PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Issue Adoption in Human Rights Advocacy Networks

Project Description for a Proposal Submitted in Response to Program Solicitation 06-604

1.0 Overview

Fifteen years ago, few people thought about the recruitment of children to fight in adults' wars as a threat to human rights or international peace and security. Today, child soldiering has become the most prominent issue on a long list decried by a transnational network of activists and organizations working in the issue domain of children and armed conflict (Achvarina and Reich, 2006).[1] However, the network around children and armed conflict does not lobby for *all* children affected by war: until very recently girls and HIV-AIDS orphans were invisible on this agenda, and issues still absent from the laundry list include children born as a result of wartime rape; children in military families, or children affected by the militarized toy and entertainment industry in industrialized societies (Carpenter, 2005; Enloe, 2005a), despite some domestic activism around these issues in many countries.

Why do some issues and/or populations of concern but not others galvanize the attention of transnational human rights networks? While the relationship between human rights advocacy networks and global policy-making has been established (Keck and Sikink, 1998; Joachim, 2003; Khagram, Riker and Sikkink, 2002), very little empirical research currently exists explaining why transnational activists themselves mobilize around certain kinds of problem and not others at specific points in history. Yet, like the CaAC network, human rights networks generally appear to be highly selective in the issues they choose to address and the populations whose grievances they choose to frame as human rights problems. Many other problems may be articulated by activists in varying policy domains, but are not picked up on by human rights 'gatekeepers' and promulgated as issues within transnational civil society.

An emerging literature at the intersection of IR constructivism, sociological institutionalism and social movement theory seeks to explain this variation by tracing the process by which specific issues are adopted by transnational networks and become visible on the international agenda. This body of inductive work has yielded a number of hypotheses about the permissive conditions for new issue adoption in the human rights area. Hypotheses suggested in this literature include the attributes of specific issues (Keck and Sikkink, 1998), the presence of issue entrepreneurs or 'champions' inside or with access to a particular network (Finnemore, 1996), the availability of existing international norms applicable to a potential issue (Price, 2001);); specific country conditions, including size and wealth (Ron, Ramos and Rodgers 2005); the scope of media coverage of an issue (Ramos, 2005; Ron and Thoms, 2007); and the 'fit' between the new issue and specific international gatekeepers' substantive and organizational characteristics (Bob, 2005).

But our existing understanding of global agenda-setting is empirically limited. The limited work explicitly tracing the emergence of new issues on the international agenda is based on case studies of issues that *have* emerged, making it difficult to test hypotheses for issue emergence against negative cases. Moreover, any efforts to do so would be hobbled by the paucity of reliable data on variation in issue prominence in the transnational arena: unlike in the domestic agenda-setting literature, scholars of advocacy networks are not systematically studying variation in the salience of global issues, across issue and over time.

We propose to fill these gaps in three ways. First, we will capture variation in the salience of human rights issues through surveys and interviews with human rights activists, combined with hyperlink

---

[1] Issue prominence is defined as the relative frequency with which an issue is referenced within a sample of advocacy discourse. The exploratory sample on which this claim is based includes a content analysis of 36 advocacy websites in the children and armed conflict issue area. See Carpenter, 2007a.

and content analysis of advocacy websites. Second, we will explore the reasons for this variation through a series of focus groups with activists from leading organizations in the human rights network. Participants will be asked about what is and is not on the human rights "agenda"; how this changes over time, and why. Third, all data compiled from web content, focus groups, and in-depth interviews will be coded in a replicable and transparent manner to examine the responses of leading activists to questions about international issue adoption. This dataset will allow the PI and other researchers to explore hypotheses about the correlates of issue adoption and non-adoption by "gate-keeping" human rights organizations, and yield insights as to how ideas move through and (sometimes) gain footholds in transnational communities of practice.

2.0 Theory and Objectives

The objective of this project is to test a method for systematically studying transnational advocacy networks (TANs) and, if successful, contribute to knowledge about the correlates of human rights issue adoption.[2] This project builds on the work conducted between 2004 and 2006 under NSF SES-0432844. That study set out to better understand how humanitarian practitioners are able to succeed as agents of change in conflict-affected societies characterized by an influx of children born as a result of wartime sexual violence. We were concerned with understanding how a protective environment could be created for such children and what role child protection advocates in conflict zones played in mitigating stigma against such babies. The project included an interdisciplinary working group who fielded papers, now forthcoming as a volume of essays, including several country case studies on the topic; and a series of focus groups with humanitarian practitioners to guage their awareness of and strategies for addressing this issue. But because we found that very few humanitarian practitioners had elected to address this issue specifically (Carpenter et al, 2005), the research question changed. The PI's effort to explain the seeming lack of advocacy attention to this particular population became grounded in the broader literature on advocacy networks and the case of children born of rape was used to build additional testable hypotheses about this broader dynamic.

The goal is now to take the research into this broader question to the next stage by testing it across a broader range of issues, both salient and non-salient, in the human rights network. In this section, I first describe the body of theoretical literature that informs this project. Existing literature on TANs is drawn upon to clarify the specific problem under study here, and the knowledge gaps that must be filled in order to systematically study issue adoption in TANs. I then briefly describe the main empirical goals of the project before turning in the next section to the specific methods and procedures to be followed.

2.1 Theoretical Significance

A proliferating literature in international relations theory now explores the impact of transnational advocacy networks (TANs) on global public policy-making (Keck and Sikkink, 1998; Khagram, Riker and Sikkink, 2002; Florini, 2000; Burgerman, 2001; Thomas, 2002). TANs are transnational networks of activists motivated by shared principled discourse and aiming to affect political behavior through moral argument (Price, 2003). All social networks are "network[s] of meanings" (White, 1992:67); advocacy networks are networks of principled meanings. In the area of human rights, the principled meanings have to do with the rights and obligations between political actors and human beings (Keck and Sikkink, 1998; Risse, Ropp and Sikkink, 2002; Hawkins, 2002; Thomas, 2002; Joachim, 2002).

Linking insights from social movement theory, IR constructivism and sociological institutionalism, this literature has documented the role by played by civil society actors as agents of change: setting the international agenda, teaching actors new norms, monitoring of compliance with

---

[2] Clifford Bob defines human rights issue adoption as the point at which 'a proposed right is embraced by an international gatekeeper, usually a major human rights NGO' (2005a). For the purposes of this project, I operationalize 'issue adoption' as the appearance of references to a specific human rights problem in web content of organizations linked within two degrees of separation from a network gatekeeper's website.

standards, and shaming norm violators (Price, 2003). Yet this literature has paid little attention so far to why such networks adopt some issues and not others around which to invest time, resources and attention. While sociologists have done some work on the construction of social problems, their analyses are generally limited to the domestic sphere (Spector and Kitsuse, 1977; Best, 2002): attention is rarely, if ever, given to the rise and fall of international issues. Although social movement theorists increasingly are looking at global civil society, they do not discuss the politics of issue emergence (e.g. Tarrow, 2005). This stands in stark contrast to the social movement literature in US politics, where issue emergence is a crucial item of discussion (e.g. Snow and Benford, 1994).

