

The Ill-Treatment & Torture (ITT) Data Project

Coding Rules & Norms

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

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

Coders (as of March 2010):

Jamie Arntson-Kynn, Claudia Artiles, Eyal Bar, Matt Carter, Jill Haglund, Emma Longster, Marlee McCleary, Jessica Meija, Brynne Miller, Jessica Montgomery, Chelsea Moore, Bryan Present, Terry Rydz, Grace Signorelli, Maggie Spicer, Hannah Tarrien, Karina Van Ginkel, Delina Wright, Eric Zerkel.

5 May 2010

Version 5.0

This project has received support from the National Science Foundation (NSF); the Department of Political Science, Florida State University; the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts, University of California at Merced; and the Department of Political Science; University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

Contents

1 Introduction	5
1.1 What Constitutes A Torture Allegation?	7
1.1.1 Definition of Torture	9
1.1.2 Definition of State Agent	10

1.1.3	Definition of Detainment	10
1.2	Units of Observation	11
1.3	Level of Certainty	13
2	General Coding Instructions	14
2.1	Long Documents About Regions (Not Individual Countries)	16
3	Description of Specific <i>and</i> Country-Year-Agency Allegation Variables	17
3.1	ISO3 Alpha Country Code	17
3.2	COW Country Code	17
3.3	ISO3 Numeric Country Code	18
3.4	AI Index Number	18
3.5	Source Title	18
3.6	Source Date	18
3.7	Source Page	19
3.8	Source URL	19
3.9	Duplicate	19
3.10	First AI Index Number	21
3.11	Year Begin	21
3.12	Year End	21
3.13	Location of Torture	22

3.14 Order of Magnitude of Victims	23
3.15 Specific Number of Victims	24
3.16 Name(s) of Victim(s)	25
3.17 Type of Victim	25
3.18 Motive Behind Torture (Why?)	26
3.19 Expectation Torture Has/Will Occur	28
3.20 Ill-treatment/Abuse Mentioned	28
3.21 Unknown Torture	30
3.22 Scarring Torture	30
3.23 Clean/Stealth Tortures	31
3.24 Torture Death	32
3.25 Agency of Control	33
3.26 Formal Complaint Filed	35
3.27 Investigation of Torturers	35
3.28 Outcome of Investigation	36
3.29 Location of Adjudication/Mediation	37
3.30 Outcome of Adjudication/Mediation	37
3.31 Trans-Border Torture	38
3.32 Destination	39
3.33 AI Negates Allegation	39

3.34 Source	40
3.35 Coder	40
4 Description of Variables coded only for Country-Year-Agency Allegations	40
4.1 Level of Torture (Country-Year-Agency)	41
4.2 AI Comments on Access (Country-Year)	42
4.3 Location of Lack of Access	42
5 Coder Notes	43

1 Introduction

This coding project will produce a dataset that contains information to help researchers answer four questions about state torture: How many victims of torture?; What government agencies torture?; What types of torture are used?; and What is the state response to torture? To do so the project codes data on four primary concepts: Incidence, Perpetrators, Motive, and Judicial Response.

Each of these concepts can be measured cross-nationally via content analysis. Content analysis “is a research tool used to determine the presence of certain words or concepts within texts or sets of texts.”¹ The text source for this project is Amnesty International (AI) *Annual Reports*, press releases, and Action Alerts ([Amnesty International, 2006](#)).

This codebook describes instruments used to measure characteristics of allegations of torture leveled by AI from 1995-2008.² It describes the coding rules you will follow when assigning values to the variables described below and contains hyperlinks to documents that can assist with coding. If you read this document on a computer you can click on the links to clarify many questions.

As a brief overview, you will be assigned a country and a year to code (e.g., Estonia, 1999). You will first consult the list of UN member states [here](#) and verify that the country is a UN member. If it is not, please notify Conrad ASAP. Assuming that the country is listed as a UN member, coders will go online and read background information about the country (e.g., the Wikipedia entry, the CIA’s World Factbook entry). Having familiarized yourselves with some basic information about the country you will visit the relevant AI websites and identify all of the documents AI published about the country for the relevant year.³ You will then read each of the AI reports: it is important to read through all of the reports before doing any coding. Having read through the publications you will then code reports that contain one or more allegations of torture. You will “code” by making judgments about the appropriate value to assign to each of the several dozen variables and recording those values in a spreadsheet. Many of the variables will be left blank for any given allegation. In some cases, more than one value can be entered for a variable (coders will separate these in the cell by using commas, such as: 1,3,4). You will also make specific notes about any questions.

We will have a weekly coding meeting. The purpose of the meetings is to review questions and discuss problems. At the meetings coders will also receive assignments for countries and years to code. Prior to each meeting coders will send via email attachment the spreadsheet and coder questions for their assignment from the prior meeting. The coders’ notes are the

¹“[An Introduction to Content Analysis](#),” Writing@CSU website, accessed 3 June 2009.

²As of 1 May 2010, we are coding through 2005 only

³As described below, the Annual Reports document the preceding year (e.g., the 1999 Annual Report describes circumstances in each country during 1998, not 1999).

primary basis for discussion at the meeting. Attendance at the meetings is required. We are aware that coders may need to travel for school or personal reasons, and recognize that some coders may experience a “crunch time” during the semester. At the beginning of the semester, we will ask each coder to submit via email requests for time off from coding. Should something unanticipated arise we ask that you notify us as soon as is reasonable so we can plan accordingly. This project is supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF), the United States’ premier source of tax payer funding for research, and we share a fiduciary responsibility to the US Congress, as well as the US tax payer, to complete this project on time and on budget. Failure to attend meetings and/or notify us about an inability to complete assigned work will be grounds for dismissal from the project.

Content analysis is challenging: coders must read text and make judgments, based on rules, about whether or not to code a given variable, and when that variable is coded, about which value to assign. We have spent two semesters, working with 10 coders, creating the rules (aka instruments) listed in this codebook. As you can see, the rules are complex, and coders will need to be trained. Further, data is only valuable when it can be replicated: the purpose of an instrument is to ensure that different people using that instrument will record the same value when they use the instrument to measure the same item. We will thus require that trainees code at a given level of proficiency before the spreadsheets they submit become part of the dataset.⁴ Further, coders’ work will be evaluated periodically to ensure that they are continuing to code at a given level of proficiency.

When training and/or coding you will encounter reports that you are uncertain about how to code. Your first inclination might be to contact Conrad or Moore, or perhaps one of your fellow coders, and ask them their opinion how to code the report. **DO NOT DO THIS.** We created the Coder’s Notes system for precisely this circumstance. If you are having trouble deciding whether and/or how to code a given report then one of three things are going on: the coding rule is not sufficiently clear, *or* you have not yet mastered it, *or* you are being sloppy. If the instrument is not sufficiently clear, we need to improve it. If you have not mastered the instrument or are being sloppy, then we need a mechanism to help you learn it better or incentivize you to sharpen up. The Coder’s Notes, describe below, is a mechanism that addresses all three of these possibilities.

In the remainder of this section, we first define terms, describe the AI documents that we use for content analysis, and then describe the two units of observation over which we code variables for torture allegations. We also describe where to locate AI documents and a Level of Certainty variable that we code for many of our variables. In the second section, we turn to a description of the coding rules for each variable.

⁴While training coders will code real AI documents. However, as this is practice, the spreadsheets they submit will not become part of the dataset. As such, trainees need not be concerned that they might “get it wrong.” Trainees are naturally going to make errors while they learn how to use the coding rules.

1.1 What Constitutes A Torture Allegation?

This project takes an events data approach to content analysis. Events data record, within a given spatial and temporal domain, an event taken by an actor toward a target, and record the date on which the event occurred. Our event of interest is an alleged act of state torture. State torture occurs when the perpetrator is an agent of the state, the victim is a person under the state's control, and the alleged abuse meets the definition of torture in the UN Convention Against Torture (CAT). For the purposes of our project AI documents serve as the source of allegations of state torture. Below we define, and distinguish among, five terms: allegation, report, document, torture, and detainment.

This project is interested exclusively in *allegations of state torture*. Let us begin by distinguishing the terms *allegation* and *report*. For this project *allegation* is the concept that we are coding. We observe allegations by reading *reports* of allegations. A *report* is an English statement (i.e., clause, sentence, paragraph, or other group of sentences). For this project one finds reports of allegations in AI *documents*. *Documents* are published collections of paragraphs issued by AI. Coders are thus searching for *allegations* (of state torture) by identifying *reports* in the text of AI *documents*.

We define a torture allegation as a *unique experience* occurring to each detained (group of) person(s). By *unique experience* we are referring to the torture experience: the type of torture, the government agency responsible, and so on. More specifically, a unique experience—what you will code as a torture allegation—is one in which the victim(s) have experienced the same treatment and therefore have the *exact* same values on the following variables:

- Location of Torture
- Victim Type
- Motive for Torture
- Expectation of Torture
- Ill-Treatment/Abuse
- Unknown Torture
- Scarring Torture
- Clean/Stealth Torture
- Torture Death
- Agency of Control
- Formal Complaint Filed

- Investigation of Torturers
- Outcome of Investigation
- Location of Adjudication
- Outcome of Adjudication
- Trans-Border Torture
- AI Refutes Allegation

For example, a report that ten criminal prisoners who were beaten would be coded as one allegation against ten victims. But a report about four criminal prisoners who were beaten along with six dissident prisoners would be coded as *two* allegations, one against four criminal victims and one against six dissident victims. **Hint:** Each of the variables listed above is mutually exclusive. In the event that you find yourself wanting to code more than one value for one of these variables, think about whether you should in fact be coding more than one allegation instead.

