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Abstract

Along with the United Nations Security Council Resolutions on women, peace and security, women's participation in peace processes has become an increasingly popular research topic in the 2000s. However, while several authors have written on the topic, there seems to be a lack of empirical data to support the argumentation regarding women's participation in peace negotiations and its impact on agreements and post-conflict societies. Therefore, the objective of this study is to carry out an analysis on the recent research processes that concern women's participation in formal peace negotiations and its impact, and assess this research in terms of its validity.

As the primary data used for this study consisted of scientific publications, content analysis and discourse analysis proved to be appropriate methods to collect and categorise the data. After this process the data were analysed with the help of an analytical framework based on the criteria for validity in scientific research, which was composed of four different elements: credibility, transferability, reliability and verifiability.

The findings regarding the validity of the research processes concerning women's participation in peace negotiations and its impact indicated that the research lacks validity to a great extent in all four areas depicted in the analytical framework. The main issues with the past research arose within the connections made between the methods, sources and findings. In addition, it was concluded that there are indications that the scientific discourse on women's participation is heavily influenced by the UNSC resolutions on women, peace and security, creating more advocacy research with political agenda rather than scientific studies aiming at objectivity. In other words, there are great opportunities to be taken in different areas of research to create more validity on the argumentation and thus, to generate data to support relevant mechanisms for more sustainable peace-building in regards of women's participation in peace negotiations.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Research problem formulation

Originally, this study began with an interest regarding the potential impact women's participation in formal peace processes may have on peace agreements and post-conflict peace processes. This focus was chosen based on the notions that the international community, as well as academia, have made on the constant absence of women in the formal negotiations, and therefore, on the exclusion of their voices and views from the structures of post-conflict societies (see e.g. Bouta & al. 2004; UNWomen 2012; and Thompson 2006). Probably the two most significant and recent milestones in this respect have been the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action (1995) and the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 on women, peace and security (2000) promoting the gender dimension of peace and conflict by emphasising the importance of women’s participation and their full involvement in peace processes as well as the need to increase women’s roles in decision-making in conflict prevention and resolution (UNSCR 2000; Bouta & al. 2004:1-2).

The first rigorous dive into the literature revealed that while a variety of research has been devoted to issues regarding women in peace processes, and whilst a strong debate exists arguing for increased inclusion, the results indicating the real impact of women’s formal participation in negotiations tended to be controversial and uncertain (see e.g. Amaybel & M’Cormack-Hale 2012; Banerjee 2008; Lachenmann & Dannecker 2010; Potter & Mundkur 2012; Thompson 2006; Byrne 1995; Snyder & Stobbe 2011; Reimann 2001; Skjelsbeck 2001; Snyder & Stobbe 2011). The original intention of this study was thus, to explore the correlation between women’s participation in negotiations and whether these then resulted in peace agreements that were more engendered1, since the literature seemed to suggest that women's participation improves the quality of the peace agreements and enhances social change bringing about more gender equal participation in the post-conflict societies. For instance, according to Charlotte Nicol (2012), one of the core arguments for women’s participation concerns sustainability of peace. In other words, it has been generally assumed that women’s inclusion in peace processes results in more effective and sustainable peace agreements, which is based on the assumption that recognition of all people and/or sectors affected by the conflict create stability as well as on the

---

1 Here, the concept engendering is understood along the lines of gender aware analysis, meaning an approach where a specific phenomenon is analysed from gender perspective seeking to develop a more gender sensitive approach i.e. understanding gender as an analytical category and abolish potential “gender blindness” from a particular context (See e.g. Mason & King 2001). Thus, with regards to peace agreements or peace processes engendering has been referred to in two ways. Firstly, engendering peace process means ensuring that women's interests and needs are addressed in peace agreements and peace processes, and secondly, that women’s role is acknowledged as peace-builders (not only e.g. as victims). (See e.g. Swanee & Hunt 2001; Pankhurst 2003; Adrian-Paul 2004)
assumption that women tend to have a more holistic and comprehensive view on peace. In other words, here peace is regarded as gendered in a sense that women and men are perceived to have different roles in it, but also in that it affects women and men differently and thus, allegedly, women and men have different input to give on the concept of peace. (Nicol 2012:24-25)

Nevertheless, the first issue this research unfortunately confronted was a lack of data. Whereas, public databases provided by institutions such as the UN Peacemakers, University of Ulster, Uppsala University Conflict Database and the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies give access to peace agreements that have had references to women and gender, none of the at least publically known sources had data regarding women’s participation in negotiations. Basically, too often the peace agreements found through these databases did not show who participated in the negotiations, which left too wide a margin of error. Due to the lack of data, this topic quickly became unmanagable.

This lack of real data on the issue opened a new set of questions regarding the research and the entire debate on women’s participation in peace processes. If half of the required data is not accessible, on what evidence are the arguments based? Therefore, this study is approaching the issue from more epistemological point of view and addresses the credibility of the current research. At the core of this study is the investigation of questions regarding scientific practice – the assumptions, methods, and implications as well as the use and merit of science i.e. to critically challenge scientific knowledge and its logic, created in this particular context of peace research.

1.2 Objective and research questions

The aim of this study is to carry out a detailed analysis of the current research concerning women’s participation in and its impact on peace negotiations and assess the connections made between the sources, methods and findings in order to evaluate its validity and credibility. In order to reach this objective, the following questions will be presented regarding the topic, authors and methods used to arrive at conclusions:

1. What has been written on the relationship regarding women’s participation in formal negotiations and their impact on peace processes/ agreements, and which major arguments have been put forth?
2. What is/ are the background of the author(s)?
3. What type of data/ sources (e.g. primary/secondary) did the author(s) use in order to reach the conclusions?
4. What were the methods used to collect and analyse the data?
5. What do the findings tell about the epistemological underpinnings of this research and where should future research go?
The first question aims at creating a frame for this study, by asking what we know about the topic. The purpose of questions 3-5 is to create knowledge on the epistemological assumptions behind the debate and research by asking how we can know what we know. Hereby, questioning methods is also to determine the validity and reliability of the conducted research, and therefore evaluating the legitimacy of the research. Furthermore, the second question regarding the authors is important in order to create a picture on the positions of the authors themselves and revealing potential biases and agendas. Moreover, knowing the author can also present geographical categorisations that may be attached to the debate. The final question is then to identify the needs for the future research by looking at the potential weaknesses and gaps in the recent research and therefore, assess the status of the conclusions drawn in the current research and seek to find potential directions for the future.

1.3 Relevance

Considering that gender, or particularly women as active agents, has become a widely emphasised category in the development context – to the extent where it has reached a legitimate position in the 2000s, for instance, through the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as well as through the focus in all the United Nations Security Council Resolutions implemented between 2000 and 2013 (1325, 1820, 1888, 1889, 2106) – it is of particular importance to ensure the basis of the arguments is credible (See UNSCR 2000; UNSCR 2008; UNSCR 2009a; UNSCR 2009b; UNSCR 2013; and Todaro & Smith 2012:16). Thus, this study, by taking a closer look into the points of departure in the debate and by evaluating the current research may strengthen the credibility of the arguments made regarding women's participation in the peace processes.

On the other hand, due to the strong emphasis on women on a global level and the fact that there seems to be no adequate data to evaluate the actual impact regarding women's participation in peace negotiations on post-conflict societies or even on peace agreements, it is highly important to investigate further what type of sources and methods have been used to draw conclusions on the topic. This way it is also possible to contribute to the topic by revealing the potential needs for the future research and develop further understanding of the debate regarding the gender aspect in conflict resolution and peace processes in general.

1.4 Analytical framework and methodology

The observations in this study are made on research processes i.e. the methods and data employed, which calls for a slightly less traditional frame that is essentially answering the
questions of how research could or should be done. The analytical framework is then utilised to analyse how particular research has been done, and will be established in chapter 3. The focus is on the criteria that in social sciences are commonly accepted to qualify research as scientific, meaning that it is carried out under explicit scientific guidelines. The focus regards the research process and the means with which scientific research produces certain results. Therefore, the core of this framework is based on the connections that should exist between the links that bind data, interpretations and conclusions.

The methods in this study are based on different types of text analysis which are utilised to examine different meanings and discourses. The tools – content analysis and discourse analysis – were picked for this study to gather data on how other research has tried to create understanding of a certain issue. Principally, the analytical frame and the methods support qualitative approach and thus, the categorisation through the analytical framework has been presented qualitatively. More detailed description of the analytical framework and the methodological choices can be found from chapter 2 and 3.

The primary sources were based on articles that contribute to the scientific debate regarding women’s participation in peace negotiations. Sources that were written as news articles or opinion pieces as well as unpublished articles were discarded as they were not seen to fit the criteria that regards scientific articles. In fact, it would have been nonsensical for this study to evaluate information with scientific criteria, if it had not been a result of a scientific process. Thus, the data selection focused on articles and reports that were produced as a result of a published research carried out by a professional public or private institution. The data retrieval began from electronic databases (Ebrary, JSTOR, One Search, Scopus) but accumulated as more sources were found through the references of the gathered data.

