

Cover Sheet (please print or type)

I. Status of Applicant, Name, and Address

Nonprofit Organization or Public Institution
(Complete nos. I and II.)
Individual Applicant (Proceed to no. II.)

Name of Organization or Institution

Address

City, State, Zip/Postal Code, Country

Institutional Contact Person, Name, Position, and
Telephone Number

II. Project Director(s)

Name

Title

Complete Mailing Address

City, State, Zip/Postal Code, Country

Telephone, Fax, E-mail Address

_____ (day)

_____ (fax)

_____ (e-mail)

III. Competition and Cycle:

Unsolicited Grants

Solicitation

A

B

Deadline for Receipt of Application

Notification Date

Spring Cycle

March 1

September 30

Fall Cycle

October 1

March 31

IV. Project Title

V. Grant Period

VI. Amount Requested

From

To

VII. Project Description Abstract (Please read instructions before completing this section. Use standard font sizes: 10 or 12 pts.)

Budget Instructions

VIII. Project Costs (in U.S. Dollars only)

The budget page shows totals, by category, of the overall budget for the project. There are two columns, one for funds requested from USIP and the other for funds already committed or anticipated from other sources. A more detailed explanation of the budget must be attached to the budget page. The detailed budget narrative should explain the anticipated expenditures in relation to the amount being requested of each donor.

1. Direct Costs

Salaries and Wages: State the amount of funds necessary to cover all personnel costs for the project (including assistants and support staff). An itemized breakdown of personnel costs should be provided in the detailed explanation of the budget. Applicants should indicate in the budget narrative whether the amount requested in this category is for salary replacement or for a salary supplement. Monies requested must correspond to the percentage of time to be devoted to the project (as indicated at no. X on page 17).

Fringe Benefits: Self-explanatory

Consultant Fees: State the amount of funds necessary for individuals who serve as consultants for the project.

Travel/Per Diem: Information describing all anticipated travel for personnel directly or indirectly involved in the program should be provided. Travel must be performed on a U.S. carrier when such service is available. The Institute will carefully scrutinize any request for travel support to ensure that it is necessary and appropriate.

Printing and Reproduction: Self-explanatory

Supplies, Materials, and Other Costs: The purchase of equipment (such as computers, equipment for reproduction, printing, and data processing) will be approved only in exceptional circumstances. The Institute may, at its sole discretion, reserve the right to request the transfer of title and the return of such equipment to itself, or some third party of its designation, if the acquisition cost of the equipment is \$500 or more and the equipment is no longer needed to carry out the purposes of the project for which funding was approved. Expenditures in this category should not include travel, per diem, salaries or other expenditures that can be associated with one of the categories listed above. **Note:** *Institute funds may not be applied toward the cost of entertainment and beverages. Food costs are allowable only as provided under per diem for individuals in travel status.*

2. Indirect Costs

The Institute does not award funds for indirect costs. This rule will be waived only in exceptional circumstances.

IX. Other Sources of Funding for the Project

The applicant should provide the source and amount of all funds committed or anticipated for the project. Committed funds should be those funds obligated for the project during the grant period (as listed at no. V on page 13). The sums of committed and anticipated funds listed under nos. VIII B and IX on page 15 must correspond.

Budget Form

VIII: Project Costs

Attach a detailed explanation of the budget. All amounts should be in U.S. dollars only.

	(A) USIP	(B) OTHER	
		I. Committed	II. Anticipated
1. Direct Costs			
Salaries and Wages	_____	_____	_____
Fringe Benefits % of	_____	_____	_____
Consultant Fees	_____	_____	_____
Travel/Per Diem	_____	_____	_____
Domestic: \$			
Foreign: \$			
Printing & Reproduction	_____	_____	_____
Supplies, Materials, & Other Costs	_____	_____	_____
2. Indirect Cost	N/A	_____	_____
3. Totals	_____	_____	_____
	(same as no. VI on p. 13)		

Total Project Costs

_____ (sum of totals in columns A and B)

IX. Other Sources of Funding for the Project

I. Committed		II. Anticipated
Source _____ Amount _____		Source _____ Amount _____
Source _____ Amount _____		Source _____ Amount _____
Source _____ Amount _____		Source _____ Amount _____

Proposal Instructions

Provide the following information in the spaces on page 17.

X. Personnel

Identify the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. Specify how much time project personnel will actually devote to the project. (For example, “Researcher A will be released from half of his/her teaching responsibilities at University X and will spend 50 percent of his/her work time on the project during the grant period; researcher B will work full time on the project from August 15 to September 30, a total of twenty three work days; assistant C will devote one day a week to the project during the first half of the project and two days a week during the second.”)

XI. Products

As noted previously, the Institute is more likely to look with favor on a proposal in which a final product of enduring value is envisioned. While grant products may be produced in languages other than English, an English translation of each product must be submitted to the Institute.

XII. Project Impact

This item assists the Institute in its efforts to avoid spending public funds for projects that may duplicate existing work. Proposals that appear to overlap previous or ongoing research or training programs should be justified. This might be done by pointing to innovations or new approaches in design, special expertise or insights offered by the applicant(s), shortcomings in existing work, or the ability to reach new or markedly different audiences.

XIII. Previous Grants and Institute Contracts

The Institute will not accept new applications from directors of USIP-funded projects unless all requirements under the previous grant have been fulfilled, including the submission of final performance reports and products. Previous grantees should also submit an additional copy of any product(s) resulting from the earlier grant. The copy of the product(s) is in addition to the work samples described on page 18.

Any applicant who has been, soon will be, or currently is, an Institute contractor should disclose that information in no. XIII of this application form. Current or prospective Institute contractors are advised to contact the Grant Program staff prior to submitting an application in order to determine their eligibility to apply for a grant.

If you have served as an Institute reviewer or panelist, please do not provide the name or date of the panel on which you served or the product you reviewed. The year of service is all that is required.

