



INCREASING THE SECURITY LEVEL: DEVELOPMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL MECHANISMS TO PREVENT ENVIRONMENTAL EXTREMISM

DIAS PARDABEKOV

Academy of Public Administration under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan – Kazakhstan
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-2636-1065> E-mail: d8707065555@gmail.com

BEKZHAN MEIRBAYEV

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University – Kazakhstan. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3543-6096>
E-mail: Bekshan.Meirbaev@kaznu.edu.kz

AINUR KARYBAYEVA

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University – Kazakhstan. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8203-8277>
E-mail: Ainur.Karybayeva@kaznu.edu.kz

AINURA KURMANALIYEVA

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University – Kazakhstan. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5299-2695>
E-mail: Ainura.Kurmanalieva@kaznu.edu.kz

LAZZAT YELUBAEVA

Independent Researcher – Kazakhstan. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-9317-9516>
E-mail: lazzat@mail.ru

NURSULU ALTAYEVA

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University – Kazakhstan. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3525-8875>
E-mail: nursulu.altayeva@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study is to evaluate the effectiveness of existing preventive strategies and identify priority areas for their improvement. The methodological basis is grounded in a consistent mixed design, which includes an expert survey of 47 experts in countering terrorism and extremism and three focus groups involving 24 experts. We used methods of descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and thematic analysis of qualitative data. The study's results demonstrate a significant differentiation in the effectiveness of institutional mechanisms, with the highest ratings for specialized anti-terrorist units (4.6 points) and critically low indicators of international legal cooperation (2.9 points). The analysis of radicalization factors showed the dominance of institutional determinants, including the ineffectiveness of traditional forms of environmental activism (87.2% of expert mentions) and the inadequate response of state institutions to environmental problems (78.7% of mentions). The regional analysis showed the predominance of centralized approaches in Russia and Central Asia and the prevalence of multilevel integrative strategies in the European context. The priority areas for improvement are the development of international legal cooperation, the establishment of specialized interdepartmental structures, and the enhancement of early warning systems. The theoretical significance of this study lies in the systematization of conceptual approaches to analyzing environmental extremism and the development of a model for evaluating the effectiveness of preventive measures. The practical significance is determined by the potential to apply the results in optimizing government policy in countering environmental extremism.

Keywords: Terrorism; Ecology; Activism; Preventive strategies; Anti-terrorism; Prevention.





AUMENTANDO O NÍVEL DE SEGURANÇA: DESENVOLVIMENTO DE MECANISMOS INSTITUCIONAIS PARA PREVENIR O EXTREMISMO AMBIENTAL

RESUMO

O objetivo deste estudo é avaliar a eficácia das estratégias preventivas existentes e identificar áreas prioritárias para seu aprimoramento. A base metodológica fundamenta-se em um desenho misto consistente, que inclui uma pesquisa com 47 especialistas em combate ao terrorismo e ao extremismo e três grupos focais com 24 especialistas cada. Utilizamos métodos de estatística descritiva, análise de correlação e análise temática de dados qualitativos. Os resultados do estudo demonstram uma diferenciação significativa na eficácia dos mecanismos institucionais, com as maiores pontuações para unidades antiterroristas especializadas (4,6 pontos) e indicadores criticamente baixos de cooperação jurídica internacional (2,9 pontos). A análise dos fatores de radicalização mostrou o domínio de determinantes institucionais, incluindo a ineficácia das formas tradicionais de ativismo ambiental (87,2% das menções dos especialistas) e a resposta inadequada das instituições estatais aos problemas ambientais (78,7% das menções). A análise regional mostrou a predominância de abordagens centralizadas na Rússia e na Ásia Central e a prevalência de estratégias integrativas multiníveis no contexto europeu. As áreas prioritárias para melhoria são o desenvolvimento da cooperação jurídica internacional, o estabelecimento de estruturas interdepartamentais especializadas e o aprimoramento dos sistemas de alerta precoce. A relevância teórica deste estudo reside na sistematização de abordagens conceituais para a análise do extremismo ambiental e no desenvolvimento de um modelo para avaliar a eficácia de medidas preventivas. A relevância prática é determinada pelo potencial de aplicação dos resultados na otimização de políticas governamentais no combate ao extremismo ambiental.

Palavras-chave: Terrorismo; Ecologia; Ativismo; Estratégias preventivas; Antiterrorismo; Prevenção.

