JOURNAL FOR DERADICALIZATION

Winter 2024/25
No. 41
ISSN: 2363-9849

Principles for Community Development Programming to Address Violent and Hateful Extremism

Leanne M. Kelly[a,d,1], Anthony Ware[b,d], Greg Barton[c,d]

[a]Postdoctoral Research Fellow, Alfred Deakin Institute, Deakin University, Burwood, Australia, [b]Associate Professor in International and Community Development, Deakin University, [c]Research Professor in Global Islamic Politics, Deakin University, [d]School of Strategic and Global Studies, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia

Abstract

This article outlines five principles for community development (primary level) programming to address violent and hateful extremism: focus on the local; strengthen capability; enhance inclusivity; foster connection; and monitor, evaluate, and learn. These principles were identified through a systematic review of programs for preventing and countering violent extremism (P/CVE) facilitated by civil society organisations (CSOs). Findings from the systematic review are presented in this article to outline a framework, which is then examined in action—using an Indonesian community P/CVE program as an example—to assess the principles' applicability and relevance in practice. The purpose of this article is to present a list of evidence-based practice principles to support design and evaluation of community development programming that seeks to address violent and hateful extremism. The article probes the question: Do these principles adequately serve their intended purpose (to support evidence-based design and evaluation) in the context of P/CVE initiatives? This inquiry is intended to enrich the dialogue among practitioners, policymakers, and scholars engaged in formulating and executing strategies to combat violent and hateful extremism. By anchoring its analysis in tangible community experiences and perspectives, the paper offers a pragmatic, evidence-informed framework for CSOs operating in the sphere of P/CVE, thereby contributing to both academic discourse and practical implementation strategies.

Article History

Received Mar 20, 2024

Accepted Nov 16, 2024

Published Dec 27, 2024

Keywords: P/CVE, Indonesia, Women, Community Development, Violent Extremism, Civil Society, Non-Government Organisation, Evaluation, Hateful Extremism

Introduction

Violent and hateful extremism is a global challenge, threatening peace, security, and social harmony across diverse communities. The complexity of this phenomenon, with roots in a confluence of socio-political, economic, and cultural factors, calls for multifaceted responses.

[1] Corresponding Author Contact: Leanne Kelly, Email: kelea@deakin.edu.au, Deakin University, 221 Burwood Hwy, Burwood, Victoria, Australia

Community development-focused civil society organisations (CSOs) implement interventions that help prevent individuals from adopting divisive hateful and violent ideologies and support community resilience against extremism by understanding and addressing the underlying push factors and the appeal of extremist ideologies (Ware et al., 2023; Kessels & Nemr, 2016). Many organisations work on the issue at other levels, for example with programs for deradicalisation and reintegration. However, community development CSOs work at the whole community level, and thus focus on early intervention to address drivers more than responding to manifestations of the issue. Both are needed, of course, and most CSOs working in this community development space design and implement programs in communities aimed at doing more than just preventing and countering violent extremism (P/CVE). Programming is at the primary level (meaning whole society prevention rather than targeting already radicalised individuals), often embedded within broader community development and peacebuilding initiatives. These are the programs on which we are focusing in this article.

This article outlines five principles for community development programming to address violent and hateful extremism identified through a systematic review of CSO-facilitated P/CVE programs. These principles are: focus on the local; strengthen capability; enhance inclusivity; foster connection; and monitor, evaluate, and learn, as detailed later. While these seem like commonly acknowledged principles of community development practice, this article proposes and examines them as a framework for the design and evaluation of P/CVE programming. The main body of the paper then adopts them to examine a case study program claiming to address P/CVE via a community development approach: the Peace Village program of the Indonesian CSO, the Wahid Foundation. This analysis both uses the case study program to assess the strengths and weakness of the principles as a framework, and uses the framework to analyse the community development program.

To facilitate this dual purpose, the article is split into two main sections. The first develops the framework of principles from the findings from our systematic review of the literature on this subject, which will be published in detail elsewhere. The second section examines these principles in action, using the Indonesian P/CVE program and examining the program in light of the principles, as a case study, to assess the principles' applicability and

relevance in practice. As the article is centred around these two studies, each of the two sections begins with an overview of the methodology, followed by presentation of the findings. After presenting the evidence for and practical implications of the principles in the main body of this paper, the discussion and conclusions highlight how the principles can be operationalised to support the design and evaluation of primary level P/CVE programming.

Systematic Review of Primary Level P/CVE Programs

In early 2024, we completed a systematic review of both peer-reviewed and grey research and evaluation literature regarding primary level P/CVE programming facilitated by CSOs (Kelly et al., 2024a). The objective of the review was to surface themes commonly reported throughout evaluations and research on this topic, to understand what is working well, what is challenging, and what recommendations are suggested for improvement and further research. This full systematic review will be published in detail elsewhere; the literature section of this paper therefore summarises these findings as a framework for the body of this paper.

By focusing on empirical studies that provide insights into the daily operations of P/CVE programs at the community level, the systematic review data was re-analysed for this article to distil key principles that can guide future efforts in community development P/CVE contexts. The purpose of incorporating the systematic review data in the current article is to outline essential practice principles highlighted across the 137 source articles, as a potential framework for designing and evaluating programs of community development CSOs. It is important to note that the systematic review excludes analyses of secondary and tertiary interventions targeting individuals at higher risk or those already radicalised, thus maintaining a focus on broad-based community strategies.

This section briefly explains the methodology utilised to conduct the systematic review, then outlines the practice principles identified by the study, before section two unpacks how these principles apply in a real-world setting.

Systematic Review Methodology

The systematic review followed the PRISMA 2020 guidelines (Moher et al., 2015; Page et al., 2021) to ensure a rigorous approach to synthesising existing literature. This systematic method was selected to enhance the more common informal scoping and rapid review methodologies found in adjacent research topics (e.g., Pistone et al., 2019). The process began with a rapid literature search to assess the feasibility of a systematic review, followed by the development of a research protocol by the first author, which was then refined by the second and third authors.

Given the extensive literature on the impact of P/CVE programs, a specific focus was chosen to prevent overlap with prior studies and to zero in on community-level interventions by development CSOs. The search was unrestricted by geography but limited to English-language sources, excluding works that focus on securitised counterterrorism, deradicalisation/reintegration, and programming for 'at risk' individuals.

Contrary to typical systematic reviews that exclude low-quality studies, our approach aimed for a comprehensive overview, incorporating insights from both peer-reviewed and grey literature including CSO-led and academic sources. As Pawson (2006) noted, even methodologically weak studies can provide valuable insights if carefully analysed. The source quality was evaluated using Hassan et al.'s (2021) checklist, leading to the exclusion of only two papers based on our inclusive criteria. The first author and a research assistant meticulously reviewed each source against the inclusion/exclusion criteria.

The initial search was conducted in November-December 2021, with subsequent searches in January 2024. Search terms were adapted to the scale of the database, ranging from broad terms like 'violent extremism' to specific combinations relevant to community and CSO involvement in P/CVE. The exclusion criteria were strict, focusing solely on community-level CSO-implemented programs and excluding related but non-specific topics. The search yielded 18,893 hits, with 15,828 excluded after title review. A closer examination of 3,065 abstracts and some full texts led to further exclusions, resulting in a longlist of 716 records. After removing duplicates, 419 sources were shortlisted. After closer reading of the full texts, 137 sources met our criteria, detailing 129 distinct studies.

The sources spanned a wide temporal range, from 2008 to 2023, and included a diverse array of publications from theses and industry reports to journal articles and book chapters. The review revealed a predominant focus on qualitative and mixed-methods research, employing a variety of data collection methods from surveys to social media analysis. Geographically, the majority of studies focused on Africa, followed by Asia and Europe, with significant contributions also from the Middle East and the Americas. Kenya emerged as the most studied country in this context.

The 137 sources were analysed using grounded theory to inductively identify themes without presupposing specific outcomes, as outlined by Bandara et al. (2015) and others. This approach allowed for a comprehensive review of the interventions, with findings triangulated against existing theoretical and review literature. The thematic analysis conducted for this article identified five key principles from the systematic review data. These are outlined in the proceeding section.