Questions X–XIII

X. Personnel. Identify project personnel and percentage of time each will devote to this undertaking.

XI. Products. What product(s) will result from this project? (Describe in detail: if a written product, provide working outline; otherwise, describe specific content.)

XII. Project Impact. How does the proposed project add to or otherwise affect existing work in this field? If your project focuses on training or education, please describe in detail your plan to evaluate the project's effectiveness in achieving its stated goals and objectives.

XIII. Previous Grants and Institute Contracts. List any previous grants from the United States Institute of Peace with which you have been involved as a principal investigator or as a participant (see instructions on opposite page). Also, list other Institute activities with which you have been, or likely will be, associated in any capacity, including contracts, consultancies, or other USIP awards.

Proposal Attachments (required for all applications)

*The following attachments **must** accompany the application.*

Complete Project Description

The complete project description should include the following items (please number all pages):

1. A detailed **narrative description**, not to exceed ten (10) double-spaced typed pages, standard font size no smaller than 10 points, which includes the following items:

- the problem or issue(s) to be addressed;
- a review of previous, related work done by you or others on this issue, and a discussion of how your project will contribute to improved understanding of the issue or problem;
- the methodology or approach to be taken;
- a work plan;
- if a book is proposed as the final product, a preliminary outline or table of contents;
- if a workshop or conference is proposed, a preliminary agenda for the event(s), including a list of tentative speakers and criteria for identifying other participants;
- if an education or training project is proposed, an evaluation plan and, where appropriate, a plan for disseminating the project's materials and for the continuation of programs beyond the tenure of the grant.

Note: *Because public funds are involved and because the Institute does not promote projects that seek to intervene in diplomatic activities or ongoing disputes, explain in detail any proposed communications with foreign governments.*

2. A **bibliography**.

Work Samples

This item seeks samples of relevant work by the project director(s). For example, applicants who seek funding to produce a film or video should provide either a sample of a similar earlier product or a script (if appropriate). Submit no more than two (2) copies of audio or video materials.

Applicants who seek funds for books, articles, or other written products should provide writing samples in related areas. Attach ten (10) copies of no more than two (2) representative writings to the application. Do not submit whole manuscripts or books as samples. Previous grantees should also submit one (1) copy of any product(s) resulting from the earlier grant as described in no. XIII on page 17.

Note: *Work samples will not be returned.*

Resumes or Vitae

Attach resumes or curriculum vitae for the primary project personnel listed at no. X on page 17. In addition, provide biographical summaries, not to exceed one page, for each individual who will play a significant role in the substantive work of the project. Resumes are not required for support staff.

Deadlines and Mailing Instructions

Application Deadlines

There are **TWO** annual cycles in the Grant Program.

Cycle	Deadline for Receipt of Application*	Notification Date
Spring	March 1	September 30
Fall	October 1	March 31

*If these dates fall on a weekend or U.S. holiday, the deadline is extended to the next business day.

Order and Submission of Material

Submit ten (10) sets of the application material collated according to the order described below.

- (1) Cover Sheet (do not attach documents in front of the cover sheet)
- (2) One copy of the Computer Disk of the Project Abstract (see instructions at no. VII on page 12)
- (3) Budget Form
- (3) Budget Explanation
- (5) Questions X–XIII
- (6) Certification Sheet
- (7) Detailed Project Description and Bibliography
- (8) Resumes or Vitae
- (9) Work Samples

Applications may be stapled or clipped. **Do not** use other forms of binding. **Do not** put in notebooks or folders.

Mailing Instructions

Mail application material to arrive no later than March 1 (Spring Cycle) or October 1 (Fall Cycle). Applications received after the deadline will be returned. Applications should be mailed to the following address:

United States Institute of Peace
Grant Program
1200 17th Street NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036-3011

The Institute will not send or accept applications by fax or e-mail.

The Grant Program is available to answer questions at (202) 429-3842 or grants@usip.org

Certification Sheet (All Applicants)

This sheet must be signed and dated by the principal institutional representative (if applying under nonprofit organization or public institution status) or by the project director(s) (if applying under individual status). By signing this form, the applicant certifies that (1) the information provided in the application is complete and accurate; (2) the applicant is not delinquent on any federal debt or debarred from receiving federal funds; and (3) the work will be conducted under drug-free workplace principles.

It is important that the certifying individual(s) realizes the seriousness of this act. Various statutes provide civil and criminal penalties for attempting to obtain public funds by fraud or deception, and the Institute will not hesitate to act decisively to prevent waste, fraud, or abuse in connection with its grant program and other activities.

Status—Institutional Applicants

Nondelinquency/Debarment: This institution certifies that it is not debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any federal department or agency.

Drug-free Workplace: This institution certifies that it has in place and will administer in good faith a drug-free workplace policy designed to ensure that the workplace is free from possession and use of illegal drugs.

This institution certifies that the information provided in this application is complete and accurate.

Status—Individual Applicants

Nondelinquency/Debarment: I certify that I am not delinquent in repaying any federal debt.

Drug-free Workplace: I certify that I will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensation, possession, or use of a controlled substance in conducting any grant activity.

I certify that the information provided in this application is complete and accurate.

Institutional Status

Authorizing Official for Institution

Name (print or type)

Signature and Date

Individual Status

Project Director(s)

Name (print or type)

Signature and Date

II. Individual Applicant

Colin Irwin, Dr.

