

Codebook and User's Guide for TRIP Journal Article Database
(revised November 2010)

Variables Coded for Each Article

This document has been constructed so that users of the data can understand the definitions and procedures used by the scholars who constructed it. As important, it is used by researchers who are working on the TRIP project or who want to replicate/amend TRIP codes for additional articles. The variable names as they appear in the database are in parentheses after the longer description of each variable. In all cases where a variable is dichotomous, a "1" means yes and a "0" means no. So, for example, if there is a variable under the methods section called "quantitative," then a "0" means the article did not use quantitative methods and a "1" means that the article did use quantitative methods. Variables in this document are followed in parenthesis by the name of the corresponding field in the downloadable dataset. Variables in this dataset are in the form "Variable Name:Code", with the variable name, followed by a colon, followed by the variable code. For example, the dichotomous variable signifying whether an article's paradigm is Realist is: "Paradigm:Realist".

When you code using the TRIP article database you don't need to memorize any of these numerical codes. You simply click on the appropriate button next to the value of a specific variable that appears in the online coding interface. Keep this document at hand when you are coding and refer to it regularly. For researchers using these data, you can use this codebook to understand our procedures and to look up the values that different variables can take.

- 1) **Year, volume and number (Journal Year, Journal Volume).** In the initial release of TRIP data (October 2010), we are only releasing those years and issues that have been double coded and reconciled (1980-2007, numbers 1 and 3).
- 2) **Journal publication name (Journal Name).** We will code all international relations (IR) articles in the following journals:

1—AJPS = *American Journal of Political Science*

2—JOP = *Journal of Politics*

3—WP = *World Politics*

4—ISQ = *International Studies Quarterly*

5—JCR = *Journal of Conflict Resolution*

6—APSR = *American Political Science Review*

7—IS = *International Security*

8—IO = *International Organization*

9—BJPS = *British Journal of Political Science*

10—EJIR = *European Journal of International Relations*

11—SS = *Security Studies*

12—JPR = *Journal of Peace Research*

We consider the following “IR journals” and thus code *every* article in every issue for every year of their publication between 1980 and 2006: *IO, IS, ISQ, WP, JCR, EJIR, SS*, and *JPR*.¹ In general political science journals (*JOP, APSR, AJPS, BJPS*), we only code those articles that fall within the IR subfield (broadly defined).

For the purposes of this project, we handle the difference between IR and other subfields in the following way: if the dependent variable (DV) has anything to do with an *inter*-state or transnational issue, the article is classified as an IR article and coded. If the independent variables (IVs) make any mention of *inter*-state or transnational issues, the article is also classified as an IR article. For example, an article that examines bureaucratic decision-making (IV) to explain the causes of inter-state war (DV) qualifies as IR under our definition. Similarly, an article claiming that economic interdependence (IV) drives electoral competition in Belgium (DV) also is classified as IR. An article claiming that civil wars (DV) are caused by religious cleavages within specific countries (IV), however, is classified as comparative politics, not IR, and is therefore excluded from our database if it is published in a “non-IR” journal. Hence, many articles that are published in general political science journals will not appear in our database because both the IVs and the DVs focus on strictly domestic factors or because they are articles in the political theory sub-field.

When we encounter articles that are purely theoretical, without reference to a particular sub-discipline (for instance a *strict* game theory article without reference to a specific empirical application), we employ the following rule: if that article is in an IR journal, we code it; if not, we do *not* code it, unless it specifically refers to *any* IR question/issue. We have adopted this rule because any article published in an IR journal is likely to be read by many IR scholars and is thus likely to have an impact on the IR subfield. A general game theoretic article in *JOP* might well be read by and influence the future research of IR scholars, but we cannot assume that it would. If the same article were published in *JCR* or *ISQ*, however, we would include it in our sample because more IR scholars read these journals, and such articles therefore are expected to have a greater impact on the field.

- 3) **Journal Editor (Editlast, Editfirst).** The first and last name of the journal’s editor or editors.
- 4) **Journal Editor Paradigm (Editpar).** This variable captures the preferred paradigm of the journal editor during his or her tenure as editor. We establish the accuracy of this value by searching books and articles written by the editor during the periods prior to and during his/her tenure as editor. We will supplement this coding rule by sending each current and

¹ All articles of WP are coded—that is, we consider it an IR journal—but we recognize that an increasing proportion of those articles fall within the sub-field of comparative politics. Hence, we also measure this change over time. Coders should click “Comparative Politics,” “Political Theory,” or “American Politics” box under “Issue Area” (Variable #19 below) for any article that is in an IR journal, but is not an IR article. We do not code book reviews; but we do code review essays, controversies, and research notes since they can all make substantial contributions to the IR literature.

former editor a survey which asks, among other things, the respondent to report his/her paradigmatic, methodological, and epistemological commitments. This is currently the only variable in the TRIP journal article database that has not been coded (as of 8/2010).

