**Coding Rules for Congressional Testimonials**

The purpose of this document is to outline how to code Congressional Testimonials for information relevant to how academic or expert evidence on looting is used by policymakers for counterterrorism and cultural heritage protection purposes. From the NSF proposal:

Congressional records will form another key component of the archival materials. Passage of H.R. 1493 hinged on Congressional hearings at which archaeologists, cultural property lawyers, and human rights advocates testified to the scope of artifact looting in the Middle East conflict zone. We will access transcripts from the relevant hearings through the Government Publishing Office. Because this project asks how satellite data inform counterterrorism policy, we will search for patterns in how researchers explain to non-experts how they “see” looting evidence and why certitude is often elusive. This work will provide additional material to address RQ3 (scientific urgency). We will also examine Congressional records related to anti-looting counterterrorism bills that did not advance to a vote, in order to understand why SRS-based claims sometimes fail to persuade policymakers.

To identify patterns, it is necessary to look to the smallest common units and themes in the documents to be coded. To this end, coding will involve looking for both attributes of the speaker and attributes of the testimony or document. Attributes of the speaker include their affiliation, job title, role (detector, analyst, or policymaker), and their experience with satellite imagery and/or SRS. Attributes of the document include the document id, document type, title of the testimonial, a brief description of the statement, the type of evidence used (in-person, satellite, SRS, etc.), whether the speaker was certain of the evidence, and whether the testimony was part of a successful vote or not.

Note that whether the speaker is certain of the evidence presented will depend on the type of document being coded. A written testimony submitted to a committee as part of a hearing for legislation will be written carefully and will minimize any statements of ambiguity so that it makes the most impact on the committee. As such, the written statements will, by nature, be certain of any evidence presented. However, during the Q & A, there may be less certainty in the answers given by the experts, so special attention should be paid to these sections. Specific coding instructions for these attributes are discussed in more depth below. This will be a living document and will change as necessary.

**Structural Variables**

**Row ID:** The unique ID for each statement of evidence (row) in the spreadsheet. This ID is automatically populated in the excel spreadsheet and concatenates the following fields: Document ID, Document Type, and a Counter variable to differentiate between multiple statements from the same document. The document type variable is automatically converted from a number to a letter as follows – “M” for documents coded as 1 (“Media”), “T” for documents coded as 2 (“Testimony”), and “B” for documents coded as 3 (“Bill”).

**Doc ID:** The unique ID for each document being coded. Multiple statements taken from the same document will have the same document ID. The document ID is also the file name and is formulated as followed: Author last nameYYYYMMDD (e.g., Hatfield20160419). If there are multiple authors, use “et al” after the first author’s last name (e.g., Hatfieldetal20160419). Excel code example: *=CONCATENATE(B3,IF(C3=1,"M",IF(C3=2, "T", IF(C3=3, "B","N/A"))),D3)*

**Doc Type:** The type of document being coded. This can include a news story, testimony for a bill, and the bill itself. “Media” includes any news coverage of the bill, its testimony, or supporting evidence. “Testimony” in rare cases can include supporting documents that have been sent to Congress in addition to the actual testimony (e.g., the Antiquities Coalition #CultureUnderThreat Report). “Bill” can also include documents that result from the legislation, such as reports by the Committee for Cultural Policy, which was created by the legislation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = |  Media |
| 2 =  |  Testimony |
| 3 = |  Bill |

**Counter:** A count variable that goes from 1 to *n* (where *n* is the number of pieces of evidence being coded in a given document). If a statement is being coded multiple times for different pieces of evidence, the counter will continue to increase (e.g., statement A is coded twice, they would have separate counters *n* and *n+1*).

**Date:** The date that the document was published, in the format MM/DD/YYYY.

**Year:** An automatically generated field for the year the document was published.

Excel codeexample: *=YEAR(E3)*

**Month:** An automatically generated field for the month the document was published.

Excel code example: *=MONTH(E3)*

**Day:** An automatically generated field for the day the document was published.

Excel code example: *=DAY(E3)*

**Speaker Variables**

**Speaker:** The full name of the speaker whose language is being coded. Record as much of the name as is available and then cross-reference with other information present to fill in any missing information. For example, if only “Mr. Scott” is listed, record “Mr. Scott” and then look to see if it is possible to find the speaker’s first name. Note, the default “speaker” in a news story is the journalist/author, unless they are quoting another document or person. Thus, in statements like “for many experts…” the speaker is still the author of the article rather than the experts, since no specific people were cited.

