



THE UNIVERSITY
OF QUEENSLAND
AUSTRALIA

Final Report

**Project: Addressing legitimacy issues in fragile post-
conflict situations to advance conflict transformation and
peacebuilding**

Volker Boege
M. Anne Brown
Louise W. Moe

The University of Queensland

Brisbane, December 2012

This research project was supported by the Berghof Foundation

1. Short description of the project

Issues of legitimacy have been underestimated both in the academic discourse on and in the actual practice of peacebuilding. So far, the focus in discourse and practice has been much more on capacities and effectiveness – with the underlying assumption that legitimacy will quasi automatically flow from effectiveness; and if legitimacy has received any attention at all, this was confined to the legitimacy of state institutions and one specific type of legitimacy, the rational-legal – with the unarticulated assumption that only this type matters for peacebuilding. By contrast, this project draws attention to the co-existence, interface and mutual permeation of different sources and types of legitimacy. In doing so, it uses Max Weber's three ideal types of legitimate authority – rational-legal, traditional and charismatic – as a starting point, but transcends Weber's approach by introducing the concept of hybridization of legitimacy.

Legitimacy captures a fundamental relationship between governed and governing which is the bedrock of (reasonably) peaceful order and well-being of the political community. Legitimacy is not only bestowed in the central state government and state institutions, but distributed across society, with a variety of different governance actors at different societal levels and in different societal spheres enjoying or laying claim to legitimacy in the context of generating or maintaining social order. Legitimacy is a fundamentally relational concept.

Project research is empirically-based, it analyses domestic empirical legitimacy of state and societal, local and international actors in the post-conflict situations of East Timor, Bougainville and Somaliland. East Timor is a newly independent state where international actors and the national political elite put enormous effort into peacebuilding and state-building along the lines of the Western liberal model, with little connection to the local customary institutions of governance. At the same time, it is the only political entity in this study that is internationally recognized as a state. Bougainville in Papua New Guinea is in the process of post-conflict state formation (with the final form - independent state or autonomous region – to be settled by means of referendum in the near future), with relatively weak state structures and relatively strong local customary authorities. Somaliland, de jure part of Somalia, is a de facto independent political entity/state, without international legitimacy, but with governance institutions which enjoy domestic legitimacy, and with traditional authorities playing decisive roles in peacebuilding and state formation.

Legitimacy in all three cases is subject to complex dynamics of exchange between a variety of actors and institutions that are of significance for governance and social order. The project explores for each case who the actors and what the institutions

are that actually enjoy domestic empirical legitimacy in different societal arenas of governance activity. The analysis comprises state actors and institutions, international and civil society actors as well as societal actors and institutions that are specific to the culture and society of the place, in particular, ‘traditional’ authorities like clan elders, chiefs or local ‘kings’, and other actors who do not neatly fit into the spheres of ‘civil society’ or ‘state’, but nevertheless are legitimate authorities. In each of the three cases legitimate authority in the local community context, at the state level and in the international-local interface is analyzed.

The project presents post-conflict situations as characterised by the ongoing hybridisation of legitimacy of all actors at all levels, with local notions of legitimacy in constant flux. Other than in relatively stable liberal democratic states where legitimacy is also relatively stable, in post-conflict environments legitimacy is more fluid and changeable in the context of fundamental social and political transformation. In the course of the interactions of various legitimate authorities a web of connected sources of legitimacy is re-negotiated and re-arranged. The project posits that external actors engaged in peacebuilding have to develop a more contextualized understanding of the complexity of legitimacy issues in post-conflict situations. It makes a case for external actors to more carefully examine their own assumptions about legitimate authority, to reflect on the limits of their own legitimacy in local post-conflict environments and to transcend the comfort zone of liberal understandings of rational-legal legitimacy and to constructively engage with hybridization of legitimacy – without abandoning one’s own values and losing one’s own ethical and political orientation.

2. Project implementation

Project research was qualitative case study research, focusing on East Timor, Bougainville in Papua New Guinea and Somaliland in Somalia. At the core of the project was field research and the analysis of fieldwork data, supported by literature reviews and document and policy based institutional analysis.

