

## **Psychological Factors Influencing Violent Religious Radicalization**

**Assoc. Prof. Agil Shirinov,**

Azerbaijan Institute of Theology,

Faculty of Theology, Department of the Religious Studies,

Baku, Azerbaijan

agilshirinov@ait.edu.az

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6835-8429>

Date of submission: 03.04.2023

Date of acceptance: 10.05.2023

### **Abstract**

There are many research studies that examine the role of psychological factors in the radicalization process, particularly, in influencing people to become violent radicals. These studies have focused on the existence of a proclivity for violence in human nature, the possibility of common psychological traits among individuals inclined to radical thoughts and behaviors.

This article examines various theories on whether the tendency to violence is inherent in human nature in the first part, and as a result, it claims that the factors driving people to violence do not originate from a single source. It also discusses the theories of Sigmund Freud, Carl Gustav Jung, Albert Bandura, Erik Erikson, Craig A. Anderson and Brad J. Bushman related to the subject. As a result, it is highlighted that childhood experiences, interpersonal social relations, a strict and radical worldview are among the factors that influence the emergence of violence, in addition to those related to human nature.

The article also discusses the psychological underpinnings of violent religious radicalization, and states that the process of entering radical groups is multifaceted. It also emphasizes that the reductionist theories, which attempt to explain radicalization process solely through

individual psychological characteristics, cannot fully explain the subject.

Individuals with unstable psychological characters are more vulnerable to radical thoughts and behaviors. However, it is also necessary to approach the process of radicalization and joining radical groups from socio-political and ideological perspectives.

There are certainly types of violence that originate from non-religious sources as well as many radical groups motivated by racial, ethnical, political, and economic and other identities and worldviews. However, since they are not included in the scope of the article, they have not been investigated in the present paper.

**Keywords:** *Psychology of Religion, Psychology of Radicalization, Theories on Violence, Religiously Motivated Violence, Religious Radicalization, Psychological Causes of Religious Radicalization*

*The copyright of the articles published in our journal belongs to the authors and is published as open access under CC-BY-NC license.*

## **Din motivli zorakı radikalizmin yaranmasına təsir edən psixoloji amillər**

***i.f.d., dos. Aqil Şirinov,***

Azərbaycan İlahiyyat İnstitutu

İlahiyyat fakültəsi, Dinşünaslıq kafedrası

Bakı, Azərbaycan

agilshirinov@ait.edu.az

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6835-8429>

Daxilolma tarixi: 03.04.2023

Nəşrə təsdiq tarixi: 10.05.2023

### **Xülasə**

Radikallaşma prosesini, xüsusilə də insanlarda ifrat zorakılığa meyli araşdıran çox sayda elmi-tədqiqat mövcuddur. Sözügedən araşdırmalarda zorakılığa meylin insan təbiətində olub-olmadığı, ifrat düşüncə və davranışlara meyilli şəxslərin müştərək xüsusiyyətləri, ictimai mühitin və ideologiyaların insan xarakterinə təsirləri müzakirə obyektinə çevrilir.

Bu məqalədə, ilk növbədə, zorakılığa meylin insan təbiətində mövcudluğuna dair müxtəlif nəzəriyyələr təhlil olunur, şəxsi şiddətə sövq edən amillərin yalnız bir mənbədən bəhrələnmədiyi irəli sürülür. Mövzu ilə əlaqəli Ziqmund Freyd (Sigmund Freud), Karl Qustav Yunq (Carl Gustav Jung), Albert Bandura, Erik Erikson, Kreyq A. Anderson (Craig A. Anderson) və Bred C. Buşman (Brad J. Bushman) kimi alimlərin nəzəriyyələri müzakirə edilir. Nəticədə zorakılığı yaradan məqamlar sırasında insan təbiəti ilə əlaqəli olanlarla yanaşı, uşaqlıq dövrü hadisələri, xatirələri, ictimai münasibətlər, həmçinin sərt və radikal ideologiya ilə əlaqəli amillərin mövcudluğu da önə çəkilir.