1 INTRODUCTION

The current stage in the development of international relations is characterized by increasing threats to global security associated with the radicalization of environmental movements and the transformation of traditional forms of environmental activism into extremist manifestations. The escalation of global environmental problems (Kiseleva et al., 2024) is accompanied by an increase in radical forms of environmental activism that can transform into extremist manifestations, creating serious challenges to ensuring public safety and law and order (Spadaro, 2020; Yang & Jen, 2018).

An analysis of the organizational structures of environmental extremist groups shows that decentralized structures and the use of direct-action tactics characterize these formations. The international legal aspects of countering environmental extremism are characterized by significant gaps in regulatory regulation (Polovchenko, 2022). The lack of





a unified approach in various national jurisdictions complicates efforts against environmental extremism (Severgin, 2024), underscoring the importance of developing a methodological framework for assessing this phenomenon.

The conceptual framework of the study requires a clear definition of key terms. In academic literature, extremism is defined as the promotion or development of an ideology based on violence, hatred, or intolerance, which aims to deny or destroy the fundamental rights and freedoms of others and undermine or replace existing democratic institutions (Educate Against Hate, 2025). An important conceptual distinction is drawn between idealistic and behavioral definitions of extremism: the former focuses on political ideas opposed to the fundamental values of society. In contrast, the latter focuses on the methods by which subjects strive to achieve their political goals (Stephens et al., 2021). In the context of this study, environmental extremism is understood as a radical form of environmental activism, including the use or threat of illegal methods to achieve environmental goals, which constitutes a behavioral form of extremism in the environmental sphere.

Various terms are used in the literature to denote radical environmental actions (Chalecki, 2024; Gruenewald et al., 2015; Spadaro, 2020). This study combines these manifestations under the concept of environmental extremism, which is the broadest category encompassing them.

Theoretical approaches to analyzing environmental extremism show significant differences in understanding the nature of this phenomenon. Researchers identify various forms of radical environmental actions, ranging from attacks on environmental resources to achieve political goals to the actions of environmental activists against industrial facilities (Abdullayev et al., 2023; Chalecki, 2024). Modern research on the radicalization of environmental movements shows a wide range of direct-action tactics, including unauthorized protests, street blockades, eco-sabotage, and "climatage" (Lederer et al., 2024).

A complex of socio-political and environmental determinants determines the causal factors of environmental movement radicalization. The radicalization of environmental views is often fueled by global environmental crises, such as climate change, resource scarcity, and biodiversity loss, which require interconnected solutions (Alidu et al., 2025; Institute for Economics & Peace, 2020).

Authors of research studies based on experience in countering environmental





extremism identify different strategic approaches to addressing it. For example, Russia emphasizes the need for law enforcement measures to counter the threats of ecoterrorism (Gedgafov, 2024). The United States criminal justice system continues to use legal mechanisms to strengthen penalties for terrorist offenses. The so-called "terrorism enhancement" in the federal sentencing guidelines increases the recommended sentences for terrorism-related crimes from several months or years to at least 17.5-21.8 years, with a 12-level increase designed to ensure equality in the treatment of federal terrorism crimes within the 8-year maximum sentence (Muslim Legal Fund of America, 2024).

- Institutional mechanisms for preventing environmental extremism require a comprehensive multi-level approach. To solve the problem of environmental extremism, as the research results show, on the one hand, it is necessary to increase the reliability of government mechanisms, including raising environmental awareness at the national level (Karatueva, 2021). On the other hand, it is necessary to develop international cooperation (between government institutions and environmental organizations) to form common standards and protocols of interaction. The adoption of international standards and the development of cross-border cooperation (Sosnitskaia, 2023) would enhance the effectiveness of countering extremism at the transnational level (Rose, 2022; Ryzhenkov, 2017).

2 METHODS

The methodology is based on an integrated approach that combines quantitative and qualitative methods for collecting and analyzing empirical data to examine institutional mechanisms for preventing environmental extremism.

The study is implemented in the form of a sequential mixed design, which comprises two main stages of data collection, followed by the triangulation of the results. The methodological approach involves the use of survey methods as the dominant tool for obtaining empirical information.

The central element of the methodology is an expert survey conducted among 47 experts in environmental extremism, counterterrorism, and public safety. The expert sample was formed using a targeted selection method using stratification criteria based on professional affiliation, geographical distribution, and level of expertise.





