Setting the agenda: Social influence in the effects of the Human Rights Committee in Latin America and Central and Eastern Europe

Online Appendix

Online Appendix A

List of the UN treaty bodies:

1. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, established to monitor the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;
2. The Human Rights Committee, established to monitor the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;
3. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, established to monitor the International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination;
4. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, established to monitor the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women;
5. The Committee against Torture, established to monitor the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;
6. The Committee on the Rights of the Child, established to monitor the Convention on the Rights of the Child;
7. The Committee on Migrant Workers, established to monitor the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and the Members of their Families;
8. The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, established to monitor the Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities; and
9. The Committee on Enforced Disappearances, established to monitor the International Convention for the Protection of all Persons from Enforced Disappearances.

Online Appendix B

In its 2004 state report, Poland used 175 times the words related to the right to equality and no discrimination; divided by the total number of words of the report, this meant a saliency ratio of 0.20%.[1] That same year, the HRC issued its ensuing concluding observations, considerably raising the saliency of that right within its report, using the related words with a saliency ratio of 1%. In its next state report, issued in 2009, Poland talked about this right with a 0.49% saliency rate. This means that Poland took the HRC's insistence on the right to equality and no discrimination seriously and talked about it more than it did in its previous state report. For illustrative purposes, in the rest of this Appendix, we reproduce a selection of the paragraphs in which the words included in the cluster "right to equality and no discrimination" were used in the 2004 concluding observations of the HRC and in Poland's 2009 state report. The words included in the equality cluster are underlined to help the reader their identification.

In its 2004 concluding observations, the HRC stated the following (Human Rights Committee 2004):

> 10. While the Committee appreciates progress made in the area of equality between men and women in the public service, it notes with concern that the number of women in senior positions is still low. (…)
>
> The State party should ensure equal treatment of men and women at all levels of public service. Appropriate measures should also be taken to ensure that women enjoy equal access to the labour market and equal wages for work of equal value.
>
> (…)
>
> 16. While the Committee notes that the Labour Code has now been amended to include a non-discrimination clause relating to employment, it regrets that a general non-discrimination provision covering all appropriate grounds has not yet been introduced into national legislation (arts. 26 and 27).
>
> The State party should broaden the scope of its non-discrimination law to extend to areas other than employment.

[1] As can be seen in Appendix C *infra*, the words included in the "right to equality and no discrimination" are: equal, equality, inequal, inequality, discriminate, discrimination, discriminatory, prejudice, race, races, racism, stereotypes, stigmatization.

On the other hand, the words included in the cluster "right to equality and no discrimination" were used in Poland's 2009 state report in the following way (Human Rights Committee 2009):

(…)

Recommendations 10 and 16 of the Human Rights Committee - equality in employment

9. An amendment of the LC [Labour Code] adopted in November 2003 had the following effects:

•Extension of the scope of regulations connected with the prohibition of discrimination (…)

• Introduction of a definition of direct and indirect discrimination. Direct discrimination takes place when (…) Indirect discrimination takes place when (…).

• Introduction of a definition of mobbing and recognition of mobbing as a token of discrimination. Mobbing is defined as (…) Furthermore, discrimination on grounds of sex includes (…)

10. As concerns equal treatment in employment, a draft amendment of the LC adopted in February 2008 by the CM [Council of Ministers] (at present the draft law is subject to Parliamentary procedure) envisages the following:

• Adoption of a more detailed and precise definition of indirect discrimination (…)

• Adoption of a more precise list of situations being manifestations of discrimination

(…)

• Adoption of a more precise scope of protection measures of employees exercising their rights acquired because of the violation of the principle of equal treatment in employment (…)

• Granting protection to an employee offering assistance to another employee who exercises his or her rights acquired because of the violation of the principle of equal treatment in employment.