A reported allegation will often be spread across several sentences or even paragraphs. In addition, the same alleged torture will sometimes be reported in multiple documents (with different details available, though sometimes the details are the same). That is why it is important to first read through all of the AI documents for a given country-year before doing any coding for that country-year. Doing so will give you a rough idea of the extent to which reports are repeated or augmented both within and across documents.

TRICKY BIT: We do not code *implicit* allegations of torture or ill-treatment. For example, we do not assume an allegation in situations in which AI encourages a country to pass laws to decrease torture or ill-treatment. We do not code as torture situations in which a court-ordered sentence goes awry and leads to pain and suffering. For example, court-ordered lethal injections that result in suffering before death are not coded as torture.

As explained in more detail below we distinguish between two types of torture allegations: a specific claim for which the prisoner-detention is our temporal unit, and another for which the country-year-agency is our unit of observation (see sections 1.2 and 3). A unit of observation is a concept that describes a “case” over which one collects data. When you open the spreadsheet you will note that there are three sheets: the first is where you record values of variables for allegations at the prisoner-detention unit of observation; the second is where you record values of variables for allegations at the country-year-agency unit of observation; and the third contains a list of the COW country codes (all described below). On our spreadsheet each row represents a unit of observation (or case).

1.1.1 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 of people at risk to torture is those people detained by the state. Each (group of) detainees at risk can be coded as a victim(s) of torture only once for any given period of detention. This rule was used in the case of *Hilao v. Marcos* (1996), brought to the U.S. 9th Circuit Court of Appeals: “In the case of *Sison*, it seems clear that all of the abuses to which he testified—including the eight years during which he was held in solitary or near-solitary confinement—constituted a single course of conduct of torture.”

Our project distinguishes among three types of torture that fall under this definition: ill-treatment (including inhumane or degrading treatment), scarring torture, and clean/stealth torture. Please see sections 3.20, 3.22, and 3.23 for discussions of each of these types. In many reports the type of torture will not be noted (please see section 3.21). Note that AI documents will report many atrocities and violations of the physical integrity rights of a person that fall outside the scope of our project. For example, we do not code reports of disappearances and killing unless AI specifically notes that the victim was tortured. Absent a report that an act constituted ill-treatment, or scarring or clean/stealth torture as defined below, general “human rights abuses” are not coded.

TRICKY BIT: Sometimes AI will report that evidence that would lead a reasonable person to infer that torture took place. For example, if AI says that “at least” three people were tortured, it can be assumed that *more than* three people were likely tortured, although it is not clear the exact number. As another example, AI might report that nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) found instruments of torture (e.g., electric wires for administering shocks, clubs for beating) in places of detention. We code these reports as torture allegations.

TRICKY BIT: We do not code situations in which a state agent ignores and/or permits a non-state agent to engage in torture or ill-treatment.

TRICKY BIT: We code allegations of torture and ill-treatment, even in cases where countries pass domestic laws permitting such activities.

1.1.2 Definition of State Agent

A state agent is 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. We rely on AI’s reports to determine whether the perpetrator is an employee of the state. When the report refers to soldiers, police officers, prison guards, intelligence officials, politicians, judges, etc. as a perpetrator, it fits our definition of state torture. In the cases of paramilitary and other like groups, we code their violations if AI specifically notes that they are working at the behest of the state.

TRICKY BIT: In some cases, the state chooses an agent (often another prisoner) to perform acts of torture on another individual. We code these reports as allegations. However, we do not code situations in which the state derelicts its duty and that leads to “prisoner on prisoner” conflict. For more details, see section 3.25.

TRICKY BIT: In “failed states” (e.g., Somalia, Sierra Leone, Lebanon, Afghanistan, Liberia, etc.), it will sometimes be unclear whether a given clan or group is in control of the government. In these cases, questions should be submitted in your coder’s notes, and we will deal with them on a case by case basis. *Please also highlight the row of these allegations in your Coding Sheet.* Although we do not automatically code allegations against the “government” in failed states, we do code Trans-Border torture against governments that extradite citizens to failed states where they are tortured or ill-treated (or at risk for either treatment).

1.1.3 Definition of Detainment

We do not code allegations of torture perpetrated by people other than government officials (or their agents). To distinguish state torture from other torture we focus on the identity of the perpetrator of the alleged act and her relationship to the victim. In order for allegations of torture to enter our data set, victims must be under the control of an agent of the state (e.g., police officer, soldier, prison official, or someone AI alleges to be operating on behalf of the government).⁵ Individuals are considered to be under state control when either 1) the state (or its agent) takes custody of a person, or 2) when the state (or its agent) targets an individual or group and deprives them of their liberty for a period of time. Alleged state torture can *only* occur after the state takes someone into its custody.

⁵By agent of the state we mean an official in the state’s employ, or someone who has been designated by such an agent to act on the state’s behalf.

For example, imagine a protestor who is whacked over the head with a club by a police officer who then moves on to whack other protestors. Based on the aforementioned definition of detainment, we do not consider the protestor to have been detained. Although a report that someone was whacked over the head while in custody constitutes a torture allegation, in this case the state did not take the person into custody. When AI reports that agents of the state restricted a (group of) person(s)' freedom of movement, even for a period of a few minutes, and then subjected that (group of) person(s) to treatment outlawed under the CAT, we code the allegation. For example, police beatings of protestors are coded if individual protestors are individually targeted and removed from the crowd before mistreatment occurs.

We assume detainment has occurred in two instances. First, if key words like “torture” and “ill-treatment” are used in a broad, generalized statement about a particular country, we assume detention has occurred. Second, if AI notes that a (group of) person(s) was “released,” coders can assume that he/she was detained prior to the release.

Coders should only code torture allegations when they are *certain* that an individual or group of individuals has been detained. Questionable cases are not coded in our data.

TRICKY BIT: We code torture occurring during wartime, but only if victims were detained as defined above and were subject to abuse at the hand of a state official.

TRICKY BIT: We do not assume that participation in the military (whether conscripted or voluntary) constitutes detainment. As a result, general abuse in the military should not be coded in our data. However, if for example, a military officer further detains another member of the military (e.g., in a confined space) and abuses him/her, we code that incident as an allegation.

1.2 Units of Observation

As noted above, we adopt an events data approach to collecting data on torture allegations. The event of interest to our project is an allegation of torture. The unit of observation is, specifically, an allegation about torture committed against a (group of) detainee(s). Each (group of) detainee(s) is at risk to torture only once per period of continuous detention.

We distinguish between two units of observation that we refer to as *specific* and *country-year-agency* allegations. The distinction between these two units of observation involves the breadth of their spatial-temporal domain. Country-year-agency allegations are allegations about the general use of (a) torture (technique) across a given country throughout a given year by a given government agency (if specified). They are more general in nature than specific allegations, and they apply only to reports that describe torture occurring across the

entire country over the entire year. Reports that refer to torture occurring within a limited time (i.e., less than a year) or space (e.g., a region, a specific prison) are not country-year-agency allegations. Specific allegations are coded from reports that describe events occurring in a limited (number of) place(s) *or* for a specific period of time (less than one year).

This distinction is important because it distinguishes our project from similar efforts by [Hathaway \(2003\)](#) and CIRI ([Cingranelli and Richards, 2004](#)). Those projects use the country-year as their unit of observation. Though it does not appear that those projects limit their coding to allegations that fall within our country-year-agency definition, we make this distinction because doing so permits us to collect data that will permit inquiries that are not possible using only a country-year unit of observation.

The spreadsheet on which you should record the values that you assign variables has two tabs upon which data may be entered: a Specific Allegations tab, and a Country-Year-Agency Allegations tab. Please choose the appropriate tab when coding allegations. Absent other information below, each of our variables is coded using both the specific allegation and the country-year-agency as the unit of observation.

Many AI documents contain multiple reports of allegations. For example, a document might describe a practice that is “widespread” throughout the country, then describe the experience of three different individuals detained by the police, two of whom were abused in four ways, and one of whom was only subject to one form of abuse. The next several paragraphs may not mention torture at all, then another report describes how a detainee in a woman’s prison was savagely beaten by guards. The fact that there are multiple reports in a document raises two important challenges with respect to recognizing the correct unit of observation to code.

TRICKY BIT 1: AI sometimes begins a paragraph with a report that contains a country-year-agency allegation and follows with several reports of specific allegations. In this case, you should code allegations at both the country-year-agency allegation unit of observation and the specific allegation unit of observation. When coding these complex reports you should use either a sheet of paper or a blank text file and take notes to help you settle how many allegations of each type (i.e., country-year-agency and specific) AI is reporting, and only enter values in the spread sheet cells after sorting it out in your notes. If you write notes on paper, please scan them and turn them in with your Coder’s Notes (see section 5), or bring the copy to that week’s meeting and we will scan them.