1.5 DisPOSITION

The thesis structure follows the pattern described henceforth. The first chapter describes the research problem, objective and questions, gives a brief insight to the analytical frame and methods and presents the relevance, ethical questions and (de)limitations. After the introduction, the thesis continues with a more in-depth presentation of the analytical framework. The first part of the second chapter portrays the formulation of the framework and the second part describes in detail the function of the frame. The next and third chapter concentrates on the methodological framework, giving first an overview on text analysis as well as discourse analysis, and then going on to the use of the methods and how the data was treated. The fourth chapter presents the findings. This chapter follows the categorisation created with
the methods and aims at describing the data in accordance to the research questions. The fifth chapter presents an analysis of the findings with respect to the research questions and objective presented in the first chapter. The final chapter provides a closure for the thesis by highlighting the main results, and aims at putting the findings into a wider context.

1.6 Limitations, delimitation and ethical questions

A clear limitation to this study has been the lack of coherent data on the past peace processes. This is not only a question of limitation regarding the structures of the public databases but particularly regarding the choices made in terms of the recorded data. The lack of appropriate records hindered this research, as well as all past research, as it was impossible to find or even create statistical information on the hundreds of peace processes in terms of formal participation.

On the other hand, one of the delimitations of this study is the focus itself. Exploring the acclaimed impact of women’s participation in peace processes by no means implies that similar issues related to men’s exclusion do not exist. Neither ‘women’ nor ‘men’ are a homogenous group with one voice. Furthermore, the choices made to narrow down the topic to negotiations and the choice to carry out a desk study instead of field work had a limiting impact on the boundaries of the work. This study however, acknowledges the potential biases and pre-understandings that come with the secondary sources. After all, to some extent this paper is concentrating on these potential biases and pre-assumptions in past research rather than accepting any of it as a fact. In addition, the data gathering was conducted mainly in English, which includes two aspects in terms of delimitations. Firstly, English is not my native language, which always leaves a margin of error in search words and interpretations. Secondly, it is probable that some documents were excluded from the search due to the language, limiting the primary sources and possibly emphasising Western discourse on the issue. However, in order to battle this delimitation, random sample of searches were carried out in Finnish and Spanish, but no new data on the topic were discovered by this method. In addition, the major institutions such as the UN, the World Bank, and some of the Spanish sources were also found in other languages in addition to English.

Since this research was conducted completely as a desk study the ethical issues exclude the questions regarding the obvious dilemmas in field studies, concerning e.g. interviewees. However, as this paper is trying to reveal some of the underlying assumptions regarding e.g. gender, it is important to emphasise that no research is free from bias or the position of the researcher. Considering that the focus of the topic is related to how research can reconstruct and
strengthen different dialogues regarding genders, it is of importance to pay attention to the writers own biases. However, as a human being with a certain social category of my own, I can only aim – by acknowledging that the approaches chosen here are only one perspective to look at peace and conflict related processes and by unfastening my own positions regarding the values and views relevant to the study – to avoid writing them in this thesis. And finally, by conducting research in a manner that respects the ‘rules’ of academia including openness, avoiding plagiarism, and presenting findings in a truthful manner will function as a guideline and solution to the obvious ethical obstacles of any research.
2. Analytical framework

2.1 Formulation

Ideally, all pieces in scientific research should strengthen each other and the inner flow of logic of the research. Thus, also the framework to analyse the data should be supporting this goal by enhancing understanding of the collected data and the research topic. The function of an analytical frame in this study is to create a number of criteria, through which it is possible to observe how a particular scientific research produces particular results. Since the observations are made on research procedures i.e. the used methods and data as well as findings as well as on the content of the analysed data, this study calls for a slightly unconventional framework for the analysis.

Therefore, the set criteria i.e. the parameters that are chosen to examine and analyse the findings, are based on the key elements that characterise scientific studies in the academia. In other words, the analytical framework consists of criteria that are considered in social sciences to categorise research as scientific, and thereby, framing an answer to the question of how research could and should be done, and looking then into how the research in the particular articles under consideration was pursued.

2.2 The making of scientific research

In the social sciences the focus is essentially on human behaviour and thus, due to its unpredictability the theories and methods vary in comparison to natural sciences, and therefore, no easy description exists for the criteria of social scientific study. However, what commonly makes science a science so to speak, are the shared rules and standards that have to be applied systematically (to the natural world) in order to create credibility and support for the evidence and lead to on-going research (Somekh & al. 2011:2-3). There are several ways in which social sciences can categorise and operationalise social knowledge and its production. For instance, social sciences can:

- use quantitative, qualitative or mixed methods design
- use abductive, deductive or inductive logic
- be based on an experimental, survey or case study
- have several different purposes in terms of basic and applied research (such as exploration, description, explanation, interpretation, documentation etc.) (See e.g., Mikkelsen 2005: 124-126; Creswell 2003:4)
Nonetheless, social research ought to be based on certain ontological, axiological and epistemological axioms that then should be based on logical argumentation and be methodologically realisable. Thus, the used theories and data collection and analysis should be used interactively, in other words, clarity should exist between the links that bind data, interpretations and conclusions. (Somekh 2011:2, 5; Silverman 2010:293) Appropriate methods used in data creation and connected to theoretical assumptions, in addition to findings that are supported by data, are elements that can increase the credibility and reliability of research. (Mikkelsen 2005:184; Creswell 2003:193) Put simply, research should state clearly what the methods were and why they were chosen to retrieve the data. Furthermore, keeping a detailed record on the gathered data and enabling others to access the material (while acknowledging ethical considerations) creates accountability and credibility to the research. Once this procedure has been carried out, the argumentation in the findings should be based on credible evidence that can be supported by the gathered data. Without these connexions, scientific research does not only lose its validity but also credibility, and in the worst case scenario can be used as a basis later on and consequently, also falsify future research. Therefore, in social sciences the results should be replicable and falsifiable or verifiable.

Accordingly, any well conducted research should include a logical interrelationship between ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions, which should be logically connected to the methods and the sources. In other words, research is a process in which the ontological stance and understandings of the research object will affect the epistemological assumptions regarding what and how we can know about it, which again should be in line with the methodological choices regarding how that knowledge can be acquired. This then should logically lead to the precise methods i.e. techniques or procedures that can be used to acquire the required knowledge and finally bring the researcher to the relevant data (sources) that can be collected with these methods. (Grix 2010:67-68) Therefore, the questions to be asked from the data (texts) in this frame relate to the formulation of data and its interpretations as presented in the seven different points in figure 1.

In the context of this study, the first point in figure 1, arguments, regards the claims the authors use to describe the impact of women’s participation in peace negotiations to post-conflict societies, whereas the second point, clarity of sources, refers to the manner the authors have presented the sources they have used. This point is mainly a question of clarity in terms of representation of sources, in other words, whether the sources are transparent and outlined clearly. The third and fourth points, primary data use and secondary data use, concern the relevancy of the data, investigating what types of sources have been used in order to reach the
conclusions, whereas the fifth point, refers to the methods that were utilised to acquire this particular data.

Figure 1. Analytical framework based on Guba and Lincoln (1986).

The sixth point in the figure 1, *generalizability* concerns the cases in the research and asks whether the quality of selected cases are able to arrive from the findings of the research based on those cases, at conclusions concerning all other cases. Finally, the seventh point, *validity* in this case refers to the criteria to judge quality of the research done and bring the earlier points together creating coherence and relevance for the frame. Basically, validity is founded on the criteria proposed by Guba and Lincoln (1989) that is based on *credibility*, *transferability*, *reliability* and *verifiability*² (Guba & Lincoln 1989:239-243). These criteria are created for qualitative studies which this study also represents.

Consequently, here the credibility criterion refers to objectivity and subjectivity in respect of the research objective and the credibility of the research findings asking whether the results represent interpretation of the data that can be considered credible. (Guba & Lincoln 1989:104, 239) In other words, the basic assumption is that "truth" is relative and thus, any argument with sufficient (empirical) evidence can be regarded “true” until more information is brought about to

---

² Guba and Lincoln originally used criteria of *credibility, transferability, confirmability and dependability*. Here confirmability is renamed as verifiability and dependability as reliability, which were chosen to create coherence and clarity to the term use.
weaken or strengthen the argument. Therefore, in this study credibility is simply addressed by revealing the presentation of and relationship between the sources, conclusions and methods, and by addressing the possible “negative” cases countering the main arguments. In the frame this point explores the connections between the points 1-5 (see figure 1).

The second criterion, transferability is in this context representing generalizability, referring to the extent to which the results in qualitative research can be transferred to other settings or contexts (Guba & Lincoln 1989:241-242). Here, the transferability is covered by the analysis of the case selection (point 6 on the frame), and will be discussed in this context. According to Guba & Lincoln, reliability is “concerned with the stability of the data over time”. To great extent, reliability is concerned with repeatability of research. (Guba & Lincoln 1989:242-243) However, within qualitative studies measuring the same exact phenomenon twice is relatively difficult. On the other hand, in order to repeat (any) study at least the methodology, consistent to the question, how the data was acquired should be as transparent as possible. Thus, the question of reliability is closely tied to credibility and concentrates on point 5 in figure 1. However, as an appliance, here also the views of the researchers regarding the directions of future research will be discussed as part of the reliability.

The final criterion for validity concerns verifiability, which according to Guba and Lincoln concerns the relationship between the data and the conclusions. In other words, verifiability is related to the assurance that the researcher draws the data, findings and analysis from actual sources rather than his or her own imagination (Guba & Lincoln 1989:243). As for interviews, it is nearly impossible to say to what extent this is true or false. However, it is possible to consider whether the sources (whether primary or secondary) were reliable in respect of their legitimacy and credibility (see particularly points 3, 4 and 5 in figure 1).

