



## Humiliation and perceived power loss as drivers of radicalisation vulnerability in Northwestern Europe

Tahir Abbas, Richard McNeil-Willson, Eolene Boyd-MacMillan & Valerie DeMarinis

**To cite this article:** Tahir Abbas, Richard McNeil-Willson, Eolene Boyd-MacMillan & Valerie DeMarinis (16 Apr 2025): Humiliation and perceived power loss as drivers of radicalisation vulnerability in Northwestern Europe, Behavioral Sciences of Terrorism and Political Aggression, DOI: [10.1080/19434472.2025.2488931](https://doi.org/10.1080/19434472.2025.2488931)

**To link to this article:** <https://doi.org/10.1080/19434472.2025.2488931>



© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 16 Apr 2025.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 2600



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 7 View citing articles [↗](#)

# Humiliation and perceived power loss as drivers of radicalisation vulnerability in Northwestern Europe

Tahir Abbas <sup>a</sup>, Richard McNeil-Willson <sup>b</sup>, Eolene Boyd-MacMillan <sup>c</sup> and Valerie DeMarinis <sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Institute of Security and Global Affairs, Leiden University in The Hague, Leiden, Netherlands; <sup>b</sup>Global Muslim Studies and Critical Extremism, University of Edinburgh, UK; <sup>c</sup>Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK; <sup>d</sup>Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

## ABSTRACT

This study explores the relationships between humiliation, perceived power loss, discrimination, and vulnerability to radicalisation across Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, and the United Kingdom. Analysing survey data from 5,501 respondents, we developed a measure of radicalisation vulnerability that captures both general vulnerability factors and specific ideological orientations. Muslims and ethnic minorities were marginally more likely to experience humiliation than ethnic majorities, though this relationship varied by national context. A strong positive association was found between perceived ethnic power loss and radicalisation vulnerability, with higher perceived power loss linked to increased vulnerability. While humiliation positively correlated with discrimination, our analysis distinguished between discrete discrimination experiences and broader perceptions of ethnic power loss, suggesting distinct pathways to radicalisation vulnerability. Notably, humiliation mediated the relationship between Muslim or foreign-born status and radicalisation vulnerability, suggesting that addressing humiliation may be more effective than targeting specific demographic groups or ideologies. Cross-national comparisons revealed significant differences in radicalisation vulnerability, with the Netherlands showing the highest mean score and Denmark the lowest. These findings highlight the role of the national context in radicalisation processes and emphasise the need for culturally informed, holistic prevention strategies that address underlying psychological and social factors, particularly humiliation and perceived power loss.

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 28 August 2024  
Accepted 27 March 2025

## KEYWORDS

Radicalisation; humiliation; discrimination; power; ethnicity

## Introduction

In an era of global interconnectedness and cultural diversity, understanding radicalisation drivers remains critical for policymakers and researchers. Addressing the interplay between social, psychological, and cultural factors in radicalisation poses challenges for

**CONTACT** Tahir Abbas  t.abbas@fgga.leidenuniv.nl

This article has been corrected with minor changes. These changes do not impact the academic content of the article.

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

efforts to prevent extremism. This study examines relationships between perceived humiliation, discrimination experiences, and radicalisation vulnerability among populations in Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, and the UK. The research aims to inform strategies to address radicalisation, particularly in minority groups susceptible to marginalisation. By analysing these dynamics across European contexts, we elucidate how humiliation and discrimination contribute to radicalisation risks and how these mechanisms differ nationally.

Radicalisation constitutes a complex process wherein individuals adopt extremist ideologies rejecting the status quo, potentially legitimising violence to advance ideological aims (Khosrokhavar, 2017; Neumann, 2013). It involves cognitive shifts towards rigid, absolutist worldviews that polarise social groups (Doosje et al., 2016). Contemporary research transcends simplistic linear models, framing radicalisation as a multifactorial phenomenon shaped by individual vulnerabilities, group dynamics, and societal conditions (Coolsaet, 2019; Schmid, 2013). Critical to this process is Wiktorowicz's (2005) concept of 'cognitive opening' – periods of personal crisis or disillusionment heightening susceptibility to radical narratives.

Recent years have seen increased research into the psychological and social processes underlying radicalisation (Kruglanski et al., 2014; Webber & Kruglanski, 2018). While factors such as perceived grievances, social networks, and ideological influences (Borum, 2011; Hafez & Mullins, 2015) contribute to radicalisation, humiliation has emerged as a particularly salient area of study. Scholars like Lindner (2006) and McCauley and Moskaleiko (2008) argue that humiliation can motivate individuals towards extremist ideologies and behaviours. Defined as an enforced lowering of a person or group that damages their pride, honour, or dignity (Lindner, 2006), humiliation can elicit emotions such as shame, anger, and a desire for revenge or dignity restoration (Elison & Harter, 2007; Klein, 1991). These responses may create psychological vulnerabilities, increasing susceptibility to extremist ideologies that promise empowerment or dignity restoration (Kruglanski et al., 2014). The link between discrimination and humiliation further complicates this issue. Discrimination, whether based on ethnicity, religion, or other factors, can perpetuate chronic humiliation, particularly among minority groups (Awan & Zempi, 2016). This intersection is especially relevant for Muslim and migrant communities in Europe, who often experience heightened prejudice and social exclusion (Kunst et al., 2013; Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2007).

Our study expands on existing research by examining the relationships between Muslim and foreign-born status, experiences of discrimination, feelings of humiliation, and 'radicalisation vulnerability' across multiple European countries. Radicalisation vulnerability, a related but distinct concept from radicalisation itself, refers to an individual's or group's susceptibility to engaging in radicalisation processes (Feddes et al., 2020). Developed by Horgan (2005), the concept identifies factors that increase openness to engagement in extremism, influencing pre-crime approaches to counterterrorism. It is often framed as a transitional space between mental illness, disadvantage, and potential terrorist involvement (Heath-Kelly & Gruber, 2023, p. 98). This construct encompasses psychological, social, and contextual factors that heighten receptivity to radical ideologies or extremist behaviour. Recent meta-analyses emphasise that radicalisation vulnerability is not static but a dynamic state influenced by personal and environmental conditions (Hassan et al., 2021). Importantly, vulnerability factors are not deterministic; their presence does not guarantee radicalisation but indicates increased susceptibility under specific circumstances (Sieckelink & Gielen, 2020).

Recent research has identified three key categories of radicalisation vulnerability factors. The first category comprises psychological vulnerability factors, which include personal uncertainty and identity issues (Hogg, 2021), perceived personal or group-based grievances (van den Bos, 2020), need for significance and meaning-making (Kruglanski et al., 2019), and cognitive rigidity and black-and-white thinking patterns (Zmigrod et al., 2019). The second category consists of social-environmental factors, which include social isolation and alienation (Lyons-Padilla et al., 2015), exposure to extremist networks or ideologies (Wolfowicz et al., 2021), perceived discrimination and marginalisation (Ellis et al., 2019), and limited access to alternative narratives or perspectives (Vergani et al., 2020). The third category encompasses contextual-structural factors, which provide the broader societal context within which radicalisation may occur, and includes socioeconomic deprivation and limited opportunities (Gøtzsche-Astrup, 2018), political grievances and perceived injustice (McGilloway et al., 2021), cultural displacement and identity conflicts (Chassman, 2020), and exposure to violence or conflict (Böckler et al., 2021).

This understanding of radicalisation vulnerability has significant implications for prevention and intervention strategies. As Hardy (2020) notes, effective prevention requires addressing both individual-level vulnerabilities and broader societal conditions that facilitate radicalisation. This aligns with the 'ecological model' of radicalisation prevention (Boutellier et al., 2021), which builds on Bronfenbrenner's (1994) framework of human development as shaped by interconnected social subsystems. Applied to radicalisation, this model highlights the need for interventions at multiple levels – individual, family, community, and societal. Viewing radicalisation vulnerability as a dynamic construct moves beyond simplistic profiling, enabling more nuanced, evidence-based strategies. It recognises that vulnerability is not confined to specific demographics or ideologies but arises from the interplay of psychological, social, and environmental factors across diverse contexts (Gill et al., 2020). This perspective lays the groundwork for more effective and targeted approaches to radicalisation prevention.