TRICKY BIT 2: AI sometimes begins a report about a group/multiple people, then follows up with details about specific individuals within that group. Recall that our definition of an allegation is a unique experience. These reports are tricky because the coder must determine whether all members of the group experienced the same torture, investigation, adjudication, etc. In the fictitious example above three people were abused by the police, but one of them was subjected to different abuse than the other two. Because of this that report produces two distinct allegations: the experience of the two who were abused in the same way, and

the experience of the one who was treated differently.

When you read a report that initially describes the abuse a group of people experienced, and then offers details (sometimes in a separate paragraph; sometimes in a separate document) that make it clear that some group members were treated differently than others, take out a sheet of paper (or open a blank document on a computer) and take notes on the number of people that experienced unique treatment. You should code a distinct reported allegation for each unique set of experience after determining how many unique sets of experience are reported (it is important to scan the whole document before trying to do this, as additional details sometimes are described several paragraphs down the page). As an example, if 18 people were arrested and experienced “ill treatment”, but the report indicates that six of those people were electrocuted, two of those folks were also waterboarded, and four others were placed in the Parrot’s Perch, that would produce a total of four specific allegations, each of which would be coded on its own row on the Specific sheet of the spreadsheet. The first reported allegation would be ill treatment against eight people (18 - 6 who were also electrocuted - 4 who were also waterboarded). The second allegation is the four people who were both electrocuted and ill treated, but not waterboarded. The third allegation is the two people who were waterboarded, electrocuted and ill treated. The fourth reported allegation is the four people who were both put in the Parrot’s Perch and ill treated.

Note that this can get very complicated when reports of alleged torture surface over time for the same person. Imagine that person X is arrested as part of a three person group and AI reports that the three of them are exposed to sleep deprivation and extreme cold. You are then coding documents for the same country, but two years later, and you encounter a report that describes a beating that intelligence officers gave person X. You will need to return to your original coding of the Specific allegation and break it into two allegations: one involving person X and a second one involving person X’s two compatriots. You will then code an additional specific allegation noting the new treatment (beating) to which person X was exposed. For that second unit of observation involving person X you will code the Duplicate variable = 1 (see section 3.9 for details).

1.3 Level of Certainty

We ask you to assign a “certainty” value to several variables for which you are required to use your judgment to assign a value. We use three levels of certainty: A [The information is written down in the report; $p = 1$], B [The coder is fairly certain of this information based on context; $p > 0.8$], and C [The coder is less certain about this information based on context; $p > 0.5$]. An A level of certainty indicates that the you exercised no discretion when assigning the value. You should assign a value of B when they have greater than 80% certainty in the value. Finally, you should assign a value of C if you have to guess, but are greater than 50% confident that the value you assigned is correct. When you have less than 50% confidence

in the value to assign a given variable, leave that variable (and its level of certainty) blank.

We code “certainty” values because we want the information available to researchers who may want to adjust their estimation procedures accordingly (see [Stemler and Tsai, 2008](#)). These variables were motivated by the grade that the Penn World Tables project ([Heston, Summers and Aten, 2006](#)) assigns to some of its variables.

2 General Coding Instructions

Once assigned a country you should first consult the list of UN member states [here](#) to verify that the country is a UN member. If it is not, please notify Conrad ASAP. If the country is a UN member, in order to familiarize yourself with the general political environment of a country before coding, you should read the Wikipedia entry on that country and code AI documents in the following order:

1. AI Annual Report, including appendices.
2. News Articles, Action Alerts, etc., including appendices, in their temporal order.

AI publishes its documents online at two locations. The Annual Reports are available at the [AI USA website](#). There is a drop down menu where you can select your country. After you do so you will be taken to a new page and to the upper right you will see an **Annual Reports** header, with a list of hyperlinked years below it. When you click on a year you will be taken to that country’s entry in the Annual Report for that year. Please note that AI Annual Reports include information about the *previous* year (i.e., an AI Annual Report labeled 2000 reports on violations that occurred in 1999).

To access the Action Alerts, News Releases, and other Reports visit the [AI Library website](#). Scroll down to the bottom of the page. Select the dates you need, then select the Country from the drop down menu. Leave the Issue field as All Issues and Language as English. Uncheck Audio/Video and Other, then click the Search Document Library button. These are the documents to code (in their temporal order) in your Excel Coding Sheet. Please name your Excel Coding Sheet according to the following format: “CountryYear_LastNameofCoder” (i.e., Portugal2000_Ryals). Allegations should also be listed in your Coder’s Notes (see section [5](#)).

When you have completed coding all of the documents for a given country–year, compare the documents you have coded from AI’s websites to the publications listed in the [AI Comprehensive Guide](#). Please go through this list of documents *carefully*. If you find any documents

that were published during the country-year you are coding are missing from the AI websites, please make a note of it in your Coder's Notes (see section 5). Because we are only interested in allegations from 1995 to present, coders should only code allegations that fall into that time period.

TRICKY BIT: Some variables are nominal and do not have mutually exclusive categories (i.e., they can be assigned more than one value). To enter those values in the spreadsheet use commas (e.g., 2,4,5). We note each nominal variable in this codebook.

TRICKY BIT: Sometimes you may be uncertain about whether certain text contains a report or about what value to record for a variable. In the former case record the text in your Coder's Notes for that week (see section 5). In the latter case insert a Comment⁶ in the appropriate cell and write it up in your Coder's Notes for that week (see section 5).

TRICKY BIT: Several of the variables we code list key words only in one part of speech. For example, under the Ill-treatment/Abuse variable, we code allegations of "brutality," which is a noun. Coders should also code other forms of this word (e.g., adjectives and adverbs). In this case, allegations that are "brutal" and treatment that occurs "brutally" should also be coded as Ill-treatment/Abuse.

TRICKY BIT: It is very important to take time into account when coding torture allegations. For example, imagine the following AI report: "There were further reports of excessive use of force and ill-treatment, sometimes amounting to torture, by law enforcement and prison officers... Numerous criminal proceedings into alleged ill-treatment, in some cases amounting to torture, and into deaths in disputed circumstances were opened or continued." Each of these sentences should be coded as separate torture allegations because Sentence 1 refers to an event occurring at time $t+1$, and Sentence 2 refers to an event occurring at time t .

EFFECTIVE 1 MAY 2010: Because we have has some problems with the AI Library Search, the order in which coders should search for and code files is as follows:

1. Code Annual Report
2. Search Comprehensive Guide, and make a list of all documents in a given country-year.
3. Search AI Library using general country-year search.
4. Search AI Library by AI Index Number for each individual document found in the Comprehensive Guide.
5. Code all documents found, and delete them from the Comprehensive Guide list included in your Coder Notes.

⁶Please see Help on your spreadsheet. In Excel these are called comments. In Open Office they are called Notes.

6. List the documents you coded at the bottom of your Coder Notes.

If a document pops up in an AI search that does not even mention the country you are coding (e.g., you are coding Finland, and a search reveals no mention of Finland), you do not have to code the document.

EFFECTIVE 1 MAY 2010: Allegations occurring prior to 1995 should be not be coded, even if their investigation and/or adjudication occurs during 1995 or later.

EFFECTIVE 1 MAY 2010: To motivate coders, we will announce weekly a “Coder of the Week.” This will be the coder who coded the highest number of AI pages of material per hour worked. We will also send coders weekly information about the number of hours worked and the number of pages coded by fellow coders.

EFFECTIVE 1 MAY 2010: Coders should code a dummy variable for whether the coding was done pre-May 1 and post-May 1.

2.1 Long Documents About Regions (Not Individual Countries)

In order to minimize the time that coders spend working on the same regional documents, we changed the process by which coders are assigned the coding of long documents about regions (rather than individual countries).

EFFECTIVE 1 MAY 2010: If a document is longer than 8 pages, coders should search for the following keywords: tortur, ill-treat, beat, abus, assault, restrain, inadeq, duress, cruel, degrad). If none of these words is listed in a document, coders do not have to read the document at all.

If you come across a document that is longer than eight pages *and* concerns a *group* of countries (rather than just the country you are coding), please email me the name of the document, its AI index number, and a link to the document. The first person to find each document will code it, and other coders will not have to code that particular document.

3 Description of Specific *and* Country-Year-Agency Allegation Variables

This section includes a description of each of the variables that we code for both the specific and country-year-agency allegation unit of observation. The variables are listed in the same order as the columns on the Specific allegation tab of the coding sheet. Absent other information, each variable is coded at both the specific and the country-year-agency unit of observation. Variables that are coded *only* for country-year-agency allegations follow below in section 4. Details on the coding scheme of each variable follow a definition of the concept.

3.1 ISO3 Alpha Country Code

Definition: This is a three-letter country identification code published by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) to represent countries, dependent territories, and special areas of geographical interest.

Coding Scheme: These values can be found on the third sheet of the coder’s spreadsheet. Alternatively, ISO3 Alpha Country Codes can be found [here](#).

For allegations against the Palestinian Authority or the Palestinian Liberation Organization, we code ISO3 Alpha as “PAL,” code COW as “664,” and do not code ISO3 Numeric Country Codes. For allegations against multinational peacekeeping forces, we code ISO3 Alpha as “MUL,” code COW as “000,” and do not code ISO3 Numeric Country Codes. In these cases, we code Location of Torture as occurring outside national boundaries.