Bearing in mind this analytical frame based on the criteria regarding how the connections are made between sources, findings and interpretations when conducting scientific research, the analysis will then look at the data with the help of the research questions and the methods and look into these particular studies concerning women’s participation in peace negotiations which this study is interested in.
3. Methodological Framework

This chapter gives an overview of the methodological choices made in this study. The data will be gathered and analysed principally by using different forms of text analysis, and the first part of this chapter is looking into the methods (content analysis and discourse analysis) chosen for this particular study whereas the latter part focuses more on describing the reasoning behind the sources and the selection of the data that is collected with these methods.

3.1 Overview of content analysis and its application

Since this study aims at examining different meanings and discourses that appear in a specific selection of texts, and thus, principally looks at the data qualitatively rather than quantitatively, the most relevant choice for the methods to gather and categorise the data seems to be tools that analyse texts. Basically, textual analysis is not understood here as a single method as such but rather an umbrella term for methods for studying texts aiming at gathering information on "how other human beings make sense of the world" (McKee 2003:1). Text analysis has been characterised as an interpretation of texts aspiring to understand the meanings, features or contexts, texts may embed. In a similar manner that a researcher treats interviews as a narrative same features can be explored in and asked from printed materials. There is no easy answer to explain what texts are, nevertheless, they can be understood as a broad category that include different types of communicative utterance such as books, letters, images, newspaper articles, conversations or any other (heard or seen) communication that can be transcribed into a written form. (Titcher & al. 2000:20) In this case, the texts under scrutiny belong to the genre of scientific texts and thus, they can be expected to follow certain patterns of rhetorical structure, which then is possible to categorise and analyse.

As a diverse method that can be utilised quantitatively or qualitatively with different ways to conduct the analysis, content analysis then could be described as more of a research strategy than a single method of text analysis. According to Holsti (1968), "content analysis is any research technique for making inferences by systematically and objectively identifying specified characteristics of messages". (Holsti 1968:601) In this respect, here content analysis, as an analogue to an interview, is utilised to ask the selected texts questions that are aimed at describing the content of the scientific documents verbally in order to identify the "messages" regarding women's participation in peace negotiations and to understand the intertextuality of these texts. Whilst the diverse nature of the method may have challenged standardisation, usually at least the following steps are included when conducting a content analysis: 1) Selection
of data and units of analysis i.e. decision on what it is that is of interest in the data; 2) separating and coding the data of interest; 3) organising the data e.g. through a certain type of typology or classification; 4) concluding the findings (qualitatively and/or quantitatively). (Titscher & al 2000:58-60; Tuomi & Sarajärvi 2009:91–92)

While content analysis is principally utilised in this study, it is not a sufficient technique or procedure alone to attain and analyse the data required to adequately reach the objective. Therefore, content analysis is combined with elements of discourse analysis in order to strengthen the analysis by identifying also the discourses that arise from the overall data regarding women’s participation in peace negotiations. Hence, the aim is not only to describe and categorise the content but also to identify the different ways women’s participation in negotiations and its impact on peace processes has been described i.e. represented and understood. These ways of understanding and representation then are discourses.

Discourse analysis, however, does not concern only the linguistic dimension of text analysis analysing the use of language. Rather than looking into detailed linguistic analysis of texts, the method is utilised to examine the epistemological dimensions of texts – how knowledge is presented and generated in a particular context, and how language is this way constructing and used to construct different meanings (Fairclough 2003:3). The term discourse is used in literature in various ways, and it is possible to speak for instance about development discourse, in which the discourse concerns the discussion of and manners of discussing development. Norman Fairclough (1997) discusses e.g. media discourses and medical discourses, where discourse refers to different ways of using language that form the object of the communication differently. If understood as part of the constructivist notion that reality is socially constructed (see Berger & Luckmann 1966) discourses as a social practice are “relationship between particular discursive event and the situations, institutions and social structures which frame it”. (Fairclough 1997:258) In other words, ultimately, discourses create certain type of views on the world where the objects (of discourses) are constructed in these discourses. Similarly, different subject positions are constructed in discourses connecting the presenter in the discourse. (Jokinen & al. 1993:37-40) Here, as a form of text analysis and complement for the content analysis, discourse analysis is utilised to explore how arguments (for women’s active participation in peace negotiations) are developed, constructed and/or (re)produced through scientific debate.
3.2 Questions regarding the data

Ultimately, the texts are approached as “a manifest reflection of communication and constitute an aid or an indicator to make it possible to analyse the communication (or communicative situation) that is documented in this form” (Titscher & al. 2000:32). In other words, since the texts are used for analysis to depict or “translate” a certain topic area related to the objective and the research questions, the sample of which this study seeks to draw conclusions needs to be identified carefully. According to Titscher et al. the selection thus, be based on the following questions (Titscher & al. 2000:33-34):

1. From which material do I make the selection?
2. What do I select from this?
3. How much of this selection do I analyse?
4. What are the units of analysis?

The answers to these questions, then, are based on the theoretical approach and research questions that should guide the research (Titscher & al. 2000:34). The research questions in this study concern scientific articles discussing a certain topic and the analytical framework concerns the criteria for scientific research. Therefore, the primary data for this study consists of articles and reports that can be considered scientific and that are discussing women’s participation in the context of peace negotiations. “How much” then is to be analysed from this selection is connected again to the research questions that create a frame for the units of analysis by asking questions on the topic, author(s), methods, findings and sources.

The databases where the selected primary sources were identified for this study consist of online article and book databases (such as Ebrary, JSTOR, One Search and Scopus) that enable identification of texts from great variety of published sources and also strengthens the reliability as the origins of the sources are well-known and verifiable. However, reports produced for institutions such as the United Nations (UN), World Bank and NGOs were also included as the debate based on scientific research does not occur in a vacuum only within academia, which also points towards intertextuality. These sources were found through UN webpages as well as from the reference lists of the articles published in scientific journals. In this respect, it is important to be aware of different agendas, positions and aims different organisations may have as well as the differences in the audience these authors are writing to. Further information on the sources will be presented in the following chapter that goes into the findings.
4. Findings

This chapter introduces the findings of the thesis, and begins with a broader presentation of the collected data and its characteristics, and then continues to a more detailed description before going into the analysis in the next chapter (5). The data was collected and organised with the methods presented in chapter 2. While it may be impossible to present findings without initiating the analysis, the idea is to present the results here in as descriptive a manner as possible, and leave room for deeper analysis in the next chapter in order to increase the transparency of this study. That being said, this chapter takes on the research questions which will then be clarified further in the analysis chapter (5). Particularly, the research question 5 concerning the epistemological underpinnings of the examined research processes will be emphasised more in the following chapter. Therefore, the findings chapter begins with (4.1) answering the questions regarding the background of the authors (question 2) and creates baseline information for question 3 regarding the sources.

The subchapter 4.2 concentrates on question 1 depicting the argumentation that has been put forth in terms of the relationship regarding women’s participation in formal negotiations, whereas 4.3 focuses on the research question (4) regarding the method use as well as builds upon the information given in subchapter 4.1 regarding the sources. Thus, subchapter 4.3 begins to draw connections regarding the epistemological underpinnings of these research processes (question 5), linking the methods and sources to the findings. The subchapter 4.4 then concludes what the authors believed to be the most important areas for future research, which will be analysed further in 5.4. The final subchapter, 4.5 gives a brief summary of the findings in order to clarify the results before going further in the analysis.

4.1 Overview of the data

The overall data consisted of 54 articles, books and reports (see table 1) that were discussing women’s participation in formal peace negotiations. These documents were published either in scientific journals or by intergovernmental organisations such as the UN and the World Bank, by scientific institutes (such as universities and private research institutes) or NGOs. 28 (51.9%) documents of the total of 54 were relying largely on primary data, whereas the remaining 26 (48.1%) documents were based solely on secondary data. Originally no specific timeframe was chosen to limit the data selection, however, the collected data fell in between the past 20 years, 1993-2013. Interestingly, before the 1990s, no articles relevant to the topic were found from the databases. It is important to consider that the spread of information has been revolutionised.
after innovations such as internet, which could partially explain the lack of pre-1990s publications on the topic. However, few books were found written in 1980s discussing women in peace processes but rather from the victim point of view. Thus, while a discussion on women’s peace movements, rights and recognition of peace negotiations as male domain exist (see e.g. Eisler 1985; Gage 1986 and Westing 1988), the literature on women’s participation in peace processes seems to be non-existent before the 1990s.

In order to answer the research question (2) regarding the background of the authors, it is important to consider first the geographical division. Based on the institutions where the authors were carrying out their research, the geographical division of the publications was heavily focused on Europe and North America as 79.6% of the documents originated from these regions. Furthermore, authors from the European institutions were solely from Western Europe and limited to seven countries (the UK, Switzerland, Sweden, Finland, Norway, Spain and Germany). This may be partially due to the delimitations related to language, which has been discussed in chapter 1.6. In addition, documents that were produced by international organisations without any specific country of origin (namely by the UN and World Bank) were categorised as ‘global’ and consisted of 14.8% of the overall 54 documents of the data. While only the remaining 5.5% came from Asia (3.7%) and from Australia (1.9%), no data from Latin American or African institutions were recorded. Another distinctive feature also related to the authors’ backgrounds was their gender. On the whole, 83.3% of the articles were written by females whereas only 3.7% were written by males. The remaining 13% of the articles were written by both male and female authors.

