



**Where is Early Childhood Development
on the International Child Advocacy Agenda?**

Prepared for the FrameWorks Institute
by
Shannon Arvizu, Adam Simon and Nathaniel Kendall-Taylor

June 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
BACKGROUND LITERATURE.....	4
METHODS AND DATA	5
FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS.....	7
PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH	20
APPENDIX A: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	23
APPENDIX B: CODEBOOK DESCRIPTION.....	25

INTRODUCTION

The research presented here was conducted by the FrameWorks Institute and sponsored by the Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University. This report documents the patterns in the ways that international advocacy groups communicate about children’s issues. The report also analyzes the degree to which this field communicates the more-specific issue of early childhood development as part of its overall policy and programmatic agenda. We pay special attention to the ways that organizations frame this issue and highlight both the problematic and promising patterns in these communications with respect to their alignment with the science of early child development.

An analysis of advocacy communications — what we here call an Advocacy Field Report — is an important part of the FrameWorks Institute’s Strategic Frame Analysis™ⁱ approach. This type of study allows us to map a key dimension of what FrameWorks calls the “swamp of public discourse,” or the stream of opinions, arguments and rhetoric to which members of cultural groups are regularly exposed. The materials reviewed here are an important contributor to this swamp of discourse around international children’s issues because they reinforce or contest habits of thinking and are therefore important to consider as part of the larger task of developing strategic communication approaches for science translation and policy and program support.

Advocacy organizations play an influential role in setting the agendas of their respective fields through the reference of issues in organizational materials.ⁱⁱ Typically, such materials are targeted at the media and the wider public or, more specifically, at policymakers and organizational members. These materials describe organizational goals, issues of importance, and proposed programmatic or policy solutions. The decisions advocacy organizations make in how they construct their materials and present selected issues influence the content of the agenda of the larger field.ⁱⁱⁱ

This process of issue presentation in communications materials is called “framing.” Framing is the intentional or unintentional use of “metaphors, symbols, and cognitive cues that cast issues in a particular light and suggest possible ways to respond to these issues.”^{iv} Through evidence-based framing, organizations can connect issues to larger societal values, make use of cognitive shortcuts through the use of metaphor, and devise causal stories to develop understanding of a problem and present effective solutions.^v

This study answers three questions:

- 1) *What are the predominant issues that shape the agenda of the international child advocacy field?*
- 2) *How are early childhood development (ECD) issues framed within this discourse?*
- 3) *What assumptions about children’s issues are evidenced by these patterns of issue presentation?*

In this report, we identify issues that are most prominent in the international child advocacy agenda using quantitative and qualitative content analysis. We discuss the

extent to which ECD is part of that agenda. We analyze the ways that organizations frame ECD and indicate possible future directions in working to increase understanding and expand adoption of this issue. Finally, we submit these patterns to an interpretive, cognitive analysis in order to examine the possible assumptions that structure these content and presentation patterns. In this way, the FrameWorks Advocacy Field Report is unique in that the study combines content and cognitive analyses to describe and interpret the ways in which organizational materials reflect and affect the international child advocacy agenda.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. **The majority of issues communicated to the public in the international children’s advocacy agenda relate to conditions that negatively affect children’s immediate state of well-being.**
 - Almost two-thirds (63 percent) of the total issues in advocacy materials relate to conditions that threaten children’s immediate state of being. These include malnourishment (13 percent), labor exploitation (10 percent), poverty (9 percent), natural disasters (9 percent), violence (7 percent), diseases (excluding AIDS) (5 percent), AIDS (5 percent) and infant mortality (5 percent).^{vi}
2. **Presentations of ECD and issues that enhance children’s state of well-being more generally are primarily concerned with school readiness, expanding educational access and increasing literacy rates.**
 - Nineteen percent of the issues presented in the materials reviewed dealt with early childhood development, while 14 percent concerned educational access and literacy and 2 percent dealt with civic engagement. Of the total mentions of ECD issues, 60 percent focused on school readiness, with significantly less attention paid to social and emotional development (20 percent), and even less to brain development (10 percent).
3. **ECD is not yet widely adopted within the international child advocacy field.**
 - While ECD is one of the most commonly cited issues in the materials examined, two organizations (out of 11 included in the sample) account for 50 percent of the total mentions of ECD issues.

In the following report, we detail the implications of these and other findings as they bear upon constructing an effective framing strategy for advancing ECD issues on the international child advocate agenda.

BACKGROUND LITERATURE

To guide the analysis of advocacy discourse on international children’s issues,

FrameWorks draws on the broader theoretical literature on advocacy organizational influence in the agenda-setting process (see Appendix A for a more detailed review of this literature).

The organizations sampled in this study form what is known more generally as a transnational advocacy network (TAN). TANs influence the global policymaking agenda by advocating for specific issue priorities.^{vii} These networks are comprised of nongovernmental organizations, intergovernmental organizations, governments, academics and media that contribute to a principled discourse about rights and obligations between political actors and citizens.^{viii} In the present study, we measure and assess the discourse promoted by international nongovernmental and intergovernmental organizations that advocate for children's issues.

A key question in this literature is when, and under what conditions, issues are adopted on TAN agendas — a process called “issue emergence.” The literature suggests that issue emergence takes place in two stages. First, organizations engage in *issue definition*, which involves demonstrating “that a given state of affairs is neither natural nor accidental, identify[ing] the responsible party or parties, and propos[ing] credible solutions.”^{ix} Organizations engaged in the early stages of issue definition, or *norm entrepreneurs*, play a pivotal role in shaping whether and how issues are framed for wider adoption.^x The second stage, known as *issue adoption*, occurs when multiple organizations accept and reference the same issue in their materials. Both issue definition (construction) and issue adoption (acceptance) are key to understanding how issues emerge in a given field's discursive space.^{xi}

We draw upon the concepts and insights of these studies to identify which issues figure prominently on the international child advocacy agenda. In addition, and more importantly for our communications research, we analyze *how* these issues are presented to their intended audiences. We also analyze the effectiveness of norm entrepreneurs in placing early childhood development on the larger agenda within the international child advocacy field.

METHODS AND DATA

This analysis was divided into three stages. First, we identified influential organizations within the field of international child advocacy and collected a representative sample of their materials. Second, we conducted a content analysis of the materials to identify the focus and frequency of issues discussed. Third, we analyzed the results of the content analysis to understand the cognitive implications of the communicative patterns for setting the agenda in this field. These analyses and a description of the data are explained in detail below.

Organizational Data and Sampling

To construct a sample of materials, FrameWorks collected information from organizational websites, press releases and annual reports for those organizations active

in the field of international children's issues. The sample included the following materials taken from each organization's website: a mission or purpose statement, ten recent press releases, and each organization's most recent annual reports for the past two years.

Organizations most influential in the field of international children's issues were identified through an earlier survey conducted by the Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University. Those organizations include: Bernard Van Leer Foundation, Consultative Group on Early Childhood Care and Development, International Pediatric Association, Open Society Institute, Plan International, Save the Children, UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, UNESCO, UNICEF, World Bank and World Vision. In total, the sample constituted 135 materials from 11 organizations.

Content Analysis

A content analysis of organizational materials is an established method for examining discourse within a given field.^{xii} This type of analysis relies upon qualitative and quantitative methods to identify the issues that comprise an advocacy agenda, and to understand the prevalence of those issues among organizations in this field.