Similarly, in international relations (IR), where scholars have taken transnational networks seriously for some time, the bulk of the TAN research agenda has focused on demonstrating (contra state-centric IR realism) that advocacy networks have an impact on state behavior (Risse, Ropp and Sikkink, eds.,1998; Khagram, Riker and Sikkink, eds., 2002; Florini, ed, 1999); why some campaigns (once initiated by gatekeepers) succeed at influencing state behavior while others fail (Price, 2003); or why certain countries and not others attract attention in a given thematic issue area, such as genocide (Ron, Ramos and Rogers, 2005; Ron and Thoms 2007). Overall, however, this body of scholarship typically bypasses the earlier question of why such networks select or "adopt" certain thematic issues and not others around which to invest time, resources and attention. Instead, most of the theorizing has dealt with later steps in the advocacy chain, such as the process of creating and diffusing new norms (which occurs when states sign onto treaties); or the process of campaigning for the creation of new norms, which occurs once a critical mass of civil society actors converges around a specific platform such as "create an international criminal court" or "ban landmines." While it is often noted in this literature that one of the most pivotal aspects of network politics is the construction of specific problems as international issues in the first place (Price, 2003), this step is seldom analyzed explicitly, and the conditions that correlate to advocacy success may or may not fully explain selection of issues in the first place.

Yet this is an extremely important question, since human rights networks are highly selective in the issues they choose to champion. For example, as Lake and Wong have noted (2005), major human rights NGOs have long focused primarily on civil and political rights to the exclusion of economic rights; until very recently gays and lesbians, disabled persons and people suffering caste-based discrimination attracted very little attention from the human rights network (Bob, forthcoming[a]). Even when a particular issue receives international attention, it can be delimited in such a way as to draw attention to only certain cases. For example, although rape of civilian women by enemy forces emerged on the international agenda in the early 1990s after 50 years of prior neglect, rape and exploitation of women and girls by UN peacekeepers and humanitarian workers became an issue only ten years later, and to date sexual violence against civilian men is rarely mentioned in advocacy discourse on the protection of civilians in armed conflict (del Zotto and Jones, 2002).

What explains this variation and, for that matter, how might it be captured and studied? The extant literature does suggest (though rarely tests) a few hypotheses. For example, in their ground-breaking study on TANs, Keck and Sikkink emphasized the importance of *issue attributes* in explaining the success of specific campaigns, an argument that might also be applicable to the construction of particular problems as issues in the first place.[3] According to Keck and Sikkink, the attributes most

---

[3] Keck and Sikkink distinguish between problems, issues and campaigns. In the human rights area, problems are pre-existing grievances that may not yet have been defined as issues. Issues are created when advocates name a problem as a human rights violation and put it on the agenda. For example, the capture and covert execution of dissidents has been a problem for dissidents throughout history, but only emerged as an issue when Amnesty International defined the concept of 'disappearances.' Campaigns involve concerted efforts by multiple organizations lobbying for a specific outcome around a certain issue. Campaigns and coalitions sometimes form around, but are distinct from, specific issues. See Khagram, Riker and Sikkink, 2002:7. Thus, the Campaign to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers was a campaign around the issue of child soldiers, aimed specifically at codifying a prohibition on child recruitment in international law (and now, at encouraging ratification). The child soldiers issue, however, is much broader, as is the issue pool within the 'children and armed conflict' network. Most of these issues do not result in specific campaigns. Here, we are interested in how problems become identified as issues.

helpful in terms of framing issues are "causes [that] can be assigned to the deliberate actions of identifiable individuals"; "issues involving bodily harm to vulnerable individuals, especially when there is a short and clear causal chain assigning responsibility; and issues involving legal equality of opportunity" (Keck and Sikkink 1998:27). The idea that the instrinsic nature of an issue can explain its success in efforts to build new international norms is shared by a variety of scholars (Nadelmann, 1990; Bob, 2005) and echoed by Price (2003).

A second explanation for the success of certain international advocacy campaigns but not others is the extent to which advocates can link a new set of inter-subjective understandings to *pre-existing applicable moral standards.* This perspective, associated in the particular with Richard Price's work on weapons taboos, suggests that the promotion of new moral standards is most likely to succeed if these can be "grafted" onto pre-existing taboos. For example, the chemical weapons taboo was popularized partly because it built upon an earlier prohibition on the use of poisons in warfare (Price and Tannenwald, 1996); and advocates of the Ottawa Convention banning anti-personnel landmines sought to move debate over landmines away from arms control discourse and graft it onto the relatively robust norm of civilian immunity by emphasizing landmines' indiscriminate effects (Price, 1998).

According to a third line of thinking, international advocacy is best pictured as a *marketplace* for short-term contracts (Cooley and Ron, 2002), in which public visibility toward a problem generates pressure to appear to be addressing it (Bob, 2005), and in which savvy advocates gravitate toward "hot" issues likely to draw donor funding and good media coverage for their organizations (Dale, 1996). This agenda-setting effect is similar to Finnemore's (1996) "norm entrepreneurship" thesis, which stresses the role of well-connected individuals with the resources and symbolic leverage to draw attention to previously unnoticed causes.[4] It also resembles a large body of work in sociology, which explores the construction of norms, discourses and political action around specific social problems such as drunk driving, drug use, and crime.[5] As Blumer (1971:302) observed long ago, public recognition of social problems ''is a highly selective process,'' with ''many harmful social conditions and arrangements'' failing to receive sufficient attention. Spector and Kitsuse's (1977) classic work went a step further, arguing that social problems ''claims making'' was a separate phenomenon that should be studied in isolation from the problem's real-world manifestations. And as Hilgartner and Bosk's (1988:57) seminal work argues, the ''fates of potential problems are governed not only by their objective natures, but by a highly selective process in which they compete with one another for public attention.'' The contagion effect of targeted media coverage is similarly often cited as a driving force behind disproportionate attention to certain regions (Ramos, 2005) or categories of victim (Carpenter, 2005a).[6] The logic of this argument is that greater public awareness of a social problem should raise the likelihood that it will be adopted as a cause by transnational advocates.

The empirical research from which these hypotheses were derived consists largely of inductive case studies. For example, Keck and Sikkink have traced the emergence of violence against women as an issue within the broader human rights network (Keck and Sikkink, 1998); Clifford Bob describes how India's Dalits went from a marginalized category to a successful rights claimant with a corresponding issue campaign around work-and-descent-based discrimination (Bob, forthcoming [b]); and Daniel Chong has described Amnesty International's gradual and belated embrace of economic, social and cultural rights (cited in Bob, forthcoming[a]).

But these hypotheses have rarely been tested on issues that have *not* emerged among gatekeeping transnational advocacy organizations. We proceed on the assumption that exploring *negative* social

---

[4] Thus as Bob writes, celebrities available to take up an international cause can be a vital element in issue emergence (Bob, 2005). For example, Princess Diana's advocacy around landmines has been cited as contributing to these issues' international visibility and thus salience (Price, 1999).
[5] For overviews, see Best (2002) and Schneider (1985).
[6] However, advocacy networks also utilize the media to set their own agenda (Ron, Ramos and Rodgers, 2005) so it is not always so clear whether the media drives issue emergence, with advocates responding to it strategically, or more accurately reflects advocacy frames given other necessary conditions.

outcomes – in this case, problems that have not been constructed openly as transnational "issues" – can provide important clues as to the causal factors underlying issue emergence (Lewis and Lewis, 1980; Mahoney and Goertz, 2004). Understanding what is left off the global agenda and why can add to our knowledge about successful issue emergence as well as the politics and pathologies of transnational advocacy networks more generally.[7] Moreover, there is reason to think that the hypotheses drawn from this inductive work may be insufficient to explain variation in transnational issue adoption. This is because the same factors said to correlate with successful issue emergence (as described in the various inductive research available) can also co-occur with *non-emergence*.