Five principles for primary level P/CVE programming

The practice principles laid out in this section summarise the findings of the systematic review of 137 sources that provided empirical data on primary level P/CVE programs implemented by CSOs. As mentioned previously, the full analysis will be published separately (Kelly et al., 2024a); therefore, this section provides only an overview of that detailed analysis. Each of the five principles were commonly discussed throughout the 137 sources and there was broad agreement of their presumed value to primary level P/CVE programming. Simply identifying these principles as key themes in the systematic review data only confirms information that we already know: We know that it is important to focus on the local; strengthen capability; enhance inclusivity; foster connection; and monitor, evaluate, and learn. Thus, the contribution of this article is to provide an evidence base for these five most prevalent principles in primary level P/CVE programming, as identified through systematic review of the 137 sources, and then to use our own empirical fieldwork to conduct an in-depth examination of how these principles are operationalised in a single case study P/CVE program.

Focus on the local

The systematic review literature makes it clear that to be effective, primary level P/CVE programs should be tailored to the specific needs, challenges, and cultural contexts of the community they serve (MacLeod 2021). The effectiveness of CSO programming in P/CVE hinges on its ability to understand and integrate into the local context. This includes recognising the unique socio-cultural dynamics, historical grievances, economic challenges, and political landscapes within which violent and hateful extremism may find fertile ground (Letsch, 2018). Moreover, the evolving nature of extremism necessitates adaptable and responsive programming that actively involves locals to ensure community ownership, relevance, and meaningfulness (Finn et al., 2016). As such, a one-size-fits-all approach rarely addresses the unique nuances of individual communities (Hassan et al., 2021).

This argument is consistent with a wealth of other development and peace literature. For example, development practice has long championed the need for bottom-up community-driven programming that places local needs and strengths at the centre of CSO activities and promotes active participation of community members in the design and implementation of programs (Chambers 1983; Lederach, 1997). Mobilising and training community leaders and influencers also strengthens trust and facilitates the wider acceptance, relevance, and credibility of a program (Barzegar et al., 2016). Ensuring programs tackle the facilitating conditions of violent extremism, such as systemic issues of discrimination or injustice, is vital (Holmes, 2017; Schirch, 2018; World Bank, 2016). Programs that address various local enablers of extremism simultaneously, such as economic, social, psychological, and ideological factors, tend to be more successful (Borum, 2011). This includes looking at the deep reasons for conflict in the intervention location, like unequal poverty or resource distribution, and addressing those through multi-faceted strategies (Collier & Hoeffler, 2004).

Strengthen capability

Primary level P/CVE programming emphasises skill development, and economic and social empowerment. The application of conflict prevention mechanisms and the enhancement of community resources for safety are also critical (Simpson, 2020). Capability development is applicable across all areas of social and economic life, including livelihood

and more general empowerment. Educational programs that promote tolerance of diversity, critical thinking, and awareness of extremist ideologies alongside or within other programming are a notable means of building resilience to resist extremist propaganda and manipulative narratives (Aly et al., 2014). The provision of training in conflict resolution and communication skills equips individuals with the necessary tools to navigate and resolve disputes peacefully, thereby reducing the likelihood of escalation into violent conflict and helping people navigate risks and uncertainty (Simpson, 2020).

Creation of economic opportunities through vocational training and microbusiness support can also help, in large part by addressing economic grievances and inequality, which can increase vulnerability to extremist recruitment and ideology (Hassan et al., 2023). The link between economic empowerment, social development, and countering extremism is well-documented, with a focus on addressing the underlying factors of marginalisation and disenfranchisement that fuel extremist ideologies (Voluvik, 2021; Kurtz et al., 2016). These strategies contribute to a more secure and stable community environment, reducing the appeal and impact of extremist rhetoric and activities (Kurtz et al., 2016).

Good practice builds on local capabilities and ensures the sustainability of efforts. Development interventions should aim to strengthen local capabilities and not create dependencies. Sustainable programming supports the benefits and impacts of these initiatives enduring beyond the life of the project.

Enhance inclusivity

Recruitment to extremism exploits feelings of exclusion and marginalisation (Kessels & Nemr, 2016). Enhancing inclusivity is a strategic priority for community development CSOs, regardless of whether they have express P/CVE goals, and this focus has a direct positive impact on P/CVE (Slavova & Simpson, 2018). Inclusion encourages appreciation of diverse perspectives, behaviours, and experiences, welcoming the participation of otherwise marginalised individuals while promoting tolerance and holistic solutions that address a wide range of issues and the grievances of various community groups. Furthermore, when individuals feel their voices are heard and their needs addressed, they are more likely to

actively participate and take ownership of initiatives, thereby extending programs' longevity and impact (Ife, 2016).

Given youth are the primary targets of extremist recruitment, their engagement and empowerment are crucial. Best practice involves education, mentorship, and platforms for youth voice and involvement in community leadership. Such initiatives help by providing alternatives to extremist narratives and foster a sense of purpose and belonging (Bjørgo & Horgan, 2009; Herrmann-DeLuca et al., 2021), vital for strengthening resilience against extremism (Slavova & Simpson, 2018).

An inclusive approach is particularly relevant in addressing gender-specific dynamics within extremism, leveraging the unique roles and influences of women and men in both perpetuating and countering radical narratives (Cunningham, 2007; Kimmel, 2018). Women and men might be driven towards extremist ideologies for different reasons, often intertwined with gender norms and expectations. For instance, some women might be drawn to extremist groups because the group promises empowerment in a context in which they feel disempowered (Bloom, 2011). In many contexts, extremist ideologies are also closely tied to toxic masculinity, where violence and dominance are seen as ways of reclaiming threatened authority. Effective programs address these toxic narratives wherever possible (Kimmel, 2018). It is important when adopting a gender-lens, however, to give thoughtful consideration to mitigating unintended impacts, such as blame for failure to achieve unrealistic expectations placed upon mothers to identify and address early signs of extremism within their families and communities (True et al., 2018; Herrmann-DeLuca et al., 2021).

Since marginalised groups are often primary targets of extremist recruitment, the literature highlights that it is vital to engage with them directly, addressing vulnerabilities and drivers, and ensuring they have the resources to resist these overtures. Members of marginalised groups should be represented in the design, implementation, and evaluation of programs, alongside the more empowered, reducing barriers and enhancing social cohesion (Kelly et al., 2024b). Involvement promotes ownership, and their insights make programs more relevant and effective (UNDP, 2016).

Foster connection and cohesion

Social connection, anchored in the principles of trust-building, multi-stakeholder collaboration, and community engagement, is well documented as an important facet of resilient and healthy communities (Ife, 2016; Putnam, 2000). The systematic review highlighted that initiatives designed to foster understanding and trust across diverse ethnic, religious, and social groups are key to reducing the appeal of extremist and divisive narratives (Slavova & Simpson, 2018). Trust is a foundation of peace; activities that bring different groups together can help build acceptance and understanding (Kessels & Nemr, 2016; Schirch, 2018).

The concepts of bonding, bridging, and linking capital are integral to these efforts (Grossman et al., 2022). While bonding capital refers to strengthened connections between members of the same group, bridging capital links across different groups such as between members of diverse religions or ethnicities (Putnam, 2000). Such practices cultivate mutual understanding, respect, and tolerance among various community groups (Voluvik, 2021). Meanwhile, linking capital is characterised by the engagement and collaboration of diverse stakeholders, including local authorities, international organisations, government agencies, civil society, and religious institutions (Putnam, 2000). These vertical linkages enable a comprehensive response to extremism by helping vulnerable people with access to decision-makers and resources, and leveraging the strengths, resources, and insights of different groups (Herrmann-DeLuca et al., 2021).