All the authors had similar educational backgrounds including Master’s or Doctoral degrees. The majority of the authors had academic backgrounds as professors, researchers or were otherwise affiliated with academia. However, while each document had at least one author who could be described as academic, others sometimes in tandem with their research seemed to be working in the field as consultants, gender and policy advisers, civil servants, and journalists. The variation in occupations is most likely due to the organisations conducting the research. Universities or other scientific institutes were behind 66.7% of the data, whereas intergovernmental organisations represented 18.5% and NGOs and non-profits 14.8%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on primary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on secondary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female/ male authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Background information on the data consisting total of 54 documents.
4.2 Main arguments

This chapter is concerned with the first research question: *What has been written on the relationship regarding women's participation in formal negotiations and their impact on peace processes/agreements, and which major arguments have been put forth?*, and begins the discussion with categorisation of the argumentation given in the documents regarding women's participation in peace negotiations and its impact on post-conflict societies. The views related to women's participation in peace negotiations varied depending on the focus of the documents. Not all documents drew conclusions on the impact of women's participation, nor focused solely on this issue in their paper. Therefore, after organising the data, two categories arose from the data regarding the arguments on women's participation in formal peace negotiations and its impact (see table 2). Firstly, a great majority (83.3%) of the papers claimed there is a connection between women's participation in formal peace negotiations and its outcome in regards of the post-conflict period. The rest (16.7%) of the papers underlined the importance of women participating in peace negotiations, but did not advance an argument concerning the connection between their participation and the outcome of the negotiations. No documents were found that were largely discouraging or obstructing women's participation. However, a few remarks that were carefully countering the debate were found and will be discussed later in the chapter 4.4 and 5.1.3.

Among the 45 documents that clearly dealt with the impact seven arguments arose regarding women's participation in peace negotiations and its impact (see table 3). Each of these arguments were represented in more than one paper meaning that the claims were often repeated among several papers, and were also cross-referenced within the collected data. It should be noted here that some of the authors had co-written more papers than others, and thus, also certain groups of individual authors also emerged in several papers and were referenced more across the data.

Nevertheless, all the seven most often mentioned arguments were promoting women's participation in formal peace negotiations, and can be seen as partially overlapping. The first argument “democratisation through peace processes” claimed that the absence of women in negotiations hinders development in general and weakens democracy in the post-conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Number of articles</th>
<th>Percentage(^3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Made statements on the correlation</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasised only women's participation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Data divided by the nature of the arguments.

\(^3\) The percentages refer to the total of the texts investigated for this particular study.
society. In other words, it was considered incompatible to exclude women from negotiations and simultaneously set up a democratic system. (See e.g. Anderlini 2000; and Manchanda 2001) The second argument and third argument were slightly entangled and seem to be interlinked.

Firstly, the argument (2) “politicising women through negotiations” seems to some extent to stem from the democratisation one as women’s representation in negotiations was seen to strengthen democratic institutions in the post-conflict society by providing women with opportunities to gain political positions (see e.g. Banaszak & al. 2005; Bouta & al. 2004; and Rehn & Sirleaf 2002). It was argued that if women participate in negotiations with other decision-makers and leaders, they have better chances of being part of the post-conflict political sphere. In this respect, if seen as an opportunity to enhance equality and transformation of institutions, the question of the impact again supports the democratisation argument.

Women’s participation at the peace table was argued to have a transformational impact on post-conflict societies as it was considered to offer women an opportunity to secure political gains on certain issues (such as women’s rights and gender equality) that are related to economic security, social development and political participation. Thus, the second part of the argumentation relates to the third argument “securing gendered results” (see e.g. Chinkin 2003; and UNIFEM 2002), namely that peace negotiations provide women with a platform to bring about and secure issues related to gender equality that they could then potentially maintain in the post-conflict society through political participation.

In addition, seeing women’s participation to have an impact through “symbolic” value was a slightly less frequently emerging argument, usually connected to politicisation (see e.g. Rehn & Sirleaf 2002). Women participating in formal negotiations were argued to represent women’s empowerment and leadership creating mental images of women’s political participation. In other words, giving women a visible role i.e. a seat at the peace table as decision-making, was thought to change attitudes and create more power for women in the public sphere. Furthermore, to a great extent, the “social justice and equality argument” can be seen as an aspect built within all the other arguments. It was sometimes presented individually, but most often was interlinked with discussions regarding for instance democratisation and politicisation (see e.g Anderlini 2000; UNIFEM 2002; and Kaufman & Williams 2010). While through women’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments for women’s participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Democratisation through peace processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Politicising women through negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Securing gendered results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social justice and equality argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Symbolic: metaphor for women’s empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sustainability argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. War and peace are gendered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. The main arguments on the impact of women’s participation in formal peace negotiations.
participation peace table was considered to become a platform for transformation of post-conflict structures and institutions, it was also seen to open doors for greater social justice. Here the authors often discussed fair participation and inclusion, since women as victims of war were rarely leaders in the pre-war societies and thus, not directly responsible for conflicts. Equal participation in negotiations was then again regarded as key to transferring the post-conflict societies towards more equality in terms of gender representation in political systems and society in general.

Nevertheless, one of the arguments that was presented most often and was particularly promoted in the documents written for the UN, was the “sustainability argument” (see Anderlini 2000; UNWomen 2010; Hunt 2005 and Nicol 2010). Here women’s participation in peace negotiations was seen to increase the sustainability of the peace. In some cases women were generally seen to have been more active in peace-building in civil society or at the grass-roots level. This was then considered to enable women to bring different practical understanding to the table regarding the challenges that the civilian population may face, as well as the solutions to address these challenges (see e.g. Manchanda 2005; Sewak 2004). On the other hand, excluding women from formal negotiations was most often considered as an exclusion of the voices of half the population, which was seen to increase the probability of an unsound peace in the long term (see e.g. Rehn & Sirleaf 2002; UNIFEM 2002; and Anderlini 2000). In other words, the argument supports the assumption that inclusiveness creates stability, which ultimately should then contribute to long-lasting and more sustainable peace.

The seventh and last argument regards the “gendered nature of war and peace” and also stems from the thought that women as peace-builders have something new to bring to the table (see e.g. Kaufman & Williams 2010; and Buchanan & al. 2012). It is based on the claim that a majority of women are civilians during the war, and thus, have a different role to play in the times of peace. Therefore, women have different experiences, views and needs than the majority of men, who in this line of argumentation are soldiers. Without female participation in negotiations, the peace accords are argued to exclude their views leading to agreements and post-conflict societies that discard their specific experiences and needs (such as reparations for sexual violence).

### 4.3 Methods and sources

In chapter 4.1, table 1 presented data regarding the use of primary and secondary sources, which will be elaborated on here further in order to answer the research question 4) *What were the methods used to collect and analyse the data?*, and question 3) *What type of data/ sources (e.g.*
primary/secondary) did the author(s) use in order to reach the conclusions? Of the 54 documents, 51.9% used primary data. However, a closer look at these documents reveals little variation in the methods used to acquire the data as well as a heavy reliance on secondary sources in conclusions. The secondary sources, composing 48.1% of the body of the data, were based on existing literature and other official documents, and were often overlapping in terms of the used sources. The use of secondary data in both groups was overlapping to the extent where it became possible to separate few core articles and authors that were repeatedly referred to with regards to women’s participation in peace negotiations. A common feature for the entire data was a qualitative approach in methods, although two co-writers presented their data in quantitative form.

The methods used in the documents based on secondary sources were different forms of text analysis, or the data retrieval process in the documents was simply classified as a literature review. However, in 72% of these documents no method for data collection was mentioned. The secondary sources used, revolved mainly around scientific publications and studies, documents produced for the UN and NGOs, but also included opinion pieces written by private scientific institutes. In this group the sources were partially presented and referenced correctly, but showed slight ambiguity as e.g. in three cases sources were presented inadequately or were lacking completely.

The studies that were based on primary sources used mainly (68.9%) ethnographic methods including interviews that were sometimes complemented with focus group discussions, and qualitative surveys. Two cases used text analysis based on qualitative and quantitative data, and slightly less than one third (27.6%) did not mention the methods. Furthermore, among the studies that used primary data, the sources were generally clearly presented, while three documents did not present them clearly. Here, the obscurity concerned the access to the primary data used. No references were provided, the links did not work, or it was unclear what the groups that had been interviewed were. The latter could be partially due to ethical considerations, however, no explanations were provided.