Centre for the Study of Ethnic Conflict

School of Politics and International Studies

Queen's University Belfast

21 University Square

Belfast, BT7 1NN

Northern Ireland, UK

Day +44 028 9027 3231

Evening +44 028 9022 2081

Fax +44 028 9023 5373

Mobile +44 07815 871 996

E-Mail c.irwin@qub.ac.uk

III. Solicitation B

Spring Cycle

IV Project Title

Improving Relations With, and Within, the Muslim World: Applying Lessons of Public Diplomacy from Northern Ireland

V Grant Period

1 October 2004 to 30 September 2005

VI Amount Requested

\$44,628 US

VII Project Description Abstract (200 words)

Although US agencies, institutes and other researchers around the world use public opinion polls as a tool for policy development these efforts have largely failed when it comes to public diplomacy with and within the Muslim world. However, in Northern Ireland, polling has been used successfully to help construct a consensus for the Belfast Agreement and keep the peace process moving forward. Critically new methods of working were developed that engaged with all sections of society to give them 'ownership' of the research so that the results would be taken seriously through an agreed process leading to publication. The methods have been replicated in the Balkans and could now be applied more widely in Muslim states to advance public diplomacy, improve community relations, make peace building more effective, take democratic reforms forward and strengthen good relations with the non-Muslim world. Through the collection of polling data and media reports in a selection of such states and through a series of lectures, seminars, workshops, interviews and consultations a body of information will be brought together for critical review and made available to the relevant agencies in these states and in Washington, London and Brussels. A final report will include their input.

VIII Project Cost

1. Direct Costs

Salaries and Wages

Salary replacement for the principle investigator Dr. Colin Irwin for 50 per cent of his time for one year at Spine Point 8 on the UK Academic Salary Scale, £11,096 or \$22,192. Spine Point 8 is the minimum replacement cost for Dr. Irwin under present contracts.

Fringe Benefits

Self-explanatory

Plus USS pension at 14 per cent (£1,553) and National Insurance at 10 per cent of sub total (£1,265) for a total of £2,818 or \$5,636.

Consultant Fees: None

Travel/Per Diem

For study trips to London, Brussels and Washington at the beginning and end of the project and field trips for lectures, seminars, interviews and consultations in states with Muslim populations in South East Europe, the Middle East, Asia and the Far East.

Return flight Belfast to London	£100 x 2	£200
Return flight Belfast to Brussels	£200 x 2	£400
Return Flight Belfast to Washington	£400 x 2	£800
Return flight Belfast to South East Europe & Middle East		£1500
Return flight Belfast to Asia and Far East		£1500
Budget for Air Travel		£4,400 or <u>\$8,800</u>
Per Diem at £50 per day for 60 days		£3,000 or <u>\$6,000</u>

The 60 days is broken down at roughly 10 days in London at no cost to the project because Dr. Irwin will stay with family there. Twenty days in Brussels and Washington. Twenty days in South east Asia and the middle East and 20 days in Asia and the Far East.

Printing and Reproduction

For purchasing and copying reports, questionnaires, and newspaper reports as well as printing consumables such as cartridges and paper.

£500 or \$1000

Supplies, Materials and Other Costs

For computing consumables, telephone, mobile telephone and recording media such as mini-disks

£500 or \$1000

2. Indirect Costs: USIP N/A

IX Other Sources of Funding for the Project: None

X Personnel

Dr. Irwin will work on the project for one year and although only 50 per cent of his time will be officially allocated to this project he will be spending the remainder of his time working on related public opinion and public diplomacy projects that will complement the work undertaken with this USIP grant.

XI Products

A combination of lectures, seminars, workshops, consultations and reports which will be published on the project website and, in consultation with USIP, a final report. See Project Abstract above and Project Description below for more details.

XII Project Impact

The project is designed to review and address current failings in public opinion research and public diplomacy using methods developed by Dr. Irwin in Northern Ireland. See Project Abstract above and Project Description below for more details.

XIII Previous Grants and Institute Contracts: None

**IMPROVING RELATIONS WITH, AND WITHIN, THE MUSLIM WORLD:
APPLYING LESSONS OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FROM
NORTHERN IRELAND**

THE FAILURES OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AND PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

With a view to making US Public Diplomacy more effective the recent reports of both the US General Accounting Office¹ (GAO) and the Council on Foreign Relations² (CFR) advocated much greater use of public opinion polls. However the CFR also concluded that:

‘This report is about strategies to address those leaders and people who are touched by anti-Americanism but who remain reachable. The United States can reach these people by listening to their needs and perspectives, by initiating a genuine dialogue, and by taking into account their cultural and political realities as Washington formulates its foreign policies’.

In Northern Ireland public opinion polls were used to help the Unionist and Nationalist populations, their political leaders, the British and Irish governments and the Office of the Independent Chairman under Senator Mitchell, to have such a dialogue as part of the process leading to the Belfast Agreement, its passage in a referendum and continued efforts to work and implement it these past five years. Through pro-active public diplomacy a consensus was built for the Agreement from the top down and bottom up, from the political centre out and from the polarities in. Consequently, in Northern Ireland, the peace process has remained sufficiently robust to the extent that it could survive several periods of institutional suspension without a return to war.

The US Department of State presently undertake an average of two polls a year in most countries where they have a mission.³ But the primary purpose of these polls is to gather information on local party political strengths and weaknesses, local social and political

¹ United States General Accounting Office, U.S. PUBLIC DIPLOMACY, State Department Expands Efforts but Faces Significant Challenges, Report to the Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives, GAO-03-951, September 2003.

² Council on Foreign Relations, Finding America’s Voice: A Strategy for Reinvigorating U.S. Public Diplomacy, Report of an Independent Task Force: Peter G. Peterson, Chairman, New York, 2003.

