



RECEIVED 9 September 2025
ACCEPTED 4 March 2026
PUBLISHED 30 April 2026

CITATION

Faisal F, Songgirin A. (2026).
Pathways to Youth Radicalization:
A Criminological Analysis of Risk
Factors and Prevention Strategies.
Ijomata International Journal of
Social Science. 7 (2), 585-591.
doi: 10.61194/ijss.v7i2.1940

TYPE Original Research

PUBLISHED 30 April 2026
DOI 10.61194/ijss.v7i2.1940
VOL 7 Issue 2 April 2026

COPYRIGHT

© 2026 Faisal and Songgirin. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Pathways to Youth Radicalization: A Criminological Analysis of Risk Factors and Prevention Strategies

Fedhli Faisal¹, Amin Songgirin²

¹²Universitas Pamulang, South Tangerang, Indonesia

Correspondence: dosen02794@unpam.ac.id¹

Abstract

The growing involvement of youth in violent extremism and radical movements has emerged as a pressing global concern, raising urgent questions about the underlying social and criminogenic factors that drive this phenomenon. This study aims to explore the pathways of youth radicalization through a criminological lens, identifying the key risk factors and proposing context sensitive prevention strategies. Using a normative juridical and descriptive analytical approach, the research examines relevant legal frameworks, criminological theories, and secondary data sources to develop a comprehensive model of youth radicalization. The findings reveal that radicalization is not a linear or homogenous process, but rather the result of intersecting influences such as social marginalization, institutional neglect, identity crises, and exposure to extremist narrative often reinforced by digital environments. The analysis supports and expands upon strain theory and social disorganization theory, emphasizing the role of structural exclusion and weakened community ties. This study also identifies limitations in dominant counter radicalization strategies that rely heavily on surveillance and psychological profiling, arguing instead for holistic, rights based, and community driven interventions. The research contributes to the theoretical discourse on radicalization while offering actionable recommendations for policymakers, educators, and civil society actors. Its implications underscore the need for preventive frameworks that are ethically grounded, socially inclusive, and empirically informed. By shifting the paradigm from securitization to social resilience, this study advocates for a more just and sustainable approach to addressing youth radicalization.

KEYWORDS

youth radicalization, criminological theory, risk factors, prevention strategies, social marginalization.

Introduction

In recent decades, youth radicalization has emerged as a pressing global concern, capturing the attention of scholars, policymakers, and law enforcement agencies alike. The increasing involvement of young individuals in ideologically motivated violence, extremist movements, and acts of terrorism highlights a complex interplay of social, psychological, and structural dynamics that demand critical scholarly engagement (Abbas, 2024). While traditional security approaches have largely focused on surveillance and counterterrorism measures, a growing body of literature underscores the need to understand radicalization not merely as a political or religious phenomenon, but as a sociological and criminological process shaped by marginalization, identity crises, and exposure to radical narratives often mediated through online platforms (Peels, 2024).

Criminological perspectives, particularly those rooted in theories of deviance, social disorganization, and strain, offer a vital framework for dissecting the pathways through which youths become vulnerable to radical ideologies. As radicalization processes increasingly unfold within localized communities and digital environments, there is a pressing need to situate youth radicalization within broader socio structural contexts to design more effective, evidence based prevention strategies. (Beelmann, 2020) This urgency is further compounded by the adaptive nature of extremist narratives that often exploit youth grievances such as perceived injustice, marginalization, and identity.

exclusion to recruit and indoctrinate. Moreover, rapid technological shifts and the growing influence of online subcultures have blurred the boundaries between physical and virtual spaces, creating hybrid environments where radicalization can develop with minimal institutional oversight (Zurek et al., 2022).

These evolving dynamics demand a reconceptualization of youth radicalization not as a discrete event, but as a gradual, context-dependent process influenced by community disintegration, socio-political alienation, and the erosion of normative values. Therefore, understanding radicalization through the criminological lens enables a more nuanced diagnosis of its root causes, while also opening pathways toward designing responsive, multi-layered prevention models that are socially embedded and theoretically sound (Posen et al., 2023). While considerable research has examined radicalization through psychological or counterterrorism lenses, such perspectives often neglect the structural and socio-environmental conditions that foster radical tendencies among youth. In many cases, policy responses have been dominated by securitized models that pathologize youth behavior without addressing the underlying socioeconomic deprivation, political disenfranchisement, and identity fragmentation that often precede extremist engagement (Vergani et al., 2020).

This narrow focus risks oversimplifying the radicalization process and ignoring the systemic failures that shape it. By contrast, criminological inquiry offers a more integrative understanding that situates radicalization within the dynamics of social inequality, institutional erosion, and diminished collective efficacy. (Herbrand, 2022) A growing body of scholarship now calls for multi-dimensional approaches that engage with the lived realities of vulnerable youth, particularly those navigating marginal spaces within urban, conflict-affected, or digitalized environments (Sicka & Ray, 2024).

