

PSYCHOLOGICAL REQUISITES FOR RADICALIZATION OF YOUTH POLITICAL BEHAVIOR: THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

V. V. Baliuta, Kyiv

The results of theoretical study of the psychological factors' influence on the radicalization of youth political behavior has discovered that radicalism plays a destabilizing role in the society on the ground of its specific features in the way of its revealing. So that it turns in one of the main factors of confrontation between political actors, it entails aggravation of conflicts in society and enhances them. The main psychological factors of radicalization of youth political behavior lie in some age-related psychological requisites, which are: risk and aggressiveness attraction; suggestibility; unique features of political socialization flow and its results; particular qualities of parent-child relationship; the processes of personal self-determination and social identification; social and psychological moods like dissatisfaction with the quality of life and one's place in it, social injustice, anxiety, fears, one's particular world view. The trigger for radical political behavior revealing in most cases is some social-political precedent. Personality in the sphere of political relations shows up through one's political behavior so that youth political radicalization displays its specific features.

Key words: political behavior, radicalization, youth, political actor, psychological requisites, social maturity.

Problem. Radicalization of youth political behavior is a non-stop process which turns into acute problem at present. Scientists among which T.R. Gurr, P.M. Fernbach, B. Ganor, A.P. Schmidt, Ye.O. Vasylychuk, have already investigated some specific underlying reasons for that matter which become apparent literally in all the spheres of everyday life – from political engagement to religious world view. Young people find themselves faced with frustration of the real world solving actual problems linked with their age – identity and self-identification so that they try to find some ways out of that status. There is a wide diversity of such ways and one possible alternative may reveal as a radical protection. Thus, there is a need in understanding requisites for radical attitudes in youth surrounding and political behavior of young people as well.

Objective of the paper lies in investigating and analyzing psychological determinants of complex phenomenon of radicalization of youth political behavior which has its own specific reasons of derivation and progression.

The group of youth itself reveals all the typical qualities of a large social group. It has its own particular social and psychological peculiarities like any other age group, so that one can distinguish it clearly from any other age group.

The specific features of some random young person lie in his or her perfectionism, emotional lability and irritability, making idols and following them afterwards. Very often there is a lack of sufficient skills for conflicts resolving in the youth surrounding as a matter of fact. Sometimes young people are not ready or rather are not able to maintain their self-possession. E. Chekmaiev noted that there is one special youth stratum which has been formed lately increasingly manifests itself to be actively focused on some postmodern values, including the emphasis on human rights and freedom and individualism, declining respect to authority and government institutions [1, p. 102].

In order to analyze the psychological determinants of youth political behavior radicalization, its strongly needed to define what is radicalism itself. Radicalism is interpreted as a specific philosophy and the idea of social and political changes focused on systematical destroying and altering the existing state institutions that is logically regarded as correct and fair [7, p. 51-54]. In a nutshell, radicalism means a distance between actual well-established regime, the desire to change it, or transform it at least in fundamental ways.

There is one more interpretation of the concept of radicalism in the discourse of political psychology in which its definition is political radicalism which is treated as a sociocultural phenomenon conditioned by the peculiarities of the state development and appears in values, some definite forms of political behavior [8, p. 282]. Anyway there is no link between radicalism and some particular political position. Thus, radicalism is not just some random situational phenomenon, but an objective reality, especially in current circumstances.

There are some very similar, but not the same concepts which are extremism and terrorism. Sometimes they can be applied as synonyms but definitely they all have different meanings.

Extremism is interpreted as a commitment to extreme positions and activities. In the political discourse this phenomenon means some specific intention to solve actual problems or achieve goals through the most radical methods even violence [3, p. 86]. Radicalism and extremism are very similar by their definitions, though M. Funke makes an attempt to differentiate concepts of radicalism and extremism so that he draws a line between them. He notes that though radicals may show high levels of intense and concentrated criticism of the system they never implement those ideas into practice and never convert words into shoots unlike the extremists who do [2, p. 43].

Terrorism is the most stringent in its methods. It is known as a generalized concept, which denotes a complex phenomenon that involves fear and terror as a goal of one's actions and some specific acts and actions, their particular results and the full range of effects [2]. So terrorism is not so much

ideology but practice as a matter of fact, and this is what differs it from radicalism.

