



# The contribution of Self-Help Groups in the Horn of Africa to a range of outcomes

Overview of the evidence of internal documents of TEAR and external literature.

January 2016

Joanne Graafland and Wouter Rijnveld

## Abbreviations

CLA	Cluster Level association
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
FGM	Female genital mutilation
FLA	Federation Level Association
HFIAS	Household Food Insecurity Access Scale
HH	Households
IGA	Income generating activities
MFI	Micro Finance Institution
SHG	Self-Help Group
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

## Contents

1	Introduction .....	1
2	Methodology.....	2
2.1	Evidence gap map approach .....	2
2.2	Application of the evidence gap map method in this research.....	2
2.3	Analysis methodology .....	2
3	Summary of all Evidence of SHG contributions to Outcomes .....	4
3.1	Summary of all internal evidence. ....	4
3.2	Summary of all external evidence.....	6
3.3	Important limitations of the analysis .....	8
4	Conclusions .....	9
4.1	Most important outcomes .....	9
4.2	Strength of the evidence and gaps .....	10
5	Recommendations .....	13
	Annex 1. Terms of Reference .....	1
	Annex 2. Literature used and persons interviewed.....	4
	Annex 3. Evidence Gap Map Framework.....	6
	Annex 4. Additional details .....	8
	Categorisation of all literature.....	8
	Weight of evidence by country.....	9

# 1 Introduction

Tear Netherlands and Tearfund UK have been given funding by the Dutch Government (BUZA) under their Strategic Partnership Protracted Crisis Programme (which they have with Tear Netherlands), in order to scale up, replicate and develop the Self-Help Group (SHG) approach across the Horn of Africa, i.e. Ethiopia, Somaliland and Kenya.

The intention of the programme is to see the SHG approach empowering people in all three countries, to be able to cope with protracted drought, food insecurity and other crisis-related events, by increasing their resilience. In order to prove this, different research activities have been done, while also indicators are regularly collected to measure progress.

The Dutch government has recently published its Theory of Change (ToC) for a new framework, which is to follow up on the present partnership. It focuses on causes of instability, conflict and forced migration. The ToC includes several domains in the social/political sphere, to which the present SHG work of Tear and their partners is expected to contribute.

This brief research is an attempt to summarize and evaluate the evidence that the SHG approach as it is implemented by Tear and their partners, contributes to a series of outcomes.

The report will present the methodology that is used to analyse the existing evidence, it will present the evidence and its strength and will formulate some recommendations how missing evidence could be collected and how weak evidence could be strengthened, both at the short term and at the long term.

## 2 Methodology

This chapter explains the basic methodology of the evidence gap map and how it has been applied in this research. It also explains how the document analysis was done.

### 2.1 Evidence gap map approach

In an evidence gap map the interventions are listed as well as the intended outcomes (Snilstveit et al. 2013). The interventions and outcomes form a matrix and in each cell the existing evidence as well as the strength of this evidence is briefly presented. The methodology has been made popular by 3IE ([www.3ieimpact.org](http://www.3ieimpact.org)). Increasingly the insight is shared that it is good to research existing evidence rather than research it again and again in every situation. This insight is also the basis for the current research.

To compile the evidence for contributions of a series of interventions to a series of outcomes, all available literature is reviewed for its credibility and the resulting evidence for contributions is summarized along with the strength of the evidence.

While the methodology is mostly applied to a complete sector, summarizing information from all geographic areas and actors, in this research the main interest is the evidence for Tear's own interventions in Kenya, Ethiopia and Somaliland. The evidence gap framework was therefore developed specifically on the basis of the Theories of Change of Tear.

### 2.2 Application of the evidence gap map method in this research.

An attempt was made to differentiate four main aspects of SHG interventions (organisational, thematic, linking, advocacy) but in the process of finding evidence for contributions to outcomes, it was impossible to attribute such evidence to any particular aspect of the intervention. For this reason, this distinction was removed from the framework. In this manner, the evidence gap map framework only included a number of outcome areas and just a single intervention (namely the SHG approach).

In order to develop the outcome framework, the Theory of Change of the current Tear programme was used as a first basis. Secondly, the new framework of MOFA was used to incorporate these outcomes as well. This framework is based on the New Deal on Fragility from the Busan high level forum, which includes five outcome areas, summarized as: human security, functioning rule of law, inclusive political processes, legitimate and capable governments, conflict sensitive employment and services. A first filtering process was used to select only those outcomes under each of these five categories where the researchers had a reasonable expectation that the SHG approach could have a contribution. Through this filtering process, about half of the outcomes proposed by MOFA were excluded. Annex 3 includes the complete MOFA framework and the reasons for those outcomes that were included in the analysis. In presenting the results, only those outcomes are shown for which evidence was found for positive (or negative contributions of the SHG approach).

### 2.3 Analysis methodology

This desk research includes internal evidence of Tear as well as general scientific literature. These two sources of evidence were split in two different parts and compared in the analysis to find possible gaps for Tear. The internal reports were first classified on the strength of the evidence they presented. Six categories were made:

- I. Anecdotes
- II. Weak qualitative research

- III. Rigorous qualitative research
- IV. Basic/weak quantitative research
- V. Rigorous quantitative research
- VI. Meta studies

Anecdotes refer to examples of individuals or families' experience with SHGs. The distinction between weak and rigorous qualitative research relies particularly on whether the researchers used a combined set of qualitative methods, for example focus groups with semi-structured interviews, or only one of these methods. Also the diversity of sources is important. The distinction between basic/weak and rigorous quantitative research relies on a whether a 'difference in difference' approach was used or not. If both the difference in time and the difference between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries was measured, it is rigorous. If the research does not meet one of these standards, it is basic. Also the sample size is of importance.

Another classification indicates the evidence from the different countries:

- a. Ethiopia
- b. Somaliland
- c. Kenya
- d. Not applicable

Based on these classifications, all outcomes that were found in the reports and in the scientific literature were classified, summarized and put in one of the five outcome categories and sub-categories in Tables 2 and 3 in Chapter 3. The internal reports were given a number. Based on the different codes, every outcome is given a reference of 1) the strength of the evidence, 2) the country and 3) the report number with page number. Some outcomes overlapped, which were combined in one outcome. Some evidence counted for more than one outcome, which we simply duplicated in the framework. The scientific literature is presented in Table 3 in Chapter 3. Here we referenced in the normal way, including a measure of the strength of the evidence.

All pieces of evidence were also included in a small database in order to generate an overview of the total strength of evidence for each outcome area. This is presented in paragraph 4.2.

### 3 Summary of all Evidence of SHG contributions to Outcomes

This chapter contains the main analysis of the evidence of contributions of the Self Help Group approach to various outcomes. Table 2 shows all the evidence that was found in the internal documents of Tear, while Table 3 shows the same for the external scientific literature. Chapter 3.3 describes some limitations to these two tables.

#### 3.1 Summary of all internal evidence.

The table below summarizes all internal evidence for SHG contributions to outcomes. The list of internal documents and studies used is included in Annex 2. Only those outcomes from the framework are used for which evidence about contributions could be found.