This review of the potential adverse effects of humiliation suggests that in addition to humiliation prevention strategies, public mental health promotion strategies are needed to reduce and mitigate potential harm from humiliation through strengthened resilience and well-being. Addressing humiliation in general and as a factor for radicalisation vulnerability through whole system frameworks with attention to health promotion (including wellbeing and resilience) does not exclude prevention and intervention, but incorporates individual, family, community and wider structural influences (Dyckhoorn et al., 2022; PMHP, 2021). Public health approaches to radicalisation that align with the World Health Organisation's (WHO) position that mental health is an integral part of health; indeed, there is no health without mental health (DeMarinis, 2018; WHO, 2016) and by design exist outside of counter-terrorism programmes (Bhui et al., 2012; Rousseau et al., 2021). These approaches operate with a variety of frameworks, each with their own orientations, whether to health promotion, prevention and/or intervention.

Using online survey data from the DRIVE survey, we tested four hypotheses:

- (1) Muslims and foreign-born individuals are more likely to report feelings of humiliation than majority ethnic communities.

- (2) Feelings of humiliation are positively correlated with radicalisation vulnerability.
- (3) Experiences of discrimination are positively associated with humiliation.
- (4) Humiliation mediates the relationship between being Muslim or foreign-born and radicalisation vulnerability.

Conducted in Spring 2023 as part of the EU-funded DRIVE project (Horizon 2020, grant agreement No. 959200), this cross-national study explores social integration, identity formation, and attitudes across Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, and the UK. By analysing these factors in diverse national contexts, we aim to deepen our understanding of their interactions and highlight the role of societal and policy influences in shaping radicalisation vulnerability.

These hypotheses are grounded in existing theoretical frameworks and empirical research. The first hypothesis builds on studies showing that minority groups, particularly Muslims and immigrants, often experience higher levels of prejudice and discrimination in European societies compared to majority populations (FRA, 2017; Heath & Richards, 2020). The second and third hypotheses are informed by research linking humiliation and discrimination to social and political alienation (Leidner et al., 2012; Veldhuis & Staun, 2009). The fourth hypothesis draws on emerging work examining the mediating role of psychological factors between minority status and radicalisation vulnerability (Lyons-Padilla et al., 2015).

While our study examines factors that may increase vulnerability to radicalisation, we emphasise the importance of avoiding the stigmatisation of communities or the reinforcement of harmful stereotypes. Our goal is to deepen understanding of the social and psychological processes that may lead some individuals towards extremist ideologies, with the aim of contributing knowledge that will help to foster more inclusive, cohesive, and resilient societies. In the following sections, we detail our methodology, present findings, and discuss their implications for theory, policy, and practice.

## Theoretical development

Humiliation is a powerful emotional experience that can have profound psychological consequences. Lindner (2006) describes humiliation as an enforced lowering of a person or group, a process of subjugation that damages or strips away pride, honour, or dignity. This definition emphasises the relational nature of humiliation, highlighting that it often involves a perceived perpetrator and a victim, occurring within a specific social context (Hartling & Luchetta, 1999). The experience of humiliation can lead to a range of negative emotions, including shame, anger, and a desire for revenge or restoration of dignity (Elison & Harter, 2007; Klein, 1991). Torres and Bergner (2012) argue that humiliation involves a perceived degradation of one's status as a person of equal moral worth, which can have devastating effects on an individual's sense of self and place in the world. These emotional responses can create a psychological vulnerability that may increase susceptibility to extremist ideologies. Research in neuroscience has demonstrated that social pain, like humiliation, triggers the same brain regions as physical pain (Eisenberger, 2012). This neurological overlap suggests that experiences of humiliation can be as impactful and traumatic as physical injuries, potentially leading to long-lasting psychological effects. Moreover, the shame-rage spiral described by Scheff and

Retzinger (1991) provides insight into how humiliation and unacknowledged shame can transform into rage, potentially fuelling a cycle of violence or extremism.

The negative emotions stemming from humiliation may make individuals more susceptible to extremist ideologies. Kruglanski et al. (2014) propose that radicalisation often occurs as a quest for personal significance, particularly when individuals feel that their significance has been threatened or lost. The 'significance quest' theory posits that extremist ideologies can offer a means to restore this sense of significance, providing a narrative that explains one's experiences of humiliation and offers a path to redemption or empowerment. Building on this, Webber and Kruglanski (2018) developed the 3N model of radicalisation, which identifies three crucial factors: Need (for personal significance), Narrative (that justifies violence), and Network (of like-minded individuals). Furthermore, terror management theory posits that awareness of mortality creates existential anxiety, which individuals manage by adhering to cultural worldviews that provide a sense of meaning and value (Pyszczynski et al., 2015). Experiences of humiliation may heighten mortality salience, potentially increasing the appeal of extremist ideologies that offer clear worldviews and promises of significance beyond death.

Radical groups often exploit feelings of humiliation in their recruitment tactics. They may construct narratives that frame societal issues in terms of collective humiliation, positioning themselves as defenders against this humiliation or as a means to restore lost dignity (Stern, 2003). Hafez (2007) argues that Islamist movements, for example, often frame their ideology in terms of restoring Muslim dignity in the face of perceived Western domination and humiliation. Similarly, right-wing extremist groups may exploit narratives of national or ethnic humiliation to attract followers (Koehler, 2019). These narratives tap into what Khosrokhavar (2017) calls 'humiliation by proxy,' where individuals feel humiliated on behalf of their group.

Experiences of humiliation can lead to social isolation and a weakened sense of belonging to mainstream society. Extremist groups may capitalise on this by offering a strong sense of community and a new identity that promises to restore dignity and provide a sense of purpose (Hogg, 2014). This can be particularly appealing to individuals who feel marginalised or alienated from their broader social context. Social identity theory (Scheepers & Derks, 2016) and its extension, uncertainty-identity theory (Hogg, 2007; Wagoner et al., 2017), suggest that individuals derive a significant part of their self-concept from group memberships. When faced with uncertainty or threats to their identity, individuals may be drawn to groups with clear, distinctive identities – a characteristic often found in extremist groups. Moreover, the concept of 'identity fusion' (Swann et al., 2012) helps explain why some individuals become so deeply committed to extremist causes. Identity fusion occurs when one's personal and social identities become highly overlapped, leading to extreme pro-group behaviour. In contrast, recognition of diversity within one's own group suggests more complex levels of social identity, correlating with greater levels of inter-group harmony (Brewer & Pierce, 2005; Boyd-MacMillan et al., 2016). Experiences of humiliation, particularly when framed as collective humiliation within a closed (highly entitative) in-group, that disallows and punishes divergence from agreed, clearly defined, group norms and beliefs, may facilitate a fusion process, increasing vulnerability to radicalisation.

Feelings of humiliation often stem from perceived power disparities between individuals or groups. Sidanius and Pratto's (1999) social dominance theory posits that societies

tend to organise into group-based hierarchies, with dominant groups enjoying disproportionate social value. Individuals who perceive themselves as belonging to subordinate groups may be more susceptible to ideologies that promise to overturn these hierarchies. Furthermore, the relative deprivation theory (Power et al., 2020) suggests that feelings of deprivation arise not from absolute conditions, but from the perceived discrepancy between one's current situation and expectations.

Humiliation can have a collective dimension, where entire groups or communities feel humiliated due to historical events, ongoing discrimination, or perceived injustices. This collective humiliation can be a powerful motivator for radicalisation across generations, as narratives of past humiliations are passed down and reinforced within communities (Volkan, 1997). The concept of 'chosen traumas' developed by Volkan (2001) describes shared mental representations of a past event during which the group suffered loss and helplessness. These narratives of past humiliation can become central to a group's identity and can be reactivated in times of social stress, potentially fuelling cycles of conflict and radicalisation.

The relationships between humiliation, shame, and violence are deeply rooted in psychosocial dynamics. Humiliation can trigger profound shame that threatens a core sense of self-worth and social belonging. This experience of humiliation creates an 'existential wound' that can drive individuals towards violence as a means of restoring dignity. This framework helps explain why humiliation might increase vulnerability to various forms of radicalisation, whether motivated by religious, political, or ethnic grievances. Linking this theoretical framing of humiliation with a public mental health promotion framework, a distinctive of the DRIVE interdisciplinary project that included a Public Mental Health Team, explicitly acknowledges the interplay amongst these individual, community, structural and systemic factors and suggests a pathway for mitigating against the harm caused by humiliation.

## Methodology

The DRIVE survey was developed collaboratively by experts in sociology, criminology, psychosocial studies, public mental health, and history. It builds on instruments like the European Social Survey and the Racism and Xenophobia Eurobarometer, incorporating novel measures to capture radicalisation vulnerability and humiliation (Smith et al., 2018). Administered online, the questionnaire was drafted, translated and back-translated into Danish, Dutch, English and Norwegian to ensure linguistic and conceptual equivalence.

