Hence good-practice deradicalisation interventions are characterized by the following *practice guidelines* and impact-factors:

(A) The good-practice intervention itself – and its components

(i) Building trust and relationship is key

Good-practice interventions are successful – above all – in *building personal trust* and convey *respect* in order to able to *challenge* and *facilitate personal change*. In other words: these interventions manage to provide a safe and confidential space for establishing a *sustainably trust- and respect-based work relationship* between the client(s) and the practitioner(s) – and between the clients as a group themselves. This is a quite demanding task since it means to build trust with a type of client that is generally alienated from authorities and society at large and thus tends to be quite distrustful and volatile as persons – sometimes bordering a paranoid mind set.

Yet, *building personal trust* is by far the most important – and utterly indispensible – prerequisite for any good-practice exit hate crime and extremism approach. Wherever and however deradicalisation programs are employed (prison, probation, schools etc.), establishing trust and confidence/ confidentiality is the all or nothing prerequisite – without which an intervention will only have limited capacity to challenge and confront the clients and thus facilitate change in personal attitude and behaviour.

aaa A trustful work relationship is substantially different from a *fraternizing comradeship*, as among buddies, fellows, homeboys etc. (which typically exists in adolescent groups). Rather, the establishment of a *trustful work relationship* will always rest both on the element of support/respect and confrontation/ critique. Moreover, it will have a clear focus on agreed objectives of the joint work effort – e.g. the client's development of certain personal skills.

aaa It is most important to note here, that building trust between clients and practitioners is, in good-practice, predicated on *personal talent and specific skills trainings of the facilitator* (see xii). Above all, however, good-practice rests upon one pivotal *context factor* which will be elaborated further down: It requires that *independent, non-statutory, i.e. non-governmental practitioners* from outside the institution are involved – and that their work is

accompanied by visible *trust between statutory and non-governmental actors* (see B.i below).

(ii)   The narrative mode and life-world focus – versus debate/ argumentation

In their methodology good-practice practitioners generally focus on facilitating *narrative exchange* – as opposed to argumentative, ideological/ political and debate-like discussion. Narrative exchange means that the clients interact on a level of speech in which they share *personally lived-through* experiences, events, and interactions – however subjectively perceived – that form a part of their individual biographical memory, carry *personal involvement* – as well as *emotional charge*. Therefore, narrative exchange always also implies to engage in a *life-world* and *relationship based* interaction. aaa It is for these reasons that narrative exchange and trust-building are closely linked – and interdependent on each other. Conversely, any exchange in 'argumentative/ rational mode' tends to convey only very little personal experiences, if at all, but rather contains arguments, theories, opinions and ideological believes. It fuels debate but does not by itself create trust.

Hence, successful good-practice anti hate crime and deradicalisation practitioners will manage to build and support in their clients the *capacity to partake in narrative inter-personal exchange* with others – and recount *thoughts and memories* of emotional significance that carry a potential of personal and/or social conflict. This means …

-- to support the client's development of a new sense and appreciation for aaa *telling stories*, i.e. *narrating personally experienced occurrences* of subjective significance – and also, with caution, expressing the either positive or negative emotional charge, that these experiences may carry,

-- to support her/his ability to *actively listen* to and respect such narrations with others and, in fact, *co-narrate* them, i.e. gain the capacity to actively encourage and assist the story-telling process of others within a group and in informal social situations,

-- aaa to instill a new attitude towards and appreciation of *personal memories* and of *remembering and recounting* events of personal (family) history.

--   This focus on a trust-based and narrative story telling exchange will particularly, and cautiously, include experiences of *embarrassment/ shame, insecurity, fear, helplessness,* also experiences of *aggression, hostility and violence* – since these affects have proven to play a major role in generating acts of hostility and hate violence.

-- It will also entail the acknowledgement of experiences of aaa *personal ambivalence*, *self-contradiction*, *internal conflict* and experiences of *compromise*.