Məqalənin ikinci hissəsində dinmotivli zorakılıq hərəkətlərinin psixoloji əsası müzakirə edilir və nəticədə, radikal qruplara qoşulma prosesinin çoxtərəfli olduğu ifadə edilir. Bununla yanaşı, radikallaşma

prosesini yalnız fərdi-psixoloji xüsusiyyətlərlə izah etməyə çalışan reduksionist nəzəriyyələrin mövzunu tam şəkildə açıqlaya bilmədiyi qeyd olunur.

Məqalədə qeyri-stabil psixoloji xarakterə malik olan fərdlərin radikalizmə yönəlmə baxımından daha həssas durumu vurğulanır, həmçinin radikallaşma və radikal qruplara qoşulma prosesinə psixoloji aspektdən yanaşma ilə bərabər, ictimai-siyasi və ideoloji baxımdan da nəzər yetirmənin zəruriliyi önə çəkilir.

Danılmaz faktdır ki, dinxarici motivlər səbəbilə meydana çıxmış zorakılıq növləri, həmçinin irqi, etnik, siyasi, hətta iqtisadi kimliklər və dünyagörüşlərinin təhrik etdiyi çoxsaylı zorakılığa meyilli qruplar vardır. Sözügedən qruplar tədqiqatımızın həddudları xaricində olduğu üçün bu məqalədə tədqiq edilməmişdir.

**Açar sözlər:** *din psixologiyası, radikallaşmanın psixologiyası, zorakılıq nəzəriyyələri, dinmotivli zorakılıq, dini radikalizm, radikal ideologiya, radikalizmə səbəb olan psixoloji amillər, dini radikallaşma, dini radikallaşmanın psixoloji səbəbləri.*

*Jurnalımızda dərc olunan məqalələrin müəllif hüquqları müəlliflərə məxsusdur və onlar CC-BY-NC lisenziyası ilə hər kəsə açıq şəkildə dərc olunur.*

## **Психологические факторы, влияющие на насильственную религиозную радикализацию**

**д.ф.по теологии, доц. Агиль Ширинов,**  
Азербайджанский институт теологии,  
Факультет теологии, Кафедра религиоведения  
Баку, Азербайджан  
agilshirinov@ait.edu.az  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6835-8429>

Дата подачи статьи в редакцию: 03.04.2023

Дата подтверждения статьи к публикации: 10.05.2023

### **Резюме**

Существует большое количество научных работ, изучающих процесс радикализации, особенно склонность людей к крайнему насилию, которые исследуют роль психологических факторов в процессе радикализации, особенно во влиянии на людей, чтобы стать жестокими крайними радикалами. Эти исследования сосредоточились на существовании склонности для насилия в человеческой натуре, возможности общих психологических черт среди людей, склонных к радикальным мыслям и поведением.

Эта статья исследует различные теории о том, является ли тенденция к насилию врожденной от человеческой природы в первой части, и в результате утверждает, что факторы, ведущие людей к насилию, не происходят из единственного источника. Также обсуждаются теории Зигмунда Фрейда, Карла Густава Юнга, Альберта Бандуры, Эрика Эриксона, Крэйга А. Андерсона и Брэда Дж. Бушмена, связанные с предметом. В результате выделены дополнения связанные с человеческой натурой, опытом неблагополучного детства, социальными отношениями, строгим и радикальным мировоззрением среди факторов, которые влияют на появление насилия.

Статья также изучает психологические основы религиозно мотивированного насилия, и заявляет, что процесс входа в радикальные группы многогранен. Также подчеркивается, что редукционистские теории, которые пытаются объяснить процесс радикализации исключительно через отдельные индивидуальные психологические особенности, не могут полностью объяснить предмет.

