**Appendix A: Details on YIO Data (rough replication of Paxton WINGO data)**

AllCounts\_CompleteData.xlsx CODE SHEET

* Sheet 1: UnconfirmedCounts
	+ This sheet contains count of all women’s organizations, both confirmed and unconfirmed, for each nation the organization is headquartered in.
	+ Column titles correspond to year and either total number of organizations (stock) or new organizations founded each time period (new).
	+ This sheet contains all Type 1 classifications.
* Sheet 2: ConfirmedCounts
	+ This sheet contains count of only confirmed women’s organizations for each nation the organization is headquartered in.
	+ Column titles correspond to year and either total number of organizations (stock) or new organizations founded each time period (new).
	+ This sheet excludes Type 1: U and J classifications (both of which are unconfirmed).
* Sheet 3: AllOrgs\_Data
	+ This sheet contains data from all organizations collected from the yearbook of international organizations. The organizations listed contain all women’s organizations (confirmed and unconfirmed), as well as non-women’s organizations.
	+ Columns correspond to organization name, date founded, country HQ, member countries, and last news received.
* Sheet 4: AllWomensOrgs\_Data
	+ This sheet contains data from only women’s organizations, both confirmed and unconfirmed.
	+ Columns correspond to organization name, date founded, country HQ, type 1 classification, and last news received.
* Sheet 5: ConfirmedOnly\_Data
	+ This sheet contains data from only women’s organizations that have been confirmed and are not multilateral agreements or treaties.
	+ Columns correspond to organization name, date founded, country HQ, type 1 classification, and last news received.

Type 1 Classification:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A | Federations of international organizations |
| B | Universal membership organizations |
| C | Universal membership organizations |
| D |  Regionally defined membership organizations |
| E |  Organizations emanating from places, persons, proprietary products or other bodies |
| F |  Organizations emanating from places, persons, proprietary products or other bodies |
| G | Internationally-oriented national organizations |
| H | Inactive or dissolved international organizations |
| J | Recently reported bodies -- not yet confirmed |
| K | Subsidiary and internal bodies of other internal bodies |
| N | National organizations |
| R | Religious orders, fraternities and secular institutes |
| S | Autonomous conference series (without secretariat) |
| T | Multilateral treaties and agreements |
| U | Currently inactive non-conventional or unconfirmed bodies |

**Appendix B: NGOs Participating in the UN Process**

For all NGOs at UN Conferences (Ex: 1975 Mexico City NGOs):

* NGOs were counted based on listed participants (on documents provided by the UN or lists provided by UN) at conferences/pre-coms.
* Please see document “Women’s Orgs. at UN Conferences” for complete lists of organizations by country and by conference.
* In reference to the category ‘International’: These were not coded as national NGOs, and are presented in a separated row as ‘International’
* For other organizations that act internationally, they are categorized into countries based on their headquarters on the ‘Civil Society’ registration on the ‘NGO Branch’ of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs search page (<https://esango.un.org/civilsociety/showProfileDetail.do?method=showProfileDetails&tab=1&profileCode=475>)

Variable: **1975 Mexico City NGOs**

* Downloaded from ps://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3800460?ln=en
* E/CONF.66/INF.2
* World Conference of the International Women’s Year
* NGOs derived from list of representatives’ positions and from “Observers of Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council” (Page 118 and onward)
* Countries like Colombia, Ireland, Lesotho, Liberia and Haiti do not have representatives from formal organizations, but they have sent many individuals
* When many university departments are listed, the university is the only organization listed

Variable: **1980 Copenhagen NGOs**

* Information from: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/36306?ln=en>
* A/CONF.94/35
* Actual document received from Geneva (A/CONF.94/INF.3) and saved on both Maggie and Majka’s computer

Variable: **1985 Nairobi NGOs**

* Downloaded from: <https://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/otherconferences/Nairobi/Nairobi%20Full%20Optimized.pdf>, pages 284-287
* A/CONF.116/28/Rev.1

Variable: **1995 Beijing NGOs**

* List(s) of organizations accredited by the Commission for the Status of Women to attend the conference:
* UN Code: E/CN.6/1995/L.4
	+ Note that not all of these organizations may have gone. They were accredited to attend.
* Downloaded from:
* Part 1: https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/LTD/N95/062/39/img/N9506239.pdf?OpenElement
* Part 2: https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/LTD/N95/068/03/img/N9506803.pdf?OpenElement
* Part 3: https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/LTD/N95/071/08/img/N9507108.pdf?OpenElement
* Extra org added : <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/do>

