The Women in Resistance (WiRe) Dataset (version 1) Description and Codebook

Erica Chenoweth

Last updated 9 September 2019

The Women in Resistance (WiRe) Dataset is the first of its kind to catalogue women's participation in 338 maximalist resistance campaigns (i.e. those campaigns that call for the toppling of an oppressive government or territorial self-determination). The dataset identifies both nonviolent and violent maximalist campaigns in every country in the world from 1945-2014, providing a comprehensive and systematic look at various dimensions of women's participation in both types of campaigns.

a. The Data Collection Process

Two research assistants independently collected and coded data for each campaign. The coders had access to the project codebook but did not have access to one another's source materials or coding decisions. Research assistants collected data from a diverse array of source materials which were identified largely through internet and university library catalogue searches relevant to each campaign. Research assistants conducted focused searches to find scholarly, journalistic, archival, or visual source material on the role of women and gender in each campaign. Such materials included scholarly books and articles, news articles, websites, existing sources of data (such as Thomas and Bond 2015), reports or archives of the participants in the groups, memoirs, NGO and government reports, online photographs, videos, or films of campaign participants engaging in resistance activities. Most materials were English-language, although some source materials were in Spanish, Portuguese, or French. With the exception of the scholarly books and articles, nearly all of the content from which the research assistants coded the data were open source.

Generally speaking, research assistants were able to find sufficient material from which to code the data through this method. Once they found particular sources that allowed them to code a variable, they would enter the data into a spreadsheet along with a link to the source, as well as any notes about rationale for the data entry. Often they found multiple independent sources to triangulate data and justify their coding decisions; in such cases, they listed all relevant sources.

At times, research assistants found conflicting information, such as an article which stated that women comprised one-third of the membership of a rebel group and another article stating that women comprised one-tenth of the membership. When they found such conflicting sources, they would seek further independent sources to adjudicate which estimate was the most reliable. For instance, sources that were published in peer-reviewed outlets were generally considered more reliable than sources with ambiguous citation practices.

Once the research assistants completed their coding, I combined their data for comparison. Where research assistants agreed on a particular coding decision, I verified the information by cross-checking it with the source material provided and marked their joint coding decision as "true". When there was disagreement between the

research assistants on a particular coding decision, I returned to the source material from which they coded the observation. In all cases of disagreement, conflicting coding decisions resulted from research assistants relying on different source material that made competing claims. In such cases, I conducted additional searches to attempt to find independent sources that could confirm which coding decision was the most reliable.

b. Inter-coder Reliability

Inter-coder reliability was quite high: research assistants agreed on 94.57% of coding decisions, which I attribute to fairly straightforward, binary coding rules among most of the variables.

There was some variation in inter-reliability among these variables. Perhaps unsurprisingly, ordinal variables had slightly lower levels of agreement. For example, the lowest inter-coder agreement occurred for the ordinal variable on the extent of frontline participation within the campaign (78%), whether the campaign featured a gender-inclusive ideology (84%), and the extent of women in leadership roles (87%). However, all told, these are impressively high levels of inter-coder reliability, and all disagreements were remedied through additional research.

Once the data were finalized, as a further check on data reliability, I randomly selected several cases and conducted research from source materials published after the data collection had been completed (e.g. Darden, Henshaw, and Szekely 2019; Webster, Chen, and Beardsley 2019). Using those qualitative and quantitative data sources, I found that 100% agreement between my independent coding decisions and the coding in the final dataset.

This high level of inter-coder reliability speaks to both a strength and a weakness of the data. The strength is that the are highly reliable and accurate. The weakness is that much of this reliability and accuracy inheres from the over-aggregated nature of the dataset. For instance, the fact that frontline participation is coded as present or absent over the entire campaign means that the data are not very informative. This is why the variable that codes the extent of frontline participation may be more informative – it allows for a range of responses rather than a dichotomous one. Unsurprisingly, the inter-coder reliability on this variable was therefore somewhat lower, although not devastatingly so.

c. The NAVCO 1.2 Dataset

The Nonviolent and Violent Campaigns and Outcomes (NAVCO) data set (version 1.2) provides cross-sectional data on 338 maximalist campaigns from 1945-2014. The data identify cases where at least 1,000 were observed mobilizing to remove an incumbent national leader, secede, remove a foreign military occupation, or expel a colonial power. This current version expands upon the NAVCO 1.1 data set by extending coverage from 2006-2014 and adding numerous new gender-related variables. However, campaign-level variables—such as the primary method of resistance, peak participation, security forces' defections, regime violence, foreign state support to campaigns, support for or sanctions against the opponent government, and the outcomes of the campaigns—

remain identical to the original coding rules. Please see navcodata.org for a more detailed description of variables, source materials, and coding rules in the NAVCO 1.1 dataset.

d. Getting & Citing the WiRe Data

The data are permanently hosted on the Harvard Dataverse. Please cite these data accordingly, using the following citation.