Positive bonding, bridging, and linking engagement promotes trust, knowledge, and resource sharing, and strengthens the overall impact of P/CVE initiatives (Herrmann-DeLuca et al., 2021). Increasing citizen engagement with leaders at various levels is essential for connecting the state and its citizens. In a best-case scenario, this can result in community members having the ability to voice grievance and trust it will be heard; thus, enabling non-violent conflict management (Simpson, 2020). The creation and nurturing of social connections in P/CVE programming is a multifaceted process that requires the integration of trust-building initiatives, intergroup dialogues, and collaborative partnerships across various societal levels. These efforts are instrumental in fostering cohesive communities capable of resisting extremist influences and promoting peace and tolerance.

Monitor, evaluate, and learn

The literature emphasises that effective development CSO programming for P/CVE requires a well-articulated theory of change that focuses on outcomes and impact (Brett, 2023). Designing programs with goals in mind supports longevity and provides outcomes for the implementing organisation to measure success. Continuous monitoring and evaluation mechanisms support CSOs to improve and refine their strategies based on real-time feedback and changing circumstances (Kelly et al., 2022). Regularly evaluating effectiveness and being willing to adapt is essential to ensuring that programs remain relevant and impactful. This regular evaluation includes both formalised reviews and informal 'everyday' evaluation techniques, such as reflective practice, check-in circles, and analysis of stakeholder feedback (Kelly & Rogers, 2022).

These five principles highlight the importance of contextually grounded, inclusive, and sustainable approaches that emphasise strengths-based, community-led design with integration of regular feedback loops. All such practices share a common goal of addressing both the symptoms and enabling conditions of extremism, thereby contributing to lasting peace and stability. This framework of principles is tested for usefulness in this article using the Indonesian case study introduced below.

Case Study: The Indonesian Wahid Foundation 'Peace Village' program

This section examines these principles in a real-world setting, evaluating them in light of the claims of this CSO about the effectiveness of their Peace Village community development program in addressing P/CVE. We use the 'Peace Village' primary level P/CVE program as a case study to critique the operationalisation of the principles to 1) assess the strengths and weaknesses apparent in implementation of the principles, 2) gauge the effectiveness of the program against the principles derived in the systemic review, and 3) provide a reflective framework to guide the evaluation of other primary level P/CVE programs. This reflective framework could be used during different phases of the program cycle: in design, implementation, or at closure. It could be used informally by program personnel or community recipients to monitor and improve a program's functioning. Or it could be a

framework for scholarly evaluation of these programs. Beginning with an overview of the case study Peace Village program, this section then outlines the methodology we used to conduct research on this program, which is followed by our findings that assess the program's ability to implement the five principles.

Commencing in 2017, the Peace Village program is an initiative of the Wahid Foundation with financial support from UN Women and other donors. Need for this primary level P/CVE program was identified as recent trends indicate the growth of social conservatism and religious exclusivism across Indonesia, which helps fuel recruitment into violent extremist networks (Sonrexa et al., 2023; Barton et al., 2019). Despite the notable success of Indonesia's counterterrorism unit, Densus 88, and other stakeholders, terrorist networks continue to operate across Indonesia.

The gender aspect in these developments has gained attention, noting that women are not only peacemakers and victims but may also be involved in extremist networks, as recruiters, supporters, or participants. In articulating their theory of change for the Peace Village program, Voluvik (2021) argues that a sense of boredom and lack of purpose can make women more susceptible to extremist ideologies that seem to offer a sense of meaning. Women may also join extremist groups to maintain connections with radicalised family members or friends, or in response to financial inducements offered by these groups. The Wahid Foundation's activities are designed to address each of these vulnerabilities. Additionally, the Foundation draws on research suggesting the influential role of women, particularly mothers, in instilling values within their families (True et al., 2018; Voluvik, 2021). In practice, their theory of change also demonstrates a belief in women's potential for peace leadership and inclusive community building.

As such, the Peace Village program aims to strengthen values of diversity and peace through supporting women in Indonesia to contribute to village governance and infuse local policies with peace-promoting values. The premise of the Peace Village initiative is that strengthening women's independence and confidence help empower them to exercise their rights and responsibilities, and to rise in leadership, and that this will lead to them becoming more resilient in their responses to misogynist extremist ideologies in the community. The program promotes this independence and confidence through economic support for women's

ventures, peace-focused education, connections with government, and training local facilitators for sustainable progress.

Becoming a Peace Village is seen as a significant achievement for the communities involved. Villages undergo a comprehensive process, including the formation of women's groups and stakeholder engagement, before being recognised as Peace Villages. These women's groups, centred largely around microfinancing and entrepreneurship, receive training in various business-related skills and serve to unite residents and foster connections among diverse community members. In the next phase, the program broadens its scope beyond economics to include peacebuilding and gender equality training. This training covers introspection, understanding of conflict and peace, the role of participants in Islam, and their responsibilities as agents of peace, rooted in the values of former President Abdurrahman Wahid (Gus Dur).

Following the establishment and training of women's groups, the focus shifts to empowering these women to drive ongoing community development and peace initiatives and assume active roles in local governance. This involves collaboration with local government and community representatives to form a working group, or *Pokja*. The *Pokja* group in each village is thus comprised of residents and membership is roughly distributed between genders with perhaps more females than males. These groups are instrumental in developing a peace declaration action plan, embodying the village's commitment to peace, inclusion, and equity. The official recognition of a Peace Village is a celebratory event marked by the signing of this action plan agreement by community leaders and government authorities.

Once designated, Peace Villages implement a variety of activities, such as setting up support centres for domestic violence victims, forming taskforces for local issues, establishing reporting mechanisms, skill-sharing, and training, all aimed at fulfilling their commitment to the agreement. The realisation of these goals heavily depends on the community's engagement, effort, and perseverance. The CSO's role thus pivots around capacity building for local facilitators to ensure the program's sustainability and contextual relevance, even after the organisation's direct involvement ends. This approach ensures the program remains sensitive to local contexts and is rooted in substantial community involvement and relevance.

Methodology

We collaborated with the Wahid Foundation who implements the Peace Village program on a broader research project around violent and hateful extremism (Ware et al., 2023). As part of our collaboration, we offered to conduct an external evaluation of their Peace Village program (Kelly et al., 2023), on the proviso that we could also use the data collected from program participants for our other research purposes.

The fieldwork for this study was conducted in two phases: the first in January-February 2023 and the second in September-October 2023. In total, we collected data in 19 Peace Villages across Central, East, and West Java. This involved conducting 50 focus group discussions (FGDs) with 371 village residents, and 8 unstructured interviews with community leaders and Wahid Foundation personnel (see Table 1). Village selection was non-random: these villages were sites of programming selected by the Wahid Foundation, because they were in areas known to have a high rate of intolerance and all were designated Peace Villages. The Wahid Foundation had already phased out support for some of the Peace Villages we visited, and was still active in others.

Table 1 - Peace Village data collection 2023

	NO# VILLAGES	NO# FGDS	PARTICIPANTS	MALE	FEMALE
PHASE 1	10	14	159	42	117
PHASE 2	9	36	212	78	134
TOTAL	19	50	371	120	251

Focus group discussions were segregated into four key groups: heads of households, women, youth, and Peace Village resident leadership team members (*Pokja*). Focus groups had an average of seven participants and went for between 90 and 120 minutes. Reflecting the demographic makeup of these regions, the vast majority of participants were Muslim, with minimal representation from other religions.

The authors of this paper conducted the focus group sessions personally, in partnership with Indonesian researchers from Universitas Indonesia and competent interpreters, which

enabled ethical navigation of potentially uncomfortable topics. Their role was vital in facilitating discussions, determining when a particular subject warranted further unpacking, or pivoting when it was time to move to a different topic. This methodology was guided by rigorous ethical considerations with ethics approval granted by Deakin University, Melbourne.

We analysed the Peace Village fieldwork data by grouping the data around the five principles, which we had previously identified using a grounded approach in analysis of the systematic review data. As there was a significant volume of data from the 50 FGDs, we conducted a thematic analysis of the fieldwork data within each of the five themes to identify sub-themes that were commonly raised in relation to the principles. Isolation of these sub-themes could help support a more detailed list of principles, and a stronger framework for analysis, for CSOs and others to use to design and evaluate primary level P/CVE programs.