No doubt, the nature of radical political behavior is protest. T. Gurr was the first who discovered the main cause for the protest and radicalization of political behavior which leads eventually to rebellion. It lies in the accumulation of so-called relative deprivation which is perceived discrepancy between value expectations and value capabilities. In other words, this is the tension between your actual state, and what you feel you should be able to achieve. The intensity and scope of relative deprivation strongly determine the potential for collective violence. T. Gurr gives a long review of psychological research on aggression, and concludes that frustration-aggression is the primary source of the human capacity for violence, although aggression is neither necessary nor sufficient (indeed, he concedes that sometimes greed drives violence, but that frustration is a much stronger motivating force). The more intense and prolonged a feeling of frustration, the greater the probability of aggression protest afterwards. The author also reveals three competing explanations and finds them either irrelevant or at least not in conflict with relative deprivation:

- cognitive dissonance,
- anomie (means normlessness),
- conflict (essentially, relative deprivation caused by competition with another group).

But aggression itself is not yet radical political behavior. For this to occur the politicization has to happen. It is embodied in the actual socio-political situation and acts as an intermediary between radical political behavior and latent aggression that becomes quite conspicuous [9]. According to the A.G. Maslow's theory of needs, the most basic dissatisfaction has physiological nature [1]. On this basis T. Gurr postulates that satisfaction of physiological needs is the panacea for its growth [9]. But still individuals seek for safety, high status, feeling themselves belong to some community so that physiological stability doesn't even cover one's radical motivation.

Aggressive behavior is something quite typical for all the people, but why then one shows aggressive behavior and another one doesn't? L. Berkowitz found out that one's awareness of frustration determines anger. Aggressive behavior shows up when it's reinforced by some external influence, i.e. in a case of interaction between individual and a source-of-frustration object [6]. So an external stimulus is inseparable for aggressive behavior showing up.

Humanistic approach in psychology explains individual behavior through investigation of personality capable for self-actualization of one's self. This person makes a responsible choice among the variety of opportunities. The interaction between a child and parents forms and shapes its self. According to C. Rogers' theory, there is the "real self" which strives for reaching the "ideal self". If the difference between them is pretty low, we can consider the

potential for personal growth, but if the difference is too high, we can observe some discomfort, which is about to be located in one's neurotic behavior. Internal contradictions between the "real self" and the "ideal self" can explain the youth radicalism. The lack of mental capacity for solving intrapersonal conflicts can compel to radical type of behavior. And that potential derives from the parents-child relationships and in turn determines the inability to build frank interpersonal relationships [13]. Thus, the lack of warm and frank relationships can lead to identity crisis which is not completely shaped at such a young age. Radical forms of behavior can bring psychological abreaction from accumulated negative mental energy.

Person's about to assimilate and keep some rules of how policy works, some patterns and standards of political behavior, traditions and stereotypes of the political world. Political values and traditions, behavioral patterns and other elements of political culture are absorbed continuously, and this process can be limited only by one's life span. Scientists who belong to the social-cognitive approach consider youth radicalism through the prism of social learning so that radical behavior is acquired through it and fastened in one's individual experience. A. Bandura's theory of social learning opens up some particular factors of mental activity which are cognitive, behavioral and environmental ones. They all are interdependent. Social surrounding influences though person participates actively according to his or her social role which in turn constructs social atmosphere. According to the theory, learning can occur through observation and can be reproduced further in person's behavior as a result of implementing into practice all that knowledge which has been obtained during observation [5]. In other words, specific conditions frame social learning of radical behavior where radicalism acts as one of the attributes of behavior.

At his time E. Fromm pointed that loneliness and alienation are constant features of human existence as people always find themselves in a situation of choice between freedom and security, between seeking for control over their own lives, on the one hand, and belonging to the community, on the other hand. The scientist highlights some strategy for solving this dilemma, which is known as "escape from freedom". It includes:

- Automaton conformity. This item is embodied in conformity, which in extreme cases transforms person into so-called "machine". Automaton conformity displaces the burden of choice from self to society. Losing individuality and uniqueness, the personality simply dissolves in the surrounding and removes the freedom of choice almost entirely.
- Authoritarianism means giving control of oneself to another. Its main purpose is to establish connection with another person that can act in the form of sadistic and masochistic behavior.
- Destructiveness is considered as any process which attempts to eliminate other people or the whole world, all to escape freedom. Its feature is

destructive behavior when the reasons for the failures are sought in the environment, striving one's own aggression for its liquidation.

Fromm's theory links existential satisfaction of human needs and social conditions. Social factors shape some deep and stable patterns in the structure of personality which remain constant throughout life as the hostility, thirst for destruction, alienation, desire for self-aggrandizement – all these and other negative aspirations and fears are not basic or given from the very birth, but rather vice versa they emerge as response to conditions of life [8]. Such background for analyzing youth radicalism reveals some understanding of mass behavior and sentiments.