Люди с нестабильными психологическими характерами более уязвимы для радикальных мыслей и поведений. Однако, также необходимо приблизиться к процессу радикализации и присоединению к радикальным группам с социополитических и идеологических точек зрения. Есть, конечно, типы насилия, которые происходят из нерелигиозных источников, так же существуют многие радикальные группы, мотивированные расовой, этнической, политической, даже экономической идентичностью и мировоззрением. Однако, так как они не включены в пределы статьи, они не были исследованы в данной работе.

**Ключевые слова:** *психология религии, психология радикализации, теории насилия, религиозно мотивированное насилие, религиозная радикализация, психологические причины религиозной радикализации.*

Авторские права на статьи, опубликованные в нашем журнале, принадлежат авторам и публикуются в открытом доступе по лицензии CC-BY-NC.

## Introduction<sup>1</sup>

A large number of scholarly studies on the psychological causes of radicalization, particularly religious-based violent extremism and terrorism, have been carried out in the last 20 years. In these studies, the role of individuals' psychological states in radicalization or, on the contrary, the effect of acquaintance with radical thoughts on individuals' psychological states became a topic of discussion, and various aspects of the problem were explored.

As Randy Borum observed, according to the majority of studies related to the topic, mental illnesses and abnormalities are not the primary causes of radical behaviour (Borum, 2014, 286 ). Among these studies the book *Blood That Cries Out From the Earth: The Psychology of Religious Terrorism* by James Jones as well as the articles such as "Psychology of Terrorism" by Randy Borum, "Decisions to use terrorism: Psychological constraints to on instrumental reasoning" by Marta Crenshaw, "From Profiles to Pathways and Roots to Routes: Perspectives from Psychology on Radicalization into Terrorism" by John Horgan, "Causal Connection between Terrorism and Mental Illness" by Naamah Humaidi and other articles can be cited as examples.

For the reason that there are many existing theories, which attempt to explain the subject, this article will only discuss the major ones. It will focus on these theories' interpretations of radicalization process. At the end, it will attempt to reach a comprehensive standpoint on radicalization process. The multidimensional approach towards radicalization process will serve for better understanding of the process of joining religiously motivated radical groups.

The main point of this article is that radicalization, particularly religiously motivated radicalization, is a two-way process. Even if no mental illnesses exist, increased exposure to psychological traumas makes people more vulnerable to radicalization. Undoubtedly, this

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is mainly based on another article written by the author himself in 2019 titled "Din motivli zoraki radikalizmin yaranmasına təsir edən psixoloji amillər" ( Azərbaycan İlahiyyat İnstitutu Din Araşdırmaları Jurnalı. No 1(2), İyun, 2019, səh.23-36)

does not imply that all people exposed to such traumas become radicals or that psychological traumas are the only cause of radicalization. Not all radicals have the same psychological characteristics, just as there are different types of radicalization and terrorism. One of the factors that determine the radicalization of people with traumatic psychological personalities is familiarity with radical ideas or the environment that carries these ideas and their assimilation. It can be expressed in the following way:

*Traumatic psychological situation + radical ideological thoughts = radical oriented personality.*

### **1. Analysis of Theories on Violence**

There are various theories as to whether human nature is predisposed to violence. These theories can be divided into two groups. The first group includes theories, which argue that violence is inherent in human nature. Sigmund Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis, is the most famous supporter of this viewpoint. According to Sigmund Freud, everyone is born with two basic tendencies. Freud referred to the first as Eros. Eros is the desire for pleasure and is regarded as man's life force. Because of this, man desires to live and create. The second tendency, which Freud referred to as Thanatos, is destructive energy, which manifests itself in the individuals' aggression toward themselves and others. Thus, Eros is the instinct of life and creativity, while Thanatos is the instinct of death and destruction. S. Freud believed that a person has an instinct to die in addition to the instinct to live. This latter instinct may cause individuals to harm themselves and others. Freud associated suicides with Thanatos. He argued that this destructive instinct could seriously damage civilization writing: "The inclination to aggression is an original, self-subsisting instinctual disposition in man, and I return to my view that it constitutes the greatest impediment to civilization" (Freud, n.d., 37).



