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In this appendix, we present and discuss the hazard shape of signing and ratifying. We also describe our sources of data in more detail.

Hazard Shape

The hazard rate over time, or the hazard shape, displays the overall pattern of commitment. We examine the hazard shape by setting the regional scores and global scores to their median score for each year, while holding all other independent variables constant at their medians (except for Polity2, which we hold constant at 0). The graphs of the hazard rates for signing and ratifying are in Figure A. The likelihood of signing starts relatively high, and then drops, and then goes back up again. This could be as a result of a worldwide trend for (and against) human rights, which affects all countries in the same way. One plausible explanation for this later increase of commitments, which occurred (for most states) in the mid-1990s, might be found in the global reactions to the horrors of Rwanda, with its 1994 genocide, and Bosnia, with the 1995 Srebrenica massacres. In contrast to the likelihood of signing, the likelihood of ratifying starts low, most likely because most countries signed first, and then ratified a few years later.

After an initial increase, the hazard rate of ratifying essentially follows the same trend as the hazard rate of signing: a decrease followed by an increase.1

_______________

1 Holding all independent variables constant across time (except for the duration dependence variables) results in essentially the same shape for signing. However, if all variables are set constant across time, the hazard shape for ratifying is monotonically decreasing.
Data Coding and Sources

**Dependent Variables**

**Signature**: Year that a state signed or acceded to the CAT. *Source*: Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights 2004, “Status of Ratifications.”

**Ratification/Accession**: Year that a state ratified or acceded to the CAT. *Source*: Office of the High Commission for Human Rights 2004, “Status of Ratifications.”

**Independent Variables**

**Regional Score (lagged)**: Average commitment score of states within World Bank-defined regions, where 0=no action, 1=signed the Convention, 2=ratified the Convention. The regions are Latin America and Caribbean, sub-Saharan Africa, East Europe and Central Asia, Middle East and North Africa, South Asia, East Asia and Pacific, and rest of Europe, including United States and Canada. For a listing of countries, see the World Bank at http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/0,,pagePK:180619~theSitePK:136917,00.html, accessed 14 November 2005.

**Global Score (lagged)**: Average commitment score of all states in the world, on same scale as regional score.

**New Democracy**: Dichotomous variable coded 1 for the years in which the Polity2 score rises to 7 or above (after being below 7) in 1975 or later until the score either drops below 7 or remains at 7 or above for more than 10 years. *Source*: Marshall and Jaggers 2002.

**Unstable Democracy**: Whether (1) or not (0) each democratic state (any state with a positive polity2 score) experienced a 3-point drop in polity2 score, 1975-2002. A gradual drop over several years and a sudden drop in one year are both included. *Source*: Marshall and Jaggers 2002.

**Polity2 Score:** Polity2 score, ranging from −10 to 10, where 10 is the most democratic. *Source:* Marshall and Jaggers 2002.

**Empowerment Rights Index (lagged):** The extent to which states respect empowerment rights (free association, movement, speech, political participation, and religion), on a 0-10 scale, with 10 as the most respectful. *Source:* Cingranelli and Richards 2004.

**Physical Integrity Rights Index (lagged):** The extent to which states respect physical integrity rights (disappearance, killings, political prisoners, torture), on a 0-8 scale, with 8 as the least abusive. *Source:* Cingranelli and Richards 2004.

**Rule of Law:** Measure of law and order on a 6-point scale, where 6 is the strongest rule of law. See Simmons 2000 for brief description. *Source:* PRS Group 2004.


**Common Law Judicial System:** Legal system in which judges can create law through rulings and are not confined to statutory law. *Source:* LaPorta et al. 1999.

**Militarized Interstate Dispute Score:** Hostility level score for each country, 1980-2001, Militarized Interstate Dispute Dataset. Hostility levels coded as follows: 0=No militarized dispute, 1=No militarized action but participant in a dispute, 2=Threat to use force, 3=Display of force, 4=Use of force, 5=War. *Source:* Ghosen and Palmer 2003.
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Figure A: Hazard Rate of Signing/Ratifying
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