The Ill-Treatment & Torture (ITT) Data Collection Project

Country-Year Data User's Guide

Courtenay R. Conrad
Department of Political Science, University of North Carolina at Charlotte
courtenayconrad@uncc.edu

Will H. Moore
Department of Political Science, Florida State University
will.moore@fsu.edu

19 July 2011

Version 2.1

1   Executive Summary

The Executive Summary provides "at a glance" data about the ITT country-year data. Please refer to the Table of Contents below for more detailed information about using the ITT country-year data.

- Concept: Amnesty International (AI) allegations about the level of government torture and ill-treatment throughout a country in a given year.

- Spatial Domain: All sovereign countries with a population of at least one million in 1995.

- Temporal Domain: 1995-2005.

- Units of Observation: Country-Year.

- Country-Year Data Sets

  - Country-Year (CY) Data

    * Highest alleged Level of Torture (LoT) throughout the country in that year.

  - Country-Year-Agency (CYAoC) Data

    * Highest alleged Level of Torture (LoT) throughout the country in each Agency of Control (AoC) in that year.

  - Country–Year–Victim Type (CYVT) Data

    * Highest alleged Level of Torture (LoT) throughout the country against that Type of Victim (VT) in that year.

  - Country–Year–Agency–Victim Type (CYAoCVT) Data

    * Highest alleged Level of Torture (LoT) throughout the country in each AoC against that VT in that year.

- How is ITT data different from the Hathaway & CIRI torture data?

  - The ITT co-PIs view ITT data as conceptually distinct from existing data on torture like that from Hathaway and CIRI. Further, the sources coded by Hathaway and CIRI are considerably smaller than those coded by ITT. As such, they are not substitutes that should be used for robustness checks, but instead are conceptually and operationally distinct data.

  - ITT codes allegations made by Amnesty International (AI). ITT explicitly assumes that the actual level of torture is unobservable and thus focuses on what can be measured reliably and validly: an IO's allegations of state torture and ill-treatment.

- – Hathaway and CIRI code the level of torture as reported by the US Department of State and AI. There is no discussion about whether these data represent actual levels of abuse or something more akin to allegations of abuse.

- – The ITT Country–Year (CY) data set has the same structure as Hathaway and CIRI. It records the highest Level of Torture for that country in that year. Unlike Hathaway and CIRI, however, ITT codes AI's *allegations*, and does so only when it is an allegation of generalized abuse that is observed throughout the country. If the allegation is limited to a specific agency or a specific region of the country, the ITT CY data do not record an allegation. This unit of observation distinction is not made by Hathaway and CIRI.

- – ITT's CYAoC, CYVT, and CYAoCVT data sets contain data on the alleged Level of Torture by Agency of Control, Type of Victim, and the intersection of these two. Neither Hathaway nor CIRI disaggregates the data that way.

- – Turning to source documents, ITT performed content analysis on all AI publications whereas Hathaway and CIRI code Annual Reports only.

- For more information, refer to the Table of Contents below and visit the ITT Country-Year Data FAQ at the ITT Data Page.

Contents

2 Introduction

This User's Guide describes data produced by the Ill-Treatment and Torture (ITT) data collection project using the country-year as the unit of observation. The ITT project also produces data that use the allegation of ill-treatment and/or torture as the unit of observation. Those data will be released in late 2011 and described in a separate User's Guide.

The ITT project reports information on allegations of ill-treatment and torture made by Amnesty International (AI) from 1995 to 2005. The text source for this project includes Amnesty International *Annual Reports*, press releases, and Action Alerts (Amnesty International, 2006). Unlike other data collection projects focusing on state torture, ITT is conceptually interested in the allegations of torture leveled by one International Non-Governmental Organization (INGO): Amnesty International. An allegation is an English sentence (or set of sentences) that makes the claim that a given state has violated the human right to the integrity of the person delineated in the CAT.