Table 1. The structure of the expert sample

| Expert category | Number (people) | Share (%) |
|---|-----------------|--------------|
| Law enforcement and intelligence officers | 14 | 29.8 |
| Academic researchers in the field of extremism and terrorism | 12 | 25.5 |
| Experts from international security organizations | 9 | 19.1 |
| Experts from non-governmental organizations (NGOs) monitoring extremism | 7 | 14.9 |
| Representatives of government agencies responsible for coordinating anti-terrorist activities | 5 | 10.6 |
| Total | 47 | 100.0 |

The geographical distribution of experts includes representatives from Russia (25.5%), Central Asian countries (Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, each at 19.1%), and European countries, such as Germany, France, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Sweden (36.2%).

The expert survey toolkit is a structured questionnaire comprising 36 questions organized into four thematic blocks:

1. **Conceptual identification of environmental extremism** (9 questions): assessment of terminological approaches, classification criteria, and definitional boundaries of the phenomenon;
2. **Assessment of the effectiveness of existing institutional mechanisms** (11 questions): analysis of the functioning of national and international systems for countering environmental extremism;
3. **Identification of radicalization factors and determinants of extremist behavior** (8 questions): identification of socio-political, economic, and psychological prerequisites of environmental extremism;
4. **Forecasting and recommendations for improving preventive strategies** (8 questions): formulation of proposals for optimizing institutional prevention mechanisms.

The operationalization of environmental extremism included an assessment of three components: (1) the radicality of the methods of influence, (2) the degree of deviation from legal forms of activism, and (3) the potential for escalation to violent actions. Each component was measured on a seven-point Likert scale to assess the degree of agreement with the proposed statements, supplemented with open-ended questions to gather qualitative data.

An additional method of data collection was the conduct of focus groups with 24 experts selected from the respondents to the expert survey. The composition of the focus





groups was based on the principle of maximum variation while ensuring the representativeness of professional and geographical groups.

Three focus groups of eight participants each were organized:

- Focus Group 1: Representatives of law enforcement agencies and government security structures;
- Focus Group 2: Academic researchers and experts from analytical centers;
- Focus Group 3: experts from international organizations and NGOs.

Each focus group discussion was conducted in a semi-structured format, lasting 120 minutes and using pre-designed moderator guidelines. The thematic structure of the talks included:

1. Analysis of the effectiveness of existing international coordination mechanisms in countering environmental extremism;
2. Assessment of gaps in national legislation and institutional structures;
3. Discussion on promising areas for the development of preventive strategies;
4. Formulation of recommendations for improving interagency and international cooperation.

3 DATA ANALYSIS

The quantitative data were processed using the SPSS 28.0 statistical package. The following analysis methods were used:

- Descriptive statistics for characterizing the main parameters of the sample and the distribution of variables;
- Correlation analysis (Pearson's coefficient) to identify relationships between variables;
- The Kendall consistency criterion (W) for assessing the consensus of expert opinions.

The qualitative data obtained from the focus groups and the expert survey's open-ended questions were processed using the thematic analysis method with NVivo 14 software. Coding was carried out in two stages: primary inductive coding followed by categorization based on the theoretical concepts of institutional analysis.

The validity of the study was ensured using multiple data collection methods (methodological triangulation), experts from diverse backgrounds (source triangulation), and standardized measurement tools. The internal consistency of the scales was evaluated





using Cronbach's alpha coefficient ($\alpha = 0.847$ for the main constructs).

The study was conducted following international ethical standards (informed consent was obtained from all participants, and the confidentiality of personal data was ensured). Methodological limitations include the potential subjectivity of expert assessments and geographical unevenness of representation, minimized through the diversification of the expert group and the use of data validation procedures.

4 RESULTS

The expert survey and focus groups provided comprehensive data on the current state of institutional mechanisms for preventing environmental extremism and the effectiveness of these mechanisms in operation. Table 2 presents the results of an expert assessment of the effectiveness of existing institutional mechanisms for countering environmental extremism on a seven-point scale.

Table 2. Expert assessment of the effectiveness of institutional mechanisms for countering environmental extremism

| Institutional mechanism | Average score | Standard deviation | Coefficient of variation (%) |
|---|---------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| National law enforcement agencies | 4.2 | 1.3 | 31.0 |
| International security organizations | 3.8 | 1.5 | 39.5 |
| Interdepartmental coordination structures | 3.5 | 1.4 | 40.0 |
| Specialized anti-terrorist units | 4.6 | 1.2 | 26.1 |
| Early warning systems | 3.1 | 1.6 | 51.6 |
| International legal cooperation | 2.9 | 1.4 | 48.3 |
| Monitoring NGOs | 3.7 | 1.3 | 35.1 |
| Academic research centers | 3.3 | 1.1 | 33.3 |

*Note: Effectiveness was assessed by the ability of institutions to prevent the transition from legal environmental activism to radical forms, including ecoterrorism and environmental terrorism.