The five principle framework in action

Analysing the results from the Peace Villages' FGD data against the principles for primary level P/CVE programming identified in the systematic review offers a case study of how the principles can be implemented in practice. Conducting an additional analysis of sub-themes within the FGD data highlighted important elements of each principle. This exercise tests the suitability of the principles from the literature in a real-world setting and thus provides both an example and an evaluation. This piloting assesses the appropriateness and relevance of the principles, and also outlines a framework of analysis that could guide program design and evaluation, as will be discussed later in this article.

Focus on the local

When analysing the FGD data against the principle 'focus on the local', four elements of this principle emerged from the data: multi-faceted strategies, context sensitivity, community-led approach, and needs-based programming.

Multi-faceted strategies to address the conditions that promote extremism: FGD and interview data showed that the Peace Village program employ holistic strategies that combine cultural, economic, social, and security aspects to counter extremism. It emphasises training in peace, tolerance, and harmony, creatively integrated into other economic and cultural activities. For instance, in one village, residents designed traditional carvings for their interfaith Peace House [*Griya Demai*] and conducted a festival attended by 10,000 people, discussing peace and extremism through culture and arts. This approach not only educates but also strengthens community bonds. Another example is women's economic empowerment, discussed in detail below.

Despite some resistance at governance levels and among male community members, this focus remains vital for promoting gender equality and economic inclusivity. Additionally, women's protection units, crisis centres, and hotlines support victims of gender-based violence, enhancing safety and promoting gender equity. The increase in reporting domestic violence incidents appears to indicate growing trust in these support systems.

The program also establishes community-based security systems, collaborating with local police and stakeholders. Taskforces monitor signs of extremism, combining proactive and reactive measures. This structure empowers residents to take proactive roles in ensuring the safety and wellbeing of their community, thereby fostering a sense of collective responsibility and trust. Its effectiveness is suggested in numerous positive comments from participants, such as the statement "The villages have become more harmonious and peaceful... as people were encouraged to take responsibility for the safety and wellbeing of others".

Tailoring programs to community contexts: The Peace Village program employs context sensitivity by adapting to local cultural, social, and economic environments. It gains cultural legitimacy by involving religious and community leaders in planning, ensuring activities align with local values and traditions. This is evident in its engagement with cultural and artistic events that promote peace and tolerance education.

The program flexibly responds to dynamic needs. For instance, during the Covid-19 pandemic, female entrepreneurs adapted their businesses to online platforms, expanding their market reach. This agility reflects the program's sensitivity to varying circumstances.

The program occasionally encounters tensions in reconciling local traditions with its broader goals of tolerance and inclusivity. This is particularly evident in the subtle resistance to gender-focused programming, as exemplified by a woman's comment about her participation in the program: "My husband...doesn't block it, but he doesn't encourage it." Such remarks underscore the difficulties in cultural adaptation, especially in areas where traditional norms may conflict with program objectives.

Moreover, while the program's messaging generally encounters minimal resistance, there is a notable reluctance to address certain sensitive topics, such as LGBTQIA+ inclusion. This hesitancy suggests that some communities might not be as open to the concept of a fully inclusive and tolerant society as the program's narrative and promotion imply (for more details, see Kelly et al., in press). Navigating culturally sensitive topics appropriately is difficult and requires further consideration.

Community-led design and implementation: The Peace Village initiative exhibits a strong commitment to community-led implementation. However, Wahid Foundation personnel encountered initial resistance in some villages, particularly from male community and religious leaders. This opposition often stemmed from misconceptions about the Foundation's intentions, with conservative Islamic groups sometimes misinterpreting its efforts as adversarial to Islam or being overly liberal, or from locals reluctant to acknowledge conflict and insecurity existed in their village. This resistance, though generally minor and surmountable, underlines the sensitive balance needed in community-led projects. The Foundation's approach to mitigating these tensions involves extensive discussions, delaying Peace Village designation until there is deep involvement and commitment from local leadership, and nurturing relationships with village governance structures. This highlights their strategic focus on community engagement and buy-in from the very beginning.

The formation of community taskforces and neighbourhood watch initiatives was noted by participants as an effective strategy for fostering sustainable local engagement and

ownership over P/CVE efforts. These groups, managed by community members with specific roles and responsibilities, embed within local dynamics. The inclusion of religious and cultural leaders, coupled with responsive community discussions and feedback mechanisms, signals an adaptive approach valuing community input, varying from context to context. While these taskforces were largely viewed by focus group participants as effective and useful, a minority of participants mentioned fears of community overreporting and, conversely, backlash against reporters, which highlights an area for continual vigilance and reassurance.

Noting that Peace Villages continue their initiatives after formal Wahid Foundation support ends, personnel credited this to rapport building with community members and positioning religious and community leaders as key stakeholders in combatting violence and hatefulness. Integrating Peace Village goals into official village regulations and decrees showcased an understanding of the importance of local legitimacy for effective P/CVE efforts. Further, this collaborative approach with various stakeholders with differing levels of power supports sustainability through community ownership and integration into local governance structures.

Addressing local needs: The Peace Village program targets economic and social issues to combat violent and hateful extremism. Its initiatives in economic empowerment, interfaith dialogue, awareness-raising, and combating gender-based violence aim to lessen the allure of extremist ideologies (Holmes, 2017). As a cornerstone of the Peace Village approach, women's economic empowerment efforts have been notably successful. Participants have moved from subsistence to financial stability, benefiting not just individuals but entire communities in terms of economic, knowledge, security, and social improvements (Kelly et al., 2023). The key observation from the focus groups was that the approach in each context was grounded in local priorities and needs.

Nevertheless, efforts in addressing grievances are often met with resistance from the alleged bad actors or those who would prefer to retain power relations and the status quo (Badurdeen & Goldsmith, 2018). Some village leaders were initially reluctant to join or support the program, and there were cases of husbands opposing their wives' participation.

Additionally, external threats from conservative Islamic groups, using sermons, leaflets, and social media, have created risks and hesitancy among some villagers. Such resistance highlights the challenges in implementing P/CVE programs in conservative areas with a reputation for intolerance and extremism, where fear of attack or backlash can impact effectiveness and safety.

While the Peace Village program aligns well with the principle 'focus on the local', it faces challenges in fully integrating these ideas across all community segments. Identifying the sub-themes from the FGD data highlighted elements of this principle that could be used as indicators when developing or assessing a program. Examining the Peace Village data against these constructs showed that there is a need for strategies to better engage marginalised groups and address resistance at various community levels. Balancing local traditions with inclusivity and tolerance goals remains a challenge. Future program adaptations should consider social and cultural barriers to participation. This could include proactively engaging men in programming to a much greater extent.

Strengthen capability

When analysing the FGD data against the principle 'strengthen capability', four elements of this principle were clear in the data: economic empowerment, training, conflict prevention, and social welfare.

Economic empowerment: Economic empowerment, particularly of women, is a central aspect of the Peace Village program with participants noting that: "The understanding and skills that the training provided started significant change for women in our community, as it was practical. …We have earned some money and gained financial independence, and the men can see the value in the work we are doing". Women participants reported transitioning from subsistence to financial stability due to practical training in business and financial management (Kelly et al., 2023). This transformation enhanced their status from "just housewives" to successful entrepreneurs, with improved business practices, including hygiene-compliant products, attractive packaging, and effective marketing. Women, once viewing themselves in a lower family role, now feel empowered with enhanced awareness,

agency, and financial management skills, contributing to their households and communities. As one participant expressed, "I've learned to use my voice. I've learned to advocate respectfully and softly, but to always have a voice. Now, I have confidence, as a woman, to use this voice."

Economic empowerment has led to broader societal benefits, including children's education, healthier family diets, and community development. Women are using their businesses to offer employment, support local producers, and provide essential community services. Regular meetings among businesswomen focus on continuous development and inclusion of new entrepreneurs, fostering strong community bonds and collaborative problem-solving.

A key outcome of the Peace Village program is the participants' eagerness to share knowledge and experiences, crucial for the program's sustainability. Women have assumed leadership roles, established businesses, and encouraged peers to engage in program activities. They have initiated their own training sessions, formed empowerment forums, and advocated for peace and tolerance and against extremism.