This User's Guide unfolds as follows. We define torture and then identify the spatial-temporal domain of the data. The following section describes the key variables: Level of Torture (LoT), Agency of Control (AoC), Victim Type (VT), and Restricted Access. We then identify the four different versions of the data. The distinction among the four data sets is in the level of disaggregation across the three key variables. In the final section we briefly identify the country-identification variables included in the data so that researchers can readily merge ITT data with other data sets.

2.1 Definition of Torture

We adopt the definition of torture set forth in the UN Convention against Torture (CAT):

> torture means any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or a confession, punishing him for an act he or a third person has committed or is suspected of having committed, or intimidating or coercing him or a third person, or for any reason based on discrimination of any kind, when such pain or suffering is inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity. It does not include pain or suffering arising only from, inherent in or incidental to lawful sanctions.

The population at risk to torture is those people detained by the state. That is, the ITT project codes allegations of torture leveled at the state, or in those instances where AI specifically states that a group is acting at the state's behest, a non-state actor working as an agent of the state.

AI has a reputation for only making allegations after having carefully vetted them (see, for example, the discussion in Clark, 2001). Indeed, if AI later learns that a published allegation was false, the organization publishes a retraction (and we do not include those allegations in our data). Nevertheless, this does not mean that AI's allegations are a record of states' violations of the CAT. This is so for two reasons.

First, AI's allegations are necessarily an undercount of any state's violations of the CAT. By their very nature, violations of the CAT are generally hidden from public view. Indeed, many (in some countries, most?) instances are likely hidden from superiors: the state itself does not have a complete catalog of all of its employees' violations of the CAT.

Second, AI is a strategic organization that must balance two goals often in tension with one another: (1) accurate reporting so as to maintain their hard won credibility, and (2) the need to raise donations of cash and volunteer labor. Interest in the impact of these cross-pressuring incentives upon the activities of INGOs is growing (e.g., Berkovitch and Gordon, 2008; Lake and Wong, 2009; Gourevitch and Lake, 2011), and it is important to recognize that these incentives lead INGOs like AI to invest their effort where they expect it to be most effective. As a consequence, AI is unlikely to report allegations with equal probability across all countries. In other words, AI's allegations are not what statisticians would call an `unbiased undercount` of states' violations of the CAT. Instead, both AI's access to information as well as AI's assessment of where it is most likely to mobilize its members to bring pressure to bear make a difference. As such, users who wish to use the ITT data to study the performance of states (rather than to study NGO naming and shaming processes) will need to include in their analyses consideration of the strategic process that influences AI's publication of allegations.[1] What that process looks like (i.e., what the candidate list of variables would be) is, of course, a theoretical question, and we leave it to ITT CY data users to develop theories about that process (though we anticipate making our own efforts in our studies that use the data).

2.2 Spatial-Temporal Domain

The ITT project coded data on all sovereign countries with a population of at least one million in 1995. We coded all AI publications that made allegations about circumstances in

---

[1]For statistical modelers this means that they will at minimum need to control for variables that measure the concepts that the user believes would influence AI's allegation decisions.

those countries during the years 1995-2005, inclusive.[2] AI publishes Annual Reports, topical and regional Reports, Press Releases, and Action Alerts. ITT included all four types of documents in its content analysis.[3] Note that a sovereign country is one in which the state is able to exercise a minimal level of sovereignty. We code states' use of torture, not the use by non-state actors. As such, we exclude country-years during which no state was able to exercise a minimal level of sovereignty over the territory that prior to, or hence, is recognized by the international system. Operationally we follow the CIRI project's example and adopt coding rules used by the Polity IV project. When Polity IV assigns a country years a value of -66 or -77 we exclude that country-year from our CY datasets. A value of -66 in Polity indicates foreign occupation and a value of -77 indicates state failure (central government collapse). We assign a value of -999 to our LoT variables when a foreign state occupies the country and a value of -777 when the central government has collapsed.

3   Description of Key Variables

In this section, we describe the key variables included in the ITT CY data: Level of Torture (LoT), Agency of Control (AoC), Victim Type (VT), and Restricted Access (Rstrctaccess).