Table 1. Summary of internal evidence

<b>Outcomes (Numbering from MOFA framework):</b>	
<b>1. Human Security</b>	
1.1 All kinds of violent acts against citizens, including sexual violence, and other physical security threats are reduced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SHG members (of which 90% underwent FGM) mention that they won't let their daughters be circumcised (III. b. 5:32), but cross checking shows that still this is happening, although maybe a less radical form (Sunna type FGM) (III. b. 5:36).</li> <li>- Women are empowered to speak out on the tradition of FGM (IV. a. 4:16) (I. b. 5:17).</li> <li>- Women bringing agents of violence to court, for example a rapist. (I. c. 1:7.) (I. b. 5:17).</li> <li>- Initially there may be conflicts within the HH if a women joins the SHG, until also the husband sees the benefits (III. a. 8:68).</li> </ul>
1.3 Communities and civil society contribute to human security and social cohesion, independently and in coordination with responsible institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Relationship building between group members eases pre-existing tensions between religious and ethnic groups and creates mutual understanding (IV. a. 4:31) (III. b. 5:6).</li> <li>- Relationship building helps returned war refugees to increase social capital (III. b. 5:5).</li> </ul>
<b>2. Functioning Rule of Law</b>	
2.1 Men and women are aware of their basic rights and fundamental freedoms and have equal means to access formal and informal justice systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Spontaneous advocacy at the local government for social justice as a result of discussion in SHG meetings (I. b. 5:17). For example, women bringing agents of violence to court. (I. c. 1:7.) (I. b. 5:17), and SHG members defend an unjust arrest (I. b. 5:17),</li> <li>- Awareness on women's rights are very sparse (III. b. 5:36).</li> </ul>
<b>4. Legitimate and Capacitated Government</b>	
4.1 Government institutions at all levels implement laws and policies and deliver core tasks in a manner that promotes inclusive and sustainable development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SHGs have lobbied local government officials especially through the umbrella organisations of CLAs (III. a. 6:38). For example CLA's lobbied for better water supply (I. b. 7:12). On the other hand, advocacy efforts are only spontaneously and not established in a structured way, like was intended (III. b. 5:5).</li> <li>- SHG's engage more with parties outside Tear programme scope, like government institutions (IV. d. 3) (III. a. 6:39).</li> </ul>
<b>5. Equal access to employment and basic services; resilience</b>	
5.1 Government institutions, (local) civil society and the private sector increase sustainable employment opportunities in a conflict-sensitive manner, working towards inclusive development and social cohesion	<p>Financial capital:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HH are able to accumulate and maintain assets over time, helping them in times of shocks (IV. a, b. 2:14) (IV. d. 3) (IV. a. 4:20/22/28) (III. b. 7:2).</li> <li>- HH income improves for (both male and female) members (IV. a. 2:15) (IV. d. 3) (IV. a. 4:16/22) (III. b. 7:2) (III. a. 8:100). However, this can be only marginally and only after several loan cycles (III. b. 5:6/34).</li> <li>- Savings in SHG allow HH to start IGAs, sometimes together with other members (IV. d. 3) (IV. a. 4:16/19) (III. a. 5:37) (III. b. 7:8) (III. a. 8:61) (I. b. 10), which helps members to gain experience and increases sustainability of income because of diversification (III. b. 5:33)(III. b. 7:8).</li> </ul>

<b>Outcomes (Numbering from MOFA framework):</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased household efficiency as a result of trainings, e.g. fuel-saving stoves, drinking less coffee and alcohol (III. a. 8:61) and less fertilizers (IV. a. 4:20) (III. a. 8:60/100).</li> <li>- CLAs approached MFIs for deposits and savings (I. d. 1:8) (III. a. 6:40).</li> </ul> <p>Natural capital:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Results of Conservation Farming methods are still limited (I. d. 1:8).</li> <li>- Agricultural production grows as a result of training on terraces and compost (III. a. 8:60), also allowing for less fertilizer use (III. a. 4:20) (III. a. 8:61).</li> <li>- SHGs feel they have little influence on natural environment, because of a lack of capacity and government influence (III. a. 6:53).</li> </ul>
5.2.a Local civil society (SHGs) improve (equitable access to) basic services in a manner that increases legitimacy of institutions and social cohesion – for their members	<p>Social capital:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased relationships, communication, trust between members, unity and friendship, are the most important effects mentioned by the group members themselves (IV. a. 4:16) (III. b. 5:5) (III. a. 6:38)(III. b. 7:2/9/10)(III. a. 8:100) (I. b. 10). This can lead to asset sharing (III. a. 6:38).</li> <li>- Despite mutual love and trust, group members can be very hard on each other regarding past mistakes and lifestyle (III. a. 8:72).</li> <li>- Relationships in the HH are improved (III. a. 8:100).</li> </ul> <p>Human capital:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More children go to (a private) school (IV. a. 4:16/20/22)(III. a. 8:100) or HH gain access to better health care and education about hygiene (IV. a. 4:23) (I. a. 8:69).</li> <li>- Literacy and numeracy improves (III. b. 5:35)(III. b. 7:11)(III. a. 8:100), but not as significantly as was intended as the women do not see it as their priority (III. b. 5:14) (III. a. 8:70). A positive side effect is that women are more aware of the use of education, therefore they are willing to send their children to school (III. b. 5:5).</li> <li>- Awareness on family planning, HIV &amp; AIDS is increased (IV. a. 4:16).</li> <li>- Awareness of problems and how to improve their lives, e.g. plan on new IGA from their savings (III. b. 7:8/10).</li> <li>- Knowledge sharing and formal trainings lead to more knowledge and skills (III. a. 6:40)(III. b. 7:2). However, depending on whether this knowledge or information is correct or not, trust is increased or decreased (III. a. 6:41).</li> </ul> <p>Psychological capital</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased confidence and skills (IV. a. 4:16) (III. a. 8:97), also among girls (IV. a. 4:21/31) (III. b. 5:18), possibly leading to employability.</li> <li>- Willingness to innovate (e.g. new technologies) increases among members (III. a. 6:43), although still differing per member and dependent on context.</li> <li>- Women have more decision making power in the HH, because husbands see the value of the SHG, and women have more economic power and mobility<sup>1 2</sup>(IV. a. 4:16/31) (III. b. 5:5/32) (III. a. 8:68).</li> <li>- More voice and status in the community for SHG members (III. b. 5:5), because the SHG is addressing problems and demonstrating their usefulness (III. a. 6:40).</li> </ul>
5.2.b Local civil society (SHGs) improve (equitable access to) basic services in a manner that increases legitimacy of institutions and social cohesion – for the wider community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SHGs are involved with community initiatives (IV. a. 2:16), thereby supporting their community (I. b. 7:10), mainly focused on vulnerable others and improving the physical environment (IV. a. 2:17) (IV. d. 3) (IV. a. 4:1).</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> However, a threat is that women are only burdened extra, because of the increased responsibility (III. b. 5:6).

<sup>2</sup> Another side note is that empowerment may be less or absent in groups of mixed gender, where men are still the leaders in the SHG (III. a. 6:53).