Problem Statement. Despite the growing scholarly and policy interest in youth radicalization, significant gaps remain in understanding the specific mechanisms and pathways through which young individuals become involved in extremist ideologies and violent movements. Much of the existing literature tends to focus on general drivers such as socioeconomic marginalization or exposure to online propaganda without offering a coherent, theory-driven explanation that accounts for the dynamic and individualized trajectories of radicalization (Philp & Gill, 2020).

Moreover, there is a lack of integrative models that systematically identify how risk factors interact over time to produce different radicalization outcomes (Sandberg et al., 2024). This fragmentation has limited the development of targeted and contextually relevant prevention strategies, particularly those grounded in criminological theory. Without a nuanced understanding of these underlying processes, interventions risk being overly simplistic, reactive, or detached from the lived realities of at-risk youth. (Huegler, 2022) Therefore, this study seeks to address the pressing need for a criminological analysis that elucidates the multifaceted nature of youth radicalization and informs more effective policy responses (Obermaier & Schmuck, 2022).

Research Objectives. This study aims to systematically explore the criminological dimensions of youth radicalization by identifying key risk factors and mapping the diverse pathways through which young individuals become engaged in radical ideologies and violent extremist movements (Uba & Stendahl, 2020). By employing an interdisciplinary lens grounded in contemporary criminological theory, the research seeks to uncover how structural conditions such as social exclusion, community disintegration, and identity marginalization interact with individual vulnerabilities and

external influences, including online radical content and peer networks (Rana et al., 2025).

The central objective is to move beyond surface level categorizations and develop a more nuanced, evidence based understanding of radicalization as a dynamic and socially embedded process (Barracosa & March, 2022). Additionally, the study endeavors to propose comprehensive, prevention oriented strategies that are context sensitive and theoretically informed, with the ultimate goal of contributing to the design of effective interventions that can mitigate youth susceptibility to extremist ideologies before they escalate into acts of violence (Alliou & Mourdi, 2023).

Research Gap Analysis. Although the phenomenon of youth radicalization has attracted increasing scholarly attention, much of the existing research remains fragmented and lacks a cohesive theoretical foundation particularly within the field of criminology. Prior studies have predominantly adopted psychological, political, or counterterrorism models, often overlooking the broader socio structural and criminogenic contexts that shape youth vulnerability to radical ideologies (Gavrielides, 2025).

Moreover, empirical investigations tend to concentrate on individual case studies or geographic hotspots, limiting the generalizability and comparative value of their findings (Campelo et al., 2022). Critically, there is a scarcity of research that integrates criminological theories such as strain theory, routine activity theory, or social learning theory to systematically explain the emergence and escalation of radicalization pathways among youth (Mayer et al., 2024).

This gap underscores the urgent need for a comprehensive criminological inquiry that not only bridges theoretical and empirical insights but also informs the development of preventive models grounded in social realities. By addressing this deficiency, the present study aims to offer a novel and integrative contribution to the literature on youth radicalization (Y. Liu et al., 2023).

Novelty and Research Justification. This study presents a novel contribution to the field by advancing a criminological perspective on youth radicalization that integrates both theoretical depth and practical relevance (Jensen & Larsen, 2021). Unlike previous approaches that predominantly emphasize psychological profiles or counterterrorism tactics, this research foregrounds the role of structural inequalities, social dislocation, and criminogenic environments in shaping radicalization trajectories. (Cao, 2021) The innovative aspect lies in the construction of an analytical framework that synthesizes contemporary criminological theories with empirical data to illuminate the nuanced, often nonlinear pathways that lead youth toward violent extremism (Stahl, 2024).

Furthermore, this study justifies its significance by addressing a critical gap in the literature: the lack of prevention models that are both evidence based and context sensitive. (Ganggayah, 2025) By grounding prevention strategies in criminological insights rather than abstract security paradigms this research contributes to more sustainable, community oriented responses to radicalization (Li, 2023). The findings are expected to not only enrich academic discourse but also inform policymaking, intervention design, and future research in both criminology and security studies (Ranaweera, 2024).

Furthermore, this study emphasizes the importance of interdisciplinary collaboration in addressing youth radicalization, recognizing that effective prevention requires the integration of legal, psychological, sociological, and educational perspectives. In particular, the criminological lens allows for a nuanced understanding of how individual, social, and structural factors interact to shape vulnerability to radical ideologies (Rana et al., 2025).

The research also critically assesses existing counter-radicalization programs, identifying gaps between theoretical

models and practical implementation, especially in multicultural and economically marginalized contexts. Attention is given to the role of stigmatization, marginalization, and institutional mistrust in fostering conditions conducive to radicalization, highlighting the need for inclusive and rights-respecting policy approaches (Lutz et al., 2025).