FrameWorks first constructed a codebook based on a qualitative analysis of a sub-sample of 30 pieces from the larger sample of 135. We subjected this sub-sample to a qualitative thematic analysis that drew upon standard codes identified in previous FrameWorks content analyses research and in the framing literature more generally.^{xiii} These codes relate to:

- (1) storytelling style (episodic vs. thematic),^{xiv}
- (2) source (website, press release or annual report),
- (3) age group focus of material, and
- (4) types of messengers/experts cited.

Additionally, we used a grounded theory approach^{xv} to identify

- (5) emergent issues mentioned and solutions offered in the materials under examination, and
- (6) the presence or absence of issues previously identified as integral components of the science of early child development.^{xvi}

In this way, we were able to detect and analyze the specific issues mentioned by organizations, as well as to detect whether organizations offered a specific solution to the issue. This enabled us to see whether organizations discuss these issues in a way that leads the audience to see a particular issue as "solvable." By coding for specific mentions (and solutions) of ECD, we were also able to measure whether the science of early childhood development was making its way into the advocate discourse on this topic. Codes included in the codebook and their justification are described in Appendix B.

After the codebook was developed, two researchers were trained to apply the codebook to the full sample. To test for intercoder reliability, each researcher coded a set of 25 randomly selected pieces from the sample. The two researchers achieved an intercoder reliability of 0.8 using Holsti's coefficient.^{xvii} This test indicated a respectable 80 percent agreement across the coded themes. After the reliability test, the remaining articles were coded and the resulting quantitative data subjected to statistical analysis. This statistical analysis examined the frequency of codes in each category. In addition, selected cross-tabulations were computed to examine relationships between codes.

Finally, we examined the implications of the findings from the content analysis for the ways that target audiences for these materials (media, policymakers and organizational members) are likely to respond to these patterns of presentation. Patterns in discourse were analyzed to reveal tacit organizational assumptions, relationships, propositions and connections that were commonly made but taken for granted throughout the sample of advocacy materials. In short, this analysis looked at patterns both in what was said (how things were related, explained and understood) as well as what was not said (shared, but taken-for-granted, assumptions). We paid special attention to the ways that organizations frame ECD in particular, as well as to which organizations are most active in promoting ECD discourse. This type of interpretive analysis derives from organizational field frame analysis.^{xviii} The implications of this analysis are integrated with the quantitative findings in the section below.

FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

In the following section we detail the findings and implications of the content and cognitive frame analysis of organizational materials.

1. International child advocacy organizations discuss children's issues using both thematic and episodic storytelling styles.

There was an almost equal number of advocate materials that spoke of children's issues in episodic (55 percent) and thematic (45 percent) styles.

Implications: The balance between episodic and thematic storytelling evidences the field's understanding of the role of systems in affecting children's well-being.

The fact that the stories in the sample tended to be fairly thematic shows a clear understanding among advocates in this field of the role of systems in shaping children's well-being. This is promising from a communications perspective, since many other advocate fields (particularly in the U.S.) are not characterized by this same balance in storytelling style and are skewed much more in the direction of episodic (i.e., individualist) approaches to communications.^{xix} However, the fact that episodic materials still constitute more than half the materials analyzed here suggests that considerable work is required to temper the tendency to tell stories of individuals and their trials and triumphs.^{xx}

2. International child advocacy organizations mention a plurality of children’s issues within each of their materials.

Organizations mentioned approximately two issues per press release (1.9), three issues per mission statement (3.0), and almost five issues per annual report (4.7).

Implications: *The plurality of issues in advocate materials may hinder effective communication.* As revealed in previous FrameWorks Institute research on child advocate organizations in the United States,^{xxi} organizational materials usually mention a plethora of issues that affect children. By mentioning a multiplicity of issues, advocates may be missing an opportunity to convey an overarching message about enhancing children’s developmental capacities. Mentioning a multiplicity of issues may also lead to audiences “tuning out” to these messages, especially if the stream of information on issues is too complex, disconnected or diverse.

3. International child advocacy organizations prefer to use the generic term “children,” rather than specify children in a certain age group.

In more than two-thirds of the materials (68 percent), organizations discussed “children” but provided no specific reference to the age of the children about whom they are communicating. One in five (19 percent) of the materials employed the slightly more age-specific but still vague term “early childhood.”^{xxii} Very rarely did advocacy organizations mention more specific age groups of reference; “teens” appeared in 4 percent of the sample, “under 18” in 2 percent and “newborns” in 2 percent. In 5 percent of the materials, no age group — not even the general term “children” — was mentioned at all.^{xxiii} Table one presents the results of age mentions within advocate materials.

Table 1. Age of Concern

<u>Age of Concern</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Children	92	68
Early Childhood	26	19
No Age Group Mentioned	7	5
Teens	5	4
Under 18	3	3
Newborns	2	2

Implications: *Lack of age references suggests the lack of a developmental approach to child well-being.*

The fact that 74 percent of the stories mention simply “children,” those “under 18,” or no age group at all suggests at least two potential cognitive interpretations. First, this gloss over age and the more specific lack of attention to early childhood in these materials ignores the idea that early development matters for later outcomes. The notion of critical periods — that all of childhood is not created equal in terms of the impact of the issues referenced on future outcomes — is not present in this discourse.

On the other hand, the lack of consideration of age may suggest another interpretation. The lack of concern with young children or with age more generally in the materials may actually derive from the depth and implicitness of the understanding of the importance of early childhood on the advocates' part. Such an understanding may be held so tacitly and implicitly in this circle of advocates that they assume such an understanding is similarly shared among the audiences at which these materials are aimed — creating a “lost in translation” effect at an implicit cultural level. In either case, FrameWorks' research in the U.S. and Canada clearly suggests that the importance of early childhood for later outcomes is not operative at the level of cultural implicitness in these two North American cultures, and highlights the problems associated with its absence in the materials analyzed in this report.^{xxiv}

4. International child advocacy organizations most frequently cite organizational representatives as messengers in their materials.

Seventy messengers were cited in the sample of advocacy materials examined. Of these messengers, fully three-quarters (76 percent) were organizational representatives. One in 10 of the messengers cited were children (11 percent), while scientists (6 percent) and government officials (5 percent) rounded out the voices. Table 2 presents the messenger data from the materials analyzed.

Table 2. Messengers (N = 70 messengers cited)

<u>Messenger</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Organizational Representatives	53	76
Children	8	11
Experts/Scientists	5	6
Government Officials	4	5

Implications: *The absence of scientists as messengers suggests that advocates in this area may not see the value of presenting children's issues as matters informed by science.*

The fact that scientists appeared as messengers in just 6 percent of the materials analyzed in this report is highly revealing from a cognitive perspective. The clear indication of this pattern is that the children's issues that make up the international agenda are morally — rather than scientifically — conceptualized and justified. This may evidence a characteristic of the understandings of the advocates themselves — in other words, they may implicitly construct these issues as moral rather than science based. Alternatively, this overwhelming pattern may derive more deliberately and explicitly from the advocates' belief that these issues are more effectively framed for their targeted audiences through a moral, rather than scientific, position — a deliberate framing strategy rather than an implicit belief. In either case, the overwhelmingly moral orientation of these materials suggests that getting science into this discourse will be decidedly difficult.

5. The majority of issues that figure prominently on the international children’s advocacy agenda relate to conditions that negatively affect children’s immediate state of well-being.

Roughly two-thirds (63 percent) of the total issues mentioned in advocate materials relate to conditions that threaten children’s immediate state of well-being. These include malnourishment (13 percent), labor exploitation (10 percent), poverty (9 percent), natural disasters (9 percent), conflict violence (7 percent), disease (excluding AIDS) (5 percent), AIDS (5 percent) and infant mortality (5 percent).

