

Evidence on what works in security and justice programming in fragile and conflict-affected settings (FCAS) around the world is limited and mixed. Most of the literature focuses primarily on the effectiveness of outputs, with very little focused on longer-term, indirect, or less tangible results. There is little or no evidence that answers how security and justice build social contracts and social covenants to build longer-term peace and stability.

Findings from the literature review include:

- The largest body of evidence (10 studies) relates to capacity building interventions which show primarily individual or short-term outcomes relates to knowledge, skills, awareness and technical ability.
- Limited evidence on community-driven interventions showed effectiveness was mixed.
 - There are some areas of promise in, for example, improving community perceptions of security and justice actors, but limited evidence that this improved delivery or sustainability.
 - Effectiveness of community-driven interventions in improving coordination within the security and justice sector was mixed.
- Five studies of medium- to high quality evidence on gender-specific interventions were largely capacity building related, although some also looked to change attitudes and norms at both an individual and societal level with the former being more successful.
- There is limited evidence on the effectiveness of accountability interventions in supporting security and justice reform and of interventions that engage with non-state actors (despite some encouraging results in the latter)
- Evidence of the effectiveness of legal aid interventions indicates that the provision of legal aid can improve access to justice, especially to socially disadvantaged members of society.

This review draws on security and justice mapping, commissioned by FCDO (then DFID) in 2019.¹

Category of intervention	Assessment of evidence strength	Examples from
Capacity building	Medium	Afghanistan, DRC, Lebanon, Liberia, Mali, OPTs, Solomon Islands, South Sudan, Timor Leste.
<p>Ten studies found, of which five are assessed as being of high quality, comprising three programme evaluations (Cox et al 2012; Bennet et al 2010; Labda 2011) and two experimental studies in peer-reviewed articles (Blair et al 2015; Karim et al 2016).</p> <p>Three other evaluations are assessed as providing medium quality evidence (Huber & Musleh, 2016; Lombardini & Vigneri 2015; Roseveare et al 2015). The methodologies for these studies reported limitations relating to the availability of data, access and timeframe, which limited the ability of evaluators to attribute findings to the interventions being measured.</p> <p>Two studies are assessed as providing low-quality evidence (Low, 2015; IDLO, 2019) as they provided only limited details of their methodologies</p>		
Community-driven	Limited	Afghanistan, DRC, Mali, Solomon Islands, Timor Leste
<p>Five studies found, including one programme evaluation assessed as providing high-quality evidence (Dinnen & Hayley, 2012).</p> <p>Two other evaluations were graded as medium-quality evidence (Koleros & Stein, 2015; Huber & Musleh, 2016). The former used a quasi-experimental approach nested within an overarching theory-based evaluation design, with quantitative data collected through two cross-sectional representative household sample surveys. However, some key information on sampling methodology was not provided. <i>Continued overleaf</i></p>		

Two programme evaluations were graded as providing low-quality evidence (IDLO, 2019; Low, 2015), as key information about their methodologies was not provided.		Afghanistan, DRC, Mali, Solomon Islands, Timor Leste
Gender-specific	Limited	Afghanistan, DRC, Lebanon, Liberia, OPTs, Timor Leste
Five studies found, including two using an experimental research design graded as high-quality evidence (Karim et al, 2018; Karim et al, 2016). Three programme evaluations were assessed as providing medium-quality evidence (Koleros & Stein, 2015; Lombardini & Vigneri, 2015; Roseveare et al 2015).		
Accountability	Limited	Afghanistan, DRC, Myanmar, OPTs, Timor Leste
Two studies found; one programme evaluation assessed as providing medium-quality evidence (Russel-Einhorn & Tun, 2017), and one evaluation assessed as providing low-quality evidence (Low, 2015).		
Engaging non-state/non-statutory actors	Limited	Afghanistan, Mali, Solomon Islands, Timor Leste
Three studies found, including one graded as high-quality (Dinnen & Hayley, 2012); one as medium-quality (Huber & Musleh, 2016) and one as low-quality evidence (IDLO, 2019).		
Policy	Limited	Afghanistan, DRC
Three programme evaluation found, graded as providing high-quality (Labda 2011) and medium-quality evidence (Huber & Musleh, 2016; Koleros & Stein 2015).		
Legal aid	Limited	Afghanistan, Haiti, Liberia, Lebanon, Myanmar
Four studies found, including two assessed as providing high-quality evidence (Slough & Fariss, 2017; Sandefur & Siddiqi, 2013) and two providing medium-quality evidence (Russel-Einhorn & Tun, 2017; Lombardini & Vigneri, 2015).		

Background

This Briefing Note draws on one of several reports produced as part of a literature review under the Somalia Security and Justice Programme (SSJP), a UK government-funded programme supporting improvements to stability, security, and rule of law in Somalia.

The review is the first step in a six-month research process that will inform the design and delivery of primary quantitative and qualitative research on security and justice practices, priorities and norms in Somalia. It explored 'evidence of effective strategies to use security and justice reform to build the social contract and social covenant as a contribution to longer term peace and stability' in Somalia. It reviewed literature from Somalia and other fragile and conflict-affected states (FCAS) on security and justice interventions, social norms interventions and access to justice for women, girls and those from minority groups. The review offers an assessment of the quality of evidence based on DFID (2014) *How To Note: Assessing the strength of evidence*. (UK: London).

¹ Bell et al (2019). *Security and Justice Evidence Mapping Update*, GSDRC.
<https://gsdrc.org/publications/security-and-justice-evidence-mapping-update/>

For further information, please visit www.ssjprog.org SSJP, the Somalia Security and Justice Programme is a UK government-funded programme supporting improvements to stability, security and the rule of law in Somalia.