³ United States General Accounting Office, U.S. PUBLIC DIPLOMACY, State Department Expands Efforts but Faces Significant Challenges, Report to the Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives, GAO-03-951, September 2003.

issues and international relations with an emphasis on the US and US foreign policy. Additionally the National Democratic Institute (NDI), International Republican Institute (IRI) and USAID sponsor work in support of programs for democracy and good governance that include public opinion polls often undertaken in collaboration with the State Department. Finally other US institutes, such as the Council on Foreign Relations,⁴ the Carnegie and Ford foundations,⁵ numerous university institutions with US grants,⁶ United States Institute of Peace (USIP),⁷ Academy for Educational Development (AED)⁸ and others all undertake polls on an ad hoc basis. Significantly a June 2003 Pew Research Center 20-nation public opinion survey found extremely unfavorable attitudes towards the United States, and recent U.S. government efforts at public diplomacy to turn the tide met with only mixed success.⁹

Domestic researchers in the Middle East also use public opinion polls to explore relations between the different communities in their states, for example Jordan,¹⁰ Palestine¹¹ and Israel¹². The states of Central Asia have also been the subject of a recent study that

⁴ For example the Council on Foreign Relations are presently working with the Center for Global Peace at American University, Washington, to explore inter-community attitudes in Azerbaijan. They have indicated their interest to use the Northern Ireland methods for the next phase of their project. Additionally, at CFR's suggestion, representatives of the Kashmir Study Group have indicated their willingness to discuss their work with Dr. Irwin whenever a meeting can be arranged.

⁵ For example the Ford Foundation sponsored a program of public opinion research in Israel and Palestine in the late 1990s. See Segal, J. M., *A Solution for Jerusalem Grounded in the reality of the Attitude of the Israeli and Palestinian Publics*, The International Conference on Jerusalem, The Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House), London, December 13, 14, 15, 1999.

⁶ For example see Tessler, M., Director, Center for Political Studies, University of Michigan, 'Middle East Attitudes and Opinions', *Communicating with Skeptical Audiences – Challenges and Solutions*, The Yaffe Center, Ann Arbor, October 16-17, 2003.

⁷ For example, following a presentation of the Northern Ireland 'peace poll' methods at a United States Institute of Peace seminar USIP researchers are now exploring the possibilities of using these methods as part of their Philippines Facilitation Project.

⁸ For example the Academy for Educational Development recently undertook some polling work in support of the Sri Lankan peace process and would like to adopt the Northern Ireland methods in any future work.

⁹ William K. Fung Multidisciplinary Workshop on: 'Communicating with Skeptical Audiences - Challenges and Solutions,' Ann Arbor, Oct 16-17.

¹⁰ Center for Strategic Studies, University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan:
<http://www.css-jordan.org/polls/peace/joris94/index.html>

¹¹ Development Studies Program (DSP), Birzeit University
http://home.birzeit.edu/dsp/DSPNEW/polls/opinion_polls.htm and the Jerusalem Media and Communication Centre (www.jmcc.org).

¹² The Tami Steinmetz Center For Peace Research, Tel Aviv University (<http://spirit.tau.ac.il/socant/peace>).

explores the prospects for reformers and Islamists using public opinion polls as the principle tool of enquiry and analysis.¹³

But none of these polling activities presently support public diplomacy in a sustained way as has been done in Northern Ireland. Either because they must focus on the immediate task of gathering information; or developing local democratic institutions; or, as independent enterprises, they fail to connect to local and international political events in a way that can effectively advance the attitudes, values and social relationships they are researching. The CFR observed that:

‘The imperative for effective public diplomacy now requires much wider use of newer channels of communication and more customized, two-way dialogue and debate as opposed to ‘push-down’, one-way mass communication.... U.S. foreign policy is too often communicated in a ‘push-down’ style that does not take into account the perspectives of the foreign audience or open the floor for dialogue and debate.’

The research methods developed in Northern Ireland do not make this mistake and it is the objective of this program of research to make the lessons learnt in Northern Ireland available to US agencies and research practitioners in Muslim states so that they can better achieve the kind of balanced dialogue sort as an ideal by the Council on Foreign Relations.

LESSONS FROM THE NORTHERN IRELAND PEACE PROCESS

Nine surveys of public opinion were conducted in support of the Northern Ireland peace process between April 1996 and February 2003.¹⁴ Critically the questions for eight of these polls were drafted and agreed with the co-operation of party negotiators to enhance the peace process by increasing party inclusiveness, developing issues and language, testing party policies, helping to set deadlines and increase the overall transparency of negotiations through the publication of technical analysis and media reports.

¹³ International Crisis Group, *Is Radical Islam Inevitable in Central Asia? Priorities for Engagement*, Asia Report No. 72, Osh/Brussels, 22 December 2003.

¹⁴ Irwin, C. J., *Using Public Opinion Polls to Support Peace Processes: Practical Lessons from Northern Ireland, Macedonia, Cyprus, Israel and Palestine*, in Guelke, A. (Ed.), *Democracy and Ethnic Conflict: Advancing Peace in Deeply Divided Societies*, Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke and New York, 2003.

In so far as it was possible the parties were given ‘ownership’ of the research so that they would take the results seriously. Each party to the negotiations nominated a member of their team to work with the facilitator on the polls. Questions were designed to test party policies as a series of options or preferences from across the social and political spectrum. The moderating voice of ‘the silent majority’ was thus given expression while extremist positions were demonstrated to be marginal with little cross community support. All questions, options and preferences had to be agreed as not being partisan or misleading. From the drafting of these questions to sample design, ethics, timing and publication, the program of research was decided by all the parties and they were encouraged to take the work in any direction that they believed would be helpful to the peace process.

The focus of the research was on problems, solutions and policies for conflict resolution as opposed to inter-community attitudes and values. ‘Beauty contest’ questions were avoided unless it was clear that running such a question would help to solve a problem. Questions were ‘pitched’ at what most people could understand most of the time NOT at the lowest common denominator. All relevant issues were covered and NO irrelevant issues. All the results were also made publicly available effectively giving the wider community a ‘seat at the negotiating table’ and exposing the research to the highest standards of peer review and public scrutiny. There was no ‘cherry picking’ of the results. Everyone had to deal with all the issues that were raised as part of what became a ‘pre-negotiation problem solving exercise’.