3.1   Level of Torture (LoT)

Our main CY measure, Level of Torture (LoT), is an ordinal scale based upon that of Hathaway (2003): it records the highest level of alleged torture that occurred in a given country in a given year. Unlike both the Hathaway data and the CIRI data, however, we limit our country-year unit of observation LoT data to allegations that can be readily classified as country-year unit of observation allegations. How might one distinguish an allegation about state abuse at the Country-Year as opposed to a sub-national or sub-annual unit of observation? The CY data include only those general allegations advanced by AI that characterize the violation as occurring *nationwide* over the course of an *entire year* for a particular AoC. For example, an AI allegation reading, "Torture was widespread in prisons in 1996" would be coded at the country-year unit of observation. AI also advances many allegations that ITT refers to as Specific Allegations. These are precise claims about abuse in a specific place that is smaller than the country itself or that occurred during a limited period of time less than the year. Because AI makes both types of allegations on a regular basis, ITT makes note of this distinction by producing two types of data sets. For

---

[2]For additional detail on how our coders identified reports, please consult our Coding Rules (Conrad and Moore, 2010*b*, pp. 14-16).

[3]By way of comparison, Hathaway and CIRI code only Annual Reports.

example, when AI singled out a single prison,[4] or the police in a particular region or city,[5] or military torture occurred only during the three weeks following an election,[6] we did not code an allegation for the country-year unit of observation.[7] To be clear, when AI made a general allegation that seemed to indicate that these violations were occurring throughout the country over the course of the year it is included in the ITT CY data sets. When AI makes a specific allegation about abuse in a particular prison or region of the country, or suggests that the abuse was limited in temporal scope to a particular set of weeks or months ITT does not include that in the CY data sets. Instead, those allegations are coded as part of the Specific Allegation (SA) data sets that will be released in late 2011.

In ITT's CY data, LoT can take 12 values, summarized in Table 1. We discuss the processes by which these values were assigned by ITT coders below.

Table 1: Level of Torture (LoT) Values

0	No Allegations
1	Infrequent Allegations
2	Some Allegations
3	Frequent Allegations
4	Widespread Allegations
5	Systematic Allegations
-6	Continued Allegations
-7	Improved Allegations
-8	Worsened Allegations
-99	Allegation, No LoT
-777	Central Government Collapse
-999	Foreign State Occupation

---

[4]e.g., "Allegations of ill-treatment were widespread at Alcatraz."

[5]e.g., "Police brutality was reported in the western district of Baltimore."

[6]e.g., "Members of the military were accused of torture against opposition following the election."

[7]These allegations will be released with the *allegation* as the unit of observation.

3.1.1 Coding LoT Data

Following Hathaway (2003) our coders were instructed to assign the values listed below when AI used one of the following terms in the allegation.[8]

- 0 = No Country-Year Allegations

- 1 = "Infrequent"/"Sporadic"/"Occasionally"

- 2 = "Some(times)"/"Several"/"Many"/"Numerous"/"Often"/"Other"

- 3 = "Frequent"/"Routinely"/"Considerable"/"Commonplace"/"Regular"/"Pattern"

- 4 = "Widespread"/"Extensive"/"All but a few"/"Prevalent"/"Generalized"/"Indiscriminate"

- 5 = "Systematic"/"Consistent"/"Endemic"/"Systemic"/"Throughout"

AI also makes reference to the change in the level of violation without referencing the status quo level prior to the change. For example, AI might allege that the situation in a country's Immigration and Detention Centers "improved" or "worsened." When in the year prior AI had made an allegation, we are able to assign an LoT value by adjusting the value in the previous year for that AoC. To address this we adopted the following approach. For "Continued," we assigned the same value as assigned for the previous year. For "Improved," we subtracted one from the preceding year's value; for "Increased," we added one.[9]

Unfortunately, the preceding year did not always have a value: in many cases that value was missing (either because AI had not made an allegation in that year or because the year with one of these values was 1995, the first year in our dataset). In those cases we assigned the following values:

- -6 = "Continued"/"Persisted"/"Further"/"Sustained"/"Remained"/"Still"

- -7 = "Improved"

- -8 = "Increased"/"Worsening"

AI sometimes makes an allegation about circumstances in a given AoC but does not identify a level of violation (i.e., LoT). We thus have an additional value

---

[8]Coders were further instructed to use their judgment when AI used a term not on the list and even to consult a thesaurus to determine which level is most appropriate for a given term not on the list.