We all live in an informational surrounding and it presses us permanently. Society transmits information and we perceive and internalize it as a matter of fact. So that sometimes one isn't even aware of how information shapes his or her thoughts and orientation in the situation around. A group of researchers led by P. Fernbach carried out a study recently and basis of political radicalization has been found. Researchers say it should lie in ignorance or as they call it - the illusion of knowledge. As the results of the study, the less person understand in the policy (and one can suppose that his or her knowledge is quite deep and profound) the more radically and aggressively this person behaves. Nothing but illusion provokes aggression. So scientists went further and found out that simple verbalizing the political actor's points of view can reduce the radical readiness dramatically. Scientists discovered that the process of one's positions explanation impacts significantly on the political behavior of the individual calming it down [12].

People are active and research themselves and the world around actively. So the system of personal constructs is the result of that search. G. Kelly's theory of personal constructs considers human behavior as implemented personal constructs [10]. So the radical youth behavior is treated as some hierarchy of personal constructs as bipolar scales. Young people's radical political behavior corresponds with exact poles so that objects and ideas are perceived through negative ones. Such system of personal constructs is an obstacle for diversity of behavioral patterns. Radicalism is a conscious choice of a construct pole. So important factors of youth political behavior radicalization lies in studying socio-political reality, searching some psychological resources for adapting to life and finally one's own political behavior in a self-created system of personal constructs.

All that psychological mechanisms of radicalization of youth political behavior are coincided with social situation and socio-psychological factors. For instance, one of the causes which can lead to radicalization is social tension in society. Or even crisis of social, political and economic processes in the society results in the disintegration of value-normative foundations which inevitably determines anomie. As a result, the flow of youth socialization is

broken and it leads to seeking some new ways for acquiring social status. All these conditions build the basis for protest forms and radical political behavior.

Conclusion. Radicalization of youth political behavior is treated as a result of deep social and political resentment, or rather anger. One's personality is revealed in political behavior so the high level of its radical significance means the degree and intensity of that status. The actualizing of radical behavior is probably unlikely without deep psychological requisites for that matter. The main psychological factors for radicalization of youth political behavior lie in age-related psychological requisites, which are: risk and aggressiveness attraction; suggestibility; unique features of political socialization flow and its results; particular qualities of parent-child relationships; the processes of personal self-determination and social identification; social and psychological moods like dissatisfaction with the quality of life and one's place in it, social injustice, anxiety, fears, one's particular points of view. But it never shows up before some environmental stimulus occurs (social, political, etc.). Social factors complete appearance of radical potential of one's behavior. They are parents-child relationships, social groups influence, peer pressure, mass media influence. Many of them find themselves while political socialization runs so that they form and shape not only personal psychological predispositions for radical behavior but induces its actualizing as well. Study of socio-psychological factors for radicalization of youth political behavior is the prospect for further research.

Literature

1. *Мартыненко Б. К.* Отличие терроризма от экстремизма, радикализма, партизанской войны / Б. К. Мартыненко // Вісник Дніпропетровського університету імені А. Нобеля. Серія "Юридичні науки". – Дніпропетровськ, 2011. – № 1. – С. 40–46.
2. *Ольшанский Д. В.* Психология терроризма / Д. В. Ольшанский. – СПб.: Питер, 2002. – 288 с.
3. *Хлобустов О. М.* Терроризм: реальность сегодняшнего состояния / О. М. Хлобустов, С. Г. Федоров // Современный терроризм: состояние и перспективы. – М.: Эдиториал, 2000. – 240 с.
4. *Чекмаев Э.* Особенности политической культуры молодежи и факторы проявления радикализма / Э. Чекмаев // Власть. – 2002. – № 3. – С. 102–105.
5. *Bandura A.* Social Learning Theory / Albert Bandura. – Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977. – 247 p.
6. *Berkowitz L.* Aggression: Its Causes, Consequences, and Control / Leonard Berkowitz. – New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993. – 485 p.
7. *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* / [eds.: E. R. A. Seligman, A. S. Johnson]. – New York: Macmillan, 1934.
8. *Fromm E.* Escape From Freedom / Erich Fromm. – New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1994. – 301 p.

9. Gurr T. R. *Why Men Rebel* / T. R. Gurr. – New Jersey : Princeton University Press, 1970. – 421 p.
10. Kelly G. A. *A Theory of Personality: The Psychology of Personal Constructs* / G. A. Kelly. – Norton, New York : W. W. Norton & Company, 1963. – 208 p.
11. Maslow A. H. *Motivation and Personality* / A. H. Maslow. – New York : Harper and Row, 1954. – 411 p.
12. Political Extremism Is Supported by an Illusion of Understanding / P. M. Fernbach, T. Rogers, C. R. Fox, S. A. Sloman // *Psychological Science*. – 2013. – Vol. 24. – P. 939–946.
13. Rogers C. *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy* / Carl Rogers. – London : Constable, 1961. – 420 p.