Nevertheless, in order to answer the first part of the research question 5, What do the findings tell about the epistemological underpinnings of this research?, the connections between the sources and the findings needs to be looked more closely. In regards to primary and secondary sources, the main focus in the analysis is on the 45 articles that made claims on women’s participation in peace negotiations (see table 2). Table 4 represents the connection between the argumentation made on women’s participation in peace negotiations and its impact, and how the sources were presented with regard to this argumentation. Primary sources refer to the

---

4 Deeper analysis on the data regarding the interviewees and interviews is carried out in chapter 5.1.1.
research where authors conducted their own fieldwork, apart from two cases where the authors collected and analysed peace agreements. The field work included interviews with different stakeholders, but the details were often not described. This will be discussed further in chapter 5.1. The secondary sources on the other hand indicate that the authors based their study on research carried out by other researchers. The columns indicating the use of sources in the table 4, refers to the relationship between the findings (arguments made on women’s participation) and how the sources were presented. In other words, no clarity in source use means that the relationship between the findings and the sources were unclearly presented in terms of methods and references. In 33.3% of the 45 documents, it was unclear as to which data the author was referring, whereas 66.7% of the presented sources clearly indicated where and how the data was acquired and derived in regards of the argumentation. Of these 45 documents primary sources presented 46.6% of the data and secondary sources presented 53.3% of the data. The largest ambiguity was found among the secondary sources where little over one fifth of the documents presented their sources unclearly. To a great extent in both groups of the data, the obscurity was due to lack of references in the text or taking the impact of women’s participation for granted. However, the implications of this categorisation including the quality of the secondary data used and the field work behind the primary data will be discussed further in the chapter 5.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of sources</th>
<th>Number of articles (%)</th>
<th>Primary sources (%)</th>
<th>Secondary sources (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No clarity in source use</td>
<td>15 (33.3%)</td>
<td>5 (11.1%)</td>
<td>10 (22.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity in source use</td>
<td>30 (66.7%)</td>
<td>16 (35.5%)</td>
<td>14 (31.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount</td>
<td>45 (100%)</td>
<td>21 (46.6%)</td>
<td>24 (53.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. The sources used in the 45 documents that made claims on the correlation of women’s participation in peace negotiations and its impact, are presented here in regards of the clarity in the source presentation.

Furthermore, in the overall data (54 documents) 85.1% of the studies used examples from different peace processes around the world. Only a fraction of these cases were actual case studies of peace negotiations, but used country cases as good practice examples or scenarios supporting their argumentation on women’s participation in peace processes and negotiations. Appendix I shows the countries and the number of times the country in question was used as an example. It is rather clear from the data that only a small number of the cases were repeated frequently in the examples, namely Afghanistan, Burundi, Colombia, Guatemala, Indonesia, Northern Ireland and Somalia. Like all 54 documents, these cases are also relatively recent and fall more or less into the same timeframe as the collected data. Further analysis on the use of case studies will be presented in chapter 5.1.3.
4.4 Proposed recommendations and needs in the data

While the documents revealed a wide range of recommendations regarding peace processes and women’s participation, this chapter presents only the findings that were relevant to the topic and thus gives an overview over the latter part of research question 5 regarding views of the authors on the directions the future research should take. In other words, only the recommendations that relate to women’s participation in peace negotiations are presented here. Hence, the recommendations or needs for future research found from the data can be categorised in two sections. On the one hand, the writers depict a good range of recommendations regarding women's participation for international and national level peace processes, focusing particularly on peace-building and negotiations. These recommendations are closer to policy recommendations, than for example, research topics. On the other hand, some of the authors present recommendations for future research describing a few areas and aspects that at the time were thought to be insufficiently researched. Naturally, not all articles gave recommendations of any kind but rather noted that the topic requires more work in the future to empower women.

Most often, the policy recommendations that were addressing peace processes or were addressed to mediators specifically, concentrated on mechanisms that aim at enhancing more (gender) equal opportunities in getting a seat at the table and in promoting women’s participation at all levels of peace-building activities. These recommendations regarded advocacy of gender parity and maintaining a minimum 30% quota for women at the table (see for instance Rehn & Johnson-Sirleaf 2002). On the other hand, another frequent comment concerned women’s informal contributions and the need to find opportunities to integrate this work into formal processes. Here it was considered of great importance to organise the women among the civil society actors for formal peace negotiations in order to have a representation for women as an organised entity.

Much attention was paid to women’s efforts as peace-builders considering their views, needs and expertise distinct from those of men’s, and how their effort has been disregarded so far within the international and national systems. Generally, it was considered important to create further understanding and spread knowledge on the international level of the misrepresentation of women and their needs in negotiations. In particular, the need to understand further the mechanisms that hinder women’s participation in negotiations was considered essential in order to make women’s voices heard. The obstacles for women to gain a seat at the peace table were also regarded as an area for future research.

The recommendations for future research often concerned developing further understanding of elements that were considered a hindrance in the long run for sustainable peace in terms of
women's participation. For instance, the concern over the continuity of women’s groups’ activities in the post-conflict society and sustaining the connection of these undertakings and connecting women to the political change after the peace negotiations were regarded as essential areas (see e.g. Ferris 1992). Moreover, the impact women have as peace-builders, was regarded as one of the main research areas. A need for better understanding and more empirical information on women's expertise as peace-builders and negotiators was underlined. For instance, Anderlini and Tirman (2010) criticises the mainstream research as putting too much emphasis on the effects of conflicts on women, considering it as an “act of disempowerment”, and therefore, more focus should be directed on the effects of women's work on peace processes (Anderlini & Tirman 2010:16).

However, a slightly more careful approach towards women’s participation was taken regarding the relationship between peace agreement texts, the implementation of accords and the sustainability of peace as it was stated that these connections remain to a great extent unknown. In this respect the recommended areas of study concerned monitoring and evaluation as well as impact assessments on the role of women or gender in peace processes. While it was considered that more effort should be made to encourage wider participation and women's ownership of the peace process, the assumption that women’s participation increases gender equality and improves the quality of peace agreements was considered to require more testing and to be backed up with more empirical evidence. Thus, more research was said to be needed on the connections between the implementation process and women's participation in peace processes and overall, on the implementation of gender related provisions in the peace accords (see e.g. Bell & O'Rourke 2007, 2010 & Anderlini & Tirman 2010). In addition, further assessments were seen fit as it was acknowledged that having women at the table does not necessary mean that women’s rights will be advocated (see e.g. Anderlini 2000). In this respect, for instance, Villelles Ariño (2010) suggested that the future research should ask why the presence of women is not always enough to engender peace processes; and what are the mechanisms that bring women to the table, which brings us back to the question of the challenges women face at the peace table (Villelles Ariño 2010:34-35).

Interestingly, the earliest article in the data claiming that there is not enough empirical evidence to indicate that women's participation results in increased gender equality and sustainability in terms of peace agreements, was published precisely 20 years ago (See Ferris 1993). Despite this, this line of argumentation remained at the margins and while few sceptics appeared, the argumentation heavily supported women’s participation in peace processes also in the same articles the countering claims were made (see also chapter 5.1.2).
4.5 Summary of the findings

The overall data concluded few common characteristics. Firstly, there was a strong western orientated dominance regarding the research environment, as of the 54 documents only 5.5% originated outside from Western Europe and North America. Secondly, the country examples that were used as case studies concerned peace processes emphasising seven countries of which one was from Europe, whereas the rest represented the developing world (two from Asia, two from Latin America and two from Africa).

Furthermore, regarding the choice of methods, there was clear distribution between two tools that were namely text analysis and ethnographical methods; interviews, focus group discussions in addition to qualitative surveys that were sometimes used to complement the interviews. As for sources and methods, in both sets of documents based on secondary and primary sources a group of documents were found, where either sources and/or methods were not clarified properly. Particularly, the majority of the documents did not mention any method for how the data was acquired.

While the interpretations and future recommendations in the documents related without exception to increasing the engagement of women in formal peace processes, few arguments were sceptical in terms of the vitality of the evidence supporting the correlation regarding women’s participation and their impact on post-conflict societies. Moreover, the data implied that the discourses on women’s participation in peace negotiations are maintained and reconstructed almost solely by women as the notable majority (83.3%) of the research was carried out by female researchers. Even in the cases where male writers had been involved, they were usually the minority among several female writers.

The next chapter takes a deeper look at the issues raised by the findings and thus, presents an analysis of the findings.
5. Analysis

With the help of the analytical framework presented in chapter 2, this chapter contrasts the findings against the criteria presented for scientific research. The first section begins with a discussion on the arguments made on women’s participation in formal peace negotiations and processes. This section (5.1) analyses further the question of the epistemological underpinnings of the research by making connections between the argumentation and the referred sources and methodology by going into more detailed analysis regarding the use of primary and secondary sources in the data. Here, the validity of the research is assessed with regards to the arguments made on women’s participation in peace negotiation and its impact as well as with regards to the “cases” that were used to support the argumentation. In the following section, 5.2 the focus is drawn on the findings by connecting the validity and the broader context of the discourses regarding women’s participation in peace negotiations, whereas the final part, 5.3 presents recommendations for future research based on the views of the authors as well as the shortcomings found from the research carried out regarding women’s participation in formal peace negotiations.

5.1 Validity of the argumentation

In this subchapter further analysis is made in order to answer the research question concerning what do the findings tell about the epistemological underpinnings of this research? Seven arguments presented in the findings (see 4.2) as well as the country cases found in the documents are now looked upon in terms of the criteria based on the analytical framework. The first part of this section (5.1.1) looks at the primary data use, exploring how the conclusions were drawn from the primary data that principally consisted of interviews and focus group discussions, whereas the next subchapter 5.1.2 discusses the connections between secondary data use and the arguments the authors drew from this data. In the last section, 5.1.3 the cases used in the documents are analysed in respect of their selection and use again in respect of the findings the cases were supporting, focusing on generalizability. The last section will also discuss the arguments that were countering the main line of argumentation.