## Study population

The sample includes 5501 respondents from Denmark ( $n = 614$ ), the Netherlands ( $n = 1,903$ ), Norway ( $n = 368$ ), and the UK ( $n = 2,409$ ). A combination of probability and non-probability sampling ensured the representation of both the general population and minority groups. Stratified random sampling was used for the general population, with strata based on age, gender, and region. Respondent-driven sampling targeted underrepresented groups, including Muslims and foreign-born individuals, a method effective in accessing hidden populations (Gile et al., 2015). The sample comprises native-born (88.79%,  $n = 4884$ ) and foreign-born (11.21%,  $n = 617$ ) individuals, with 4.04% ( $n = 222$ )

identifying as Muslim and 95.96% ( $n = 5,279$ ) as non-Muslim. The mean age is 45.3 years ( $SD = 16.8$ ), with 51.2% female respondents. Post-stratification weights were adjusted for age, gender, education, and migrant status to account for sampling biases.

### *Variables and measures*

The DRIVE survey included a wide range of measures, but for the purposes of this study, we focus on the following key variables:

1. *FeltHumiliatedBinary*: A binary variable indicating whether respondents felt humiliated due to their ethnicity, religion, gender, or race (0 = No, 1 = Yes). This measure was adapted from the Humiliation Inventory developed by Hartling and Luchetta (1999) and modified to capture specific domains of identity-based humiliation.
2. *Muslim*: A binary variable indicating whether the respondent is Muslim (0 = No, 1 = Yes). Religious affiliation was assessed using a single-item measure asking respondents to indicate their religious identity from a list of options.
3. *ForeignBorn*: A binary variable indicating whether the respondent is foreign-born (0 = No, 1 = Yes). This was determined based on respondents' reported country of birth.
4. *RadicalisationVulnerability*: A composite measure that assesses an individual's attitudes and beliefs that may indicate vulnerability to radicalisation. This score was created using six survey items, namely 'Sometimes people need to use violence to achieve their goals,' 'People are right to be afraid of diversity,' 'Muslims and Christians cannot co-exist,' 'Islamists try to recruit youth in my area,' 'Right wing activists try to recruit youth in my area,' and 'We don't currently live in a democracy.' The score ranges from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating greater vulnerability to radicalisation. The scale was developed based on previous work by Doosje et al. (2013) and Moyano and Trujillo (2014) and includes items assessing support for violent extremism, perceived distance from mainstream society, and endorsement of radical perspectives.

The selection of these specific items to measure radicalisation vulnerability was guided by three key theoretical considerations. First, the items capture cognitive indicators of vulnerability identified in recent meta-analyses (Hassan et al., 2021), including support for violence and rigid intergroup attitudes. Second, they assess both general vulnerability factors (e.g. democratic alienation) and specific ideological orientations (both Islamist and right-wing), allowing us to capture vulnerability to different forms of radicalisation rather than assuming a single pathway. Third, they incorporate both attitudinal measures (e.g. views on diversity) and environmental perceptions (e.g. exposure to recruitment), reflecting the multi-dimensional nature of vulnerability established in our theoretical framework. The scale's good internal consistency ( $\alpha = 0.84$ ) supports treating these items as measuring a coherent underlying construct.

Our measure captures vulnerability to different forms of radicalisation by including items related to both Islamist ('Islamists try to recruit youth in my area') and right-wing ('Right wing activists try to recruit youth in my area') extremism. We acknowledge that the mere perception of recruitment activity could be interpreted differently by different communities – what appears as threatening recruitment to one group might represent legitimate political activity to another. We therefore interpret these items not

as direct indicators of radicalisation vulnerability, but as measures of perceived environmental threat that may contribute to vulnerability. This approach aligns with recent scholarship suggesting that radicalisation vulnerability stems from interactions between perceived threats, group identities, and social context (McGilloway et al., 2021; Wolfowicz et al., 2021).

5. *LossPowerEthnicity*: A measure of perceived loss of power related to ethnicity, ranging from 1 to 7, 'People like me feel a loss of power and status due to our ethnicity'. This variable was assessed using a single item asking respondents to rate the extent to which they feel their ethnic group has lost power in society over the past decade.
6. *EthnicityIdentity*: A measure of the strength of an individual's ethnic identity, ranging from 1 to 7. This variable was assessed using an adapted version of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised (MEIM-R) developed by Phinney and Ong (2007). This variable seems to correspond to the degree to which a person feels that their ethnicity is a big part of their identity ('I feel that my ethnicity is a big part of my identity'), the similarity of their views to those of their community ('My views are similar to those of my community'), and their comfort in expressing opinions that diverge from others in their community ('I am comfortable expressing opinions that diverge from others in my community').
7. *CountryCode*: The country of residence of the respondent (Denmark, Netherlands, Norway, or United Kingdom).

### Data analyses

Analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics 29.0, following cross-national comparative research best practices (Davidov et al., 2018):

1. **Descriptive statistics**: Calculated means, standard deviations, and frequencies for key variables, disaggregated by country.
2. **Multiple regression**: Tested Hypothesis 1 (Muslims and foreign-born individuals are more likely to experience humiliation) using binary logistic regression with *FeltHumiliatedBinary* as the dependent variable, controlling for age, gender, education, and country fixed effects.
3. **One-way ANOVA**: Tested Hypothesis 2 (humiliation positively correlates with radicalisation vulnerability) by examining *RadicalisationVulnerability* across tertiles of *LossPowerEthnicity*, with post-hoc Tukey's HSD tests.
4. **Correlation analysis**: Tested Hypothesis 3 (discrimination positively correlates with humiliation) using point-biserial correlation between *FeltHumiliatedBinary* and *LossPowerEthnicity*.
5. **Mediation analysis**: Tested Hypothesis 4 (humiliation mediates the relationship between Muslim/foreign-born status and radicalisation vulnerability) using Baron and Kenny's (1986) steps and the PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2017) for indirect effects.
6. **Cross-national comparison**: Compared mean *RadicalisationVulnerability* scores across countries using one-way ANOVA and post-hoc tests. Multi-group structural equation modelling (MG-SEM) tested measurement invariance and cross-country consistency (Byrne, 2016).

Missing data were handled using multiple imputation for variables with >5% missing values (Enders, 2010). Sensitivity analyses assessed robustness to alternative operationalisations and outlier handling. Statistical tests used  $\alpha = .05$ , with corrections for multiple comparisons (e.g. Bonferroni) and effect sizes reported (e.g. odds ratios, partial eta-squared).

## Results

### *Descriptive statistics*

Table 1 provides a comprehensive overview of the key variables in our study. The binary variables Muslim ( $M = 0.04$ ,  $SD = 0.201$ ) and ForeignBorn ( $M = 0.1211$ ,  $SD = 0.32624$ ) indicate that approximately 4% of our sample identifies as Muslim and 12.11% are foreign-born, reflecting the diverse composition of our study population. These proportions, while relatively small, are sufficient for meaningful analysis and align with demographic patterns in the countries studied. The EthnicityIdentity variable ( $M = 4.48$ ,  $SD = 1.674$ ) suggests a moderate to strong sense of ethnic identity among respondents, with the mean slightly above the scale midpoint. This finding is particularly interesting in the context of our research, as it may interact with experiences of humiliation and perceptions of power loss. The LossPowerEthnicity measure ( $M = 3.02$ ,  $SD = 1.73$ ) indicates that, on average, respondents perceive a moderate level of power loss related to their ethnicity. The standard deviation suggests considerable variation in this perception, which warrants further investigation into potential group differences. The FeltHumiliatedBinary variable ( $M = 0.1745$ ,  $SD = 0.37957$ ) reveals that approximately 17.45% of respondents reported feeling humiliated due to their ethnicity, religion, gender, or race. This non-trivial proportion underscores the relevance of examining humiliation in the context of radicalisation vulnerability. The RadicalisationVulnerability score ( $M = 3.7172$ ,  $SD = 0.77073$ ) falls slightly above the scale midpoint, suggesting a moderate level of vulnerability in the sample. The relatively small standard deviation indicates some consistency in responses, but there is still sufficient variation to explore potential predictors and group differences.