(iii) Emotional intelligence – rather than cognitive

Good-practice anti hate crime and deradicalisation interventions put the emphasis on *emotional learning* and *emotional intelligence* rather than cognitive learning. It specifically aims at acquiring *conflict intelligence*, i.e. the ability to handle conflict in productive ways. aaa This also means that these interventions don't overstress any educational 'topic' or 'intellectual issue' as such. Instead they focus on the subjective – and most often conflictive – dimension of any topic and on 'identity issues'. *Emotional and conflict learning* needs to be the main focus due to the well-known fact that prejudices, hostility and hate crime are first and foremost emotional phenomena – even if they are attached to elements of cognitive and ideological reasoning.

(iv) Voluntary participation – and incremental buy-in

In good-practice anti hate crime and deradicalisation interventions participants sign up *on a voluntary basis* only – in the sense that enrolling and attending is up to the participants own decision and is carried by some degree of personal motivation. This means that participation *must not be assigned* or mandatory, and drop-out must not be held against the client and go on her/his records in any way. (Notably, drop-out under these circumstance is minimal, usually around 3-5%.) By the same token, only modest forms of *incentive* – if any at all – should be held out for participants.

Voluntary participation does, however, not at all rule out *motivational* one-on-one conversations and mentoring in order to encourage and specifically support a person once s/he has expressed some minimal degree of interest in taking part and undergoing personal change.

(v) Group-based intervention work is key

In some good-practice approaches the most significant parts of the work take place *in the group and with the group*, and thus attention is paid to the process and *group-dynamic* relationships of the participants with one another. No one-on-one intervention can possibly be as effective and profound in its deradicalising impact as a group-work approach.

Good-practice group-work approaches will secure a *conducive dosage* of group intensity. They will off-set and balance the group-work by pedagogical exercises and supplementary one-on-one sessions of support for individual clients whenever the need arises – especially

in moments when the client changes from one institution/ life period to another (prison, probation, community, school, employment etc.).

(vi)   Open-process, 'participatory' approaches – methodological flexibility

Good-practice methodology is based on *open-process interaction* which, as a matter of principle, builds on and explores the participants' issues, suggestions and immediate reactions during the group interaction process – while the facilitators make suggestions only. Hence, there is *no strict syllabus*, *fixed session plan*, or *set tool box*. Rather, the interventions are characterized by *methodological flexibility* and *eclecticism*. Open-process, 'participatory', and exploratory interaction is indispensable for building trust, respect and personal commitment with difficult to engage client groups.

Clients from sub-cultural areas of group-focused hatred and ideologically charged violent extremism will hardly change their attitude and behavior just because they are told/ taught to – or are put through a cognitive-behavioral training program with a set modular structure. Hence, the participants – even though and precisely because they may not be used to doing so! – will explore the issues around their offenses (which may be issues of prejudice, extremism or harassment etc.) on their own paths rather than be taught to or reasoned with.

(vii)   Likely topics and issues of open-process anti hate crime work

If the aforementioned methodological principles of open-process narrative group-work are at work and the group/ individuals have picked up on this process, the following *topics and issues* are quite likely to be brought up in the group – or may easily be suggested by the facilitators:

- commonly shared and/or individual *biographical issues* and *social circumstances*
- experiences of *dysfunctional parenting*, unstable family conditions and chronic relational stress in their families (which clients are often hardly aware of). This most often encompasses experiences of *deprivation, denigration and violent victimization* (which clients tend to belittle or deny), also depending on the client group: experience of *alcohol and drugs* as dysfunctional coping strategies in the family
- one's own *patterns* of behavior as member of a group and/or within the group work intervention itself
- e.g. one's tendency to install *power relationships*, claiming superiority over and subdue/ denigrate others

- events/ experiences within a clique as *'surrogate family'* – and becoming dependent on it
- experiences of *being recruited* in a personally targeted manner
- *friendship*, loyalty – versus *dependency*/ subjugation
- *gender issues*, as manliness / maleness , the other sex, homosexuality etc.
- most importantly: the scenes of having *acted as a perpetrator/ victimizer*, and of having committed acts of hatred, denigration and violence against others
- politics/ religion, discussing and reflecting upon *internalized ideological believes* – and looking at and confronting *simplified thought patterns* and *pseudo-logical explanations,* also *geo-political conflicts* – as portrayed *in the media*
- *fictional media narratives* of the participants own choice in their particular function to personal thought and action[1]

aaa Of particular *narrative-emotional* intensity will be the group sessions on scenes of hostile/ violent acting-out, committed brutalities and hate crimes – sometimes in combination with the exchange about experiences of victimization and denigration. Research and practitioner experiences clearly indicate: A frank and as detailed as possible exchange about these scenes is crucial for good-practice anti hate crime interventions.