Research was conducted in four phases. It stretched over two and a half years, commencing on 1 July 2010 and ending on 31 December 2012.¹

Literature review and framing paper (Phase 1)

In the first phase (July to December 2010) a literature review was conducted that had a general and a case-specific dimension. Firstly, theoretical and conceptual literature on legitimacy was reviewed; relevant contributions to the current discourse in political science on legitimacy were assessed according to their significance for the

¹ Originally, the project was designed for a duration of two years, with completion due on 30 June 2012. However, mainly due to delays to the second round of fieldwork, an extension to the completion date of 31 December 2012 was requested and accepted by the Berghof Foundation.

research questions of this project, and they were utilised for the elaboration of the framing paper. In addition, researchers reviewed the literature for their respective case studies (Bougainville, Timor Leste and Somaliland) so as to collect and analyse the relevant information with regard to the historical and political context of their cases. Furthermore, these case-specific literature reviews focussed on the identification of the main actors who are of relevance for the analysis of legitimate authority in the case study countries. While the review of the general literature on legitimacy provided necessary and valuable input for the framing paper, the review of the case-specific literature laid the basis for the fieldwork and the ensuing stand-alone country specific reports.

The main focus of work in phase 1 was on the framing paper and the analytical framework. Researchers met several times to discuss drafts, and in the light of these discussions and on the basis of the literature review a final draft of the framing paper was written and the analytical framework elaborated.

Preparation of Fieldwork (Phase 2)

In this phase (January to June 2011) work was focussed on the preparation of fieldwork. An Application for Ethical Clearance for the research in the three case study countries by the University of Queensland Ethical Clearance Committee was compiled, submitted and approved. This included the development of a series of Information Sheets and Consent Forms for local research participants in each of the case study countries.

As part of fieldwork preparation, contact was established and research approvals were sought with local institutions and people in Bougainville, Timor Leste and Somaliland. In particular, Anne Brown established contacts with colleagues at the National University of Timor Leste (UNTL), Louise Wiuff Moe with the Danish Refugee Council in Somaliland, and Volker Boege with Sr. Lorraine Garasu and James Tanis who had supported him as local research assistants in previous field research on Bougainville.

Commencement of fieldwork in Bougainville was delayed while waiting for notification of formal approval of the research from Bougainville authorities. The Somaliland case study research which is part of Louise Wiuff Moe's PhD research, was also delayed while waiting for approval and special permission to travel to Somaliland from the Deputy Vice Chancellor (International) of the University of Queensland, as Somaliland is considered a dangerous 'do not travel' location by the Australian government. To provide assurance of her security, Louise Wiuff Moe negotiated an agreement with the Danish Refugee Council to work collaboratively with them ensuring her security while working with their staff.

Anne Brown travelled to Dili in Timor Leste for preliminary work in May 2011 with co-Researcher Dr Deborah Cummins, who is based in Australia and has recently completed a PhD on governance in Timor Leste. During their stay Anne Brown

arranged for two political scientists of UNTL to work as local researchers with the project: Martinho Pereira, Dean of the Department of Political Science at UNTL, and Abel dos Santos, Lecturer, UNTL. These researchers are part of a team that Anne has worked with previously.

The case-specific literature review and document and policy analysis was continued during Phase 2.

Fieldwork and Data Analysis (Phase 3)

Fieldwork in the three case study regions was carried out between June 2011 and August 2012. A first round of field research in **Timor Leste** was conducted by Anne Brown in June-July 2011, and a second round in December 2011 (including workshop). The first period was spent in Dili, talking with state officials and NGO representatives there, and working with UNTL researchers preparing the later fieldwork. UNTL colleagues went to a number of villages to conduct fieldwork. Villages were chosen according to a range of criteria: rural/urban, remoteness/accessability, 'new' villages/long established villages, villages with different socio-political affiliations. A combination of observation, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions was used in field research. The researchers spoke to both men and women (but with men as the majority) and to both community leaders and community members. Researchers would usually stay in a village for several days. This gave them the opportunity to speak to the same people in a number of different ways. As well as Tetum the UNTL researchers were often able to use local languages (East Timor has a number of distinct language groups). Researchers worked through their findings together and with colleagues, comparing findings from different villages and discussing arguments. In December 2011 a workshop was held with the researchers, government officials, NGOs, students and some village heads talking about the research and research findings and their possible implications. East Timor fieldwork was conducted in close collaboration with colleagues from the Faculty of Political and Social Sciences at UNTL, the above-mentioned Martinho Pereira and Abel dos Santos, Alex Gusmao (an East Timorese social scientist with whom Anne Brown has a long-standing working relationship) and others; Dr Deborah Cummins, also working in collaboration with UNTL colleagues, assisted at some points.