<b>Outcomes (Numbering from MOFA framework):</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SHGs built kindergartens, supported orphans in their communities, rebuilt houses for widows, dug wells or terraced land to prevent soil erosion (IV. a. 4:1).</li> <li>- SHGs take action to reverse degradation and clean up polluted areas (IV. a. 4:16).</li> <li>- SHG's participated in developing DRR plans in their community (IV. d. 3) (III. a. 6:43).</li> </ul>
5.2.c Governments institutions improve (equitable access to) basic services in a manner that increases legitimacy of institutions and social cohesion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Women gain access to extension services of the government through their SHGs (III. a. 6:39), for example a bus facility to their area (I. b. 5:17). However, this still is a challenge that women cannot overcome (III. a. 6:38).</li> <li>- WASH interventions help women in their hygiene and daily work (II. a. 4:31).</li> </ul>
5.3 In situations of protracted crisis, national and international actors support vulnerable groups (including refugees, displaced persons and host communities) to enhance their resilience and build sustainable livelihoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The presence of SHG's for more than 3yrs shows improved food security (III. a. 8:100), based on the HFIAS indicator (IV. a. 2:10).<sup>3</sup> For example, 44% of HH in increased HFIAS score (IV. b. 3) and HH buy more and better food (IV. a. 4:16). Food security was improved through 1) higher production, 2) lower expenditures, and 3) additional forms of income (III. a. 8:100).</li> <li>- Internal safety nets in the SHG's makes members more resilient (IV. a. 4:32), e.g. SHGs act as insurers for members in great need (III. b. 5:5) (III. a. 6:38)(III. b. 7:2/8)(III. a. 8:100) (I. b. 9).</li> <li>- SHGs allow to mitigate some, but not all shocks (III. a. 6:37) (III. b. 7:2). Especially on covariate shocks there is no evidence yet. Somaliland is less evident than Ethiopia (III. b. 7:2).</li> </ul>

### 3.2 Summary of all external evidence

The table below summarizes all evidence from external literature for SHG contributions to outcomes. The list of the literature used is included in Annex 2.

Table 2. Summary of external evidence

<b>Outcomes:</b>	
<b>1. Human Security</b>	
1.1 All kinds of violent acts against citizens, including sexual violence, and other physical security threats are reduced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decreased number of incidences of violence against women (Husain et al, 2010, IV) (Brody et al., 2015, VI).</li> <li>- On the short term membership could create tension in the HH, but on the longer term, there is no increase of domestic violence (Brody et al., 2015, VI).</li> </ul>
1.3 Communities and civil society contribute to human security and social cohesion, independently and in coordination with responsible institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increase of trust in other villagers and government officers (Deininger and Liu, 2009a, IV).</li> <li>- Growth of collective identity and political awareness (Husain et al, 2010, IV) (Brody et al., 2015, VI).</li> <li>- Improving social relationships (Thomson, 2010, III)<sup>4</sup>.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Functioning Rule of Law</b>	
2.1 Men and women are aware of their basic rights and fundamental freedoms and have equal means to access formal and informal justice systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Women have agency to challenge gender dynamics (Thomson, 2010, III).</li> <li>- Members have better access to public security (Crowley et al, 2005, II).</li> <li>- Failure to challenge traditional social structures for empowerment of women (Husein et al, 2010, IV).</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> However, this conclusion is based on data collected in a relatively food secure time. The analysis should be repeated in times of less food security to make a more legitimate statement.

<sup>4</sup> This study has been performed for Tear UK in 2010. Maybe they can show the strength of the study?

<b>Outcomes:</b>	
<b>4. Legitimate and Capacitated Government</b>	
4.1 Government institutions at all levels implement laws and policies and deliver core tasks in a manner that promotes inclusive and sustainable development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More political participation among women of SHGs in their community (Brody et al., 2015, VI) (Deininger and Liu, 2009a, IV) (Desai and Joshi, 2010, V).</li> <li>- More participation of women in community programs and development (Crowley et al, 2005, II) (Tesoriero, 2005, III) (Thomson, 2010, III).</li> <li>- Women gain more respect from the HH and the community (Brody et al., 2015, VI) (Crowley et al., 2005, II).</li> </ul>
<b>5. Equal access to employment and basic services; resilience</b>	
5.1 Government institutions, (local) civil society and the private sector increase sustainable employment opportunities in a conflict-sensitive manner, working towards inclusive development and social cohesion	<p>Financial capital:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Economic empowerment (Deininger and liu, 2009a, IV).</li> <li>- Employment creation: 1) 17% more employment (Tankha, 2002, II); 2) Increase (Desai and Joshi, 2010, V)(Swamy &amp; Tulasimala, IV); 3) No increase of IGA (Custer, 2013, V), but increased investment in existing business (Beaman et al., 2014, V).</li> <li>- Asset creation / savings: 1) 73% asset creation in the HH over period of 3yrs (Tankha, 2002, II); 2) 31% of poor HH grow their assets ( Tankha, 2002, II); 3) Asset creation on the longer term term (Deininger and Liu, 2009b, V) (Swain &amp; Varghes, 2009, IV); 4) Savings / assets increase (Custer, 2013, V) (Desai and Joshi, 2010, V) (Swamy &amp; Tulasimala, IV); 5) HH assets do not increase (Deininger and Liu, 2009a, IV).</li> <li>- Income creation: 1) Income is increased (Swamy &amp;Tulasimala, IV)(Tankha, 2002, II); 2) Income is not increased (Deininger &amp; Liu, 2009a, IV); 3) 44% of poor HH increase income ( Tankha, 2002, II); 4) Increase of agricultural output (Beaman et al., 2014, V)</li> </ul>
5.2.a Local civil society (SHGs) improve (equitable access to) basic services in a manner that increases legitimacy of institutions and social cohesion – for their members	<p>Social capital:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increases, i.e. solidarity (Brody et al., 2015, VI)(Deininger and Liu, 2009a, IV)</li> <li>- Safety net function (Foster, 2007, II)</li> <li>- Quantitative data does not show increase, but perceived social capital (i.e. qualitative data) shows this is the most important effect (Custer, 2013, V).</li> </ul> <p>Human capital:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Education: 1) improves ( Tankha, 2002, II) (Husain et al, 2010, IV), e.g. on malaria prevention (Custer, 2013, V), although this does not lead to health outcomes; 2) School enrolment does not improve (Custer, 2013, V).</li> </ul> <p>Psychological capital</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased self-confidence / sense of self-worth (Crowley et al, 2005, II) (Husain et al, 2010, IV) (Thomson, 2010, III).</li> <li>- Women are empowered (Sudipta &amp; Sarker, 2011, IV)(Swamy &amp; Tulasimala, IV), i.e. they have more mobility, economic freedom to put aside money and to do other activities (Brody et al., 2015, VI)(Deininger and Liu, 2009a, IV) (Husain et al, 2010, IV).</li> <li>- Women have more decision making power and respect in the HH/community (Brody et al., 2015, VI)(Crowley et al, 2005, II) (Desai and Joshi, 2010, V) (Husain et al, 2010, IV) (Sudipta &amp; Sarker, 2011, IV).</li> </ul>
5.2.b Local civil society (SHGs) improve (equitable access to) basic services in a manner that increases legitimacy of institutions and social cohesion – for the wider community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Spillover effect of positive effects on non-members (Brody et al., 2015, VI)(Crowley et al, 2005, II) (Desai and Joshi, 2010, V), for example empowerment of women (Deininger and Liu, 2009a, IV).</li> </ul>
5.2.c Governments institutions improve (equitable access to) basic services in a manner that	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SHG members could express their complaints about services better (Desai &amp; Joshi, 2010, V), and gain more access to public services &amp; security (Crowley et al, 2005, II).</li> </ul>