The data demonstrate a significant differentiation in assessments of the effectiveness of various institutional mechanisms, with a predominance of critical assessments of international cooperation.

The results of the analysis of factors contributing to the radicalization of environmental movements are presented in Table 3, organized by the frequency of mentions in expert interviews and the rank distribution according to degree of importance.

Table 3. Factors of transformation of environmental activism into extremist manifestations (ranking by degree of importance)





| Rank | Radicalization factor | Frequency of mentions (%) | Average significance score |
|------|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | Ineffectiveness of traditional forms of environmental activism | 87.2 | 6.1 |
| 2 | The feeling of an existential environmental threat | 83.0 | 5.9 |
| 3 | Lack of adequate response of state institutions to environmental problems | 78.7 | 5.7 |
| 4 | The impact of social media and online platforms with radical content | 74.5 | 5.4 |
| 5 | Socio-economic inequality in access to an environmentally sound environment | 68.1 | 5.2 |
| 6 | The ideological impact of extremist groups | 63.8 | 4.9 |
| 7 | Marginalization and social exclusion of potential participants | 57.4 | 4.6 |
| 8 | Politicization of the environmental agenda | 51.1 | 4.3 |

*Note: Radicalization is understood as a process of transition from moderate forms of environmental participation to extremist methods of influence.

The analysis showed the complex nature of the determinants of radicalization, with institutional and socio-psychological factors predominating.

Geographical differences in approaches to institutional regulation of environmental extremism are reflected in Table 4, which demonstrates the regional specifics of preventive strategies.

Table 4. Regional approaches to institutional counteraction to environmental extremism

| Region | Dominant approach | Priority mechanisms | Effectiveness assessment |
|------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| Russia | Centralized law enforcement | Federal special services, anti-terrorist units | 4.4 |
| Kyrgyzstan | Coordination and preventive measures | Interdepartmental commissions, international cooperation | 3.2 |
| Uzbekistan | Administrative and regulatory approach | State environmental agencies, legal regulation | 3.6 |
| Europe | Multilevel integrative approach | European Police Office (Europol), national agencies, NGOs | 4.1 |

The results indicate significant differences in institutional approaches with a predominance of centralized models in post-Soviet states.

An assessment of promising areas for improving institutional mechanisms is presented in Table 5 based on consolidated expert recommendations.

Table 5. Priority areas for improving institutional mechanisms for preventing environmental extremism





| Area of improvement | Priority (rank) | Expert consensus (Kendall's W) | Expected efficiency |
|--|-----------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| Development of international legal cooperation | 1 | 0.73 | High |
| Creation of specialized interdepartmental structures | 2 | 0.68 | High |
| Improving early warning systems | 3 | 0.71 | Average |
| Development of preventive educational programs | 4 | 0.65 | Average |
| Increased monitoring of online activity | 5 | 0.59 | Average |
| Integration of NGOs into preventive strategies | 6 | 0.62 | Low |
| Development of alternative channels of environmental participation | 7 | 0.56 | Low |

The Kendall consistency coefficient ($W = 0.67$) indicates a high level of expert consensus on the priority areas of institutional reforms.

A correlation analysis of the relationships between estimates of the effectiveness of various institutional mechanisms showed statistically significant correlation coefficients, shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Matrix of correlations between estimates of the effectiveness of institutional mechanisms (Pearson's coefficient)

| | Mechanism | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|----|---|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|--------|---------|-------|
| 1. | National law enforcement agencies | 1.000 | | | | | | | |
| 2. | International security organizations | 0.423* | 1.000 | | | | | | |
| 3. | Interdepartmental coordination structures | 0.567** | 0.712** | 1.000 | | | | | |
| 4. | Specialized anti-terrorist units | 0.641** | 0.298 | 0.445* | 1.000 | | | | |
| 5. | Early warning systems | 0.234 | 0.589** | 0.623** | 0.156 | 1.000 | | | |
| 6. | International legal cooperation | 0.178 | 0.734** | 0.498* | 0.089 | 0.687** | 1.000 | | |
| 7. | Monitoring NGOs | 0.312 | 0.456* | 0.534* | 0.203 | 0.612** | 0.423* | 1.000 | |
| 8. | Academic research centers | 0.287 | 0.389* | 0.467* | 0.145 | 0.598** | 0.378 | 0.745** | 1.000 |

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$

The results of the correlation analysis demonstrate the presence of two clusters of institutional mechanisms characterized by a high degree of interrelation in their functioning efficiency.