For example, the PI's previous NSF-funded work on the humanitarian response to children born of wartime rape found that this issue is of low salience to the children's rights network. Yet this cannot be explained easily by any of the implicit hypotheses in the TAN literature. Given the specific predictions of the Keck and Sikkink's issue attributes hypothesis, these children should be likelier to be on the agenda than child soldiers, for example, given that as infants they should be perceived as highly vulnerable and innocent, and given that the rights violations they experience include bodily harm and discrimination. "Champions" also exist for this group: although no major gatekeeper in the CaAC network has defined them as a category of concern, at least one small NGO in Norway has done so, as well as some human rights intellectuals, including this author. If media attention drives issue emergence, one would expect these children to be on the agenda, as numerous reports of "rape babies" in war zones from Bosnia to Rwanda to East Timor to Sudan have appeared in the press (Becirbasic and Secic, 2001; Powell, 2001; Wax, 2004; Polgreen, 2005.) Additionally, there are numerous international legal standards that should be easily applicable to the kinds of rights abuses these children face. In other words, if the theoretical predictions about campaign success are transferable to the earlier stage of issue emergence, this would seem like a likely case. The lack of attention within the CaAC network to this population despite the presence of what have been described loosely as permissive conditions for issue emergence raises the question of how to explain failures in issue emergence like this.

We hypothesize that stigma against children born of rape is but one of many existing problems that might be, but has not been, adopted by "gatekeepers" in the human rights network. To build a generalizable theory of why, we need data on many more such low-prominence issues, and better data on prominent issues for comparison; and, perhaps, better hypotheses suited in particular to the questions of issue creation in global civil society. In the next section, I explain the methods we will use to gather such data and generate hypotheses on issue adoption in human rights networks.

Table 1 - Hypotheses

H1	Issue adoption is a function of the attributes of specific problems, as relevant attributes are defined by advocates.
H2	Issue adoption is likelier to the extent that advocates can link a new issue to pre-existing international rights standards or to other issues already on the agenda.
H3	Issue adoption is a function of market pressures by global media, donors, or public opinion.

2.2 Goals and Objectives

The objective of this research is to pilot a methodology for collecting data on variation in the international issue pool within the human rights networks, and to use that data to explore and expand upon the above four hypotheses regarding the adoption or non-adoption of specific issues by leading organizations within the human rights network. Measuring and examining the correlates of issue adoption is logically dependent on three analytical steps, completion of which constitute the main objectives of this

---

[7] Finnemore and Barnett, 2004.

project. The means and methods used to collect and code this data, including the integration of the project into training and curricular innovations at the PI's institution, are described at further length below.

2.2a. Operationalizing The Human Rights Network

Since measuring a network issue pool requires first operationalizing the network itself, the first goal of the project will be to map out the constituent organisations in the human rights network and the patterns of connections between them using hyperlink analysis, triangulated with focus group research and in-depth interviews.

A clear understanding of the constituent elements of specific network boundaries over time is important to the study of issue adoption in two ways. First, we need to identify network actors in order to accurately sample advocacy network discourse. Without identifying a manageable population of organizations which are representative of the broader network and, for those organizations, a manageable and reasonably representative set of advocacy text data, one can say little meaningful about the "network agenda." Creating a replicable method for identifying organizations belonging to a specific network is also crucial in determining from which organizations to recruit focus group participants.

Operationalizing the human rights network will also provide crucial data on the structural relations between its constitutent organizations. As Lake and Wong (2005:2) have demonstrated, in transnational advocacy networks, "nodes in networks are not equal": that is, some entitites have much greater influence, operationalized as number of relative connectivity to the rest of the network, than others. Since it is these "key" organizations or "gatekeepers" whose adoption of a specific issue weighs in most in the process of issue adoption (Bob, 2005), it is important to identify these particular actors relative to others in a particular issue network. As described below, this will be done using a combination of automated methods available by subscription from the University of Amsterdam, and online surveys of and in-depth interviews with human rights activists themselves.

2.2b Measuring Variation In the Human Rights Issue Pool

As detailed below, we will capture variation in the issue pool through a qualitative analysis of advocacy website content and by asking survey and interview respondents to list "the most important issues in the human rights movement today."[8] By aggregating the references to each specific issue, we can measure both the presence and relative prominence of particular issues on the human rights agenda. For example we predict that 'torture' will appear in many advocacy websites discussing the range of issues attended to by human rights activists, and that many survey and interview respondents will also mention 'torture' as an important issue in the movement. However, we will not know until the analysis is complete the prominence of 'torture' relative to other issues such as 'gender-based violence' or 'disappearances.'

Website analysis can provide data on failures in issue adoption: an issue such as children born of rape might be conspicuous in its absence from leading advocacy websites, once an investigator has thought to look for its presence. However, it cannot give us clues as to the range of possible problems that might be, but are not, adopted by gate-keeping organizations; selecting cases on the basis of issues to which a researcher happens to be attuned introduces an unacceptable amount of bias to the study. Instead, we will ask survey and interview respondents two additional questions: what problems they can think of that have received little or no attention from the human rights network, and what problems or conditions they wish human rights organizations would pay more attention to.

2.2c Theorizing the Correlates of Issue Adoption

The third goal of the project will be to generate hypotheses about the reasons that gatekeepers in advocacy organizations select certain issues and not others for advocacy attention. In both surveys and interviews, activists will be asked for their opinions as to the factors driving issue adoption in

---

[8] This measure is similiar to that used in domestic agenda-setting literature to measure "issue salience" (Epstein and Segal, 2000; Hutchings, 2001) while imperfect (Wlezien, forthcoming) it is a useful means of triangulating the frequency analysis of the web text data.

transnational organizations. In addition, a series of focus groups will provide a conversational setting in which practitioners may reflect on these issues and consider whether advocacy around specific low-salient-issues (randomly drawn from the survey responses) should or should not receive more advocacy attention, and why.

The text data from these various sources can be compared to the implicit hypotheses on issue emergence drawn from the TAN literature. Exploratory work on focus group data gathered with previous NSF funding suggests it is possible to create a coding scheme to reliably capture the type of substantive comments and discursive properties that might be expected to correspond to the factors described above. Advocates' perceptions of various issues' attributes, of organizational constraints in lobbying on a particular problem, of tension between issue networks over a particular problem, or of ease and difficulty linking a problem to existing issues are all measurable in text data resulting from directed discussions in focus group settings.

For example, if advocates typically argue that issue attributes matter or are unconvinced that specific low-salience issues have the appropriate attributes for advocacy, this would lend support to Keck and Sikkink's 'issue attributes' hypothesis; to the extent that practitioners invoke the agenda-setting constraints posed by the media and donors, this would lend support to the political economy thesis. While this would not constitute a robust test of any of these hypotheses, the annotated text data should provide some insight into which if any of these theoretical predictions correspond to advocates' own understanding of why certain issues do or do not lend themselves to transnational advocacy. We also anticipate that the process of engaging practitioners on these points will produce a better, more refined set of hypotheses amenable for later testing.

