Codebook for the Dyadic Militarized Interstate Dispute Data, Version 3.10
Version 3.0 Codebook October 10, 2003
Version 3.10 Codebook September 25, 2007

Faten Ghosn
and
Scott Bennett

Correlates of War2 Project
The Pennsylvania State University
http://correlatesofwar.org

Overview

This codebook refers to the variables that are in the dyadic MID data set created as part of the MID 3.0 project, for the years 1993-2001 (see note below on time coverage). Dyadic MIDs break down the overall MIDs, some of which have many participants, into actual disputing pairs of states. Each dyadic MID has exactly two states involved, on opposite sides of the MID. Each of these two states was directly involved in militarized incidents against the other, and either (or both) took direct actions toward the other state or from it. The data set omits dyads where the two states were on opposite sides of a multi-party dispute, but never took action towards one another. In addition, where a state exits and reenters a MID after a substantial period of time, there is a new dyadic MID, While there are approximately 300 MIDs from 1993-2001, there are over 500 dyadic MIDs during this period.

Because dyadic MIDs are generated from the incident-level data, the COW project's dyadic MID set is generally restricted to the years 1993-2001. Additionally, dyadic MID data is provided for MIDs that were ongoing as of 12/31/1992, as incident-level information was gathered for those MIDs.

Specific Procedures

COW 2 project employs a custom routine written in Bennett and Stam's *EUGene* software program (http://www.eugenesoftware.org) to develop a final data set representing truly disputing pairs of states. To create dyadic MIDs, *EUGene* uses incident level data from the MID 3.0 data set, coupled with higher level MID information. In particular, *EUGene* uses the participant-incident level file (e.g. MIDIP_3.10.csv) to note exactly what pairs of states engaged in incidents against one another. Only those states that were engaged on opposite sides of at least one incident in a MID are coded as members of a dyadic MID. Additional information is brought in from the participant level (MIDB) file for the coding of dyadic MID hostility levels, end dates, and occurrence.

EUGene processes the incident participant file, creating a list of dyads that actually engaged in MID interaction. A new dyadic MID is created for each interaction. In addition, a new dyadic MID is coded if a state involved in the MID exits and then reenters the MID. For example, if in hypothetical MID 1 states A and B were in a MID vs. C, dyadic MIDs would be coded for the A

vs. C and B vs. C dyads. Further, if states A vs. C were involved in the MID from (say) 1995 through 1999, but B was involved in 1995 and then exited until it reentered in 1999, then there would be 3 dyadic MIDs: A vs. C 1995-1999; B vs. C 1995; and B vs. C 1999.

A variety of variables are computed across the set of incidents involving the two states in the dyadic MID. The start date of the dyadic MID is the start date of the first dyadic incident. The end date of the dyadic MID is normally the end date of the last dyadic incident. The highest hostility levels for the two states in the dyadic MID are the highest hostility level reached by each state across all dyadic incidents with that particular other state in this MID. Exceptions to these rules exist in two cases.

- *First*, there are several MIDs where the end date of the MID is later than the end date of the last incident, normally because a settlement of the MID occurs after the final incident, or because of coding rules that code the end of the MID explicitly a given length of time after the end of the observed conflict. If the MIDB files indicate clearly (i.e. in a dyadic or many-on-one dispute) that the MID end date for a state was later than the last incident in the MIDIP file, then the end date of the dyadic MID is set to the end date from the MIDB file, not the incident file. Examining the data, in all multilateral (many-on-many) disputes where the last incident end date was earlier than the MIDB end date for one of the countries, it was verified in the data that in fact the incident end date was appropriate for the state in question, and so the dyad MID receives its end date from the incident data.
- *Second*, in cases of war the end date of the MID is normally set to the end date of the war, but the incident file stops recording incidents after the war begins. Also, a war can occur (recorded at the MIDA and MIDB level as a hostility level 5) even if no incident reaches a level 5 hostility (many level 4 actions can add up to war). In cases where <u>both</u> states in a dyadic MID are war participants at the MID level, they both receive a hostility level of 5 (war) and the end date of the end of MID (which is also the end of war), even though the incident data does not show a war incident. If only one state becomes a war participant, then the end of the MID and dyadic hostility levels are left at the values that emerge from the incident data.

Because states can take different levels of action against different target states and on dates that do not correspond to the very first and last incidents within the larger MID, dyadic MID data frequently differ from the overall MID. The information should be presumed to be the same only for MIDs that involve just 2 states.