3.2 COW Country Code

Definition: This is a three-digit numeric identification code published by the Correlates of War (COW) project to represent countries, dependent territories, and special areas of geographical interest.

Coding Scheme: These values can be found on the third sheet of the coder’s spreadsheet. Alternatively, a comma separated values (.csv) file that can be opened in Excel that lists the COW Country Codes can be found at the [COW project website](#).

3.3 ISO3 Numeric Country Code

Definition: This is a three-digit numeric identification code published by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) to represent countries, dependent territories, and special areas of geographical interest. ISO3 Number Codes are the same as codes defined by the United Nations Statistics Division.

Coding Scheme: These values can be found on the third sheet of the coders spreadsheet. Alternatively, ISO3 Numeric Country Codes can be found [here](#).

3.4 AI Index Number

Definition: AI codes each of its press releases and related documents with a unique index number. AI Index Numbers specify the region, country, year, and document number in temporal order of each report. They are typically found on the top of each AI document. Because AI Index Numbers are not listed on AI Annual Reports accessed online, please leave AI Index Number missing when coding AI Annual Reports.

Coding Scheme: Record (e.g., copy and paste) the entire AI Index Number exactly as written on the document from which the allegation comes. If this information is unavailable, please leave the cell on the coding sheet blank.

3.5 Source Title

Definition: AI titles each of its Action Alerts and Press Releases with a unique title about the topic of the report.

Coding Scheme: Record (e.g., copy and paste) the entire title of the publication, article, or press release from which the allegation comes. AI Annual Reports should be listed in the following format: “AI Annual Report: Country, Year.”

3.6 Source Date

Definition: AI records the publication date of each of its Action Alerts and Press Releases.

Coding Scheme: Use the following format to record the date of the document in which the allegation is reported: DD Month YYYY. For Annual Reports, please record only the year.

Note that allegations may have occurred in a year different from the publication year of the document (e.g., the document might be published in 1998 and report an allegation from 1996; see section 3.11). Coders will record all allegations: those reported in the year that they allegedly occurred, and those that allegations reported to have occurred in the past.

FORMAT NOTE: Depending on the version of Microsoft Excel or Open Office that you use, dates typed into cells may automatically reformat themselves. In this case, coders should right-click the column and format the cell type to “General.”

3.7 Source Page

Definition: AI paginates the paper copies of its Annual Reports, Action Alerts, and Press Releases. This variable is only coded if the coder is using a paper copy of the document.

Coding Scheme: Record the page number of the part of the publication or article from which the allegation comes. If publications are accessed online, you should leave Source Page blank and instead code Source URL (see below).

3.8 Source URL

Definition: AI Annual Reports, Action Alerts, and Press Releases found online have an associated URL (i.e., website address). You should only code this variable when coding online documents.

Coding Scheme: Coders should record the url of the publication or article from which the allegation comes. If publications are accessed in paper form, you should leave Source URL blank and instead code Source Page (see above).

3.9 Duplicate

Definition: Duplicate is a dichotomous variable that indicates whether or not the coder has previously coded an allegation for this person–detention (for specific allegations) or

country–year–agency (for country–year–agency allegations; see sections 1.1 and 1.2). Multiple allegations need not report the same activities or the same date(s) as the original allegation; they need only involve the same person–detention (for specific allegations) or the same country–year (for country–year–agency allegations) and the same Agency of Control. One implication of this rule is that nearly every country-year-agency allegation following the first country-year-agency allegation should be coded as a duplicate. Country-year allegations referencing different Agencies of Control are not coded as duplicates. Additionally, when AI references previously written documents (or documents from other sources including the UN Committee on Torture), you should mark these as duplicates.

AI often reports the same torture allegation [1] in multiple paragraphs in a single AI document and/or [2] in more than one AI document. If a report identifies the same (group of) individual(s), during the same detainment, and the report is found in the same document, we code one torture allegation. More specifically, for one row in the spreadsheet you will record a value for each variable on which you have information. If the same (group of) individual(s) and the same detainment is reported in more than one document, you will code a distinct row in the spreadsheet for each document that reports the allegation (i.e., two rows if the allegation is reported in two documents, three rows for three documents, and so on.) Each allegation after the first should then be coded as a duplicate. If AI and another human rights organization (e.g., the UN Committee on Torture) report a particular allegation separately in the same document, these allegations should be coded separately. The second allegation should be coded as a duplicate. This is the only time allegations from the same document should be coded as duplicates.

In cases where the allegation neither meets the breadth of the country–year–agency nor identifies specific persons the coder will code each allegation as a new one if it occurs in a different year (i.e., reports about the same prison, over different years are not duplicates, but reports about the same prison across different documents for the same year are duplicates).

EFFECTIVE 1 MAY 2010: Do not code the duplicate variable for country-year-agency allegations.

Coding Scheme: Code according to the following dichotomous scale.

- 0 = No
- 1 = Yes

3.10 First AI Index Number

Definition: If Yes on Duplicate, coders should determine the AI index number of the publication, article, or report in which they first coded the duplicate allegation. If there are three reports of the same allegation, the second and third reports should both refer back to the First AI Index Number.

Coding Scheme: If Duplicate = 1, record the entire AI Index Number exactly as written by Amnesty International on the first document that was coded pertaining to a particular allegation. List duplicates on AI Annual Reports as “Annual Report on COUNTRY YYYY” (e.g., COUNTRY=Ghana and YYYY=2002). If Duplicate = 0, leave the cell on the coding sheet blank.

3.11 Year Begin

Definition: AI typically records the year in which the alleged torture began. This may or may not be the same year as the date of the publication (see section 3.6). As an example, an AI Report from 2000 may report on torture that occurred in 1996. In that case, Year Begin is coded as 1996.

TRICKY BIT: In cases where AI reports that torture began mid-decade (e.g., mid-1990), we code Begin Year as the year ending in “5” (e.g, 1995). Absent other information, we assume that allegations from the Annual Report occurred in the year prior to publication. Allegations from other reports occurred in the year of publication. If an allegation was said to begin/end in a decade generally or “early” in a decade (e.g., 1980s, early-1980s), we code it as beginning/ending in XXX3 (e.g., 1983). If an allegation was said to begin/end “late” in a decade (e.g., late-1980s), we code it as beginning/ending in XXX7 (e.g., 1987). If the Year Begin/End is unclear *and* none of the aforementioned rules apply, coders should be comfortable leaving Year Begin/End blank.

Coding Scheme: Record the year in which a particular abuse began. If this information is unavailable, leave the cell on the coding sheet blank.

3.12 Year End

Definition: In cases of detention and torture lasting more than one year, AI often records the year in which the alleged torture ended. This may or may not be the same year as the date coded on Year Begin (see section 3.11). As an example, an report than alleged than an

individual was detained and tortured from 1992 to 1994 would be coded with a Year Begin of 1992 and a Year End of 1994.

TRICKY BIT: In cases where AI reports that torture ended mid-decade (e.g., mid-1990), we code End Year as the year ending in “5” (e.g, 1995).

Coding Scheme: Record the year in which a particular abuse ended. If this information is unavailable, leave the cell on the coding sheet blank.

3.13 Location of Torture

Definition: This is a binary indicator that indicates whether or not the alleged torture occurred on national territory. Although the majority of allegations of torture against a given country occur within that country’s national territory, some allegations occur outside of a state’s national territory. For example, allegations of torture against the United States in Guantánamo or Afghanistan do not occur on US soil. International law stipulates that when a country exercises effective control over territory or an individual, it does not matter whether it does so within its own boundaries or outside them: its obligations under treaties hold (Satterthwaite, 2007, pp. 1351-75). As a result, we include a variable indicating whether an allegation of torture occurred within a country’s national territory or not.

When you encounter an allegation that appears to occur outside of the national territory of the government that is holding the detainee(s), they should first consult the list of UN member states [here](#) to determine whether the the country or territory where the allegation took place is listed as a UN member state. If the country or territory is listed on this page, code the allegation as occurring outside the national territory of the country detaining the person(s), and record the ISO3 numeric code of the location. If the country or territory is not listed on this page, code the allegation as occurring outside of national territory, listing the ISO3 numeric code of the location. If the location has no ISO3 numeric code, write the name of the location into the coding sheet and include the information in your notes.⁷

As an example, consider the difference of reports of alleged torture by US government officials in Hawaii, Guantánamo Bay, and American Samoa. None of these territories are UN Member States. You know that Hawaii is one of the 50 states, and thus part of US national territory. That allegation would be coded as occurring on national territory. The other two, however, occur outside of national territory, but there is no ISO code to assign. A report of torture by US government officials in Kabul, Afghanistan, is also coded outside of national territory, but since Afghanistan is listed, you would record the ISO3 numeric code for Afghanistan.

⁷For allegations that occur in airspace, please code them as occurring elsewhere and note airspace as the location in the coding sheet and in your Coder’s Notes.