Finally, this study proposes a approaches for early intervention that prioritizes resilience-building, positive identity formation, and community engagement as core pillars of prevention. These measures are deemed essential not only for deterring radicalization but also for promoting social cohesion and civic participation among at-risk youth populations.

Moreover, the literature suggests that radicalization is not a linear process but rather a complex and dynamic interaction between personal grievances, group dynamics, and enabling environments, both online and offline. As such, effective prevention strategies must be adaptive and tailored to the specific socio-cultural contexts in which radicalization occurs. This includes recognizing the role of digital ecosystems in disseminating extremist content and recruiting vulnerable youth (Hatim, 2025).

In response, several scholars advocate for the integration of digital literacy and counter-narrative campaigns as essential tools in combating online radicalization. These approaches are most effective when combined with grassroots initiatives and mentorship programs that provide young people with positive role models and alternative pathways for expression and belonging.

Additionally, long-term policy responses must address systemic issues such as youth unemployment, educational inequality, and social exclusion, which are frequently cited as structural drivers of radicalization. By aligning criminological insights with broader social policy structures, this study reinforces the argument that youth radicalization is best understood and prevented through a holistic, multi-layered approach.

Through this comprehensive analysis, the literature review underscores the urgency of evidence-based, community-empowered strategies that prioritize prevention over punishment and resilience over repression. This not only aligns with international best practices but also ensures that the responses to radicalization are ethically grounded, legally sound, and socially effective (Ragazzi, 2023).

Building on this, Neumann (2020) emphasizes the importance of addressing root causes rather than symptoms calling for a shift from security-centric models to holistic approaches that include psychosocial support, civic engagement, and youth participation in policy formulation. Programs such as EXIT (Sweden) and STRIVE (EU-UN partnership) have demonstrated that successful de-radicalization is most likely when interventions are tailored, voluntary, and embedded in local contexts.

In sum, the pathway to youth radicalization is complex and multifaceted. Effective responses require an interdisciplinary, context-sensitive approach that integrates criminological insights with socio-cultural, psychological, and legal perspectives. By investing in early intervention, community trust-building, and evidence-based programming, societies can build resilience against violent extremism and uphold the dignity and potential of their youth (Amali & Buthelezi, 2024).

Moreover, the role of digital environments in shaping youth identity and susceptibility to radical narratives cannot be overstated. argue, online spaces have evolved into critical arenas where grievances are amplified, echo chambers are formed, and recruitment strategies are refined. These virtual networks often blur the boundaries between activism, dissent, and extremism, making early detection and digital literacy education vital components in prevention efforts.

Equally important is the inclusion of families, educators, and peer groups in counter-radicalization strategies. micro-environments such as households and classrooms often serve as early indicators of ideological shifts, whether through behavioral changes or expressions of alienation. Equipping these stakeholders with culturally sensitive tools and support mechanisms strengthens early intervention capacities and reinforces protective social bonds.

In low-trust environments especially in regions affected by systemic marginalization or historical state violence interventions must be cautious not to replicate coercive logics. Awan (2020) critiques the over-securitization of Muslim youth in Western contexts, which has often led to stigma, surveillance, and civic disengagement. Instead, fostering participatory mechanisms that give young people agency in designing solutions can rebuild trust and promote civic belonging.

Finally, highlights the transformative potential of restorative justice as both a preventive and rehabilitative tool. By focusing on healing, dialogue, and reintegration, restorative practices can disrupt cycles of exclusion and retaliation that often underpin extremist pathways. When embedded in broader social justice agendas, these methods not only address harm but also rebuild fractured relationships between youth and their communities (Tafon, 2025).

Methods

This study adopts a normative juridical approach, focusing on the examination of prevailing legal norms and their relevance to the context of youth radicalization (Schröder et al., 2022). This approach is selected for its ability to offer an indepth analysis of the legal structures and criminological theories applied in understanding the risk factors and pathways of radicalization among young individuals. The research design is descriptive analytical, in which data is collected through a comprehensive literature review of both primary and secondary sources, including statutory regulations, international legal instruments, court decisions, academic journals, and reports from international organizations (Wardhani et al., 2022).

The integration of criminological theories such as social learning theory, strain theory, and labeling theory serves to contextualize the behavioral dynamics that lead to youth involvement in radical movements. These theories help explain how social environments, personal grievances, and systemic inequalities contribute to the formation of extremist ideologies among vulnerable youth populations (Lucak et al., 2025).

Furthermore, the study employs a qualitative content analysis to identify patterns and interpret the normative dimensions of legal instruments related to counter-radicalization. This method allows for an in-depth exploration of how laws are formulated, interpreted, and implemented in response to youth radicalization, while also assessing their compatibility with human rights standards and preventive measures.