[9]It may be the case that AI reports changes in LoT that are greater than one according to our ordinal scale. We chose to add and subtract one to our LoT values (rather than two or three) as a conservative estimate of the change.

- -99 = "Allegation, No LoT"

3.1.2 Using LoT Data

Our assignment of the negative values on LoT described above is consistent with AI's reporting practices, but those values present econometric challenges to researchers interested in using the ITT CY data. Although we encourage scholars to choose solutions to these challenges based on their research questions, we suggest four options for dealing with the negative values on LoT.

First, and perhaps most simply, researchers can take a "complete cases" or "listwise deletion" approach and drop from their data observations in which LoT has negative values. ITT does not endorse this option and instead recommends an approach like one of the following three which takes advantage of information that we do have to estimate these missing values.

Second, users might recode all instances in which LoT is negative as missing values and employ various methods of multiple imputation (e.g., Amelia, ICE) to "fill in" the missing values. One benefit of multiple imputation is that it allows users to include estimates of the uncertainty of the imputed values in their econometric models. The multiple imputation literature strongly suggests that this is the best option (e.g., Little and Rubin, 1987).

Third, and less elegantly, one might assume that the central tendency (i.e., median or mode) of each country's observed values is the best estimate of the missing values. This is a strong assumption and less desirable than multiple imputation.

Fourth, one could take a more sophisticated approach to estimating the missing value given other values. For example, one could work out the values that can logically be ruled out given the sequence that either precedes and/or follows the missing value and then develop a rule for selecting among the remaining logically possible values.[10]

3.2 Agency of Control (AoC)

Agency of Control (AoC) indicates the domestic institution and/or agent(s) that is responsible for a given allegation of torture. As noted above, ITT codes allegations in which an individual detained by the state is victimized. We define a state agent as "someone in the state's employ or someone who is directed by a person in the state's employ to act on behalf of the state" (Conrad and Moore, 2010a, p. 10). Coders were instructed to choose values

---

[10]We thank Peter Haschke for this suggestion.

on Agency of Control based on the official role of the agent, rather than the role he/she is acting in. For example, police officers working temporarily as prison guards are coded as police on AoC.

Values on AoC are not mutually exclusive; this is so because AI sometimes alleges that a detainee or prisoner is abused by more than one government agency. Sometimes this occurs because personnel from more than one agency are present at the same location and time, but in other instances this occurs because a person is abused first by the agency that conducted an arrest, later by an agency that conducted interrogation, and perhaps even later by the agency that held the person in prison.

Coders were instructed to code AoC only when AI explicitly identified the agency responsible for an abuse. AI often made allegations without identifying a specific agency.[11] Our coders assigned a value of "Unknown" when this occurred. Including the "Unknown" value, we distinguish among six state agencies that might control detainees.

- Unknown

- Police[12]

- Prison[13]

- Military[14]

- Intelligence[15]

- Immigration Detention[16]

- Paramilitary[17]

---

[11]AI's allegations most frequently fail to identify an AoC in their *Annual Reports*.

[12]Coders were instructed to code Police (and not Prison) for allegations conducted by police officer, but occuring in holding cells.

[13]Coders were instructed to code Prison (and not Police) for allegations in which the victim was abused in pre-trial detention.

[14]Absent other information, coders were instructed to code gendarmes and military police as Military.

[15]Coders were instructed to code only civilian intelligence services as Intelligence and to code military intelligence services as Military.

[16]Immigration detention centers include immigration and border control agents of the state.