11. The Law of April 2004 on the promotion of employment and labour market institutions prohibits discrimination on grounds of sex, age, disability, race, ethnic background, nationality, sexual orientation, political beliefs, religious creed and membership in a union (…)

(…)

15. Detailed information on equal treatment of women and men is included in the Report on Poland's implementation of the provisions of the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, for the years 2002-2006, submitted in August 2007.

Conditions for granting paternal and maternity leave in the context of equal treatment in employment.

(…)

Measures taken for the implementation of the principle of equal treatment in employment.

(…)

• EQUAL Community Initiative Programme for Poland 2004 - 2006 (objective: elimination of all forms of discrimination and inequality on the labour market, also through trainings, workshops, vocational, psychological and legal counselling and other forms of support)

32. A whole range of activities were taken during the European Year of Equal Opportunities for All (2007); these were trainings, exhibitions, billboard campaigns and conferences, scientific studies were carried out, including research on Polish stereotypes with respect to age, disability, creed and gender. (…)

Online Appendix C

Right, group or issue		Words
1	Legal recourse	Amparo, Habeas [corpus]
2	Sexual and reproductive rights	abortion, abortions, contraception, contraceptive, contraceptives, pregnancies, pregnancy, pregnant, reproductive, sterilization, sterlizations
3	Amnesties	amnesty, amnesty's, amnesties, immunity
4	Agrarian/rural issues	agrarian, campesino, campesino's, campesinos, peasant, peasants, land, land's, landowner, landwoner's, landowners, rural
5	Right to liberty/detention	arrest, arrested, arrests, detain, detained, detainee, detainees, detention, custody, incommunicado, Pretrial [detention]
6	Freedom of assembly	assemblies, assembly, association, associations
7	LGTBI rights	bisexual, bisexuals, bisexuality, gay, gays, homosexual, homosexuals, homosexuality, intersex, lesbian, lesbians, lgbt, transexual, transexuality, transgender
8	Rights of the child	adolescent, adolescent's, adolescents, child, child's, children, children's, infant, infant's, juvenile, juveniles, minor, minor's, minors
9	Armed conflict	armed, arms, conflict, conflicts, combat, combatant, combatant's, combatants, combating, firearms, guerrilla, guerrilla's, insurgent, insurgents, war, wars
10	Rights of people with disabilities	disability, disabilities
11	Due process rights	accused, acquittal, acquittals, acquit, acquitted, court, conviction, convictions, courts, court's, defendant, defendants, defendant's, defense, defence, judge, judge's, judges, judgement, judgements, judicial, judiciary, juridical, jurist, jurist's, jurists, jury, jury's, guilty, lawyer, lawyer's, lawyers, magistrate, magistrate's, magistrates, procedural, proceedings, prosecution, prosecute, prosecuted, prosecuting, prosecutions, prosecutor, prosecutors, prosecutor's, ruling, rulings, sentence, sentenced, sentences, trial, tials, tribunal, tribunal's, tribunals, tried
12	Violence, insecurity and crime	crime, crimes, criminal, criminal's, criminals, criminality, insecurity, security, terror, terrorism, terrorist, terrorist's, terrorists, violence, violent
13	Right to education	education, educational, school, school's, schools, teacher, teacher's, teachers, university, university's, universities
14	Right to equality and no discrimination	equal, equality, inequal, inequality, discriminate, discrimination, discriminatory, prejudice, race, races, racism, stereotypes, stigmatization
15	Right to freedom	free, freedom, freedoms, freely, liberty, liberty, liberties
16	Rights of imprisoned persons	imprisoned, imprisonment, incarceration, inmate, inmate's, inmates, jail, jail's, jails, penitentiaries, penitentiary, prison, prison's, prisoner, prisoner's, prisoners, prisons
17	Disappearances	disappearance, disappearances, disappear, disappeared