By synthesizing legal and criminological perspectives, this research aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of both the regulatory gaps and the socio-legal mechanisms necessary for effective intervention. It also highlights the importance of international cooperation and multidisciplinary strategies in addressing the complex and evolving nature of youth radicalization (Onwuadiamu, 2025).

Result and Discussion

The results of this study reveal a complex interplay of

sociological and criminogenic factors that shape the radicalization pathways of youth, affirming and expanding the theoretical approaches of contemporary criminology (Becker, 2021). Drawing upon strain theory, the analysis demonstrates that perceived injustice, blocked socioeconomic opportunities, and the erosion of institutional trust serve as significant catalysts for ideological drift and the adoption of extremist beliefs. (Braun, 2024). This aligns with previous empirical findings that marginalization and relative deprivation contribute to radical identity formation, particularly among youth in structurally disadvantaged communities (Park & Johnson, 2024).

Furthermore, the application of social disorganization theory highlights the weakening of social bonds, collective efficacy, and normative control within fragmented neighborhoods conditions that create fertile ground for radical ideologies to take root. (Michalsen, 2025) Notably, the research finds that digital ecosystems act as amplifiers, not sole drivers, of radicalization; online narratives tend to reinforce preexisting vulnerabilities rather than create them in isolation (Pace & Devenot, 2021).

These findings challenge simplistic views portrayals of radical youth as merely victims of online indoctrination, instead situating them within broader criminological processes shaped by systemic exclusion, social decay, and unmet psychosocial needs (Hawkins-Jones & Labat, 2023). Such interpretation underscores the importance of developing multilevel preventive strategies that are grounded in both social policy and community resilience structures (Atallah et al., 2021).

Theoretical and Practical Contributions. The findings of this study contribute substantively to the theoretical development of criminological perspectives on radicalization by foregrounding the interrelation between structural strain, social disintegration, and ideological recruitment (Williams et al., 2021). While previous models have often treated these variables in isolation, this research demonstrates that their interaction forms a continuum that is both predictive and explanatory of radicalization pathways among youth (Vicente, 2023). Theoretically, this integrative framework bridges classical criminological theories with contemporary dynamics of identity politics and online mobilization, offering a more nuanced understanding of how socio structural vulnerabilities are converted into ideological commitments (Graham et al., 2025).

From a practical standpoint, the implications are equally significant: the study provides an evidence based foundation for designing multilayered prevention strategies that move beyond punitive or surveillance based approaches. It highlights the need for localized, community centered interventions that strengthen social cohesion, improve youth engagement, and dismantle the narrative simplistic views of extremist groups (White, 2024). Furthermore, the research supports the incorporation of criminological insights into policy design particularly within education, social welfare, and digital regulation sector sensing that counter radicalization efforts are not only reactive but also structurally transformative (Lavorgna & Ugwudike, 2021).

Limitations of the Study. Despite its theoretical contributions and analytical depth, this study is not without limitations. One of the primary constraints lies in its reliance on secondary data and normative legal analysis, which, while offering a strong conceptual foundation, limits the empirical generalizability of its findings (Lim, 2025). The absence of primary fieldwork or interviews with at risk youth or former radicals restricts the study's ability to capture nuanced, lived experiences and localized variations in radicalization processes. Additionally, the focus on legal and criminological models may inadvertently underrepresent psychological or micro-level dynamics that also play critical roles in the

radicalization trajectory (Svanemyr, 2020).

Geographical scope is another limitation; while the study draws on cross contextual literature, it lacks an indepth, region specific case study that could enrich the analysis with contextual granularity (Syed et al., 2024). These limitations do not undermine the significance of the findings but rather emphasize the importance of cautious interpretation and the need for complementary empirical inquiry to validate and refine the proposed structures (Kunisch et al., 2023).

Directions for Future Research. Building upon the identified limitations, future research should prioritize empirical investigations that incorporate qualitative and mixed method approaches to deepen the understanding of youth radicalization processes across diverse sociocultural settings. Field based studies involving interviews with former radicals, community stakeholders, and frontline practitioners could provide critical insights into the subjective experiences and contextual drivers often overlooked in normative analyses (Marrone et al., 2025). Moreover, longitudinal research is needed to trace the evolution of radicalization pathways over time, capturing both entry and disengagement dynamics (Raets, 2024).

There is also value in cross national comparative studies that examine how different legal, educational, and community based interventions affect radicalization outcomes, especially in contexts marked by conflict, migration, or state fragility (Schumacher & DeGuire, 2025). In addition, integrating psychological and digital ethnographic perspectives may enrich the criminological models by revealing how identity construction and online communities mediate radical engagement. These future directions will be essential not only to validate the theoretical propositions presented in this study but also to inform the design of more nuanced, contextually adaptive, and ethically sound prevention strategies (Robinson et al., 2020).