In discussing these issues, organizations frequently draw connections to a specific program or policy solution. This study found that organizations mentioned a specific solution for 70 to 80 percent of each issue mentioned. Table 5 presents the frequency of total issues and solutions found in advocate materials.

Table 5. Issues on the International Child Advocate Agenda (N = 315 issues cited)

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Mentions of Issue</u>		<u>Solutions to Issue</u>	
	<u>Count</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>As Percent of Mentions</u>
Threats to Well-Being				
Malnourishment	41	13	29	71
Exploitation/Lack of Child Rights	31	10	23	74
Natural and Other Disasters	29	9	23	79
Poverty	28	9	19	69
Conflict/Violence	23	7	17	74
Disease (Excludes AIDS)	17	5	12	71
AIDS and Sexual Disease	17	5	13	76
Infant/Mother Mortality	16	5	10	63
Enhancements to Well-Being				
Early Childhood Development	59	19	44	75
Education: Access and Literacy	45	14	37	82
Civic Engagement	5	2	5	100
Birth Registrations	4	1	4	100

We present a brief treatment below of how malnourishment, exploitation, natural disasters, poverty, violence, disease, AIDS and infant mortality are discussed in organizational materials, as well as the types of solutions proposed for each issue.

Malnourishment: Malnourishment is a key issue that figures prominently in organizational literature. Organizations frequently focus on statistics that illustrate the *extent* of child malnourishment. These statistics are used to provide evidence of the

issue's penetration in Asia and Africa, in particular.^{xxv} Chronic malnourishment is commonly cited as a cause of endemic poverty in these regions. For example, UNICEF discusses child malnourishment in Africa by stating, "Evidence consistently shows that where children and mothers have poor health and poor nutrition, they earn less, are less productive members of society and they pass this poverty on to the next generation."^{xxvi} For solutions, advocates mention a variety of community-based nutritional programs that increase the life chances of children.^{xxvii}

Labor Exploitation: Advocates discuss labor exploitation in relation to negative effects on the social, economic and health status of children. In these discussions, organizations usually consider the compounding consequences of low wages, physical abuse, and exposure to chemicals and other unsafe working conditions. The most telling example of this is a report cited by Plan International about child tobacco pickers in Malawi. The report, "Hard Work, Little Pay and Long Hours," mentions that children work up to 12 hours a day, for less than two cents an hour, and suffer from "severe physical symptoms from absorbing up to 54 milligrams a day of dissolved nicotine through their skin — the equivalent of 50 average cigarettes."^{xxviii} As a solution, organizations call for increased government regulation of child labor and unsafe working conditions.^{xxix}

Natural Disasters: Organizations mention the increase in frequency of both man-made and natural disasters and their deleterious effects on children worldwide. They often cite climate change as a primary reason for the recent surge in natural disasters. As Save the Children reports, "Climate change is an immediate global emergency and a real threat to children in the 21st century."^{xxx} Organizations mention the efforts of disaster-relief programs targeted towards children as solutions to these threats.^{xxxi}

Poverty: International child advocacy organizations often frame children as "poor children" and "world's poorest children" in their materials.^{xxxii} They speak about the general effects of poverty on children, as well as a lack of educational access that accompanies impoverished conditions. As such, the most often cited solution for children in poverty, especially for girls, is increased educational access.^{xxxiii} This argument is used to justify the expansion of educational opportunities for poor ethnic minority children as well. For instance, the Open Society Institute reports on a new grant that provides several million dollars for the Roma Education Fund (REF). The Chairman says, "The most important factor that keeps so many Roma trapped in poverty is a lack of education."^{xxxiv} In this way, "poor" children are usually equated with "uneducated children."

Violence: Organizations depict children as the victims of sexual and conflict violence. In regions where wartime conflict is common, children (and schools) are seen as particularly vulnerable. This is especially true in Afghanistan, where girls' schools are targeted for their perceived threats to the militant power structure.^{xxxv} Other sources discuss sexual violence directed at children. Organizations call for "urgent international action," such as stronger national legislation and effective law enforcement to stem the "appalling levels of rape and sexual violence" against children.^{xxxvi}

Disease: When organizations speak about childhood diseases, they usually reference those that have the potential to lead to an early death for children. These include tuberculosis, acute respiratory diseases, malaria and cholera. Organizations link the need to decrease the risk of infection from these diseases as a way to stem damage to “physical growth and development.”^{xxxvii} By mitigating the spread of disease among children, organizations also hope to increase levels of prosperity in communities. For example, World Vision states, “Good health is a strategic investment in breaking generational cycles of poverty and risk — and a fundamental contributor to children’s well-being.”^{xxxviii} For solutions, organizations advocate for immunization programs, community management health centers, and the use of bed nets to prevent malaria.

AIDS: When organizations mention the effects of AIDS on children, it is in relation to children orphaned by parents with AIDS, the risks of adolescents in contracting AIDS, and the needs of children born with AIDS. As solutions, organizations emphasize the need to implement HIV-prevention education programs to prevent increasing infection rates in target countries, and end-of-life care for children born with AIDS.^{xxxix}

Infant Mortality: To a lesser degree, organizations state the need to address maternal health and infant mortality. This discourse is usually laden with statistics on global mortality trends that provide little context for understanding the causes or effects. For example, UNICEF says, “Since 1990, the number of estimated annual global maternal deaths has remained around 500,000, while the absolute number of child deaths in 2008 declined to an estimated 8.8 million from 12.5 million in 1990.”^{xl} A few sources connect mother and infant mortality to economic development. They state that maternal mortality is “a major economic drag” and is the cause of \$15 billion in “annual productivity losses.”^{xli} As a solution, organizations recommend expanded delivery of basic health and nutrition services to mothers and children. These are seen as “smart investments” in a nation’s economy.

Implications: *The international children’s advocacy agenda is dominated by issues that suggest an immediacy model of children’s well-being.*

The issues that comprise the focus of the field convey the notion that immediate threats are the primary and proximate determinants of children’s well-being. This suggests the existence and use of what can be thought of as a “hierarchy of needs” model in setting the agenda of this advocacy discourse. In other words, organizations forward the notion that issues like physical safety from disease, violence and natural disasters must be addressed before other issues can be broached. This approach works to justify specific programs that advocacy organizations propose as solutions to these issues. Unfortunately, this focus occludes the importance of development as a causal factor in many of these issues and instead clearly positions development as secondary or tertiary to what become implicitly defined as more pressing and immediate issues. This creates the clear perception that development is of little consequence *until* other issues have been dealt with and, in so doing, positions development as an add-on factor, rather than as the central process, in shaping child well-being outcomes.

The fact that these issues are frequently accompanied by a specific programmatic or policy solution is also noteworthy. Presenting a preferred solution to a stated problem is an important element in an effective framing technique.^{xlii} The fact that organizations presented solutions for 70-80 % of each issue mentioned is likely to create an implicit message that the issue is addressable and solvable. Most of the solutions presented, however, involve programs and policies that address the immediate situation at hand and not the long-term developmental needs of children in general.

6. Attention to issues that enhance children’s state of well-being is heavily concerned with expanding educational access and increasing literacy rates.

Compared to the issues of immediate physical and safety concerns discussed above, a smaller percentage of issues mentioned in organizational materials reference early childhood development (19 percent), educational access and literacy (14 percent), and civic engagement (2 percent). Early childhood development will be discussed in greater detail in a subsequent section. Here, we outline how advocates discuss educational access and civic engagement.