Outcomes:	
increases legitimacy of institutions and social cohesion	
5.3 In situations of protracted crisis, national and international actors support vulnerable groups (including refugees, displaced persons and host communities) to enhance their resilience and build sustainable livelihoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Income is not increased, but consumption is increased and is smoothed (Beaman et al., 2014, V)(Custer, 2013, V) (Deininger and Liu, 2009a, IV).</li> <li>- Increased food security (Beaman et al., 2014, V) (Custer, 2013, V). Nutritious intake is better for SHG members (Deininger and Liu, 2009b, V) (Sudipta &amp; Sarker, 2011, IV); 44% of HH increased food consumption (Tankha, 2002, II).</li> </ul>

### 3.3 Important limitations of the analysis

Although Tables 1 and 2 show that there are many positive outcomes found in both sources of literature, there are some important notes that nuance these findings. Although the evidence generally was quite convincing, many of these positive outcomes were only positive for some people and in some circumstances and not in all circumstances, all SHGs nor for all SHG members (III. a. 8) (Steward et al., 2012). There are many factors influencing the effects that can be observed. The first factor mentioned in the documents is the age and strength of the SHG. Generally it can be said that the older the SHG, the more the positive outcomes. Regarding strength of the SHG an important illustration from the internal evidence is the difference between evidence from Ethiopia compared to Somaliland. Ethiopia is performing better than Somaliland in many aspects, among others because of the governance of the groups. Important factors in this regard are the number and effectiveness of the trainings, whether or not CLAs have been formed to help the SHGs, and how many loans are given out to the SHG members. Especially in Somaliland the SHGs can be hesitant to give out loans, meaning the members do not benefit from their savings (III. b. 7:8). A third important factor influencing the effectiveness of SHGs to reach the potential outcomes is the context of the SHG. For example, SHG members only gain extra respect and status in the community when the SHG is respected and no bad stigma is given to the group (Brody et al., 2015, VI).

## 4 Conclusions

This chapter provides a narrative summary of the findings, as well as a conclusion on the strength of the evidence for each of the outcomes, both from the internal and external evidence and distinguishing qualitative and quantitative research.

### 4.1 Most important outcomes

#### 4.1.1 Household assets and food security

Looking at both the internal reports and scientific literature, the majority of the outcomes fall in the last category, mainly focusing on improvements within the SHGs and in the household of the members. One of the most important outcomes of the SHGs is social capital, which is an umbrella for different things (Brody et al., 2015, VI)(Deininger and Liu, 2009a, IV). Mentioned by the members were friendship, trust, unity, 'sisterhood', better communication (III. b. 5) (III. a. 6:38)(III. b. 7:2/9/10)(III. a. 8:100) and social support (III. a. 6:38) (III. b. 7:2/8) (III. a. 8:100) (Foster, 2007, II). As the reports show, better relationships have several effects on communities too, such as better relationships between groups of different religion and ethnicity (IV. a. 4:31), or just people that normally do not meet each other. As the evidence of Somaliland shows, this is especially important for war refugees returning to their home country, who do not have any social ties left (III. b. 5:5). An interesting side note is the contrast found by a study in Mali, where quantitative data showed no increase in social capital, while qualitative data clearly stated an increase. This suggests that SHG members may not actually grow in social capital according to the facts, but they still perceive a big growth (Custer, 2013, V). Maybe this can be explained by the fact that people become more aware of their social capital when joining the SHG, therefore thinking that their social capital has grown.

Improvements of financial capital, including assets and income, was more ambiguous but still evident. This includes asset creation (also because of increasing savings), increased income, and increased access to loans (IV. a. 2:14/15) (I. b. 2:14) (IV. d. 3) (IV. a. 4:16/20/22/28)(III. b. 5:6/34)(III. b. 7:2)(III. a. 8:100) (Deininger and Liu, 2009b, V) (Swain & Varghes, 2009, IV) (Swamy & Tulasimala, IV) (Tankha, 2002, II). Not all the studies show increases on all different aspects. For example Deininger & Liu (2009a, IV) do not show increasing income or assets, and other studies only show marginal effects. The evidence for this may be more convincing over longer periods of time.

Human capital increases because SHG members gain skills through trainings (e.g. on savings, literacy, or business management, or things like HIV/AIDS and malaria) (IV. a. 4:16) (III. b. 5:35) (III. a. 6:40) (III. b. 7:2/11) (III. a. 8:100) (Custer, 2013, V) (Husain et al, 2010, IV) (Tankha, 2002, II), but also because they share their knowledge with each other. Also, as a result of savings in the SHG, members start new IGA (including new methods of agricultural production) (III. a. 6:43) (Desai and Joshi, 2010, V) (Swamy & Tulasimala, IV) (Tankha, 2002, II), giving them new business knowledge and experience (III. b. 5:33)(III. b. 7:8) (Beaman et al., 2014, V). Another important effect can be that members become more aware of the importance of education, therefore sending their children to school, which increases the human capital of the next generation. The evidence for this was mixed: some studies found a positive effect on the percentage of children going to schools (IV. a. 4:20/21/22/31) (III. b. 5:5) (III. a. 8:100), some studies did not (Custer, 2013, V).

Findings on natural capital and on the health aspect of human capital were limited. There were some anecdotes of SHGs cleaning polluted areas and reversing environmental degradation, but this was only mentioned a few times (III. a. 4). Also once mentioned was a WASH intervention, decreasing the burden for women to access water and improving their hygiene (IV. a. 4:31). For improvement of household efficiency two examples were given: composting techniques (IV. a. 4:20) and usage of fuel-saving stoves (IV. a. 4:20) (III. a. 8:100). Physical health may improve because of better access to health services, but

the evidence for this was mixed. Linked to it is psychological capital. For this it is clear that self-worth and self-confidence of members has grown (IV. a. 4:16) (Crowley et al, 2005, II) (Husain et al, 2010 IV) (Thomson, 2010, III). A side effect is that also the self-confidence of their daughters can grow (IV. a. 4:21/31) (III. b. 5:5).

The above mentioned assets stand apart from another outcome on the household level, namely food security. As this is Tears aimed final outcome for the SHGs, the evidence for this in the report should be emphasized. Although the evidence did not come from many different sources, all evidence on food security was found to be positive. Most importantly the indicator of Tear, HFIAS, shows an increase (IV. a. 2:10), but also internal and external reports show the same (III. a. 8:100) (Beaman et al., 2014, V) (Custer, 2013, V). Outcomes that can relate to food security are nutritious intake and consumption. Studies show that consumption is increased and smoothed (i.e. more stable consumption) (Beaman et al., 2014, V) (Custer, 2013, V) (Deininger and Liu, 2009a, IV) and that nutritious intake is increased (Deininger and Liu, 2009b, V) (Sudipta & Sarker, 2011, IV).

