

### **Effect of peace processes and diplomacy on political security**

Peace process interventions have no effect on political security in terms of civil liberties, and women's political participation through gender-inclusive agreements.

Geographic region: Global, Sub Saharan Africa

Effect size: No effect ( $g=0.001$ )

Confidence in study findings: Low (2 studies with 12 effect sizes)

#### **Short summary**

Peace process interventions, such as agreements with human rights provisions could enhance political security by fostering stability, inclusivity, and civil liberties. Gender-specific provisions improve women's political participation. Meanwhile, bureaucratic efficacy enhances the positive effects of human rights treaties on political security. Overall the cell has low confidence as it has less than 4 impact evaluations.

#### **Long summary**

##### *The intervention*

Peace process interventions and diplomacy, which include peace agreements and provisions for human rights, aim to foster political stability and enhance civil and political rights. These agreements may incorporate gender-specific provisions, emphasizing inclusivity and equality. State capacity, including bureaucratic efficacy and reduced militarization, also plays a role in securing political rights by ensuring effective implementation.

##### *How the intervention is expected to affect this outcome*

Peace process interventions and diplomacy are expected to improve political security by fostering stability, reducing violence, and addressing systemic inequalities. Gender-specific provisions in peace agreements aim to increase women's political representation and civil liberties, creating a more inclusive political environment. Effective state capacity, characterized by strong bureaucratic systems and infrastructural reach, facilitates adherence to political rights and implementation of agreements. Conversely, excessive coercive capacity, such as militarization, may undermine these positive outcomes by increasing the likelihood of rights violations. Overall, these interventions aim to create a governance framework that secures and enhances civil and political rights post-conflict.

##### *The evidence base*

The cell includes 2 non-experimental impact evaluation studies, both of which include global datasets over a long-time frame. Bakken and Buhaug (2020) examines data from 160 countries between 1975 and 2017 while Cole (2015) evaluates the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) globally. There is also one qualitative study Adedokun (2019) included in this cell, which is set in Mozambique.

### *Evidence findings*

Findings suggest that peace agreements that include gender-specific provisions are particularly effective in improving women's political representation. It was also found that bureaucratic efficacy enhances the positive effects of human rights treaties on political security.

### *Included studies*

**Bakken & Buhaug (2020)** examines the transformative potential of civil war on female empowerment, focusing on how conflict severity and termination conditions affect outcomes for women in the aftermath of civil conflict. The context includes various countries experiencing civil wars, with a particular emphasis on the role of peace agreements and gender-specific provisions in these agreements. The study employs a statistical analysis of changes in female empowerment across 160 independent countries from 1975 to 2017. It uses data from the Varieties of Democracy project to measure women's civil liberties and political representation. The analysis includes Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) models with panel-corrected standard errors to account for heteroskedastic residuals and autocorrelation. Findings suggest high-intensity conflicts lead to greater post-conflict improvements in women's civil liberties and political representation compared to low-intensity conflicts. Peace agreements that include gender-specific provisions are particularly effective in improving women's political representation. The study is rated as medium confidence as the study is non-experimental and interventions are only partially described.

**Cole (2015)** explores the role of state capacity in implementing human rights treaties, with a specific focus on the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). The study employs a two-stage regression model to examine the relationship between state capacity and treaty compliance across a sample of countries that are ICCPR signatories. The independent variables include various indicators of state capacity, such as bureaucratic quality, corruption control, military involvement in politics, and infrastructural strength, to test their impact on compliance with civil, political, and physical integrity rights. To address endogeneity, the following instrumental variables were used: ratification hurdles, legal system type, government type, and a global cumulative ratification measure. The study finds that higher bureaucratic efficacy, characterized by reduced corruption and military influence in politics, significantly enhances compliance with human rights commitments. Meanwhile, enhanced infrastructural reach, such as communication networks and urbanization, is associated with better protection of physical integrity rights. Finally, strong coercive capacities, indicated by larger military expenditures, were found to be linked to increased likelihood of rights violations. The study is rated medium confidence due to its partial description of the intervention and outcomes, and its non-experimental design. The study finds that state capacity plays a critical role in improving both empowerment rights and physical integrity rights. High bureaucratic efficacy and territorial reach enhance adherence to these rights, enabling states to implement treaty commitments effectively, while excessive coercive capacity (e.g., militarization) often leads to rights violations. The effectiveness of human rights treaties is thus conditional on a state's administrative and infrastructural strength, with coercive states showing mixed or adverse outcomes. The study is rated medium confidence due to its partial description of the intervention and outcomes, and its non-experimental design.

### *Confidence assessment*

Overall low: This cell has an overall low rating as it has less than 4 impact evaluations.

**Other outcomes in the study:**

Human security / Physical security