New Variables in Dyadic MID Set: SideA Dyadic, Dyadic MID Number

Two new variables are reported in this data set that identify critical elements of the dyadic interactions.

SideADyA, SideADyB: These are dyadic versions of the SideA variable. The overall "SideA" variable marks which states were on side A in the <u>overall dispute</u>, that is, states on the same side as the state who took the first militarized action. This marker identifies which state in the <u>dyad</u> took the first militarized action against the other state in the <u>dyad</u>. An expansion of a MID beyond the original dyad (either including new interactive pairings of original participants who did not confront one another, or involving new states) may involve a state who was on the

original side B but who actually initiated a new action against a new state. For instance, consider a hypothetical MID ultimately involving the US against Canada and Britain. Assume that the MID begins with a threat by the US against Canada on day 1. The US is then coded as being on side A of the overall dispute, and Canada on side B, so a US-Canada MID. But assume that after the first US challenge on day 1, on day 2 Britain joins Canada in a counter-threat against the US. Now, Britain has started the dyadic Britain-US MID (although not the overall MID). Thus the US would be coded as being on Side A through the dispute (and Britain and Canada on side B), but Britain would be on the dyadic Side A in the Britain-US dyad.

DyMIDNum: This variable records a *Dyadic MID Number*. In addition to the number of the overall MID within which a dyad is having a dispute, the data now also report a dyadic MID number. This number is unique for each conflicting dyad within an overall MID. The number is also unique for the different interactions that occur when a state in a MID exits and reenters the MID. When this happens, the case is a new dyadic MID, with a new number. For example, if in hypothetical MID 1 states A and B were in a MID vs. C, dyadic MID 101 might refer to the A vs. C dyadic MID, and dyadic MID 102 to the B vs. C dyadic MID. Further, if states A vs. C were involved in MID 1 from (say) 1995 through 1999, but B was involved in 1995 and then exited until it reentered in 1999, then there would be 3 dyadic MIDs: A vs. C 1995-1999; B vs. C 1995; and B vs. C 1999. These three MIDs would have dyadic MID numbers of 101, 102, and 103 respectively.

Adjusting Variables for Dyadic Interaction

Some variables in the dyadic MID data set are specifically dyadic, that is, they are computed to take into the dyadic nature of these interactions (for instance, the start and end dates of dyadic interaction may differ from interaction in the overall MID). Other variables are reported that are simply taken as the value from the overall MID without adjustment (for instance, fatality levels cannot be computed as to who inflicted what specific fatalities, and so fatality level variables report unadjusted, overall MID values).

Variables that are adjusted/take into account dyadic interactions:

InSideA. This marker identifies which state in the dyad took the first militarized action against the other state in the dyad, that is, the first mover in the dyadic MID.

Start and end date of the dyadic MID: taken as the start date of the first incident in the MID, and the last day of the last incident in the MID, involving the two states in the dyad on opposite sides of any incident within the overall MID.

Highest hostility level and highest action: reflect the hostility levels reached only across those incidents where the two states in a dyad were on opposite sides.

Revisionist: The revisionist variable marks those states who were revisionist in incidents involving the other state in the dyad. That is, a state in a dyadic MID is coded revisionist if the state, in any incident involving the two states in the dyad, has a non-0 value for some issue. So a state is non-revisionist if and only if it has no issues in any incident involving it and the other state in the dyad during the MID. States could be revisionist in their aims against some states, but not others.

Revision type: Reflects revisions sought only in those incidents involving the other state in the dyad. Since only two revision types may be coded, and there may be many incidents, *EUGene* keeps the 2 most serious revision types (ranked as 1 > 2 > 3 > 4) across all incidents involving the two states in the dyad.

Reciprocation: Reciprocation is marked when both states take a directed incident-level action against the other state in the dyad.

Unadjusted variables that come from overall MID/state information

SideA: The SideA variable marks states who were on the side of the overall first-mover in the MID.

Fatalities (state level): reported fatalities for states in dyadic disputes are simply the fatalities that come from the overall dispute. They are NOT adjusted for dyadic interaction (there is no way to accurately determine in a multi-state engagements who inflicted casualties on whom). No new fatalities are computed in dyadic MIDs, and fatalities are not divided in any way among dyadic MIDs. Thus the same value will appear for a state in all dyadic MIDs that emerge from a single overall MID. Users of the fatality variable should be careful to use only one value for each overall MID, because adding state-level fatality values from the dyadic MID level will overcount fatalities. [If the user selects the Maoz version of dyadic MIDs for the pre-1993 period, Maoz has adjusted some fatalities for the dyadic disputes. Post 1992 dyadic MIDs do not have an adjustment.]