#### 4.1.2 Community wide outcomes

Besides the outcomes within the households and within the SHGs, there can also be effects observed outside the SHGs, in the community. One side effect of the relationship building in the SHG is better relationships and trust in the community in general (Deininger and Liu, 2009a, IV) (Thomson, 2010, III), for example between different religious or ethnic groups (II. a. 4:31). Empowerment of women is another important effect (Sudipta & Sarker, 2011, IV) (Swamy & Tulasimala, IV). While on the one hand the women themselves feel empowered, for example their increased self-worth and self-confidence, on the other hand people outside the groups also change their behaviour towards the women. Women get more freedom and say in the household and in the community (IV. a. 4:31) (III. b. 5:5/32) (III. a. 6:40) (Brody et al., 2015, VI) (Crowley et al, 2005, II) (Deininger and Liu, 2009a, IV) (Desai and Joshi, 2010, V) (Husain et al, 2010, IV) (Sudipta & Sarker, 2011, IV), and even increased influence on politics was mentioned (Deininger and Liu, 2009a, IV) (Desai and Joshi, 2010, V). There were some anecdotes of women empowered to speak out on women rights and thereby challenge existing gender dynamics (Thomson, 2010, III). For example, the issue of female genital mutilation was discussed by the women in the SHGs, thereby convinced not to let their own daughters be circumcised (III. b. 5:32) and addressing these issues in their communities (IV. a. 4:16) (I. b. 5:17). There were anecdotes of women empowered to claim social justice, e.g. for a case where a girl was raped (I. c. 1:7.) (I. b. 5:17). Especially the CLAs seem to have an influence on this, including local politics (III. a. 6:38), and other service suppliers (IV. d. 3) (III. a. 6:39/40) (Crowley et al, 2005, II). In general there is some evidence that women participating in SHGs experience less violence (Husain et al, 2010, IV) and gain respect in their community, also because of their active role in the community development (IV. d. 3) (Brody et al., 2015, VI) (Crowley et al, 2005, II) (Tesoriero, 2005, III) (Thomson, 2010, III). Besides their growing collective identity and political awareness (Husain et al, 2010, IV), and conscious and visible involvement in the community (IV. a. 2:17) (IV. d. 3) (IV. a. 4:1) (I. b. 7:10), several scientific authors also speak of 'spill over effects', i.e. the improving status etc. of women in SHG are beneficial for other women in the community (Brody et al., 2015, VI) (Crowley et al, 2005, II) (Desai and Joshi, 2010, V).

#### 4.2 Strength of the evidence and gaps

In order to visualise the strength of the evidence depicted in Tables 1 and 2, another analysis was done based on quantification of the strength of the evidence. Weights were given to each category of evidence, shown in Table 3. The resulting tables do not show absolute strength of the evidence for different outcomes, but rather show relatively to other outcomes how strong the qualitative and quantitative evidence is for each category and each outcome. For the internal evidence, this was also split between

the three countries. Negative or neutral evidence is taken into account by subtracting the same weight. Therefore it is possible that the total strength of the evidence is negative, indicating that overall no evidence is found.

Table 3. Weights of strength categories (categories refer to the list in par. 2.3)

Positive evidence:		
Category	Weight	Research method
1	1	Qualitative
2	2	Qualitative
3	3	Qualitative
4	3	Quantitative
5	5	Quantitative
6	8	Systematic review
Negative evidence:		
Category	Weight	Research method
1	-1	Qualitative
2	-2	Qualitative
3	-3	Qualitative
4	-3	Quantitative
5	-5	Quantitative
6	-8	Systematic review

Table 4. Overview of strength of internal evidence (higher number is green is strong evidence; lower number is red is weak evidence)

Outcomes	Qualitative Evidence	Quantitative Evidence
<b>1. Human Security</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1 Less Sexual Violence	6	3
1.3 Social cohesion	6	3
<b>2. Functioning Rule of Law</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
2.1 Access to justice	1	
<b>4. Legitimate and capable government</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>
4.1 Inclusive government	4	3
<b>5. Access to employment and services</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>84</b>
5.1 Employment, income	31	30
5.2.a Assets and services others	56	21
5.2.b Assets and services community	4	21
5.2.c Services government	3	
5.3 Resilience	22	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>93</b>

Table 5. Overview of strength of external evidence (higher number is green is strong evidence; lower number is red is weak evidence)

Outcomes	Qualitative Evidence	Quantitative Evidence
<b>1. Human Security</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>33</b>
1.1 Less Sexual Violence		19
1.3 Social cohesion	3	14

<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Qualitative Evidence</b>	<b>Quantitative Evidence</b>
<b>2. Functioning Rule of Law</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>-3</b>
2.1 Access to justice	5	-3
<b>4. Legitimate and capable government</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>24</b>
4.1 Inclusive government	10	24
<b>5. Access to employment and services</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>142</b>
5.1 Employment, income	8	26
5.2.a Assets and services others	13	64
5.2.b Assets and services community	2	16
5.2.c Services government	2	5
5.3 Resilience	2	31
<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>196</b>

Table 4 shows the relative strength of the internal evidence. It shows that qualitative evidence is stronger than quantitative evidence. Most of the evidence is found on category five, namely 200 out of 226. This is not surprising since these outcomes are closest to the original intended outcomes of the SHG approach. They are also the main outcomes summarised in par. 4.1. For category 1 (human security), 2 (rule of law) and 4 (legitimate and capable government) relatively little is found.

Annex 4 presents the same table by country. This shows that most evidence is found for Ethiopia with 150 out of 226, followed by Somaliland with 56 out of 226. For Kenya almost nothing is found, and is therefore seriously lacking in evidence. This is understandable, as the SHGs only recently started in 2014.

External evidence in Table 5 shows a similar picture as the internal evidence, i.e. that the evidence is the strongest on category 5, namely 169 out of 241. The balance between qualitative and quantitative evidence is different: here quantitative evidence is stronger, particularly because of the systematic reviews that include many quantitative studies. The external evidence therefore poses a stronger claim that SHG have a positive impact on SHG members and the wider community. However, it should be noted that this evidence has not been found in the Horn of Africa specifically: most evidence originates from India where the SHG movement started and has been very successful. Therefore, it is hard to directly conclude from the external evidence that the SHG approach also has a positive impact in countries in the Horn of Africa.

Combining the strength of the internal evidence and external evidence, it can be concluded that most evidence has been found on category 5. This includes both economic aspects and other services, assets and capitals, and it comprises the effect of SHGs themselves on their members and the wider community, as well as the effects of SHGs on services of the government through successful lobby, although to a lesser extent. Evidence for contributions to categories 1 (human security, less sexual violence and social cohesion) is less but still present, as well as contributions to the functioning of the government in making their operations more inclusive and involving and on functional rule of law. Although the evidence for these last three categories is more meagre, it is remarkable that the SHGs still have some influence, because this was not the intended effect of the initial theory of change of Tear of the current framework.