This inter-track activity, that extended across the political spectrum to all the major parties, civil society and the public at large helped to build support for the Belfast Agreement that lead to a 72 per cent ‘yes’ vote in the 1998 referendum and a subsequent period of increasing stability and peace. In an effort to internationalise this work a book ‘The People’s Peace Process in Northern Ireland’ has been published by

Palgrave/MacMillan;¹⁵ numerous papers and reports have been made available on the project web-site at peacepolls.org; a poll was completed in Macedonia¹⁶ and feasibility studies undertaken in Cyprus, Israel and Palestine¹⁷ in 2002 and the EC have agreed to fund a poll in Bosnia in 2004.¹⁸ Clearly the Northern Ireland methods can be applied elsewhere but getting the producers, users and consumers of public opinion research to adopt new practices seems to be more problematic.

METHODS AND APPROACH

Although the main thrust of the Northern Ireland work was to resolve problems and find agreement between parties engaged in a conflict it should be noted that the first in this series of polls dealt with all the key aspects of Catholic and Protestant community relations and policies for peace building.¹⁹ Similarly the poll completed in Macedonia dealt with the recent conflict there and relationships between the Muslim Albanian community and the Orthodox Christian Serb community. When it came to the design of these polls all manner of persons were involved in drafting the questions. Not just politicians but also civil servants, university lecturers, journalist, community leaders etc.

Running a new series of public opinion polls in a selection of Muslim states is beyond the scope of this project in terms of both costs and time. However, by critically examining the public opinion research already undertaken in a number of countries with Muslim majorities or minorities and by exploring issues and developing questions important to the leaders of civil society in these states it will be possible to complete a critical report

¹⁵ Irwin, C. J., *The People's Peace Process in Northern Ireland*, Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke and New York, 2002.

¹⁶ Irwin, C. J., Forum Macedonia: An Opinion Poll and its Implications, *The Global Review of Ethnopolitics*. vol. 2, no 1, September 2002, at www.ethnopolitics.org.

¹⁷ Irwin, C. J., Forum: Northern Ireland – International Negotiation Best Practice: A Reply to Hancock, Noel and Kennedy-Pipe, *The Global Review of Ethnopolitics*. vol. 2, no 3-4, March/June 2003, at www.ethnopolitics.org.

¹⁸ Dr. Irwin has been asked to undertake this poll to provide a base line study of community relations in Bosnia as an analytical foundation from which to develop scripts for BBC broadcasts in their 'Our Town, Our Future' project. The work is being completed in collaboration with the Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe (CDRSEE), Thessaloniki, Greece who also supported the public opinion work in Macedonia.

¹⁹ Irwin, C. J., Chapter 5, 'Peace Building and Public Policy' in *The People's Peace Process in Northern Ireland*, Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke and New York, 2002.

of recent public opinion research and how it can be made more effective as a tool for public diplomacy. Questions of improved community relations, peace building, democratic reform and relations with the external non-Muslim world will all be explored as may be appropriate. This work will be completed by firstly identifying the most suitable states for study, secondly undertaking a program of field work and thirdly disseminating the findings of the research as follows:

Identifying target states

1. London has become a centre for public diplomacy in the Middle East. Dr. Irwin has been a guest at roundtables and conferences held at the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA) at Chatham House. At the present time a series of roundtables is being organised jointly by the RIIA Middle East Program and the Media Outreach Centre (MOC) of the US Embassy in London.²⁰ Dr. Irwin will continue to attend these events and consult with participants as to the best states and which institutions would most like to participate in a more advanced program of public diplomacy and public opinion research. To this end the Centre for Strategic Studies at the University of Jordan has already invited Dr. Irwin to Amman.

2. Brussels hosts a number of important research institutes as well as being the centre for the development of European foreign policy. Several Balkan states, Cyprus and Turkey have Muslim populations and are candidates or potential candidates for membership of the European Union. Dr. Irwin has met with staff of the European Conflict Prevention program, has standing invitations to meet with EU staff throughout the Balkans and was introduced to the staff at the research offices of the International Crisis Group (ICG) by Senator George Mitchell. Through these contacts a review of potential states for further study will be made with a view to improving public opinion research to advance public diplomacy in Muslim countries of particular interest to the EU and ICG.

3. Washington takes a very special interest in the Middle East as well as good relations with the Muslim world in general. With this point in mind Dr. Irwin will consult with

²⁰ *The US and Reform in the Middle East*, Roundtable organised by the Royal Institute of International Affairs in cooperation with the Media Outreach Centre of the Embassy of the United States in London, Chatham House, 11 December, 2003.

staff at USIP as to the best states to undertake research in and which institutes to collaborate with. Work undertaken by agencies in London and Brussels will be gone over, the research priorities of, for example the RIIA and ICG will be explored and examined in the context of research presently being undertaken by US agencies and institutes. In consultation with USIP a final list of target states will be drawn up and schedule of fieldwork agreed hopefully, in collaboration with other Washington based institutes, as USIP may consider most appropriate.

Fieldwork

1. Collection of public opinion poll data will be undertaken in London, Brussels, Washington and in the target states. Some materials are available 'on the net' but copies of questionnaires, results, reports and media coverage often are not and will have to be copied from researches who have a particular interest in such work.
2. Seminars and roundtables are often a very good way to initiate discussion of the critical issues that need to be explored. Fortunately most people are familiar with the Northern Ireland peace process and are interested to hear about it. Using this as an 'ice breaker' it will be possible to launch into discussions about public opinion research and public diplomacy as it relates to local issues in the target state.²¹
3. Interviews will be completed with the users of public opinion research in the target states. This will include journalists, social scientists, community leaders, politicians and civil servants who, as consumers of such research must use it to develop policy and advance public diplomacy. These interviews will focus on both what has worked for them and what has failed in terms of, for example, the quality of the research, the relevance of the questions, access to the media and problems of reporting, impact on policy and shifts in public opinion.
4. Consultations will be freely given whenever opportunities arise.²² Although it may not be possible to undertake a series of new polling projects as part of this program of research it will be possible to help others apply the Northern Ireland methods to their own

²¹ Dr. Irwin has presented lectures, seminars and workshops at conferences and institutes in Europe, the Middle East and North America.