References

1. Martynenko, B. K. (2011). Otlichye terrorizma od ekstremizma, radikalizma, partizanskoy voyny [The Difference Between Terrorism, Extremism, Radicalism and guerrilla warfare]. *Visnyk Dnipropetrovskoho universytetu imeni A. Nobelia. Seriya "Yurydychni nauky"* [Bulletin of Dnipropetrovsk Alfred Nobel University. Series "Jurisprudence"], 1, 40–46 (rus).
2. Olshanskiy, D. V. (2002). *Psikhologiya terrorizma* [Psychology of Terrorism]. St. Petersburg: Piter Publ. (rus).
3. Khlobustov, O. M. (2000). *Terrorizm: realnost segodnyashnego sostoyaniya* [Terrorism: the Reality of Current State]. Moscow: Editorial Publ. (rus).
4. Chekmayev, E. (2002). Osobennosti politicheskoy kultury molodyezhy i factory radikalizma [Peculiarities of Youth Political Culture and Factors of Radicalism]. *Vlast* [Power], 3, 102–105 (rus).
5. Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
6. Berkowitz, L. (1993). *Aggression: Its Causes, Consequences, and Control*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
7. Seligman, E. R. A., Johnson, A. S. (Eds.). (1934). *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*. New York: Macmillan.
8. Fromm, E. (1994). *Escape From Freedom*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
9. Gurr, T. R. (1970). *Why Men Rebel*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
10. Kelly, G. A. (1963). *A Theory of Personality: The Psychology of Personal Constructs*. Norton, New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
11. Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
12. Fernbach, P. M., Rogers, T., Fox, C. R. & Sloman, S. A. (2013). Political Extremism Is Supported by an Illusion of Understanding. *Psychological Science*, 24, 939–946.
13. Rogers, C. (1961). *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy*. London: Constable.

Балюта В. В. Психологічні чинники радикалізації політичної поведінки молоді: теоретичний аналіз

Представлено результати теоретичного дослідження впливу психологічних чинників на радикалізацію політичної поведінки молоді. Установлено, що, тяжючи до крайнощів у способі діяльності, радикалізм відіграє в суспільстві дестабілі-

заційну роль, адже виступає одним з основних чинників конфронтації політичних сил, спричиняє поглиблення конфліктів, загострює їх. Визначено основні психологічні чинники радикалізації політичної поведінки молоді: вікові психологічні потяги до ризику, агресивності; сугестивність; специфіка перебігу та результати політичної соціалізації, батьківсько-дитячих взаємин; особистісні процеси самовизначення, соціальної ідентифікації; соціально-психологічні настрої, як то невдоволеність рівнем життя і своїм місцем у ньому, соціальна несправедливість, тривога, страхи, особливості поглядів. Зроблено висновок, що тригером розгортання радикальної політичної поведінки найчастіше стає соціально-політичний прецедент. Наголошено, що суб'єктність у сфері політичних відносин проявляється саме в політичній поведінці, а значить, її радикалізація в середовищі молоді демонструє її специфіку.

Ключові слова: політична поведінка, радикалізація, молодь, політична суб'єктність, психологічні чинники, соціальна зрілість.

Балюта В. В. Психологические факторы радикализации политического поведения молодежи: теоретический анализ

Представлены результаты теоретического исследования влияния психологических факторов на радикализацию политического поведения молодежи. Установлено, что, стремясь к крайностям в способе деятельности, радикализм играет в обществе дестабилизирующую роль, поскольку является одним из основных факторов конфронтации политических сил, ведет к усугублению конфликтов, обостряет их. Определены основные психологические факторы радикализации политического поведения молодежи: возрастные психологические влечения к риску, агрессивности; суггестивность; специфика протекания и результаты политической социализации, родительско-детских взаимоотношений; личностные процессы самоопределения, социальной идентификации; социально-психологические настроения, такие как неудовлетворенность уровнем жизни и своим местом в ней, социальная несправедливость, тревога, страхи, особенности взглядов. Сделан вывод, что триггером разворачивания радикального политического поведения чаще всего является социально-политический прецедент. Подчеркнуто, что субъектность в сфере политических отношений проявляется именно в политическом поведении, а значит, его радикализация в среде молодежи демонстрирует ее специфику.

Ключевые слова: политическое поведение, радикализация, молодежь, политическая субъектность, психологические факторы, социальная зрелость.