## 5 Recommendations

Research ideas that can be used on the short term

1. For the new framework, proposed by MOFA, Tear could more clearly elaborate to which outcomes their SHG approach is actually expected to contribute and in what way. For this research a first analysis was done by the researchers to select those outcomes from the MOFA frameworks that were deemed relevant. The recommendation is to elaborate explicitly to which of the five outcome categories and to which of the outcomes the approach is expected to contribute. Such detailed theory of change will help to develop focused monitoring or research designs and will also facilitate a theory-based evaluation approach.
2. The evidence for contributions of the SHG approach to the socio-political outcomes is the weakest or lacking. Based on a more elaborate theory of change for these domains, a brief set of specific questions could be formulated for field staff. This would be intended to capture the silent knowledge, experiences and anecdotes that they could have. This will only result in anecdotal evidence, but many anecdotes together can also form a strong story. It is likely that this will work best if one staff per partner takes the lead and asks each of their colleagues to report such specific anecdotes if they exist. The questions could be framed as follows (for each of the intended outcomes, as specified, see recommendation 1):
  - We are looking for contributions of our work with SHGs to <outcome of interest>. Do you have one or more examples where you have seen this happen? If yes, please describe the example very specifically, including names, locations and dates. (It should be possible to go and verify the story on the basis of the details provided). What happened, where, when and with whom?
  - How exactly did the SHG approach contribute to the story in this example?
  - What other factors were the reason that the story in this example could happen? Any specific circumstances?
  - Record name and phone number of the person narrating the example in order to be able to request further information if necessary.
3. In each location, a brief set of questions could be formulated for government officials. This could include questions that probe for involvement of SHGs (or rather CLAs or FLAs) in political or developmental processes. Since this could easily result in socially desired responses, open questions requesting examples would be required. An example of such question could be:
  - We are looking for examples where SHGs or CLAs have been involved in constructive ways in meetings with you or with government departments. This could be informal discussions about what needs to happen, or meetings about the development of <location>. Do you have any such examples? (probe for location, date, specifics of the meeting)
  - How did you regard the input of the SHGs / CLA? Were they able to make a positive contribution, or were you able to make any commitment to them?
  - [make these questions specific depending on the type of government official or department you are speaking to]
4. The same could be done with SHG leaders and CLA / FLA leaders. The specific questions to be included would depend the result of number 1 above. Questions could be similar to the questions above.



## Annex 1. Terms of Reference

### Term of Reference for Research consultancy January/February 2016

Assignment Title: <b>Horn of Africa Research for the Dutch Government Strategic Partnership Protracted Crisis Programme</b>
Consultant's Name:
Location of Assignment: <b>Ethiopia, Somaliland and Kenya</b>
Partner's Name: <b>Tearfund UK and Tear Netherlands</b>
Country Rep's Name: <b>Chris McDonald, Gladys Wathanga, Keith Etherington, Jonathan Stone and Caspar Waalewijn</b>
Does this assignment require the consultant to have either one-to-one contact, regular or frequent contact with children or young people under the age of 18? <span style="float: right;">No</span>

#### Background

context:

*How has the need for the assignment arisen?*

Tearfund and Tear Netherlands have been given joint funding by the Dutch Government (BUZA) under their Strategic Partnership Protracted Crisis Programme (which they have with Tear Netherlands), in order to scale up, replicate and develop the Self-Help Group (SHG) approach across the Horn of Africa, i.e. Ethiopia, Somaliland and Kenya.

The intention is to see the SHG approach empowering people in all three countries, to be able to cope with protracted drought, food insecurity and other crisis-related events, by increasing their resilience. In order to prove this, different research activities have been done, while also indicators are regularly collected to measure progress.

The Dutch government has recently published its Theory of Change (ToC) for a new framework, which is to follow up on the present partnership. It focuses on causes of instability, conflict and forced migration. The ToC includes several domains in the social/political sphere, to which our present SHG work is expected to contribute. This research will help us to determine also what evidence we have to prove this contribution.

#### Duration:

The work would need to produce the report by the end of February so as to be available for a next framework on instability announced by the Dutch government. There is flexibility in the intensity of the work, but it is estimated to have two phases:

- An initial period of estimated 5 days in which present research on SHGs and specific information in our programme will be reviewed, to determine the evidence base and possible gaps.
- On the basis of the overview next steps will be determined to deepen available evidence in a qualitative way.

It is now estimated that the total consultancy will take 20 full days, but this will be further specified after the initial phase.

#### Background reading:

*What is the context for this assignment?*

The following documents are stored in the drop box file:

- The Dutch Government ToC for the protracted crisis

- The link to the ToC for the new framework of the Dutch government is here (in Dutch) <https://www.government.nl/documents/regulations/2015/12/04/call-for-proposals-ngo-fund-root-causes-of-instability-conflict-and-forced-migration>
- The summary of the ToC of the new framework in English
- The annual report 2014
- The baseline report with the indicators
- The ToC for the present Tear Netherlands/Tearfund UK programme in the HoA
- A costs-benefit analysis of the Ethiopia SHGs, by consultant, Courtenay Cabot Venton
- The Somaliland SHG Evaluation December 2014.
- A study on resilience of SHG members in Somaliland

What is not available yet with me:

- DRR study, to be requested from Ephraim
- HFIAS study, to be requested from Lianne, student 2015
- Link SHG and food security study, form Iris, student 2015

What can be added on request:

- Individual (quarterly reports of partners TDA, IUDD and Gilgal in Ethiopia, of Gargaar in Somaliland and FH in Kenya)
- Conservation farming results as collected by TDA in Ethiopia, which is most advanced in CA implementation and monitoring
- Submitted outcomes to the Dutch government for the SHG/FS programme, March 2014
- Study into facilitator capabilities, Anika Quist, early 2015
- Study of relationship SHG and facilitator, Klaas Evers, 2010

#### **Key project members:**

- Caspar Waalewijn - BUZA Programme Coordinator, Tear Netherlands
- Keith Etherington - Tearfund, Ethiopia Country Rep
- Ephraim Kahsay – Tearfund , Ethiopia Programme Manager
- Gladys Wathanga - Tearfund, Kenya Country Rep
- Chris McDonald - Tearfund, Somalia & Somaliland Country Rep
- Andy Morgan - Tearfund, Deputy Head of ESAT - liaison between Tearfund and Tear NL
- Jonathan Stone, staff member learning on resilience at Tearfund UK
- Other stakeholders will be consulted and invited to input as appropriate.

#### **Goal:**

*What is the intended purpose of this assignment?*

To present the strongest argument possible that the SHG work supported by Tear/Tearfund in Ethiopia, Kenya and Somaliland is contributing to food security and is a strategic fit with the new BuZa framework.