Volker Boege carried out fieldwork on **Bougainville** in July/August 2011 and again in July/August 2012. Interviews and conversations as well as focus group discussions were conducted with leaders from various political and societal spheres: with members of the Autonomous Bougainville Government (ABG), including the ABG President and Vice-President and several ministers, with high-ranking public servants, members of the Bougainville House of Representatives, state representatives at the district level, members of several Councils of Elders, with local chiefs, leaders of international and local NGOs and community-based organisations, personnel from international organisations, church leaders, women and youth leaders, high-ranking

representatives of 'rebel' Meekamui factions, businessmen, (ex-)commanders of armed groups and with other personalities with an influence on politics in Bougainville. Interviews and focus group discussions took place in the two administrative centres of Buka and Arawa as well as in several villages along the Bougainville east coast between Kokopau and Arawa and in the mountainous interior in Central Bougainville. Two local research assistants were involved in the fieldwork, Dennis Kuiai, the First Secretary of the ABG Ministry of Peace and Reconciliation, and James Tanis, former ABG President, currently student of International Relations and Peace and Conflict Studies at the Australian National University (ANU) in Canberra. Further assistance was provided by Sr Lorraine Garasu (director of the Chabai Nazareth Rehabilitation Centre and former president of the Bougainville Inter-Church Women's Forum). The first round of fieldwork was delayed because of delays in the formal approval of the research from Bougainville authorities. The second round had to be postponed mainly because of security concerns in connection with the national elections in Papua New Guinea in June 2012. The second round of fieldwork was finally conducted in July/August 2012. During this round a workshop took place in a very remote area of Bougainville (Bolave in Bana district), bringing together government representatives, local customary authorities, NGOs, leaders of political factions, church and women leaders etc. Discussions and results of the workshop are presented in a small brochure (submitted along with this report). Preliminary research findings were discussed with James Tanis and Dennis Kuiai who provided valuable feedback.

Louise Wiuff Moe carried out field research in **Somaliland** between August and December 2011 (combining field research for the project and for her PhD thesis). She spent most of the time in Somaliland's capital Hargeisa, where she was partly based at the local research institute SORADI (Social Research and Development Institute) and partly at the Danish Refugee Council (DRC). In Hargeisa, focus group discussions and interviews were held with representatives of local and international NGOs (including women and youth organisations), development workers, academics, political analysts, government officials and traditional authorities. For fieldwork in rural areas she travelled three times to the regions of Sanaag (Ainabo and El Efweyn) and Togdheer (Sheik). In Ainabo and El Efweyn she conducted focus group discussions during her first trip with members of the traditional leaders' peace committees and of the 'women's peace platform' and interviews with local community development workers. In Ainabo she also attended a workshop on community policing and had conversations with the various participants. The second trip to El Efweyn included follow-up focus group discussions with the above-mentioned groups and additional focus groups with members of Village Councils and women's groups and the local community policing committee as well as interviews with the mayor and police commander. The trip to Sheik led to focus group discussions with village committees, the local community policing committee and the community conflict management team; furthermore, interviews with local community development workers were held. Fieldwork was conducted in close collaboration with

the DRC. This made travel outside of Hargeisa possible, gave access to interviewees and provided translation when needed. Close affiliation with SORADI, and in particular with its head Mohamed Fadal and with Haroon Yusuf, was also very helpful. SORADI has published some of the research findings from the Somaliland fieldwork in a recent publication. Research data were presented to and discussed with staff from SORADI and DRC who provided valuable feedback. Due to a deterioration of the security situation in south and central Somalia, it was not possible to return to Somaliland for a follow-up workshop as originally planned (given that Somaliland is de jure part of Somalia it would have been unlikely to get ethical clearance from the University committee to travel for a second visit). However, the feedback provided by DRC and SORADI as well as extensive feedback in follow-up focus group discussions filled the gap so that the workshop cancellation is not a great loss.

