



RAN Collection practice template

<h2>Name of the practice</h2> <p>Please note that by practice we mean an activity/method/tool that has been used or is in use by professionals and/or community members.</p>	<h2>IC Thinking</h2>
<p>Description (max. 300 words)</p> <p>Short description of the aim and working method of the practice. Please note that in this description, it must be clear that <u>there is an explicit connection to preventing and/or countering radicalisation and/or violent extremism</u>. This means that in the aims and/or the activities/methods/tools of the practice, there is a link to preventing and countering radicalisation and/or violent extremism. Practices without this link cannot be included in the RAN Collection.</p>	<p>IC Thinking uses an evidence-based method of intervention science, based on the psychometric research of integrative complexity (IC). The aim is to equip people of all ages to work collaboratively with many types of differences — viewpoints, life stances, cultural norms — instead of moving into destructive polarisations and violence.</p> <p>The IC Thinking method was developed by psychologists at the University of Cambridge. Their expertise is being implemented through IC Thinking (Cambridge) Ltd, a social enterprise company under license from Cambridge Enterprise, University of Cambridge.</p> <p>IC measurement has two components: differentiation and integration. Differentiation refers to the perception of different perspectives or views on a topic or issue. Integration refers to the recognition of connections among several different perspectives (e.g. shared underlying values, mutual influence).</p> <p>IC Thinking interventions engage the fundamental cognitive, emotional, and social processes active in all human beings as they interact with their social worlds.</p> <p>Delivered by trained pairs of facilitators, IC Thinking interventions target these processes. They aim to grow participants' capacity to respect differences and recognise in</p>

	<p>other people the same underlying human processes at work in themselves. Participants experience an enhanced sense of their personal individuality and shared humanity.</p> <p>Through role play and other forms of action learning using multimedia, participants develop increased meta-awareness, metacognition, critical thinking, empathy and resilience. The goal in IC interventions is not to resolve debates toward a specific predetermined outcome. Rather, it is to empower participants to think for themselves and to learn experientially how to work collaboratively with different viewpoints, values, and identities, while maintaining their own values and social affiliations.</p> <p>Courses are usually 16 contact hours, ethically approved for each context, and precisely targeted to reflect a specific linguistic, social and cultural context. They allow some flexibility in delivery while maintaining fidelity to the evidence-based model. Delivered over eight two-hour sessions, IC interventions create safe spaces for participants to engage with topics debated in their own communities. Delivery of IC interventions requires specialised professional training provided by IC Thinking trainers. All IC interventions and co-facilitator training is adapted for each context, to ensure effectiveness.</p> <p>IC Thinking has developed a number of interventions for diverse target participants in a range of contexts, in partnership with international and national governmental bodies, local universities, and non-governmental organisations (NGOs). These span the Balkans, England, Finland, Kenya, Pakistan, Scotland and Sweden. Projects in development include Lebanon and Northern Ireland.</p> <p>In each context where invited, IC Thinking works collaboratively with a wide range of community researchers and leaders to develop IC interventions that reflect that social context. This initial research and development process ensures that the course sessions reflect the participants' social reality. As a result, participants are thoroughly engaged in the sessions, allowing maximum growth and development.</p>
<p>Peer reviewed</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Key themes</p> <p>Please <u>choose</u> 2 key themes most corresponding with the practice.</p>	<p>Training</p> <p>Social cohesion and polarisation</p>

<p>Target audience</p> <p>Please <u>choose</u> a minimum of one target audience most corresponding with the practice.</p>	<p>Youth / Pupils / Students</p> <p>Educators / Academics</p> <p>First responders or practitioners</p>
<p>Geographical scope</p> <p>Please indicate where the practice has been/is implemented (countries, regions, cities).</p>	<p>Partnerships currently or in the past have included the Balkans, Bangladesh, Europe (including England, Finland, Scotland, Sweden), the Middle East and North Africa region (MENA), Kenya and Pakistan.</p>
<p>Start of the practice</p> <p>Please indicate when (year) the practice was developed and implemented to indicate the maturity of the practice. In case the practice is no longer active, please indicate when it ended.</p>	<p>Starting year: 2004</p> <p>Research from 2004 onwards led to the action research project, 'Being Muslim Being British' (Dec 2007–June 2010), funded by the European Commission (Justice and Security Directorate).</p> <p>Since then, ICthinking interventions with professional training for delivery have continued to be researched, developed and produced, with empirical assessments, to address extremisms, including sectarianism, and intergroup conflicts and polarisations, for public mental health promotion.</p>
<p>Deliverables</p> <p>Please indicate if the practice has led to concrete deliverables, such as (links to) handbooks, training modules, videos.</p>	<p>IC Thinking interventions and resources in conjunction with co-facilitator training specifically tailored to the intervention comprise two interdependent components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a course script (manual) with activity guides, targeted audiovisual stimuli and accompanying resources; 2. training of a cohort of co-facilitators in intervention-appropriate group work and fundamentals of intervention science, along with safeguarding and reflective practices that conform with international ethical requirements. <p>IC Thinking partners are part of a professional network for ongoing updates based on the latest research and professional development, all as part of continued quality assurance.</p>
<p>Evidence and evaluation</p>	<p>The cross-culturally validated and reliable IC construct and measurement frame is implemented by IC Thinking (Cambridge) Ltd, based on over 40 years of research (Suedfeld & Tetlock, 2014).</p>