This empowerment is symbolically represented by some women wearing Peace Village t-shirts, which they made, using them as conversation starters to raise program awareness and encourage participation.

Capability building through training and workshops: The Peace Village program also has a strong focus on training and workshops. Topics range from practical skills like baking, sewing, and financial management to awareness-raising on gender-based violence and resilience against extremism. These sessions contribute to financial self-sufficiency, mutual respect, community cooperation, increased confidence, and overall capability enhancement (Kelly et al., 2023). A voiced by one participant: "The impact has been building harmony and the *Pokja* and people here have more knowledge from Wahid Foundation trainings and workshops. [We] learn from each other and work together".

Some villages sought to expand the reach and impact of these trainings by holding large-scale events to educate about peace and tolerance. Additionally, the program's focus on developing leadership and governance skills within the community, through initiatives like

security taskforces and gender-based violence hubs, is indicative of its comprehensive approach to peace education. Training community leaders who then educate others further extends the program's influence. However, participants in some villages raised that they face challenges with youth engagement when there is no youth group [*Karang Taruna*] or organised place to connect with young people, highlighting the need for strategies specifically tailored to younger demographics.

Conflict prevention mechanisms: The Peace Village program's conflict prevention strategy uses a gradual approach. This method begins with non-controversial training and progressively incorporates information about peace and tolerance, highlighting the importance of trust-building for community acceptance (Slavova & Simpson, 2018). Participants remarked that training sessions increased their understanding of social issues like intolerance and violence and recourses such as legal rights, reporting procedures, risk mitigation, and mediation. As a result, fear and suspicion have been mitigated by positive, solution-focused dialogues and actions. Participants report a newfound ability to resolve conflicts and a stronger inclination to act against social injustices. For example: "I learned how to better resolve conflict and how to focus on building peace and harmony between people in my community", "I gained self-confidence and courage to go against violence, hatefulness, and conspiracy theories", and "I feel empowered and confident because I received the knowledge from the Wahid Foundation".

Alongside training in P/CVE topics, Peace Villages established security taskforces, Women's Crisis Centres, and other mechanisms where community members can report their concerns, seek support, and find solutions, in collaboration with police, village chiefs, and other stakeholders. Participants noted that these mechanisms enhance their feelings of self-efficacy and safety as they have agency when things feel wrong; they know what to do and where to go when they need help. "I feel relieved that I know what to do", explained one community member.

Supporting social welfare: The Peace Village program does not seek to duplicate the work of other social welfare initiatives and government programs, like health and child protection.

Nevertheless, the establishment of Women's Protection Units and Crisis Centres support these areas and collaborate with existing services to offer a joined-up contribution to the local services map. Furthermore, activities such as women's economic empowerment affect social welfare by raising household wealth as well as improving products (e.g., food hygiene) that impact the health of consumers. Additionally, participants observed that the program increased their income enough that they could contribute financially to the community fund, which is available to support projects and advance families who require financial assistance.

Participants actively utilise their newfound skills, resources, and positions to further the objectives of the program, which often includes actions that enhance social welfare. For example, one participant manages a *rumah ramai* [community house] from her residence, offering a nurturing environment for children lacking parental care. Through her simultaneous role in the *Pokja* working group, she advocates and organises initiatives aimed at supporting effective parenting, such as parenting classes and resources. "I have always helped children who need me, but after engaging in the Peace Village activities, I am now more prepared to extend my support further to the wider community," she explained.

Thus, the program contributes to strengthen capability through empowering women, fostering skills necessary for effective governance and leadership, and enhancing community capacities to prevent extremism. Participants reported feeling more invested and active in fostering a society that values gender equality and peace and that repels hateful and violent ideologies. They expressed similar sentiments including: "The Peace Village has changed my mindset. I used to want to just be average, not to stand out. Now I want to act fairly and be a decision-maker, and I know who I am as a woman", "It [the Peace Village program] made us braver", and "It helped us to express ourselves more freely, for me and my friends".

Enhance inclusivity

Inclusion is a vital aspect of effective P/CVE programming, as demonstrated in the systematic review overviewed the start of this paper. The review of the literature highlighted three key areas requiring inclusion, surrounding youth, gender (with a particular focus on women), and marginalised groups. Evaluating the Peace Village program through an inclusion lens uncovers progress, challenges, and opportunities for improvement. Inclusion and

exclusion was rarely mentioned in the FGDs and we had to deliberately ask probing questions to assess sub-themes of the principle 'enhance inclusivity', despite all participants acknowledging its importance.

Youth involvement: The Peace Village program makes integrating youth (primarily young women) in educational and vocational activities a priority, to prevent marginalisation and vulnerability to radicalisation, as well as build their leadership and capability. The program demonstrates a conscious effort to engage them in community initiatives. Challenges remain, however, in fully capturing youth interest and participation in some villages. Participants noted that it helped when there were pre-established youth groups in the village with which they could connect. Without these platforms, it was sometimes difficult to engage participants and they needed more tailored or appealing approaches to resonate with the youth demographic.

Nonetheless, most villages had successfully engaged youth and were utilising young people's energy to encourage prosocial change-making behaviours. The Peace Village program gave young people opportunities to take leadership roles and develop new activities and initiatives. In one village, young people had a program where they would provide older members of their village with technological support and thus build bridging bonds between generations.

Gender impact and women's empowerment: The program focuses on women's empowerment, viewing it as a key strategy against extremism. Consistent feedback from participants demonstrates the positive shift in women's roles and confidence levels. Nevertheless, the data reveals complex interconnections between traditional patriarchal values and evolving gender dynamics. While many husbands eventually supported their wives' involvement in Peace Village activities, this support often came after observing positive changes (namely household wealth increases), indicating a reactive rather than proactive acceptance and need for women to courageously commence without their husbands' express support. Additionally, the issue of women needing permission from husbands to participate, and husbands' fears that participation would result in wives neglecting domestic duties, point

to persistent gender role expectations. Thus, the program's focus on women's economic empowerment and leadership has had notable successes, but it also navigates cultural sensitivities and resistance, and risks increasing workload responsibilities on women. In fact, the strong focus on women's empowerment may be supported through a deeper gender analysis that resulted in better inclusion of men in the Peace Village program. Ensuring that men's concerns and needs are heard and that their contributions are acknowledged or extended could be beneficial by helping men feel more included in programming (Kimmel, 2018). Having men more onside with the program would not only enhance their wellbeing and sense of purpose, it could support women's access to the program and have a significant influence on the prevention of violent and hateful extremism.

Inclusion of marginalised groups: The Peace Village program makes concerted efforts to include many marginalised segments of the community, including women, religious and ethnic minorities, and economically disadvantaged groups. Initiatives like women's support groups, engagement with religious minorities, leadership opportunities, and economic empowerment activities reflect a commitment to inclusivity. Nevertheless, the data indicates a potential reductionist approach to diversity, with limited exploration of inclusion beyond religion and ethnicity. The lack of discussion around LGBTQIA+ people or people with disabilities, and the stability of long-term *Pokja* group memberships, suggests areas for improvement in fully realising inclusive practices.

The Peace Village program enables youth involvement, consideration of gender, and inclusion of marginalised groups to varying degrees. It shows strong commitment and progress, particularly in women's empowerment, but also reveals areas needing further development to fully embrace inclusivity and diversity. Assessing application of the principle 'enhance inclusion' supported identification of challenges and opportunities for improvement, such as the need for additional youth engagement strategies, navigating complex gender dynamics, and expanding the understanding and practice of inclusivity.

Foster connection and cohesion

A strong thread throughout the focus groups emphasised the positive impact of Peace Village initiatives on social cohesion, connection, and social capital. Participants shared that the Peace Village activities allowed them to concentrate on personal growth, foster friendships, and spark innovative ideas. They described this experience as pivotal, witnessing the emergence of "a new type of happiness". Participants emphasised the empowering effect of social interactions within the Peace Village activities. One woman of Chinese-Indonesian descent recounted her transformation: "Before joining with the Wahid Foundation [activities] I didn't have any confidence. After joining, I socialised a lot more with others and it built my confidence and feeling of self-worth". Another group reflected on the impact of these connections: "We've made friends, strengthened relationships. We feel happy. We've become more confident in ourselves".