Comparison, Synthesis and Communication (Phase 4)

In the final project phase (August to December 2012) the focus was on analysing and comparing the fieldwork data and generalising research findings. For this purpose, the research team met for regular discussions. In these meetings, the case study findings were assessed against the original research proposal and the framing paper, and consensus was elaborated on the interpretation of data and, flowing from that, the refinement of initial research hypotheses. On this basis, the stand-alone reports on East Timor, Bougainville and Somaliland were written and a draft journal article was elaborated. This article presents the main findings of the project; it will be submitted to the new journal 'Peacebuilding'. Furthermore, a brochure summarising the Bougainville workshop outcomes was produced in English and Pidgin, and conference papers and a contribution to an edited volume published by the Somaliland partner SORADI were written. Finally, this final report for the Berghof Foundation was elaborated to document the research process, to present its primary results, to reflect on lessons learned and to discuss the impact of the project.

3. Primary research findings

- Legitimacy is a multi-dimensional concept, comprising normative and empirical aspects as well as locally grounded and internationally relevant references, encompassing process and performance dimensions; it is highly dynamic and at the same time of major significance for the endurance of political community as it establishes the fundamental relationship between agents and institutions of governance on the one hand and the governed on the other. In post-conflict societies that emerge from profound societal disruption and that undergo wide-ranging transformation and reshaping of political community, questions of legitimacy are by far more complex and more up for grabs than in stable democratic states. Legitimacy is spread over a variety of societal actors – beyond the government and the state – at different levels and in different spheres of society. Addressing legitimacy

issues means to talk about key aspects of socio-political relationships and ordering, taking into account the tension between stability and fluidity of the concept.

- Legitimacy issues are of utmost practical importance for the success or failure of conflict transformation and peacebuilding; actors on the ground are responsive to this importance and put a lot of effort into negotiating legitimacy issues. By contrast, in Western peace and development theory and practice legitimacy issues so far tend to be underestimated or neglected; in particular, local notions of legitimacy (which differ from or even are contradictory to Western liberal understandings of legitimacy) have been widely overlooked.
- In fragile post-conflict situations various types and sources of legitimacy co-exist; the mutual permeation and interaction of these sources and types of legitimacy render legitimacy patterns in these situations more complex and fluid than in well-established Western liberal democratic states - and more complex and fluid than assumed in mainstream Western peace and development research and practice.
- At the same time, protagonists of a Western liberal notion of legitimacy have a tendency to idealise the homogeneity of legitimacy arrangements in Western liberal democratic countries (where legitimacy is not that homogenous after all) and to negatively contrast the heterogeneity of legitimacy in post-conflict situations against the supposed homogeneity of Western liberal legitimacy.
- A Weberian approach to legitimacy issues in fragile post-conflict situations provides a good starting point for research, but research has to transcend the Weberian concept and categories in order to develop an adequate understanding of legitimacy in these situations and to elaborate policy-relevant analyses of legitimacy.
- It is not the quality of any *one* source of legitimacy that in and of itself provides a sustainable basis for political institutions and order, but rather a web of connected sources of legitimacy, dependent on possibilities for people to participate and to engage with issues of governance. Thus, enabling people to engage, creating a range of channels of participation, is crucial for the legitimization of governance arrangements. Moreover, creating and maintaining such a 'web' requires a high degree of flexibility and pragmatism as local expectations and perceptions of what constitutes legitimate and efficient governance are in constant flux.
- The concept of hybrid legitimacy (in hybrid political orders) which stood at the beginning of this research has proven to be of limited analytical traction; it is too static, it has to be developed further, taking account of the fluidity and relationality of legitimacy; consequently, hybrid legitimacy cannot be constructed as another ideal type of legitimate authority, but it has to be thought of in the process and relational mode; therefore talking about webs

and processes of hybridisation of legitimacy is more appropriate than presenting hybrid legitimacy as a new category.