Carl Gustav Jung, widely regarded as the father of analytical psychology, defended the notion that violence arises from the collective unconscious. According to Jung, there is a collective unconscious in addition to the individual unconscious. People's experiences are passed down from generation to generation in the collective unconscious. C.G.Jung explained it as follows: "A more or less superficial layer of the unconscious is undoubtedly personal. I call it the "personal unconscious". However, this personal layer rests upon a deeper layer, which does not derive from personal experience and is not a personal acquisition but is inborn. This deeper layer I call the "collective unconscious". I have chosen the term "collective" because this part of the unconscious is not individual but universal; in contrast to the personal psyche, it has contents and modes of behaviour that are more or less the same everywhere and in all individuals" (Jung, 1980, 3-4). Jung proposed that primitive patterns, which he called archetypes, shape human behaviour and are the result of the collective unconscious. There are many archetypes, but the four most important are persona, anima/animus, shadow, and self. Jung explained the violence in human nature through one of these four archetypes, the shadow archetype. "The shadow archetype represents the darkest and most dangerous side of the human personality" (Yung, 1972, 139). This archetype is both a source of energy and a potential source of danger because it represents a person's animal side. If a person's conscious life continues normally, the negative elements in the "shadow" remain neutrally in the unconscious; however, when the individual's affairs do not continue normally and become difficult, the "shadow" can become uncontrollable by the ego and cause violent behaviour (Cayır-Özer, 2011, 10). Thus, according to Jung, violence exists neutrally in men's collective unconscious and does not manifest itself under normal circumstances. When a person's affairs do not go well and their psychological state becomes unstable, the animalistic features of the collective unconscious can emerge, leading to violence.

Researchers such as Melanie Klein, Hans J. Eysenck, Jeffrey A. Gray, Gustave Le Bon, and Harold B. Gerard asserted that a proclivity

for violence exists in human nature, advancing various theories about this proclivity (Cayır-Özer, 2011, 8-10).

In the second view represented by the cognitive trend in psychology, violence, like all other behaviours, is learned over time through socialization. According to Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory, people learn negative violence through imitative behaviour patterns. Thus, parents, teachers, mass media, and other forms of socialization serve as role models for children. If these models instil aggression, the child is more likely to engage in negative violence (Greider, 1997, 23). According to Bandura, individuals learn social rules and standards that guide their behaviour through behavioural models and the punishment and reward provided in exchange for behaviour. Aggression, like other behaviours, is learned in this manner. Bandura also claims that people use a variety of neutralization strategies to avoid taking responsibility for their aggressive behaviour. These strategies include avoiding responsibility, justifying violence in the context of higher practices and principles (Xie et al., 2005, 111).

Erik Erikson's identity theory emphasizes the importance of identity formation beginning in childhood for the development of human personality. Erikson believes that a person's childhood development is accompanied by a series of crises. All of these crises must be resolved in order for the child's personality to come together. Failure to address these early childhood crises causes a number of psychological issues later in life (Horgan, 2005, 53).

The General Aggression Model (GAM) developed by Craig A. Anderson and Brad J. Bushman combined the above-mentioned theories and stated that violence is caused by both human personality and human interaction with the situation (Anderson - Bushman, 2002, 33-46). It is worth noting that some empirical studies can back up the last point; for example, in a study on girls' aggression conducted in America and Canada, it was concluded that, in addition to individual factors, family, partner, and social relationship factors all play a role in the occurrence of violence (Pepler - Madsen, 2005, XVII).

To summarize, the factors that drive people to violence do not emanate from a single source. In addition to human nature factors, childhood experiences, interpersonal social relationships, and, at the same time, worldview are all factors that influence the emergence of violence.