Building trust and understanding among diverse groups: An important outcome of the program has been the growing acceptance of diversity and the strengthening of bridging capital. Participants shared how cultural and interfaith activities inspired them to consider diversity and establish connections beyond their immediate social circles. These events disseminated peace and tolerance messages, reinforced community bonds and cultural appreciation, and provided opportunities for participants to broaden their network and enhance skills like public speaking. These events prioritised inclusion of minority ethnic and religious leaders and the active participation of women and youth. Participants from one village spoke about the deep emotional connections within their community, describing them as familial ties that create a natural obligation to look out for each other's wellbeing. This sense of community has grown beyond the confines of women's groups to encompass broader village activities and decision-making forums, as well as events and connections that span across different villages.

Partnering for joined-up approach against violent extremism: The program partners with various stakeholders including local authorities, government agencies, police, military, international organisations, civil society, and religious leaders. This multifaceted

collaboration is evident in the integration of government endorsements, resources from local governance, and the mobilisation of women in leadership roles (Voluvik, 2021). Bringing together diverse institutions for common goals, such as tackling gender-based violence and extremism, has been a key strength of the Peace Village program. This collaboration often led to the formation of panels focused on identifying and addressing local challenges and threats. Participants appreciated the effectiveness of this community-based collective approach, as each member brought unique skills that contribute to the development and execution of practical solutions. The close working relationships between different organisational representatives fostered a deeper understanding of each other's roles and how these roles interconnect to work toward joint efforts.

For example, women in one village sought to improve social policies around conflict and violence. They initiated efforts to tackle violence by mapping out extremist activities and incidents of domestic violence within their locality and conducting a thorough situational analysis. This led to collaboration with other organisations to share insights and create a comprehensive registry of prosocial services. Jointly, they formulated strategies for preparing and responding to issues of violent extremism and gender-based violence.

Enhancing linking capital: Collaboration across various levels of society has supported the functioning of the Peace Village program (Voluvik, 2021). The program is designed to cultivate meaningful vertical relationships and a shared sense of responsibility among government entities, organisations, and community members, both as groups and individuals. This is reflected in the program's efforts to engage women and youth in leadership and peacebuilding activities, and connect them with governance structures.

The endorsement and facilitation of Peace Village activities by government entities, particularly local governments, are crucial for successful implementation. These bodies include district and village level government; the Ministry of Villages, Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration; the National Commission on Violence Against Women; and the Ministry of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection (Voluvik, 2021).

A few local authorities faced criticism for their delayed endorsement and minimal involvement in Peace Village initiatives. Nevertheless, the majority of community members

participating in the focus groups noted the substantial support and resources offered by their local governments. They highlighted the positive role of local governments in offering encouragement to female leaders, sustaining initiatives post-Wahid Foundation's involvement, backing community-driven activities, and aiding in the organisation of forums and consortiums aimed at tackling critical issues like family violence.

The program's initiatives have made meaningful contributions to fostering social cohesion and collaborative governance. However, participants identified challenges around solidifying linking capital in some instances, particularly in securing consistent support from *kelurahan* (ward level) governments for the *Pokja* working groups. On occasions, discrepancies in values and political views between *Pokja* and local government officials posed difficulties. While Wahid Foundation sought to mediate and mentor these relationships, finding a mutual understanding between *Pokja* and the government proved challenging in some rare cases. In certain situations, local government officials appeared apprehensive about aspects of the program, leading to a slowdown in implementation. Their inaction, rather than direct opposition, created hurdles in advancing the P/CVE initiatives. Demonstrating the early successes of the program was often effective in persuading government officials of the program's merit, but this approach did not uniformly yield positive results.

Monitor, evaluate, and learn

The final principle seeks to support a culture of learning and improvement among P/CVE programs and was heavily discussed throughout the literature in the systematic review. Three sub-themes were identified in the FGD data round monitoring, evaluation, and sustainability.

Monitoring and feedback mechanisms: Incorporating regular monitoring and feedback mechanisms is vital for program fidelity, continuous improvement, and effective assessment. Wahid Foundation had formulated several lists of indicators; however, it was unclear if data to measure progress on these indicators was being captured and no structured, standardised approach for collecting this information was evident at the time of our study. Furthermore, while personnel and *Pokja* members mentioned that they regularly discuss the program with

community members, this data was not being systematically recorded, analysed, and shared. In some instances, *Pokja* members commented that they followed up with participants to measure the extent to which training met its intended outcomes. For example, *Pokja* members reported that "80% of participants who came [to train the trainer sessions] have spread the knowledge with their respective groups – they are monitoring every month to make sure the training is happening". This quote implies a commitment to ensuring the ongoing effectiveness and reach of the program, with structured monthly checks to assess the dissemination of knowledge and training, but while this was reported to us, it was not systematically collected by the organisation. While the intention is there, *Pokja* members acknowledge that their data is based on trust via trainees' self-reports. "We aren't monitoring it, but it seems to be happening in practice – they say they're doing it, but we haven't gone to check". Further, this only refers to output data (e.g., number of participants and sessions held), which was almost the only monitoring data collected by the Peace Villages. This suggests a need for more comprehensive oversight and structure to ensure all aspects of the program are consistently monitored and that data is collected that provides evidence for indicators that contribute towards intended outcomes.

A positive example of informal or everyday evaluation (Kelly & Rogers, 2022) is demonstrated in monthly meetings held by local women's groups "where they monitor how the knowledge is delivered to the other women. They talk about what's been done, what the challenges are and what they can do about it". This regular engagement allows for bottom-up evaluation and improvement, ensuring that the program remains responsive and adaptable to the community's needs.

Evaluating impact: The program's impact on community peace and tolerance is evident in the residents' testimonies. They frequently mentioned their peaceful aspirations and noted increased knowledge and self-efficacy in responding to social issues. The mention of early warning taskforces and multiple security teams as effective mechanisms in preventing extremism and violence further highlights the program's positive impact on fostering harmony.

Nevertheless, formal capture of evidence to demonstrate impact could be improved. The program has a theory of change and multiple sets of indicators. However, the indicators are not streamlined and appear to have been created by several different individuals without clarifying an overarching monitoring and evaluation framework, and certainly nothing like that has been developed collaboratively with community members. Despite limited internal evaluation, the program has been externally evaluated by consultants using various frameworks and key evaluation questions. External evaluation could be supported through clarification of a monitoring and evaluation framework.

Sustainability: The Peace Village program has a strong approach to sustainability, which offers useful lessons for other organisations. Wahid Foundation's input is based on transparent and upfront timelines and clear goals that support communities to become established and put mechanisms in place that enable ongoing operation without outside leadership. Respondents from villages where Wahid Foundation's active presence had ceased still reported continued development and empowerment; for example: "Things that were established during Wahid Foundation's involvement are still running although this project has formally ended. This has been quite sustainable." Participants noted the sense of ownership and self-sufficiency in Peace Village communities: "We have motivation to keep going. We are very proud of what we've achieved and want to keep doing more. We feel grateful to be able to do it by ourselves." They highlighted the importance of roles and responsibilities assigned at the community level and the presence of inspiring local leaders as critical factors for sustainability.

Operationalising the principles

This article has analysed evaluation data collected in the Wahid Foundation's Peace Village program communities against five principles for primary level P/CVE programming identified by our systematic review. The purpose of using the Peace Village program as a case study was to test these principles and assess their applicability for supporting the design and evaluation of primary level P/CVE programs. We found that they usefully helped guide our

analysis and that further exploration into sub-themes provided a robust analytical framework for developing and assessing other community P/CVE programs. This section discusses ways in which the principles could be applied and provides further explanation of how the sub-themes could be used to guide program design and evaluation.

A guide for program design

The principles offer five key areas for program designers to build into primary level P/CVE programming, which are centred on concepts of context sensitive community leadership, capacity building, inclusion, social connectivity, and continuous improvement. The sub-themes identified through thematic analysis of Peace Villages data have been reworked in Table 2 to provide points for consideration under each principle.