Variable: **1999 Beirut NGOs**

* “An international Workshop on "Beijing +5 – Future Actions and Initiatives" was convened by the United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW) and organized jointly with the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) at the United Nations House in Beirut, Lebanon, from 8 to 10 November 1999”
* Downloaded from: <https://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/beirutreport.htm>
	+ Annex (where NGO information actually is): <https://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/beirutannex.pdf>)

Variable: **2000 ECE Pre-Meeting NGOs**

* Regional Preparatory Meeting on the 2000 Review of Implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action
* E/ECE/RW.2/2000/INF.1
* Downlaoded from: <https://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/Gender/documents/beijing-5/e.ece.rw.2.2000.inf.1.e_01.pdf>

Variable: **2000 Beijing NGOs**

* Downlaoded from: <https://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/followup/b5ngo.htm>
* ECOSOC/Beijing and new accredited NGOs that attended the special session of the General Assembly  "Women 2000: gender equality, development and peace for the twenty-first century"

Variable: **2005 New York NGOs**

* Downloaded from: <https://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/csw49/documents/csw49OrgAttended.html>
* **49th Session of the Commission on the Status of Women List of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)**

Variable: **ECE Pre-Meeting 2009 NGOs**

* Downloaded from: <https://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/Gender/documents/Beijing%2B15/Final_LoP.pdf>, pages 10-14
* Regional Review Meeting 2-3 November 2009

Variable: **2015 Invitee NGOs**

* Downloaded from: <https://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing15/docs/invitedNGOs.pdf>
* Non-ECOSOC accredited NGOs to be invited to the BEIJING +20 COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN NEW YORK, UNITED STATES
	+ Note that not all of these may have attended, but they were all accredited and invited to attend

**Appendix C: Twitter Data**

**International Women’s Day Tweets Counts**

 All Twitter data was purchased directly from Twitter through Gnip, an authorized seller for Twitter data using queries which limited the searches based on the hashtags #IWD, #InternationalWomensDay, #InternationalWomensDay2015, and #IWD2015 in the search. The search was limited to the week surrounding International Women’s Day from March 3 to March 11th in 2015. All of the tweets were put into a MongoDB databases. This database is searchable and enables searching for specific tweets or tweets that share particular characteristics based on their metadata. The metadata was included when purchasing Tweets through GNIP.

In order to determine the country counts for tweets in 2015, each hashtag was queried using the application MongoDB Compass to connect to the databases using a specific hashtag (such as #IWD) and the ISO country code included within the metadata for self-disclosed location (such as CL for Chile). The returning number of tweets were then updated in a spreadsheet organized by country year and hashtag. Totals for International Women’s Day were then determined by adding together all the hashtags that use the International Women’s Day hashtags.

**Locations for #WomensDay, #WhyIStrike, and #NiUnaMas**

Of the 470 users engaged with #WhyIStrike, 308 users self-disclose their location (65.5% of users). These locations were coded by country, and of the 308 disclosed locations 252 users country were able to be determined. An additional 2 users are identifiable by region, cases where users indicated their location as regional (Europe, Asia etc.). The remaining 52 represent cases where users indicated their location as global (21), or using fictional or outlandish place names (ex.: The Moon) (31). The same process was used to determine the location of the users within the #WomensDay network, of the 602 users, 341 disclosed their location (56.6% of users) and 286 were able to be coded by country. An additional 4 users indicated their region. Finally, 19 users indicated their location as global, and 32 users used fictional or comical place names as their location.

The locations for these users were coded to determine the country of residence of the users for #NiUnaMas, using the same process as was used when coding the #WomensDay and #WhyIStrike Tweets. Within this coding, 538 users represent 21 countries, with the largest number of users representing Mexico (287 users) and Spain (143). An additional 7 users are identifiable by region, for example the indicating their location as three different cities within Europe (Zurich, Marburg, Gottingen) or within a particular region (Latinoamerica or Union Europea); The remaining 64 users indicate their location indicating their location as global (Worldwide, Earth etc) (13 users); using comical place names (Rivendel, Twitterland) (50 users); or it is unclear which country the city place name is referring to due to the same name referring to cities in multiple countries (Toledo)(1 user).

**Appendix D: Number of Twitter Users by Country**

Both networks reflect the dominance of users from the Global North: for both campaigns, users from the United States making up 44% of users in both networks. Overall, taking the subset of users that disclose their country location, 89% of the users in #WhyIStrike and 82% of the users in #Womensday, are from the Global North. The top Southern country for each network is different, with Mexico representing 3% of users in #WhyIStrike and Pakistan representing 2% of users #WomensDay. Interestingly, though both networks represent the global North, #Womensday seems to include users from wider array of Northern countries: #Womensday users cover a larger number of countries (41) than #WhyIStrike (28) (Table D.1, Table D.2 and Table D.3). One might attribute this to the larger size of the overall network, but a similar number of users indicate their location within a specific country in each network (252 and 286). Overall, despite the roots of the Women’s Strike in autonomous transnational feminist organizing between feminists in the Global North and South, we see a similar trend to International Women’s Day, where the online campaign associated with the action is dominated by Twitter users in the Global North.