**Affiliation:** The affiliation of the speaker (e.g., Department of State, University or Organization they work at, etc.). In some cases, an individual may be speaking as an independent scholar or expert, in which case their affiliation should be marked as “Independent Scholar/Expert” as appropriate. If not immediately present in the document being coded, cross-reference with other sources or an internet search to find the speaker’s affiliation at the time the document was published. Internet sources should be restricted to looking for resumes, employment profiles, and news articles quoting the speaker from the same time period.

**Title/Job:** The speaker’s specific job within their organization at the time the document was published. If not available, try to cross-reference with other information to fill this in.

**Role:** The speaker’s role as it pertains to this research project. This can fall into one of three categories – detector, analyst, or policymaker. Detectors include those that work with satellites, sensors, algorithms, computers, screens, and technicians. Examples include geospatial engineers and technicians that work with computer equipment to produce images used by analysts. Analysts include archaeologists, satellite engineers, researchers at think tanks, and intelligence officials. Policymakers include Congressional officials, international NGOs like UNESCO, and the National Counter Terrorism Center. These individuals create policy and security procedures based on the findings of Analysts. Code as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = |  Detector |
| 2 =  |  Analyst |
| 3 = |  Policymaker |
| 4 = |  Media |

**Satellite Imagery Experience:** Does the speaker have experience working with satellite imagery professionally? This can be as a detector, an analyst, or a policymaker.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2 = |  Unclear/Unknown |
| 1 = |  Yes |
| 0 =  |  No |

**Satellite Remote Sensing Experience:** Does the speaker have experience working with satellite remote sensing technology professionally? This can be as a detector, an analyst, or a policymaker.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2 = |  Unclear/Unknown |
| 1 = |  Yes |
| 0 =  |  No |

**Standards of Evidence Variables**

**Title:** The title of the testimonial being coded.

**Brief Statement:** Copy the exact statement being coded from the document using quotation marks to signal that it is a direct quote. Start from the beginning of the sentence and include a maximum of two sentences. If the same speaker says multiple relevant statements, then code each statement separately. The focus is on looting or other types of damage (e.g., destruction), satellite imagery, and terrorism as their intersections relate to policy. As such, statements related to the antiquities trade or terrorism in general are not specific enough to warrant coding in all cases. See below for examples of statements to code and to NOT code. If it is not clear whether the statement is relevant, include and code it to the best of your ability but also make sure to mark 1 for the LOOKUP variable and copy the statement to the REVIEW tab with the specific question on relevance.

* Examples of statements to be coded should include:
	+ Looting activities
		- E.g., Evidence of looting occurring from personal experience, observation, satellite imagery, or reports from other sources and the media
	+ Evidence connecting looting activities and terrorist organizations
		- E.g., Daesh directly working with looted objects
	+ Evidence connecting looting and other criminal organizations
		- E.g., Weapons or drug smugglers participating in looting activities
	+ Destruction, damage, or other types of impacts to cultural heritage relative to conflict and/or satellite imagery
		- E.g., Destruction of a monument or archaeological site captured on satellite imagery.
* Examples of **statements that should not be coded** include:
	+ General statements about the illicit trafficking of antiquities or blood antiquities
		- *Exception:* If the statement is specifically related to looting and/or satellite imagery, include and code it.
	+ General statements about terrorist organizations and the illicit antiquities trade
		- *Exception:* If the statement is specifically related to looting and/or satellite imagery, include and code it.
	+ General statements about the antiquities market
		- *Exception:* If the statement is speaking about standards of evidence relating to the field of antiquities looting in conflict, include and code it.

**Lookup:** Indicates that either it is unclear whether the statement is relevant or there is a question on coding that requires additional information. In either case, include the statement, code this variable as “1” and copy the statement into the “REVIEW” tab with the question on coding. Then, code all other variables to the best of your ability.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = |  Yes |
| 0 =  |  No |

**Multiple:** Are there multiple types of cultural heritage impacts/criminal element types mentioned, such that the statement is worth coding separately for each. If yes, copy the statement and code both. Mark multiple as “1” for both. Indicate in the notes anything specific about why it constitutes a multiple. If you are unsure, also mark “1” for “lookup.”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = |  Yes |
| 0 =  |  No |

**Cultural Heritage Impacts Discussed (CH Impacts Discussed):** Does the statement discuss or mention cultural heritage being impacted by an action or group? This includes looting, destruction, or any kind of damage that could reasonably be seen from a satellite image.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = |  Yes |
| 0 =  |  No |

