A Note on Scope

- Two key levels:
  - The initial turn to militancy (directly participating or indirectly supporting)
  - Return to militancy after a period of previous violence

- CSO may be more interested in the first level, but most rigorous evidence is on the second level
Key Themes

- Socioeconomic status:
  - Poverty $\rightarrow$ VE

- Education:
  - Less educated / madrassas $\rightarrow$ VE

- Religion
  - Islam $\rightarrow$ VE

- Repression
  - Physical integrity violation $\rightarrow$ VE

- Trust in government
  - Lack of trust in gov’t $\rightarrow$ VE
Some Reasons to Be Concerned

- Subjects in studies are unique in key ways
  - Those who are VE vs. those who could be

- Factors allegedly producing VE do not allow identification of independent effect

- The micro-macro challenge in existing research
Evidence: Experimental

- Information: VE costs reduces support for militancy
- Cash programs may reduce participation in crime and violence
- Social skills training plus cash grants reduce recidivism
- Community driven development / reconstruction may increase social cohesion & thus reduce VE
Integrating Experiments into the Policy Process

Credit: EPoD
Example of Integrating Experiments into the Policy Process

- 2011: DFID & Government of Punjab initiative
  - Bring vocational skills to poor and marginalized
- Researchers integrated through every stage
- Stages:
  - Standard rollout – lessons learned
  - Mobilized through NGOs vs. micro-training centers
  - Varied distance to training center
  - Scaled up vocational education
- Punchline:
  - Process allowed optimization of implementation
For Discussion

- How can we generate more researcher-policy implementer collaborations that allow for dynamic experimentation?

- Could such collaborations allow for creative testing of conventional explanations vs. interventions such as those currently being tested?