3.0 Methods and Procedures

As described in the introduction, the goals of this study are three-fold: operationalize the human rights network itself; measure variation in the human rights issue agenda; and consult with practitioners to develop better hypotheses about the correlates of issue adoption. This section describes a combination of methods to be used for gathering and coding data on the human rights network to achieve these goals during the funding period.

Data on the network itself and on the content of the advocacy agenda will be gathered primarily from three sources: the World Wide Web, which provides a set of data on the population of organizations around specific issues, their structural relations, and the official agenda; surveys with activists in the wider human rights movement; and in-depth interviews with activists drawn from the global South in order to compensate for any bias toward developed countries that may be introduced by using web-based recruitment methods for the survey.[9] In addition, a series of focus groups will bring together members of organizations identified as human rights 'gatekeepers' by the surveys/interviews and hyperlink analysis to discuss factors impacting issue adoption decisions in major human rights organizations. Institutional Review Board approval for the use of human subjects in this research is pending, but will be obtained before the start of the project.

The text data yielded from websites, surveys, interviews and focus group transcripts will be coded manually by graduate student coders trained in ATLAS.ti, a qualitative analysis management and model building software package. This section describes the data collection and analysis methods envisioned for this project in some detail.

---

[9]While it is not the key focus of this study, the data so collected would also enable these or other researchers to explore gaps between Northern and Southern responses to these questions, and between the issue agenda as articulated by real-space activists vs. represented in cyberspace. This could provide insights about the significance of the Internet in reflecting or indeed constructing the global issue agenda, or whether in fact hyperlink analysis distorts that agenda in favor of the most powerful and technologically savvy agents of global change.

Table 2 - Research Goals and Methods Used

Methods > Goals \/	Hyperlink Analysis	Website Analysis	Surveys	Interviews	Focus Groups
Operationalize Network	X		X	X	
Operationalize Issue Pool		X	X	X	
Theorize Issue Adoption					X

3.1 *Data Collection: Multi-Method Qualitative Research*

Data for this project will be gathered using a combination of qualitative methods. First, *hyperlink analysis* will be used to identify a population of organizations most recognized as authorities in the human rights network, and archive a dataset of advocacy content from these organizational websites. Second, a series of online surveys will be conducted with individuals subscribed to several major human rights listservs, aimed at capturing activists' perceptions of the network gatekeepers, the issue agenda, and problems deserving advocacy attention. Because this method may be biased in favor of Northern populations, the surveys will be supplemented with in-depth interviews with Southern human rights activists at The International Human Rights Training Program in Montreal, Quebec. Third, six *focus groups* will be held during year two to guage advocates' understandings of the factors promoting issue adoption and their responses when asked to discuss certain low-prominence issues in conversational settings. Both the hyperlink analysis and focus group research will involve collaboration with professional consultants and graduate student researchers, and aim to create linkages between GSPIA, the School of Information Sciences (SIS) at University of Pittsburgh, between Univeristy of Pittsburgh and Carleton University, and between GSPIA students and policy-makers in the human rights sector.

3.1a Hyperlink and Web-Content Analysis. A key data source on advocacy networks and their issue pool will be the World Wide Web. Representations of advocacy organizations in cyberspace are a relatively underutilized data source that is highly appropriate for measuring networks themselves and the advocacy agenda in the transnational sector. As much of the literature on TANs notes in passing, contemporary transnational advocacy is heavily reliant on global communiations networks, including the Internet. However as Price reminds us (2003:597) TAN scholarship in international relations theory has not adequately exploited the Internet as a data resource or systematically analyzed it as an organizational medium for advocacy networks. An emerging scholarship at the intersection of transnational social movement theory, network analysis and computer-mediated communications studies suggests, however, that the World Wide Web is more than a means by which network actors associate: it is also a virtual context in which they construct shared meanings. It is thus a useful source of data on advocacy networks themselves, the issues on or off the agenda, and the nature of advocacy discourse. "In creating an online persona, NGOs engage in framing activities... by shaping the ways that issues are conceptualized and understood" (Warkentin, 2001:36-37). The rhetorical content of websites, the accompanying images, the way content is categorized and the way in which different themes and frames are connected in cyberspace matter enormously in terms of the construction of advocacy frames in transnational civil society (Rogers and Marres, 2000; Halavais and Garrido, 2003; Bai and Choi, 2000; Hine, 2000).

Data collection from the World Wide Web for this project will be undertaken through a combination of hyperlink analysis and content analysis of advocacy websites. Together, this combination of hyperlink analysis with systematic qualitative analysis of web content is similar to what Foot and

Schneider call "web sphere analysis": an analytical strategy for studying "communicative actions and relations between web producers and users developmentally over time" (Foot and Schneider, 2004). This project, however, aims not to study the web as a social space in itself so much as to use cyberspace as one proxy for a broader transnational community of meaning, in an effort to operationalize both the community itself and the set of meanings prevalent within its discourse over a particular time period (Rogers, 2002).

Hyperlink analysis is, essentially, social network analysis applied to cyberspace: social network analysis looks at the relational links between discrete "nodes" and maps the patterns in these relationships (Park and Thelwall, 2003; Park, 2003). Since linking practices in cyberspace connect websites much as social relations connect agents in real space (Wasserman and Faust, 1994), hyperlink analysis of advocacy sites in cyberspace allows us to empirically map out a network of common meaning and purpose as represented in online linking practices (Adamic and Adar, 2001). The assumption behind this methodology is that a hyperlink from one website to another functions as a citation, representing membership in a common ideational community as well as acknowledgement of authority (Barabasi, 2002:5; Henzinger, 2001:45). A recent analysis by Bae and Choi (2000) suggests that this type of linking practice is particularly relevant in the transnational human rights sector. Thus, hyperlinking practices can be used as one indicator of the constitutive organizational elements and boundaries of advocacy networks (Marres and Rogers, 2005).

Additionally, because of the recognition function of linking practices, link analysis also measures structural relations within network boundaries: hyperlink analysis tells us who the authorities or "gatekeepers" are within the network, as represented by the relative number of incoming and outgoing links (Park and Thelwall, 2003). Of major importance to studying the agenda are identifying the network "hubs," expected to play a disproportionate role in intra-network agenda-setting and therefore of importance in drawing a weighted sample of sites to study.[10] Clifford Bob has argued that such gatekeepers' choices "have powerful demonstration effects, signaling that certain causes are important" and that the adoption of an issue by key gatekeepers is the best indicator that an issue has emerged on the transnational network agenda (Bob, 2005:5).

In practice, links between organizations in the CaAC network will be identified and catalogued using IssueCrawler, a software application available by subscription from the University of Amsterdam, that allows the user to create graphical representations of online issue networks. The software follows hyperlinks from a set of source pages, repeating the process on each additional web-page with two or more in-links, until no more new pages are discovered, and then creates graphical representations of the entire issue network.[11] The hyperlink analysis will enable the research team to analyze not only the current parameters and structural relations within the human rights network. Additional analytical tools developed by Dr. Rogers at University of Amsterdam include an adaptive web scraper, which allows the downloading and archiving of website content on an iterative basis, to track changes in new content over time without manually recoding each time. The PI will travel toAmsterdam at the outset of the project for training and assistance in operating IssueCrawler, and to collaborate with Dr. Rogers in using other automated tools relevant to the web sphere analysis.