Educational Access and Literacy: Expanding primary school education to children to increase literacy is a core issue among the organizations included in this sample. Many organizations include an educational component in their mission statement and describe their goals and programs for expanding educational access in their annual reports.^{xliii} Girls and children of ethnic minorities are often the target of these programs, and are described as being most in need of literacy skills. As solutions, organizations mention the need for special residential schools, and teachers who speak and teach ethnic dialects. This is seen as a way to increase literacy rates, as well as to further opportunities for these children later in life.^{xliv}

Civic Engagement: In a few organizational materials, advocates discuss the need to teach young people in secondary schools how to engage in critical discussions about issues they view as important to their communities. As solutions, these organizations mention debate programs and citizen journalist projects intended to involve young people in civic activities.^{xlv} These programs are viewed as critical to young people’s civic and political development.

Implications: International child advocates conceive of development as being heavily concerned with learning and literacy.

When discussing issues that positively affect children’s development over time, advocates mostly focus on expanding primary school educational access for the accumulation of conventional learning skills. Perhaps organizations implicitly attribute educational access as a primary mechanism by which children develop other important faculties. More likely, however, is that organizations have not yet considered how to address other facets of child development, including social, cognitive and emotional development. The FrameWorks Institute has found that the reduction of child development to academic learning is a common notion among the U.S. public as well.^{xlvi}

This understanding limits the public’s ability to recognize other key aspects of development and the benefits of programs that foster social, cognitive and emotional development for enhancing the life outcomes for children.^{xlvii}

7. When advocate materials mention early childhood development, they focus squarely on school readiness.

The fact that almost 20 percent of the mentions in the sample deal with ECD issues presents a picture in which ECD gets considerable coverage in these materials. However, closer analysis paints a decidedly less optimistic picture. When we reviewed the subset of organizational materials that specifically mention ECD, we found that most of these mentions were cursory and did not address ECD in any significant depth. A closer look at the more specific constitution of these mentions reveals further cause for concern. When these organizations discuss ECD issues, they tend to focus on school readiness (58 percent), with considerable less attention paid to social and emotional development (34 percent), and even less to biological and brain aspects of development (8 percent).^{xlviii}

Table 6. Early Childhood Development Issues (N = 59 mentions)

<u>Sub-Issue</u>	<u>Mentions</u>		<u>Solutions</u>	
	<u>Count</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>As Percent of Mentions</u>
School Readiness	34	58	27	79
Social and Emotional Development	20	34	13	65
Brain Development	5	8	4	80

In the following paragraphs, we detail how organizations discuss school readiness, social and emotional development, and brain development in light of specific values or causal arguments used to justify endeavors to address these issues. We find that, contrary to the framing of many of the issues as immediate threats to children, organizations that mention ECD areas engage in promising communication directions worthy of further testing and evaluation at a later stage in the larger research project. However, by focusing on school readiness to the exclusion of other aspects of child development, organizations are neglecting to communicate the core story of early childhood development in a holistic fashion.^{xlix}

School Readiness: Early childhood development is most often linked to discussions of establishing preschool centers. Organizations describe the need to implement preschool centers as a way to address the “equity challenge” and serve the needs of disadvantaged and minority children. For example, the Open Society Institute (OSI) states,

“The aims of the Early Childhood Program reflect OSI’s mission to promote social justice by supporting activities that expand access to quality early childhood development, with special attention to minorities, children with disabilities, and children living in poverty.”¹

The other primary justification used to support the implementation of preschool programs relates to civic and/or economic benefits. The Group on Early Childhood Care and Development (CGECCD) says,

“Children who attend the kindergarten attain better results in school, more successes in their life and become more productive citizens when matured.”^{li}

In this way, the advocacy discourse around early childhood development focuses centrally on school readiness — more specifically on preschool programs — and justifies this focus by citing the need to extend services to communities equally and to increase the economic potential of society. This way of framing the issue is consistent with a values orientation and is likely to allow people to understand investments in early child programs as central to the prosperity of a society.^{liii}

Social and Emotional Development: The importance of social and emotional development in early childhood is less frequently mentioned in organizational materials. One example worth citing is a Bernard Van Leer Foundation (BVLF) research initiative aimed at understanding the development and importance of young children’s peer relationships. The BVLF states:

“Forming their first friendships is critical to children’s well-being and sense of identity and belonging — but it’s a process we know surprisingly little about ... If we understand better how to structure and manage these settings, we can help ensure that the rest of the relationships children form are positive and beneficial ... [To this end] the Community of Reflection and Practice is a major initiative to bring together the world’s leading researchers on the topic of young children’s peer relationships.”^{liiii}

By providing a larger context for this research (i.e., “children’s well-being and sense of identity and belonging”) and making explicit the connection between interventions and outcomes (“if we understand better how to structure and manage these settings, we can help ensure that the rest of the relationships children form are positive and beneficial”), the BVLF reflects effective communication practice on this issue.

The healthy development of children’s emotional capabilities is also a relatively infrequently discussed theme in these materials. One of the few examples of this type of discourse involves a program in the Caribbean aimed at helping parents integrate play and storytelling into parenting practices. The program was recently evaluated for its potential to increase children’s socio-emotional skills. The BVLF reports:

“An impact evaluation carried out in 2009 by the Amsterdam Institute for International Development compared parenting practices in 15 villages in St. Lucia between 2006 and 2008; the [play and storytelling program] was introduced in eight of those villages, while the other seven served as a control. Parents in the program became significantly more likely to engage their children in ways, such

as storytelling, which are correlated with linguistic and socio-emotional development.”^{liv}

This example illustrates one way in which organizations integrate socio-emotional development outcomes as part of their program operations. Support for programs of this sort may increase when coupled with values and conceptual cues that describe the importance of play and storytelling for stimulating emotional development and executive functions.

Brain Development: The role of brain development in ECD appears in very few of the organizational materials included in this analysis (approximately 1 percent of the total mentions). Organizations that mention brain and biological development focus on the importance of adequate nutritional, health and social interaction necessary for proper brain development. For example, the CGECCD says:

“Research suggests that significant and critical brain development and development of intelligence occurs before the age of seven, particularly during the first three years of life. This process is influenced by a child’s nutritional and health status and also by the kind of interaction a child develops with people and objects in the environment.”^{lv}

However, when discussing brain development, these few discussions lack any process explanation of how brain development occurs, which is a key element in effectively building public understanding and policy support around issues of early child development.^{lvi} This is a missed opportunity, as the model of “brain architecture” has been shown to be empirically effective in expanding understanding and building support for early childhood developmental programs in the United States and Canada.^{lvii}

Implications: The international children’s advocacy agenda misses the core story of early child development.

By focusing on school readiness over social, emotional and brain development, advocates leave out critical components of the early childhood development story. According to ECD experts, programs that enhance social, emotional and brain development in young children are critical for children’s well-being. In reality, these programs are often integrated within a preschool setting. Perhaps organizations implicitly attribute preschool as a primary mechanism by which children develop other important faculties. More likely, however, is that organizations have not systematically thought about the importance of social, emotional and brain development during early childhood, and how programs that foster these developments might contribute to their goals of improving children’s well-being.

8. Two organizations in the sample account for the majority of the mentions of ECD issues.

In this study, two organizations were responsible for half (50 percent) of the mentions related to early childhood development. The CGECCD accounted for 36 percent of the ECD mentions, while the BVLf accounted for 14 percent.

Table 7. Organizations Mentioning ECD Issues (N = 42 mentions)^{lviii}

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Percent</u>
CGECCD	15	36
BVLf	6	14
Open Society International	5	12
UNESCO	4	10
Plan International	3	7
Save the Children	3	7
UN Committee on Rights of the Child	2	5
UNICEF	2	5
World Bank	1	2
World Vision	1	2

Implications: ECD has not yet emerged as a primary issue in the international child advocacy field.