aaa *Conversely*, *what does not* lend itself to supporting open-process, narrative, and exploratory exchange and to developing personal capacities of (co-)narrative interaction, is: cognitive-behavioral training programs with a modular structure, as they are currently applied in many sectors of intervention work. Quite on the contrary, cognitive-behavioral approaches often serve the function of avoiding the direct (co-)narrative interaction among facilitators and clients and instead produce obedience – and thus forgo the most powerful impact factor of inducing personal change.

(viii) Civic education – political debate and perceived/real grievances and injustice

While the modus of narrative, emotional and life-world oriented exchange is prevalent in good-practice approaches, strategies and issues *of civic education* and *political/ ideological debate* need to be part of the intervention to some extent. However, it is important to keep in mind that it is generally not too conducive to talk ideology or morals to clients with extremists/ fundamentalist leanings. Because even with them, ideology/ religion wasn't an

---

[1] The particular option to work with fiction narratives may have certain methodological ramifications (see www.weilnboeck.net: Provincializing Trauma: A Case Study …" (2012), "Towards a New Interdisciplinarity …" (2009), "Mila … Fallgeschichte …" (2008), "Die Anwendung der Gruppenanalyse …" (2002).

issue in the first place but came later as secondary add-on to their pre-existing extremist/ delinquent disposition.

Hence, the *ideological believes* – and *simplified attitudes/ opinions* – which are, in fact, internalized in the course of an extremist's biography, need to be worked with systematically through observing these believes' emotional investment and biographical embedding in the person's life-history. aas Yet, instead of aiming to win arguments the maximum effect one may aim for, is putting in 'seeds of doubt' – since for this group of clients doubts, questions and ambivalences are, generally, not acceptable as viable options of thought.

Aside of ideological believes, particular attention needs to be given to any perceived and real *grievances and injustices* which participants bring up in such debate. These grievances need to be acknowledged and flashed out by a more in-depth narrative exchange, while taking into account the fact that main-stream society – and governmental representatives – may, on numerous occasions and/or even systematically, act in a less than fair and human-rights affirming fashion.

**(ix)   Pedagogical exercises from 'democracy education' and
           'human rights education' – emphasis of personal responsibility**

aaa There are various traditions of methods for educational group settings that help to render more graspable what democracy, non-discrimination and human rights mean in actual living practice. 'Diversity training', 'anti-bias work' and other such approaches may – if not imposed and/or overdone – help a group to acquainted with new thinking about and experiences of human rights, respect, inclusion/ non-racism etc. and thus build democratic and liberal society values, in very participatory-focused ways.

(x)   The element of history – and the factor of culture/ youth-culture and fictional media narratives

aaa By the same token, good-practice narrative anti hate crime interventions always have an intrinsically *historical dimension* – albeit possibly a very simple one which certainly does not require systematic teaching of 'history lessons'. History, thus, means that the intervention raises awareness for the plain fact that things in life develop over time, depend on given formative real-world circumstances – and most of all: are changeable in principle. Hence, history is, at first, dealt with as *individual life-history* of the clients and as their

family history. It may then, all the more effectively, be approached as the *socio-political* history – i.e. History in the usual sense.

Furthermore, good-practice approaches tend to observe the *factor of culture and media* – and of *co-narrative creativity*. They may thus bring in cultural, youth-cultural and fictional media narratives and work with them – and they encourage creativity and reflexive thought. Generally, young people are very approachable by youth-cultural activities. Also they are avid users of media, in particular of *fictional media narratives* (films, TV, on-line, songs etc.) which carry personal investments of identity issues and/or have 'entertainment' functions.