²² In addition to analytical and methodology papers all the questionnaires and statistical reports have been made available on line at www.peacepolls.org.

work. This will be encouraged and it is to be hoped that a number of polls and associated media reports will be much improved and made more effective during the life-time of this research grant. Such results can be included in the final project report.

5. Feasibility studies can be completed where it is considered appropriate.²³ These studies will answer the series of questions posed in the ‘peace polls check list’²⁴ and could be undertaken in a few target states²⁵ of particular interest where future work may be under consideration or where USIP may already be engaged in a related project.²⁶

Dissemination and final report

1. A draft report will be produced reviewing all the research undertaken in the target states. Conclusions will be drawn as to how these states can improve their research and associated public diplomacy and how institutions based in London, Brussels and Washington can help to facilitate such improvements while making their own work more effective.

2. Closing seminars will be held in London, Brussels and Washington to allow feedback to be included in the final report.²⁷ Some of the conclusions of the report may challenge established practice as it relates to public opinion research undertaken by institutions with government affiliations and how their work can be applied to advance public diplomacy. Policy issues that may be addressed might include:

²³ At the request of the Greek/Turkish Forum a feasibility study was completed on the island of Cyprus in 2002. The work took about two weeks to complete and the report was sent to the Forum members and more recently to USAID after they expressed an interest in commissioning a new poll as part of their ‘Integrated Education, Information and Communication Strategy for the BDP’.

²⁴ Irwin, C. J., How Public Opinion Polls Were Used In Support Of The Northern Ireland Peace Process, *The Global Review of Ethnopolitics*. vol. 1, no 1, September 2001, 62-73. at www.ethnopolitics.org.

²⁵ With the support of local NGOs the work for the Macedonian poll was completed in a little over a month.

²⁶ For example G. Eugene Martin at USIP has expressed an interest in using the Northern Ireland ‘peace poll’ methods as part of the *Philippines Facilitation Project*.

²⁷ Dr. Irwin gave a seminar on public diplomacy and his Northern Ireland work at USIP in 2003. He has attended conferences and round tables at Chatham House and they have agreed to host a roundtable on the outcome of this project. In Brussels staff at the International Crisis Group have recommended that such a roundtable should be organised through the Centre for European Policy Studies. Dr. Irwin has met with their Director.

- The need for specialised polls run by people with appropriate political and communication skills as well as public opinion expertise.
- For these polls not to be part of wider polls but dedicated research enterprises designed to address matters of particular concern with clear research and public diplomacy objectives.
- For the work to be undertaken with local input but not with just one academic, political or community perspective.
- The need for outside facilitators to be brought in to co-ordinate the research when local representatives cannot work together to produce a common piece of work.
- The benefits of publication to make the research available to academics, journalists, and broadcasters for critical review and incorporation into other activities.
- For all the reasons made clear in the CFR report the need to create appropriate mechanisms for working with private institutions and companies on a regular basis and establish working relationships that allow distance when appropriate but also allow funding agencies to take credit for successes when appropriate.²⁸

WORK PLAN

October 2004: Set up financial arrangements and make study trips to London and Brussels to gather most recent public opinion data on Muslim states and take views on most appropriate target states for further study.

November 2004: Make study trip to Washington, gather more public opinion data on Muslim states and identify target states for further study in consultation with USIP.

December 2004 to May 2005 inclusive: Undertake fieldwork in target states: seminars, interviews, consultations and further collection of public opinion poll data (questionnaires, results, reports and media coverage).

June 2005 to July 2005 inclusive: Write up preliminary report.

August 2005 to September 2005 inclusive: Circulate preliminary report to interested parties, arrange and undertake roundtable meetings in London, Brussels

²⁸ For example the Norwegian Foreign Ministry and the Oslo Peace Research Institute (PRIO).

and Washington.

In consultation with USIP publish a final report as may be required.

PRODUCTS AND OUTPUT

During the life time of the project

1. Lectures, seminars and workshops on the Northern Ireland work will be made available to agencies, institutions the media and NGOs undertaking public opinion research in a selection of states with Muslim populations.
2. Consultation will be provided to all such practitioners with regard to research and questionnaire design, publication, dissemination and relating the work to effective public diplomacy.

At the end of the project

1. A review and critical report will be published on public opinion research undertaken in states with Muslim populations and how that work can better advance public diplomacy to improve community relations, make peace building more effective, take democratic reforms forward and strengthen good relations with the non-Muslim world.
2. Feasibility studies will be completed in a selection of such states so that other agencies, institutions and NGOs can initiate programs of public opinion research and public diplomacy as may be required.
3. Seminars will be arranged and undertaken in Washington, London and Brussels in collaboration with the USIP, the International Institute for International Affairs, Chatham House and the Centre for European Policy Studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

References have been provided in the footnotes where required and a full bibliography will be produced as part of the final report.

Alterations to the layout of this form will invalidate the application.



FULBRIGHT APPLICATION FOR SCHOLARS AND FELLOWS 2004/2005

Please carefully read the instructions before completing this form. All answers should be completed in black ink and be typewritten or legibly printed in BLOCK CAPITALS. If this form has been downloaded from the website, please complete using a different font. **Alterations to the layout of this form will invalidate the application.** This form should be used for applications for the following scholarships and fellowships (please tick the appropriate box). The closing date for each award is indicated in parentheses.

- Fulbright-**AstraZeneca** Research Scholarship (12/3/04)
- Fulbright Fellowship in **Cancer** Research (26/3/04)
- Fulbright **Distinguished Scholar** Awards (12/3/04)
- Fulbright-**Robertson Visiting Professor** in British History (9/1/04)

Applicants for all other Fulbright Awards must use a different form

PERSONAL DETAILS

Title Dr. Surname Irwin First name(s) Colin John

Address Centre for the Study of Ethnic Conflict, School of Politics and International Studies, 21 University Square, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, BT7 1NN, Northern Ireland, U. K.