5.1.1 The use of primary data and the validity of the argumentation

Of the 45 documents that made arguments on the impact of women’s participation in formal peace negotiations 46.6% used primary data (see table 4 in chapter 4.3). Within this selection of data, 85.7% (18) relied on interviews, while 14.3% (3) relied solely on text analysis. In only 2 of
these documents, the authors used both interviews and focus group discussions, and in another one interviews were complemented with surveys, whereas only one document was based on research that used all three methods (interviews, surveys and focus group discussions). Furthermore, the length of the period during which the research had been carried out was unclear in most of the documents as only two articles mentioned the length – one revealing that the research was carried out during five years, and the other referring to a period of two weeks in the field. Thus, it is impossible to take this into account in the analysis in a meaningful way. On the other hand, the lack of this information regarding the length of the fieldwork reduces credibility of the research, since it cannot be proven whether these were in-depth studies or did they merely scratch the surface. Nonetheless, generally, the reliability aspect of the research can be considered strong within this group of data due to a relatively good transparency in the presentation of methods, which enables researchers to repeat the research and creates legitimacy.

The focus group discussions and surveys were primarily used only to strengthen the research process, and thus, interviews were always the primary method used in the field. As for the interviews, the quality of the research varies greatly among the primary data in terms of relevant interviewees, amount of interviewees or focus of the interviews. Out of the 16 documents that used interviews only five articles indicated how many interviews had been carried out, whereas the rest merely settled describing who had been interviewed. Furthermore, the groups identified as interviewees varied greatly and can be divided in five different groups (see table 5; and appendix II). A common characteristic for all the interviewee groups is that all groups were predominantly made up of women.

However, considering that the question is about “women’s participation in formal peace negotiations and its impact on post-conflict societies”, in terms of credibility it is remarkable that only six (31.6%) research processes involved female interviewees who had actually been part of peace negotiations, and within two of these cases the women had only been part of informal negotiations. In addition, in two of the three articles in the group classified as members of military groups involved women, but it was unclear whether these women had been always participating in peace negotiations as the interviewees in this group were only mentioned as members of “separatist groups” and “armed opposition”. Civil society groups consisted of NGOs, local charities and associations working at the grass-root level on human rights and women’s rights issues. In comparison to the civil society groups, equally frequently interviewed groups spawned from the decision-makers/ politicians. This group consisted of presidents, representatives of governments and senators. While the choice to interview people from the civil society groups had usually been justified by their inclusion in the informal peace
negotiations, the relevancy of the interviews among the decision-makers was often unclear indicating that the interviewees had authority in regards of the country where the conflict had taken place but not necessarily connections to the actual negotiations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Women involved in peace negotiations (formal/informal)</th>
<th>Civil society groups</th>
<th>Representatives of international organisations</th>
<th>Decision-makers/politicians</th>
<th>Members of military groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Articles that relied on interviews as primary data and the groups they interviewed. See also appendix II for more detailed author information.

The Representatives of international organisations consisted of staff members in organisations such as European Union (EU) and the UN; the latter being the most dominant. Interestingly, no research was solely based on interviews of representatives of international organisation, and thus, it can be concluded that each study included representation from local or national level actors. However, considering how few research actually involved people who had been participating in formal negotiations, the data suggest that the majority of the field work could not draw valid connections in terms of the correlation between women’s participation in peace negotiations and its impact, which is supported by the data regarding the focus the research had in terms of peace processes.

A closer look at the focus reveals that 12 articles (66.7%) out of the 18 where field work was conducted focused only on peace negotiations or peace negotiations and the potential impact women’s participation could have on accords. The assumption in these documents was that participation in peace negotiations would affect the conditions in the agreement that would have long-term effects in the post-conflict society. However, in addition to the lack of interviewees who had actually participated in peace negotiations, over half the research concentrated only on peace negotiations and did not continue assessing the results in the context of the post-conflict society, and thus, the argumentation can be considered weak in terms of verifiability and credibility. In addition, in the 33.3% of the data that had a broader focus, concentrated on the
impact of women's participation in negotiations and its impact on post-conflict reconstruction particularly from transformational perspective. Here the main line of argumentation followed almost an institutionalist view emphasising from different angles how women's participation in formal negotiations can influence the reconstruction of institutions and thus, through institutions transform gender relations and drive social change in the post-conflict society through institutions (see also table 3, arguments 1 to 3). However, it is important to notice that only in two of these research processes assessing the impact on post-conflict societies more broadly interviewed female negotiators in their fieldwork.

In terms of clarity of the source presentation (see subchapter 4.3 and table 4), the primary data was clearly stronger than secondary data (see 5.1.2) as only in 11.1% of the primary data sources were not presented clearly, increasing verifiability and credibility of the research. If the results are now combined regarding the studies that relied on primary sources, it is possible to narrow down the data into research where 1) the data had source clarity, 2) the focus was beyond the negotiations, and 3) where the female interviewees had been involved in formal peace negotiations. This data consist of a total of two articles (see Anderlini 2000; and Pampell Conaway & Martínez 2004), and thus, overall degrades the credibility and verifiability of the research based on primary data, and thus, decreases the validity of the research that used interviews as a method to acquire primary data.

The remaining 15.8% of the research based on primary data that relied solely on text analysis produced controversial results. Two of the three articles were in fact based on the same research, but produced in different years (Bell & O’Rourke 2007, 2010), and should be taken into consideration also, because they were among the most referenced articles in both research based on primary and secondary data. Both of articles had very good source clarity as they were assessing over 500 peace agreements (in the past 20 years) based on their own (public) database, which all in all creates verifiability and reliability. However, the main focus was not on women’s participation in peace negotiations but on the gender references in the agreements, and in this respect is clear that in order to make connections between women’s participation in peace negotiations and its impact on agreements, they would have also needed an access to the data regarding whether women participated in the negotiations. Accordingly, the authors remained sceptical and stated that there is not enough empirical data to confirm that increased participation of women in negotiations would actually be able to address the priorities of the post-conflict peace processes; which increased the credibility and verifiability of these research. However, the third document using primary data relying on text analysis again undermined the argumentations in terms of validity. The document lacked source clarity almost completely, making it impossible to assess the connections between the conclusions, methods and sources as
it was impossible to know the where and how the data had been acquired (See UNWomen 2012), impeding the repeatability of the research; and therefore reducing its value in terms of verifiability, reliability, and credibility.

In summary, the research relying on primary data was rather strong in terms of reliability due to a clear method presentation. In addition, also in majority of the research sources were presented clearly, thus increasing verifiability and credibility. On the other hand, the authors did not provide enough detailed information on the length of the field work, and most of the informants seemed to be irrelevant, since only one third mentioned the (female) interviewees had been involved in formal peace negotiations. In addition, the focus was often only in negotiations taking the impact for post-conflict societies for granted. These issues undermined the credibility and verifiability of the research. Consequently, it can be concluded that there were more issues hampering than strengthening validity of the research based on primary data.

The following section 5.1.2 continues to analyse the validity of the argumentation by looking at the secondary data use, after which the chapter 5.1.3 assess the validity of the research in terms of reliability by looking into the cases used in the primary data.

5.1.2 The use of secondary data and the validity of the argumentation

The research that was based on secondary data sources consisted of 24 documents (53.3%) of the overall 45 documents that made claims on women’s participation peace processes and its impact (see 4.3, table 4). Within the documents that relied on secondary data, the source clarity in the presentation of sources was unclear in 41.6% of the documents, meaning that nearly half the research based on secondary sources did not present their sources clearly in regards of the conclusions they drew on the correlation between women’s participation and impact on post-conflict societies. For instance, often the text were missing references or referring to data that the readers have no access to, making it unclear how the author had exactly arrived at conclusions. Further investigation revealed that only 33.4% presented their methods clearly, leaving 66.6% of the research unclear about how and where the data was acquired. The methods presented in the remaining 33.4% consisted of text analyses and in one occasion the data retrieval process was described as literature review. Considering the lack of source clarity and method presentation in a majority of the data, it is nearly impossible make connections between the findings, methods and sources; which exceedingly undermines the validity of the majority of the research processes in terms of credibility, verifiability, as well as reliability.

Furthermore, another interesting question with regard to validity is the characteristics of the actual data i.e. the secondary sources that were used in these studies. The research can be separated between the use of secondary sources, based on secondary data and the use of
sources that were based on primary data. A little less than two thirds (62.5%) of the research used sources that were based only on secondary data; whereas the rest (37.5%) of the data was based on secondary sources where the data was collected and created from primary data.

A further look into the secondary sources that a) were based on secondary data and b) presented their sources clearly reveals how there is an overlap in the sources. Three authors (Chinkin 2003, Ferris 2003 and UNIFEM 2002) are continuously used to draw conclusions on women's participation. Of these three sources, the two former had no clarity in source presentation and the latter one was based on supportive argumentation emphasising only women's participation without advancing the arguments concerning the connection between women's participation and the outcome of the negotiations (see table 2 in 4.2).