Short description on performance measures of the practice, including

1. qualitative views and quantitative (statistical) data e.g. measure of the success of your project or intervention.
2. evaluation and feedback, including surveys and/or anecdotal evidence e.g. have you done either an internal or external evaluation, have you encouraged any feedback from your target group?
3. peer review which feedback did the practice receive in the RAN working group and/or study visit where the practice was discussed.

Please elaborate on the outcomes of your monitoring and evaluation efforts.

IC interventions are tested for effectiveness by measuring IC pre- and post-course delivery. Ten years of cross-cultural empirical findings show increased critical and complex thinking after IC interventions, predicting more peaceful outcomes to conflict, and less destructive conflicts and violence. When measuring resilience (using the cross-culturally validated CD-RISC measurement), strong increases are observed across varied populations and contexts. When measuring empathy (using the cross-culturally validated IRI empathy measurement) strong increases are likewise observed across varied populations and contexts.

For further assessment details (e.g. mixed-method approaches, analytical frameworks, statistical analyses and findings), please refer to the publications list of peer-reviewed articles, below.

The pre-intervention measures show that before IC Thinking interventions, participants perceive polarised social groups relevant to extremism and other social conflict in rigid, closed, 'us-versus-them' categories, judging from a single evaluative viewpoint and rejecting other viewpoints.

The post-intervention measures show that after an IC Thinking intervention, participants respect the differing perspectives, viewpoints, life stances, and cultures of others, and have the desire to engage cooperatively and collaboratively despite difference and disagreement.

This change in thinking predicts less violent conflict: rigid, closed thinking represented by polarised worldviews becomes more flexible and open, enabling constructive engagement with others. Gains in IC predict more conflict resolution, based on four decades of research by Prof. Peter Suedfeld, Prof. Philip Tetlock, Prof. Luke Conway and others (Suedfeld, 2010; Suedfeld & Tetlock, 2014).

Qualitative and quantitative analysis of participants' oral presentations (audio recorded, transcribed and anonymised) reveals an ability to perceive validity in different viewpoints. It also points to increased empathy, self-management and emotional regulation, and increased confidence in the use of IC to address grievances and resist the persuasiveness of extremist or polarising narratives. Through their presentations, participants integrate their IC learning into their personal narrative, rewriting and recreating a new narrative for their lives and future. IC measurement shows end-of-course IC scores as high or higher than the post-course written data.

IC interventions facilitate the development of new friendship networks. These networks can be supported by local partners through the creation of IC ecosystems or structures and systems that support IC flexibility. Self and observer reports describe changed relationships at home, in school and in the workplace.

To view interviews of students and staff member 22 months after completing an IC intervention, without interview briefing or preparation, please see <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HRa9bh8TJnE&t=1s> online.

On some recent projects, funders have commissioned follow-up monitoring and evaluation (e.g. 6 months and 12 months post-course) by independent evaluators. Articles detailing their findings are in submission to journals for publication.

Publications to date

Andrews Fearon, P., & Boyd-MacMillan, E. (2016). Complexity under stress: Integrative approaches to overdetermined vulnerabilities. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 9(4), 11-31. <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jss/vol9/iss4/3/>

Boyd-MacMillan, E. (2017). The vicious cycle of extremism and polarisations (keynote). Published proceedings: Local Institutions against violent extremism II (LIASE 2): The rise of polarisation and radicalisation in Europe: Tackling all forms of violent extremism at the local level. European Forum for Urban Security 19th May 2017, Rimini, Italy.

Boyd-MacMillan, E. (2016). Increasing cognitive complexity and collaboration across communities: Being Muslim Being Scottish. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 9(4), 79 -110. <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jss/vol9/iss4/6/>

Boyd-MacMillan, E. (2016). Experiencing conflict and its social solutions via IC Thinking. Keynote address delivered December, 2016, UK Educational Psychologists Northwest Annual Gathering, Manchester. Published proceedings.