---

[10] A critique of relying on cyberspace for operationalizing a network and sampling its advocacy discourse is that this method discriminates against less-connected organizations within a network (for example, those in developing countries with lesser access to the Internet). However, for our purposes this bias works methodologically in our favor, assisting in gathering a representative sample. This is because advocacy networks themselves discriminate in this way, with central nodes (in our case, leading human rights NGOs such as Amnesty International) exercising a "gatekeeping" role due to their disproportionate access, resources, and prestige (Lake and Wong, 2005).

[11] See http://www.govcom.org/Issuecrawler_instructions.htm.

The population of organizations identified through the Issuecrawler will be used for the purpose of recruiting for the focus groups. In addition, the websites of the organizations in the network with the highest in-link density, or "gatekeepers," will be examined by student coders to determine which issues are listed on their advocacy agenda.

For example, Figure 1 provides a screenshot of the 'issues' page from Human Rights Watch, which we predict will emerge as a 'gatekeeper' in the hyperlink analysis. These will be taken as examples of issues 'on the agenda' and will be drawn on in prompting survey and interview respondents on questions of the relative prominence of issues in the human rights movement. Using GovCom's adaptive scraper, we will re-archive the sites on a quarterly basis to track changes in the agenda over the funding period.

Figure 1. Human Rights Watch

Source: http://www.hrw.org/advocacy/index.htm

3.1b. Surveys. One could conduct an analysis of the issue content of all the websites within the network, but this would provide only an indicator of the issue agenda in cyberspace. To capture attitudes regarding the relative prominence of different issues in the real-space human rights network, a survey will be distributed to human rights activists subscribed to one of several major human rights listservs, including HURIDOCS, Oneworld, The Advocacy Project and the Global Human Rights Education List. Those who respond will be asked to name the 'most important issues' in the human rights movement today, a measure similar to that used in domestic agenda-setting studies. Open-ended responses to this question will help us quantify the prominence of specific issues in human rights advocacy, and may also provide information on how activists think about what constitutes an 'issue'. The next question in the survey asks activists to rank a list of issues, randomly selected from the websites of gatekeeping organizations identified through the hyperlink analysis, in terms of their prominence in the human rights movement. This list includes issues such as torture, disappearances or genocide and is meant to provide a sense of the variation in prominence of the issues in the existing issue pool.

The survey will also ask participants to think about human rights 'problems' that are not yet considered 'issues' in the movement. Respondents will be asked first, whether they can think of problems that are receiving little or no attention by major organizations; and second which problems if any they wish major NGOs like Human Rights Watch would pay more attention to. From these questions we will able to develop a population of 'negative cases' against which to compare those issues that have in fact received attention by gatekeepers, while controlling for researcher bias. The surveys will be created, administered and analyzed using Survey Monkey web-based software and will be accessible to participants by clicking on a link in the recruitment letter posted to a human rights listserv.

3.1c. In-Depth Interviews.

We acknowledge that the use of online surveys will be biased in favor of individuals with regular Internet access. In transnational networks, this might in particular fail to capture the perspectives of human rights activists in the global south. The answers to these questions cut to the heart of human rights research and action. Is the human rights movement part of a mechanism for global citizen governance and activism, or is it fragmented, nationally-constrained, and/or hopelessly elitist? Given the importance of these questions, it is remarkable how little systematic and comparative research on the transnational activist movement has been done. This paucity of research stems, in part, from the difficulties involved in

studying a transnational network of this sort. Network members are spread across the globe, and their numbers, organizational affiliations, and engagement with human rights issues fluctuates dramatically, in accordance with both personal and political developments.

To broaden the participation of these underrepresented groups in our study, we will endeavor to triangulate the survey findings by also interviewing activists from Southern countries. Such activists will be identified and recruited while they are visiting a major hub in the global human rights movement: the annual "International Human Rights Training Program" (IHRTP) held each year by *Equitas: The International Centre for Human Rights Education* in Montreal, Quebec. In this and a handful of other locations worldwide, relatively large numbers of activists from around the world gather each year to engage in human rights training and education activities. Such venues offer a unique opportunity for social science research, as they bring together a relatively large cross section of activists from multiple regions.

The IHRTP program began in 1980, and now regularly attracts grass roots activists from all regions of the world. Each June, roughly 130 activists from over 40 countries are selected from a pool of approximately 700 applicants who learn of the training program through word of mouth. Thus, the applicant pool consists of a "snowball sample" of sorts. Previous program alumni, Canadian aid officials, other Northern diplomats or aid officials, peer organizations, all spread word of the training program. Applicants are largely funded by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Canada's official development arm, although a small number pay their own way with the help of other Northern donors.

We propose to conduct two waves of interviews with IHRTP participants in June 2007 and 2008. In total, we will attempt to identify and interview approximately 60 activists from developing countries: 15 in year one; and 45 in year two. A series of such interviews has already been piloted by Professor Ron in 2005-2006, so the research team already has a good working relationship with Equitas, the group running the conference. For a fee, the organization will assist in facilitating access to its participants as interview subjects. Equitas staffers will help the interviewers select the right sample from amongst 130 IHRTP trainees; ensure that the right respondents are available at the right time and place; replace respondents when they are sick or otherwise unavailable; handle questions about the interviews; and coordinate follow-up with respondents after they return to their country of origin for reasons of safety and research ethics.

This portion of the project will be handled through a subaward to Professor Ron of Carleton University, who will hire and train two graduate student interviewers. IHRTP trainees are fluent in either French or English; graduate students from Carleton University, familiar with bilingual environments, are capable of conducting interviews in both languages. These individuals will meet with informants at the site of the training session at the John Abbott College on Montreal's West Island. Interviews will incude the types of questions provided on the online survey, in particular which issues are seen as the most important, which players in the network are seen as most influential, and which problems in the world need more attention from leading human rights actors. With the informants' informed and written consent, we will tape the discussions on a digital recorder, while also taking handwritten notes.

Interviewers will assemble an accurate but abridged version of the interview from both sources, thus serving also as transcriptionists for the interview portion of the project. While it would be more cost-effective to hire transcriptionists at the University of Pittsburgh rate, significant methodological concerns necessitate allowing the same individuals who conduct the interviews to also transcribe/translate the audio-tapes into text documents. (The interviews are conducted in English or French with non-native speakers. The conversation is thus often difficult to understand. Terms such as "human rights" and "activism" mean different things in different contexts, requiring protracted discussion and clarification. In addition, the audio-recordings take place under difficult recording conditions; background noise makes for a particularly tricky transcription effort.) The text data from these transcriptions will be submitted to the Qualitative Data Analysis Program at University of Pittsburgh for coding and analysis.

3.1d. Focus Group Research. Text data from focus groups with representatives of gatekeeping organizations will be used to complement these sources on the issue agenda and to gather primary information on advocates' decision-making regarding issue adoption. Participants will be recruited from the population of advocacy organizations identified through hyperlink analysis as belonging to the human rights network. We will send an initial letter of invitation to each organization or individual requesting their participation, and a follow-up call. Prior experience with focus group research in this sector as part of NSF SES-0432844 suggests it is feasible to fill groups of this size using these recruitment methods, as long as participants' travel costs are covered.