Absent other information, we assume that the Location of Torture is within national territory. If an allegation occurs in airspace or seaspace, coders should code Location of Torture as “1” and assign an ISO3 numeric code of 000. If an allegation occurs on sovereign territory abroad (e.g., aircraft carriers, foreign embassies, Guantanamo Bay), coders should assign Location of Torture as “2.” If the location of torture is not within national territory, but is otherwise unknown, coders should use an ISO code of “-9.”

Coding Scheme: If Location of Torture = 1, provide the ISO3 numeric code of the location where the alleged tortured occurred according to the following dichotomous scale. This variable is mutually exclusive.

- 0 = Within National Territory
- 1 = Elsewhere (Specify with ISO3 numeric code)

3.14 Order of Magnitude of Victims

Definition: One way that we code the number of victims is to use the *Order of Magnitude*, which is the number rounded to the nearest power of 10: 0=0, 1–9=1, 10–99=2, 100–999=3, etc. (Weisstein, ND). Our Magnitude variable is an ordinal indicator that codes whether an alleged tens, hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, or millions of people were victimized. This variable is only coded for allegations for which the specific allegation is the unit of observation.

There are several things to note when coding this variable. First, when you have less than 50% certainty about the number of victims, assign a value of -9, which represents “not zero, but otherwise unknown number of victims” and assign a certainty value of A. Second, some key words show up frequently in AI publications and should be coded with the following values:⁸ “Some” = 1 (B Certainty), “Dozens” = 2 (A Certainty), “Scores” = 2 (A Certainty), “Certain” = 1 (B Certainty), “Numerous” = 2 (B Certainty), “Many” = 2 (A Certainty), “Few” = 1 (A Certainty). Finally, if AI finds the tools of torture in a specific allegation (with no other information on number of people tortured), record -9 (A Certainty) for Order of Magnitude of Victims.

AI also often begins a report with an allegation about a group/multiple people, then follows up with details about specific individuals within that group. If AI does not reference the specific number of victims in its first, general allegation, coders should code Order of Magnitude one order lower than stated in the allegation and code Specific Number of Victims (below) as -9.

⁸Please note that we indicate in parentheses the Level of Certainty value to assign to each of these Order of Magnitude values.

You may encounter reports that refer to a set of people who experienced one *or* another experience, but fails to indicate how many people experienced each type. *We are going to assign the Order of Magnitude that corresponds to 50% of the minimum value of the term used in the report*

For example, “Scores of people were tortured *or* executed,” is ambiguous, and we need a norm to help us assign an Order of Magnitude value. First, is the term (in this case, “scores”) singular or plural? If it is singular, and we assume that 50% of the people experienced each event only (i.e., 50% were tortured and the other 50% were executed), what level of magnitude is most likely? A score is 20, and half of 20 is 10, and that is a level 2 Order of Magnitude. However, in the example above the term is plural, so scores is a minimum of 40. Half of 40 is 20, and 20 is a 2 level Order of Magnitude, so in this example we will assign an Order of Magnitude value of 2 (in this example whether the term is singular or plural makes no difference).

The question here is: how many of the scores of people were tortured? We need to make an assumption about the probability distribution.

Coding Scheme: Assign value using to the following scale. This variable is mutually exclusive. Note that this variable requires coding a Level of Certainty variable.

- 0 = None
- 1 = 1 - 9
- 2 = 10 - 99
- 3 = 100 - 999
- 4 = 1,000 - 9,999
- 5 = 10,000 - 99,999
- 6 = 100,000 - 999,999
- 7 => 999,999
- -9 = Not Zero (Level of Certainty Always A)

3.15 Specific Number of Victims

Definition: AI documents often provide information on the precise number of victims tortured in a given allegation. In these cases you should record a value for both the Order of Magnitude and this variable.

Coding Scheme: Record the integer value of the number of victims. This variable is mutually exclusive. When a specific number is not reported, record the value: -9.

3.16 Name(s) of Victim(s)

Definition: AI often reports the name(s) of victim(s). Because our definition of a torture allegation permits a detainee to at be victimized only once per continuous period of detention (see section 1.1) we need to be able to record reports that refer to the same individual(s) (see section 3.9). Listing victim names is critical for this task of identifying duplicate reports. In cases where a specific name is not used, but the report otherwise identifies the victim(s) in a meaningful way, such as “Protestors at G8 Summit” or “Prisoners in Local Prison,” you should record that information.

Coding Scheme: Record the name(s) of the victim(s) in its entirety. When this information is unavailable, leave the cell on the coding sheet blank.

3.17 Type of Victim

Definition: Type of Victim is a nominal variable that allows us to distinguish among victim types, by which we mean the economic, social, or political groups of which a victim is reported to be member. The categories are listed below.

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. We consider Immigrants to be Marginalized Individuals, except in the case of Illegal Immigrants, who are both Marginalized Individuals and Criminals. Absent other information, we consider Prison Populations (pre- and post-sentence) to be Criminals. Asylum seekers being deported should be coded both as Marginalized Individuals and Criminals because we assume the State would not remove them if they were legal aliens. Terrorists should be coded as both Criminals and Dissidents. Guerrillas should be coded as Dissidents only. In countries where AI notes that the government persecutes the news media, we code members of the press as Dissidents. Victim Type is only coded as State Official when a state agent is abused by other agents of his/her home country. Prisoners of War (POWs) are coded “5” on Type of Victim.

TRICKY BIT: 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.

TRICKY BIT: AI occasionally notes that an (often marginalized or dissenting) individual has been detained for breaking a domestic law that is discriminatory (e.g., laws making homosexuality illegal in Romania). 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](#).

Coding Scheme: Assign values according to the following nominal scale. This variable is not mutually exclusive because an individual victim may fall into more than one category (e.g., a marginalized individual who is also a criminal). If an individual victim falls into more than one category, you should put multiple values in the coding sheet, separated by commas. Please note, however, that different victims should not be included as part of the same allegation if they are of different victim types. For example, two people—one a marginalized individual and one a criminal—should be coded as two separate allegations. Note that this variable requires coding a Level of Certainty variable, which should be coded “A” if Unknown.

- 0 = Unknown
- 1 = Criminal (One believed to have contravened statute, excluding crimes that are considered threats to national security)
- 2 = Dissident (One believed to be a threat to the state or be willing to engage in illegal activity to challenge policy)
- 3 = Marginalized Individual (Member of a marginalized group)⁹
- 4 = State official or state agent (e.g., member of the military or sitting judge)

3.18 Motive Behind Torture (Why?)

Definition: This is a nominal typology based on the typology proposed in [Davis \(2005\)](#). Torture is “Compellent” when it is undertaken to compel the victim to take action that the torturer wants the victim to take. Some compellence is used for specifically “Interrogative” purposes (i.e., to obtain a confession or other information), and since some researchers might want to focus on this subset, we distinguish it from non-interrogative compellent torture. All

⁹We 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 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. State torture directed at members of marginalized groups often occurs in public rather than behind closed doors because it is intended to serve as a statement to a particular individual or group of individuals. A marginalized group in sociology refers to various groups that are outside of ‘mainstream’ - like the homeless, geeks, punks, skinheads, as well as minorities (sexual, national, etc.). Often those groups lack a voice in the society and are underrepresented. Please refer to <http://www.nationmaster.com/encyclopedia/Marginalized-group>.

allegations that reference state interest in a confession are coded as “Interrogative” unless AI specifically states that the torture was used to punish the person for failing to confess. Torture is “Deterrent” when it seeks to dissuade the victim from taking action he/she would prefer to take. Torture is “Punitive” when it is used to punish past behavior. Torture is “Destructive” when it is used to physically and/or psychologically diminish the victim’s capacity to act. Finally, torture is “For Personal Profit” when the torturer exploits a victim for monetary or other compensation. Note that sometimes relatives or friends are tortured in order to punish or get information from another individual. Regardless of who the victim may be, coders should code motive based on the end goal of the state agent. On allegations of Ill-treatment, Motive is coded as “Unknown” except when AI specifically attributes a motive.

Coders should always code Motive of rape, sexual abuse, and molestation as “Destructive.” Coders can also code additional values of this variable as they see fit.

Coding Scheme: Assign values according to the following nominal scale. This variable is not mutually exclusive because an individual victim may be tortured for more than one motive. If an individual victim is tortured for more than one reason, you should put multiple values in the coding sheet, separated by commas. Please note, however, that victims should not be included as part of the same allegation if they were tortured for different motives. For example, two people—one a tortured for compellence and one tortured for punishment—should be coded as two separate allegations. Note that this variable requires coding a Level of Certainty variable, which should be coded “A” if Unknown.

- 0 = Unknown
- 1 = Compellent (to force a victim to do something he/she would not otherwise do at the moment of abuse)¹⁰
- 1.1 = Interrogative (to force a victim to provide information at the moment of abuse)
- 2 = Deterrent (to prevent a victim to from doing something he/she wants to do at the moment of abuse)
- 3 = Punitive (to punish past behavior)
- 4 = Destructive (to physically or psychologically damage a victim)¹¹
- 5 = For Personal Profit (to exploit the victim for compensation)¹²

¹⁰Deterrent and Compellent are described in the codebook as occurring at the moment of abuse. We are interested in the *preference* of the victim at the time of abuse, not the action. For instance, beating a victim to prevent him/her from attending political meetings in the future would be coded as deterrence because the victim’s preference at the time of abuse was to attend the meeting.