The fact that two organizations are primarily responsible for most inclusions of ECD issues in this sample demonstrates that this topic is not yet widely adopted within the international child advocate field. As mentioned in the background literature section, issue emergence occurs when “norm entrepreneur” organizations define and bring attention to an issue and multiple organizations subsequently adopt and reference the issue in their organizational literature.^{lix} In this way, CGECCD and BVLf act as norm entrepreneurs to define ECD in this field. They reference ECD frequently in their organizational literature and CGECCD positions ECD as a core issue in its mission statement. Taken as a whole, however, the evidence does not show that multiple organizations reference ECD as a primary issue in their materials. Greater dissemination of the core story of ECD and principles of Strategic Frame Analysis™ by norm entrepreneurs may facilitate the emergence of ECD as a primary issue on the international child advocacy agenda.

The CGECCD may be particularly influential in this regard. According to its literature, the organization promotes itself as an “inter-agency consortium with strong links to regional networks and a track record of advocacy and knowledge generation and dissemination at an international level.” It is made up of “committed partner agencies, institutions and professionals involved in the field of ECCD (early childhood care and development) at all levels.”^{lx} As such, the CGECCD appears to have the structure and network access to facilitate knowledge transfer among a variety of organizations in this field. However, this potential hinges on how effectively CGECCD frames ECD in its communications. CGECCD materials suggest that some elements of effective framing might already be in place, such as the use of values.

One framing hypothesis that emerges from the literature on TANs is that, by aligning ECD with other, more prominent issues on the agenda, greater understanding of the

science of ECD, its policy implications, and increased support for specific programs and policies may be achieved without distorting the current practice of international child advocacy organizations. Put another way, the field has already embraced many issues that have an established relationship to brain and biological development and to social and emotional aspects of development. By “building out” this foundational structure with a more robust appreciation for ECD, international child advocacy organizations may be able to deepen support for these existing issues by showing the breadth and complexity of their impact.

9. Some organizations align the goals of ECD with related issues in international child development.

In this sample, we found a few examples in which organizations align the interests of early childhood development with related international children’s issues. The alignment of two issues on an agenda is known as “frame extension.” Frame extension happens when organizations communicate about some target issue (e.g., ECD) in ways that extend the boundaries of the issue “to encompass interests that are incidental to its primary objectives, but are important to potentially adopting organizations.”^{lxi}

The following are examples of frame extension that organizations have used to apply notions of early childhood development to issues related to violence, malnutrition and disease, and educational access. These represent potential pivot points between issues and raise reframing questions (e.g., “Can communications that link violence to ECD increase support for ECD policies?”) that must be explored in future research to determine their actual effect relative to the goals of international ECD advocates.

- *ECD and Violence*: In a press release, the BVLFF justifies its programmatic goals for ECD by discussing the effects of violence on early childhood development in certain regions. The BVLFF writes:

“Our first goal in 2010 will be to reduce violence in young children’s lives. We have seen in places like Israel, Colombia, Brazil and Mexico that the traditional work of the Foundation in early learning is severely hampered by violence. We know from research that witnessing or experiencing violence as a young child is the best single predictor of violence as an adult, and that early experience of violence can permanently impair brain development.”^{lxii}

In this statement, BVLFF brings attention to the role of violence in the developmental process. Issues related to conflict and violence figure prominently within this sample, but few organizations discuss the effects that violence has on the cognitive and emotional development of children. Using this prominent issue and its thematic relationship to the process of development as a way to pivot to a discussion of ECD may be an effective framing strategy. Prior FrameWorks research suggests that messaging about the effects of violence on development, as a source of toxic stress, is effective in increasing support for ECD policies.^{lxiii} A fully realized frame extension strategy would go further than the paragraph cited

to embrace a discussion of how persistent exposure to unremitted violence and disruption results in life-long impairment by bringing in aspects of the core story of ECD.

- *ECD and Malnutrition/Disease*: As a solution to the prevalence of malnutrition and disease, many organizations mention the need for community centers that provide health and nutrition services (immunizations, nutritional supplements, etc.) for mothers and young children. We found one mention of the use of these centers for providing preschool education as well. In India, for example, some of the state-run community health centers now also include a preschool component for tribal children. The BVLF reports:

“Research shows that children stay at school for longer, and do better, if their first few years of schooling are in their mother tongue. ICDS centres (Integrated Child Development Services) which are being universalized across the state, provide services to mothers and children aged up to 6 — but they have tended to focus more on health and nutrition than preparing children for school. The new agreement means that ICDS centres will begin to work more closely with primary schools to make it easier for children to cope with the transition into formal education.”^{lxiv}

A stronger way to align these issues would be to explain how child development affects life-long health. Such a strategy would emphasize the impact of development on the health and educational capacities of children and position community health centers as the solution for the delivery of services that directly address the developmental process, contribute to the overall well-being of children, and prepare them for future success.

- *Educational Access and ECD*: The issue of educational access suggests another potential opening into which ECD may be fitted. The CGECCD, for example, discusses a UNESCO report that speaks to the need to increase educational access to early childhood care and education for underserved populations. They state:

“UNESCO’s report examines those children whose educational needs have been neglected and the reasons why. In particular to early childhood care and education, it discusses access, costing targets, the effects of malnutrition, and the importance for equity.”^{lxv}

Such statements appear to present an opening to communicate about the importance of quality early education contexts in shaping the developmental process and its outcomes. However, on the whole, educational access is primarily discussed in terms of primary and secondary school education. Access to preschool education is less frequently mentioned. One way to connect these issues would be to stress the positive effects of preschool education on children’s subsequent success in primary and secondary school, perhaps by talking about such concepts as executive function. Since education is commonly offered as a

solution to poverty issues that affect children, it may also be advantageous to link preschool education with its capacity to enhance the economic development of communities.^{lxvi}

Frame extension of ECD with other prominent issues on the international child advocate agenda may contribute to wider adoption within the field. By identifying areas of shared values and concerns, ECD advocates can influence the development of discourse alliances that lead to wider support for ECD issues. The good news from this report is that the foundation for such a strategy is present in the current communications practices of the international child advocacy community.

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Through the analysis above, we glean several key findings whose implications bear upon future ECD communications research within the international child advocate field. This section reviews those findings and details preliminary recommendations and directions for further strategic framing research.

In terms of general communication patterns on children's issues, we found that advocates:

- Discuss children's issues using both a thematic and episodic storytelling style.
- Mention a plurality of children's issues in their materials without an overarching value to convey their relevance to the public.
- Prefer to use the generic term "children," rather than specify children in certain age groups.
- Frequently cite organizational representatives as messengers in their materials.
- Rarely explain how the formation of brain architecture and early biological development take place, such that the public, media, and policymakers can appreciate the underlying mechanisms.

In terms of specific issues on the international child advocacy agenda, we find that:

- The majority of issues relate to conditions that negatively affect children's *immediate* state of well-being.
- When organizations mention child development in general and ECD in particular, these discussions are primarily about school readiness, expanding educational access and increasing literacy rates.
- The presence of ECD on the international child advocacy field is largely the result of two "norm entrepreneur" organizations.

The present analysis suggests several communications opportunities that could be pursued in future communications research. Those include:

- Identifying and testing values as an orienting tool to build support for ECD programs among international child advocate organizations.
- Identifying and testing conceptual models for explaining the importance of social, emotional, and neuro-biological components of ECD among international child advocate organizations.
- Identifying and testing strategies for embedding ECD within the international child advocate agenda by aligning the goals of ECD programs with the goals of programs that address violence, health, and educational access for children.