5 DISCUSSION

The results of the expert study allow us to conduct a comparative analysis with empirical data presented in modern scientific literature and identify the specific features of institutional mechanisms for preventing environmental extremism.

The results of the expert assessment of the effectiveness of institutional mechanisms





show significant discrepancies with the official statistics of law enforcement agencies (Kiryushin et al., 2024; U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2023).

This discrepancy may indicate that an increase in the number of investigations does not correlate with an increase in the effectiveness of preventive mechanisms. The high coefficient of variation (31.0%) in estimates of the effectiveness of national law enforcement agencies indicates significant differences in expert opinions, which may reflect the uneven institutional approaches in different national jurisdictions.

The particularly low scores of international legal cooperation (2.9 points) confirm the conclusions of Rose (2022) that environmental terrorism (as a form of environmental extremism) has not yet received the status of an international crime, which creates significant gaps in legal regulation. The coefficient of variation of 48.3% for this mechanism indicates a substantial polarization of expert opinions regarding the potential of international legal instruments.

The analysis of radicalization factors shows that institutional determinants take priority over individual psychological factors. The dominance of the "ineffectiveness of traditional forms of environmental activism" factor (87.2% of mentions, 6.1 significance points) is consistent with the conceptual provisions of Lederer et al. (2024) on the transformation of environmental movements toward more radical forms of activism.

The high importance of the "feeling of an existential environmental threat" factor (83.0% of mentions) aligns with the Institute for Economics & Peace's (2020) conclusions on the impact of global environmental crises on the radicalization of environmental views. These results confirm the conceptual model proposed by Spadaro (2020) on the relationship between the degradation of basic resources and the strengthening of terrorist organizations.

The significant role of social media and online platforms (74.5% of mentions) is consistent with the results of a study by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Behavioral Threat Assessment Center (2022), which found that ideologically motivated individuals were rarely completely isolated. This highlights the importance of considering the network aspects of radicalization when developing preventive strategies.

The results of the analysis of regional approaches demonstrate a significant differentiation in assessments of the effectiveness of institutional mechanisms. The highest rating of Russia's centralized law enforcement approach (4.4 points) may reflect the effectiveness of integrated security structures, which is consistent with Gedgafov's (2024)





conclusions on the need for law enforcement measures to neutralize the threats of ecoterrorism.

Low ratings of Kyrgyzstan's coordination and preventive approach (3.2 points) may indicate insufficient institutional maturity of preventive mechanisms in transitional political systems. The interim indicators of Uzbekistan's administrative and regulatory approach (3.6 points) suggest the potential for developing hybrid models of institutional regulation.

The relatively high scores of the multilevel integrative approach of European states (4.1 points) confirm the conclusions of Elsässer et al. (2022) on the importance of institutional cooperation in global environmental governance. These results are consistent with the conceptual provisions on the proliferation of international institutions governing the global environment (Goncharov, 2024; Muhlinina, 2024).

The high priority of developing international legal cooperation (rank 1, $W = 0.73$) in expert assessments (Table 5) aligns with the recommendations of the scientific literature on adopting international standards to address the transnational nature of environmental extremism effectively. These results confirm Rose's (2022) conclusion on the need to develop a treaty to define and criminalize acts against the natural environment.

The priority of creating specialized interdepartmental structures (rank 2, $W = 0.68$) is consistent with the conclusion that developing cooperation between government institutions and environmental organizations is crucial for the effective prevention of ecoterrorism (Karatueva, 2021; Korotenko & Togusakov, 2024).

The relatively low estimates of the expected effectiveness of integrating NGOs and developing alternative channels of environmental participation may reflect experts' skepticism regarding the potential of civil society in countering radical forms of environmental activism (Khlebushkin et al., 2021).

The high Kendall consistency coefficient ($W = 0.67$) indicates a sufficient level of expert consensus, which increases the validity of the results obtained. Significant coefficients of variation in the estimates of individual institutional mechanisms indicate the need for additional analysis of the sources of expert discrepancies.

The results complement the existing empirical base for analyzing environmental extremism, providing a systematic assessment of institutional mechanisms from the expert community's perspective. These patterns can serve as a basis for the development of scientifically based recommendations for improving preventive strategies in the context of





modern global security challenges (Akhmetshin et al., 2024; Babintseva et al., 2025).