The focus groups will be conducted at University of Pittsburgh's Ford Institute for Human Security. At each group, the PI will ask questions and facilitate dialogue, while the GSR will take field notes and monitor the order in which participants speak. Anonymity will be protected by assigning each participant a number at the start of the session. Participants will be asked to identify the important players in the networks around specific issues, to discuss their own current and emerging agendas, and to brainstorm about particular issues that are not receiving advocacy attention, culled from survey and interview responses to the question about low-salient problems. The data will be collected by the PI, with the help of a GSR who will oversee the collection of verbatim transcripts.

Focus groups, as conversational settings, provide an environment in which to examine what ideas, assumptions or discourses advocates across issue networks hold in common: they are "particularly suited to the study of attitudes and experiences around specific topics" and to ways in which those topics are articulated in social settings (Barbour and Kitzinger, 1999:5). Thus, in addition to substantive information on how advocates explain their issue selection decisions, the transcripts will provide data on the way in which particular issues are currently conceptualized, constructed, or discussed among advocates themselves; which issues are conceptually linked to which other issues; the extent to which advocates can agree that particular 'non-issues' lack some factor required for advocacy.

3.2 *Data Coding and Analysis*

The text-data gathered from these sources will be coded and analyzed using a qualitative data analysis application called Atlas.ti. Atlas software allows the user to systematically categorize and count occurences of particular themes in text, theorize about the relationships between discrete discursive properties, and document an analytical process that allows the reader to replicate the analysis. It is also very useful in allowing multiple independent coders to sift through raw data in order to identify initial codes, while then allowing a principal investigator to refine and categorize the discrete coded categories as needed given the focus of a particular qualitative project. The coded data will tell us how the networks are defined and related, which issues are currently present in the human rights network, which problems advocates are aware of that are currently not prominent in the network, an which factors hypothesized to explain variation are mentioned by advocates as reasons behind issue adoption.

To manage these data in a structured and rigorous manner, assistance will be sought from the Qualitative Data Analysis Program (QDAP) within University of Pittsburgh's Center for Urban and Social Research (UCSUR). QDAP's mission is to annotate (or code) text documents using ATLAS.ti so that researchers can easily and reliably report on specific patterns in the data. QDAP consults with researchers to develop a coding scheme appropriate to their projects; employs and trains graduate students in ATLAS.ti and in the coding schemes relevant to each specific project; and produces project outputs for analysis by the PI. Engaging QDAP's expertise and its staff of trained graduate student coders will greatly reduce the time required to prepare the data for analysis.

Manual coding of such extensive data will be time-consuming and labor intensive, but it serves two goals. First, it will culminate in a replicable, annotated dataset on a sample of data on a specific network that can be made available to others working on advocacy networks. The test bed for both the data and the analytical tools used will be made available online to the academic and practitioner community, so that the dynamics of these TANs may be investigated by other researchers bringing other hypotheses to bear. Second, it contributes to the training of graduate students in the rigorous, computer-assisted study of text data.

The outcome of the coding process will be a transparent, replicable dataset of annotated text on advocacy network discourse. A related project output will be a systematic coding scheme that can later be replicated and applied to a more comprehensive dataset. Analysis of this data will also yield insight into the social construction of human rights in international society, and into the discursive pratices within the human rights network when presented with emergent or unfamiliar issues in conversational settings.

4.0 Project Timeline

Table 3.

Year	Research, Education, and Training Activities
Summer 2007	Travel to Amsterdam to train with Issuecrawler; first wave of IHRTP interviews.
AY 2007-2008	Conduct hyperlink analysis; begin archiving web-content data quarterly; develop, pre-test and refine coding scheme for web-content; disseminate online survey; code survey results.
Summer 2008	Conduct second wave of in-depth interviews in Montreal; transcribe interview data; submit to QDAP for coding.
AY 2008-2009	Code and analyze interview data; compare to survey and web data; develop focus group protocol and identify focus group participants; organize/conduct focus groups.
Summer 2009	Transcribe focus group data; develop coding scheme for focus group data.
AY 2009-2010	Code focus group data; analyze focus group data relative to surveys, interviews and web data; begin work on scholarly outputs.

5.0 Expected Significance

We expect this project to be of intellectual merit to the fields of political science, sociology and information science; to impact curricular innovations and the training of graduate students at Carleton University and University of Pittsburgh; to broaden the participation of under-represented groups; to fulfill HSD criteria of cross-cutting, innovative, multi-disciplinary research on agents of change; and to yield outputs of value both to specific disciplines represented, and also to interdisciplinary forums.

5.1 Intellectual Merit.

Within political science, the theoretical contribution of this work will be to advance scholarship on TANs and global public policy-making. By emphasizing issue adoption as a stage of TAN activity in need of study, it advances theory on global agenda-setting, which has to date sought primarily to understand how TANs matter and the conditions under which they succeed, rather than why they mobilize around certain issues in the first place. Using interdisciplinary methods, we will build a dataset capturing variation in issue prominence, as well as how practitioners think about this variation. The data developed will be of use to other scholars interested in identifying substantive gaps in the human rights agenda. The TAN literature has often been criticized for emphasizing only advocacy that has taken place and succeeded, rather than the myriad dogs that have not barked in the advocacy realm (Price, 2003). This project will look for such 'quiet dogs' and theorize the silences and gaps as well as "loud" issues.

The project will also advance the discipline of sociology, by expanding its analyses of the construction of social problems beyond the domestic arena to global civil society. To date, sociologists have been slow to take up the study of transnational networks, preferring to focus instead on advocacy

networks and movements at the domestic level. Yet the sociological literature has rich theoretical insights and a long history of studying issue emergence, and international relations theorists have much to learn. Our publications and research contacts will help generate important cross-disciplinary debates, linking up scholarly communities in new and exciting ways. By the same token, this study will draw in information science researchers who are building tools to automate many of the data collection and coding processes set out in this proposal. Future large scale studies of the web sphere will build on the foundational work undertaken in this project.

Within the scientific community more broadly, this research will advance methodological approaches for systematically studying transnational social phenomena. This project will pilot new means of operationalizing issue network gatekeepers, the issue agenda, and the populations of non-salient issues within the network. The methodology piloted for this process combines web-based analysis, as a means of operationalizing and analyzing networks and network discourse, and qualitative analysis of advocacy discourse both in confidential surveys and interviews and in conversational settings. This combination of both conventional and web-based methodologies also contributes to the information sciences, offering insights into the construction and movement of issues on the world wide web, and how this domain interfaces with transnational knowledge comunities in real-space. By connecting web sphere analysis to the study of TANs, the goal is to pioneer of a means and method for analyzing transnational social relations that will inform scientific studies of other communities interfacing both in cyberspace and in conversational settings. The entire test-bed resulting from this project will be made available to the public through the use of the world wide web, enabling other researchers to replicate this methodology or develop and test additional hypotheses regarding transnational communities.