Paradigm is represented by a dichotomous variable in the data. Some scholars might refer to these categories more narrowly as theories or more broadly as approaches, but we adopt the term most commonly used in the literature to refer to these four major schools of thought.² One might divide the literature in other ways (in terms of levels of analysis, issue area, or epistemology); hence, we attempt to capture such variation in the literature with additional variables specified below. If an author combines or synthesizes two or more paradigms, rather than advancing one in particular, this variable is coded to reflect the paradigm that appears more prominently. If these paradigms are equally prominent, then the coder chooses the paradigm that is mentioned first. The six “Paradigms” are listed below³:

Realist
Liberal
Marxist
Constructivist
Non-paradigmatic
Atheoretic/None

Authors working within a particular paradigm tend to focus on certain dependent variables, but paradigms are defined primarily by their core assumptions and secondarily by the independent variables they emphasize. Paradigms are not defined by their dependent variables.⁴ Hence, there are both realist theories of war and liberal theories of war. They differ not in their attempt to explain why wars occur, but in their core assumptions and in the explanatory variables they privilege in empirical research.

We code an editor as realist if he or she employs the following assumptions in his/her work: (1) states are the dominant actors in international politics; (2) states are unitary, rational actors; (3) states pursue their interests, which are defined in terms of power; and (4) the international system is anarchic. To be considered a realist article it is necessary that the role of power or anarchy is *the* key explanatory variable.⁵ Some explanatory variables which would meet these criteria include hegemony, polarity, offense-defense balance, or relative and absolute power.

² Katzenstein, Keohane and Krasner refer to these four categories as “general theoretical orientations” and distinguish them from “specific research programs” (Katzenstein et al 1999).

³ We include within each school all the variants. For example, neorealism, structural realism, offensive realism, and classical realism are all included in our “realist” paradigm. Neo-marxist and neoliberal approaches similarly fall under the broader paradigmatic categories because they share core assumptions with Marxism and liberalism, respectively. For a narrower (and more conceptually coherent) definition of liberalism see Moravcsik (2004). We include neoliberal institutionalism under the liberal category because this choice is consistent with discourse in the field of IR, not because we believe it is analytically the cleanest choice. Further, excluding neo-liberal institutionalism from the liberal paradigm would inhibit comparisons to other work in the field that has attempted to catalog trends in IR.

⁴ For an alternative approach that includes the DV as part of the coding criteria for paradigm, see Vasquez, *The Power of Power Politics*.

⁵ For the first systematic empirical study along these lines see Vasquez, *The Power of Power Politics*.

We code an editor as liberal if his/her work is consistent with the following assumptions: (1) the primary actors in IR are individuals and private groups, who organize and exchange to promote their own interests; (2) states represent some sub-set of (domestic and, sometimes, foreign) societal actors through domestic political institutions, which transmit demands to government officials authorized to act in the name of the state;⁶ (3) the nature of the international system (including state behavior and patterns of conflict and cooperation) is defined by the configuration of state preferences rather than the distribution of power or the dominant system of economic production; (4) as a result of shifting patterns of preferences states may develop shared norms and institutions, which serve some of the functions typical of institutions within domestic politics (see Moravcsik 2003; Keohane 1984; and Keohane and Nye 1977). Liberals often highlight the importance of the following causal variables: domestic institutions, the preferences of societal actors and trans-national actors, the relative competitiveness of economic producers in the international market, economic interdependence, international law, regimes, international institutions, ideas, and beliefs.

We code an editor as Marxist if his/her work rests on the following assumptions: (1) economic actors are the dominant unit of analysis in international politics; (2) the international system is hierarchic; and (3) mechanisms of domination perpetuate underdevelopment. Marxist approaches tend to focus on class structure, the global capitalist system, and the role of elites within that system as the primary causal variables in their explanations. Some Marxist approaches do invoke the role of “cultural hegemony,” but these ideas reflect the interests of the dominant economic class within society.

We code an editor as constructivist if his/her work assumes that the identity of agents and the reality of institutions are socially constructed. Constructivists employ many IVs that are typical of Liberalism—such as regimes, norms, identities, and institutions—and even sometimes with realists or Marxists. In addition to the causal variables they share with other paradigms, constructivists frequently examine organizational culture, discursive processes, and principled beliefs as explanatory variables. Constructivists certainly are associated with the “ideational turn” in IR research, but they have no monopoly on ideational explanations and many articles that invoke the importance of ideas do not fit within the constructivist paradigm. We include constructivism as the fourth major research paradigm in IR not because it is perfectly analogous to the other three paradigms,⁷ but because it has become the fourth major category for organizing research by IR scholars (Katzenstein et al 1999; Nye 2003).⁸ While the term “constructivism”

⁶ Hence, both the underlying structure of preferences among potential governing coalitions, and the specific domestic rules that structure political bargaining and transmit demands are crucial to determining the preferences of a state in IR.