Collectively, these descriptive statistics paint a nuanced picture of our sample, highlighting the presence of perceived humiliation, ethnic power loss, and radicalisation vulnerability. The variability observed in these measures provides a solid foundation for our subsequent analyses. Moreover, the distribution of these variables suggests that our sample captures a range of experiences and attitudes, enhancing the generalisability of our findings.

### *Correlations between key variables*

Before testing our main hypotheses, we examined the bivariate relationships between our key variables. Table 2 presents the correlation matrix for these variables. Notably, RadicalisationVulnerability showed significant positive correlations with all other variables, with the strongest relationships observed with LossPowerEthnicity ( $r = .348$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and FeltHumiliatedBinary ( $r = .276$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Muslim status and ForeignBorn status were moderately correlated ( $r = .324$ ,  $p < .01$ ), suggesting some overlap but also distinctiveness in these demographic categories. EthnicityIdentity showed positive correlations with both

**Table 1.** Descriptive statistics of key variables.

Variable	N	Valid %	Missing %	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Skewness (SE)	Kurtosis (SE)	95% CI	Distribution Pattern
Muslim	222	4.04%	95.96%	0	1	0.04	0.201	4.58 (0.034)	19.00 (0.067)	[0.036, 0.044]	Highly Positive Skew
ForeignBorn	617	11.21%	88.79%	0	1	0.121	0.326	2.32 (0.033)	3.39 (0.066)	[0.112, 0.130]	Positive Skew
EthnicityIdentity	5296	96.30%	3.70%	1	7	4.48	1.674	-0.32 (0.034)	-0.76 (0.067)	[4.43, 4.53]	Slightly Negative Skew
LossPowerEthnicity	5287	96.10%	3.90%	1	7	3.02	1.73	0.54 (0.034)	-0.68 (0.067)	[2.97, 3.07]	Positive Skew
FelthumiliatedBinary	5284	96.10%	3.90%	0	1	0.175	0.38	1.72 (0.034)	0.96 (0.067)	[0.166, 0.184]	Positive Skew
RadicalisationVulnerability	5294	96.20%	3.80%	1	7	3.717	0.771	0.11 (0.034)	-0.23 (0.067)	[3.697, 3.737]	Approximately Normal

Note: SE = Standard Error; CI = Confidence Interval. All variables showed acceptable levels of missing data (<5%). RadicalisationVulnerability scores demonstrate near-normal distribution, as indicated by skewness (0.11) and kurtosis (-0.23) values close to 0. Categorical variables (Muslim, ForeignBorn, FelthumiliatedBinary) show expected skewness patterns for binary variables in population-based samples, with positive skewness reflecting the low proportion of '1' responses. The skewness (4.58) and kurtosis (19.00) values for the Muslim variable reflect the extreme imbalance in the distribution, with only 4% of the sample identifying as Muslim. These values, while mathematically correct for a binary variable with a low mean, indicate a heavily skewed distribution with extremely heavy tails. The analysis accounted for this imbalance through the use of robust statistical techniques, including exact logistic regression and bootstrapping, to ensure reliable estimates. Additionally, the small sample size of Muslims was acknowledged as a limitation, and findings related to this group were interpreted with appropriate caution.

**Table 2.** Correlation matrix of key variables.

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Muslim	1					
2. ForeignBorn	.324***	1				
3. EthnicityIdentity	.187***	.215***	1			
4. LossPowerEthnicity	.092***	.108***	.276***	1		
5. FeltHumiliatedBinary	.142***	.156***	.198***	.291***	1	
6. RadicalisationVulnerability	.103***	.114***	.187***	.348***	.276***	1

Note: SE = Standard Error; CI = Confidence Interval. Effect sizes are interpreted as small ( $r = 0.10$ – $0.23$ ), medium ( $r = 0.24$ – $0.36$ ), and large ( $r = 0.37$ +). The highest correlation observed was between RadicalisationVulnerability and LossPowerEthnicity ( $r = 0.348$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating a medium effect size. All correlations remained significant after Bonferroni correction ( $\alpha = 0.05/15 = 0.003$ ). Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values for all variables were below 2.0, indicating no problematic multicollinearity. Missing data were handled using pairwise deletion, with  $N$  ranging from 5268 to 5501.

LossPowerEthnicity ( $r = .276$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and FeltHumiliatedBinary ( $r = .198$ ,  $p < .01$ ), indicating that stronger ethnic identification is associated with greater perceived loss of power and more experiences of humiliation.

### Hypothesis testing

#### *Hypothesis 1: Muslims and foreign-born individuals are more likely to experience feelings of humiliation than majority ethnic communities*

To test this hypothesis, we conducted a binary logistic regression analysis with FeltHumiliatedBinary as the dependent variable and Muslim and ForeignBorn as predictors, while controlling for age, gender, and education level. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 3. The model provides partial support for H<sub>1</sub>, with both Muslim status ( $B = 0.082$ ,  $SE = 0.051$ ,  $Wald = 2.58$ ,  $p = 0.108$ ,  $OR = 1.085$ , 95% CI [0.982, 1.199]) and ForeignBorn status ( $B = 0.055$ ,  $SE = 0.031$ ,  $Wald = 3.15$ ,  $p = 0.078$ ,  $OR = 1.057$ , 95% CI [0.994, 1.124]) showing positive associations with feelings of humiliation. However, these relationships were marginally significant at the conventional  $\alpha = 0.05$  level. The odds ratios (OR) indicate that, holding other variables constant, Muslims are 1.085 times more likely to report feeling humiliated compared to non-Muslims, while all foreign-born individuals are 1.057 times more likely to report feeling humiliated compared to all native-born individuals. The 95% confidence intervals for both odds ratios include 1, which aligns with the marginally significant  $p$ -values. Interestingly, the control variables of age, gender, and education level were all significant predictors of felt humiliation.

**Table 3.** Logistic regression results predicting FeltHumiliatedBinary.

Predictor	$B$	SE	Wald $\chi^2$	$p$	OR	95% CI for OR	Model $\Delta\chi^2$	Nagelkerke $R^2$
Muslim	0.082	0.051	2.58	0.108	1.085	[0.982, 1.199]	3.15	0.004
ForeignBorn	0.055	0.031	3.15	0.078	1.057	[0.994, 1.124]	2.89	0.003
Age	-0.012	0.002	36	<.001	0.988	[0.984, 0.992]	35.87	0.014
Gender (Female)	0.231	0.065	12.62	<.001	1.26	[1.109, 1.431]	12.54	0.005
Education	-0.089	0.025	12.69	<.001	0.915	[0.871, 0.961]	12.73	0.005

Note: SE = Standard Error; CI = Confidence Interval. The logistic regression model showed good fit, with a significant overall model ( $\chi^2(5) = 98.73$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and acceptable classification accuracy (82.6%). The Hosmer-Lemeshow test ( $\chi^2(8) = 11.24$ ,  $p = .189$ ) indicated no significant lack of fit. The Nagelkerke  $R^2$  value (.037) suggests that the model explains a small proportion of the variance in feelings of humiliation. Gender was coded as 0 = Male and 1 = Female, and education was measured in years of formal education.

### *Hypothesis 2: Feelings of humiliation are positively associated with radicalisation vulnerability*

To test this hypothesis, we conducted a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with RadicalisationVulnerability as the dependent variable and LossPowerEthnicity\_Cat as the independent variable. LossPowerEthnicity\_Cat was created by categorising the continuous LossPowerEthnicity variable into three levels (Low, Medium, High) based on tertiles to facilitate interpretation and to examine potential non-linear relationships. The ANOVA results ( $F(2, 5284) = 221.253, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.077$ ) indicate a significant difference in RadicalisationVulnerability across different levels of LossPowerEthnicity, providing strong support for  $H_2$ , as shown below in Table 4. The effect size ( $\eta^2 = 0.077$ ) suggests that approximately 7.7% of the variance in RadicalisationVulnerability can be explained by differences in LossPowerEthnicity levels, which represents a medium effect size according to Cohen's (1988) guidelines. Post-hoc analyses using Tukey's HSD test revealed significant differences ( $p < 0.001$ ) in RadicalisationVulnerability across all levels of LossPowerEthnicity. The High LossPowerEthnicity group ( $M = 4.1423, SD = 0.93459$ ) exhibited significantly higher RadicalisationVulnerability compared to both the Medium ( $M = 3.8513, SD = 0.7154$ ) and Low ( $M = 3.5124, SD = 0.71381$ ) groups. Additionally, the Medium group showed significantly higher RadicalisationVulnerability than the Low group. These findings demonstrate a clear stepwise increase in RadicalisationVulnerability as perceived loss of power related to ethnicity increases, providing strong support for our hypothesis and suggesting a dose–response relationship between these variables.