Table 2 - Program design framework

Principle	*Points for consideration*
Focus on the local	▪ Use multi-faceted strategies to address a spectrum of extremism drivers — economic, social, psychological, and ideological. ▪ Tailor programs to fit the cultural, social, and economic contexts of each community while ensuring adaptation to changing social, political, and economic conditions. ▪ Actively involve communities to lead in designing and implementing programs, ensuring local knowledge and needs guide the process. ▪ Proactively work on addressing underlying economic and social issues and grievances that may fuel extremist ideologies.
Strengthen capability	▪ Equip individuals with conflict resolution, communication, and other relevant skills and knowledge to foster peaceful problem-solving. ▪ Implement educational programs that promote tolerance, critical thinking, and awareness about the dangers of extremist ideologies. ▪ Create economic opportunities, such as training and microbusiness support, to address economic grievances that may lead to extremism. ▪ Support implementation of conflict prevention mechanisms and enhanced community resources for safety. ▪ Develop programs that improve overall social welfare, including health and child protection initiatives.
Enhance inclusivity	▪ Actively involve youth in educational, vocational, and community initiatives to provide purpose and prevent marginalisation. ▪ Consider the impact of gender on the roles and experiences of people in the community in terms of violent extremism and program accordingly. ▪ Leverage women's empowerment as a key strategy for building community resilience against extremism. ▪ Ensure inclusion of marginalised groups that incorporates mechanisms for their active participation.
Foster connection and cohesion	▪ Create initiatives that build trust and understanding within and between different ethnic, religious, and social groups. ▪ Partner with local authorities, government agencies, international organisations, civil society, and religious leaders for a unified and more comprehensive approach against violent extremism that promotes knowledge and resource sharing. ▪ Create opportunities for community members to collaborate with stakeholders at different levels to strengthen linking capital.
Monitor, evaluate, and learn	▪ Incorporate regular monitoring and feedback mechanisms to assess program effectiveness and facilitate necessary adjustments. ▪ Regularly evaluate program impact to assess progress toward outcomes. ▪ Align programs with a sustainability strategy and long-term vision for community development and peacebuilding.

A guide for monitoring and evaluation

As well as supporting program design, the five principles and their sub-themes could provide a foundation for monitoring and evaluation. Table 3 offers a draft example of how these categories could be rephrased whereby principles become outcomes and sub-themes become indicators.

Table 3 - Monitoring and evaluation framework

Outcomes	***Indicators***
People are proactively driving solutions in their community	▪ Number and type of distinct multi-faceted strategies employed to address economic, social, psychological, and ideological drivers of extremism, with assessments of their effectiveness. ▪ Percentage of initiatives tailored to fit the cultural, social, and economic contexts of the community, with documented adaptations made in response to changing conditions. ▪ Percentage of initiatives developed with active community involvement in design and implementation, reflecting local knowledge and needs. ▪ Number and type of initiatives aimed at addressing underlying economic and social grievances linked to extremist ideologies, with community participation documented.
People have skills and capability to achieve their goals	▪ Number of individuals equipped with conflict resolution, communication, and other relevant skills through educational programs, with evidence of knowledge acquisition and real-life skill application. ▪ Number and type of economic opportunities created aimed at addressing economic grievances, with metrics on participant success rates. ▪ Number and type of conflict prevention mechanisms implemented in the community, along with community feedback on perceived safety and effectiveness of these resources. ▪ Number and type of initiatives developed to improve overall social welfare with metrics on participation and impact assessments on community wellbeing.
People feel accepted and included	▪ Number of youth actively involved in educational, vocational, and community initiatives, with qualitative assessments of their sense of purpose and belonging. ▪ Number of programs that specifically consider gender dynamics, with assessment of strategies for enhancing equality. ▪ Percentage of initiatives designed to include marginalised groups, along with assessment of participation and feedback on their experiences.

People are socially connected	▪ Number and type of initiatives aimed at building trust and understanding among different ethnic, religious, and social groups, with qualitative feedback on relationship changes. ▪ Number and type of partnerships established between local authorities, government agencies, international organisations, civil society, and religious leaders, along with documented outcomes related to knowledge and resource sharing. ▪ Number and type of opportunities created for community members to collaborate with various 'vertical' stakeholders, with metrics on participation and perceived changes in social connectivity.
There is a culture of continuous improvement	▪ Number and type of regular monitoring and feedback mechanisms implemented, along with data on how feedback informed adjustments. ▪ Frequency and thoroughness of program impact evaluations conducted, with documented changes made as a result of the evaluations. ▪ Percentage of programs aligned with a sustainability strategy and long-term vision for community development and peacebuilding, including metrics on community involvement in this process.

Conclusion

The five principles identified through our systematic review have been shown relevant in the Wahid Foundation case study, to support the design and evaluation of primary-level P/CVE programs as facilitated by development CSOs and other civil society actors. Each principle is grounded in the P/CVE literature and supported by empirical evidence. At each stage, the principles could be used as a type of checklist to help CSOs ensure a comprehensive, evidence-informed approach. The principles could also be used as a foundation for the articulation of program outcomes and subsequent indicators.

While these principles aim to support comprehensive, evidence-informed P/CVE programming, they are only guidelines and will not necessarily be applicable to all programs. They seek to generate constructive conversations and get people involved in program design. For this reason, the principles are as broad and simple as possible, allowing for creativity and authentic co-inquiry rather than expecting conformity within strict parameters (Hedayah, 2021). As such, the utilisation of these principles should align with the values they promote;

thus, utilisation of the principles should encourage active participation through a strengths-based and learning-focused approach.

Other limitations include that the data collection for the case study was restricted to a specific region and program, which may affect the generalisability of the findings to other contexts. Additionally, the focus group discussions, while rich in qualitative detail, may not capture the full spectrum of community opinions due to the self-selection of participants who are more likely to engage in such discussions. Furthermore, the study does not account for the long-term sustainability of the observed changes, as the follow-up period was not extensive enough to evaluate enduring impacts.

Limitations with the systematic review include that criteria excluded non-English publications and publications that are not in the public domain. Additionally, evaluation designs and results in the included studies were heterogeneous, making comparisons difficult. Further, the evaluations commonly lacked rigor, which impeded reliable evidence of program effectiveness.

As such, there is significant room for further testing and improvement of these principles. While they have been drawn through a systematic review of the empirical literature from development CSOs delivering primary-level P/CVE programs, these could be deepened through inclusion of theoretical literature from P/CVE and beyond. Additionally, they will require adaptation and improvement as more evidence emerges from the field. It would also be helpful to test the principles throughout the lives of various programs to assess their utility at each stage of the program management cycle.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Universitas Indonesia and the Wahid Foundation for their support facilitating the fieldwork for this article.

References

Aly, A., Taylor, E., & Karnovsky, S. (2014). Moral Disengagement and Building Resilience to Violent Extremism: An Education Intervention. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 37(4), 369-385.

Badurdeen, F. & Goldsmith, P. (2018). Initiatives and Perceptions to Counter Violent Extremism in the Coastal Region of Kenya. *Journal for Deradicalization* 16: 70–102.

Barton, G., Husy, D., Kelly, L., Sonrexa, J. & Ware, A. (2019). *Navigating violent and hateful extremism in complex settings: The work of plan International in Myanmar, Indonesia and the Philippines*. Plan International/Deakin University.

Barzegar, A., Powers, S. & el Karhili, N. (2016). *Civic Approaches to Confronting Violent Extremism: Sector Recommendations and Best Practices*. United States Institute for Peace.

Bjørgo, T., & Horgan, J. (2009). *Leaving Terrorism Behind: Individual and Collective Disengagement.* Routledge.

Bloom, M. (2011). Bombshells: Women and Terrorism. *Gender Issues*, 28(1-2), 1-21.

Borum, R. (2011). Radicalization into Violent Extremism I: A Review of Social Science Theories. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 4(4), 7-36.

Brett, J. (2023). Enhancing the quality of P/CVE programming through robust application of theory of change, *Conflict, Security & Development*, *23*(5), 447-464.