[17]Allegations regarding paramilitary groups are only coded if AI indicates within an individual document that a group has at least the tacit approval of the state government. Coders were instructed to code Militias as Paramilitary units, but only if AI explicitly indicates that the group has at least the tacit approval of the state government.

3.3 Victim Type (VT)

The ITT project produced a typology to code the target victimization as reported in AI's documents. Our typology distinguishes among the economic, social and/or political groups that AI's allegation suggests the victim is a member. It is influenced by Rejali's (2007) tripartite typology of the state's motive for ill treatment and torture: criminal investigation, national security interrogation, and social control. We added a fourth type—state agent (as defined above)—as we encountered it in several documents and did not feel that it fit well in any of the other three categories. If a friend/family member of a detainee is tortured in an effort to hurt the detainee, absent other information we code the victim type based on the identity of the original detainee.

Like those for Agency of Control, values on VT are not mutually exclusive. The reason is that victims often exhibit more than one identity. For example, a theft suspect in Brazil who is a street child fits both the Criminal and the Marginalized Individual types.

Coders were instructed to code VT only when AI explicitly identified the type of victim in a given allegation. Many AI allegations do not provide sufficient information to permit coders to assign a value across these four types,[18] so we also have an "Unknown" value, which reflects that AI did not report sufficiently detailed information about the type of victim. Including the "Unknown" value, we distinguish among five victim types:

- Unknown

- Criminal[19]

- Dissident[20]

- Marginalized Individual[21]

---

[18]We also code information on allegations in which AI refers to a victim as a prisoner of war or POW. Such a characterization is rare, however, and we do not release a value for POW in our final data.

[19]One believed to have contravened statute, excluding crimes that are considered threats to national security. We do not code Victim Type as Criminal in instances where a victim has broken a law that is in opposition to the articles in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Absent other information, we consider Prison Populations (pre- and post-sentence) to be Criminals. Asylum seekers being deported were coded both as Marginalized Individuals and Criminals because we assume the State would not remove them if they were legal aliens.

[20]One believed to be a threat to the state or be willing to engage in illegal activity to challenge policy. Note that we consider Prisoners of Conscience, Human Rights Defenders, and Protestors to be Dissidents unless otherwise noted in the report. We also consider individuals who AI notes have been disappeared as Dissidents. Terrorists were coded as both Criminals and Dissidents. Guerrillas were coded as Dissidents only. In countries where AI notes that the government persecutes the news media, we code members of the press as Dissidents.

[21]Member of a marginalized group. We assign a victim as a member of a marginalized group if he/she is tortured by the state for the purpose of social control (i.e., humiliation or other punishment to establish

- State Agent[22]

3.4   Restricted Access

Restricted access (Rstrctaccess) is a binary variable assigned a value of one in any year for which AI published a statement that it, or another INGO, had difficulty gaining access to detainees in that country. At a minimum, we recommend using this variable as a control in any statistical analyses that use AoC or LoT as a dependent variable. Rstrctaccess is coded as follows:

- 0 = No INGO Comment on Lack of Access

- 1 = INGO Comment on Lack of Access

4   Country-Year Datasets for Download

We produced four ITT datasets that use variations of the country–year as the unit of observation. The first includes similar information as that found in Hathaway (2003) or Cingranelli and Richards (2010): the highest level of violation reported by AI in that country for that year.[23] We call this the Country–Year (CY) dataset.

Second, we have a Country–Year Agency of Control (CYAoC) dataset that records the highest level of violation reported by AI for a given Agency of Control (AoC) in that country for a given year. The AoC is the state agency responsible for detaining the person or people AI identifies as the victim(s).

Third, ITT has produced a Country–Year Victim Type (CYVT) dataset which records the the highest level of violation reported by AI against a given type of victim.

Fourth, we have data that combines the AoC and VT data (CYAoCVT), reporting the highest level of violation reported by AI for the intersection of each AoC and VT. Below we

---

that [1] her/his behavior was inappropriate and [2] that the state can abuse her/him with impunity), rather than for the collection of information. We consider Immigrants to be Marginalized Individuals, except in the case of Illegal Immigrants, who are both Marginalized Individuals and Criminals.