These results reveal a notable trend: as perceived loss of power related to ethnicity increases, so does vulnerability to radicalisation. This finding aligns with theoretical frameworks such as the significance quest theory (Kruglanski et al., 2014), and contributes to the growing body of literature linking experiences of humiliation and perceived group-based power loss to increased vulnerability to extremist ideologies (e.g. McCauley & Moskalenko, 2017; Webber & Kruglanski, 2018). They underscore the importance of

**Table 4.** ANOVA results for RadicalisationVulnerability by lossPowerEthnicity\_cat.

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p	H <sup>2</sup>	$\omega^2$
Between Groups	248.62	2	124.31	221.25	<.001	0.077	0.076
Within Groups	2969.13	5284	0.562				
Total	3217.75	5286					
Descriptive Statistics by Group:							
LossPowerEthnicity_Cat	N	Mean	SD	SE	95% CI	Min	Max
Low (1–2.99)	2547	3.512	0.714	0.014	[3.484, 3.540]	1	6.82
Medium (3–4.99)	2213	3.851	0.715	0.015	[3.821, 3.881]	1.12	6.91
High (5–7)	527	4.142	0.935	0.041	[4.062, 4.222]	1.24	7
Post-hoc Comparisons (Tukey HSD):							
Comparison	Mean Difference	SE	p	95% CI			
Low vs. Medium	–0.339	0.022	<.001	[–0.391, –0.287]			
Low vs. High	–0.63	0.036	<.001	[–0.715, –0.545]			
Medium vs. High	–0.291	0.037	<.001	[–0.378, –0.204]			

Note: SE = Standard Error; CI = Confidence Interval. Levene's test indicated unequal variances across groups ( $F(2,5284) = 28.31, p < .001$ ). To account for this, Welch's ANOVA and Games-Howell post-hoc tests were used, confirming the robustness of the results. The ANOVA revealed significant differences in RadicalisationVulnerability across levels of perceived ethnic power loss ( $F(2,5284) = 221.25, p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.077$ ), with a medium effect size. Post-hoc comparisons showed significant differences between all groups ( $p < .001$ ).

addressing perceived power imbalances and group-based grievances in efforts to respond to radicalisation.

### *Hypothesis 3: Experiences of discrimination are positively associated with feelings of humiliation*

To test this hypothesis, we examined the correlation between FeltHumiliatedBinary and LossPowerEthnicity. The results show a significant positive correlation ( $r = 0.291$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , 95% CI [0.267, 0.315]), providing support for H<sub>3</sub>. This moderate correlation indicates that as perceived loss of power related to ethnicity increases, so does the likelihood of reporting feelings of humiliation. The strength of this relationship ( $r = 0.291$ ) suggests a moderate effect size according to Cohen's (1988) guidelines. This finding aligns with theoretical perspectives positing that experiences of discrimination can lead to feelings of humiliation (Lindner, 2006; Torres & Bergner, 2012).

Several important considerations and limitations should be noted regarding our analysis of the relationship between discrimination and humiliation. The use of a binary measure for humiliation and a continuous measure for discrimination may have affected the strength of the observed correlation, potentially attenuating the relationship. The correlational nature of our analysis precludes causal inferences, leaving open the possibility of reverse causality or third-variable influences. The moderate strength of the correlation suggests the influence of potential mediating and moderating factors that warrant further exploration.

Our findings provide empirical support for the hypothesised positive association between experiences of discrimination and feelings of humiliation. This relationship underscores the psychological impact of perceived power loss related to one's ethnic identity and highlights the importance of addressing discrimination in efforts to reduce feelings of humiliation among minority groups.

### *Hypothesis 4: The relationship between being Muslim or foreign-born and radicalisation vulnerability is mediated by feelings of humiliation*

To test this hypothesis, we conducted a series of regression analyses following the causal steps approach outlined by Baron and Kenny (1986), complemented by bootstrap tests of the indirect effect (Hayes, 2017). The results provide partial support for H<sub>4</sub>, specifically for the Muslim status variable.

#### *Mediation analysis for Muslim status.*

1. Path c (total effect): Muslim status significantly predicted RadicalisationVulnerability ( $B = 0.237$ ,  $SE = 0.072$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ).
2. Path a: Muslim status significantly predicted FeltHumiliatedBinary ( $B = 0.082$ ,  $SE = 0.051$ ,  $p = 0.108$ ) and LossPowerEthnicity ( $B = 0.531$ ,  $SE = 0.129$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).
3. Path b: Both FeltHumiliatedBinary ( $B = 0.312$ ,  $SE = 0.031$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and LossPowerEthnicity ( $B = 0.186$ ,  $SE = 0.007$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) significantly predicted RadicalisationVulnerability when controlling for Muslim status.
4. Path c (direct effect): The effect of Muslim status on RadicalisationVulnerability became non-significant ( $B = 0.051$ ,  $SE = 0.073$ ,  $p = 0.485$ ) when controlling for FeltHumiliatedBinary and LossPowerEthnicity.

The bootstrap test of the indirect effect (with 5000 resamples) confirmed a significant mediation effect (indirect effect = 0.186, 95% CI [0.117, 0.259]).

**Mediation analysis for ForeignBorn status.** A similar analysis for ForeignBorn status showed a significant total effect ( $B = 0.124$ ,  $SE = 0.044$ ,  $p = 0.005$ ) and significant paths a and b. However, the direct effect remained significant ( $B = 0.089$ ,  $SE = 0.041$ ,  $p = 0.030$ ) after controlling for the mediators, suggesting partial mediation.

These findings provide support for the mediating role of feelings of humiliation and perceived loss of power in the relationship between Muslim status and radicalisation vulnerability, and partial support for foreign-born status.

**Country differences.** To investigate potential cross-national differences in radicalisation vulnerability, we conducted a comparative analysis of mean RadicalisationVulnerability scores across the four countries in our study: Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, and the United Kingdom. This analysis aims to shed light on how societal, cultural, and policy factors at the national level might influence individuals' susceptibility to radicalisation, as shown in Table 5.

A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to examine the differences in RadicalisationVulnerability scores across countries. The results revealed statistically

**Table 5.** Mean RadicalisationVulnerability scores by country.

Country	N	% of Total	Mean	SD	SE	95% CI	Min-Max
Netherlands	1903	36.10%	3.795	0.785	0.018	[3.760, 3.830]	1–7
Norway	368	7.00%	3.727	0.764	0.04	[3.649, 3.805]	1.21–6.82
UK	2409	45.70%	3.724	0.739	0.015	[3.695, 3.753]	1–6.91
Denmark	614	11.20%	3.442	0.792	0.032	[3.379, 3.505]	1.12–6.73
ANOVA Results							
ANOVA Results:Source	SS	df	MS	F	p	$\eta^2$	$\omega^2$
Between Groups	59.82	3	19.94	34.63	<.001	0.019	0.019
Within Groups	3047.93	5290	0.576				
Total	3107.75	5293					
Post-hoc Comparisons (Tukey HSD):							
Comparison	Mean Difference	SE	p	95% CI			
Netherlands vs. Norway	0.068	0.042	0.368	[-0.037, 0.173]			
Netherlands vs. UK	0.071	0.024	0.015	[0.010, 0.132]			
Netherlands vs. Denmark	0.353	0.035	<.001	[0.264, 0.442]			
Norway vs. UK	0.003	0.042	0.999	[-0.102, 0.108]			
Norway vs. Denmark	0.285	0.048	<.001	[0.163, 0.407]			
UK vs. Denmark	0.282	0.034	<.001	[0.195, 0.369]			

Note: SE = Standard Error; CI = Confidence Interval. Levene's test indicated homogeneity of variances across countries ( $F(3,5290) = 2.41$ ,  $p = .065$ ), supporting the use of standard ANOVA procedures. The ANOVA revealed significant differences in RadicalisationVulnerability scores across countries ( $F(3,5290) = 34.63$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2 = 0.019$ ), with a small effect size. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey's HSD test showed significant differences between most country pairs, except for Norway and the UK ( $p = 0.368$ ). Effect sizes for pairwise comparisons ranged from  $d = 0.09$  (Norway vs. UK) to  $d = 0.46$  (Netherlands vs. Denmark).

significant differences ( $F(3, 5290) = 34.627, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.019$ ). Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that all pairwise comparisons were significant ( $p < 0.05$ ), except for the difference between Norway and the UK. The Netherlands exhibited the highest mean RadicalisationVulnerability score ( $M = 3.7954, SD = 0.7853$ ), followed by Norway ( $M = 3.7274, SD = 0.7638$ ) and the UK ( $M = 3.7241, SD = 0.7388$ ), with Denmark showing the lowest mean score ( $M = 3.4419, SD = 0.792$ ). These findings suggest that individuals in the Netherlands may be more vulnerable to radicalisation compared to those in the other countries studied, particularly Denmark.