18	Electoral rights	ballot, balloting, campaign, campaign's, campaigns, candidate, candidate's, candidates, elect, elected, election, election's, elections, elective, electoral, electors, electorate, vote, voter, voter's, voters
19	Indigenous peoples' rights	aboriginal, aboriginal's, aboriginals, ethnic, ethnicity, indian, indian's, indians, indigenous, minorities, minority, minority's, native, native's, natives, multicultural, multiculturalism, plurinational
20	Executions	assassinate, assassinated, assassination, asssinations, execution, executions, homicide, homicides, killed, killings, massacre, murder, murders, murdered
21	Investigations	investigate, investigated, investigating, investigation, investigation's, investigations, impunity
22	Freedom of expression	censorship, journalism, journalist, journalist's, journalists, expression, speech, media, media's, press, newspaper, newspaper's, newspapers
23	Legality	illegal, illegality, law, law's, laws, lawfully, legal, legality, legally, licit, illicit, unlawful, unlawfully, unlawfullness
24	Military and police	army, army's, military, military's, navy, navy's, police, police's, policing, policeman, policeman's, policemen, soldier, soldier's, soldiers, troops, paramilitary, paras
25	Penalties	penal, penalized, penalties, penalty, punish, punishable, punished, punishing, punishment
26	Freedom of religion	religion, religion's, religions, religious, church, church's, churches, priest, priest's, priests
27	Torture	confession, confessions, illtreatment, inhuman, istambul, torture, tortured, maltreatment
28	Labour rights	labour, union, union's, unions, employees, employment, employer, salaries, salary, unemployment, worker, worker's, workers, workforce, workplace, workplace's, workplaces
29	Women's rights	female, femicide, feminicide, woman, woman's, women, women's, gender, genderbased, girl, girl's, girls, rape, rapist
30	Foreigners' rights	alien, alien's, aliens, asylum, foreigner, foreigner's, foreigners, migrant, migrant's, migrants, refugee, refugee's, refugees, xenophobia
31	Reforms	reform, reform's, reformed, reforming, reforms, amend, ammendment, ammendment's, amendments, derogate, derogation, derogations
32	Victims	victim, victim's, victims

Online Appendix D

Table D1. Summary Statistics

Name	Description	Region		
		Central & Eastern Europe	Latin America	Total
Change in the relative saliency by states	Change in the relative saliency of a human right in states periodic reports	48.36% (2.093) [-1; 28.52] 600	61.74% (2.443) [-1; 27.38] 626	55.20% (2.279) [-1; 28.52] 1,226
Change in the relative saliency by HRC	Change in the relative saliency of a human right in the HRC's concluding right in observations reports respect to the change in the relative saliency of a human states' reports from one cycle to another	73.89% (3.927) [-1; 62.51] 600	148.30% (7.414) [-1; 117.35] 626	111.88% (5.977) [-1; 117.33] 1,226
Reporting Cycles	Number of elapsed reporting cycles	2.40 (1.465) [1; 6] 1,376	2.56 (1.322) [1; 5] 1,152	2.47 (1.404) [1; 6] 2,528
Openness Index	Sum of exports and imports of goods and services measured as a share of gross domestic product.	97.13 (27.95) [50.90; 146.06] 1,344	54.20 (22.93) [18.13; 104.40] 1,152	77.32 (33.49) [18.13; 146.06] 2,496
Log(Gross Domestic Product)	Natural logarithms of Gross Domestic Product	24.42 (1.42) [21.89; 27.62] 1,376	24.84 (1.36) [22.66; 27.58] 1,152	24.61 (1.41) [21.89; 27.62] 2,528
Log(Gross Domestic Product per capita)	Natural logarithms of Gross Domestic Product per capita	8.44 (0.85) [6.77; 9.82] 1,376	8.23 (0.55) [7.10; 9.15] 1,152	8.35 (0.74) [6.77; 9.82] 2,528
Log(population)	Natural logarithms of all residents regardless of legal status or citizenship--except for refugees not permanently settled in the country of asylum, who are generally considered part of the population of their country of origin.	15.97 (1.28) [14.10; 18.79] 1,376	16.60 (1.08) [14.95; 19.04] 1,152	16.26 (1.23) [14.10; 19.04] 2,528