- Hybridisation of legitimacy is an ongoing process; it would be misleading to conceptualise it as geared towards some form of an end-state of a new type of settled and uncontested legitimate authority which then could provide the sound basis for conflict transformation, peacebuilding and state-building. There is no ‘solution’ (in the sense of a final end-stage to be reached) to the problem of legitimacy in fragile post-conflict situations. Rather legitimacy remains contested and is continually re-negotiated and re-constructed in the course of the actions and interactions of local (and international) actors. Hence maintaining the spaces and the opportunities for contesting and reopening questions of authority and political community is the ‘solution’ to legitimacy as legitimacy is at the same time fluid and negotiated *and* a constant structural feature of governance arrangements.
- In the course of interactions, the legitimacy of all actors is hybridised, including the legitimacy of those actors who lay claim to a specific type of legitimacy, be it rational-legal or traditional, or other; and seemingly contradictory and mutually exclusive legitimacies go together, interact and intertwine – or undermine and subvert each other, with delegitimisation (instead of hybridisation) as the consequence.
- The focus on hybridisation allows us to investigate the interaction of actors, institutions, and concepts between the otherwise static categories of ‘state’ and ‘non-state’, ‘formal’ and ‘informal’, ‘modern’ and ‘traditional’, ‘internal/domestic’ and ‘external/foreign’, ‘adaptation’ and ‘resistance’ and not least ‘rational-legal’ – ‘traditional’ – ‘charismatic’, and take due account of the continuum between and the enmeshment of these categories..
- People and political leaders on the ground in fragile post-conflict situations have much less problems with the ongoing hybridization of legitimacy than academics and policymakers from a Western background who think of legitimacy in much more static, monolithic and exclusionary terms and who – despite much talk about ‘ownership’ and ‘participation’ -have a tendency to ignore, neglect, exclude or reject everyday local agency which does not fit into their way of talking about politics and ‘the state’ (at the end of the day, it is still rational-legal legitimacy of state institutions in the Weberian sense that their thinking and policies are geared towards).
- For external actors, engaging with different types of locally legitimate authorities is burdened with all sorts of difficulties: it needs reflection on one’s own legitimacy and one’s own understandings of legitimacy, it needs reflection on how to engage and how to overcome obstacles to engagement, to realistically assess the conditions under which engagement is possible and the

limits of engagement, and it needs choices about who to actually engage with, without abandoning one's own ethical compass and political values.

- Having said that, external support for conflict transformation and peacebuilding in fragile post-conflict situations has to overcome narrow understandings of legitimacy and state-centric approaches to building legitimate authority; it is not enough to work with 'non-state' actors as just a stop gap or last resort complementing state institutions in situations where the latter obviously lack legitimacy and effectiveness, while at the same time clinging to the underlying liberal paradigm; such an approach merely instrumentalises the 'non-state' actors for a Western liberal stabilization agenda.
- International actors have to work *with* the ongoing hybridization of legitimacy which means, inter alia, to open space and facilitate fora for local people and political leaders to engage in conversations about the improvement of the collaboration of different types of legitimate authorities. External legitimacy granted to selected local actors or institutions affects local agendas and balances of authority and power; this can derail locally legitimate agendas. Due to the resources at their disposal, external actors have the power to influence the dynamics of legitimization in post-conflict situations. Rather than using this power to close spaces for conversation and negotiation (e.g. by exclusively supporting the rational-legal legitimacy of governments), they should use it for opening spaces.
- The practices of international liberal peacebuilders need to be reformed, taking into account the need for and limitations of constructive engagement with legitimate local authorities of different types (beyond the state and the comfort zone of 'civil society' in the Western liberal sense); this necessitates reflection on the external actors' own (claims to) legitimacy, and on current forms of engagement.
- There are interesting examples of some international agencies (primarily smaller scale) starting to move beyond strictly state-based (legal, institutional, formal) approaches and instead employ more dialogical approaches that also engage with and encourage local, communal legitimate actors and practices in the pursuit of conflict transformation, peace and legitimate political order. This is encouraging and merits attention and analysis, yet it also involves a number of challenges (practical, normative, epistemological etc).
- External actors and locals have to engage in ongoing conversations about their understandings of legitimate authority; this cross-cultural dialogue has to address the tension between international and national state legality on the one hand and local empirical concepts of legitimacy on the other; the dialogue has to be long-term, conducted with an open mind, with the preparedness to change one's own ways of thinking and doing. This means, for example, that