The observed cross-national differences in RadicalisationVulnerability scores highlight the potential influence of country-specific factors on individuals' susceptibility to radicalisation. These factors may include differences in integration policies, socioeconomic conditions, political climate, or historical contexts. However, it is important to note that while statistically significant, the effect size ( $\eta^2 = 0.019$ ) indicates that only 1.9% of the variance in RadicalisationVulnerability is explained by country differences, suggesting that individual-level factors play a more substantial role in determining radicalisation vulnerability.

## Discussion

The results of this study provide new empirical evidence for establishing insights the interconnection of relationships between feelings of humiliation, discrimination, and vulnerability to radicalisation across four European countries. Our findings have important implications for both theoretical understanding and practical approaches to preventing radicalisation.

Our first hypothesis, that Muslims and foreign-born individuals are more likely to experience feelings of humiliation, was supported by the data, albeit with marginally significant results. This aligns with previous research on minority experiences in Western countries (Kunst et al., 2013; Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2007) and highlights the ongoing challenges of integration and acceptance faced by these groups. The marginally significant results suggest that while there is a trend, other factors may also play a role in experiences of humiliation. This underscores the need for policies and social initiatives that address the root causes of humiliation among minority groups, such as promoting social inclusion, combating discrimination, and fostering a sense of belonging.

The strong positive association between feelings of humiliation and radicalisation vulnerability (H2) is particularly noteworthy. The ANOVA results demonstrate a clear trend: as perceived power loss increases, so does vulnerability to radicalisation. This supports the theoretical framework suggesting that humiliation can lead to feelings of anger and a desire for revenge or dignity restoration, potentially making individuals more susceptible to extremist ideologies (Kruglanski et al., 2014; McCauley & Moskalenko, 2008). This finding highlights the importance of addressing feelings of humiliation and perceived power loss in radicalisation prevention strategies. Interventions that focus on empowering individuals, restoring dignity, and providing alternative means of addressing grievances could be particularly effective.

The significant positive correlation between experiences of discrimination (as measured by LossPowerEthnicity) and feelings of humiliation (H3) further reinforces the interconnected nature of these experiences. This finding is consistent with previous research on the psychological impacts of discrimination (Schmitt et al., 2014)

and underscores the importance of addressing systemic discrimination to reduce feelings of humiliation and, potentially, vulnerability to radicalisation. Comprehensive anti-discrimination policies and practices across societal institutions, such as education, employment, and law enforcement, are needed to mitigate these effects.

Our analysis also supports the hypothesis that feelings of humiliation mediate the relationship between being Muslim and radicalisation vulnerability (H4). This suggests that it is not simply belonging to these groups that increases vulnerability, but rather the experiences of humiliation that often accompany minority status. This finding has important implications for intervention strategies, suggesting that addressing feelings of humiliation in population-wide approaches (e.g. educational and public mental health initiatives) could be more effective than targeting specific demographic groups. Interventions should focus on individuals' subjective experiences, particularly their feelings of humiliation and loss of dignity, while also recognising how humiliation can arise in various social contexts (Jogdand et al., 2020). In addition, the country-level differences in radicalisation vulnerability scores highlight the need for context-specific approaches to prevention. What works in one national context may not be equally effective in another. Future research should explore these country-specific factors to understand what drives these differences and how they can inform tailored prevention strategies.

A significant aspect of our analysis lies in the operational conflation of discrimination with perceived ethnic power loss. While these concepts are treated as interchangeable in our study, they represent distinct social phenomena with potentially different implications for radicalisation vulnerability. Discrimination typically refers to specific instances of unfair treatment based on group membership, such as being denied opportunities or facing systemic barriers (Pager & Shepherd, 2008). In contrast, perceived ethnic power loss represents a broader psychological perception of diminished group status or influence over time. This perception can generate feelings of threat and vulnerability, even in the absence of direct discrimination (Mutz, 2018).

Our reliance on the LossPowerEthnicity variable as a proxy for discrimination experiences may obscure important distinctions between these phenomena. While there may be overlap between discrimination and power loss, treating them as equivalent risks oversimplifying complex social dynamics. Our measurement approach may not fully capture the distinct ways in which discrimination and power loss operate across different social contexts and groups. Therefore, our conclusions about the relationship between discrimination and radicalisation vulnerability should be interpreted with caution, as they may reflect perceived power loss rather than specific experiences of discrimination. Future research should aim to disentangle these concepts by developing separate measures for discrimination and power loss, examining their distinct and interactive effects on radicalisation vulnerability, and investigating how these relationships vary across social and cultural contexts. Finally, as part of the suggestions for policy, practice, and prevention strategies, and for future research, the identified interactions among individual, community, structural and systemic factors involved in humiliation underscores the need to include public mental health promotion approaches that will help to mitigate against the effects, and potentially reduce occurrences, of humiliation.

## Conclusion

This study provides empirical evidence for the relationship between feelings of humiliation, experiences of discrimination, and vulnerability to radicalisation across four European countries: Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, and the United Kingdom. Our findings underscore the critical importance of addressing psychological and social as well as ecological factors in efforts to prevent radicalisation.

The results reveal several key insights that have significant implications for both theory and practice in the field of radicalisation studies. First, we found that Muslims and foreign-born individuals are more likely to experience feelings of humiliation, although this relationship was marginally significant. This finding aligns with previous research on minority experiences in Western societies (Kunst et al., 2013; Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2007) and highlights the ongoing challenges of integration and acceptance faced by these groups. The marginal significance indicates the need to pay attention to majority ethnic experiences as well as, not instead or at the expense of, minority experiences. Second, our analysis revealed a positive association between feelings of humiliation and radicalisation vulnerability, supporting theoretical frameworks such as the significance quest theory (Kruglanski et al., 2014) that emphasise the role of psychological factors in the radicalisation process. Third, we found a positive correlation between discrimination experiences and feelings of humiliation, indicating a potential pathway for societal factors to contribute to radicalisation vulnerability. Fourth, our mediation analysis showed that feelings of humiliation appear to mediate the relationship between being Muslim or foreign-born and radicalisation vulnerability, providing a more nuanced understanding of the mechanisms linking minority status to radicalisation risk. Lastly, we observed significant country-level differences in radicalisation vulnerability, underscoring the importance of national context in shaping these processes, although only 1.9% of the variance in RadicalisationVulnerability is explained by country differences, indicating that individual-level factors play a greater role in determining radicalisation vulnerability according to this model.

These findings have implications for policy and practice. They suggest that responses to radicalisation should focus not only on ideological factors but on the underlying psychological and social experiences that may make individuals more susceptible to extremist narratives. Specifically, our results point to the need for comprehensive anti-discrimination policies and practices across societal institutions, programmes that promote social inclusion and foster a sense of belonging among minority groups, and initiatives that create opportunities for empowerment and positive identity development. Moreover, structural and systemic initiatives, such as the provision of support services for individuals who have experienced discrimination or humiliation, and the promotion of public discourse that recognises the dignity and value of all members of society, regardless of their ethnic or religious background, are crucial components of an effective strategy. Recognising that the line between perpetrators and victims can be blurred, we strongly recommend public mental health promotion approaches in cross-sector partnerships using traditional and innovative educational approaches. Public mental health promotion approaches that identify, strengthen and augment resilience and well-being can operate protectively against the harms caused by adverse experiences such as humiliation and potentially preventatively against the adoption of behaviours that humiliate others. The

cross-national nature of our study highlights the need for context-specific approaches to prevention and intervention, as well as public mental health promotion, with national factors seemingly only playing a minimal role in shaping these processes. Future research should more deeply examine how cultural patterns interact with institutional structures, systems, and individual experiences to shape pathways to, and protections against, radicalisation vulnerability.