## **2. The Psychological Origins of Religious Radicalization**

Throughout the last century, psychologists studying radical, particularly terrorist, behaviour have investigated whether mental illnesses contribute to such behaviour. These individual studies concluded that mental illnesses or psychological abnormalities are not the primary cause of violent radical and terrorist behaviour. Thus, all radical-minded individuals do not share a single way of thinking, and in this regard, it is impossible to speak of a single type of radical or terrorist (Borum, 2014, 286). Furthermore, discussing specific psychological characteristics or psychopathology that distinguish radicals from other people is difficult (Post, 2014, 306). However, studies indicate that there are many psychologically traumatized individuals among radicals with religious or non-religious motives, especially those who are prone to violence. This is especially evident in terrorist acts committed alone rather than in groups. Such acts, known as lone wolf terrorism, are typically carried out by individuals who have difficulty establishing relationships with family and society and may be psychologically traumatized (McCauley – Moskalenko, 2011, 117-125). It is worth noting that the ideological position and worldview can also create a fruitful psychological environment for radicalization. According to R. Borum, the worldview can provoke psychological tendencies that increase sensitivity to justifying extremist ideology, even terrorism, and can be the result of these psychological tendencies (Borum, 2014, 287). Thus, the worldview can affect the psychological state, and the psychological state, in turn, can affect the worldview.

Borum's claim is supported by numerous real-world facts. One of the clearest examples is the life of a Bahraini ISIS terrorist. Abdulaziz, who chose one of the more radical interpretations of

Salafism, believed that his sect members were oppressed by Westerners and Shiites in Syria and Iraq, so he decided to join the jihad. In this case, Abdulaziz's worldview is the primary motivator for his radical behavior. As a result, this worldview instils armed conflict with "infidels" as a religious duty. According to the last letter he wrote to his mother, Abdulaziz was also a psychologically sensitive young man. So he was too attached to his mother and considered doing everything he could, including using violence to ensure that she would go to heaven in the afterlife. In his final letter to his mother, he writes:

"As you know and watch on television channels, the infidels, and rafida [a bigoted term used to describe the Shia] have gone too far in their oppression, killing, torture and violations of Muslims' honor. I, by God, cannot see my Muslim sisters and brothers being killed, while some of them appeal to Muslims and find nobody coming to their help, and I sit without doing anything. I wanted to be like al-Muta'sim Billah. And the most important reason is that I longed for heaven, near the Prophet Muhammed, peace be upon him, and I wanted to ask for forgiveness for you in the afterlife." (Weiss - Hassan Hassan, 2016, XVI).

This example demonstrates the complexities of the factors that lead to radical behaviour. It has been observed that Abdulaziz's radicalization is multi-faceted. On the one hand, he identifies with a specific group and feels humiliated by the group's humiliation. According to some psychologists, humiliation injures an individual's sense of self and self-esteem, and the human ego perceives it as a threat directed at itself. When the human self feels psychologically threatened, it reacts violently (Jones, 2008, 137). On the other hand, Abdulaziz's worldview increases his radicalization potential. Thus, in the worldview of radical groups, people are primarily classified as "white" or "black", "good" or "bad". Such groups portray those who do not accept their meeting and worldviews as "satanic" and "inhuman", relegating compassion for the opposing meeting to the margins (Jones, 2008, 43-45). Individuals' worldviews are thus among the factors that drive them to violence. In this regard, a person's political, economic, and social convictions frequently form a personality model

that is an expression of his deep-seated tendencies (Adorno et al., 1950, 1).

