s important to see this as a matter for children’s rights and human rights, creating the conditions for equality and inclusion of all young people. In this respect, again, there was resistance to deficit framing of the language of *“vulnerability”* which tended to individualise and *“psychologise”* these issues, in favour of looking at the systemic barriers in place and developing a positive discourse about inclusion that reframes the work of justice. Building on this the union representative noted how the *“ultra right”* have mobilised the *“culture wars and identity politics”* to remove young people from school or withdraw young people from participation in the wider curriculum. This tension between *“parental rights”* and *“children’s rights”* was viewed as significant, in particular in the Irish context in terms of constitutional protections. In this regard, a further discussion ensued about child protection policies in relation to prevention, as one that moves from a minimal approach of *“keeping children safe”* to one that affords the opportunity to all children to exercise their rights. One youth work participant asked *“Is it possible to take the education space, to extricate it from the security frame”*, and if so *“what would be the specific role [of education]”*

Conclusion of National Report

Whilst there is a fringe far-right movement in Ireland, there is little evidence of widespread extremism or violent extremism or violent radicalisation. It should be noted that those groupings who remain committed to physical force republicanism or loyalism are not framed as extremist, and indeed are not referred to by the vast majority of participants. In this regard, it may be helpful to reflect on the social construction of extremism and the ways in which this is shaped and understood by global trends and discourses. A further key issue that requires further exploration is the legacy of cultural nationalism in Ireland, one historically defined in opposition to Britain, and its relation to racism. However, it should be noted that racism is an issue and Ireland has not introduced hate speech

2.3 EDURAD MAPPING AND RESEARCH Analysis– Ireland



Co-Funded by the Internal Security Fund Police (ISF-P) Programme by the European Union

legislation. At the moment a National Anti-Racism Committee is developing an Action Plan against Racism. The aim of this is to address the policy implementation gap through concrete actions.

There is a risk in a project focused on prevention, such as EDURAD, of seeking to pre-empt a problem because of the fear that it might come into being, and in so doing create a problem that did not exist until constituted as such. The issue of extremism is a sensitive and complex one, and there is a risk of constructing polarised positions that in turn create the conditions for reciprocal polarisation. Wider societal and global discourses, shape how participants understand concepts like extremism, and these also influence perceptions of existential threat and fear. Importantly in dialogues with a number of participants, prior to dissemination of the questionnaires, upon invitation to the focus groups, and during the focus groups, concerns were raised about the purpose of the project and the aims that it served. In part, these were informed by the experience in the UK of the Prevent strategy and concerns that this project might seek to support a securitised approach to these questions, one that risked alienating, stereotyping, and/or demonising young people.

No evidence of violent extremism was provided by participants, and participants were keen to engage with the question of extremism educationally. There was some difficulty raised with the “negative” and anticipatory framing of the term “prevention” and a sense that more positive ways of approaching these issues might be more helpful. This meant for a number of participants examining the meaning of the term “preventing extremism”. In this regard, it was seen as more helpful to reframe the educational task as one of “unpacking extremism” whilst also exploring as professionals what prevention and protection mean in education. Participants were keen to reflect on what prevention and child protection mean in a holistic sense. This involves, in the case of prevention, thinking more holistically about supportive structures for young people from the micro to the macro level, engaging with questions of identity, belonging, systemic and structural racism (including by the State), and democratic participation. In the case of child protection, there is a risk of the securitisation of child protection, or of treating the child as inherently vulnerable rather than, in the case of education, seeking to conceptualise child protection in such a way that it is protective of a range of rights of the child. However, some participants suggested that youth work may be better positioned for prevention and intervention than school settings which could be more suited to prevention.

Overall, the research suggests a positive educational engagement with these issues is one which: 1. Supports reflection, dialogue, and relationships (a “self-other-us” framework); 2. Develops capabilities for facilitating and engaging with difficult conversations, including hate speech, racism and sexism, on both an individual and collective level; 3. Addresses prevention and intervention differently, acknowledging the tensions; and 4. Cultivates the imagination and explores questions of identity, belonging, meaning, agency, and purpose, individually and collectively. There was an appetite to create communities of practice with practitioners of diverse professional backgrounds to share knowledge, ideas and practice. As one participant noted, there is a risk in stereotyping those in marginalised and disenfranchised communities as ‘at risk of radicalisation’ when there are other young people who are not in that marginal position and become involved in (violent) extremism or radicalisation because they feel they don’t fit into a frame. It was felt that it is important to include the voices and ideas of young people in discussions about these questions, and there was a need for further discussion about the question of harm, power, agency, parameters for engagement, and clarity in terms of best approaches to working with stakeholders, including those from the criminal justice system.

The European Commission’s support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which 22 reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.