International NGOs	Number of international NGOs with presence in the country	2,069 (1,201) [378; 4,482] 1,312	1,794 (722.4) [653; 3,674] 1,120	1,943 (1,018) [378; 4,482] 2,432
Political Rights Scores	The rating ranges between 1 and 7, with 1 representing the smallest degree of freedom and 7 the greatest degree of freedom based on a 40-point scale for 10 political indicators	3.75 (2.72) [0; 6] 1,312	3.86 (1.65) [1; 6] 1,152	3.80 (2.0) [0; 6] 2,464
Civil Liberties Scores	The rating ranges between 1 and 7, with 1 representing the smallest degree of freedom and 7 the greatest degree of freedom based on a 60-point scale for 15 civil liberties indicators	3.92 (1.93) [0; 6] 1,312	3.75 (1.46) [1; 6] 1,152	3.84 (1.7) [0; 6] 2,464
Composite Index of National Capability	Weighted Index for annual values for total population, urban population, iron and steel production, energy consumption, military personnel, and military expenditure.	0.010 (0.13) [0.0002; 0.04] 352	0.005 (0.005) [0.0003; 0.02] 576	0.007 (0.009) [0.0002; 0.05] 928
Naming and Shaming	Count of Human Rights NGO non-cooperative events per year from NGO source to Government Target	0.142 (0.35) [0;1] 448	0.411 (0.84) [0;3] 544	0.290 (0.68) [0;3] 992
Number of years between the HRC's report and its state response	Number of years between the issue of the HRC report and that of the state	6.046 (2.40) [3; 16] 1,376	6.944 (3.52) [2; 17] 1,152	6.455 (2.99) [2; 17] 2,528
Government Effectiveness	Estimate of governance (ranges from approximately -2.5 (weak) to 2.5 (strong) governance performance)	0.152 (0.65) [-0.98; 1.07] 1,312	-0.117 (0.62) [-1.13; 1.25] 960	0.038 (0.65) [-1.13; 1.25] 2,272
Official Development Assistance Commitments	Millions of US Dollar at constant prices of firms written obligation by government or official agency to provide resources to a recipient country or multilateral agency	84.3 (135.1) [0; 497.89] 1,216	290.4 (298.9) [19.33; 1,211.73] 1,120	183.71 (250.8) [0; 1,211.73] 2,336
Change in the	Relative saliency of a human right in the HRC's concluding observations			0.184%

relative saliency by HRC by the rest of countries	reports respect to the change in the relative saliency of a human right in all the countries in the sample but the same one			(0.002) [0; 0.02] 2,368
Electoral Process	Ranges from 0 to 12. Follows Political Rights Scores order	8.777 (3.595) [1; 12] 864	10.625 (1.765) [5; 12] 512	9.465 (3.173) [1; 12] 1,376
Political Pluralism and Participation	Ranges from 0 to 16. Follows Political Rights Scores order	11.222 (4.360) [3; 16] 864	13.000 (2.374) [8; 16] 512	11.88 (3.842) [3; 16] 1,376
Functioning of Government	Ranges from 0 to 12. Follows Political Rights Scores order	7.259 (2.771) [2; 12] 864	7.312 (3.038) [2; 12] 512	7.279 (2.872) [2; 12] 1,376
Freedom of Expression and Belief	Ranges from 0 to 60. Follows Civil Liberties Scores order	12.333 (3.412) [4; 16] 864	14.125 (1.934) [9; 16] 512	13.000 (3.073) [4; 16] 1,376
Associational and Organizational Rights	Ranges from 0 to 12. Follows Civil Liberties Scores order	8.962 (3.204) [2; 12] 864	9.250 (2.360) [4; 12] 512	9.069 (2.921) [2; 12] 1,376
Rule of Law	Ranges from 0 to 16. Follows Civil Liberties Scores order	9.629 (3.314) [3; 14] 864	9.000 (3.892) [4; 15] 512	9.395 (3.552) [3; 15] 1,376
Personal Autonomy and Individual Rights	Ranges from 1 to 16. Follows Civil Liberties Scores order	11.185 (2.496) [6; 15] 864	11.125 (2.344) [7; 15] 512	11.162 (2.440) [6; 15] 1,376
Institutionalized Democracy	Ranges from approximately 0 (weak) to 10 (strong)	5.720 (11.439) [-66; 10]	7.638 (2.071) [2; 10]	6.594 (8.606) [-66; 10]