The behaviour of Abdulaziz and others can be explained in terms of Social Identity Theory. According to Henri Tajfel's theory, people's feelings of pride and self-esteem are satisfied by the group to which they belong. Thus, belonging to a specific group provides people with a sense of social identity. Individuals try to raise the status of the group to which they belong in order to boost their self-esteem. A social being feels the need to identify with a specific group in order to socialize. According to this theory, people will denigrate the status of a group or groups to which they do not belong and will form various stereotypes about them in order to elevate their own group and, thus, themselves. In this case, they divide people into two groups: their own (in-group) and the other (out-group), "us" and "them". This division, according to Tajfel and Turner, goes through three mental stages. The first stage is known as categorization. At this stage, people categorizes themselves and others in order to know and understand them; for example, they divide people into white, black, Muslim, Christian, European, Asian, and other categories. As a result, they identify which group they belong to. The second stage is social identification. At this point, we have already adopted the identity of the group or groups to which we have classified and identified ourselves, and we have expressed ourselves through this identity. The final stage is known as social comparison. At this stage, a individual compares his/her group to other groups, tends to show this group as superior to others in order to boost self-esteem, even forms stereotypes against other groups for the sake of group interests, and sometimes nurtures feelings of rivalry and even hostility toward other groups (McLeod, 2002).

When the aforementioned theory is applied to radical religious groups, it is discovered that individual identity is an integral part of group identity, and the distinction between "us" and "them" is clearly defined. This characteristic is prevalent in radical religious groups of both Christian and Muslim origin; for example, European and American Christian radicals regard their Christian identity as an integral part of European and American identity, and see Jews and Muslims as a

potential threat to this identity. As a result, these groups become xenophobic and Islamophobic. Although they have had no negative experiences with Jews or Muslims as individuals, they have an intolerant attitude toward representatives of the aforementioned religions because they identify their individual identity with the identity of the group to which they belong.

Dina Al Raffie discovered that many Muslims in the diaspora are experiencing an identity crisis after studying the behaviour of extremist-oriented Muslim communities in Europe in the context of social identity theory. They are preoccupied with preserving their Muslim identity. Extremist organizations as well as some non-governmental organizations, incite this feeling in Muslim communities and lay the groundwork for violent and non-violent radicalization (Al Raffie, 2013, 67-91).

What psychological motivation drives people to sacrifice themselves for the sake of group interests? One of the unique responses to this question is evolutionary psychology. Altruism is associated with self-sacrifice for the sake of the group, according to this viewpoint. Individuals who are closely connected to their group, therefore, consider it their duty to punish those who do not adhere to the group's norms for the sake of the common good. That is, such people direct their altruistic feelings toward the group rather than the individual, and believe they are doing good by punishing those who act against the group interests. The second, more widely held viewpoint is based on group identification. According to this point of view, when a person identifies with a victimized or persecuted group, he or she feels resentment and hatred toward the people or groups who put the group in this situation, which ultimately encourages him to resort to radical and violent methods (McCauley – Moskaleiko, 2011, 123). In fact, when all of these theories are considered together, it is possible to conclude that a social being desires to realize himself /herself in society. To that end, social beings strive to carry out their activities in groups rather than alone. As a result, the group to which they belong becomes the environment in which they realize themselves. As a

result, they identify with the group to which they belong. The group identity has now become an integral part of their personal identity. If the group to which they belong is the bearer of harsh and radical ideologies, they begin to share these thoughts as an individual of the group, sometimes displaying extreme altruism, and they are willing to give their life for the sake of the group interests.

It is worth noting that the theories discussed above clarify most people's desire to belong to a certain group and their activities after joining the group, but they do not fully explain why people join radical groups. The main reason for this, in our opinion, is that the process of joining such groups is multi-faceted, and individual factors arising from the unique characteristics of each individual become apparent. It is extremely difficult to make a generalization about the topic from this vantage point. In addition to all of these difficulties, we can see in the lives of many of those who turn to violent radicalism that they do not have a stable psychological character, and they also have a strong sense of identification with a specific group. This is evident in the life of Abu Musab al Zarqawi (1966-2006), a key figure in the establishment of religiously motivated terrorist organizations in the Middle East including "Jama'at al-Tawhid wa al-Jihad" (جماعة التوحيد و الجهاد). He lost his father in 1984 and dropped out of school that year. Zarqawi was an alcoholic, a smuggler of alcoholic beverages, and even a murderer at one point in his life, according to information provided by one of his relatives to the New York Times. He was arrested for drug possession and sexual assault at first (Weiss – Hassan, 2016, 2). In her article "The Short, Violent Life of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi", Mary Anne Weaver describes the impressions of Zarqawi from those who knew him during his adolescence: "During his adolescence, Zarqawi was a brawler, a murderer, an alcohol smuggler, an alcoholic, and even allegedly an intermediary in Zarqa's underworld" (Weaver Mary Anne). To keep him away from this life, his mother enrolled him in religious courses at Ali ibn Husayn Mosque in Amman. Later, he became acquainted with the radical Salafist ideology and founded one of the religiously oriented terrorist groups (Weiss – Hassan, 2016, 4).