Fatalities (overall): Similar to state level fatalities, overall fatalities represent the total fatalities of the overall MID, not divided by state or dyad. The same value will appear for all dyadic MIDs within an overall MID.

Originator: Reports states that were on the originating side in the overall MID.

Role: Reports states' role in the overall MID.

Variables in MIDDyadic_v3.10.csv file

Variable Number	Variable Name	Variable Description
1	DispNum	Dispute number
2	DyMIDNum	Dyadic Dispute number
3	CCodeA	COW country code of the first state in the dyad
4	CCodeB	COW country code of the second state in the dyad
5	StDay	Start day of incident (-9 = missing)
6	StMon	Start month of incident
7	StYear	Start year of incident
8	EndDay	End day of incident (-9 = missing)
9	EndMon	End month of incident
10	EndYear	End year of incident
11	HiactA	Highest action taken by State A across all incidents involving both A and B in this MID (bracketed numbers refer to corresponding hostility level) 0 No militarized action [1] 1 Threat to use force [2] 2 Threat to blockade [2] 3 Threat to occupy territory [2] 4 Threat to declare war [2] 5 Threat to use CBR weapons [2] 6 Threat to join war [2] 7 Show of force [3] 8 Alert [3] 9 Nuclear alert [3] 10 Mobilization [3] 11 Fortify border [3] 12 Border violation [3] 13 Blockade [4] 14 Occupation of territory [4] 15 Seizure [4] 16 Attack [4] 17 Clash [4]

18 Declaration of war [4]
19 Use of CBR weapons [4]
20 Begin interstate war [5]
21 Join interstate war [5]
-9 Missing [-9]

12 HiactB Highest action taken by State B across all incidents involving both A and B in this MID

13 HostlevA Highest hostility level reached by State A across all incidents involving both A and B in this MID
1 No militarized action
2 Threat to use force
3 Display use of force
4 Use of force
5 War

14 HostlevB Highest hostility level reached by State B across all incidents involving both A and B in this MID

15 SideAA State A is on Side A of overall MID (1 = yes; 0 = no)

16 SideAB State B is on Side A of overall MID (1 = yes; 0 = no)

17 RevstatA State A is a revisionist state in at least one incident involving both States A and B in this MID (1 = yes; 0 = no)

18 Revtyp1A Revision Type #1, State A. Revision types 1 and 2 code the top 2 issues state A had across all incidents in the MID with state B.
0 Not applicable
1 Territory
2 Policy
3 Regime/government
4 Other
-9 Missing

19 Revtyp2A Revision Type #2, State A
0 Not applicable
1 Territory
2 Policy
3 Regime/government
4 Other
-9 Missing

20 RevstatB State B is a revisionist state in at least one incident involving both States A and B in this MID (1 = yes; 0 = no)

21	Revtyp1B	Revision Type #1, State B
22	Revtyp2B	Revision Type #2, State B
23	OrigA	State A is an originator of the overall dispute (1 = yes; 0 = no)
24	OrigB	State B is an originator of the overall dispute (1 = yes; 0 = no)
25	FatalA	Fatality level of overall MID, state A 0 None 1 1-25 deaths 2 26-100 deaths 3 101-250 deaths 4 251-500 deaths 5 501-999 deaths 6 > 999 deaths -9 missing
26	FatalB	Fatality level of overall MID, state B
27	FatalPrA	Precise Fatalities in overall MID, if known, state A (-9 = missing)
28	FatalPrB	Precise Fatalities in overall MID, if known, state B (-9 = missing)
29	RoleA	State A's role in the overall dispute 1: Originator on initiator side (Side A) 2: Joiner on initiator side 3: Originator on target side (Side B) 4: Joiner on target side
30	RoleB	State B's role in the overall dispute 1: Originator on initiator side (Side A) 2: Joiner on initiator side 3: Originator on target side (Side B) 4: Joiner on target side
31	Reciproc	Dyadic MID is reciprocated (there was an incident both with A vs. B, and B vs. A, that is, both took action where the other state is a target).
32	SideADyA	State A is on side A of the dyadic dispute (meaning basically, state A took the first militarized action against B rather than vice-versa
33	SideADyB	State B is on side A of the dyadic dispute (meaning basically, state B took the first militarized action against A rather than vice-versa

34	Version	Version number of this data set