Boyd-MacMillan, E., Campbell, C., & Furey, A. (2016). An IC intervention for post-conflict Northern Ireland secondary schools. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 9(4), 111-124. Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jss/vol9/iss4/7/>

Boyd-MacMillan, E., Andrews Fearon, P., Ptolomey, A., & Mathieson, L. (2016). I SEE! Scotland: Tackling sectarianism and promoting community psychosocial health. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 9(4), 53-78. Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jss/vol9/iss4/5/>

De Marinis, V., & Boyd-MacMillan, E. (2019). A mental health approach to understanding violent extremism. RAN H&SC ex post paper, 3 June 2019. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-h-and-sc/docs/ran_hsc_prac_mental_health_03062019_en.pdf

DeMarinis, V., Nordendahl, M., Arnetz, B., Arnetz, J., Sandlund, M., Näslund, U., & Boyd-MacMillan, E. (2018). Research Plan Report for the Pilot Study on Integrative Complexity (IC) Thinking in Sweden: A health promotion course/intervention for countering extremism for youth and young adults. Umeå University, Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine. Umeå: Regional Ethics Committee 2018-report number 463-31.

Liht, J., & Savage, S. (2013). Preventing Violent Extremism through Value Complexity: Being Muslim Being British. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 6(4), 44-66. Retrieved from <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jss/vol6/iss4/3>

Nemr, C., & Savage, S. (2019) Integrative complexity interventions to prevent and counter violent extremism, *Global Center on Cooperative Security*, January 2019. Retrieved from <https://www.globalcenter.org>

Peracha, F.N., Khan, R.R., & Sara. S. (2015). Sabaoon: Educational methods successfully countering and preventing violent extremism. *Expanding research on Countering violent extremism* (pp. 85-104). Hedayah and Edith Cowan University. Retrieved from <http://www.hedayahcenter.org/activites/80/activities/511/2016/719/international-cve-rese>

Savage, S. (2018). 'Preventing violence and promoting community through cognitive complexity in the UK', paper presented at the American Psychiatric Association 2018 Annual Meeting: Terrorism: Radicalization and Rehabilitation, Symposium 2496, 5 May 2018, New York, USA.

	<p>Savage, S. (2016) Integrative complexity approaches to prevention in education: the key is to identify the 'cognitive casualty' in each extremism context. In J. Spitaletta (JHU-APL) (Ed.), White Paper on Bio-Psycho-Social Applications to Cognitive Engagement A Strategic Multi-Layer Assessment (SMA). Periodic Publication. October 2016. Retrieved from https://info.publicintelligence.net/SMA-CognitiveEngagement.pdf</p> <p>Savage, S. (2015). Extremism and complexity of thinking; the psychological reason for investing in education. In K. Kose & T. Thorp (Eds.), Global Perspectives: How to prevent extremism: policy options (Section 2, Chapter 1). Blair Foundation.</p> <p>Savage, S., & Gordon, E. (2018). Living well with difference: empirical assessment of an intervention in ten secondary schools in the UK, 30 April 2018, British Red Cross, London.</p> <p>Savage, S., Khan, A., & Liht, J. (2014). 'Preventing violent extremism in kenya through value complexity: assessment of being Kenyan being Muslim.' Journal of Strategic Security 7(3), 1-26. Retrieved from https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jss/vol7/iss3/2</p>
<p>Sustainability and transferability (maximum of 200 words)</p> <p>Short description on the sustainability and transferability of the practice, including e.g. information on the costs of the practice. <u>Please elaborate on which elements are transferrable and how.</u></p>	<p>Sustainability</p> <p>IC Thinking works cross-culturally, partnering with local researchers, organisations and governmental bodies to ensure a new ICthinking intervention is contextualised appropriately, and to fulfil all local ethics requirements. Alongside the intervention, IC Thinking upsills and builds capacity in local professionals through a professional co-facilitator training programme adapted for local needs, while maintaining fidelity to the model.</p> <p>IC Thinking supports sustainability through quality assurance monitoring and regular reviews of intervention materials and co-facilitator skills, for ongoing effectiveness and professional development. These processes are agreed with local partners. Due to vast contextual differences and local requirements, structures and systems for sustainability are the primary responsibility of local partners, although they are discussed and developed in consultation with IC Thinking.</p> <p>Transferability</p> <p>IC Thinking has developed, run and successfully assessed the ICthinking method interventions with highly diverse population groups in a range of contexts and countries (the</p>