5.2 Broader Impacts.

Broader impacts at the University of Pittsburgh include strengthening of linkages between the Graduate School of Public and International affairs and the School of Information Sciences (SIS). The web-analysis portion of the project will draw on student and faculty expertise in the joint degree program between GSPIA and SIS, thereby strengthening those cross-disciplinary connections and bringing insight from SIS to bear on the longer-term goal of developing automated collection, annotation and analysis tools.

Additionally, the grant will allow international collaboration with two other major research universities. The project will benefit from the expertise in sociological methods provided by the senior personnel from Carleton, and from connections to the human rights hubs in Montreal with which NPSIA researchers have a historical relationship. Synergy between these two leading schools of Public and International Affairs will enrich both schools' research and teaching agendas. Liasons between researchers at University of Amsterdam, whose GovCom Institute is now a leader in the social scientific study of issue advocacy on the Internet, and University of Pittsburgh's Qualitative Data Analysis Program will advance the work of those pioneering the use of computer-based tools for analyzing complex social phenomena. This project represents a snapshot of the convergence of scholarly concern worldwide around how best to capture, study, and explain the role of Internet. As such, it may be a harbinger for future studies that bring advanced IT tools (eg., web scrapers or human language technologies) to bear on new and interesting digitized datasets.

Our team is also committed to broadening the participation of under-represented groups in two respects. First, by including specific efforts to reach activists from the Global South in sampling the transnational human rights network, we aim to incorporate the participation by and perspectives of a significant population often understudied in previous scholarship of advocacy networks. Second, the PI will actively seek to recruit female, minority and international graduate students for positions funded through the grant, and preference will be given to those pursuing a joint degree in GSPIA and the School of Information Science (SIS).

The research will also positively impact students at Carleton and University of Pittsburgh by integrating both substantive expertise in network analysis and rigorous qualitative methods training into the curriculum absorbed by future policy-makers and analysts. Substantively, the PI expects to create a

new course in Year Two on Transnational Advocacy Networks at University of Pittsburgh. Further, the expertise of practitioners who visit campus as research subjects may at times be integrated into the curriculum through additional invited talks in classes or colloquia on specific subjects. These efforts will strengthen GSPIA's goal of expanding its curriculum in human rights issues, exemplified by a brand new major in Human Security.

In addition to these curricular impacts, the project will train significant numbers of Masters and Ph.D students. At Carleton University's Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, Canada's leading school for training MAs and PhDs for professional careers in international affairs, students will benefit from the experience of collecting interview data in a transnational setting. At University of Pittsburgh, graduate student coders hired through QDAP will be trained in the systematic use of qualitative data analysis software and the social scientific methods for reaching valid inferences about large, unstructured text datasets. Additionally, students' professional development will also be enhanced through training in a specific software package whose use will enable them to apply the skill-sets learned on the project to future qualitative analyses throughout their careers. They will also gain literacy in human security issues, having immersed themselves in large quantities of related text. These skill-sets will be particularly valuable in programs that have historically stressed quantitative rather than qualitative data analysis packages.

The two full-time graduate student employees associated with this project will benefit from these skills as well as benefiting from administrative and networking opportunities. The Project Manager, working under the direction of Dr. Shulman and in collaboration with Dr. Carpenter, will gain experience supervising and training a team of coders, as well as managing the annotated datasets produced. This individual or individuals will work across disciplines, applying insights from information technology to the study of transnational social phenomena and working closely with students involved in public administration. The GSR who works with the PI to organize and facilitate the focus group component of the project will gain valuable networking experience within the field of human security as the project liason, and will have the opportunity to travel to Geneva to assist with research and to present findings at conferences and to co-author with senior personnel. S/he will also gain experience in focus group data collection and analysis, of use to many policy-makers and analysts.

A key broader impact will be the encouragement of similar projects and scholarly articles by emerging scholars at the intersection of social and information sciences. As Editor-in-Chief of the *Journal of Information Technology and Politics*, Dr. Shulman is in a unique position to cultivate, encourage, and publish such research. The relationship of the Internet to the study of transnational networks is a priority area for the journal and a special issue on this subject is already being developed in collaboration with Dr. Rogers. Leading political science journals as yet do not reflect the rising importance of the Internet as a site for research and source of data. Articles based on this effort will chart a compelling pathway for future studies of the shifting digital landscape.

A final broader impact is on the direction of new research by other scholars. Although the entire team is unlikely to meet at specific disciplinary conferences, given its multi-disciplinary character, both Dr. Shulman and Dr. Carpenter will attend the American Political Science Association each year, and will endeavor to organize panels centered around these project themes through the co-sponsorship of the Human Rights Section and the Information, Technology and Politics Section. Authors recruited to write papers on these panels will be encouraged to submit their work to interdisciplinary journals such as *JITP,* and particular effort will be made to encourage junior researchers to explore these areas.

5.3 Fit to Human and Social Dynamics. As demonstrated throughout this narrative, the intellectual merits and broder impacts of these project activities will add to the fundamental knowledge base regarding the rise and fall of issues in the human rights sphere, fulfilling HSD's intent to "foster breakthroughs in understanding the dynamics of human action... as well as knowledge about organizational, cultural and societal adaptation and change" (NSF, 2006:2). By extending models applicable domestically to capture transnational dynamics resulting from globalization, we hope to capture the factors that promote and inhibit ideational innovation in transnational communities of

knowledge and practice, as well as exploring the role of scientific and technological advances in communications technology in disseminating such ideas. Our exploration of how activists succeed or fail at pitching new ideas to 'gate-keeping' organizations in the human rights network dovetails with HSD's interest in the relationship between technological developments, social action and organizational change at the global level.

5.4 Interdisciplinarity. Such a project requires a multi-disciplinary team drawing on expertise from across the social and information sciences. These two fields have, in the past, seldom benefited from strong collaborative partnerships or a common language and methods, as demonstrated by the difficulty this PI has had seeking support for this project, with its heavily interdisciplinary methods, from within NSF's Political Science division. By contrast, we expect the interdisciplinary character of this project to appeal to HSD, which specifically endeavors to support such novel activities not falling clearly into discipline-specific NSF programs.

     As elaborated under the Management Plan, each member of our team has some expertise either in information science or social science (sociology or political science); several are working at the intersection between these disciplines already. For example, Dr. Shulman was trained as a political scientist but holds an appointment in the School of Information Sciences, teaches classes in information science and policy almost exclusively, publishes primarily in interdisciplinary outlets, and is the founder and Editor-in-Chief of the *Journal of Information Technology and Politics*, which is a journal with a specifically interdisciplinary focus and Editorial Board members from both social and computational sciences. Dr. Rogers' GovCom Institute in the Netherlands regularly draws workshop participants from diverse disciplines interested in the interface between global communication technologies and issue networks. Dr. Carpenter and Dr. Ron bring to the project a grounding in both quantitative and qualitative methods for studying social phenomena, and connections within the disciplines of sociology and political science. In addition to publishing collaboratively in interdisciplinary outlets, we fully expect the insights from this project to inform our separate disciplines as well.

     The interdisciplinary linchpin is the coding. It is the manual annotation of text that unites the separate threads of the project. Coders tag text in ways that both allow more systematic social science inferences and make possible cutting edge advances in tool development for gathering, sorting and understanding emergent and vast quantites of web content. This project builds a foundation on which future interdisciplinary work may build.