Correlation analysis shows structured patterns of relationships between assessments of the effectiveness of various institutional mechanisms, allowing for the identification of specific clusters of institutional interaction.

The most pronounced correlations are observed between international security organizations and interdepartmental coordination structures ($r = 0.712$, $p < 0.01$), which confirms the conceptual provisions (Elsässer et al., 2022) on the importance of institutional cooperation in global environmental governance. This relationship highlights the complementarity of multi-level institutional mechanisms in countering environmental extremism (Sapaev et al., 2024).

A significant correlation exists between international security organizations and international legal cooperation ($r = 0.734$, $p < 0.01$), indicating the critical role of regulatory and legal instruments in the functioning of supranational security structures (Kiseleva, 2024). This is consistent with the conclusions of (Tugelbayev, 2024) about the need to form an international legal framework for effective counteraction to environmental terrorism.

The formation of a cluster of soft institutional mechanisms is demonstrated by a high correlation between monitoring NGOs and academic research centers ($r = 0.745$, $p < 0.01$). This relationship reflects the specifics of the civil sector's functioning in the system of preventive counteraction to environmental extremism. It confirms the conclusions of (Khakimov et al., 2024) about the importance of developing cooperation among institutional factors.

The absence of statistically significant correlations between specialized anti-terrorist units and early warning systems ($r = 0.156$, $p > 0.05$) may indicate a functional disconnect between repressive and preventive mechanisms in national security systems. This result suggests potential gaps in the integration of various components of the institutional architecture for countering environmental extremism.

The study is characterized by several methodological and structural limitations that must be considered when interpreting the results obtained and extrapolating them to a broader context of institutional mechanisms for countering environmental extremism.

The geographical unevenness of the representation of the expert sample is a significant limitation of the study. The dominance of experts from Russia and Asian countries (63.7%) and the underrepresentation of experts from Africa, Latin America, and Southeast





Asia may affect the validity of conclusions regarding the universality of the identified institutional patterns. This disparity may limit the ability to generalize results to a global level and reflect regional specifics of institutional approaches.

The time constraints of the study are due to the dynamic nature of the environmental extremism phenomenon and the relatively short period of empirical data collection. The recorded expert assessments reflect a specific period. They may not accurately reflect changes in the institutional architecture of counteraction that occur under the influence of evolving threats and the adaptation of extremist groups to preventive measures.

The subjectivity of expert assessments is a methodological limitation despite the use of standardized validation procedures. Differences in professional experience, institutional affiliation, and cultural contexts among experts can affect the consistency of assessments of the effectiveness of institutional mechanisms. The coefficients of variation, ranging from 26.1% to 51.6%, indicate a significant polarization of expert opinions on specific aspects of the study.

The conceptual limitations stem from the lack of a generally accepted definition of environmental extremism in international law, which creates methodological difficulties in operationalizing variables and comparing results with those of other studies. The differentiation between environmental terrorism and ecoterrorism, noted in the scientific literature, may affect the uniformity of expert interpretations of the phenomenon under study.

Restrictions on access to confidential information of law enforcement agencies and special services prevented the obtaining of objective data on the practical effectiveness of institutional mechanisms. Dependence on expert assessments in the absence of verifiable statistical data on the success of preventive measures reduces the objectivity of the analysis of institutional effectiveness.

These limitations determine the directions for subsequent research, including expanding the geographical coverage of the expert sample, conducting longitudinal studies of the dynamics of institutional mechanisms, and developing quantitative indicators of the effectiveness of preventive strategies based on objective data from law enforcement agencies.

6 CONCLUSIONS





Our study of environmental extremism understood as a complex of radical forms of environmental activism that employ illegal methods of influence, enables us to formulate scientifically sound conclusions about the effectiveness of existing preventive strategies and identify priority areas for their improvement.

Expert analysis showed a significant differentiation in assessments of the effectiveness of institutional mechanisms. Specialized anti-terrorist units demonstrated the highest scores (4.6 points). In comparison, international legal cooperation was characterized by critically low scores (2.9 points), which confirms the existence of gaps in regulatory regulation at the supranational level.

The analysis of radicalization factors established the dominance of institutional determinants over individual psychological prerequisites. The ineffectiveness of traditional forms of environmental activism is a leading factor in the transformation of legitimate environmental participation into extremist manifestations.