Since advocate organizations play a critical role in building public policy and member support for a wide variety of issues and programs that affect children, the adoption of ECD on the international child advocate agenda can have far-reaching implications and benefits for the development of children worldwide. The effective translation of the science of ECD and its connection to the issues that prominent organizations already embrace appears to constitute an unrealized promise at this point but one that, with the support of effective communications practices, can greatly enhance public understanding of both ECD and these issues of enduring concern.

About FrameWorks Institute

The FrameWorks Institute is an independent nonprofit organization founded in 1999 to advance science-based communications research and practice. The Institute conducts original, multi-method research to identify the communications strategies that will advance public understanding of social problems and improve public support for remedial policies. The Institute's work also includes teaching the nonprofit sector how to apply these science-based communications strategies in their work for social change. The Institute publishes its research and recommendations, as well as toolkits and other products for the nonprofit sector, at www.frameworksinstitute.org.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of FrameWorks Institute.

Please follow standard APA rules for citation, with FrameWorks Institute as publisher. Arvizu, S., Simon, A., & Kendall-Taylor, N. (2011). *Where is early childhood development on the international child advocacy agenda?* Washington, DC: FrameWorks Institute.

APPENDIX A: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Advocacy Organizations and Issue Emergence in the Agenda-Setting Process

How do advocacy organizations influence the emergence of issues in the agenda-setting process? What role does framing play in facilitating the adoption of issues by organizations within a given field? This section provides a brief overview of the scholarly literature that informs these questions.

Advocacy organizations are defined as groups that make public interest claims for the promotion or resistance of action that leads to social change.^{lxxvii} Advocacy organizations seek to stimulate social change through agenda-setting, participation in the policymaking process, monitoring and shaping the implementation of policies, and shifting the long-term priorities and resources of political institutions.^{lxxviii} We focus here on the role of advocacy organizations in issue emergence and framing in the agenda-setting process.

Advocacy organizations rely heavily on education and awareness campaigns to influence the agenda-setting process. They actively construct the discourse agenda through the reference of issues in their organizational literature.^{lxxix} This literature is mainly directed towards the media, policymakers and the wider public.^{lxxx} Their attempts to influence the agenda-setting process usually take place, however, within a dense environment of competing issues and ideas.^{lxxxi} This has prompted many researchers working in this area to consider *how* advocacy organizations influence the emergence of issues on the public agenda.^{lxxxii}

Issue emergence usually takes place in two stages. First, organizations engage in *issue definition*, which involves demonstrating “that a given state of affairs is neither natural nor accidental, identify[ing] the responsible party or parties, and propos[ing] credible solutions.”^{lxxxiii} Organizations engaged in the early stages of issue definition are known as *norm entrepreneurs*.^{lxxxiv} They play a pivotal role in shaping how issues are framed for adoption. The second stage, known as *issue adoption*, occurs when multiple organizations accept and reference the same issue in their communication materials.^{lxxxv} Both issue definition (construction) and issue adoption (acceptance) are key to understanding issue emergence in a given field’s discursive space.^{lxxxvi} Some researchers also refer to a third stage, what may be called *issue politicization*. This describes the process when multiple organizations collectively engage in strategic framing campaigns to influence a specific outcome around a certain issue.^{lxxxvii}

Framing plays an important role in the agenda-setting process. Frames are “metaphors, symbols, and cognitive cues embedded in patterns of discourse that cast issues in a particular light and suggest possible responses.”^{lxxxviii} Consistent with FrameWorks’ approach to this literature, frames act as cues within discourse that correspond to specific ways of understanding information. In this way, frames can be seen as properties used in the “meso-mobilization” of different groups around issues of concern.^{lxxxix} Through strategic framing, organizations can be intentional in their use of frames as cognitive cues to connect issues to larger societal values (or “master frames”), use cognitive shortcuts,

and devise causal stories to develop understanding of a problem and present a certain solution.^{lxxx}

The primary challenge for organizations seeking to influence issue adoption is how to align or extend an issue frame in a way that effectively mobilizes the target audience.^{lxxxi} The degree to which an issue becomes adopted by other organizations and leads to a wide-scale campaign for action depends on specific processes of *frame alignment*.^{lxxxii} This can occur through *frame bridging*, in which organizations invoke frames that emphasize shared values and practices. This may also occur through *frame extension*. Frame extension happens when organizations invoke frames that extend the boundaries of the issue “to encompass interests that are incidental to its primary objectives, but are important to potentially adopting organizations.”^{lxxxiii} Finally, organizations may engage in *frame transformation* processes that rely upon frames that change organizational values and practices to match those of the issue.

Through the strategic framing of issues that lead to frame alignment with multiple organizations within the field, groups can increase the likelihood of issue adoption on the larger advocacy agenda. To this end, the present analysis is tasked with identifying the issues that currently compose the advocacy agenda, noting the presence or absence of a particular issue on the advocacy agenda, analyzing the potential of organizational entrepreneurs in defining the issue, and suggesting promising framing strategies of the issue for greater adoption among organizations in the field.

APPENDIX B: CODEBOOK DESCRIPTION

Storytelling Style: Storytelling style refers to whether an issue is discussed in an “episodic” or “thematic” context. As expounded by Shanto Iyengar, a leading scholar on media framing, most stories in the media are told in an episodic style.^{lxxxiv} By highlighting stories about discrete occurrences or persons, this type of coverage has the effect of keeping the issue in the private or individual realm. Thematic stories, by contrast, focus on issues and trends over time. Thematic stories direct attention to contexts beyond the individual and toward the community or systems level, with the effect that they enhance public understanding on an issue. In this analysis, we coded materials as thematic or episodic.

Source of Materials and Issue Frequency: We coded for the source of each material as a website, press release or annual report. In addition, coders were instructed to note how many issues (up to six) were mentioned within each source. This information was used to detect whether the findings of this study match up with previous FrameWorks research on child advocate organizations in the United States.^{lxxxv} Prior research found that, in general, child advocate materials are characterized by a wide range of messages and that this range of messages may hinder effective communication to the public.^{lxxxvi} Testing for the quantity of issues within each material allows us to ascertain if this holds true for international children’s advocate organizations as well.

Age Group: We also inductively coded for the age group focus of the materials. Coders were instructed to note how each organization defined “children.” This information was used to detect if organizations focus on children within a specific age range, or if they simply refer to them in general terms such as “children” or “teens.”

Messengers: Our codebook also included a category for “messengers.” Messengers refers to the types of people quoted as sources within the materials examined. FrameWorks has found that the presence or absence of certain types of messengers referenced in materials has implications for what is (and what is not) communicated.^{lxxxvii} Based on our qualitative analysis of the sub-sample, we coded for four categories of messengers. They include advocacy organizational leaders/representatives, children, government officials and experts/scientists.

Issues: The bulk of the content analysis was directed towards detecting patterns in the mention of specific issues in organizational materials. We examined the types of issues covered in the texts, how issues were defined and conceptualized, how the materials attributed responsibility for issues, the causal stories employed and the solutions proposed. Through a qualitative analysis of the sub-sample, we identified the following issues: *malnourishment, educational access, poverty, natural disasters, conflict violence, infant and mother mortality, child exploitation, STDs/AIDS, civic engagement and birth registrations*. We also identified a set of issues related to early childhood development.^{lxxxviii} These included: *school readiness, brain development, social interaction and emotional development*. Coders were instructed to note whether advocacy organizations connected a policy or program solution to the issues they discussed.