**Impact Type (Primary CH Impacts Type):** The type of impact described in the statement. Cultural heritage impacts can be seen at museums, monuments, archaeological sites, or other important cultural sites that are visible on satellite imagery. The impacts to these sites can include damage, destruction, or looting. This project is primarily interested in looting; however, in some cases destruction and damage can also be relevant. For destruction or damage (or another type of impact) to be relevant, it must meet two criteria. **First**, the context in which the type of impact is discussed matters. If it is discussed in the context of data standards, or as an intentional statement as part of conflict, then it is relevant. **Second**, if the impact type can be seen on satellite imagery, then it is relevant to this project. If the impact cannot be feasibly seen on satellite imagery, then it is not relevant. For example, looting at a museum would not be considered relevant as it cannot be seen or captured on satellite imagery. However, destruction or damage to the museum or looting at an archaeological site could be captured and so would be relevant. If it is not clear whether the statement is relevant, include and code it to the best of your ability but also make sure to mark 1 for the LOOKUP variable and copy the statement to the REVIEW tab with the specific question on relevance.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 0 = |  Not Applicable |
| 1 = |  Looting |
| 2 =  |  Damage |
| 3 = |  Destruction |
| 4 = |  Other |

**Cultural Heritage Impact Evidence (CH Impact Evidence):** Does the statement discuss or present any evidence relating to the impacted cultural heritage?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = |  Yes |
| 0 =  |  No |

**Evidence Type (CH Impact Evidence Type):** The type of looting evidence described in the statement. Evidence can include satellite imagery, personal experience/witnessing of the events (observational evidence), reports from news stories (external summary of evidence), and statements that looting occurred. If no evidence is discussed or described, code as not applicable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 0 = |  Not Applicable |
| 1 = |  Satellite imagery/SRS |
| 2 =  |  Observational evidence |
| 3 = |  External summary of evidence |
| 4 = |  Statement that looting/destruction occurred |

**Criminal Element:** Does the statement discuss or mention any type of criminal element?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = |  Yes |
| 0 =  |  No |

**Criminal Element Type:** The type of criminal element discussed. If no evidence is discussed or described, code as not relevant. Terrorism and illicit markets overlap. As such, if the focus of the statement is on the participation of the element in market activities (trafficking, looting, etc.) then the code as illicit markets. If the focus of the statement is on an act of terrorism that affects cultural heritage (e.g., damage, destruction), then code as terrorism. For example, ISIS may be coded as either terrorism or illicit market, depending on the activity in question.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 0 = |  Not Relevant |
| 1 = |  Terrorism |
| 2 =  |  Illicit Markets (weapons, drugs, etc.) |
| 3 = |  Other |

**Criminal Element Group Name:** The criminal group referenced in the statement. This may include more than one group and is a text variable.

**Evidence Source:** The type of source, the looting evidence comes from. This can include primary, secondary or tertiary. Primary evidence constitutes a direct quote from an expert speaking about the looting evidence. Secondary sources would include references to the work of other experts and scholars. Tertiary sources would include media coverage and summaries of evidence of looting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = |  Primary evidence |
| 2 =  |  Secondary evidence |
| 3 = |  Tertiary evidence |

**Certainty of Evidence:** The degree to which the speaker is certain that the evidence of looting presented represents actual looting. Note that by their nature, written testimony will frame any evidence presented as certain through the language employed. The Q&A section of hearings may reveal more nuances in terms of certainty of evidence – **pay special attention to the Q&A sections.** Code this as a likert scale from 1 (not at all certain) to 5 (very certain). If it is not clear whether the statement is relevant, include and code it to the best of your ability but also make sure to mark 1 for the LOOKUP variable and copy the statement to the REVIEW tab with the specific question on relevance.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Number | Label | Description |
| 1 | Not at all Certain | Media coverage may fall here. An unsubstantiated claim may fall here. An example of an unsubstantiated claim might include the millions of dollars in income from looting. |
| 2 | Not Very Certain | Media coverage may fall between here and unclear depending on the language used. An unconfirmed report may fall here. An unconfirmed report might include a claim that a heritage site had been destroyed but it is unable to be verified due to cloud coverage in the satellite imagery. |
| 3 | Unclear | Media coverage that alleges something and is waiting for confirmation would fall into this category. Also, during the Q&A section of testimonies, if the witness back tracks his or her statement, it could fall here. |
| 4 | Certain | Most testimonies and statements will fall in this category unless given a reason to put it in Unclear or Very Certain. Due to the nature of rhetorical devices, this will be the default. |
| 5 | Very Certain | If the statement gives specific evidence such as a reference to satellite imagery or to pictures of the damage, then it will be classified under very certain. |

**Notes:** Any notes relevant to the coding, especially useful for the “lookup” and “multiple” variables.