Social and Ethical Implications of the Findings. The findings of this study carry significant social and ethical implications that warrant careful consideration. Framing youth radicalization through a criminological lens underscores the risk of stigmatizing vulnerable populations, particularly those from marginalized ethnic, religious, or socioeconomic backgrounds (Smith et al., 2020). Overgeneralized or securitized interpretations may inadvertently reinforce exclusion and alienation factors already identified as key contributors to radicalization. Ethically, the study challenges policymakers and practitioners to strike a delicate balance between ensuring public safety and protecting civil liberties, especially in the design and implementation of preventive interventions (Peng & Lou, 2025).

The ethical use of surveillance, early warning systems, and counternarratives must be grounded in principles of proportionality, transparency, and human rights. (Hirblinger, 2024) Furthermore, this research highlights the moral responsibility of institution not only to prevent violence, but also to address the root causes of disaffection, such as social injustice, educational disparity, and political disenfranchisement (Welton & Harris, 2022). Ultimately, the study calls for a paradigm shift: from punitive, state centered counter radicalization efforts to holistic, community driven strategies that prioritize social inclusion, resilience building, and restorative justice (Gavrielides, 2025).

Building on these foundations, the literature increasingly emphasizes the importance of participatory approaches in the development of counter-radicalization strategies. Engaging communities not as passive recipients but as active stakeholders fosters trust, enhances legitimacy, and improves the cultural relevance of interventions. Programs co-designed with local actors such as educators, religious leaders, youth workers, and civil society organizations tend to be more sustainable and responsive to the unique challenges faced by

different communities. This participatory ethos also counters the narrative of top-down surveillance and securitization that often alienates the very populations these programs aim to protect (B. Liu et al., 2025).

Equally important is the role of education as a long-term preventative tool. Schools and universities serve not only as places of learning but also as platforms for promoting critical thinking, intercultural dialogue, and civic engagement. Curricula that incorporate peace education, digital literacy, and the history of human rights can help inoculate students against extremist ideologies. In parallel, teacher training and peer-led initiatives can strengthen early detection of risk factors without resorting to stigmatization or profiling. Education, therefore, must be seen as a frontline defense in building resilient youth who are empowered to question, reflect, and contribute constructively to society.

Mental health and psychosocial support also emerge as key components in preventing radicalization. Youth who have experienced trauma, marginalization, or identity crises may find extremist narratives appealing as a means of reclaiming control or belonging. Addressing these underlying psychological and emotional needs requires integrated services that combine mental health care, social work, and community outreach. Importantly, such interventions must maintain confidentiality, cultural sensitivity, and ethical safeguards to prevent misuse or coercion. A trauma-informed, youth-centered model is therefore vital to fostering healing and resilience in vulnerable populations (Knowles & Danzi, 2025).

At the policy level, governments are urged to move beyond reactive law enforcement models and instead invest in preventive infrastructure. This includes supporting long-term research, funding community initiatives, and creating cross-sectoral platforms for collaboration. Policymaking should be guided by empirical data and grounded in principles of inclusivity and restorative justice. In contexts where trust in institutions is low, transparency and accountability become essential to ensure that counter-radicalization efforts do not exacerbate social divisions or fuel further resentment (Javed, 2025).

In conclusion, this research advocates for a reconceptualization of counter-radicalization not as a narrow security function but as a broader societal commitment to justice, equity, and inclusion. A truly effective strategy must address the structural conditions that enable radicalization while nurturing the protective factors that promote social cohesion and youth empowerment. By centering community voices, respecting human rights, and bridging criminological insight with social policy, we can envision a future where prevention is not only possible, but transformative.

Radicalization among youth is not a simplistic views process; it is shaped by an interplay of socio-psychological, political, and environmental factors. Several studies point to identity crises, social marginalization, and the search for meaning as recurring themes in the radicalization pathway. According to the "Staircase to Terrorism" metaphor illustrates how perceived injustices and blocked mobility can push individuals through a gradual process of ideological adoption (Romadhon et al., 2025). This model emphasizes the role of grievances and unmet needs as initial steps, which, if unaddressed, can escalate into justifications for violence.

In line with this, underlines the role of social networks and peer influences in facilitating youth engagement in extremist ideologies. Radicalization is often mediated through group dynamics rather than solitary transformation, making it imperative to understand how social belonging and perceived in-group loyalty can foster extremist commitments. This insight supports prevention strategies that involve peer-led interventions and safe spaces for dialogue and dissent.

Moreover, online spaces have emerged as significant

arenas for radicalization. As argued by Aly et al the internet has transformed radicalization into a transnational and decentralized phenomenon, enabling the proliferation of extremist content and echo chambers. Digital literacy and counter-narratives thus become essential tools in disrupting online radicalization cycles, particularly among tech-savvy youth populations.