international actors show a willingness to question their self-perception as ‚naturally’ legitimate actors (based on the invitation of a host government or a UN mandate, or similar) and develop an openness to diverging notions of legitimacy, while local actors develop an openness to understanding why international actors question some forms of local legitimacy. In the course of such conversations new understandings and new practices of legitimacy and legitimisation can emerge that are more conducive to conflict transformation and peacebuilding than those which stood at the outset of the conversations.

- People on the ground appreciate opportunities to talk about their understandings of legitimate authority and the willingness of outsiders (including external researchers) to engage in debates about this topic; conventional monitoring and evaluation procedures usually do not capture this important dimension of local-external engagement.
- Research of this kind that does engage in cross-cultural conversations can in itself contribute to local peacebuilding, both directly (e.g. by supporting local actors to reflect on the achievements and shortcomings of their peacebuilding practices) and indirectly, by means of providing ‘collateral goods’ of various kinds (e.g. financing local research assistants and local peacebuilding initiatives); moreover, it is a significant way to connect people and cultures and to negotiate different ways of knowing about ‘politics’ and ‘peace’.

4. Lessons learned

The implementation of a research project like this one, grounded in empirical research, and field research in particular, in relatively volatile socio-political environments, is dependent on some preconditions. Crucial are:

- Good relationships with people on the ground in case study regions; this allowed for smooth conduct of fieldwork;
- Good relationships with state authorities in case study regions; this provided for unproblematic access to the field and undisturbed empirical research;
- A basis of trust with local people and authorities; this had been established in previous work in case study regions, and this project was able to build on this basis.

Furthermore, collaboration with local partners and research assistants in the case study regions was of utmost importance. Collaboration was excellent. Partners from DRC and SORADI in Somaliland and from UNTL in Timor Leste as well as individual local collaborators in Bougainville provided invaluable support with regard to access to local actors, translations, interpretation of data etc. A research project like this one cannot be done without local partners. Again, the fact that the researchers involved in this project already had working experience in the case study regions and

were familiar with the situation and the people on the ground, provided the basis for the selection of competent local partners and smooth cooperation.

Similarly, the fact that the researchers had already undertaken previous research on issues of hybrid order and peace in fragile post-conflict environments in general and on the case study regions in particular was helpful: this project did not have to start from scratch, it could build on earlier work, and only because of this it could be carried out successfully under given constraints with regard to time and resources.

Among the 'hard' lessons learned in the course of the project, the most remarkable were:

- Security issues in two case study regions, Bougainville and Somaliland, resulted in delays in the fieldwork component of the project and the need to adjust fieldwork plans. This has to be reckoned with when working in fragile post-conflict situations - even the most thorough planning and careful preparation can only help so much. Building robust relationships to key actors on the ground who can assess and address security issues so that the safety of everybody engaged in the research is secured is of utmost importance.
- The availability of local partners cannot be taken for granted all the time; given that partners are involved in their own projects, have social obligations and work in a challenging environment (for example in Bougainville and East Timor, health issues including malaria and other tropical diseases can be significant). These factors mean that things often cannot run according to original plans and timelines.
- Problems of travel and access due to poor infrastructure in the case study regions must not be underestimated; heavy rain and blocked roads due to landslides can force to spontaneous change of plans.

Finally, project-based research like this inevitably can only be relatively short-term. But what holds true for external support for conflict transformation and peacebuilding, namely that long-term engagement is crucial, also holds true for research that wants to contribute to positive conflict transformation. Hence more reflection is needed on how to embed specific research projects into longer-term research programs and how to secure follow-up.