(B) The context factors of good-practice intervention programs

(i) Independent outside practitioners – confidentiality

As already alluded to above (in A.i), with regard to the *formal setting* of the intervention it is most conducive if the *facilitators come from outside the institution* of their clients (prison, probation, schools etc.) – and have non-governmental status. For, the facilitators of deradicalisation processes need to be able to – and be perceived by their clients to – *act with a certain degree of independently* and, thus*, grant a safe and confidential space* to the participants of the intervention.

In light of the indispensable element of trust and confidence-building, *independence and confidentiality* are key requirements of good-practice anti hate crime work, without which an intervention has only little prospects of sustainable success – and may even have adverse effects. Because, firstly, a radicalized person – or any institutionalized person – will hardly be able to build sustainable trust vis-à-vis an institutionalized government employee who has power over and writes reports on her/him. Secondly, a person that joins a – state-of-the-art – anti hate crime intervention is up for processes of personal change which touch upon quite deep-seated and sensitive affects and memories. This undertaking compares to a process of personal coaching or psychotherapy – and there it is generally regarded as not permissible to receive services (as coaching or psychotherapy) from a practitioner who has existential power over her/him (like family or job superiors). Therefore, the independent outside anti hate crime practitioners must have the authority to provide a *secure and confidential space* for the clients to speak and interact freely.

(ii)   The institution supports the outside-practitioners

However, good-practice delivered by independent outside-practitioners heavily relies *on the institution itself.* The institution needs to be on board. It needs to actively signal its high esteem for the incoming facilitators – and its readiness to support, secure and carry on the results of their work. aaa For this purpose institutional staff needs to be trained and educated about the complexity of anti hate crime and deradicalisation work. Statutory employees and leadership may, thus, ask for *consultancy and staff training* from the independent practitioners and/or their organization – in order to be able to better sustain the work done by the practitioners.

(iii)   Funding NGOs – trust between state and non-governmental sector

Already the EC's 2009 *Stockholm Programme* states: "Key to our success (in de-radicalisation) will be the degree to which non-governmental groups [...] across Europe play an active part". Allowing for independent, non-governmental practitioners to play a key role within anti hate crime interventions of governmental institutions (prison, probation, schools etc.) also relies on *statutory* and *budgetary structures* – for financial and for principle reasons. It requires providing a modus of stable funding for experienced non-governmental practitioners' organizations – which are mostly NGOs and civil society organizations.

Professional and financial security also supports another key element of building resilient societies and effective societal prevent structures: It signals *visible trust between governmental and non-governmental* organizations. Given that for most sorts of extremism/ terrorism the state is a key enemy image and is perceived as an entity that abuses and distrusts its citizens, visible trust between statutory and civil community actors as well as support and trust for 'outside practitioners' – i.e. 'outsiders' – needs to be regarded as a systemic impact factor of deradicalisation in its own right.

(iv)   The practitioners' skills/ talent – and intervention style

The *practitioners' intervention style* will lend itself to generating a resilient work relationship, based on narrative and open-process/ exploratory interaction – both in group and one-on-one exchange. In particular, the practitioners will signal *trustworthiness, personal authenticity, institutional independence,* and *personal curiosity.* Furthermore, the practitioners' interaction style will be characterized by *critical attentiveness* (or *respectful enquiry*) which is both *accepting and confrontational* at the same time. Thereby, a basic distinction will be observed *between the person* of the client, which is accepted and

respected, and *the offence behavior* and violently extremist opinions which are not accepted but will be questioned and confronted.

(v)   Training and professional assistance for practitioners – and quality management

Good-practice experiences in anti hate crime and deradicalisation interventions show that this work relies on practitioners that possess various kinds of *skills and knowledge* both on the personal/ attitudinal and the methodological level. However, no one has ever been able to implement state-of-the-art deradicalisation methodology just from reading examples of best-practice (on a website). Hence, a *train-the-trainer program* and a *pool of expert practitioners* is needed who have experience with and in-depth knowledge about state-of-the-art deradicalisation methodology and about how to personally implement, adjust and employ it in different work fields and local areas.