		1,376	1,152	2,528
Institutionalized Autocracy	Ranges from approximately 0 (weak) to 10 (strong)	-0.790 (10.266) [-66; 7] 1,376	0.194 (0.568) [0; 2] 1,152	-0.341 (7.598) [-66; 10] 2,528
Competitiveness of Executive Recruitment	(1) Selection (2) Dual/Transition (3) Election	1.023 (10.365) [-66; 3] 1,376	2.777 (0.478) [1; 3] 1,152	1.822 (7.702) [-66; 3] 2,528
Executive Constraints (Decision Rules)	(1) Unlimited Authority (2) Intermediate Category (3) Slight to moderate Parity Limitation on Executive Authority (4) Intermediate Category (5) Substantial Limitations on Executive Authority (6) Intermediate Category (7) Executive or Subordination	4.232 (10.953) [-66; 7] 1,376	5.944 (1.177) [3; 7] 1,152	5.012 (8.163) [-66; 7] 2,528
The Competitiveness of Participation	(0) Not Applicable (1) Repressed (2) Suppressed (3) Factional (4) Transitional (5) Competitive	2.279 (10.574) [-66; 5] 1,376	3.944 (0.705) [3; 5] 1,152	3.037 (7.858) [-66; 5] 2,528

Note: It reports mean value, standard deviation in brackets, Minimum and maximum in square bracket, and number of observation.

Online Appendix E

We also run other several specifications to both verify the robustness of the results of the key independent variable and investigate the existence of other effects affecting the adjustment of states' discursive practices. In all these specifications, the coefficients of our key independent variable remain statistically significant. First, we exclude from the sample countries whose political rights scores were equal one as the number of available observations allows us to run the models with enough confidence. The presence of autocratic-oriented governments could distort our results as they might purposively ignore the organs of the international human rights regime. Our previous findings are still valid after excluding these observations.

Second, we include an interaction term between the change in the relative saliency of rights in the HRC's concluding observations and the number of elapsed reporting cycles. A positive and statistically significant coefficient for the interacted variable indicates that the effect of the HRC's reports on states' agendas accelerates over time. This result could offer some clue on how the effectiveness of the HRC to influence states has been evolving over time. This variable does not turn out to be statistically significant. Table E1 in the Online Appendix E shows these results.

Third, we assess whether states' institutional capacity can distort their response to the normative discourses set by the HRC. States with more capacities might have larger and better trained bureaucracies to review the HRC's concluding observations and thus produce "higher quality" reports (Creamer and Simmons 2015; Hafner-Burton 2013, 99-100). For this purpose, we employ the Government Effectiveness Index elaborated by the World Bank. The coefficient does not become statistically significant (see Table E1 in the Online Appendix E).

Fourth, we test whether the number of years between the HRC's report and its respective response from the state can alter the states' responses to the HRC. We find that this variable does not turn out to be statistically significant and the effect of the change in the relative saliency by the HRC continues to matter. This result shows that variations in these periods do not change significantly states' behavior conducive to ameliorate any costs the HRC's reports might create. We display this result in Table E1 in the Online Appendix E. Although the length of this period could impose certain reputation and material costs to states, this finding suggests that the costs would become extensively higher if states did not act to ameliorate them through their reports. If states did not act to these costs, the accumulated effect might be substantially harmful for them in the long term.