Based on the information given above about Zarqawi's life, it is possible to suggest that his unstable personality influenced his

lifestyle. Thus, the loss of his father during his adolescence may have made his psychological condition more sensitive. Some empirical scientific studies confirm that the loss of a parent can lead to trauma in children and adolescents if the necessary psychological support is not provided; for example, such a result was reflected in a scientific study involving 33 people under the age of 18 who lost their parents in Great Britain (Ellis et al., 2013, 57-66). According to Mary Jo Auman's article "Bereavement Support for Children", if children who have lost a parent at the age of adolescence are not provided with the necessary psychological support, they can manifest the characteristics of numbness, egocentricity, and neglect, as a result of which situations such as truancy, persistent depression, drug and alcohol addiction will arise (Auman, 2007, 35). The above-mentioned events happened in Zargawi's life. Thus, it is possible to argue that Zargawi was mentally traumatized as a result of his father's death and his withdrawal from school in the same year. Furthermore, his harsh and violent personality affected his religious beliefs. So, this person, who used to kill people for personal reasons, became religious and began killing people for "religious" motives for the benefit of the group, becoming one of the cruellest terrorists. As a result, the content of their actions remained the same, but their form changed. The extreme religious ideology he adopted radicalized him even further; thus, the unstable psychological state and the extreme ideology nourished each other.

Zargawi is not the only radical with a traumatic character. In the lives of many people who are prone to violence, there are examples that are similar in content but differ in form. Of course, concluding that "all violent radicals are psychologically traumatized" is naive. However, it is possible to conclude that "people who have experienced psychological traumas are more sensitive in terms of their proclivity to violence".

According to the findings of some studies, one of the motivators for radical groups to resort to violence is a sense of being humiliated and threatened as an individual or as a group. This feeling has been observed to manifest itself prominently in radical religious groups both in the Middle East and in the West. Lord Alderdice discusses the



increased potential for violence in his article "The individual, the Group, and the Psychology of Terrorism". He describes how the feeling of group or individual identity being denigrated or threatened leads to anger and fear in Catholic and Protestant groups in Northern Ireland (Alderdice, 2007, 205). Similar to this can be seen in the radical religious groups in the Middle East.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, it could be said that the reasons, which push people into radical groups vary. The theories that attempt to explain radicalization process only on the bases of personal psychological characteristics of people cannot fully elucidate the subject. Namely, it is not psychologically possible to speak of a single type of radical personality. In this regard, alongside physiological aspects, it is necessary to take socio-political and ideological aspects into account when explaining the process of radicalisation. However, it should be mentioned that psychologically unstable people can be regarded as vulnerable in terms of inclination towards radicalism. Various empirical research studies on the psychological traumas that cause changes in human personality show that some childhood traumas can increase humans` inclination to violence. Psychologically traumatized individuals have the potential of embracing radical views or accepting more radical interpretations of different ideologies that they encounter in the course of time more than other people. Also, individuals, who have feeling that their personal or group identities are humiliated or in danger, might turn towards violent behaviours for the sake of protecting their "identity". For the reason that collective identity is very important for religiously motivated radicals, they can accept potential or real humiliations and dangers towards their groups` and groupmates` interests as the acts against their own identity.