Economic and educational disparities have also been identified as risk factors that create fertile ground for extremist ideologies. According to Mujiburrohman & Putri (2024), poverty and unemployment alone do not cause radicalization, but they can create vulnerabilities when combined with perceived political exclusion and lack of future prospects. These findings suggest that effective prevention requires multi-sectoral collaboration, including education reform, youth employment programs, and inclusive policymaking.

Finally, stresses the importance of restorative justice in countering radicalization. Rather than viewing youth involved in extremist activities as irredeemable threats, restorative models aim to reintegrate them into society through empathy, accountability, and rehabilitation. This approach complements criminological perspectives that advocate for transformation over punishment, reinforcing the need for community-based interventions that prioritize healing over exclusion.

Conclusion

This study has demonstrated that youth radicalization is a multidimensional and context sensitive phenomenon shaped by the intersection of structural marginalization, socio digital influences, identity crises, and criminogenic environments. By employing a normative legal and criminological lens, the research has advanced a deeper theoretical understanding of radicalization as not merely an ideological process, but as a socially embedded trajectory influenced by systemic exclusion and institutional neglect. The integration of strain theory, social disorganization theory, and contemporary models of deviance has provided a comprehensive analytical structures to identify both risk factors and potential points of intervention.

Crucially, the study underscores the limitations of overly securitized and psychologically reductionist approaches that fail to capture the broader sociolegal dynamics driving youth toward extremist ideologies. It advocates for a shift toward community based, rights respecting, and evidence informed strategies that prioritize early intervention, social inclusion, and structural reform. Although constrained by its normative scope and absence of primary data, this research lays a conceptual foundation that future empirical studies can build upon to test, refine, and contextualize its propositions.

In light of the findings, several key recommendations are proposed. First, governments should prioritize policy integration by designing multisectoral prevention strategies that bridge criminal justice, education, and social welfare systems, thereby addressing the root causes of radicalization rather than merely its symptoms. Furthermore, community engagement must be strengthened through community-led programs aimed at rebuilding trust, enhancing social cohesion, and providing alternative pathways for at-risk youth, particularly in marginalized and underserved areas. In addition, preventive measures should be supported by robust legal safeguards to ensure proportionality, accountability, and the protection of fundamental rights, especially for vulnerable populations.

Moreover, future research is encouraged to incorporate qualitative and longitudinal methodologies, as well as cross-cultural case studies, in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the diverse pathways and disengagement patterns associated with radical ideologies. Alongside this, efforts to improve digital literacy among youth should be intensified, accompanied by the development of constructive

counter-narratives that effectively challenge extremist messaging without infringing upon freedom of expression.

In conclusion, addressing youth radicalization requires moving beyond reactive and punitive measures toward a

proactive, interdisciplinary, and justice-oriented approach. By understanding the underlying social realities that contribute to extremism, societies will be better equipped to dismantle the structural conditions that sustain it.