Erica Chenoweth, 2019, "Women in Resistance Dataset," Harvard Dataverse, V1.

e. The Codebook

I designed the codebook and coding rules to mimic those of related studies that focus largely on armed groups. This is to ensure compatibility and comparison with existing studies (e.g. Asal, et al 2013; Thomas and Bond 2015; Henshaw 2016). See below.

Women in Resistance (WiRe) Dataset Codebook, v.1

Note: this list of variables complements the NAVCO 1.2 Dataset (Chenoweth 2019). The unit of analysis is the campaign.

Variable Name	Variable	Definition	Additional Rule(s) / Clarification	Example(s)
frontlinerole	**Women in Frontline Roles (0=no; 1=yes)?**	Women reported / observed in combat roles or on frontlines of peak demonstrations, protests, or nonviolent events (1) or not (0)	To qualify as a 1, must be reports of women actively involved in frontline confrontation against opponent personnel (either violently or nonviolently).	0=Taliban, an all-male group; 1=Khmer Rouge, which involved female cadres among combatants; Egyptian revolution, which involved women protestors on the front lines.
extentfrontrole	**Extent Women in Frontline Roles (0=none; 1=limited; 2=moderate; 3=extensive; -99 ambiguous/ unknown)**	Extent of women's frontline participation. None (0) indicates no observed frontline role for women. Limited participation (1) indicates a handful of observed frontline women participants (i.e. women are less than 25% of frontline participants). Moderate participation (2) means that women are clearly and routinely involved in the frontline of the campaign, and that the proportion of women campaigners is significant (between 25 and 50% of frontline participants). Extensive participation (3) means that women frontline campaigners comprised the majority (at least 50%) of observed participants. Ambiguous (-99) indicates that after extensive searching, the extent of frontline participation by women is ambiguous or difficult to nail down.	A code of 0 for this variable must match a code of 0 for the "Women in Frontline Roles" variable.	0=Taliban, an all-male group; 1=FLN, where women bombers received a lot of attention but were clearly a minority among the hundreds of thousands of male combatants; 2=the Cuban Revolution, where women constituted a named brigade and were claimed to have had significant numbers; 3=Bahrain, where women participants numbered about 50% of the total demonstrators.

supportrole	**Women in Support Roles (0=no; 1=yes)?**	Women reported / observed in support roles outside of the frontlines (training for combatants/activists; hiding combatants/activists; slave labor; sexual slavery; gather, prepare and cook food; porter; looting; mine sweepers; child care and rearing; spies or informants; messengers; intelligence officers; communications) (1) or not (0)	A code of 0 means that extensive searching has turned up no explicit mention of women serving in a support capacity.	0=Afghan insurgency against Soviets, where women were not observed engaging in support roles; 1=FLN, where women provided extensive support outside of combat.
symbolicrole	**Women in Symbolic Support Roles (0=no; 1=yes)?**	Women reported / observed advocating for the campaign in the news or social media (1) or not (0)	A code of 0 means that extensive searching has turned up no explicit mention of women serving in a symbolic support capacity by advocating for the campaign in a public media or social media forum.	0=Lord's Resistance Army, where no women observed supporting or advocating for the campaign in news or social media; 1=Egyptian revolution, where women took to Twitter and Facebook to pledge their support for the campaign.
leadership	**Women Reported in Active Leadership (0=no; 1=yes)**	Women reported / observed in movement leadership (1) or not (0)	To qualify as a 1, there must be explicit mention of women functioning as campaign leaders, either as a single leader or in the context of a primary leadership group. If there is a women's wing or some other formal organization that is excluded from the primary movement leadership, this is coded as 0.	0=FLN in Algeria, where photographs of the six primary leaders of the group display only men; 1=Khmer Rouge, which had two female leaders; People Power movement, which had a female figurehead in Corazon Aquino.
figureheads	**Woman Icons/Symbolic Figureheads (0=no; 1=yes)**	Women reported / observed as movement icons or symbolic figureheads, martyrs, etc., invoked by movement participants	To qualify as a 1, there must be explicit mention of specific women functioning as martyrs, icons, or symbolic figureheads. The iconic women must be representatives of the community the campaign purports to represent; religious, spiritual, or mythical icons are not included here.	0=Lord's Resistance Army, where there are no reported female figureheads. 1=Green Movement, which martyrized "Nada," a girl shot in the head by Iranian security forces.