Tel. Number Day +44 028 90273231 Eve. +44 028 90222081 E-mail c.irwin@qub.ac.uk

Date of birth DD/MM/YY 22/05/446 Town and country of birth Eastbourne, England, U. K.

Citizenship British and Canadian Have you studied in the United States before? Yes

PROPOSED US RESEARCH AND INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION

Title of US Project and brief synopsis of statement of purpose: Public Opinion, Public Diplomacy and the Resolution of Conflicts. New methods of analysis and public diplomacy developed and applied to the negotiation and implementation of the Belfast Agreement will be refined and developed for use by US institutions to analyse conflicts, improve community relations and strengthen public diplomacy both domestically and abroad.

Title of appointment 'Visiting Research Scholar' Dates Sept 04 to Aug 05

Name and title of host contact Prof. P. Ginsberg (Psychology Utica), Prof. B. Dayton (Maxwell Syracuse)

Department Maxwell and Newhouse Schools at Syracuse University and Department of Psychology and Communications at Utica College

Institution Utica College of Syracuse University and Syracuse University at Syracuse

Address 1600 Burrstone Road, Utica, NY 13502, USA and Syracuse University, Global Affairs Institute,

Maxwell School, 346 Eggers Hall, Syracuse, NY 13244, USA Telephone number (315) 792-3176

Applications will not be accepted after the appropriate closing date. Refer to list on p.1 for deadlines.

REFERENCES:

Name and address of first referee	Name and address of second referee
Prof. Adrian Guelke School of Politics and International Affairs Queen's University Belfast Belfast, BT7 1NN, Northern Ireland, UK.	Prof. Fiona Chew Newhouse School of Public Communications Syracuse University, 215 University Place Syracuse, NY 13244-2100, USA

EDUCATION AND TRAINING:

Institution Syracuse University	Dates 1981 to 1985
Qualification Doctor of Philosophy in Social Science	

Institution University of Manitoba	Dates 1978 to 1981
Qualification M.A. Interdisciplinary (Anthropology, Religion and Philosophy)	

Institution NA	Dates _____
Qualification _____	

CAREER HISTORY

PRESENT POSITION RESEARCH FELLOW Date post taken up 2002

Department Centre for the Study of Ethnic Conflict, School of Politics and International Studies

Address Queen's University Belfast, Belfast BT7 1NN, Northern Ireland, UK.

Responsibilities The management and undertaking of applied research projects on conflict resolution in Northern Ireland and abroad

NOTABLE HONOURS:

2000-2002, Queen's University of Belfast Foundation Fellowship. 1987-1989, Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) Post Doctoral Fellowship. 1985-1987, Killam Post Doctoral Fellowship, Dalhousie University. 1981-1985, SSHRC Doctoral Fellowship. 1980-1981, SSHRC Special M. A. Scholarship. 1979, Dean's Honour List, University of Manitoba.

MEMBERSHIP OF PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES:

Member, World Association of Public Opinion Research (WAPOR)

EXTRACURRICULAR /COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES :

1993-94, briefs on rights of Northern Ireland children to attend integrated schools submitted to the UN and UNESCO. 1977-78, advisor on land claims and native issues for Inuit Associations in Canada. 1978, Royal Cruising Club Medal for Seamanship for single-handed navigation of Northwest Passage. 1976, voyage from Scotland to Iceland, Greenland and Hudson's Bay. 1972-1973, completed crossing of Arctic North America by dog team. 1966, British Sub-Aqua Club Duke of Edinburgh Scientific Award for underwater living experiment. 1964, recovered 4500 year old dug out canoe from Poole Harbour, U.K.

Alterations to the layout of this form will invalidate the application.

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS:

Home institution None

Host institution Accommodation, office space and workshop honourarium

Personal funds None

Other Resources to cover costs of public opinion poll

Please list members of your family who will accompany you to the United States:

Name	Relationship to you	Date of Birth	Country of Birth	Nationality
None				

What means of financial support will be available to the individuals listed above in the United States?
NA

PUBLICITY SURVEY

To assist the Commission with future publicity, please indicate below where you heard about the Fulbright Scholarships. Circle **one** only.

Current Employer/Institution
US Educational Advisory Service
Journal (which one) _____
Newspaper (which one) _____
Other Publication (which one) _____

Colleague
US Institution
Internet (which web site) _____
Other (please clarify) US Department of State
Judith S. Siegel
Deputy Coordinator for Thematic Programs
International Information Programs

Applications will not be accepted after the appropriate closing date. Refer to list on p.1 for deadlines.

Alterations to the layout of this form will invalidate the application.

DATA PROTECTION

Personal data on this form will be held and processed on a computer. A summary of the data protection policy, including the rights of subjects for which data is held, is obtainable from the British Programme Manager at the Fulbright Commission.

Applications will not be accepted after the appropriate closing date. Refer to list on p.1 for deadlines.

Alterations to the layout of this form will invalidate the application.

**STATEMENT OF PURPOSE
FULBRIGHT AWARD 2003/2004
Do not exceed this page.**

Name of applicant Colin John Irwin

Project title Public Opinion, Public Diplomacy and the Resolution of Conflict

NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Nine surveys of public opinion were conducted in support of the Northern Ireland peace process between April 1996 and February 2003. Critically the questions for eight of these polls were drafted and agreed with the co-operation of party negotiators to enhance the peace process by increasing party inclusiveness, developing issues and language, testing party policies, helping to set deadlines and increase the overall transparency of negotiations through the publication of technical analysis and media reports. This activity, that extended across the political spectrum to all the major parties, civil society and the public at large helped to build a consensus for the Belfast Agreement that led to a successful referendum and subsequent period of increasing stability and peace. In an effort to internationalise this work a book 'The People's Peace Process in Northern Ireland' has been published by Palgrave/MacMillan; numerous papers and reports have been made available on the project website at peacepolls.org; a poll was completed in Macedonia in 2002 and feasibility studies undertaken in Cyprus, Israel and Palestine.