Similar results were found from the research that used secondary sources based on primary sources. Here, the sources were also based on only few authors that then were repeated among the used secondary sources that were based on primary sources. The most commonly used sources in this data were Anderlini 2000, Bell & O'Rourke 2007 and 2010, Rehn & Sirleaf 2002, Sharoni 1995 and Fisas 2008. Two of these sources (Sharoni 1995 and Fisas 2008) were only emphasising women's participation without creating further connections to the impacts of women's participation in peace negotiations, and thus, are not relevant or credible sources to draw conclusions. Rehn & Sirleaf (2002) on the other hand did not interview any women that had actually been involved in formal peace negotiations, and Bell & O’Rourke (2007 and 2010) carried out a text analysis on peace agreements and made a remark that there is not enough empirical evidence to make claims regarding the impact of women's participation in peace negotiations. This would then leave us one source that has credibility in terms of the connections between methods, sources and findings, and even this source is over ten years old.

Furthermore, in terms of this thesis, the overlap and cross-referencing among the 45 documents investigated in this study could be considered as one indication of saturation, implying that the (qualitative) research process has reached the point where the data become repetitive and contains no new categories (See Somekh & Lewin 2011:322).

In summary, the research based on secondary sources was clearly weaker in terms of validity than the research based on primary sources. The data lacked credibility to a great extent, since the used data were either poorly referenced or was merely recycling the existing primary data based on few authors of which only one did not lack credibility. Since the description of the methods were missing to a great extent, it would be impossible to repeat most of the research, and thus this research is neither strong in reliability. Finally, due to the ambiguity in the source presentation, the reuse of the existing primary data and the use of secondary data that did not...
deal with the impact of women’s participation, the research based on secondary data neither proved to have strong validity in terms of *verifiability*.

### 5.1.3 Case studies, and scepticism

This subchapter analyses the cases presented in the 45 documents that made claims on the correlation between women’s participation in formal peace negotiations and its impact, aiming at assessing the validity of the research processes in terms of *transferability*. The focus on the cases is important in order to assess the generalizability of the findings made in the documents on women’s participation. However, it is also important to notice that out of the 45 documents 37 (82.2%) used examples of different peace negotiations to support their argumentation regarding women’s participation.

Generally speaking there was a great variation in the number of examples used in the documents. Country specific examples varied from 1 case to 31 cases\(^5\) per document. Seven documents\(^6\) can be considered case studies as such, since they concentrated solely on one peace process and thus, were more in-depth studies of a single case. In other occasions the cases were presented as examples of women’s participation in peace processes in order to show the added value women can bring to the table (see table 3 concerning the arguments on the impact) but without deeper insight to these particular cases. In addition, in most cases the case selection was not justified, but only mentioned that the examples were from settings where women had successfully participated in or where women’s contributions would have benefitted the formal peace processes – had women been able to access the platforms. If the case selection was justified, it was based on a sample where the core focus was on women’s experiences from peace negotiations (See e.g. Anderlini 2000 & Nakaya 2003).

Table 6 shows the most common cases (Afghanistan, 2011; Burundi 2000; Colombia, 2000; Guatemala, 1996; Indonesia, 2005; Northern Ireland 1998; and Somalia, 2008\(^7\)) that were used as examples of women’s participation in peace processes among the 45 documents. In the first column the peace processes are categorised by country, and the second column presents the number of times a specific example came up in different documents. The third column shows whether women we were actually present in formal negotiations with regards to the particular example.

---

\(^5\) Excluding Bell & O’Rourke (2010) from this selection since their study did not concern negotiations but (over 500) peace agreements.


\(^7\) The years do not refer to the entire peace process but the year the peace process was considered ended in spite of reached agreement.
Interestingly, only in the three most used examples (Burundi; Afghanistan; Northern Ireland), women had actually participated in formal negotiations, which may explain the popularity of these cases. Northern Ireland was clearly the most used example as it was utilised in over 64.8% documents relying on cases; making it questionable whether this type of a heavy reliance on a single country in a research can result in credible data. All in all, 27% of the documents relying on country examples were based on only one case, and only 6 (13.3%) documents presented more than 10 cases in support of their argumentation. This indicates that the case selection in at least 27% of the documents was not broad enough to make generalisations, since these studies did not present credible statistical representativeness that would be required to create general knowledge. On the other hand, as mentioned above, the in-depth one-case case studies represented a minority, and thus, it is also debatable whether examples drawn from several cases in a superficial manner would result in any more credibility than single cases. Overall, it is questionable whether the conclusions drawn from the cases in question could be maintained in other settings, which reduces the transferability of the research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peace processes according to the countries</th>
<th>Frequency of the use of the examples</th>
<th>Women's participation in formal negotiations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>women participated in negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>women participated in negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>women participated in negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>contradictory information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>no data regarding participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>no women in peace negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>no women in peace negotiations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. The most frequently used examples of peace processes and women's participation in negotiations in regards of the cases.

Furthermore, in two cases (Columbia and Indonesia) women were not involved in the formal negotiations, and in these cases the examples often were related to efforts of the civil society to influence negotiations (see e.g. UNIFEM 2005, Rehn & Sirleaf & CMI & UNIFEM 2006), which were considered valuable lessons in regards of the potential impact women could have. In the Somalia example no data was provided on whether women were actually part of the negotiations, and in the case of Guatemala the claims on women's participation were contradicting as in other documents women were presented as actively involved in and in others women were excluded from the peace negotiations (see e.g. UNWomen 2012, Adrian-Paul 2004; Page & al. 2009). In one case contradictory information was found on women’s participation. While for instance UN Women (2012) claimed women have been participating in the negotiation
teams in Guatemala\(^8\), but Adrian-Paul and al. (2004) contradicted the argumentation by claiming that the civil society assembly through which women’s organisations were also acting, was only giving recommendations to negotiations teams and had no real negotiation power (UNWomen 2012; Adrian-Paul & al 2004). Constant inclusion of unclear data on women’s participation and the contradicting information between different documents, undermines credibility and legitimacy of the entire research and discourse on women’s participation in peace negotiations\(^9\).

The too narrow scope within the case studies indicates towards the same direction than the obscurity in the source and method presentation in regards of the arguments. It seems, there is a lack of coherent empirical data to support credible evidence, where more general hypothesis could be drawn. Moreover, the same view was also taken by the authors who were sceptical about the impact women might have through peace negotiations. For instance, Bell and O’Rourke (2007) questioned the connection between gender provisions in peace agreement and its contribution to durable peace, and later on (2010) commented on the lack of knowledge based on empirical evidence in regards of women’s participation and its impact on peace settlements (see also Borer 2009; Byrne 1996 and Nakaya 2003).

However, questioning the impact of women’s participation was not only based on the lack of empirical evidence. While many writers seemed to describe women as more or less of a homogenous group striving for peace and similar issues regarding not only gender per se but the society as whole (see e.g. UNIFEM 2012; Sewak 2004; and Asi & al. 2010), it was also pointed out in connection to the country examples, that not all women are advocates for women’s rights or gender equality (e.g. Kaufman & Williams 2010; and Nicol 2012). In addition, it was also argued that participation of women at the peace table is not sufficient measure alone, however, here the criticism was not directed to women’s participation but on the procedures that should take place to make women’s voices heard (see e.g. Chinkin 2003; and Sørenson 1998). Since several documents also questioned the arguments promoting women’s participation in peace negotiation, and since it seems the research conducted (at least) during the past 20 years has not been able to address the negative arguments, the evidence found in this study points again to lack of credibility of the findings in the research regarding women’s participation.

The following chapter takes a step back from single documents to discuss the findings in regards to validity from a broader perspective.

---

\(^8\) This peace process took place between 1987 and 1996.

\(^9\) Considering for instance that not all negotiators are signatories in peace agreements, it is difficult to determine whether the researchers have in fact interviewed the participants or signatories who have had no part or power to play in the actual negotiations; unless the author has mentioned it clearly. At the end, it is extremely challenging to gather information on the participation without direct sources (see also chapter 5.3).
5.2 Scientific or political discourse?

The selection of 54 documents discussing women's participation in peace negotiations showed a growing trend in the amount of articles towards the mid-2000s, which could be translated as an effect of the first UNSC resolution (1325) that promoted women's participation in peace negotiations as well as MDGs promoting women as active agents at the dawn of this century. The UNSCR 1325 was also mentioned often when the argumentation did not stand on empirical evidence but the legitimacy of women's participation seemed to have been taken for granted based on the assumption that women are naturally more peaceful or resourceful to find peaceful solutions (see e.g. Byrne & McCulloch 2012; Chinkin 2003 and Manchanda 2003). Another distinct feature regarding the post-2000 research was the increase in field work. Only one research based on field work (Byrne & al. 1996) was published before the 2000s, whereas the rest were published in 2000s having two peaks in the amount of documents in 2005 and 2010; both after the UNSCR 1325, and the latter at the time when three new UNSC resolutions were made on women, peace and security (UNSCR 2008, 2009a and 2009b).

On the one hand, this indicates that not only the research topic regarding the impact of women’s inclusion on peace processes – rather than the impact of peace processes on women – has trended relatively recently in terms of the interest towards the topic, but there is also an indication that the UNSC resolutions addressing women, peace and security in the 2000s have influenced the scientific discourses rather than the other way around. Moreover, considering that the majority of the authors were females, and that the overall analysis on the research processes showed negligence in the method presentation as well as the presentation of the connections between findings and sources, there is no conclusive proof that women’s participation in peace negotiations is not a topic with a feminist agenda advocated by the UNSCR 1325; which again implies the research on the topic has a low validity with regards the criteria for credible and reliable scientific research. On the other hand, the increase in field work in the latter part of the 2000s indicates a positive trend in terms of strengthening validity.