Chambers, R. (1983). *Rural Development: Putting the Last First*. Routledge.

Collier, P., & Hoeffler, A. (2004). Greed and grievance in civil war. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 56(4), 563-595.

Cunningham, K. (2007). Countering Female Terrorism. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 30(2), 113-129.

Finn, M., Momani, B., Opatowski, M. & Opondo, M. (2016). Youth Evaluations of CVE/PVE Programming in Kenya in Context. *Journal for Deradicalization* 7, 164–224.

Grossman, M., Hadfield, K., Jefferies, P., Gerrand, V. & Ungar, M. (2022). Youth resilience to violent extremism: Development and validation of the BRAVE measure, *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 34(3), 468-488.

Ife, J. (2016). *Community development in an uncertain world* (2nd Ed.), Cambridge.

Hassan, G., Brouillette-Alarie, S., Ousman, S., Kilinic, D., Savard, E., Varela, W., Lavoie, L. et al. (2021). *A Systematic Review on the Outcomes of Primary and Secondary Prevention Programs in the Field of Violent Radicalization*. Canadian Practitioners Network for the Prevention of Radicalization and Extremist Violence.

Hassan, G., Brouillette-Alarie, S. & Ousman, S. (2023). Risk for violent radicalization: Do primary, secondary and tertiary prevention programmes effectively address risk and protective factors? (pp. 179-212), in C. Logan, R. Borum & P Gill (Eds.) *Violent extremism*, UCL Press.

Hedayah. (2021). *Expert roundtable on psychological resilience to extremism and violent extremism*, International Center of Excellence for Countering Violent Extremism, Hedayah, and the International Institute for Counter-Terrorism (ICT), 1-25. https://hedayah.com/app/uploads/2021/08/Final-Report-Psychological-Resilience-to-Extremism-and-Violent-Extremism_21JUL21.pdf

Herrmann-DeLuca, K., Aktar, R., Khan, S., Karim, K. & Ashraf, W. (2021). *Countering violent extremism: A provincial perspective*. DO2 Learning Agenda Working Group Pakistan, USAID.

Holmes, M. (2017). Preventing Violent Extremism through Peacebuilding. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development* 12 (2): 85–89.

Kelly, L., Goodall, J. & Lombardi, L. (2022). Developing a monitoring and evaluation framework in a humanitarian non-profit organisation using agile methodology. *Disaster Prevention and Management*, 31(5), 536-549.

Kelly, L. & Rogers, A. (2022). *Internal evaluation in non-profit organisations*, Routledge.

Kelly, L., Ware, A. & Barton, G. (2023). *Evaluation of Wahid Foundation's Peace Village program*, Deakin University.

Kelly, L., Ware, A. & Barton, G. (2024a). How development-focused NGOs engage with CVE. *Hedayah international CVE research conference proceedings*, Hedayah, The Hague, 11-13 October.

Kelly, L., Hajistassi, M. & Ramasundram, S. (2024b). Migrant and refugee communities strengthening disaster resilience, *Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, 39(3), 40-58.

Kelly, L., Ware, A., Badry, I., Barton, G. & Ware, V. (in press). There are no gays in the village: Youth perspectives of LGBTQIA+ people in Java, Indonesia, *Journal of Youth Studies*. 10.1080/13676261.2024.2426470

Kessels, E. & Nemr, C. (2016). *Countering Violent Extremism and Development Assistance: Identifying Synergies, Obstacles, and Opportunities*. Global Center on Cooperative Security.

Kimmel, M. (2018). *Healing from hate: How young men get into - and out of - violent extremism*, University of California Press.

Kurtz, J., Wolfe, R. & Tesfaye, B. (2016). *Does youth employment build stability? Evidence from an impact evaluation of vocational training in Afghanistan*. Mercy Corps.

Lederach, J.P. (1997). *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies.* United States Institute of Peace Press.

Letsch, L. (2018). Countering Violent Extremism in Tunisia - between Dependency and Self-Reliance. *Journal for Deradicalization* 17, 163–95.

MacLeod, R. (2021). Engaging Communities in P/CVE Projects in Fragile and Conflict Affected States. In *Researching the Evolution of Countering Violent Extremism*, edited by Farangiz Atamuradova and Sara Zeiger, 97–123, Hedayah.

Pistone, I., Eriksson, E., Beckman, E., Mattson, C. & Sager, M. (2019). A Scoping Review of Interventions for Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism: Current Status and Implications for Future Research. *Journal for Deradicalization* 19: 1–84.

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community,* Simon & Schuster.

Schirch, L. (2018). *The ecology of violent extremism: Perspectives on peacebuilding and human security,* Rowman & Littlefield.

Simpson, R. (2020). *Briefing Paper: Measuring protective factors against violent extremism*, UNDP and International Alert.

Slavova, I. & Simpson, R. (2018). *Making PVE programmes work: Rethinking approaches to the prevention of violent extremism in Lebanon*, International Alert. https://www.international-alert.org/app/uploads/2021/08/Lebanon_MakingPVEProgrammesWork_EN_2019_0.pdf

Sonrexa, J., Kelly, L., Ware, A., & Barton, G. (2023). Perspectives on violent extremism from development-humanitarian NGO staff in Southeast Asia. *Third World Quarterly*, 44(1), 170-189.

True, J., Gordon, E., Johnston, M. & O'Brien, K. (2018). *Empowering Women for Peaceful Communities: Evidence from Indonesia and Bangladesh*. Edited by Roshni Menon and Hanny Cueva-Beteta. UN Women and Monash GPS.

UNDP. (2016). *Preventing Violent Extremism Through Promoting Inclusive Development, Tolerance and Respect for Diversity*. United Nations Development Programme.

Voluvik, V. (2021). Peace Villages, pp. 101-124, in G. Barton, M. Vergani. & Y. Wahid (Eds.), *Countering violent and hateful extremism in Indonesia: Islam, gender and civil society*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Ware, A., Kelly, L. & Barton, G. (2023). Development NGO responses to countering violent extremism and hate, *Conflict, Security & Development, 23*(5), 367-383.

World Bank. (2016). Economic and Social Inclusion to Prevent Violent Extremism. *Middle East and North Africa Economic Monitor*, World Bank, Washington, DC.

About the JD Journal for Deradicalization

The JD Journal for Deradicalization is the world's only peer reviewed periodical for the theory and practice of deradicalization with a wide international audience. Named an "essential journal of our times" (Cheryl LaGuardia, Harvard University) the JD's editorial board of expert advisors includes some of the most renowned scholars in the field of deradicalization studies, such as Prof. Dr. John G. Horgan (Georgia State University); Prof. Dr. Tore Bjørgo (Norwegian Police University College); Prof. Dr. Mark Dechesne (Leiden University); Prof. Dr. Cynthia Miller-Idriss (American University Washington D.C.); Prof. Dr. Julie Chernov Hwang (Goucher College); Prof. Dr. Marco Lombardi, (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore Milano); Dr. Paul Jackson (University of Northampton); Professor Michael Freeden, (University of Nottingham); Professor Hamed El-Sa'id (Manchester Metropolitan University); Prof. Sadeq Rahimi (University of Saskatchewan, Harvard Medical School), Dr. Omar Ashour (University of Exeter), Prof. Neil Ferguson (Liverpool Hope University), Prof. Sarah Marsden (Lancaster University), Prof. Maura Conway (Dublin City University), Dr. Kurt Braddock (American University Washington D.C.), Dr. Michael J. Williams (The Science of P/CVE), Dr. Mary Beth Altier (New York University) and Dr. Aaron Y. Zelin (Washington Institute for Near East Policy), Prof. Dr. Adrian Cherney (University of Queensland), Dr. Wesley S. McCann (RTI International), and Dr. Daren Fisher (Hampton University).

For more information please see: www.journal-derad.com

Twitter: @JD_JournalDerad
Facebook: www.facebook.com/deradicalisation

The JD Journal for Deradicalization is a proud member of the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ).

ISSN: 2363-9849

Editor in Chief: Daniel Koehler