Notes

ⁱ Strategic Frame Analysis™ includes a variety of methods such as: cultural models interviews, focus groups, media content analysis, cognitive media content analysis, Simplifying Models development and empirical testing of frame effects using experimental surveys.

ⁱⁱ Carpenter, C. (2007). Setting the advocacy agenda: Theorizing issue emergence and nonemergence in transnational advocacy networks. *International Studies Quarterly*, 51, 99-120.

ⁱⁱⁱ Carpenter, C. (2007). Setting the advocacy agenda: Theorizing issue emergence and nonemergence in transnational advocacy networks. *International Studies Quarterly*, 51, 102.

^{iv} Campbell, J. (2005). Where do we stand? Common mechanisms in organizations and social movements research. In Davis, et. al. (Eds.), *Social movements and organizational theory*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

^v Campbell, J. (2005). Where do we stand? Common mechanisms in organizations and social movements research. In Davis, et. al. (Eds.), *Social movements and organizational theory*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press; Joachim, J. (2003). Framing issues and seizing opportunities: The UN, NGOs, and women's rights. *International Studies Quarterly*, 47(2), 247-274.

^{vi} Total percentages are greater than 100% because some stories discussed multiple issues and were coded as such.

^{vii} Keck, M.E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press; Joachim, J. (2003). Framing issues and seizing opportunities: The UN, NGOs, and women's rights. *International Studies Quarterly*, 47(2), 247-274.

^{viii} Carpenter, C. (2007). Setting the advocacy agenda: Theorizing issue emergence and nonemergence in transnational advocacy networks. *International Studies Quarterly*, 51, 101.

^{ix} Keck, M.E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders* (p 19). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

^x Joachim, J. (2003). Framing issues and seizing opportunities: The UN, NGOs, and women's rights. *International Studies Quarterly*, 47(2), 247-274; Keck, M.E., & Sikkink, K. (2008).

^{xi} Carpenter, C. (2007). Setting the advocacy agenda: Theorizing issue emergence and nonemergence in transnational advocacy networks. *International Studies Quarterly*, 51, 103. In order to illustrate this process, Carpenter examines the work of TAN advocates to bring attention to issues related to children and armed conflict. While the issues of "child soldiers" and "girls in war" have become widely adopted within this field, little attention has been directed towards children "born of war." A few organizations have taken on the role of entrepreneurs to define this issue in their literature. These are children who are at "risk of infanticide, abandonment, abuse, neglect, discrimination, and social exclusion ... as a result of their biological origins" (ibid: 99). However, despite the efforts of these organizations to garner media and donor attention towards children "born of war," the larger advocacy network on children and armed conflict has not defined this issue as a category of concern. Through this analysis, Carpenter underscores the importance of enrolling the support of multiple organizations (many of whom serve as "gatekeeping organizations") in order to promote issue emergence.

^{xii} Carpenter, C. (2007). Setting the advocacy agenda: Theorizing issue emergence and nonemergence in transnational advocacy networks. *International Studies Quarterly*, 51, 99-120.

^{xiii} O'Neil, M., Mikulak, A., Morgan P., & Kendall-Taylor, N. (2009). *Competing frames of mental health and mental illness: Media frames and the public understandings of child mental health as part of Strategic Frame Analysis™*. Washington, DC: FrameWorks Institute.

^{xiv} Iyengar, S. 1991. *Is Anyone Responsible? How Television Frames Political Issues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

-
- ^{xv} Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing and Strauss, A.L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- ^{xvi} Aubrun, A. & Grady, J. (2002). What kids need and what kids give back: A review of communications materials used by early childhood development advocates to promote school readiness and related issues. *Cultural Logic*, May 2002
- ^{xvii} Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- ^{xviii} Lounsbury, M., Hirsch, P., & Ventresca, M. (2003). Social Movements, Field Frames and Industry Emergence: A Cultural-Political Perspective on U.S. Recycling. *Socio-Economic Review* (1) 71-104.
- ^{xix} Iyengar, S. 1991. *Is Anyone Responsible? How Television Frames Political Issues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ^{xx} Gilliam, F. (2006). *Vivid examples: What they mean and why you should be careful using them*. Washington, DC: FrameWorks Institute.
- ^{xxi} Aubrun, A. & Grady, J. (2002). What kids need and what kids give back: A review of communications materials used by early childhood development advocates to promote school readiness and related issues. *Cultural Logic*, May 2002
- ^{xxii} Since we were looking for overall patterns in representation in children's materials, we did not analyze the specific terms of reference for children by organization. It is highly probable to assume, however, that the organizations that are most active on the issue of early childhood development are responsible for the majority of "early childhood" references in advocacy materials.
- ^{xxiii} These were cases in which organizations that dealt with children's issues were messaging without referencing the specific ages of a target group or population. Such stories included, for example, organizational materials that focused on violence or poverty without ever providing more specific information about the age of the populations involved or affected.
- ^{xxiv} Davey, L. (2011). *Talking children's mental health and the core story of child development in Alberta*. Washington, DC: FrameWorks Institute.
- ^{xxv} "Attention to child health is critical in a country where one in ten children die before their fifth birthday and one third of all children are malnourished." World Vision (2010). *New government of Myanmar should prioritize child well-being* [Press release].
- ^{xxvi} UNICEF. (2010). *UNICEF urges increased investment in Africa's children for the continent's future development* [Press release].
- ^{xxvii} "World Vision responds to and prevents undernourishment through a variety of interventions. Community management of acute malnutrition (CMAM) is a decentralized community-based approach to treating undernourishment that was initially used in emergencies, but World Vision now applies it in many situations with high levels of severe acute malnutrition (SAM). CMAM promotes treatment of children under age 5 in their homes using ready-to-use therapeutic foods and has been shown to significantly reduce the number of children dying, increase coverage rates of children being treated, and be cost effective." World Vision. (2009). *World Vision Annual Report*.
- ^{xxviii} Plan International. (2009). *Malawi child tobacco pickers' "50-a-day habit"* [Press Release].
- ^{xxix} While we expected the analysis to reveal a strong emphasis on "child rights" and "human rights," this discourse did not feature prominently across the sample of materials analyzed. While not prominent, the discourse did appear in certain places. When the materials included in the analysis did invoke the child rights frame such invocations were typically embedded in discussions in the larger labor exploitation theme and were discussed in terms of "rights" to fair

working conditions. We also found brief mentions of a rights-based discourse within discussions on conflict violence and natural disasters. Only one organization, UNESCO, focused exclusively on a rights-based discourse, particularly in relation to the UN Committee of the Rights of the Child..

^{xxx} Save the Children. (2009). *Save the Children calls on world leaders in Copenhagen to protect children from increased climate-related natural disasters*, [Press release].

^{xxx}_i Plan International. (2010). *Young people's voices to be heard in Haiti's reconstruction* [Press release].

^{xxx}_{ii} Plan International. (2009). Chairman's report. *Plan International Annual Review*,.

^{xxx}_{iii} Plan International. (2009). Chairman's report. *Plan International Annual Review*.

^{xxx}_{iv} Plan International. (2009). Chairman's report. *Plan International Annual Review*.

^{xxx}_v World Bank. (2009). *Knowledge on fire: Girls' schools in Afghanistan face highest risk of violence* [Press Release].

^{xxx}_{vi} Plan International. (2010). *Appalling levels of sexual attacks on children must be tackled* [Press Release].

^{xxx}_{vii} World Vision Mission Statement, <http://www.worldvision.org>

^{xxx}_{viii} World Vision Mission Statement, <http://www.worldvision.org>

^{xxx}_{ix} Save the children. (2009). *Save the Children Annual Report*.