US INTERNATIONAL POLLING ACTIVITY IN STATES SUBJECT TO CONFLICT

US institutes and NGOs, such as the Council on Foreign Relations, the Carnegie and Ford foundations, numerous university institutions with US grants, United States Institute of Peace, Academy for Educational Development and others all undertake public opinion polls on an ad hoc basis. Additionally the National Democratic Institute, International Republican Institute and USAID sponsor work in support of programs for democracy and good governance that include public opinion polls often undertaken in collaboration with US universities and institutes, NGOs and the US Department of State. But none of these polling activities presently support peace processes in a sustained way as has been done in Northern Ireland. Either because they must focus on the immediate task of gathering information; or developing local democratic institutions; or, as independent enterprises, they fail to connect to local and international political events in a way that can effectively advance the peace process they are researching. Critically, as the innovators of new approaches to the problems of conflict resolution, academics, their students and NGOs working on peacebuilding projects lack the kind of peace polling skills used so successfully in Northern Ireland.

PROGRAM OF RESEARCH TO BE UNDERTAKEN AT SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY IN SYRACUSE, UTICA, WASHINGTON AND NEW YORK

1. Lectures, seminars and workshops on the Northern Ireland work will be made available to students and staff at Syracuse University in the Maxwell School: Global Affairs Institute, Program for the Analysis and Resolution of Conflict and International Relations Program; the Newhouse School of Public Communications; the Departments of Psychology and Communications at Utica College of Syracuse University and through Syracuse University's facilities in New York City and Washington D.C. to the news and broadcast media, NGOs and US Government departments and institutions.
2. A case example will be completed in Utica, NY using the Northern Ireland 'peace poll' model. There, in cooperation with the local newspaper, UC students and faculty will explore community relations with regard to the existing population and the recent immigrant population of Bosnian Muslims following the Balkans war.
3. Ongoing cooperative research will be explored and developed between the relevant institutes and programs at Syracuse University, NGOs, US Government departments and institutes and Queen's University Belfast.

US AND UK FUTURE COOPERATION AND UNDERSTANDING

The US and UK, as close allies, share a very great deal of both public and private research as it relates to matters of security, peace processes, political development, public opinion and public diplomacy around the world. By making the latest techniques, developed in Northern Ireland, available to US researchers they will be able to improve the quality and effectiveness of their public opinion survey work often undertaken in cooperation with UK and other partners. It is to be expected that US public opinion research will consequently be more relevant and have greater influence, both domestically and abroad, as has been the case with the polls completed in support of the Northern Ireland peace process.

Signature _____ Date _____

Applications will not be accepted after the appropriate closing date. Refer to list on p.1 for deadlines.

INFORMATION ABOUT VISAS

Successful applicants will be issued with a J-1 visa with the assistance of Fulbright House. This is the only type of visa that Fulbright scholars may use to enter the United States of America.

Two Year Home Residency Rule:

The present rules governing the J-1 visa impose certain restrictions upon recipients of a United States government grant under an exchange visitor programme. Fulbright scholarships are a part of this programme. Candidates should note that on completion of their study programme, they will be required to return to their home country for a cumulative total of two years to be eligible to apply for an immigrant or temporary worker's visa or for permanent residence in the United States. This rule is rarely waived. This does not affect visits to the US as a tourist.

Spouses, Partners and Children of Exchange Visitors:

The Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Affairs (BCIS) of the United States grants separate visas for spouses, children and co-habiting partners of J-1 exchange visitors. For information please visit the US Embassy Website at http://www.usembassy.org.uk/cons_web/visa/niv/exchange.htm

STATEMENT BY APPLICANT

1. I certify that I am not entitled to/do not hold US citizenship.
2. I have read and understood the visa regulations concerning this award and agree to abide by them if my application is successful.
3. I understand that should I choose to take members of my family with me to the United States, their maintenance will not be the responsibility of the Fulbright Commission.
4. I undertake to return to the United Kingdom on the expiration of my grant in order that my American experience may be of benefit to the United Kingdom.
5. I certify that the information given in this application is complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge.
6. I undertake to inform the Commission of any change of address or of any change of plan which may affect my application.

Signature _____ Date _____

Alterations to the layout of this form will invalidate the application.

STATEMENT BY EMPLOYER (Applicable only to those scholarships where the employer is expected to continue paying the applicant's salary for the duration of the award):

I have read and endorse this application for a Fulbright Award 2003/2004 and believe that the candidate meets the requirements for such an award. I am qualified to certify that if successful, the applicant's salary will be paid for the duration of the award.

Name NA

Position/Title

Address

Signature

Date

Return EIGHT (8) copies of this application, collated & stapled, to the Fulbright Commission.

Applications will not be accepted after the appropriate closing date. Refer to list on p.1 for deadlines.

Alterations to the layout of this form will invalidate the application.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION FOR A FULBRIGHT AWARD 2003/2004

Please return this form to British Programme Manager, Fulbright House, 62 Doughty Street, London WC1N 2JZ (Fax: 020 7404 6834) by the closing date advertised. For reasons of economy, no acknowledgement will be sent, but the Commission thanks you for your assistance.

NAME OF APPLICANT _____

Name of award _____ Closing date of award _____

Members of the selection board would appreciate receiving, in confidence, your views on the applicant. In particular, they would like to have your assessment of his or her professional ability, capacity for independent study and research, seriousness of purpose and adaptability. Your comments on the advantages that the proposed visit is expected to have on the applicant, the home institution and US/UK relations in the applicant's field of interest would be especially helpful. Please use **ONE** side of the paper only and type if possible.

Name _____ Signature _____

Position/Title _____

Address _____

Applications will not be accepted after the appropriate closing date. Refer to list on p.1 for deadlines.