¹¹Motive is coded Destructive when an action is intended to decrease a victim’s capacity to *resist*.

¹²The term “profit” can be generalized to “gain” or “benefit.”

3.19 Expectation Torture Has/Will Occur

Definition: AI sometimes issues statements of “official concern” that a person is at grave *risk* to torture or ill-treatment. When AI receives what it considers to be a credible report that a person has been abducted or, in many cases, arrested in a country that AI knows to be one in which torture is likely, it will often issue an Action Alert requesting that its members contact government officials to express concern for the individual’s rights to physical integrity of the person (and other rights). Other AI reports indicate that they *believe* torture occurred in the past, but is not certain. To distinguish these “less certain” allegations from those where AI expresses confidence that an allegation is based in fact we code this variable. Additionally, sometimes AI will report that another human rights organization believes a particular victim is at risk for torture. We code allegations as Expectation Torture Has/Will Occur, even though AI is not the original source.

AI tends to use specific terms to identify these allegations. If AI indicates that an individual or group are “vulnerable” to torture, the allegation should be coded as official concern. Similarly, if AI uses any of the following words, coders should code the official concern variable: “expectation,” “believes,” “expects,” “fears.” These instances should be distinguished from instances in which AI expresses “concern about reports of torture.” We code these instances as actual allegations, coding the Expectation variable as “0.” These instances should also be distinguished from instances in which AI expresses “fears for the safety of” an individual or group. Those are too broad a concern: we only code Expectation Torture Has/Will Occur when it is an express concern that the person(s) will be (has been) subjected to ill treatment or torture.

Coding Scheme: Code according to the following dichotomous scale.

- 0 = No/Not Noted
- 1 = Yes

3.20 Ill-treatment/Abuse Mentioned

Definition: In addition to proscribing torture the CAT also requires that states “...shall undertake to prevent in any territory under its jurisdiction other acts of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment which do not amount to torture as defined in article I, when such acts are committed by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity” (Article 16). We distinguish this treatment from torture and code a variable if AI alleges that a country is engaged in “cruel,” “inhuman,” or “degrading” behavior against individuals under their control.

When a report uses the terms “ill-treatment,” “mental abuse,” or “physical abuse” we code the Ill-treatment variable, and assign an “A” value to Level of Certainty. The following terms are coded as Ill-treatment with “B” level certainty: “excessive use of force,” “brutality,” “cruel, inhuman, and degrading.” Acts leading to humiliation, mental anguish, and distress and allegations of inadequate food/water/medication (often due to overcrowding) should also be coded as Ill-treatment with “B” Level of Certainty. Absent other information, we do not code poor prison conditions as ill-treatment.

TRICKY BIT: Note that we code allegations of *purposeful withholding* of food/water/medication as Stealth Torture rather than Ill-treatment.

TRICKY BIT: Absent other information, intimidation, harassment, and harsh conditions are not coded.

TRICKY BIT: If two Ill-treatment key words with different Levels of Certainty are used in a single allegation, please code according to the higher level of certainty.

TRICKY BIT: We do not code overcrowding in prison unless AI notes that it leads to another type of Ill-treatment or torture.

TRICKY BIT: Absent other information, verbal (e.g., racial) abuse are not Ill-treatment.

TRICKY BIT: Duress is not Ill-treatment. It should be coded “1” on Clean/Stealth Torture.

TRICKY BIT: We assume that allegations of “abuse” are either “mental abuse” or “physical abuse” and code them accordingly.

TRICKY BIT: We do not code synonyms on ill-treatment. Only code words (or derivatives of words) that are listed in the codebook in quotations marks. We do code maltreatment **and mistreatment** as ill-treatment (“A” Level of Certainty).

TRICKY BIT: Although we do not code harsh conditions or poor conditions, we do code *life-threatening* conditions as Ill-treatment (“B” Level of Certainty).

TRICKY BIT: We code mock executions as Ill-Treatment (“B” Level of Certainty), assuming that they lead to humiliation and mental anguish.

TRICKY BIT: We code forced abortion and sterilization as Scarring torture and Ill-treatment.

TRICKY BIT: Absent other information, we assume rape is vaginal or anal and code it as Scarring Torture and Ill-treatment. We code forced oral sex as Ill-treatment only. Coder

should make their own determination on case by case basis of whether sexual abuse, molestation, etc. is scarring. If it is, it should be coded as such. If it is not, it should be coded as Ill-Treatment only.

TRICKY BIT: We code psychological torture as Ill-Treatment (“A” Level of Certainty), assuming it is the same as mental abuse.

Coding Scheme: Assign values according to the following dichotomous scale. Note that this variable requires coding a Level of Certainty variable, which should be coded “A” if Ill-Treatment = 0.

- 0 = No
- 1 = Yes

3.21 Unknown Torture

Definition: Unknown Torture is coded to specify allegations in which we know that torture occurred, but we have no information about its type. It is coded “1” in two situations: First, Unknown Torture is coded in situations when AI makes broad claims that torture has occurred, but gives no further details. Second, AI often makes an allegation like the following: “Victims were subjected to torture, including rape.” In cases such as that coders should code both the the scarring or stealth variables (see below), but also code this variable as the allegation indicates that other unknown torture also took place.

Coding Scheme: Assign values according to the following dichotomous scale.

- 0 = No
- 1 = Yes

3.22 Scarring Torture

Definition: We distinguish between two broad types of torture: scarring torture and stealth torture (Rejali, 2007). These two classes differ with respect to whether or not they leave marks on the human body. Scarring torture includes (but is not limited to) burning, beating, cutting, whipping, boiling, sexual abuse (to include rape), abuse using animals (e.g., allowing dog bites), maiming, and disfiguring. “Clean” beating is purposeful and carefully executed.

If AI does not mention that a beating was “stealth,” we assume that it left marks on the body and code it as Scarring Torture. Allegations of “assault” should be coded as scarring torture.

TRICKY BIT: If an individual is beaten to death, we coded that as Scarring Torture (see section 3.24).

TRICKY BIT: If AI or another organization finds the tools of torture, we code an allegation. The allegation should be coded as Scarring Torture if it is used for such (e.g., truncheons), and Clean Torture if it is used for such (e.g., restraints).

TRICKY BIT: Coders can infer that torture was scarring if AI comments that marks were left on the body of a victim. In cases where torture begins as Stealth and becomes so prolonged that it leads to scarring of the body, we code do not code Stealth Torture as “1,” but do code Scarring Torture as “1.”

TRICKY BIT: Absent other information, we assume rape is vaginal or anal and code it as Scarring Torture and Ill-treatment. We also code penetration by any object (including animals as Scarring Torture and Ill-treatment. We code forced oral sex as Ill-treatment only. Coder should make their own determination on case by case basis of whether sexual abuse, molestation, etc. is scarring. If it is, it should be coded as such. If it is not, it should be coded as Ill-Treatment only.

Coding Scheme: Assign this variable a value of “1” if the allegation definitely involves Scarring Torture and “0” if AI does not mention that it involves Scarring Torture. In cases where you are unsure where a particular method of torture should be classified, please insert a comment within the appropriate spreadsheet cell and include it in your Coder’s Notes for that week (see section 5).

- 0 = No
- 1 = Yes

3.23 Clean/Stealth Tortures

Definition: “Stealth” or “clean” torture techniques are distinguished from scarring techniques because they do not mark the body. In other words, they are difficult to detect with certainty and, thus, plausibly deniable after the torture has been administered.

Clean/stealth torture includes (but is not limited to) electro-torture, beating with instru-

ments,¹³ beating on body parts so as not to leave marks,¹⁴ water torture, dry choking, climatized air,¹⁵ exhaustion exercises,¹⁶ positional torture and devices, restraints, irritants,¹⁷ sleep deprivation, noise, sensory deprivation,¹⁸ purposefully withholding food/water/medication,¹⁹ isolation from all human beings, forced feeding. Furthermore, AI often notes that confessions are obtained under “duress,” which we code as Clean Torture.

TRICKY BIT: Do not code overcrowding in prison as torture unless AI notes that it leads to another type of torture.

TRICKY BIT: Absent other information, we do not code incommunicado detention as torture. We do code isolation from all human beings as stealth torture, but we do not assume incommunicado torture always necessitates solitary confinement.

TRICKY BIT: We do not code mental illness resulting from torture, and we do not code situations in which the state provides inadequate or denies mental health care.

Coding Scheme: Assign this variable a value of “1” if the allegation definitely involves Clean/Stealth Torture and “0” if AI does not mention that it involves Clean Torture.

- 0 = No
- 1 = Yes

3.24 Torture Death

Definition: Although victims of Scarring and/or Stealth torture are not often killed, sometimes AI comments that victims were tortured to death. We code victims as having been

¹³Sandbags, Telephone books, Whipping/beating on soles of feet, Clean whipping, Paddles, Rollers, Clubs, Rubber hoses, Sandbags, Pressing/twisting genitals (Rejali 2007, 92).

¹⁴Blows to fleshy areas so as to spread blow, Slapping, Ear cuffing, Dorsiflexing, Violent shaking, Eyeball and Ear Press.