[22]Victim Type is only coded as State Official when a state agent is abused by other agents of his/her home country (e.g., member of the military or sitting judge).

[23]Our decision to take the highest value is consistent with Hathaway (2003). The differences between our data and the Hathaway (2003) and Cingranelli and Richards (2010) data are discussed above.

describe the variables included in each dataset.

4.1   Country-Year (CY) Data

The CY dataset has 1,661 cases and is comprised of six variables:

- `cowccode`
- `iso3numeric`
- `iso3alpha`
- `year`
- `LoT`
- `Rstrctaccess`

The `LoT...` variables is the highest LoT alleged by AI for that country in the relevant year.

4.2   Country-Year, Agency of Control (CYAoC) Data

The CYAoC dataset has 1,661 cases and is comprised of 12 variables:

- `cowccode`
- `iso3numeric`
- `iso3alpha`
- `year`
- `LoTUnknown`
- `LoTPolice`
- `LoTPrison`
- `LoTMilitary`
- `LoTIntelligence`

- `LoTImmigrationDetention`

- `LoTParamilitary`

- `Rstrctaccess`

Each of the `LoT...` variables is the highest LoT alleged by AI for the AoC represented by the `...` for that country in the relevant year. For example, if the content analysis conducted by ITT's coders produced three CY allegations about torture by a country's police, and two of them alleged that torture often occured, while one of the allegations claimed the torture was widespread, the data will record a LoT value of 4 rather than 2 `LoTPolice`.

4.3   Country-Year, Victim Type (CYVT) Data

The CYVT dataset has 1,672 cases and is comprised of 10 variables:

- `cowccode`

- `iso3numeric`

- `iso3alpha`

- `year`

- `LoTUnknown`

- `LoTCriminal`

- `LoTDissident`

- `LoTMarginalized`

- `LoTStateAgent`

- `Rstrctaccess`

Each of the `LoT...` variables is the highest LoT reported by AI for the the type of victim (VT) represented by the `...` for that country in the relevant year. For example, if the content analysis conducted by ITT's coders produced two CY allegations about torture against dissidents, and two stated that dissidents were "often" abused while the other reported that victimization of political prisoners was widespread, the data will record a LoT value of 4 rather than 2 for `LoTDissident`.

16

4.4 Country-Year, Agency of Control, Victim Type (CYAoCVT) Data

The CYAoCVT dataset has 1,672 cases and is comprised of 40 variables:

- cowccode
- iso3numeric
- iso3alpha
- year
- LoTUnkUnk
- LoTUnkCrim
- LoTUnkDiss
- LoTUnkMarg
- LoTUnkStAgt
- LoTPolUnk
- LoTPolCrim
- LoTPolDiss
- LoTPolMarg
- LoTPolStAgt
- LoTPrisUnk
- LoTPrisCrim
- LoTPrisDiss
- LoTPrisMarg
- LoTPrisStAgt
- LoTMilUnk
- LoTMilCrim
- LoTMilDiss

- `LoTMilMarg`

- `LoTMilStAgt`

- `LoTIntelUnk`

- `LoTIntelCrim`

- `LoTIntelDiss`

- `LoTIntelMarg`

- `LoTIntelStAgt`

- `LoTImmUnk`

- `LoTImmCrim`

- `LoTImmDiss`

- `LoTImmMarg`

- `LoTImmStAgt`

- `LoTParaUnk`

- `LoTParaCrim`

- `LoTParaDiss`

- `LoTParaMarg`

- `LoTParaStAgt`

- `Rstrctaccess`

Each of the `LoT...` variables is the highest LoT reported by AI for the the conjunction of the AoC and the VT represented by the `...` for that country in the relevant year.

5   Merging ITT with other Data

The four ITT country-year datasets are available on the ITT project website in Stata data and .csv (ASCII) format. To facilitate the use of ITT data with other datasets we have included three country identifier variables.