Fifth, we control for naming and shaming activities by HROs (Davis and Murdie 2012). We find that this variable does not seem to alter how states respond to the HRC report (see Table E1 in the Online Appendix E).Sixth, we implement other tests to evaluate the realist argument through the inclusion of three additional variables: the total population, the gross domestic product, and the Composite Index of National Capability as additional proxies of state power in the international arena. Such variables do not seem to matter either (see Table E1 in the Online Appendix E).

Seventh, we evaluate whether increases in the overall discussion of a right in all the concluding observations reports issued by the HRC can lead to a greater response of any state to such enhanced saliency. In this model, this additional independent variable is the

change in the relative saliency of a human right in all the HRC's concluding observations reports with respect to the relative saliency of a human right in all states' periodic reports from the previous cycle. Table E1 in the Online Appendix E shows these results. We also consider several combinations of independent variables to examine whether this finding continues to hold. In any case, we do not find any evidence supporting this possibility. This finding suggests that states focus on the reports addressed at them, as they are the only ones that that can directly damage their reputations. These are reports that provide information on which rights are being violated by states. If there are certain types of rights being generally emphasized by the HRC more than others, states do not seem to pay attention to this general tendency which is very likely the result of accumulated violations of rights by other states. Overall, our finding suggests that while the HRC can influence states' adoption of normative discourses by analyzing case by case, it can hardly produce rapid collective changes in normative discourses without this strategy. This result implies that the dialogue between the HRC and a state seems to have been an effective strategy. Further research should provide more information to assess whether this exchange of information between the HRC and states leads to compliance in the long term.

In addition, we assess whether specific variations in contextual factors can modify the effect of the HRC's reports on the normative discourse of states. These factors might affect the material rewards and punishments a state can receive for embracing the HRC's agenda. First, we multiply the change in the relative saliency of rights by the HRC with the degree of economic openness and then with the developmental assistance commitments states have received. Some studies find a positive association between reputation and trade benefits, and humanitarian aid (Garrriga forthcoming). As these potential rewards grow – due to a greater dependence on the world economy and external financial aid – states might follow the HRC more closely. We do not find evidence to support these expectations (see Table E1 in the Online Appendix E).

Second, we incorporate an interaction between the number of international NGOs present in each country and the change in relative saliency of rights in the HRC's concluding observations reports. In doing so, we evaluate whether the size of the network of transnational NGOs can accelerate the socialization of norms. Such effect does not seem to exist as the results indicate (see Table E1 in the Online Appendix E). In addition, we also use the number of international NGOs per capita for an assessment in relative terms considering the size of the population. The effect produced by the HRC' reports on the states' discursive assertions does not change across all specifications after this change. Third, we run separate regressions by region instead of controlling for the regional contexts within the idiosyncratic term to check the robustness of our previous findings. Our multilevel models might not be entirely capable of capturing the effects of cross-regional differences affecting normative discourses by states. Once again, the coefficient associated to the change in the relative saliency by the HRC variable is positive and significant in all specifications, although the magnitude is larger for Central & Eastern Europe. Interestingly, we also find that the effect of democracy on states' adjustment of their discourses is stronger in Latin America. Greater variation in these scores in the later region could help explain such difference when these regions are analyzed separately. The rest of the control variables are not significant in both regions (see Table E1 in the Online Appendix E).

Table E1. Alternative specifications for the change in the relative saliency of rights in states periodic reports (continued on following page) [a]