***Ethical Statement:*** *I express my sincere appreciation to the language editor of the article Ms Leyla Salayeva.*

## References

- Adorno, Theodor et al. (1950). The authoritarian personality. New York: Harpers.
- Al Raffie, Dina. (2013). "Social Identity Theory for Investigating Islamic Extremism in the Diaspora". Journal of Strategic Security. vol.6, no. 4. (67-91).
- Alderdice, Lord. (2007). "The Individual, The Group and The Psychology of Terrorism". International Review of Psychiatry. vol.19 (June 2007-issue 3), (201-209).
- Anderson, Craig A - Bushman, Brad J. (2002). "Human Aggression", Annu. Rev. Psychol. 53 (1), (27–51).
- Auman, Mary Jo. (2007). "Bereavement Support for Children". Journal of School Nursing. vol.23 (1), (34-39).
- Borum, Randy. (2014). "Psychological Vulnerabilities and Propensities for Involvement in Violent Extremism". *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*. 32(3) (May-June), (286-305).
- Çayır, Celal – Özer, Çetin, (2011). "Din ve Şiddet Üzerine Psikolojik Bir Yaklaşım". Dicle Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi. vol. 13 (1). Diyarbakır: Dicle Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dekanlığı, (1-34).
- Ellis, Jackie et al. (2013). "The Long-Term Impact of Early Parental Death: Lessons From A Narrative Study". Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine. vol. 106 (2), (57–67).
- Freud, Sigmund. Civilization and its Discontents. trans. James Strachey. PDF.  
<http://www.stephenhicks.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/FreudS-CIVILIZATION-AND-ITS-DISCONTENTS-text-final.pdf>
- Greider, Kathleen J. (1997). Reckoning with Aggression: Theology, Violence, and Vitality. Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Horgan, John. (2005). The Psychology of Terrorism. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Jones, James. (2008). *Blood That Cries Out From the Earth: The Psychology of Religious Terrorism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jung, Carl. G. (1980). *The Archetypes and The Collective Unconscious*. Collected Works of C.G. Jung. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, 2nd edition (Bollingen Series XX). trans. R.F.C.Hull. vol. 09 (1). Princeton University Press.

Jung, Carl. G. (1972). *Two Essays in Analytical Psychology*. Collected Works of C.G. Jung. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, 2nd edition (Bollingen Series XX). trans. R. F. C. Hull. vol. 07 (Part 1). Princeton University Press.

McCauley, Clark - Moskalenko, Sophia. (2011). *Friction: How Radicalization Happens to Them and Us*. Oxford University Press.

McLeod, Saul. (2022). "*Social Identity Theory*". Accessed 15 November 2022. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/social-identity-theory.html>

Pepler, Debra J.- Madsen, Kirsten C. (ed.) (2005). "Introduction Girlhood Aggression: Building Bridges Between Research and Treatment". *The Development and Treatment of Girlhood Aggression*. ed. Debra J. Pepler et al.. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. XV-XXIII.

Post, Jerrold M et al. (2014). "The Changing Face of Terrorism In The 21st Century: The Communications Revolution and The Virtual Community of Hatred". *Behavioral Sciences and the Law Behav. Sci. Law*. vol. 32, (306–334).

Weaver, Marry Anne. (2022). "The Short, Violent Life of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi". Accessed 15 November 2022. <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2006/07/the-short-violent-life-of-abu-musab-al-zarqawi/304983/>

Weiss, Michael–Hassan, Hassan. (2016). *İŞİD: Terör Örgütünün İçyüzü*. trans. E.A.Kayhan. İstanbul: Kırmızı yayınları.

Xie, Hongling et al. (2005), "The Development of Aggressive Behaviors Among Girls: Measurement Issues, Social Functions, and Differential Trajectories". *The Development and Treatment of*

Girlhood Aggression. ed. Debra J. Pepler et al. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, (105-136).