

## 2. Chapter: Methodological Approach & Case Selection Rationale

In order to achieve the research objective and answer the research sub-questions this work utilised a combination of qualitative research methods.

After introducing and examining the concept of *Strategic Resilience* and arguing for its continuing relevance for pluralist societies in face of ongoing challenges from terrorist actors (Chapter 1), the work defines and classifies the used terms in the context of this work and lays out the work's overall scope and limitations (see Chapter 3).

To answer *sub-question one*, the work proceeds to identify and to carefully examine the relevant existing scientific literature that can help explain how terrorism and its accompanying violence and threat scenarios affect the resilience of populations and individuals and their coping strategies in direct and indirect ways (see Chapter 4). The scope adopted, is intentionally wide beyond the field of studies on terrorism and deliberately cuts across diverse research areas including sociology, psychology, communications and disaster management. The focus is placed on scientific research that helps understand the effect particularly on those who are indirectly affected by terrorism – in contrast to studies that cover resilience regarding individuals and groups directly affected, e.g. in natural disaster like floods, wildfire or industrial accidents.

The identification and examination process of the literature is conducted in a five-step process:

1. Identification of relevant keywords,
2. Using the combination of the respective keywords as markers in online database search,
3. Screen the identified papers for their relevance in building, sustaining or strengthening *Strategic Resilience*,
4. The remaining identified theories and models are subsequently analysed in detail,
5. The elements that can contribute to *Strategic Resilience* are dissected from each theory and converted into concrete proposed policy measures.

The sum of all the different proposed single measures that were deduced from the analysis of the theories underlying the *Strategic Resilience* concept,

are subsequently aggregated in a spreadsheet calculation program (see Chapter 5). Through iterative cycles of filtering, classification, and categorisation, the over 100 micro- and mid-level *Strategic Resilience*-enhancing policy measures are subsumed under nine macro-level categories which, the work suggests, constitute the essential elements for building, strengthening and maintaining *Strategic Resilience* in a modern, pluralist society, and answers *sub-question two*. Based on these nine macro-level categories the work builds a comprehensive model, that it proposes can function as an organising- and analytical framework for building *Strategic Resilience*, thereby enabling open pluralist societies to build muscle to repel and withstand or to bounce back from jihadi terrorist attacks. That model is used to deduce general recommendations for practical measures to be taken preventively before an attack, as an immediate response to an attack, and measures to help coping after an attack.

Proceeding to answer *sub-question three* the relevance and validity of this new proposition is tested by selecting a positivist deductive case study approach as posited by Yin<sup>106</sup>, examining and comparing the counter-terrorism policies and programmes enacted to counter jihadi terrorism threat in two different countries. Both countries assessed, the United Kingdom and the Republic of Singapore who have a reputation for their resilience-focused approach to counter-terrorism, are otherwise dissimilar cases, on two extremes on the spectrum of parliamentary democracies.

The United Kingdom (UK) (see Chapter 6) is the prototype of a liberal parliamentary democracy. Its policy decisions are meant to be achieved through reasoned deliberation and debate, guided by logic and moderation. Its liberal values are protected from government overreach or religious fervour by an independent judiciary, a strong parliament, an independent press and a self-confident citizenry. The combination with a liberal trade and economic agenda has allowed the UK's capital to develop into inarguably, the most pluralistic city in the world, the prototype of the cosmopolitan city.<sup>107</sup>

The Republic of Singapore's (SG) (see Chapter 7) parliamentary system is built on the same Westminster System and its government has been credited for creating an open and globally interconnected city state through good governance and a *muscular secularism* that mandates societal toler-

---

106 Yin, 2001, 49-51.

107 See Truc 2017: pos 1997.

ance and moderation as a necessary prerequisite for preserving harmony in a pluralistic, multi-ethnic society.<sup>108</sup> Despite practically limited options for opposition, especially concerning media freedom, the Singapore government has been able to claim large consent with those it governs.<sup>109</sup>

Since 2001 both the UK and SG have become the target of jihadi terrorism from *AlQaida* and *Daesh* and have since both supported supra-national counter-terrorism efforts. As pluralist, secular societies with prototypical cosmopolitan urban centres both countries are equally facing the threat from Muslim radicalisation of their nationals and of foreigners living in their countries. As a consequence, both countries have to also deal with the challenges of co-radicalisation and xenophobia.<sup>110</sup>

Despite these shared commonalities, as mentioned above both countries can be said to fall on opposite sides of the spectrum of practiced parliamentary democracy: The UK historically placed strong emphasis on limited government, a strong parliament and protecting individual freedoms, while Singapore based on different outside and inside circumstances opted for a dominant government, a practically limited parliament role and an emphasis on the community wellbeing over the protection of individual freedoms.<sup>111</sup>

In knowledge of these variances between the countries, the assessment of their policy responses to the similar *jihadi* terrorism threat, promises to be very fertile. The purpose thereby is not to identify all and every small measure or factor that may help the case country to achieve *Strategic Resilience* or to evaluate its effectiveness. The interesting thing is to see, if the newly established nine critical tasks are being reflected in the actual government programs in both countries. In addition, through the analyses of the cases, the author expects to identify additional practical measures that may be generalised and can further substantiate the implementation of the nine critical tasks elsewhere.

Utilising a holistic multiple-case replication design<sup>112</sup>, the new theory is tested by analysing each of the cases for convergent evidence as if they were a whole study in their own right. For each case the work first analyses in detail the countries' counter-terrorism strategies for the necessary context

---

108 See Ramakrishna.

109 See Chin 2016 ; Ramakrishna.

110 See UK Government 2018 ; See Rashith 2019 ; See Hanes and Machin 2014.

111 See Mohamed Nasir and Turner 2013 ; See Ramakrishna.

112 As described by Yin 2001, 49.

before assessing the deployed programmes against the nine variables established in the new *Strategic Resilience* framework individually.<sup>113</sup>

For better understanding, each case assessment is quantified and visualised with the help of radar chart. The selection of both countries is neither a normative statement about the general effectiveness nor of the legitimacy of the measures as they are highly context specific.

The work then compares the conclusions of both cases with each other and draws a *cross-case conclusion*,<sup>114</sup> whether the cases were able to falsify the new theory (see Chapter 8). The qualitative comparison is again augmented by radar chart quantifying outliers and commonalities in the programme mix of both countries.

As a concluding step (see chapter 9) the findings of the work are then summarised and implications for academia and practitioners proposed.

---

113 See Yin, 2001, 13.

114 See Yin, 2001, 49.