#### **Specific objectives:**

1. Review the Theory of Change for the present programme and the Dutch government framework for the partnership Protracted Crisis
2. Review the BuZa Theory of Change for the new framework on causes for instability and determine the specific outcomes and assumptions in regards to achieving the intention and identify any further outcomes or assumptions which should be considered.
3. Review current programme information and research (DRR, HFIAS/SHG pathways, Cost Benefit in Ethiopia; resilience in Somaliland) undertaken by Tearfund/Tear in Ethiopia, Kenya

and Somaliland as well as research done by others (e.g. Myrada) on the SHG approach, in the light of both ToCs

4. Draft a report to present the evidence of how appropriate the SHG approach is to achieve the purpose of the present partnership on Food Security and the new initiative.
5. Determine what additional evidence is needed to strengthen the report in the short term (by the end of February) and agree with Tear/Tearfund on the means by which this could be achieved.
6. Advise on longer term research to be done during 2016 to strengthen the evidence base of the SHG approach for both ToCs.

(at this stage, but also already at point 5, the next phase two starts to come in)

7. Undertake additional analysis on available data to obtain required evidence or collect additional qualitative information to enrich the final report with this information and agree it with Tear/Tearfund
8. Produce an evidence based report on the results of the SHG approach for food security, resilience and social/political domains. The report will also include recommendations for the research planned for 2016 and beyond.

### **Methodology:**

*What approaches will be needed to undertake in this assignment?*

It is assumed that this will be mainly desk-based research, in which the consultant will be supported by staff in country who have been involved with the previous research. The desk study will be enriched with interviews with key staff from Tearfund, Tear Netherlands, and partners in all three countries. As indicated under specific objective seven, there may be a small period of practical research.

### **Scheduling:**

*Dates for:*

- Briefing and desk research first half of January; first debriefing January 8<sup>th</sup> in Utrecht. A brief report will be produced by the evening of the 7<sup>th</sup> of January
- Travel – *To Be Determined*
- Submission of draft report – by the end of February, to be adapted to the date of the reconstruction framework, which will be announced in January 2016
- Submission of final report – *To Be Determined*

*Itinerary for the planned visit, who, when and where*

To be determined

### **Management of visit:**

*What is the name of the Client who is commissioning and approving the work?*

Tear Netherlands will manage the consultancy but liaises with the country offices of Tearfund UK in the three countries.

16<sup>th</sup> December 2016

Caspar Waalewijn

## Annex 2. Literature used and persons interviewed

### Programme documentation

1. Model annual narrative report 2014
2. Baseline Report for the Food Security / Self Help Group programme in Ethiopia, Somaliland and North Kenya, 2014.
3. Indicators Tear HoA programme March 2015 for all partners.
4. Partnerships for change: a cost benefit analysis of Self Help Groups in Ethiopia, 2013.
5. Gargaar SHG evaluation modified final 2014.
6. PGT Dissertation DAD AnnabelleWilson 2014.
7. SHGs and Resilience in Somaliland - CMcD comments AW responses (6 9 15)
8. Thesis\_klaas Evers Eindversie mailversie 1
9. SHG Case story- Sahra Hasan\_Sept '14
10. Suaad Moalin-Story of Change July 2015

### Other literature

Beaman L, Karlan D, Thuysbaert B. 2014. Saving for a (not so) rainy day: a randomized evaluation of savings groups in Mali. National Bureau of Economic Research, Working paper 20600, accessed on <http://www.nber.org/papers/w20600>

Brody C, De Hoop T, Vojtkova M, Warnock R, Dunbar M, Murthy P, Dworkin S. (2015). Economic Self-Help group Programs for Improving Women's Empowerment: A Systematic Review. Campbell Systematic Reviews 2015:19.

Custer S. (2013). Final Impact Evaluation of the Saving for Change Program in Mali, 2009-2012. Bureau of Applied Research in Anthropology, University of Arizona Innovations for Poverty Action.

Deininger, K. and Liu, Y., (2009a), Economic and Social Impacts of Self-Help Groups in India, Policy Research Working Paper 4884, The World Bank.

Deininger, K. and Liu, Y., (2009b), Longer-Term Economic Impacts of Self-Help Groups in India, Policy Research Working Paper 4886, The World Bank

Desai, R., and Joshi, S (2010), The Role of Self-Help Groups in Community Development, Evidence from a Field Experiment in India, Georgetown University

Foster, G., (2007), Under the radar: Community safety nets for AIDS-affected households in sub-Saharan Africa, AIDS Care, 19: 1, pp. 54-63

Husain et al. (2010), Self Help Groups and empowerment of women: Self-selection or actual benefits?, MPRA Paper No. 20765 <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/20765/>.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, NL (MOFA) Theory of Change for the security and rule of law policy priority in fragile situations, May 2015 including a diagram and a summary document.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, NL (MOFA) Translated version of Foreign Affairs Call Protracted crises-2014-2016

Stewart R, van Rooyen C, Korth M, Chereni A, Rebelo Da Silva N, de Wet T (2012). Do micro-credit, micro-savings and micro-leasing serve as effective financial inclusion interventions enabling poor people, and especially women, to engage in meaningful economic opportunities in low- and middle-income countries. A systematic review of the evidence. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.

Sudipta D, Sarker D. (2011). Women's Empowerment through Self-help Groups and its Impact on Health Issues: Empirical Evidence. Journal of global analysis, Vol. 2, No. 1.

Swain, B.R., and Varghes, A., (2009), Does Self Help Group Participation Lead to Asset Creation?, World Development Vol. 37, No. 10, pp. 1674–1682

Tankha, A., (2002) Self-help Groups as Financial Intermediaries in India: Cost of Promotion, Sustainability and Impact, a study prepared for ICCO and Cordaid, The Netherlands

Tesoriero, F., (2005), Strengthening communities through women's self-help groups in South India, Community Development Journal Vol 41 No 3 July 2006pp. 321–333

Thomson, S., (2010), Journeys of Empowerment, Evaluation of the empowerment potential of the SHG Model in Ethiopia, Master Thesis, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK

## Annex 3. Evidence Gap Map Framework

Table 6. Complete MOFA framework, explaining which outcomes are selected for this research

Result framework MOFA	Link Tear ToC Current program	Potential contribution SHGs
<b>1. Human Security</b>		
1.1 All kinds of violent acts against citizens, including sexual violence, and other physical security threats are reduced		Strong SHG (or higher level associations) report cases, increasing the risk / costs for impunity and decreasing the incidence of sexual violence.
1.2 Institutions responsible for maintaining security perform their tasks effectively, accountably and in better coordination, in response to the needs of citizens		No contribution expected
1.3 Communities and civil society contribute to human security and social cohesion, independently and in coordination with responsible institutions	The SHG approach contributes to social cohesion among group members and between groups	
1.4 Transnational drivers of conflict such as organised crime and illicit flows of finance, arms and conflict commodities are reduced based on an integrated approach		No contribution expected
<b>2. Functioning Rule of Law</b>		
2.1 Men and women are aware of their basic rights and fundamental freedoms and have equal means to access formal and informal justice systems		SHGs (or higher level association) could advocate with (judicial mechanisms and women's voices could be made heard in specific cases.
2.2 All justice institutions responsible perform their tasks effectively, accountably and in better coordination, responding to the needs of citizens		No contribution expected
2.3 The justice system is independent and effectively curbs abuse of power by state institutions, armed actors or powerful individuals		No contribution expected
2.4 Formal and informal justice institutions effectively address legacies of human rights violations and serious crimes committed during periods of armed conflict or dictatorship, and address root causes that give rise to conflict		Indirect reasoning: social cohesion and increased reliance / improved food security as root causes.
<b>3. Inclusive political processes</b>		
3.1 Political decision making at different levels is participatory, representative and inclusive of all social groups	Marginalized people are more involved in decisions that affect them. This is modelled through decision making in SHGs (and higher level associations).	
3.2 National and international actors take responsibility for effective and inclusive mechanisms for peacebuilding and prevention of conflict, with an active role for women	Organizations cooperate with and involve SHGs in developmental and political processes.	
<b>4. Legitimate and capable governments</b>		