¹⁵Refrigerated cells, Powerful fans, Computerized cooling systems, Exposure to heat or cold weather conditions, Exposure to the elements, Sweatboxes.

¹⁶This does not include forced labor.

¹⁷Using irritants (i.e., salt, pepper, acid, drugs, sedation, forced alcohol, etc.)

¹⁸To include exposure to extreme light or darkness.

¹⁹Withholding medicine, food, or water does induce pain, yet is non-scarring, and thus is considered to be Stealth torture. As long as AI explicitly uses language such as “withheld” which makes it clear that the AoC made a choice (i.e., had resources available, but did not use them), then we code these allegations as Stealth torture rather than Ill-treatment. If AI comments that a detainee has yet to receive treatment, we code allegations occurring more than 24 hours after the initial detainment as Clean Torture. We do not code allegations of this nature occurring within 24 hours of detention.

tortured to death only if AI explicitly mentions or strongly insinuates that this is the case. If a victim is tortured and then shot and killed, for example, we do not code that the victim has been tortured to death. Deaths in disputed circumstances are not coded unless torture is explicitly mentioned.

The description of *Torture Death* is written such that it should only be coded if “torture” leads to death. We are also interested in situations in which Ill-Treatment leads to death. Tortures should also code this variable as “1” if AI reports that ill-treatment in detention has led to death.

If AI indicates that a victim committed suicide as a result of torture or ill-treatment, we code Torture Death with a value of “2” in the Coding Sheet.

Coding Scheme: Assign this variable “0” if AI does not mention that torture led to the death of the victim, and record a value of “1” if the report explicitly states that torture led to the death of the victim.

- 0 = No
- 1 = Yes
- 2 = Suicide

3.25 Agency of Control

Definition: Agency of Control (AoC) indicates the domestic institution and/or agent(s) that is responsible for a given allegation of torture. We leave this variable blank when AI refer to them as “state agents.” You should choose Police (and not Prison) if a violation is conducted by a police officer, but occurs in a holding cell, etc. You should choose Prison (and not Police) if the victim is in pre-trial detention. Some reports employ country-specific jargon to define the Agency of Control. In cases such as this, you should search the web to try to determine the type of AoC that agency is.²⁰

We code 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.

²⁰In some cases, all relevant hits only reveal AI documents, indicating that only AI seems to use the term (e.g., Mutual Defense Teams in China). In such cases coders should leave the AoC as missing and include this information in their notes.

If the Agency of Control responsible for an allegation is not listed in the Codebook, please code it as Unknown, and insert a comment in the cell on the Excel sheet to describe the Agency. We code executive agencies as Unknown, and insert a comment in the cell on the Excel sheet that reads, “Executive.”

Immigration detention centers include immigration and border control agents of the state. Absent other information, we code gendarmes as Military.

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. We code Militias as Paramilitary units, but only if AI explicitly indicates that the group has at least the tacit approval of the state government.

Coding Scheme: Assign a value of “1” to each of the following applicable Agencies of Control. If you code “Unknown” below, you cannot code any other values on this variable. If you do not code “Unknown” below, this variable is not mutually exclusive because more than one AoC may be responsible for a given allegation of torture. If more than one AoC is responsible for *a given allegation*, you should put multiple values in the coding sheet, separated by commas. This is the only time AoC is not mutually exclusive. With regard to country–year–agency allegations, allegations of the same *type* should be coded as separate allegations. If this information is unavailable, please leave the cell on the coding sheet blank. Note that this variable requires coding a Level of Certainty variable.

- Unknown
- Police (to include Law Enforcement Officials and Special Police Units)
- Prison (to include Detention Centers, Juvenile Detention Centers, and Labor Camps)
- Military Forces (to include Military Police, Military Intelligence, Military Bodies charged with police duties among civilian populations, and Security Forces absent additional information)
- Legislature
- Judiciary
- Immigration Detention Centers (to include Repatriation Centers)
- Civilian Intelligence Agency (e.g., United States CIA)
- Paramilitary Unit (You should only code allegations against paramilitary units if AI specifically calls a group a paramilitary unit or says *explicitly* that the group has at least the tacit approval of the state government.)

3.26 Formal Complaint Filed

Definition: AI sometimes comments on whether allegations of torture were formally reported to the State (or another State) by either the victim or by NGOs and like-groups. Consequently, we include a variable for whether there was a formal report filed on behalf of an alleged torture victim(s). We assume that a formal complaint was filed if an investigation occurs and that all cases in which AI reports that a victim complained to an authority figure are formal complaints. Because protests occur outside typical political channels, we do not code them as formal complaints.

We only recognize complaints as formal complaints if they are made to the State or one of its agents in such a way that the State would recognize the complaint as legitimate. For example, prisoners engaging in hunger strikes or detonating a bomb in response to allegations of ill-treatment or torture is not coded as a Formal Complaint to the State.

Coding Scheme: Code according to the following trichotomous scale. This variable is mutually exclusive.

- -1 = No
- 0 = Unknown
- 1 = Yes

3.27 Investigation of Torturers

Definition: AI sometimes comments on whether allegations of torture were investigated by state authorities. Consequently, we include a variable for whether there was a report of an Investigation of the alleged torture. If AI reports that an allegation is adjudicated (in a court of law), mediated (by an NGO or other non-judicial body), or results in sanction by the perpetrator's employer, we assume that an investigation occurred and code this variable accordingly. "Judicial inquiries" and "fact-finding investigations" are coded as investigations. We code Investigation of Torturers as "1" if legislation is passed in response to an allegation.

If a perpetrator is arrested, we assume an investigation has occurred.

Coding Scheme: Code according to the following trichotomous scale. This variable is mutually exclusive.

- -1 = No

- 0 = Unknown
- 1 = Yes

3.28 Outcome of Investigation

Definition: We also code whether an Adjudication/Mediation procedure, administrative sanction, or a termination of employment (e.g., of a prison guard) followed the Investigation(s). If a country enacts legislation, etc. to prevent torture, we assume that an investigation occurred prior and code the Outcome of Investigation variable accordingly.

If an outcome of an investigation is listed AND the investigation is said to continue, we code the outcome listed and ignore the continuation of the investigation unless an additional outcome comes up in later coding.

If the outcome of an investigation is adjudication, we code it regardless of whether AI indicates that it is a civil or criminal case.

We do not code resolutions and other like statements as legislation.

Coding Scheme: If Investigation of Torturers = 1, Outcome of Investigation should be coded according to the following scale. If Investigation of Torturers = -1 or 0, please leave this variable blank. This variable is not mutually exclusive. If more than one value applies, please separate them in the Coding Sheet using a comma.

- -1 = None
- 0 = Unknown
- 1 = Adjudication/Mediation
- 2 = Administrative Sanction (e.g., employment probation; not to include Dismissal from Employment)
- 3 = Dismissal from Employment
- 4 = Legislation/Institution Creation

3.29 Location of Adjudication/Mediation

Definition: This variable indicates whether Adjudication or Mediation proceedings took place domestically or internationally.

We only code Location of Adjudication as Domestic if the court is tried in the same country where the allegation occurred. In the event that an allegation is tried in a domestic court in a country other than the country where the violation was committed (e.g., a Spanish court tries a Chilean violation), it should be coded as Location of Adjudication International. If International is coded, coders should add a comment to the cell and identify the Court.

Note that the passing of legislation does not have to be normatively anti-torture. In response to an investigation, states can also pass legislation that legalizes certain types of torture.

Although we call the variable Trans-Border Torture, we also coded instances in which a prisoner is transferred from an agent of one state to an agent of another state within state borders. For example, if Danish troops in Afghanistan hand a prisoner to US troops in Afghanistan to be tortured, we code it as Trans-Border Torture.

We only code cases as trans-border torture when AI makes clear that the state sending the victim is *aware* that the person will be or is likely to be subjected to torture.

In determining where an allegation occurs, we use UN recognized boundaries of states. If an allegation occurs in a disputed territory, we code it as occurring within the internationally recognized country.

Coding Scheme: If Outcome of Investigation = 1, Location of Adjudication/Mediation should be coded “1” on each of the following applicable locations of the Adjudication. This variable is mutually exclusive. If Outcome or Investigation is not 1, or if this information is unavailable, please leave the cell on the coding sheet blank.

- International Court
- Domestic Court

3.30 Outcome of Adjudication/Mediation

Definition: This variable indicates the outcome of a given Adjudication/Mediation of a torture allegation.

In cases of retrials, etc. discussed in *the same* AI document, we record the final outcome of the final round of adjudication only.

If a victim receives compensation (or some other outcome of Adjudication, we assume that Adjudication and an Investigation occurred.

In cases in which a court makes a broad ruling against a practice (i.e., condemning a particular torture technique), we code Outcome of Adjudication as “2: Conviction.”

If we know only that a perpetrator was arrested, we code Outcome of Investigation as “1: Unknown.”

Coding Scheme: If Outcome of Investigation = 1, code this variable according to the following nominal scale. This variable is mutually exclusive. Note that you should assign a Level of Certainty value on the coding of this variable.

