

**Speaker:** Friedrich Lösel (Cambridge University, UK and University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany)

**Presentation title:** Promoting desistance from extremism and violent radicalization: A systematic international review of psychosocial prevention programs

**Co-authors:** Irina Jugl, Sonja King and Doris Bender (University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany)

Politically, religiously, and otherwise motivated extremism, radicalization and terrorism are high priority topics that led to numerous psychosocial prevention and intervention programs. However, there is not yet sound knowledge on their effectiveness. This presentation aims to reduce this gap by two studies funded by the German Federal Ministry of the Interior: an international survey of prevention programs and a systematic review on outcomes. In our survey, we interviewed prevention experts from 32 countries and received detailed information on 55 programs. Most programs had a universal or universal-selective approach. We gathered much detailed knowledge on the content (e.g. workshops), context (e.g. schools), funding (mainly governments), and implementation problems in practice. Only few programs reported controlled outcome data. Therefore, we widened the scope by a systemic review that used a wide range of data sources. About 15,000 reports were systematically screened, but in spite of lenient eligibility criteria we only found 26 (quasi-)experimental outcome evaluations from ten countries. All studies were analyzed for numerous criteria, e.g. for design, program contents, samples, and effect sizes. Most programs addressed religiously motivated or right wing extremism and had a quasi-experimental pre-post design. Compared to our previous review (Jugl et al., 2021) there was a recent increase of sound evaluation designs (including some RCTs). Overall, programs had a moderate mean positive effect on behavioral and attitudinal outcomes related to violent extremism. We found stronger effects for programs with target groups from mixed ethnic backgrounds and approaches addressing both at-risk individuals and participants from the general population. Despite promising results, the low internal validity of most evaluations and small number of eligible studies limit generalization. More high-quality evaluations are necessary. These would help to allocate resources in an evidence-based manner and provide a better understanding of the mechanisms of successfully preventing violent extremism.