(vi)   Party-political and media discourses

Party-political and *media discourses* on issues of extremism are of crucial importance for the success of deradicalisation interventions with at-risk individuals. Hence, the manner in which representatives from *government(s), political parties* and other *public institutions* speak about issues and incidents of violent extremism, hate crime, and human rights – as for instance about victims/ survivors, perpetrators, interventions, prejudices and possibly mainstream extremist views – needs to be taken into account. Currently incidents of *group related hatred* and extremism are often neglected, covered-up, and/or instrumentalised for populist campaigning and partisan political interests in the overwhelming majority of EU Member States. Moreover, media tend to use these issues mostly for sensational purposes rather than helping to counter and prevent any further promotion of extremism and group-focused hatred.

These predicaments of public discourses would need to be openly acknowledged and dealt with by any intervention. In addition it may be pointed out to the participants what difference it would make if a *cross-partisan code of ethics/ conduct* was in place which provided guidelines and rules on how to best speak about issues and incidents of hate crime and extremism in public discourse – be it as representative of a government, a (non-extremist) political entity, or the media.

(vii)   Family, community and other civil society groups – also victims/ survivors

In addition to specialized deradicalisation practitioners coming from outside into the institution (prison, schools etc.), good-practice will also often encompass an extra, third-party element of civil society and community participation. Hence, members of *different groups of civil society* should be called upon to come into the institution and take on a particular role in the intervention as interlocutors, commentators and witnesses with special experiences – e.g. ex-offenders and so-called 'formers', i.e. people who have exited violent extremist life-styles, also victims/ survivors of extremist acts (with certain methodological precaution), and respected/ charismatic representatives from the community or mainstream society. Particularly, family members may under certain conditions contribute to deradicalisation processes.

To be sure, the participation of family, community and civil society persons has to be well thought through, prepared and mediated by the practitioners. Also it needs to be carefully embedded into the methodical intervention program as such.

In general, however, it seems quite desirable that the risk-averse *security perspective* which has been characteristic for most of the statutory counter-extremism and prevent activities in the past, may be supplemented by a more risk-open and *inclusive civil society perspective*. Bridges need to be build across opposite entities such as 'civil and public', 'statutory and non-governmental', 'professional and volunteer', 'local, national and international', 'East and West" (cf. Copenhagen Convention 2012, see note xx).

(viii)   Cross-institutional, long-term support relationships – and change management

Disengaging from extremism requires *stable practitioner and mentor relationships* which last over time and, most importantly, remain in place when the client leaves an institution and moves on towards a different sphere of life. (Hence, even for practical reasons non-statutory NGO practitioners that can easily be active in several sectors of society are well positioned to execute this cross-institutional function.)

The necessity of *cross-institutional mentoring/ coaching* may be most evident with imprisoned clients. Here the deradicalisation practitioner/ mentor should already be in charge during prison time and the client relationship developed there should be carried over into the post-release time. There, the same practitioner may then provide *change management* during the early phases of the ex-offender's time in the community.

The need for stable support and prevent radicalisation relationships also holds true for other sorts of institutional change, e.g. school- apprenticeship/work etc.

By the same token, interventions have to be *long-term* and be carried by a visible *strong institutional and societal commitment*. Project-style interventions of an only short/middle-term stretch may even be counter-productive, since they tend to enhance frustration and distrust with the, mostly quite volatile, clients – that generally have not had much experience of stable commitment and responsibility in their personal lives. Here, only long-term and resilient coaching relationship will be able to create confidence and thus set the stage for facilitating personal change and deradicalising effects. aaa (Again, non-governmental practitioners being independent, offering confidentiality, and being supported in their work by state-of-the-art quality control measures are in a good position to provide this coaching.)

(ix)   What doesn't work – anger management and cognitive-behavioral training

Regarding the reverse question of *which approaches have little or adverse effects* in exit hate crime and deradicalisation work, the quoted research and practitioner exchanges agree on the pitfalls and shortcomings of (a) fully modularized *cognitive-behavioral training programs* (CBT) and (b) pure *anti-aggression* or *anger management trainings*. aaa Pure CBT approaches do not support open-process/ exploratory exchange. On the contrary, they often serve the function of actively avoiding the direct (co-)narrative interaction between facilitators and clients and among clients in the group. They instead involuntarily produce obedience and a Let's-get-it-over-with attitude) that lacks personal commitment. Anger management courses tend to stay on the surface of what the "anger"/ "aggression" means personally to the individual, where it comes from biographically and what attitudes and behaviours it is attached to. Unless such techniques are carefully embedded into a solid methodological framework of an open-process, relationship-based and narrative intervention approach, elements of cognitive-behavioural and anti-aggression trainings will be less effective than generally expected – and carry considerable risks of adverse effects.