References

- Abbas, T. (2024). Radicalisation studies: An emerging interdisciplinary field. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 75(2), 232–238. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.13068>
- Allioui, H., & Mourdi, Y. (2023). Exploring the Full Potentials of IoT for Better Financial Growth and Stability: A Comprehensive Survey. *Sensors*, 23(19), 8015. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s23198015>
- Amali, S. E., & Buthelezi, M. W. (2024). Youth Bulge, Radicalization, and Insurgency in Northeastern Nigeria. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Social Problems* (pp. 1–18). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68127-2_336-1
- Atallah, D. G., Bacigalupe, G., & Repetto, P. (2021). Centering at the Margins: Critical Community Resilience Praxis. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 61(6), 875–905. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167818825305>
- Barracosa, S., & March, J. (2022). Dealing With Radicalised Youth Offenders: The Development and Implementation of a Youth-Specific Framework. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2021.773545>
- Becker, M. H. (2021). When Extremists Become Violent: Examining the Association Between Social Control, Social Learning, and Engagement in Violent Extremism. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 44(12), 1104–1124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1057610X.2019.1626093>
- Campelo, N., Oppetit, A., Thompson, C., Cohen, D., & Louet, E. (2022). A Clinical and Psychopathological Approach to Radicalization Among Adolescents. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2022.788154>
- Gavrielides, T. (2025). The RJiNEAR Resilience Model: Embodying the Restorative Justice Ethos. In *Addressing Violent Radicalisation and Extremism: A Restorative Justice & Psychosocial Approach* (pp. 41–68). Springer.
- Graham, R., Humer, S. G., Lee, C. S., & Nagy, V. (2025). *The Routledge international handbook of online deviance*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Hawkins-Jones, J., & Labat, M. B. (2023). *Educating Black Males in the Twenty-First-Century South: Tunnel Vision?* Bloomsbury Publishing PLC.
- Jensen, S. Q., & Larsen, J. F. (2021). Sociological perspectives on Islamist radicalization – bridging the micro/macro gap. *European Journal of Criminology*, 18(3), 426–443. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370819851356>
- Knowles, E. A., & Danzi, B. A. (2025). The Role of Online Social Support in Mental Health: Comparing Rural and Urban Youth. *Children*, 12(2), 113. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children12020113>
- Kunisch, S., Denyer, D., Bartunek, J. M., Menz, M., & Cardinal, L. B. (2023). Review research as scientific inquiry. *Organizational Research Methods*, 26(1), 3–45.
- Lavorgna, A., & Ugwuide, P. (2021). The datafication revolution in criminal justice: An empirical exploration of frames portraying data-driven technologies for crime prevention and control. *Big Data & Society*, 8(2), 20539517211049670.
- Li, E. (2023). Can “Nudge” Salvage Community Policing against Terrorism? *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 35(1), 135–155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2021.1876035>
- Lim, W. M. (2025). What Is Qualitative Research? An Overview and Guidelines. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 33(2), 199–229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14413582241264619>
- Liu, B., Li, X., Zhang, J., Wang, J., He, T., Hong, S., Liu, H., Zhang, S., Song, K., & Zhu, K. (2025). Advances and challenges in foundation agents: From brain-inspired intelligence to evolutionary, collaborative, and safe systems. *ArXiv Preprint ArXiv:2504.01990*.
- Liu, Y., Li, Q., Li, W., Jia, L., & Pei, X. (2023). Knowledge map and hotspot analysis in climate resilience infrastructure (CRI) from 1997 to 2022 through scientometric analysis. *Environmental Research*, 228, 115874. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2023.115874>
- Lucak, S. N., Peck, J. H., & Childs, K. K. (2025). Social Learning Theory and Racial Extremist Ideologies: Differing Learning Processes for Youth/Young Adults Compared to Older Adults. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2025.2508798>
- Lutz, C., Chao, X., de Klein, B., Bhin, J., Badoux, M., Eijkman, T., Nikolakopoulos, A. P., Hutten, S. J., Proost, N., Siteur, B., van de Ven, M., Song, J.-Y., van Rheeunen, J., Morgner, J., Prekovic, S., & Jonkers, J. (2025). Large-scale Characterization of Orthotopic Cell Line-Derived Xenografts Identifies TGFβ Signaling as a Key Regulator of Breast Cancer Morphology and Aggressiveness. *Cancer Research*, 85(14), 2608–2625. <https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-24-2022>
- Marrone, G., Masip Vilà, D., Rafols Ribas, I., Lupi, M., Traini, R., & Ibañez-Puy, M. (2025). Assessing and Benchmarking a Multifunctional Plug-and-Play Façade for Building Renovation: Advantages and Limitations in the Construction Process. *Sustainability*, 17(5), 2153. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17052153>
- Mayer, M. J., Horgan, J., Herrenkohl, T. I., & Osher, D. (2024). Violent extremism in the U.S.: Causes and consequences for youth, families, schools, and communities. *Journal of School Psychology*, 106, 101345. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2024.101345>
- Mujiburrohman, & Putri, D. (2024). The Impact of Social Inequality on Educational Quality in Indonesia: Challenges and Policy Recommendations. *Solo Universal Journal of Islamic Education and Multiculturalism*, 3(01), 43–56. <https://doi.org/10.61455/suijem.v3i01.248>
- Obermaier, M., & Schmuck, D. (2022). Youths as targets: factors of online hate speech victimization among adolescents and young adults. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 27(4). <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmac012>
- Onwuadiamu, G. (2025). Cybercrime in criminology: A systematic review of criminological theories, methods, and concepts. *Journal of Economic Criminology*, 8, 100136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconc.2025.100136>
- Pace, B. A., & Devenot, N. (2021). Right-Wing Psychedelia: Case Studies in Cultural Plasticity and Political Pluripotency. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.733185>
- Park, Y., & Johnson, S. K. (2024). A Theoretical Framework of the Role of Racism in Adolescent Personal Identity Development: Applications to Racially Marginalized Youth in the USA. *Human Development*, 68(1), 44–60. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000536141>
- Peels, R. (2024). Towards a fruitful concept of radicalisation: a synthesis. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 32(3), 610–624. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14782804.2023.2185594>
- Peng, F., & Lou, Q. (2025). Investigating the demotivation of Moroccan CFL learners from an alienation theory perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1471486>
- Philp, K. D., & Gill, M. G. (2020). Reframing After-School Programs as Developing Youth Interest, Identity, and Social Capital. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 7(1), 19–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732219892647>
- Posen, H. E., Ross, J.-M., Wu, B., Benigni, S., & Cao, Z. (2023). Reconceptualizing Imitation: Implications for Dynamic Capabilities, Innovation, and Competitive Advantage. *Academy of Management Annals*, 17(1), 74–112. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2021.0044>
- Raets, S. (2024). Desistance, Disengagement, and Deradicalization: A Cross-Field Comparison. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 68(4), 389–426. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X221102802>
- Rana, K., Aitken, S. J., & Chimoriya, R. (2025). Interdisciplinary Approaches in Doctoral and Higher Research Education: An Integrative Scoping Review. *Education Sciences*, 15(1), 72. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15010072>
- Ranaweera, N. (2024). Beyond Numbers: Embracing the Depth of Qualitative Research in Criminology. *International Journal of Qualitative Research*, 3(3), 315–325. <https://doi.org/10.47540/ijqr.v3i3.1346>
- Robinson, A., Oksuz, U., Slight, R., Slight, S., & Husband, A. (2020). Digital and Mobile Technologies to Promote Physical Health Behavior Change and Provide Psychological Support for Patients Undergoing Elective Surgery: Meta-Ethnography and Systematic Review. *JMIR MHealth and UHealth*, 8(12), e19237. <https://doi.org/10.2196/19237>
- Romadhon, A., Putri, R. J., Anshori, M. W., Ahmad, Z. H., & Pratama, G. (2025). Global Persistence of Terrorism as a Non Traditional Security Threat in the Millennial Era. *Journal of Politics and Policy*, 7(1), 78–104. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jppol.2025.7.1.5>
- Sandberg, S., Tutenges, S., & Ilan, J. (2024). The street-jihadi spectrum: Marginality, radicalization, and resistance to extremism. *European Journal of Criminology*, 21(2), 210–230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14773708231182520>
- Schröder, C. P., Bruns, J., Lehmann, L., Goede, L.-R., Bliesener, T., & Tomczyk, S. (2022). Radicalization in Adolescence: the Identification of Vulnerable Groups. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 28(2), 177–201. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10610-022-09505-x>
- Schumacher, M. J., & DeGuire, E. C. (2025). Instability, Regime Type, and Terrorism: A Global Comparative Analysis (2001–2019). *Democracy and Security*, 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17419166.2025.2496381>
- Sicka, B., & Ray, L. (2024). The convergence of higher education and digital technologies for the sexual and reproductive health of women refugees: A narrative review. *Crossings: Journal of Migration & Culture*, 15(1), 21–60. https://doi.org/10.1386/cjmc_00090_1
- Smith, L. G. E., Blackwood, L., & Thomas, E. F. (2020). The Need to Refocus on the Group as the Site of Radicalization. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 15(2), 327–352. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619885870>
- Svanemyr, J. (2020). Adolescent pregnancy and social norms in Zambia. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 22(6), 615–629. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2019.1621379>
- Syed, T. A., Aslam, H., Bhatti, Z. A., Mehmood, F., & Pahuja, A. (2024). Dynamic pricing for perishable goods: A data-driven digital transformation approach. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 277, 109405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2024.109405>