- `cowccode`

- `iso3alpha`

- `iso3numeric`

The `cowccode` variable is a revised version of the Correlates of War (http://www.correlatesofwar.org/) Country Codes.[24] We have made a minor revision to those codes: the COW value of 666 is changed to 665.

The second identifier, `iso3alpha` is the three letter code assigned to each country by the International Standardization Agency. Those values are listed here: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISO_3166-1_alpha-3.

The third identifier, `iso3numeric` is the three number code assigned to each country by the International Standardization Agency. Those values are listed here: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISO_3166-1_numeric.

6 Data Quality: Reliability, Validity & Replication

ITT has conducted an initial intercoder reliability analysis which show that the data described here have the following Proportion of Overall Agreement, $P_O = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{C} \sum_{k=1}^{K} n_{jk}(n_{jk-1})}{\sum_{k=1}^{K} n_{jk}(n_{jk-1})}$, which has a range from zero to one where zero represents no agreement and one represents perfect agreement (Ubersax, 2009), that ranges from 0.771 to 0.821.

- Level of Torture (LoT): 0.761

- Agency of Control (AoC): 0.918

- Victim Type (VT): 0.739

- Restricted Access: 0.919

ITT plans to produce a full intercoder reliability analysis of all of the ITT data sets and post it on the ITT website.

---

[24]As of this writing the official COW Country Codes are available here: http://www.correlatesofwar.org/COWStatelist.xls.

For those interested in replication of the data, the Coding Rules used to produce the data are described in detail in Conrad and Moore (2010a). The data produced by the content analysis were further processed as described in Conrad and Moore (2010b). Users should find the information contained in this Guide sufficient for their purposes, but are welcome to consult those documents for further information. At a date to be determined, all of the raw files produced by the project will also be made available on the project website, thus making it possible for anyone to replicate our data collection effort.

References

Amnesty International. 2006. *Amnesty International's Country Dossiers and Publications, 1962-2005.* Leiden: IDC Publishers.
URL: *http://www.idcpublishers.com/ead/ead.php?faid=127faid.xml*

Berkovitch, Nitza and Neve Gordon. 2008. "The political economy of transnational regimes: The case of human rights." *International Studies Quarterly* 52(4):881–904.

Cingranelli, David L. and David L. Richards. 2010. "The Cingranelli-Richards (CIRI) Human Rights Dataset.".
URL: *http://www.humanrightsdata.org*

Clark, Ann Marie. 2001. *Diplomacy of Conscience: Amnesty International and Changing Human Rights Norms.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Conrad, Courtenay R. and Will H. Moore. 2010*a*. *The Ill-Treatment & Torture (ITT) Data Project Coding Rules & Norms.* Merced and Tallahassee: Ill Treatment and Torture Data Project.
URL: *http://faculty.ucmerced.edu/cconrad2/Academic/Under_the_Hood_files/*

Conrad, Courtenay R. and Will H. Moore. 2010*b*. *The Ill-Treatment & Torture (ITT) Data Project Data Cleaning Manual (Step 3 Stata CYA).* Merced and Tallahassee: Ill Treatment and Torture Data Project.
URL: *http://faculty.ucmerced.edu/cconrad2/Academic/Under_the_Hood_files/*

Gourevitch, Peter and David A. Lake. 2011. Credible Ethical Action. In *TBA*, ed. Peter Gourevitch and David A. Lake. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hathaway, Oona A. 2003. "The Cost of Commitment." *Stanford Law Review* 55:1821–1862.

Lake, David A. and Wendy H. Wong. 2009. The Politics of Networks: Interests, Power, and Human Rights Norms. In *Networked Politics: Agency, Power, and Governance*, ed. Miles Kahler. Ithaca: Cornell University Press pp. 127–150.

Little, R.J.A. and D.B. Rubin. 1987. *Statistical Analysis with Missing Data.* New York: J. Wiley and Sons.

Rejali, Darius. 2007. *Torture and Democracy.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Ubersax, John. 2009. "Raw Agreement Indices.".
URL: *http://www.john-uebersax.com/stat/raw.htm*