Furthermore, the discussion on women’s participation in peace processes was to a great extent not only generated by female researchers but Western females, which could be partially explained by the use of English publication and databases used to source the data, or on statistics regarding the division between developing and developed countries in terms of tertiary education\(^\text{10}\) (see World Bank 2013). However, this does not diminish the fact that the documents written in Western Europe and North America (the USA and Canada) seem to be

\(^{10}\) World Bank statistics show a sharp the division between the developing countries and developed countries in terms of enrolment in tertiary education i.e. post-secondary education including universities and institutions teaching specific capacities. In this dataset the developed countries are dominating the less developed (World Bank 2013).
looking mainly into the conflicts in the less developed world through a feminist framework. This raises a question whether the research from Latin America or Africa that was not represented in this selection would have brought different results, or more interestingly, why the institutions of the countries where many of the conflicts in the past century have emerged, were completely absent. Therefore, it is questionable whether this discourse is reproducing western ideologies and objectifying further the people in the context of less developed countries rather than creating a credible scientific debate regarding the impact of women’s participation in peace negotiations.

Departing slightly from the discussion on women’s participation another common discourse in the data concerned the definition of peace negotiations. In regards to women’s participation, redefining ‘peace negotiations’ was considered important as negotiations as a top-down process was seen to exclude the local level communities including women (see e.g. Kaufman & Williams 2010; Anderlini & Tirman 2010; Ward 2006; and Pankhurst 2003). This discussion was built on the transformative aspect that women’s participation in peace negotiations could transform the post-conflict structures, and thus requiring changes on all levels of institutions including peace negotiations (see also 4.2 and 5.1.1), which brings us to the last point. While the empirical evidence to support each of these discourses in the conducted research indicated to have serious weaknesses, the questions regarding the connections between the factors at the peace negotiations and the long-term impacts should not be shrugged off too easily. This will be discussed further in the next section (5.3) where the recommendations for future research are presented based on the findings regarding the recommended areas in the documents (see 4.4) as well as the shortcomings found from the research processes. The figure 2\textsuperscript{11} presents a summary of the results concluding the main findings as examined through the analytical framework depicting what were the main issues in regards of the past research. Herewith, the aim of the next section is to present some ideas how the gaps in the research on this topic could be addressed in order to increase validity of the research.

\textsuperscript{11} The scale “weak to strong” (very weak, weak, strong, very strong) used in this figure is not based on any particular scale but is used as a reference point depicting the criteria in reference to its “roots” (points 1-6).
5.3 For future research

While the findings in this study indicate that the research conducted on women’s participation in peace negotiations is not high in validity, it does not imply that the topic should not be researched. On the contrary, particularly the past research conducted in a form of field studies, presented empirical evidence regarding the gap between the needs of local communities, including women and the solutions peace processes such as peace negotiations offer. While the evidence is insufficient to present solid proof in regards of the impact of women’s participation in formal peace negotiations, it is increasingly important to address the issue in order to find the most functional ways to create sustainable and long-term solutions for the post-conflict society – whether it means increasing women’s participation or finding alternative ways to improve the quality of the solutions negotiations and accords may offer.

The past research offered recommendations for peace processes including gender quotas, gender aware training for mediators and other parties at the table as well as integrating women’s efforts in the informal negotiation platforms to the formal negotiations. In this respect the future research could focus on the impacts such actions may have not only on peace accords but on the post-conflict societies in the long run in terms of women’s positions as well as
structures of institutions. Particularly, the lack of information on the connections between the implementation processes and women’s participation in peace processes seemed to raise questions. There are multiple ways to address this knowledge gap, and one of the most obvious one would be to investigate thoroughly all peace negotiations generating data on who participated in the negotiations, and comparing this data to the accords, the implementation of the accords and the structures of post-conflict societies. Thus, in addition to the small-N studies that provide more contextual account on the topic, the research would benefit greatly from large-N studies to increase credible statistical representativeness in order to create general knowledge and increase validity for the argumentation. In addition, or in connection to this, a need for field work consisting of interviews that includes women who have actually participated in formal peace negotiations is clearly high in demand. Perhaps here, it would be also important to consider interviews with the men who participated with the women in the negotiations. This is a highly relevant measure, since one of the main issues undermining the validity of the research regarded *credibility* in relation to irrelevant selection of informants.

On the one hand, generally, conducting a research on the topic with integrity where sources are clearly presented in terms of methods and origin and where the methods and sources are connected more clearly to the findings with sufficient case selection would solve most problems in terms of increasing *reliability*, *verifiability*, *credibility* as well as *transferability*. On the other hand, while increase in (valid) ethnographic studies is an important aspect in strengthening the validity of the research, the topic would benefit from inter-disciplinary studies. Considering the multi-faceted consequences peace processes may have in post-conflict societies in the areas of economic, political and social sectors, evaluating the impact of a negotiated solution surely would profit from research that is able to take as many factors into account as possible. Overall, looking further beyond the peace agreements to the post-conflict societies would bring more meaningful results than concentration on the immediate results and relationships between women’s participation and the demands women manage to negotiate.
6. Conclusions

The aim of this study was to conduct an analysis on the current research that concerned women’s participation in formal peace negotiations and its impact, and assess this research in terms of its validity. Validity in this research was composed of four elements credibility, transferability, reliability and verifiability. In this respect, seven arguments were found to depict the impact of women’s participation in formal negotiations, however, the findings indicated that there are several areas that need more work before women's participation in formal negotiations can be confirmed to have a specific impact, if any on post-conflict societies.

Firstly, the research conducted on the topic had serious challenges with respect to credibility. In the overall data over one third of the sources were presented unclearly impairing the transparency and legitimacy of the sources. The research that was based on secondary sources ended up recycling the existing research, since at the same the data was repeated among the authors and sometimes relying on sources that had no clear references to the origin of their conclusions. Whereas among the data based on primary sources, almost two thirds of the informants were representing international organisations, decision-makers and civil society organisations rather than women that had been participating in formal peace negotiations, which weakened the verifiability and therefore undermined the legitimacy and credibility of the sources from which the conclusions were drawn.

Furthermore, the reliability aspect regarding the transparency of the research also suffered as the documents often had no description of methods employed, and thus lacked details on how the data had been acquired. This was particularly the case with the documents that were based on secondary data, whereas the authors that had carried out their own field work had much stronger transparency in regard to methods, and thus were in this respect also allowing other researcher to repeat their studies. However, the documents based on secondary sources made up over half the data. Therefore, in most cases the validity of the argumentation was poor, either due lack of clarity in sources or lack of data on methods describing how and where the data had been acquired.

Finally, the case selection in regards to the peace negotiations within the overall data initially looked promising as it was divided between several cases worldwide. However, among the most used country examples only a fraction of the cases actually had women participating in the negotiations and almost one third of the documents were based on a single case. Thus, as for transferability, the findings implied that broad generalisations drawn from the data are not credible and it is questionable whether the conclusions could be maintained in other settings. In addition, whilst promoting women’s participation in peace negotiations, a few articles also
raised questions regarding empirical evidence to support the data, which again undermines the credibility of arguments making claims on the positive impact of women’s participation through peace negotiations.

In conclusion, we do not seem to know if gender matters in this context, but in order to increase validity of the research on women’s participation more attention ought to be paid to the credibility and validity of the sources. A common characteristic undermining the validity tended to be either absence of clear source representation or justification as to why certain stakeholders had been chosen e.g. for interviews resulting in sources that lacked legitimacy. On the other hand, lack of transparency in the presentation of methods and sources implies the lack of validity also poses questions as to the integrity of the researchers to conduct scientific research of the highest quality.

Furthermore, the future research could also benefit from interdisciplinary studies that include e.g. ethnographic research to gather experiences of experts who have taken part in (formal) peace negotiations as well as large-N studies to create coherence and statistical representativeness. On the other hand, it is not clear whether it is possible to take such results out of the local or national context and create meaningful results that are globally applicable in other contexts. However, one of the main aims for the future research should revolve around the question how to avoid the advocacy research for pushing major initiatives such as the UNSCR 1325 and conduct research on this topic with higher independency and objectivity. Nonetheless, one of the most interesting questions is not whether women (or men) should participate or not, but what are the consequences of different compositions in peace negotiations for the structures in post-conflict societies, and what are the mechanisms through which peace processes create stability and sustainability for long-term peace?
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Appendix I

Countries used as examples in the collected data. The examples column presents how many times the countries in question has been referred to in the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (DRC)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d’Ivoire 2003</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darfur</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea/ Ethiopia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India/Pakistan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel/Palestine</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II

List of authors’ whose research relied on interviews as primary data and the groups they interviewed in reference to the articles on table 5 (see also chapter 5.1.1).

1. Anderlini, 2000
2. Byrne & al., 1996
4. Hunt, 2005
5. Justino & al., 2012
6. Anderlini & Tirman, 2010
8. CMI & UNIFEM, 2006
9. Asi & al., 2010
12. Suthanthiraraj & Ayo, 2010
13. Kaufman & Williams, 2010
14. Lynes & Torry, 2005
15. Pampell Conaway & al., 2004
18. Douglas & Hill, 2004

Copy of table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Women involved in peace negotiations (formal/informal)</th>
<th>Civil society groups</th>
<th>Representatives of international organisations</th>
<th>Decision-makers/politicians</th>
<th>Members of military groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