	<p>Balkans, England, Finland, Kenya, Scotland, Sweden and Pakistan). The diverse populations include mainstream secondary school students, students excluded from mainstream education, young people involved in violent extremism going through rehabilitation programmes, young people involved in community youth centres, young people returning to education, youth and community workers, teachers, long-term offenders preparing for re-entry, prison staff, police officers, social workers, university students, and unemployed, retired and other professionals (e.g. mediators). The contexts and venues include schools, community/youth centres, rehabilitation centres, prisons, business centres, hotel meeting rooms, further education institutions and universities. Using different educational approaches suitable for particular age groups, IC can be taught to participants aged from five through adulthood. With the youngest ages, IC foundational skills and building blocks are put in place, ready to be built upon during cognitive development and maturation.</p> <p>IC Thinking does not view extremisms, intergroup conflicts or polarisations as deriving from a problematic social group, but rather as a synergistic dynamic that requires society-wide, long-term prevention approaches. Our goal is nothing less than for IC Thinking interventions to become core to educational curricula, community development, and professional development across societies and cultures. We are convinced that ICthinking interventions can play a key role in civil societies and public mental health promotion.</p> <p>Costs</p> <p>Costs vary according to context, initial research, development, assessment and long-term commitment to observing fidelity to content and implementation protocol.</p> <p>In order to facilitate compliance with local ethics requirements and ensure quality control of IC intervention programs over time, partnership with a local university is advisable.</p> <p>Often governmental bodies are involved, to support structural and systemic sustainability, along with NGOs.</p>
<p>Presented and discussed in RAN meeting</p> <p>Please note that to be included in the Collection, the practice is preferably nominated through one of the RAN meetings. Add name of the RAN Working Group/event, date, place and subject of meeting.</p>	<p>Name: Education event</p> <p>Date: 26-27 June 2014</p> <p>Place: Barcelona</p> <p>Subject:</p> <p>Name: Education event</p> <p>Date: 24-25 November 2016.</p>

	<p>Place: Gothenburg.</p> <p>Name: Keynote Date: 20-22 April 2017. Place: The Hague.</p> <p>Name: RAN youth gathering Date: Select date of the meeting. Place: Vienna. Subject: 1 June 2017.</p>
<p>Linked to other EU initiatives or EU funding (maximum of 100 words)</p> <p>Please indicate how your project was funded, if your practice is linked to other EU initiatives or projects, AND explicitly note if it is (co-) funded by the EU, and if so, by which funds? Such as Erasmus +, Internal Security Funds (ISF), European Social Fund (ESF), Horizon 2020, etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - European Commission Action Grant 2007-2010 to address radicalisation, funded by the European Commission (Justice and Security Directorate) - EPAREX, Ealing Borough, London 2012-2014, funded by the European Commission (Justice and Security Directorate) - EfUS project BRIDGE: Building resilience to reduce polarisation and growing extremism 2019-2022, project expert (IC Thinking Co-Founder/ Co-Director, Dr Eolene Boyd-MacMillan), financed at 90 % by the European Union Internal Security Fund – Police - IC Thinking has also been invited to present at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • European Forum for Urban Security (EFUS), Rimini, Italy, 19 May 2017 • Denmark Learning Festival (Keynote) Copenhagen, March 2017 • e-Twinning gathering (Plenary, annual gathering), Florence, Italy, September 2016.
<p>Organisation (enter maximum of 100 words and select organisation type)</p> <p>Please briefly describe the organisation behind the practice including the legal status e.g. NGO, governmental, limited company, charity etc.</p>	<p>IC Thinking (Cambridge) Ltd is a company licensed through Cambridge Enterprise, University of Cambridge.</p> <p>IC Thinking (Cambridge) Ltd is a social enterprise that uses earned revenue to fulfil the company's social mission to further research into and development of IC-based intervention science.</p> <p>IC Thinking researchers are based at the Department of Psychology, University of Cambridge.</p> <p>Type of Organisation: Other</p>
<p>Country of origin</p> <p>Country in which the practice is based.</p>	<p>EU or EEA country: Choose from list of EU and EEA countries.</p> <p>or:</p>

	Non-EU country: United Kingdom
Contact details Please provide contact details of who can be contacted within the organisation, with name and email address.	Address: IC Thinking (Cambridge) Ltd 17, Sydenham Rd London, SE26 5EX United Kingdom Contact person: Click or tap here to enter text. Email: https://icthinking.org/contact Telephone: Click or tap here to enter text. Website: https://icthinking.org
Last update text (year)	2019