Example profiles of good practice approaches in anti hate crime/ deradicalisation work

To sum up, most successful are *open-process, exploratory* intervention approaches, which, in methodological terms, are *narrative*, *relational as well as trust and challenge* based, offer *confidentiality* and *commitment*, and ideally are delivered by *non-governmental* practitioners. These especially *skilled* and *trained* practitioners act with some degree of independence within and across *statutory institutions* the staff of which proactively assist and complement the intervention. The *open-process* approaches focus on *emotional* intelligence, use *group*-dynamics, touches upon biography, family, gender, and violence/

power issues, employ advanced *civic education* and fiction/ cultural methods, include family, community and civil representatives, combine both *accepting* and *confrontational* modes of interaction – and are supported by state-of-the-art *quality control*.

The 'European Network of Deradicalisation' website which is currently built up by VPN (Berlin) in the context of an EU-ISEC project, will soon be able to provide numerous examples and profiles of first-line practitioner approaches throughout Europe that, in their own specific contexts, have developed or are in the process of developing good-practice work. In anticipation of these profiles two Berlin NGO approaches (by Cultures Interactive and the Violence Prevention Network) may stand in for the moment.

xxx
(i)   Testimonials – and 'deradicalising narratives'

Some intervention approaches use audio-visual *testimonials* – and/or '*counter-narratives*' in the broadest sense (accessible through media and the internet). These testimonials may stem from (a) ex-radicals/ ex-offenders of different kinds of violent extremism and hate crime, (b) family and acquaintances of (ex-)radicals, (c) moderate voices of the respective cultural and community backgrounds, (d) social workers and experts that work with such clientele, and (e) – with certain methodological precaution – victims/ survivors of terrorist acts and hate crimes.

The systematic conceptualisation of such testimonials/ deradicalising narratives as well as the development of methodology – in terms of interviewing, post-production of interview materials, and didactic embedding of the testimonial into the intervention program – is still very much at the beginning. One needs to be aware that not every testimonial/ narrative may in fact have a deradicalising effect with every kind of at-risk person at every moment of his/her deradicalisation process. (This might apply in particular to victim/ survivor testimonials.)
Moreover, it has to be kept in mind that a triggered deradicalisation process may fail and even backfire, i.e. have avers effects, if not handled appropriately.

Methodologically unquestioned, however, seems at this point in time, that any such audio-visual testimonials should…

(1) … be largely in "narrative mode" in the strict sense, as stated above ("the narrative mode … of exchange", A.ii). This implies that the person providing the testimony "shares personally lived-through experiences" and accounts of subjectively factual events and interactions. It does so in a manner that is as saturated by first-hand experience, personal

involvement/ emotion as possible – and therefore induced trust and trustworthiness. Hence, such testimonial does not so much express opinions, thoughts, ideologies/ theories – let alone 'counter-arguments'.

(2) … be carefully embedded into the intervention process itself. Watching a testimonial does not necessarily have a deradicalising effect by itself. Whenever a testimonial is placed within an intervention it needs to be (a) didactically prepared before and (b) appropriately worked-through after the input and thus personalized for the individual participants. This requires, among other things, that the testimonial is systematically sequenced and dealt with in an in-depth and step-by-step manner. This process needs to be assisted by guiding questions and narrative impulses that help to illuminate and further develop the complex subjective readings (subjective reception procedures) that the individual listeners will have of the testimonial – and that the listeners will articulate within the group process.

As to the "narrative mode", it needs to be stated that current notions of "counter narratives" against violent extremism(s) tend to overlook the crucial linguistic and psychological distinction between *narrative and argumentative*. They thus follow strategies of "countering arguing" and "delegitimizing extremist rhetoric" by way of debate, rational and factual information input. However, it has long been proven that just "countering" extremist arguments/"narratives" will have but little deradicalisation effect on more vulnerable and already radicalized individuals. On the contrary, it might even have avers effects. For, extremist arguments/ "narratives" feed on being "countered", they feed on arguments psycho-dynamically as they feed on any logic of fight and warfare in general.