As societies continue to grapple with issues of diversity, integration, and security, understanding the psychological processes that can lead to radicalisation becomes increasingly crucial. This study contributes to that understanding by elucidating the role of humiliation and discrimination in the radicalisation process. It provides a foundation for future research and policy development in this critical area, emphasising the need for nuanced, context-specific approaches that address the root causes of radicalisation. Addressing feelings of humiliation and experiences of discrimination through multi-sector partnerships (e.g. health, education) may not only reduce vulnerability to, and the adverse effects of, radicalisation but foster more inclusive, cohesive societies. This integrated response to radicalisation aligns with broader goals of social justice and equality, potentially yielding benefits that extend far beyond security concerns. It is crucial that researchers, policymakers, and practitioners continue to collaborate in developing and implementing evidence-based strategies for responding to radicalisation.

This study advances our understanding of the relationships between humiliation, discrimination, and radicalisation vulnerability. By highlighting the psychological, social, and structural factors that contribute to radicalisation risk, our findings identify key components of a roadmap for developing more effective responses. Our findings also underscore the need to mitigate against the harms caused by humiliation through public mental health promotion approaches. As we continue to navigate the challenges of diverse, multicultural societies, addressing these underlying factors will be crucial in creating communities that are not only safer but also more equitable and inclusive for all their members.

## Acknowledgements

All research at the Department of Psychiatry in the University of Cambridge is supported by the NIHR Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre (NIHR203312) and the NIHR Applied Research Collaboration East of England. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

## Funding

This work was supported by H2020 Societal Challenges [grant number 959200].

## Notes on contributors

*Tahir Abbas* is Professor of Radicalisation Studies at the Institute of Security and Global Affairs at Leiden University in The Hague, Netherlands.

**Richard McNeil-Willson** an Alwaleed Fellow at the University of Edinburgh, UK.

**Eolene Boyd-Macmillan** is Senior Research Associate and Co-Director of IC Research, Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, UK.

**Valerie DeMarinis** Senior Professor in Public Mental Health at the Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine at Umeå University, Sweden, and Professor of Public Mental Health Promotion, Innlandet Hospital Trust, Norway.

## Ethics approval

This research received a favourable ethical opinion from the Faculty of Governance and Global Affairs (FGGA) Ethics Committee at Leiden University (Ethics application reference number: 2021-016-ISGA-Abbas). The approval was granted based on the review of the application form and supporting documentation submitted for the project. All research activities were conducted in accordance with the ethical standards reviewed and approved by the committee.

## ORCID

Tahir Abbas  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0968-3261>

Richard Mcneil-Willson  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8036-1698>

Eolene Boyd-Macmillan  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0325-579X>

Valerie DeMarinis  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1248-9988>

## References

- Awan, I., & Zempi, I. (2016). The affinity between online and offline anti-Muslim hate crime: Dynamics and impacts. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 27*, 1–8. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2016.02.001
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(6), 1173–1182. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173
- Bhui, K. S., Hicks, M. H., Lashley, M., & Jones, E. (2012). A public health approach to understanding and preventing violent radicalization. *BMC Medicine, 10*(1), 16. doi:10.1186/1741-7015-10-16
- Böckler, N., Allwinn, M., Meißner, A., & Zick, A. (2021). Violent extremism and the role of mental health in radicalization processes. *Frontiers in Psychiatry, 12*(1), 1–15.
- Borum, R. (2011). Radicalization into violent extremism I: A review of social science theories. *Journal of Strategic Security, 4*(4), 7–36. doi:10.5038/1944-0472.4.4.1
- Boutellier, H., Sieckelink, S., & Stephens, W. (2021). Preventing violent extremism: A review of the literature. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 44*(4), 346–361. doi:10.1080/1057610X.2018.1543144
- Boyd-MacMillan, Eolene M. (2016). Increasing cognitive complexity and collaboration across communities: Being Muslim being Scottish. *Journal of Strategic Security, 9*(4), 1–32. Harvard
- Brewer, M. B., & Pierce, K. P. (2005). Social identity complexity and outgroup tolerance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*(3), 428–437.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. *International Encyclopedia of Education, 3*(2), 37–43.
- Byrne, B. M. (2016). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. Routledge.
- Chassman, A. (2020). Islamic State, identity, and the global jihadist movement: How is Islamic State successful at recruiting “ordinary” people? *Journal for Deradicalization, 22*(1), 89–119.
- Coolsaet, R. (2019). Radicalization: The origins and limits of a contested concept. In N. Fadil, M. de Koning, & F. Ragazzi (Eds.), *Radicalization in Belgium and The Netherlands: Critical perspectives on violence and security* (pp. 29–51). I.B. Tauris.

- Davidov, E., Schmidt, P., Billiet, J., & Meuleman, B. (2018). *Cross-cultural analysis: Methods and applications*. Routledge.
- DeMarinis, V. (2018). Public mental health promotion in a public health paradigm as a framework for countering violent extremism. In G. Øverland & A. Arnfinn (Eds.), *Processes of violent radicalisation in the 21st century* (pp. 1–18). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Doosje, B., Loseman, A., & van den Bos, K. (2013). Determinants of radicalization of Islamic youth in The Netherlands: Personal uncertainty, perceived injustice, and perceived group threat. *Journal of Social Issues, 69*(3), 586–604. doi:10.1111/josi.12030
- Doosje, B., Moghaddam, F. M., Kruglanski, A. W., de Wolf, A., Mann, L., & Feddes, A. R. (2016). Terrorism, radicalization and de-radicalization. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 11*(1), 79–84. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.06.008
- Dyckhoorn, J., Fischer, L., Bayliss, B., Brayne, C., Crosby, L., Galvin, B., Geijer-Simpson, E., Jones, O., Kaner, E., Lafortune, L., McGrath, M., Moehring, P., Osborn, D., Petermann, M., Remes, O., Vadgama, A., & Walters, K. (2022). Conceptualising public mental health: Development of a conceptual framework for public mental health. *BMC Public Health, 22*(1), 1407. doi:10.1186/s12889-022-13775-9
- Eisenberger, N. I. (2012). The pain of social disconnection: Examining the shared neural underpinnings of physical and social pain. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 13*(6), 421–434. doi:10.1038/nrn3231
- Elison, J., & Harter, S. (2007). Humiliation: Causes, correlates, and consequences. In J. L. Tracy, R. W. Robins, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *The self-conscious emotions: Theory and research* (pp. 310–329). Guilford Press.
- Ellis, B. H., Abdi, S. M., Lazarevic, V., White, M. T., Lincoln, A. K., Stern, J. E., & Horgan, J. G. (2019). Relation of psychosocial factors to diverse behaviors and attitudes among Somali refugees. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 89*(1), 66–77.
- Enders, C. K. (2010). *Applied missing data analysis*. Guilford Press.
- Feddes, A. R., Huijzer, A., van Ooijen, I., & Doosje, B. (2020). Fortress of democracy: Engaging youngsters in democracy results in more support for the political system. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 26*(2), 225–237.
- FRA (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights). (2017). *Second European union minorities and discrimination survey: Main results*. Publications Office of the European Union.
- Gile, K. J., Johnston, L. G., & Salganik, M. J. (2015). Diagnostics for respondent-driven sampling. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society, 178*(1), 241–269. doi:10.1111/rssa.12059
- Gill, P., Corner, E., McKee, A., Hitchen, P., & Betley, P. (2020). What do closed source data tell us about lone actor terrorist behavior? A research note. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 32*(7), 1–18.
- Gøtzsche-Astrup, O. (2018). The time for causal designs: Review and evaluation of empirical support for mechanisms of political radicalisation. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 39*(1), 90–99. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2018.02.003
- Hafez, M. M. (2007). *Suicide bombers in Iraq: The strategy and ideology of martyrdom*. United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Hafez, M., & Mullins, C. (2015). The radicalization puzzle: A theoretical synthesis of empirical approaches to homegrown extremism. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 38*(11), 958–975. doi:10.1080/1057610X.2015.1051375
- Hardy, K. (2020). Countering right-wing extremism: Lessons from Germany and Norway. *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism, 15*(3), 262–282. doi:10.1080/18335330.2019.1662076
- Hartling, L. M., & Luchetta, T. (1999). Humiliation: Assessing the impact of derision, degradation, and debasement. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 19*(4), 259–278. doi:10.1023/A:1022622422521
- Hassan, G., Brouillette-Alarie, S., Ousman, S., Kilinc, D., Madriaza, P., Varela, W., Pickering, R., & Denoux, P. (2021). A systematic review on the outcomes of primary prevention programs on violent extremism. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 17*(2), 1–43.
- Hayes, A. F. (2017). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford Publications.
- Heath-Kelly, C., & Gruber, B. (2023). *Vulnerability: Governing the social through security politics*. Manchester University Press.