5.5 Expected Outputs. We foresee several sole-authored and collaborative outputs of this project within the next five years. Collaborative outputs will include one or more substantive articles on human rights issue adoption, which will likely be submitted to a major international affairs journal such as *International Organization* or *International Studies Quarterly*; a methods piece covering lessons learned from combining social and information science methodologies to study transnational networks, likely to be submitted to a top-tier political science journal such as *American Political Science Review*; and an article more explicitly examining the relationship between transnational advocacy on the Internet and in real-space networks, to be submitted to a peer-reviewed interdisciplinary journal such as *Journal of Information Technology and Politics.*

     The contributors to this project may also draw on the data derived collaboratively for use in their individual projects. The dataset from this project will be drawn on to develop a sole-authored book manuscript by Dr. Carpenter on issue emergence in advocacy networks. This will be the first book-length treatment of this subject in the discipline of international relations. Dr. Ron will use the interview data collected as part of this project to supplement that already collected for his pilot project on southern global rights activism, an under-studied phenonena in the human rights literature. Dr. Shulman and Dr. Rogers are also likely to find the data collected of interest to their own projects regarding the interface between information technology and citizen input to governance structures, nationally and transnationally. These outputs are particularly significant as they will forge new frontiers at the intersection of sociology, political science and information science both substantively and

methodologically, contributing to a clearer understanding of the human and social processes underlying political change in an era of globalized communications.

6.0 Management Plan

6.1. Senior Personnel and Responsibilities. The following individuals are to be considered senior personnel for the purpose of this grant.

Dr. Charli Carpenter, an Assistant Professor of International Affairs at University of Pittsburgh's Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, is the Principal Investigator and will provide the overall management for the project. She will oversee the collection and storage of web content, survey and focus-group data; supervise the annotation process in collaboration with QDAP; travel to conferences, meetings and other project-related settings to present findings of the research; and will prepare yearly reports to the NSF as well as other project outputs.

Dr. James Ron is a sociologist by training, and currently serves as Associate Professor in the interndisciplinary Norman Paterson School of International Affairs at Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada. Until recently, he was the Canada Research Chair in Conflict and Human Rights at McGill University's department of sociology. Dr. Ron will recruit and train two graduate students to conduct interviews with human rights activists, will oversee the collection and transcription of interview data from Montreal, and will submit copies of interview transcripts to Dr. Carpenter for analysis at QDAP. He will also be available for consultations regarding other aspects of the project on an as-needed basis.

Dr. Stuart Shulman is Assistant Professor in the School of Information Sciences at University of Pittsburgh and Director of the Qualitative Data Analysis Program (QDAP) in the University's Center for Urban and Social Research (UCSUR). He will assist in developing, refining and implementing a coding scheme for the project text data, will oversee the training and supervision of a full-time graduate student Project Manager and part-time graduate student coders, and will consult as needed regarding the analysis of the annotated data.

Dr. Richard Rogers is a Web Epistemologist based in the New Media Studies Department at the University of Amsterdam and Director of GovCom.org Foundation, a project that maps debates on the World Wide Web on important social issues. He will make available his web-based algorithm for use on the project for a fee; will train Dr. Carpenter and other project personnel in the use of hyperlink analysis software; and make himself available for consulting as needed regarding the software and the analysis of its outputs.

6.2 Other Personnel. In addition to senior project personnel and the QDAP Project Manager and staff, Dr. Carpenter will recruit and supervise a full-time graduate student researcher (GSR). In Year One, the GSR will be trained in the use of Issuecrawler software, will conduct initial hyperlink analysis and undertake the collection and archiving of text data from the world wide web, transferring the web content to QDAP for coding. In Year Two, s/he will recruit focus group participants from qualifying organizations and assist in the collection of the focus group data. The GSR will be trained by QDAP in Atlas.ti and will serve as the liason between GSPIA, Carleton and QDAP for the duration of the project, transferring collected data to QDAP for coding, assisting with the development and implementation of coding schemes, and consulting with the senior personnel about means of interpreting the results of the data analysis. The QDAP subaward also includes funds for a web designer to build and maintain the project website throughout the project. This will include archiving websites analyzed as a result of the project, and posting annotated datasets, interview protocols, coding manuals, and project outputs. Finally, two students will be employed by Dr. Ron through the Carleton subaward to conduct and transcribe interviews in Montreal.

6.3 Mechanisms of Coordination and Synergy. To facilitate coordination and synergy among the senior personnel, meetings will be held twice yearly at University of Pittsburgh. Funds are requested for travel by Dr. Rogers and Dr. Ron to attend these meetings. In addition, the PI will travel to Amsterdam and to Ottawa once yearly to connect with research activities ongoing in those locations and participate in other synergistic activities. The travel budget includes funds for these trips. In between face-to-face meetings, the research team will stay in regular touch by phone, email and, iChat video-conferencing. Part of the equipment budget includes funds necessary to conduct long-distance face-to-face meetings in this manner. In addition, the team will benefit from free international telephone calls using Skype Internet VOIP phone technology.

7.0 Results from Previous NSF-Funded Research

SES-0432844: (84,938 total project funding) 9/1/04 – 10/30/05, "Children as Legacies of War: Humanitarian Actors as Agents of Change." **Results**: The PI supervised a collaborative project examining the humanitarian response to children born as a result of sexual violence in conflict zones. A web archive for the project, including working papers, focus group transcripts and workshop proceedings, is available: http://www.pitt.edu/~charli/childrenbornofwar. Scholars from seven countries attended an interdisciplinary workshop at University of Pittsburgh in November, 2004. Working papers were discussed and revised, and a edited volume manuscript on the human rights of children born of wartime sexual violence is forthcoming Spring 2007 from Kumarian Press. Focus groups were held in New York, Geneva and Pittsburgh in collaboration with Columbia University and University of Geneva. The results of the focus group research have been disseminated as a report through the Ford Institute of Human Security at University of Pittsburgh, and were also used as a basis for developing hypotheses about issue adoption in advocacy networks presented at the 2005 APSA meeting in Washington, DC and now forthcoming as a peer-reviewed research article in *International Studies Quarterly* entitled 'Setting the Advocacy Agenda: Theorizing Issue Emergence and Non-Emergence in Transnational Advocacy Networks.'

An NSF Supplement provided additional funding for the re-coding and analysis of the focus group data to pilot a methodology for testing hypotheses about issue non-emergence – in this case, the absence of attention to children born of wartime rape within the network around children and armed conflict. The text data was coded for content, substantive themes and discursive properties and coders achieved an average inter-rater reliability rate of .70. The results from the research were presented at the 2006 NSF's Human and Social Dynamics PI Meeting in Washington DC and will appear next year as a research note in the journal *International Organization,* under the title 'Studying Issue (Non)-Adoption in Transnational Advocacy Networks.'

In addition, two book chapters drawing on the data collected as a result of NSF SES are now forthcoming in edited volumes. One, entitled 'War's Impact on Children Born of Rape and Exploitation' will appear in *Children and War-Impact*, edited by Andry Knight and published by University of Edmonton Press. The other, 'Orphaned Again? Children of Wartime Rape as a Non-Issue for the Human Rights Network' will appear in *Rights on the Rise*, edited by Clifford Bob and forthcoming from University of Pennsylvania Press.