More helpful it is to realize that both "extremist" and "counter extremist narratives" usually have only little or no *narrative* quality – in the sense of sharing first-hand personal experience. The widespread term "extremist narratives" thus is basically a misnomer. In fact, one key psychological function that countering, arguing, fighting etc. has for at-risk or extremists people is to avoid narratives proper, i.e. evade any situation in which "personally lived-through experiences" might be shared and explored. Therefore, the way to handle extremist patterns of thought and affect (which is mostly hatred and self-aggrandizement) is not to argue with or counter them but to – as it were – dissolve them by *narrativising* them, i.e. by exploring and uncovering the areas of personal experience which, consciously or not, fuel these patterns.

Adopting a conceptual framework of *narrativity* and strategies of *narrativising* is strongly commended by the findings of interdisciplinary psychology, biography studies, narratology and psychotherapy research, i.e. the systematic investigation of how people may embark on personal change. (David Herman xx Mc Load, Rosenthal, Weilnböck). Here key

methodological resources for interviewing, postproduction, and the embedding into the intervention-process can be found.

In consequence, what good-practice testimonial methodology needs to keep in mind is the risk of falling into the trap of anti-narrative, argumentative communication which spends much effort on countering arguments. Hence, if the United Nation's Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (UN-CTITF) states that "counter-narratives" we should produce need to put forth "an effective comprehensive message" which "dismantles and counter-argues against every dimension of the extremist narrative", it will not succeed in stimulating a deradicalisation process.

The degree of narrativity (and impact) which a testimonial may have is, for the most part, subject to the technique of interviewing which is applied to generate it. (For sure, the person's ability to narrate as well as the post-production design of the testimonial play a role too.) As far as academic narratology is concerned, narrativity depends on various general and specific parameters. General parameters of narrativity are:

the level of detail of the narrative,
the mise-en-scene of the accounted events/ interactions,
the richness of its wider life-world context,
biographical embedding in a timeline of past-present-future
its interactive quality vis-à-vis the interviewer (in terms of the principles above)

subjective perception of the narrator.

the consistency/-ies of account (cf. psycho-linguistic consistency criteria)
the emotional charge throughout the process of storytelling
the amount of expressed reality-checking and personal ambivalences,
the sense of (self-) empathy / introspection

The question of how to gain material and produce testimonials of high narrativity can be quickly answered here: The methodology both of interviewing and of postproduction follow the very principles which have been laid out as principles of good-practice intervention approaches above: That means that the interviewing and the arrangement of materials focus on open-process, narrative, and relational interaction which unfolds in a confidential and exploratory space, allows for emotional charge and ambivalence – and is based on both trust/ respect and challenge. Hence, the interviewing proceeds this way in order to gather the narrative interview material and the postproduction thereof does something similar in that it makes sure that the testimonial not only contains answers and statements, but also portrays the process and conveys the ethics of open-process interaction/ facilitation. In terms of

concrete methodological resources, the technique of narrative-biographical interviewing from social research and various approaches of conducting in-take interviews for psycho-therapy (Angus/ McLeod, Lucius-Hoene/Deppermann, G.Rosenthal).

As specific parameters of narrativity (impact) in deradicalising narratives/ testimonials:

grievances
credentials

Narrative exchange means that the clients interact on a level of speech in which they share *personally lived-through* experiences and accounts of events,– however subjectively perceived – that form a part of their individual biographical memory, carry *personal involvement* – as well as *emotional charge*. Therefore, narrative exchange always also implies to engage in a *life-world* and *relationship based* interaction. aaa It is for these reasons that narrative exchange and trust-building are closely linked – and interdependent on each other. Conversely, any exchange in 'argumentative/ rational mode' tends to convey only very little personal experiences, if at all, but rather contains arguments, theories and ideological believes. It fuels debate but does not by itself create trust.

(2)

that the interviews are systematically designed for the target group

basically in two direction
as it were – a vertical and horizontal direction of of illuminating and deepening the personal experience
delve into and engross and explore
immerse oneself

for the medial presentation