1.1 **Evidence guide**: How strong is the empirical evidence that approaches used in safety, security and justice programming have had an impact (whether positive, neutral, or negative) on the achievement of security and justice objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>Focusing on technical capacity building (see section 4.3)</th>
<th>Strengthening local ownership (see section 4.4)</th>
<th>Using gender-aware strategies (see section 4.5)</th>
<th>Engaging with pluralistic legal systems (see section 4.6)</th>
<th>Promoting human rights (see section 4.7)</th>
<th>Sector-wide approaches and coordination (see section 4.8)</th>
<th>Using theories of change (see section 4.9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral impact</td>
<td>[MEDIUM] Multi-country (1)</td>
<td>[LIMITED] Multi-country (6)</td>
<td>[LIMITED] Afghanistan (8); Liberia (9); Multi-country (10)</td>
<td>[LIMITED] Afghanistan (8)</td>
<td>[LIMITED] DRC, Timor-Leste (13); Jamaica (14)</td>
<td>[LIMITED] Multi-country (15); Liberia (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impact</td>
<td></td>
<td>[LIMITED] South Sudan (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This evidence guide is not based on a comprehensive systematic review, but is an overview of evidence referenced in this topic guide. Numbers in parentheses refer to the sources identified on the following page.

**Key to evidence base**

- **[STRONG]** Mix of methods; multiple contexts; significant number of relevant studies or literature reviews
- **[MEDIUM]** Mix of methods; multiple contexts; some relevant studies or reviews
- **[LIMITED]** Limited methods; isolated context; few relevant studies
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5. [S; OR] DFID (2012a) A theory of change for tackling violence against women and girls – contains a number of boxed case studies demonstrating that community-based approaches to tackling social norms can have a positive impact on tackling gender discrimination and VAWG.
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