^{xl} UNICEF. (2010). *Canada's G8 focus on maternal and child health will help global efforts* [Press Release].

^{xli} Save the Children. (2010). *Save the Children boost development and economic potential, African leaders must invest in maternal and child health* [Press Release].

^{xlii} Benford, R., & Snow, D.A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26 611-639.

^{xliii} Open Society International. (2009). *Open Society International Annual Report*.

^{xliv} World Bank. (2010). *Reaching millions in India: Primary education for all children* [Press Release].

^{xlv} Open Society International. (2009). *Open Society International Annual Report*.

^{xlvi} http://www.frameworksinstitute.org/assets/files/ECD/child_poverty_message_brief.pdf

^{xlvii} http://www.frameworksinstitute.org/assets/files/ECD/child_poverty_message_brief.pdf

^{xlviii} Only two organizations in the sample mention ECD issues in any depth (CGEECD and BVLFF). OSI also mentions ECD issues, although to a lesser extent. The remaining organizations only make cursory references to issues related to ECD. As most organizations in the sample do not discuss this issue in any significant way, there is therefore not enough data about ECD in this sample to do a cross-organizational comparison of ECD framing.

^{xlix} http://www.frameworksinstitute.org/toolkits/ecd/resources/pdf/ECDDToolkit_core_story.pdf

^l Open Society International. (2009). *Open Society International Annual Report*.

^{li} Open Society International. (2009). *Open Society International Annual Report*.

^{lii} In previous FrameWorks research, the two prominent values of “fairness between places” and “prosperity” have been shown to be effective in increasing support on education issues. By invoking these two values, organizations may attract wider appeal for the support of ECD preschool centers in international communities.

^{liii} Bernard Van Leer Foundation. (2009). *BVLFF Annual Report*.

^{liv} Bernard Van Leer Foundation. (2009). *BVLFF Annual Report*.

^{lv} CGEECD website. <http://www.ecdgroup.com>

^{lvi} Tiffany, M. (2009). *Refining the core story of early childhood development: The effects of science and health frames*. Washington, DC: FrameWorks Institute.

-
- ^{lvii} Davey, L. (2011). *Talking children's mental health and the core story of child development in Alberta*. Washington, DC: FrameWorks Institute.
- ^{lviii} The number of articles does not equal the number of mentions (59, from Table 6) because some articles contain more than one mention.
- ^{lix} Carpenter, C. (2007). Setting the advocacy agenda: Theorizing issue emergence and nonemergence in transnational advocacy networks. *International Studies Quarterly*, 51.
- ^{lx} CGECCD website. <http://www.ecdgroup.com>
- ^{lxi} Vasi, B. (2006). Organizational environments, framing processes, and the diffusion of the program to address global climate change among local governments in the United States. *Sociological Forum*, 21(3) 439-466.
- ^{lxii} BVLf. (2010). *New decade, new countries, new goals* [Press Release].
- ^{lxiii} <http://www.frameworksinstitute.org/assets/files/ECD/refiningthecorestoryofecd.pdf>
- ^{lxiv} Bernard Van Leer Foundation. (2009). *BVLf Annual Report*.
- ^{lxv} CGECCD. (2010). Early childhood in Africa. *CGECCD Newsletter*, May 2010.
- ^{lxvi} http://www.frameworksinstitute.org/assets/files/ECD/child_poverty_message_brief.pdf
- ^{lxvii} Andrews, K.T., & Edwards, B. (2004). Advocacy organizations in the U.S. political process. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 481.
- ^{lxviii} Andrews, K.T., & Edwards, B. (2004). Advocacy organizations in the U.S. political process. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 492.
- ^{lxix} Carpenter, C. (2007). Setting the advocacy agenda: Theorizing issue emergence and nonemergence in transnational advocacy networks. *International Studies Quarterly*, 51, 102.
- ^{lxx} Andrews, K.T., & Edwards, B. (2004). Advocacy organizations in the U.S. political process. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 493; Keck, M.E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders* (p 22). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.; Burstein, P. (1991). Organization, culture, and policy outcomes. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17, 334.
- ^{lxxi} Andrews, K.T., & Edwards, B. (2004). Advocacy organizations in the U.S. political process. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 493.
- ^{lxxii} Andrews, K.T., & Edwards, B. (2004). Advocacy organizations in the U.S. political process. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 493; Joachim, J. (2003). Framing issues and seizing opportunities: The UN, NGOs, and women's rights. *International Studies Quarterly*, 47(2), 249; Carpenter, C. (2007). Setting the advocacy agenda: Theorizing issue emergence and nonemergence in transnational advocacy networks. *International Studies Quarterly*, 51, 116..
- ^{lxxiii} Keck, M.E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders* (p 19). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press
- ^{lxxiv} Keck, M.E., & Sikkink, K. (2008).
- ^{lxxv} Carpenter, C. (2007). Setting the advocacy agenda: Theorizing issue emergence and nonemergence in transnational advocacy networks. *International Studies Quarterly*, 51, 103.
- ^{lxxvi} Carpenter, C. (2007). Setting the advocacy agenda: Theorizing issue emergence and nonemergence in transnational advocacy networks. *International Studies Quarterly*, 51, 103.
- ^{lxxvii} Joachim, J. (2003). Framing issues and seizing opportunities: The UN, NGOs, and women's rights. *International Studies Quarterly*, 47(2), 248; Burstein, P. (1991). Organization, culture, and policy outcomes. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17, 327.
- ^{lxxviii} Campbell, J. (2005). Where do we stand? Common mechanisms in organizations and social movements research. In Davis, et. al. (Eds.), *Social movements and organizational theory*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- ^{lxxix} Vasi, B. (2006). Organizational environments, framing processes, and the diffusion of the program to address global climate change among local governments in the United States. *Sociological Forum*, 21(3) 439-466; Campbell, J. (2005). Where do we stand? Common mechanisms in organizations and social movements research. In Davis, et. al. (Eds.), *Social*

movements and organizational theory. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press; Benford, R., & Snow, D.A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26 611-639.

lxxx Campbell, J. (2005). Where do we stand? Common mechanisms in organizations and social movements research. In Davis, et. al. (Eds.), *Social movements and organizational theory*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press; Benford, R., & Snow, D.A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26 611-639; Joachim, J. (2003). Framing issues and seizing opportunities: The UN, NGOs, and women's rights. *International Studies Quarterly*, 47(2), 251.

lxxxi Benford, R., & Snow, D.A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26 611-639.

lxxxii Benford, R., & Snow, D.A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26 611-639.; Vasi, B. (2006). Organizational environments, framing processes, and the diffusion of the program to address global climate change among local governments in the United States. *Sociological Forum*, 21(3) 439-466.

lxxxiii Vasi, B. (2006). Organizational environments, framing processes, and the diffusion of the program to address global climate change among local governments in the United States. *Sociological Forum*, 21(3) 439-466.

lxxxiv Iyengar, S. 1991. *Is Anyone Responsible? How Television Frames Political Issues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

lxxxv Aubrun, A. & Grady, J. (2002). What kids need and what kids give back: A review of communications materials used by early childhood development advocates to promote school readiness and related issues. *Cultural Logic*, May 2002

lxxxvi Aubrun, A. & Grady, J. (2002). What kids need and what kids give back: A review of communications materials used by early childhood development advocates to promote school readiness and related issues. *Cultural Logic*, May 2002

lxxxvii <http://www.frameworksinstitute.org/assets/files/PDF/FramingPublicIssuesfinal.pdf>

lxxxviii Davey, L. (2011). *Talking children's mental health and the core story of child development in Alberta*. Washington, DC: FrameWorks Institute.