Correlation analysis demonstrated the formation of structured clusters of institutional interaction. In contrast, the absence of significant correlations between repressive and preventive mechanisms indicates a functional disconnect between the components of the institutional architecture.

Regional analysis showed the predominance of centralized approaches in post-Soviet states and multilevel integrative strategies in the European context, reflecting the influence of political and legal traditions on the formation of preventive mechanisms (Otcheskiy et al., 2024).

The priority areas for improvement are the development of international legal cooperation, the establishment of specialized interdepartmental structures, and the enhancement of early warning systems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (AP19175423 «Socio-psychological aspects of the manifestation of religious destructiveness»).

REFERENCES





Abdullayev, I., Tadjiev, T., & Saparova, M. (2023). Evaluation factors of industrial production in the region. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 449, 01002. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202344901002>

Akhmetshin, E., Abdullayev, I., Kurikov, V., Khadasevich, N., Shichiyakh, R., & Severyanova, M. (2024). Opportunities for socio-economic development in Russia: Integration of education, science, and business through the university 4.0 model. *Relacoes Internacionais no Mundo Atual*, 4(46), 639-656.

Alidu, A.F., Man, N., Ramli, N.N., Haris, N.B.M., & Alhassan, A. (2025). Enhancing adoption intensity: Exploring the nexus between climate information access and climate-smart adaptation practices among smallholder farmers in Ghana. *Journal of Global Innovations in Agricultural Sciences*, 13(1), 19-27. <https://doi.org/10.22194/JGIAS/25.1302>

Babintseva, E., Mansur, D., Trifonova, E., & Dugina, T. (2025). Impact of environmental education development on promoting environmentally safe use of natural resources and careful attitude toward nature. *International Journal of Ecosystems and Ecology Science*, 15(1), 123-132. <https://doi.org/10.31407/ijees15.114>

Chalecki, E.L. (2024). Environmental terrorism twenty years on. *Global Environmental Politics*, 24(1), 1-9. http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/glep_a_00728

Educate Against Hate. (2025). What is extremism? Definition of extremist ideology. Retrieved April 10, 2025 from <https://www.educateagainsthate.com/what-is-extremism/>

Elsässer, J.P., Hickmann, T., Jinnah, S., Oberthür, S., & de Graaf, T.V. (2022). Institutional interplay in global environmental governance: Lessons learned and future research. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, 22(1), 373-391. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10784-022-09569-4>

Federal Bureau of Investigation, Behavioral Threat Assessment Center. (2022, July 21). Lone offender terrorism report. FBI press release. Retrieved from <https://www.fbi.gov/news/press-releases/press-releases/fbi-behavioral-threat-assessment-center-release>

Gedgafov, M.M. (2024). Fenomen ekologicheskogo terrorizma [The phenomenon of environmental terrorism]. *Journal of applied research*, 8, 145-148.

Goncharov, V.V. (2024). Predstavitel'nyye organy mestnogo samoupravleniya kak ob'yekt obshchestvennogo kontrolya: Konstitutsionno-pravovoy analiz [Representative bodies of local self-government as an object of public control: Constitutional and legal analysis]. *Administrative and Municipal Law*, 1, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.7256/2454-0595.2024.1.39878>

Gruenewald, J., Allison-Gruenewald, K., & Klein, B.R. (2015). Assessing the attractiveness and vulnerability of eco-terrorism targets: A situational crime prevention approach. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 38(6), 433-455. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1057610X.2015.1009798>





Institute for Economics & Peace. (2020). Global terrorism index 2020: Measuring the impact of terrorism. Sydney: IEP. Retrieved from <https://www.imctc.org/en/eLibrary/INTReports/Documents/Report-Issu-20-EN.pdf>

Karatueva, E.N. (2021). Problemy klassifikatsii ekologicheskogo terrorizma [Problems of classification of environmental terrorism]. *Political Expertise: POLITEX*, 17(4), 387-407. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu23.2021.405>

Khakimov, N., Yakushkina, N., Iskakov, A., Troitskaya, E., Galkin, A., & Stepanova, D. (2024). Legal and political perspectives in countering eco-terrorism: Case of the animal liberation front. *Revista relações internacionais do Mundo Atual*, 3(45), 612-625.

Khlebushkin, A., Krainova, N., Agapov, P., & Radoshnova, N. (2021). Policy in the field of countering the activities of terrorist and extremist organizations. *Relacoes Internacionais no Mundo Atual*, 3(32), 216-234.