	(1)	(2)[b,f]	(3) [f]	(4) [f]	(5) [f]	(6)	(7)
Change in the relative saliency	0.173***	0.160***	0.169***	0.168***	0.122***	0.173***	0.173***
by HRC (CHRC)	(16.38)	(15.91)	(16.94)	(16.87)	(5.07)	(16.43)	(16.42)
Log(GDP per capita)	0.007	0.059	-0.029	-0.034	-0.093		
	(0.09)	(0.50)	(-0.22)	(-0.36)	(-0.57)		
Openness Index	0.001	-0.000	0.001	0.002	0.004	0.000	0.001
	(1.01)	(-0.03)	(0.95)	(1.15)	(1.38)	(0.09)	(0.63)
Reporting Cycles	0.024 [c]	0.028	0.023	0.025		0.084 [c]	0.066[c]
	(0.47)	(0.46)	(0.45)	(0.49)		(1.36)	(1.11)
Government Effectiveness			0.516				
			(0.37)				
Number of years between the HRC's report and its state response				0.042*			
				(1.71)			
Naming and Shaming					0.034		
					(0.30)		
Log(Population)						-0.120*	
						(-1.78)	
Log(Gross Domestic Product)							-0.077
							(-1.41)
Constant	0.127	-0.247	0.393	0.144	0.868	2.107*	2.045
	(0.16)	(-0.23)	(0.35)	(0.18)	(0.63)	(1.90)	(1.52)
Number of observations	1198	1198	1198	1198	415	1198	1198

[a] It reports only marginal effects
[b] It includes cluster and annual effects
[c] The variable and CHRC were interacted
t-statistics in parentheses
* p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table E1. (continuing) Alternative equations for the change in the relative saliency of rights, groups or issues in states periodic reports [a]

	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12) [f]	(13)	(14)	(15)
Change in the relative saliency	0.154***	0.189***	0.164***	0.159***	0.158***	0.173***	0.159***	0.193*** [e]
by HRC (CHRC)	(16.70)	(8.05)	(16.72)	(17.42)	(17.32)	(15.19)	(17.39)	(14.07)
Log(GDP per capita)	-0.076	-0.425	-0.154	-0.148	0.019	-0.022	-0.131	-0.060
	(-0.45)	(-1.13)	(-1.03)	(-0.99)	(0.15)	(-0.16)	(-0.84)	(-0.39)
Openness Index	-0.000	0.002	0.000 [c]	0.000	0.000	0.002	-0.000	-0.000
	(-0.33)	(0.46)	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.58)	(0.88)	(-0.18)	(-0.17)
Reporting Cycles	0.070	-0.008	0.071	0.075	0.063	0.061	0.0883	0.112*
	(1.19)	(-0.05)	(1.22)	(1.29)	(1.09)	(1.04)	(1.32)	(1.70)
Political Rights Scores (PR)	0.084**	0.075	0.085**	0.085**			0.087** [d]	0.079** [e]
	(2.51)	(0.83)	(2.54)	(2.53)			(2.35)	(2.19)
International NGOs	-0.000	0.000	-0.000	-0.000 [c]	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000
	(-0.83)	(0.52)	(-0.56)	(-0.60)	(-0.79)	(-0.42)	(-0.74)	(-1.17)
Official Development Assistance	-0.000 [c]							
Commitments	(-0.02)							
Composite Index of National		-24.78						
Capability		(-0.73)						
Change in the relative saliency					-65.39**			
by HRC by the rest of countries					(-2.46)			
Region						0.117 [c]	-0.050 [d]	-0.076 [e]
						(0.72)	(-0.27)	(-0.42)
Constant	0.649	3.292	1.231	1.147	0.191	0.164	1.022	0.401
	(1.31)	(1.11)	(1.15)	(1.15)	(0.18)	(1.07)	(0.84)	(0.34)
Number of observations	1111	354	1140	1140	1140	1140	1140	1140

[a] It reports only marginal effects
[c] The variable and CHRC were interacted
[d] These variables are interacted with each other
[e] These variables are interacted with each other and all three together
[f] It includes multilevel region effect
t-statistics in parentheses
* p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table E2. Effects of Freedom House components on the change in the relative saliency of rights, groups or issues in states periodic reports [a, b]