**Table D.1: Transnational Feminist Twitter Campaigns by Region**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | #WomensDay | #WhyIStrike | #NiUnaMas |
| Number of Countries | 41 | 28 | 21 |
| % of Users in the Global North[[1]](#footnote-1) | 82.75% | 90.94% | 32.84% |
| % of Users in the Global South[[2]](#footnote-2) | 17.24% | 11.02% | 67.15% |

**Table D.1: Twitter Users for #WhyIStrike by Country**

| **Country** | **Number of Twitter Users** |
| --- | --- |
| United States of America | 113 |
| Italy | 37 |
| United Kingdom | 33 |
| Spain | 18 |
| Mexico | 10 |
| Canada | 6 |
| Poland | 6 |
| Argentina | 3 |
| Japan | 3 |
| Austria | 2 |
| Belgium | 2 |
| Germany | 2 |
| The Netherlands | 2 |
| Australia | 1 |
| Chile | 1 |
| France | 1 |
| Honduras | 1 |
| India | 1 |
| Ireland | 1 |
| Kenya | 1 |
| Lebanon | 1 |
| New Zealand | 1 |
| Nigeria | 1 |
| Russia | 1 |
| Senegal | 1 |
| Thailand | 1 |
| Turkey | 1 |
| Uruguay | 1 |
| **Grand Total** | **252** |

**Table D.2: Twitter Users for #WomensDay by Country**

| **Country** | **Number of Twitter Users** |
| --- | --- |
| United States | 127 |
| United Kingdom | 45 |
| Spain | 14 |
| Canada | 12 |
| Australia | 10 |
| Pakistan | 7 |
| The Netherlands | 7 |
| France | 5 |
| India | 5 |
| Ireland | 4 |
| United Arab Emirates | 4 |
| Argentina | 3 |
| Germany | 3 |
| Mexico | 3 |
| Nigeria | 3 |
| Saudi Arabia | 3 |
| Switzerland | 3 |
| Colombia | 2 |
| Cyprus | 2 |
| Kuwait | 2 |
| Venezuela | 2 |
| Austria | 1 |
| Bahrain | 1 |
| Botswana | 1 |
| Cambodia | 1 |
| Eritrea | 1 |
| Fiji | 1 |
| Guatemala | 1 |
| Italy | 1 |
| Japan | 1 |
| Jordan | 1 |
| Kenya | 1 |
| Morocco | 1 |
| Norway | 1 |
| Poland | 1 |
| Romania | 1 |
| Rwanda | 1 |
| South Africa | 1 |
| Sweden | 1 |
| Uganda | 1 |
| Yemen | 1 |
| **Grand Total** | **286** |

**Table D.3: Number of Users for #NiUnaMas Tweets by Country**

| **Country** | **Number of Twitter Users** |
| --- | --- |
| Mexico | 287 |
| Spain | 143 |
| Colombia | 26 |
| Venezuela | 20 |
| United States of America | 18 |
| El Salvador | 7 |
| Ecuador | 6 |
| Panama | 6 |
| Chile | 4 |
| Germany | 4 |
| Argentina | 3 |
| Canada | 2 |
| France | 2 |
| The Netherlands | 2 |
| Australia | 1 |
| Austria | 1 |
| Cuba | 1 |
| Dominican Republic | 1 |
| Italy | 1 |
| Nicaragua | 1 |
| Paraguay | 1 |
| Portugal | 1 |
| **Total Number of Users** | **538** |

**Appendix E: Top Users for #WomensDay and #WhyIStrike by Betweenness Centrality**

 Beyond the role of Women’s March, in bridging the conversation between #WhyIStrike and #WomensDay for their followers, this account also has the highest betweenness centrality within the #Womensday campaign (See Table F.1), followed by UN\_Women and womensday. In contrast, Womensmarch does not play the same bridging role within the #WhyIStrike campaign (See Table F.2). While the account is clearly involved in promoting the message of the campaign, it does not connect users engaging with the campaign in the same way it connects users within #Womensday. Instead, Womensmarch does not even count among the top 10 users by betweenness centrality with the #WhyIStrike network.