Result framework MOFA	Link Tear ToC Current program	Potential contribution SHGs
4.1 Government institutions at all levels implement laws and policies and deliver core tasks in a manner that promotes inclusive and sustainable development	Advocacy of SHGs (and higher level associations) contributes to leaders becoming more active in development (esp. toward marginalized groups).	
4.2 Government institutions at all levels are responsive to needs and views articulated by citizens and civil society and have functioning mechanisms in place for internal and external accountability	Governmental actors cooperate with CLAs or FLAs and get their inputs on important matters.	
4.3 Government institutions manage domestic resources and public finance transparently and have functioning mechanisms in place to reduce and prevent corruption		This could be an effect of the involvement and/or advocacy of CLAs / FLAs (see 4.2)
<b>5. Equal access to employment and basic services; resilience</b>		
5.1 Government institutions, (local) civil society and the private sector increase sustainable employment opportunities in a conflict-sensitive manner, working towards inclusive development and social cohesion	SHG members get access to finance and knowledge and thereby improve their self-employment (and hence income).	
5.2 Governments institutions, (local) civil society and the private sector improve (equitable access to) basic services in a manner that increases legitimacy of institutions and social cohesion	a. SHG improve their asset base. b. SHGs contribute to the wider community. c. Advocacy of SHGs (and higher level associations) contributes to more responsive leaders and service providers (esp. toward marginalized groups).	
5.3 In situations of protracted crisis, national and international actors support vulnerable groups (including refugees, displaced persons and host communities) to enhance their resilience and build sustainable livelihoods	SHG members increase their yields, assets, income, also their skills, knowledge, confidence, self-esteem; improve their feeding patterns, and become more resistant against shocks and crises	

The main adaptation of the framework is related to outcome 5.2. This outcome is divided into a, b and c as follows:

- a) SHGs increase the asset base of their members. This is local civil society contributing to more equitable access to (among others) education and health services, through means of mutual solidarity and use of increased financial assets.
- b) SHGs contribute to the wider community. This is local civil society contributing to development of the community as a whole, including improved access to basic services.
- c) SHGs' advocacy to governments is successful and results in better (access to) services.

## Annex 4. Additional details

Categorisation of all literature

Table 7. Categorising all literature.

Document	Strength of report	Reason	No. positive citations	No. negative citations
<b>Internal Documents</b>				
1. Model annual narrative report 2014	I	No methodology mentioned	1	1
2. Baseline Report for the Food Security / Self Help Group programme in Ethiopia, Somaliland and North Kenya, 2014.	IV	Baseline report that already distinguishes three groups and thereby shows differences.	4	1
3. Indicators Tear HoA programme March 2015 for all partners.	IV	No control groups	7	
4. Partnerships for change: a cost benefit analysis of Self Help Groups in Ethiopia, 2013.	IV	Focus group discussions & semi-structured interviews with SHG and non-SHG members led to quantified effects of the SHGs, but this was not compared over time.	18	
5. Gargaar SHG evaluation modified final 2014.	III	Different qualitative methods, such as interviews, workshops and Focus group discussions by an external consultant	15	4
6. PGT Dissertation DAD Annabelle Wilson 2014.	III	Used focus groups and interviews. No control groups.	11	3
7. SHGs and Resilience in Somaliland - CMcD comments AW responses (6 9 15)	III	focus group discussions and interviews, also with non-SHG members.	11	2
8. Thesis_klaas Evers Eindversie mailversie 1	III	Focus groups and interviews, also with non-members	12	2
9. SHG Case story- Sahra Hasan_Sept '14	I	Anecdote	1	
10. Suaad Moalin-Story of Change July 2015	I	Anecdote	2	
<b>External documents</b>				
Beaman et al 2014	V	Difference in difference studie	4	1
Brody et al 2015	VI	Systematic review of 23 quantitative and 11 qualitative studies.	8	
Crowley et al 2005	II	methodology not mentioned, but probably interviews with FAO staff and UN documents	7	



Document	Strength of report	Reason	No. positive citations	No. negative citations
Custer 2013	V	RCTs	4	3
Deininger and Liu, 2009a	IV	Quantitative survey with control groups, but no baseline study	7	2
Deininger and Liu, 2009b	V	Difference in difference	2	
Desai and Joshi 2010	V	Difference in difference approach	6	
Foster 2007	II	Unknown methodology	1	
Husein et al 2010	IV	quantitative research without time and using control groups.	5	1
Sudipta & Sarker 2011	IV	Surveys, control groups, no baseline	3	
Swain & Varghes 2009	IV	control group but no baseline	1	
Swamy and Tulisamala	IV	No control group and no baseline.	3	
Tankha 2002	II	Based on a desk study and interviews with staff	6	
Tesoriero 2005	III	Mentioned by Evers 2011 as ethnographic study	1	
Thomson 2010	III	Mentioned by Evers 2011 as ethnographic study	3	

## Weight of evidence by country

Table 8. Weight of evidence by country

Outcome	Qualitative Evidence	Quantitative Evidence
<b>Ethiopia</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>1. Human Security</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1 Less Sexual Violence	3	3
1.3 Social cohesion		3
<b>4. Legitimate and capable government</b>	<b>6</b>	
4.1 Inclusive government	6	
<b>5. Access to employment and services</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>63</b>
5.1 Employment, income	24	18
5.2.a Assets and services others	28	21
5.2.b Assets and services community	3	15
5.2.c Services government	2	
5.3 Resilience	15	9
<b>Somaliland</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1. Human Security</b>	<b>8</b>	
1.1 Less Sexual Violence	2	
1.3 Social cohesion	6	
<b>2. Functioning Rule of Law</b>	<b>0</b>	

Outcome	Qualitative Evidence	Quantitative Evidence
2.1 Access to justice	0	
<b>4. Legitimate and capable government</b>	<b>-2</b>	
4.1 Inclusive government	-2	
<b>5. Access to employment and services</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>6</b>
5.1 Employment, income	7	3
5.2.a Assets and services others	28	
5.2.b Assets and services community	1	
5.2.c Services government	1	
5.3 Resilience	7	3
<b>Kenya</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>1. Human Security</b>	<b>1</b>	
1.1 Less Sexual Violence	1	
<b>2. Functioning Rule of Law</b>	<b>1</b>	
2.1 Access to justice	1	
<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>4. Legitimate and capable government</b>		<b>3</b>
4.1 Inclusive government		3
<b>5. Access to employment and services</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>
5.1 Employment, income	0	9
5.2.b Assets and services community		6
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>93</b>