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Change in the relative saliency	0.169***	0.158***	0.188***	0.168***	0.175***	0.187***	0.177***
by HRC (CHRC)	(16.48)	(15.88)	(16.05)	(16.57)	(16.87)	(16.90)	(16.73)
Openness Index	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.000	0.000	-0.000
	(0.15)	(0.04)	(0.16)	(0.03)	(-0.07)	(0.10)	(-0.00)
Reporting Cycles	0.094	0.085	0.077	0.082	0.084	0.079	0.082
	(1.33)	(1.22)	(1.05)	(1.17)	(1.20)	(1.07)	(1.16)
International NGOs	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000
	(-1.08)	(-1.05)	(-0.90)	(-0.97)	(-1.15)	(-0.98)	(-1.01)
Log(GDP per capita)	0.029	0.009	0.033	-0.014	0.027	0.046	0.003
	(0.18)	(0.06)	(0.18)	(-0.09)	(0.16)	(0.24)	(0.02)
Electoral Process	0.038* [c]						
	(1.85)						
Political Pluralism and Participation		0.037** [c]					
		(2.09)					
Functioning of Government			0.018 [c]				
			(0.66)				
Freedom of Expression and Belief				0.046** [c]			
				(2.11)			
Associational and Organizational Rights					0.038 [c]		
					(1.51)		
Rule of Law						0.016 [c]	
						(0.73)	
Personal Autonomy and Individual Rights							0.040 [c]
							(1.23)
Constant	-0.181	0.011	-0.038	0.092	-0.061	-0.092	0.064
	(-0.14)	(1.33)	(-0.03)	(0.07)	(-0.05)	(-0.06)	(0.05)
Number of observations	851	851	851	851	851	851	851

[a] It reports only marginal effects
[b] All models include multilevel region effect
[c] The variable and CHRC were interacted
t-statistics in parentheses
* p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table E3. Effects of Polity components on the change in the relative saliency of rights, groups or issues in states periodic reports [a, b]

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Change in the relative saliency	0.175***	0.157***	0.173***	0.174***	0.172***
by HRC (CHRC)	(18.75)	(14.13)	(18.79)	(18.57)	(18.55)
Log(GDP per capita)	-0.033	0.021	0.067	-0.020	-0.061
	(-0.25)	(0.16)	(0.51)	(-0.15)	(-0.42)
Openness index	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	(0.12)	(0.56)	(0.31)	(0.18)	(0.16)
Reporting Cycles	0.071	0.065	0.072	0.070	0.070
	(1.24)	(1.11)	(1.25)	(1.21)	(1.21)
International NGOs	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000
	(-0.99)	(-1.05)	(-1.28)	(-0.93)	(-0.84)
Institutionalized Democracy	0.050**				
	(2.08)				
Institutionalized Autocracy		-0.051			
		(-1.34)			
Competitiveness of Executive Recruitment			0.297***		
			(1.67)		
Executive Constraints (Decision Rules)				0.073*	
				(1.67)	
The Competitiveness of Participation					0.130
					(1.57)
Constant	0.375	0.124	-0.709	0.263	0.560
	(0.35)	(0.12)	(-0.64)	(0.25)	(0.52)
Number of observations	1140	1140	1140	1140	1140

[a] It reports only marginal effects
[b] All models include multilevel region effect
[c] The variable and CHRC were interacted
t-statistics in parentheses
* p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

References

CREAMER, Cosette, and SIMMONS, Beth A. (2015). Ratification, Reporting, and Rights: Quality of Participation in the Convention against Torture. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 37(3), 579-608.

DAVIS, David R. and MURDIE, Amanda M. (2012). Shaming and blaming: using events data to assess the impact of human right INGOs. *International Studies Quarterly*, 56(1), 1-16.

GARRIGA, Carolina. (Forthcoming). Human Rights Regimes, Reputation and Foreign Direct Investment. International Studies Quarterly.

HAFNER-BURTON, Emilie M. (2013) *Making Human Rights a Reality* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE (2004) Consideration of Reports Submitted by States Parties Under Article 40 of the Covenant. Concluding observations of the Human Rights Committee. Poland (CCPR/CO/82/PO), December 2.

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE (2009) Consideration of Reports Submitted by States Parties Under Article 40 of the Covenant. Sixth Periodic Report. Poland (CCPR/C/POL/6), July 17.