**Table E.1: Top Users for #Womensday by Betweenness Centrality**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Top User | In-Degree | Out-Degree | Betweenness Centrality |
| womensmarch | 117 | 1 | 20309.000 |
| Womensday | 48 | 4 | 9563.667 |
| un\_women | 34 | 1 | 8287.167 |
| heather98609981 | 0 | 2 | 6100.000 |
| girlsreallyrule | 21 | 1 | 5130.000 |
| Dimokdi | 0 | 2 | 5000.000 |
| acid\_headz | 0 | 2 | 2192.000 |
| greenpeaceusa | 9 | 1 | 1974.000 |
| Womengid | 0 | 2 | 1456.000 |
| unwomenwatch | 7 | 2 | 1276.000 |
| Unesco | 6 | 1 | 655.500 |

**Table E.2: Top Users for #WhyIStrike by Betweenness Centrality**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Twitter User | In-Degree | Out-Degree | Betweenness Centrality |
| Womensstrike | 103 | 4 | 39158.441 |
| Womenstrike | 8 | 4 | 34479.078 |
| fab\_\_olous | 27 | 1 | 31583.422 |
| 000120o | 0 | 7 | 28991.263 |
| Nonunadimenomi | 20 | 11 | 25365.157 |
| Nonunadimeno | 23 | 2 | 25359.029 |
| a\_treaclemine | 0 | 6 | 20774.781 |
| Womensmarchlon | 0 | 5 | 20177.422 |
| zarita1987 | 0 | 5 | 13294.359 |
| Ujcemadrid | 24 | 1 | 13222.000 |
| Evapalazzetti | 0 | 2 | 12222.000 |

**Appendix F: Language of the Networks**

All edges within the networks for #WhyIStrike, #WomensDay, and #NiUnaMas were coded based on the dominant language of the tweet. For multilingual tweets dominant language was determined by whichever language took up at least 50% of the tweet. Below are the tables for the percent of edges in each language for each campaign.

We refer to the percent of edges using a particular language as opposed the percent of tweets using this language because within a network analysis the same substantive tweet *may be and often is multiple edges* as each edge in our networks is a retweet or reply to another tweet. The dominant language of the networks reflects the dominant language used by the *most retweeted users within a network* not necessarily the first or dominant language used by the users retweeting or engaging with these tweets. It is for this reasons that our primary analyses focus on the location of users (nodes) as opposed to the language of the tweets that connect these users (edges)*.*

**Table F.1: Language of Tweets for #WhyIStrike**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Language** | **Percent of Edges** |
| English | 79.78% |
| Italian | 13.66% |
| Spanish | 4.37% |
| Equal Use of All 3 Languages\* | 1.31% |
| \*this reflects one tweet that is retweeted multiple times in the dataset where no one language is dominant because it is made up of all the women’s strike hashtags in each language |

**Table F.2: Language of Tweets for #WomensDay**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Language** | **Percent of Edges** |
| English | 86.76% |
| Spanish | 8.78% |
| Arabic | 1.83% |
| French | 1.70% |
| Hindi | 0.78% |
| Dutch | 0.13% |

**Table F.3: Language of Tweets for #NiUnaMas**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Language** | **Percent of Edges** |
| Spanish | 98.71% |
| Catalan | 0.51% |
| German | 0.45% |
| English | 0.25% |
| Italian | 0.06% |

**Appendix G: Top Hashtags used in #WhyIStrike, #WomensDay, and #NiUnaMas Networks**

**Table G.1: Top Hashtags in #WomensDay network (excluding #WomensDay)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Hashtag** | **Number of Tweets** |
| #daywithoutawoman | 163 |
| #iwd2017 | 66 |
| #beboldforchange | 49 |
| #istrikefor | 30 |
| #womenshistorymonth | 21 |
| #díadelamujer | 15 |
| #women | 14 |
| #palestina | 12 |
| #freepalestine | 12 |

**Table G.2: Top Hashtags in #WhyIStrike (excluding #WhyIStrike)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Hashtag** | **Number of Tweets** |
| #yoparo8m | 140 |
| #womensstrike | 127 |
| #lottomarzo | 125 |
| #mujeresenhuelga | 69 |
| #iosciopero8m | 63 |
| #daywithoutawoman | 58 |
| #resist | 56 |
| #muslimban | 49 |
| #8m | 45 |

**Table G.3: Top Hashtags in #NiUnaMas (Excluding #NiUnaMas)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Hashtag** | **Number of Tweets** |
| #NiUnaMenos | 114 |
| #violenciadegénero | 49 |
| #felizmartesactivistas | 41 |
| #sosolivar | 41 |
| #feminicido | 24 |
| #feminicidosemergencianacional | 22 |
| #feminicidios | 20 |
| #naucalpan | 16 |

1. Calculated using number of users indication location at the country and regional level (See Appendix C for summary numbers) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Calculated using number of users indication location at the country and regional level (See Appendix C for summary numbers) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)