extentleadership	**Extent of Women Reported in Leadership (0=none; 1=women among formal leadership; 2=women primary campaign leaders; -99=ambiguous /unknown)**	Extent of women in campaign leadership. None (0) indicates no observed women in campaign's upper echelons. Women among formal leadership (1) indicates that one or more women are among the campaign's leaders, but not the primary leader or figurehead. Women primary campaign leaders (2) indicates that the primary campaign leader is one or more women. If this is ambiguous or unknown after extensive searching, code this variable as -99.	A code of 0 for this variable must match a code of 0 for the "Women Reported in Leadership" variable.	0=FLN in Algeria, where photographs of the six primary leaders of the group display only men; 1=Khmer Rouge (Cambodia); 2=People Power (Philippines).
voluntary	**Reported Voluntary Womens' Participation (0=no; 1=yes)?**	Reported / observed womens' participation that is voluntary (i.e. apparently self-initiated/consensual) (1) or not (0)	This is not mutually exclusive with coerced participation. Both coerced and voluntary participation can occur within the same campaign. Often coders are required to make inferences about whether participation was voluntary or not. We assume that women's participation was voluntary unless circumstances from the case suggest otherwise.	0=Boko Haram, where girls are reported to be exclusively abducted and forcibly recruited. 1=FLN, where women were reportedly volunteers.
coerced	**Reported Coerced Womens' Participation (0=no; 1=yes)?**	Reported / observed womens' participation that is coerced (i.e. via abductions; forced marriages; sex slavery; slave labor; forced extraction of taxes, food, shelter) (1) or not (0)	This is not mutually exclusive with voluntary participation. Both coerced and voluntary participation can occur within the same campaign.	0=Bulgaria, where reportedly all women participants joined voluntarily; 1=FLN, where forced marriages and forced extraction reportedly took place, especially in rural areas of FLN control.

wmissues	**Womens' Issues Central to Campaign Demands (0=no; 1=yes)?**	Womens' issues featured among the top 5 demands made by the movement/campaign (1) or not (0)	Code for the entire campaign, not just for women participants of the campaign.	0=FLN, where women's equity was ultimately championed, but not among the top demands of the FLN. 1=Bahrain, where inclusion of women as full citizens in political life was among the major demands of this pro-democracy movement.
gi_ideol	**Gender-Inclusive Ideology (0=no; 1=yes; 2=contested)?**	Segments of movement/campaign explicitly advocate the inclusion of women in public life or not (based on MAROB) (1) or not (0). A code of (2) suggests that the campaign is actively debating its ideology regarding gender-inclusion.	This defaults to 0 unless there are explicit mentions by movement participants that the ideology is gender-inclusive, or there are movement documents indicating as much. Coders should choose the code that best represents the campaign at its end (i.e. if this was contested early in the campaign but resolved later, code this variable according to the way the movement resolved the gender-inclusivity question). Note that this variable is not mutually exclusive with gender-exclusive ideology; both gender-inclusive and gender-exclusive ideologies can exist within the same campaign.	0=ISIS, which proscribes women in public life; 1=Bahrain, where women actively promoted in political life as part of pro-democracy movement; 2=Khmer Rouge, where presence of several female leaders coexisted with calls for women to perform traditional gender roles.