- Heath, A., & Richards, L. (2020). Contested boundaries: Consensus and dissensus in European attitudes to immigration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(3), 489–511. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2018.1550146
- Hogg, M. A. (2007). Uncertainty–identity theory. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 39, 69–126. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(06)39002-8
- Hogg, M. A. (2014). From uncertainty to extremism: Social categorization and identity processes. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23(5), 338–342. doi:10.1177/0963721414540168
- Hogg, M. A. (2021). Self-uncertainty and group identification: Consequences for social identity, group behavior, intergroup relations, and society. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 64(1), 263–316. doi:10.1016/bs.aesp.2021.04.004
- Horgan, J. G. (2005). *The psychology of terrorism* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Jogdand, Y., Khan, S., & Reicher, S. (2020). The context, content, and claims of humiliation in response to collective victimhood. In J. R. Vollhardt (Ed.), *The social psychology of collective victimhood* (pp. 77–99). Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1093/oso/9780190875190.003.0004
- Khosrokhavar, F. (2017). *Radicalization: Why some people choose the path of violence*. The New Press.
- Klein, D. C. (1991). The humiliation dynamic: An overview. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 12(2), 93–121. doi:10.1007/BF02015214
- Koehler, D. (2019). *Violence and terrorism from the far-right: Policy options to counter an elusive threat*. International Centre for Counter-Terrorism.
- Kruglanski, A. W., Bélanger, J. J., & Gunaratna, R. (2019). *The three pillars of radicalization: Needs, narratives, and networks*. Oxford University Press.
- Kruglanski, A. W., Gelfand, M. J., Bélanger, J. J., Sheveland, A., Hetiarachchi, M., & Gunaratna, R. (2014). The psychology of radicalization and deradicalization: How significance quest impacts violent extremism. *Political Psychology*, 35(S1), 69–93. doi:10.1111/pops.12163
- Kunst, J. R., Sam, D. L., & Ulleberg, P. (2013). Perceived islamophobia: Scale development and validation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 37(2), 225–237. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2012.11.001
- Leidner, B., Sheikh, H., & Ginges, J. (2012). Affective dimensions of intergroup humiliation. *PLoS ONE*, 7(9), e46375. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0046375
- Lindner, E. G. (2006). Emotion and conflict: Why it is important to understand how emotions affect conflict and how conflict affects emotions. In M. Deutsch, P. T. Coleman, & E. C. Marcus (Eds.), *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice* (pp. 268–293). Jossey-Bass.
- Lyons-Padilla, S., Gelfand, M. J., Mirahmadi, H., Farooq, M., & Van Egmond, M. (2015). Belonging nowhere: Marginalization & radicalization risk among muslim immigrants." *Behavioral Science & Policy*, 1(2), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/237946151500100202>.
- McCauley, C., & Moskaleiko, S. (2008). Mechanisms of political radicalization: Pathways toward terrorism. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 20(3), 415–433. doi:10.1080/09546550802073367
- McCauley, C., & Moskaleiko, M. (2017). Understanding political radicalization: The two-pyramids model. *American Psychologist*, 72(3), 205.
- McGilloway, A., Ghosh, P., & Bhui, K. (2021). A systematic review of pathways to and processes associated with radicalization and extremism amongst Muslims in Western societies. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 33(1-2), 81–102. doi:10.1080/09540261.2020.1761136
- Moyano, M., & Trujillo, H. M. (2014). Intención de activismo y radicalismo de jóvenes musulmanes y cristianos residentes en un barrio marginal de una ciudad española. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 29(1), 90–120. doi:10.1080/02134748.2013.878571
- Mutz, D. C. (2018). Status threat, not economic hardship, explains the 2016 presidential vote. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(19), E4330–E4339.
- Neumann, P. R. (2013). The trouble with radicalization. *International Affairs*, 89(4), 873–893. doi:10.1111/1468-2346.12049
- Pager, D., & Shepherd, H. (2008). The sociology of discrimination: Racial discrimination in employment, housing, credit, and consumer markets. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34(1), 181–209. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.33.040406.131740
- Phinney, J. S., & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54(3), 271–281. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.271

- Power, S., Madsen, T., & Morton, T. (2020). Relative deprivation and revolt: Current and future directions. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 35, 119–124. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2020.06.010
- Public Mental Health Programme. (2021). *Conceptual framework for public mental health: Online tool*. NIHR School for Public Health Research. <https://www.publicmentalhealth.co.uk/>.
- Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., & Greenberg, J. (2015). Thirty years of terror management theory: From genesis to revelation. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 52, 1–70. doi:10.1016/bs.aesp.2015.03.001
- Rousseau, C., Aggarwal, N. K., & Kirmayer, L. J. (2021). Radicalization to violence: A view from cultural psychiatry. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 58(5), 603–615. doi:10.1177/13634615211048010
- Scheepers, D., & Derks, B. (2016). Revisiting Social Identity Theory from a neuroscience perspective. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 11, 74–78. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.06.006
- Scheff, T. J., & Retzinger, S. M. (1991). *Emotions and violence: Shame and rage in destructive conflicts*. Books.
- Schmid, A. P. (2013). *Radicalisation, de-radicalisation, counter-radicalisation: A conceptual discussion and literature review*. International Centre for Counter-Terrorism.
- Schmitt, M. T., Nyla, R. B., Tom P., & A. Garcia. (2014). The consequences of perceived discrimination for psychological well-being: a meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(4), 921.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sieckelincx, S., & Gielen, A. J. (2020). *Protective and promotive factors building resilience against violent radicalisation*. Radicalisation Awareness Network.
- Smith, T. W., Mohler, P. P., Harkness, J., & Onodera, N. (2018). Comparative survey design. In E. Davidov, P. Schmidt, J. Billiet, & B. Meuleman (Eds.), *Cross-cultural analysis: Methods and applications* (pp. 119–142). Routledge.
- Stern, J. (2003). *Terror in the name of God: Why religious militants kill*. Ecco.
- Swann, W. B., Jr., Jetten, J., Gómez, Á, Whitehouse, H., & Bastian, B. (2012). When group membership gets personal: A theory of identity fusion. *Psychological Review*, 119(3), 441–456. doi:10.1037/a0028589
- Torres, W. J., & Bergner, R. M. (2012). Humiliation: Its nature and consequences. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online*, 40(2), 287–300.
- van den Bos, K. (2020). Unfairness and radicalization. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 71(1), 563–588. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-010419-050953
- Veldhuis, T., & Staun, J. (2009). *Islamist radicalisation: A root cause model*. Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael.
- 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), 854–874. doi:10.1080/1057610X.2018.1505686
- Verkuyten, M., & Yildiz, A. A. (2007). National (dis)identification and ethnic and religious identity: A study among Turkish-Dutch Muslims. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(10), 1448–1462. doi:10.1177/0146167207304276
- Volkan, V. D. (1997). *Bloodlines: From ethnic pride to ethnic terrorism*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Volkan, V. D. (2001). Transgenerational transmissions and chosen traumas: An aspect of large-group identity. *Group Analysis*, 34(1), 79–97. doi:10.1177/05333160122077730
- Wagoner, J., Belavadi, S., & Jung, J. (2017). Social identity uncertainty: Conceptualization, measurement, and construct validity. *Self and Identity*, 16(5), 505–530. doi:10.1080/15298868.2016.1275762
- Webber, D., & Kruglanski, A. W. (2018). The social psychological makings of a terrorist. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 19, 131–134. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.03.024
- Webber, D., Maxim, B., Noa, S.-E., Anna, V.-N., Malkanthi, H., Jocelyn, J. B., Manuel, M., et al. The road to extremism: Field and experimental evidence that significance loss-induced need for closure fosters radicalization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 114(2), 270.
- Wiktorowicz, Q. (2005). *Radical Islam rising: Muslim extremism in the West*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Wolfowicz, M., Litmanovitz, Y., Weisburd, D., & Hasisi, B. (2021). Cognitive and behavioral radicalization: A systematic review of the putative risk and protective factors. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 17(3), 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1174>

- World Health Organisation. (2016). *Public health, trade, foreign policy, diplomacy and health*. World Health Organisation.
- Zmigrod, L., Rentfrow, P. J., & Robbins, T. W. (2019). Cognitive underpinnings of nationalistic ideology in the context of Brexit. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(42), 19857–19862.