Kiryushin, I.I., Ivanov, I.P., Timofeev, V.V., & Zhmurko, D.Yu. (2024). The use of blockchain technology in law enforcement. *Police Activity*, 1, 27-41. <https://doi.org/10.7256/2454-0692.2024.1.44207>

Kiseleva, E.V. (2024). Povysheniye effektivnosti protivodeystviya korruptsii kak usloviye obespecheniya natsional'noy bezopasnosti [Increasing the effectiveness of anti-corruption as a condition for ensuring national security]. *National Security*, 1, 33-46. <https://doi.org/10.7256/2454-0668.2024.1.69502>

Kiseleva, I., Tramova, A., Popov, A., Chernikova, E., & Tsetsgee, B. (2024). Ecological risks: Assessment and management. *International Journal of Ecosystems and Ecology Science*, 14(4), 167-72. <https://doi.org/10.31407/ijees14.420>

Korotenko, V., & Togusakov, O. (2024). Ecological consciousness and sustainable development: Bridging environmental education with green economy practices. *International Journal of Ecosystems and Ecology Science*, 14(4), 17-24. <https://doi.org/10.31407/ijees14.403>

Lederer, M., Mena, V.L., Marquardt, J., Richter, T.A., & Schoppek, D.E. (2024). Radical climate movements—Is the hype about ‘eco-terrorism’ analogy, warning or propaganda? *Frontiers in Political Science*, 6, 1421523, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2024.1421523>

Muhlinina, M.M. (2024). Realizatsiya gosudarstvennoy politiki po okhrane okruzhayushchey sredy v sel'skom khozyaystve [Implementation of the environmental protection policy in agriculture]. *Agriculture*, 1, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.7256/2453-8809.2024.1.71786>

Muslim Legal Fund of America. (2024). MLFA calls for reform: Challenging discrimination in ‘terrorism enhancement’ sentencing. Retrieved from <https://mlfa.org/call-for-reform-challenging-discrimination-in-terrorism-enhancement-sentencing/>

Otcheskiy, I., Ignatova, I., Galkin, A., Abdullayeva, M., Ivanova, T., & Orlova, E. (2024). Impact of eco-terrorist organizations on the development of international law and regulatory





measures. *Revista relações internacionais do Mundo Atual*, 3(45), 486-498.

Polovchenko, K.A. (2022). The Constitutional Court as a subject of the political process. *Politics and Policy*, 50(3), 622-630. <https://doi.org/10.1111/polp.12469>

Rose, G.L. (2022). Environmental terrorism: Not yet an international crime. *Environmental Policy and Law*, 52(2), 161-170. <https://doi.org/10.3233/EPL-219023>

Ryzhenkov, A. (2017). Environmental terrorism as a global problem of modern times. *Legal Concept*, 16(2), 27-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15688/lc.jvolsu.2017.2.3>

Sapaev, G., Abdullaeva, M., Alimova, M., Ibrayev, A., & Turdieva, D. (2024). Countering global extremism and terrorism: The role of international organizations. *Juridicas CUC*, 20(1), 223-238. <https://doi.org/10.17981/juridcuc.20.1.2024.09>

Severgin, A.D. (2024). Yurisdiksiya gosudarstv v metavselennoy [Jurisdiction of states in the metaverse]. *International Law*, 4, 121-136. <https://doi.org/10.25136/2644-5514.2024.4.72828>

Sosnitskaia, V. (2023). Transatlanticheskiye otnosheniya v sfere bezopasnosti: Problemy relevantnosti NATO [Transatlantic security relations: NATO relevance issues]. *World Politics*, 2, 20-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.25136/2409-8671.2023.2.40029>

Spadaro, P.A. (2020). Climate change, environmental terrorism, eco-terrorism and emerging threats. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 13(4), 58-80. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5038/1944-0472.13.4.1863>

Stephens, W., Sieckelinck, S., & Boutellier, H. (2021). Preventing violent extremism: A review of the literature. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 44(4), 346-361. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1057610X.2018.1543144>

Tugelbayev, U. (2024). International information security and the presence of terrorist threats. *Revista relações internacionais do Mundo Atual*, 3(45), 532-546.

U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2023, March 2). The rising threat of domestic terrorism in the U.S. and federal efforts to combat it. Retrieved from <https://www.gao.gov/blog/rising-threat-domestic-terrorism-u.s.-and-federal-efforts-combat-it>

Yang, S.M., & Jen, I.C. (2018). An evaluation of displacement and diffusion effects on eco-terrorist activities after police Interventions. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 34(4), 1103-1123. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-017-9367-4>