ge_ideol	**Gender-Exclusive Ideology (0=no; 1=yes; 2=contested)?**	Segments of movement/campaign reported to advocate for the exclusion of women in public life or not (based on MAROB) (1) or not (0). A code of (2) suggests that the campaign is actively debating its ideology regarding gender-exclusion.	This defaults to 0 unless there are explicit mentions by movement participants that the ideology is gender-exclusive, or there are movement documents indicating as much. Coders should choose the code that best represents the campaign at its end (i.e. if this was contested early in the campaign but resolved later, code this variable according to the way the movement resolved the gender-exclusivity question). Note that this variable is not mutually exclusive with gender-inclusive ideology; both gender-inclusive and gender-exclusive ideologies can exist within the same campaign.	0=Bahrain, where no movement activists reported to promote gender-exclusive ideology; 1=Egypt, where there were calls among conservative activists for women to assume traditional gender roles; 2=Khmer Rouge, where presence of several female leaders coexisted with calls for women to perform traditional gender roles.
formalinvolve	**Formal Womens' Groups Involved in Campaign (0=no; 1=yes)?**	Formal women's groups/associations/movements are involved in the movement/campaign (1) or not (0)	"Formal women's groups" means women's organizations with formal titles.	0=Bulgarian "Dance with Me" movement, that had no reported formal women's associations involved; 1=Let's Save Togo movement, which had a "Women's Wing" formally developed.
peace_calls	**Women Participants Observed Calling for Peace / Peaceful Mobilization (0=no; 1=yes)?**	Women participants (either formal or informal) are reported to explicitly call for peace and/or peaceful mobilization (1) or not (0)	Code as 1 if women participants or formal women's groups are explicitly calling for peaceful mobilization or peace. This includes, by inference, women calling methods of peaceful protest (e.g. sex strikes, candlelight vigils, etc.). 0 if otherwise.	0=Khmer Rouge, where women involved in campaign did not call for peace but rather were participants in combat; 1=People Power movement in the Philippines, where nuns explicitly called for peaceful mobilization.

gbvwithin	**Gender-Based Violence Reported Within Campaign (0=no; 1=yes)?**	Whether women participants face violence from within the movement for defying gender roles (1) or not (0)	Code as 1 only if women are reportedly harmed through direct physical force by other campaign participants for defying/transgressing traditional gender roles.	0=Bulgarian "Dance with Me" campaign, where there were no reported violent incidents against women who participated in the campaign from within; 1=FLN in Algeria, wherein some women reportedly experienced violent sanctions from within the movement when they transgressed gender roles.
gbvagainst	**Gender-Based Violence Reported Against Campaign (0=no; 1=yes)?**	Whether women participants reportedly face violence from outside the movement for defying gender roles (1) or not (0)	Code as 1 only if women are reportedly harmed through direct physical force by non-movement participants (i.e. state, counter-movement, etc.) for defying/transgressing traditional gender roles.	0=Bulgarian "Dance with Me" campaign, where there were no reported violent incidents targeting women in specific due to their participation in the campaign from outside the campaign; 1=Egypt, wherein some women reportedly experienced gender-based violence by police or criminals, targeting them because of their transgression of traditional gender roles.
discrimination	**Gender-Based Discrimination Reported Within Campaign (0=no; 1=yes)?**	Whether women participants face political, social, or economic discrimination from within the movement (1) or not (0)	Code as 1 only if women report discrimination by other campaign participants in ways short of violence (i.e. exclusion from leadership or decision-making, denial of services, reduced wages, fewer options regarding participation, etc.).	0=Bulgarian "Dance with Me" campaign, where there was no reported discrimination against women who participated in the campaign from within; 1=FLN in Algeria, wherein some women reportedly experienced social sanctions from within the movement when they transgressed gender roles.

Works Cited

Asal, Victor, Richard Legault, Ora Szekely, and Jonathan Wilkenfeld. 2013. "Gender Ideologies and Forms of Contentious Mobilization in the Middle East." *Journal of Peace Research* 50 (3): 305-18.

Darden, Jessica Trisko, Alexis Henshaw, and Ora Szekely. 2019. *Insurgent Women: Female Combatants in Civil Wars.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Henshaw, Alexis. 2016. "Why Women Rebel: Greed, Grievance, and Women in Armed Rebel Groups." *Journal of Global Security Studies* 1 (3): 204–219.

Thomas, Jakana and Kanisha Bond. 2015. "Women's Participation in Violent Political Organizations." *American Political Science Review* 109 (3): 488-506.

Webster, Kaitlyn, Chong Chen, and Kyle Beardsley. 2019. "Conflict, Peace, and the Evolution of Women's Empowerment." *International Organization* 73 (2): 255-289.