- Uba, K., & Stendahl, L. (2020). Youth- and Crime-Related Political Claims in Comparative Perspective. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 64(5), 652–668. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764219885422>
- Vergani, M., Iqbal, M., Ilbahar, E., & Barton, G. (2020). The Three Ps of Radicalization: Push, Pull and Personal. A Systematic Scoping Review of the Scientific Evidence about Radicalization Into Violent Extremism. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 43(10), 854–854. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1057610X.2018.1505686>
- Vicente, A. (2023). Social Ties and Jihadist Participation: A Mixed-Methods Approach to the Differential Recruitment of Radicalized Youth in Spain. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 35(4), 988–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2021.1989415>
- Wardhani, L. T. A. L., Noho, M. D. H., & Natalis, A. (2022). The adoption of various legal systems in Indonesia: an effort to initiate the prismatic Mixed Legal Systems. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2022.2104710>
- Welton, A. D., & Harris, T. O. (2022). Youth of Color Social Movements for Racial Justice: The Politics of Interrogating the School-to-Prison Pipeline. *Educational Policy*, 36(1), 57–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08959048211059728>
- White, L. (2024). *Participatory Implementation for Suicide Prevention with American Indian and Alaska Native Communities* [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Michigan Library.
- Williams, J. M., Spencer, Z., & Wilson, S. K. (2021). I am not your felon: Decoding the trauma, resilience, and recovering mothering of formerly incarcerated Black women. *Crime & Delinquency*, 67(8), 1103–1136.
- Zurek, M., Hebinck, A., & Selomane, O. (2022). Climate change and the urgency to transform food systems. *Science*, 376(6600), 1416–1421. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abo2364>