

## Effect of Social Inclusion & Reintegration Activity on Educational Security

The BRA-KDP program had no effect on improving school attendance rates, with limited program impact attributed to its short duration and community-driven approach.

**Geographic region:** East Asia & Pacific

**Effect:** No effect (g=0.000)

**Confidence in study findings:** low ( 1 study with 1 Effect size)

### Short Summary

The study evaluated the Community-Based Reintegration Assistance for Conflict Victims Program (BRA-KDP) in Aceh, Indonesia, which supported conflict-affected communities through block grants to promote local development and reintegration. Using a quasi-experimental design, the study compared outcomes in 1,724 treatment villages across 67 subdistricts with control villages, applying matching and instrumental variable techniques to minimize bias. The findings show no effect on school enrollment or attendance rates between intervention and control groups. The program's short duration and community-driven design limited its capacity to influence educational outcomes.

### Long summary

#### *The intervention*

The Community-Based Assistance for the Reintegration of Conflict Victims (BRA-KDP) focused on community-driven development (CDD), providing block grants to conflict-affected villages, particularly in high-conflict areas. Activities included infrastructure development, livelihood support, and participatory decision-making to promote recovery and reintegration.

#### *How the intervention is expected to work*

The program aimed to empower conflict-affected communities by financing locally identified development projects, including education-related initiatives. By promoting inclusive participation and addressing local service needs, the intervention sought to enhance access to education and improve attendance rates.

#### *The evidence base*

The cell contains one primary study, which was conducted in Indonesia. There is a low to medium degree of consistency in the findings. The details of the study summary are thus provided here,

#### *Evidence findings*

The BRA-KDP program showed **no effect** on school attendance rates. Limited program duration and the community-driven focus constrained its ability to generate measurable improvements in educational security.

### *Included studies*

The cell contains one low, consistent primary study. The detailed cell summary thus provided here:

**Barron (2009):** The study evaluated the Community-Based Reintegration Assistance for Conflict Victims Program (BRA-KDP) in Aceh, Indonesia. This intervention plans to support conflict-affected communities by providing block grants directly to villages. The evaluation used a quasi-experimental design to compare treatment villages that received the program with control villages that did not. Initially planned for two phases across Aceh, only the first phase was completed. Conducted from August to the following year, the program targeted 1,724 villages—about one-third of Aceh's total—across 67 rural sub districts chosen for their conflict impact and success in fund disbursement, ensuring all villages in these sub districts received block grants. To address selection bias, the researchers utilized matching techniques, where treatment villages were matched with control villages based on factors like conflict exposure and village characteristics to ensure comparability. An instrumental variables approach addressed non-compliance and confounding factors, isolating the program's effects. Alternative specifications were used to test the robustness of findings, particularly regarding social divisions and conflict escalation.

The research examined school enrollment rates and found no significant differences in educational outcomes between communities involved in the BPD program and those that were not. There is also limited evidence of improvements in education within project areas. Additionally, the study assessed violence escalation, conflict resolution, material well-being (poverty reduction and asset ownership), social cohesion (social acceptance and community participation), trust in government, welfare perceptions, and infrastructure development. The study is rated as a low confidence.

### *Confidence assessment*

Overall, the cell is rated as low due to the small (n) in the cell and the presence of low confidence in the findings.

### *Link to review study summaries:*

Lwamba Etienne (2022).

The study may be accessed via EGM.

### **The other outcomes assessed in the study**

**Social cohesion/**Feeling of trust & acceptance of diversity. Sense of belonging

**Human security/**Economic security, Education security, Health security,

**Community & state governance/**Government performance,

**Violence or atrocity prevention/**Nature and scale of violence or atrocities