- 0 = Unknown
- 1 = Pardon (Accused found guilty, but executive excuses crime)
- 2 = Conviction or Plea (Accused found guilty or pleads guilty)
- 3 = Acquittal (Case dismissed for lack of evidence or accused found Not Guilty)
- 4 = Compensation (Victim provided with [monetary] compensation)
- 5 = Pending

3.31 Trans-Border Torture

Definition: Article 3 of the CAT requires that no state expel, return, refool, or extradite a person to another state where that individual is likely to be in danger of being tortured. Although we define refolement as the expulsion of persons who are recognized as refugees according to the definition in Article 1 of the [UN Convention on the Status of Refugees](#), we do not require these individuals to have formally applied for refugee status or asylum. If these refugees were to be refoled to their home countries, their lives and freedom would be threatened because of their political affiliation, race, religion, etc. Conversely, we define Extradition (or Rendition) as the exchange of fugitive offenders (not refugees) between states. Finally, we do not code the expectation of refolement of extradition; refolement or extradition must have already occurred to be coded in our data.

TRICKY BIT: Allegations of Trans-Border torture against one country will typically be coded with an accompanying allegation of torture or expectation of torture in another country. For example, imagine a report that China extradited North Korean citizens to North Korea where they were at risk for torture. One allegation should be coded for Trans-Border torture in China. A *separate* allegation should be coded for Expectation of Torture in North Korea. These two allegations are **not** coded as duplicates.

Coding Scheme: Code according to the following trichotomous scale.

- 0 = No
- 1 = Refoulment
- 2 = Extradition²¹

3.32 Destination

Definition: When a State is accused of Trans-Border torture, it is typically because that State sent an individual or group of individuals to another State where they are likely to be tortured. This variable indicates the State to which those individuals have been sent.

Coding Scheme: If Trans-Border Torture = 1 or 2, code the location where individuals were sent according to the following scale. This variable is mutually exclusive. Note that you should assign a Level of Certainty value on the coding of this variable.

- 1 = Country of Origin (Specify with ISO3 numeric code)
- 2 = Other (Specify with ISO3 numeric code)
- -9 = Unspecified

3.33 AI Negates Allegation

Definition: Following an allegation or statement of official concern of torture, AI occasionally refutes the allegation in another document. This variable is coded each time AI refutes a previously stated allegation.

²¹Extradition is synonymous with Rendition.

If AI negates an allegation, coders should code an entirely new row indicating the information about the allegation that has been negated. Coders should not change the original allegation, but should code the allegation with the negation as a duplicate of the original allegation.

Coding Scheme: Assign this variable a value of “1” if AI refutes an allegation it previously reported and “0” otherwise.

- 0 = AI Does Not Negate Allegation
- 1 = AI Negates Allegation

3.34 Source

Definition: Coders should record the source of information in which AI negated a previous allegation. AI Index Numbers are typically found on the top of each AI document. AI Index Numbers are not listed on AI Annual Reports accessed online. Coders should leave AI Index Number missing when coding AI Annual Reports.

Coding Scheme: If AI Negates Allegation = 1, record the entire AI Index Number exactly as written by Amnesty International on the document from which the allegation is refuted (please use Copy and Paste). AI Annual Reports should be listed in the following format: “AI Annual Report: Country, Year.”

3.35 Coder

Definition: This variable identifies the coder.

Coding Scheme: Record your initials here.

4 Description of Variables coded only for Country-Year-Agency Allegations

This section includes a description of three variables that we only code at the country-year-agency allegation unit of observation. To avoid repetition of previously described variables,

they are not listed in the same order as the columns on the country-year-agency allegation tab of the coding sheet.

4.1 Level of Torture (Country-Year-Agency)

This variable is located between the ISOCODE of LOCATION and MOTIVE variables on the country-year-agency tab of the coding sheet.

Definition: Level of Torture is coded when AI makes an allegation about the general torture environment of a particular country in a particular year. You should look for language indicating a pattern of abuses. If two different agencies report differently on the level of torture in a given country-year-agency, we code both allegations, marking the second allegation as a duplicate.

Coding Scheme: Assign values to this variable according to the following ordinal scale. This variable is mutually exclusive, but if AI refers to a country-year-agency allegation with two of the following words from different values, please code both of the words in the same cell, and separate them with a comma. Make a note of this in that week's Coder's Notes (see section 5). If the report does not include sufficient information, please leave the cell on the coding sheet blank. Note that you should assign a Level of Certainty value on the coding of this variable.

- 1 = “Infrequent” / “Sporadic” / “Occasionally”
- 2 = “Some(times)” / “Several” / “Many” / “Numerous” / “Often” / “Other”
- 3 = “Frequent” / “Routinely” / “Considerable (number)” / “Commonplace” / “Regular” / “Pattern”
- 4 = “Widespread” / “Extensive” / “All but a few” / “Prevalent” / “Generalized” / “Standard”
- 5 = “Systematic” / “Consistent” / “Endemic” / “Systemic”
- -6 = “Continued” / “Persisted” / “Further” / “Sustained” / “Remained” / “Still”
- -7 = “Improved”
- -8 = “Increased” / “Worsening”
- -9 = “Throughout” with no other information
- -10 = “Indiscriminate” / “Arbitrary”

4.2 AI Comments on Access (Country-Year)

This variable is located between the ISOCODE of DESTINATION and CODER variables on the country-year-agency tab of the codebook.

Definition: AI (or another organization) will often note that a particular country limits the access of human rights organizations to work within their borders (or to have access to certain prisons, etc). This variable is coded “Yes” if AI comments on limited access within a country either by AI itself or by another human rights organization. Even if AI comments on lack of access in a specific location, we do not associate lack of access with specific allegations. Instead, we code it at the country-year-agency unit of observation, even when there is no associated country-year-agency allegation. Absent a country-year-agency allegation, we code Lack of Access with all other variables except descriptive variables (i.e., AI Index Number, URL, etc.) coded as missing.

Regardless of how many times Lack of Access is mentioned in the reports associated with a particular country-year, coders only code one allegation of Lack of Access, separate from the allegations of ill-treatment and torture (i.e., with all other variables coded as missing).

Coding Scheme: Code according to the following dichotomous scale.

- 0 = No
- 1 = Yes

4.3 Location of Lack of Access

Definition: Although the majority of lack of access allegations occur within a country’s national territory, some allegations may occur elsewhere. For example, allegations that the US will not allow AI to inspect prisons at Guantánamo do not refer to lack of access on US soil and do not pertain to the larger US prison system. As a result, we include a variable indicating whether an allegation of lack of access occurred within a country’s national territory or not. When you encounter an allegation, first consult the list of UN member states [here](#). If the country or territory is listed as a UN member state, code the allegation as occurring within national territory. If the country or territory is not listed on this page, code the allegation as occurring elsewhere, listing the ISO3 numeric code of the location. If the location has no ISO3 numeric code, write the name of the location into the coding sheet and include the information in your weekly notes.

If Location of Lack of Access = 1, provide the ISO3 numeric code in the same cell. Separate

the “1” and the ISO3 numeric code with a comma.

Coding Scheme: If AI Comments on Access = 1, provide the ISO3 numeric code of the location where the alleged tortured lack of access according to the following scale. This variable is mutually exclusive.

- 0 = Within National Territory
- 1 = Elsewhere (Specify with ISO3 numeric code)

5 Coder Notes

Coders should turn in their Excel Coding Sheets to the principal investigators weekly. To accompany these Coding Sheets, coders should also compile a Word (or Open Office) document of Coder Notes listing the allegations that correspond with those in the Excel Coding Sheet. An example of Coder Notes will be distributed to all coders at the beginning of the project. The format used on this example should be followed in your own Coder Notes. Coder Notes files should be named according to the following format: “CountryYear_LastNameofCoder” (i.e., Portugal2000_Ryals).

Finally, Coder Notes should also include a list of Unavailable Reports from the AI Comprehensive Guide that the coder was *unable* to find in AI’s Online Library, as well as a list of documents coded by the coder.

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>
- Cingranelli, David L. and David L. Richards. 2004. "The Cingranelli-Richards (CIRI) Human Rights Dataset."
URL: <http://www.humanrightsdata.org>
- Davis, Michael. 2005. "The Moral Justifiability of Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment." *International Journal of Applied Philosophy* 19(2):161–178.
- Hathaway, Oona A. 2003. "The Cost of Commitment." *Stanford Law Review* 55:1821–1862.
- Heston, Alan, Robert Summers and Bettina Aten. 2006. "Penn World Table Version 6.2." Center for International Comparisons of Production, Income and Prices at the University of Pennsylvania.
URL: <http://pwt.econ.upenn.edu/>
- Rejali, Darius. 2007. *Torture and Democracy*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Satterthwaite, Margaret L. 2007. "Rendered Meaningless: Extraordinary Rendition and the Rule of Law." *George Washington Law Review* 75(5/6):1333–1420.
- Stemler, Steven E. and Jessica Tsai. 2008. Best Practices in Interrater Reliability: Three Common Approaches. In *Best Practices in Quantitative Methods*, ed. J.W. Osborne. Los Angeles: Sage pp. 29–49.
- U.S. 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. 1996. "Hilao v Marcos."
URL: <http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=9th&navby=case&no=9516779>
- Weisstein, Eric W. ND. "Order of Magnitude."
URL: <http://mathworld.wolfram.com/OrderofMagnitude.html>