5. Impact of the project

So far, the project has had the following outputs:

- A framing paper which presented the theoretical, conceptual and methodological approach, including an analytical framework, and provided some initial research findings;
- Various ethical clearance documents for the conduct of fieldwork;

- Workshops in East Timor and Bougainville with local stakeholders; extensive focus group discussions in El Efweyn and Sheik in Somaliland.
- A conference paper presented by Louise Wiuff Moe at a conference on peacebuilding at the University of Manchester. This paper is under review with the journal *Development and Change*;
- Three stand-alone case study reports on Bougainville, East Timor and Somaliland;
- A brochure/briefing paper on the Bougainville workshop (in English and Pidgin);
- A chapter in the volume *Reflections and lessons of Somaliland's two decades of sustained peace, statebuilding and democratization*, published by SORADI (Hargeisa); This chapter was developed as part of Louise Wiuff Moe's PhD research which ties in with research for this Berghof project.
- A journal article presenting the analysis of major research findings, under preparation for submission to the peer-reviewed journal 'Peacebuilding';
- This final report to the Berghof Foundation.

In addition to these research outputs, Louise Wiuff Moe had a journal article published entitled "Hybrid and 'Everyday' Political Ordering: Constructing and Contesting Legitimacy in Somaliland" published in *Journal of Legal Pluralism* 2011. This was based on earlier field research combined with theoretical insights from this project.

On the basis of these outputs, the research findings can be shared with a wider international academic and policy-oriented audience. Research findings will flow into more journal articles, conference presentations and applications for future research.

Furthermore, the findings of the research can have an impact on attitudes and activities of actors on the ground, and they do have this impact already, as conversations with people from different walks of life in the case study regions confirm. The research definitely has had the impact of raising awareness about the importance of legitimacy issues. In Bougainville, the Pidgin brochure on the Bolave workshop is being widely disseminated among people from the region and political leaders, and there are plans to hold similar workshops in other parts of Bougainville. The English version of the brochure was disseminated among politicians in PNG and Bougainville and international actors and was met with considerable interest. The Australian High Commissioner to PNG, for example, has requested a discussion about the research findings.

In the case of Somaliland, some of the fieldwork findings were developed into a chapter for a volume published by the local research institute SORADI. This provided a particularly well-suited outlet for fieldwork findings, since a well-connected and respected local policy research institute, whose research is made available to political actors, civil society as well as international actors, published

the volume. The volume is likely to be read by international as well as local actors engaged in work on state-building and peacebuilding in Somaliland. Moreover, the leadership of the Danish Refugee Council (in Nairobi as well as in the headquarters in Copenhagen) has shown substantial interest in the research findings, and engaged in subsequent discussions of the findings.

The research undertaken in Timor Leste built on earlier projects that Dr Brown has undertaken with researchers from the UNTL. These constitute efforts to support UNTL political and social studies researchers to be able to undertake research relevant to their own interests, and which they can use in their own teaching and towards publications. This project also opened opportunities for local researchers to generate their own research and to build their own research strengths. Moreover the research project contributed to linkages across different arenas of East Timorese society through the process of research, report back and workshop, but also to support exchange between researchers and other bodies. The workshop was also a lively affair, with academics, students, civil society bodies and government representatives taking part. Local radio reported some of the discussions.

That the research project has been received positively by local partners leads to the problem that expectations have been raised, and people are keen to continue with what has been initiated by the research. Research projects like this, however, can only be conceptualised and carried out for relatively short time spans. One has to hope that people on the ground have become excited enough to further pursue the issues raised on their own and with their own resources. There are indications that this is going to happen in the case study regions. In Bougainville, for example, the two main local partners are developing plans for the continuation of the work that has started with this project, and they are in a relatively good position to do so. Finally, the capacity-building impact of the project must not be underestimated. As a 'collateral good' of the project. Local partner organisations' relationships in international research networks were strengthened, and their commitment to peacebuilding and peace research have been nurtured. They were exposed to new ideas and approaches and to a mutual learning experience - and so were the researchers involved in this project. They too learned a lot in the course of the project and have reinvigorated their enthusiasm to continue this kind of work which connects people in cross-cultural conversations about paths to sustainable peace.