⁷ In fact, unlike Realism, Liberalism, and Marxism, Constructivism does not suggest any particular substantive model of politics or human behavior. As Adler (2002) explains, constructivism is not “yet another IR ‘ism’, paradigm, or fashion.” Instead, constructivism is a “meta-physical stance, a social theory, and an IR theoretical and empirical perspective.” Hence, constructivism may be less a paradigm or theory of politics than a meta-theoretical approach within which a variety of specific theories could be built. This leaves open the possibility of a “liberal-constructivist” or a “realist-constructivist” approach to IR.

⁸ In this respect we take seriously the constructivist idea that the field of IR has inter-subjectively defined

does not enter the IR lexicon until the 1990s, articles that share the features described above published prior to the use of the term “constructivist” can still be coded as “constructivist.” For example, Wendt’s work in the late 1980s is coded as constructivist even when he and others are giving it different names.

We also employ a “non-paradigmatic” category, which captures scholars that do advance or test coherent theories, but do not fit comfortably within one of the four major paradigms outlined above. We do not imply by this choice that the previous four paradigms are superior to alternatives in the IR literature—such as feminism, English School, post-modernism, cognitive psychology, or a host of other potential rivals—but only recognize the fact that the first four paradigms are the most prominent and frequently discussed in the IR literature.

Those editors who do not employ any theory at all are coded as “atheoretic.” Generally, the work of atheoretic scholars is purely descriptive or tests inductively derived hypotheses that are not related to any theory or paradigm.

In some cases, editors’ work may cross paradigmatic boundaries during their tenure. As long as the plurality of their work falls into a single category, we code the editor as falling within that category.

- 5) **Total articles (Total, TotalIR).** This variable measures the total number of articles published in a given volume of the journal, and how many of these are IR articles.
- 6) **Title (Title).** This is the full title of the article.
- 7) **Author’s name (A1 Last Name, A1 Middle Name, A1 First Name – A6 Last Name, A6 Middle Name, A6 First Name).** We track the first, middle and last name of authors 1 through 4.
- 8) **Author’s gender (A1 Gender–A6 Gender).** This is recorded for all authors of an individual article. If an author’s gender cannot be determined by his/her name, then we attempt to discover the author’s gender through an online search or by contacting the author directly.
- 9) **Paradigm advanced/advocated by author or used to guide analysis (Paradigm).** Here, we measure the paradigm used to frame the research question and answer. We employ the same values as in #4 above.

Paradigm is represented in the data as a dichotomous value. Some scholars might refer to these categories more narrowly as theories or more broadly as approaches, but we adopt the term most commonly used in the literature to refer to these four major schools of thought.⁹ One might divide the literature in other ways (in terms of levels of analysis, issue area, or

the four major paradigms. These categories themselves are socially constructed and they define our discourse as a field.

⁹ Katzenstein, Keohane and Krasner refer to these four categories as “general theoretical orientations” and distinguish them from “specific research programs” (Katzenstein et al 1999).

epistemology); hence, we attempt to capture such variation in the literature with additional variables specified below. If an article combines or synthesizes two or more paradigms, rather than advancing one in particular, this variable is coded to reflect the paradigm that appears more prominently. If these paradigms are equally prominent in the article, then the coder chooses the paradigm that is mentioned first. We do not code articles based on the publicly stated preferences of the author. Instead, we read the article to determine which paradigm is advanced in this particular piece of research. So, if Alexander Wendt writes an article that argues that the distribution of power influences the probability of war, that article is coded as “realist,” even though nobody in the discipline would consider Wendt a realist. The unit of analysis is the article. The six “Paradigms” are listed below¹⁰:

Realist
Liberal
Marxist
Constructivist
Non-paradigmatic
Atheoretic/None

Authors drawing upon a particular paradigm tend to focus on certain dependent variables, but **paradigms are defined primarily by their core assumptions and secondarily by the independent variables they emphasize**. Paradigms are not defined by their dependent variables.¹¹ Hence, there are both realist theories of war and liberal theories of war. They differ not in their attempt to explain why wars occur, but in their core assumptions and in the explanatory variables they privilege in empirical research.

Realist articles frequently employ the following assumptions: (1) states are the dominant actors in international politics; (2) states are unitary, rational actors; (3) states pursue their interests, which are defined in terms of power; and (4) the international system is anarchic. To be considered a realist article it is necessary that the role of power or anarchy is *the* key explanatory variable.¹² Other explanatory variables that are frequently employed in realist analyses include hegemony, polarity, offense-defense balance, or relative and absolute power.

We code an article as liberal if it is consistent with the following assumptions: (1) the primary actors in IR are individuals and private groups, who organize and exchange to promote their own interests; (2) states represent some sub-set of (domestic and, sometimes, foreign) societal actors through domestic political institutions, which transmit demands to government

¹⁰ We include within each school all the variants. For example, neorealism, structural realism, offensive realism, and classical realism are all included in our “realist” paradigm. Neo-marxist and neoliberal approaches similarly fall under the broader paradigmatic categories because they share core assumptions with Marxism and liberalism, respectively. For a narrower (and more conceptually coherent) definition of liberalism see Moravcsik (2004). We include neoliberal institutionalism under the liberal category because this choice is consistent with discourse in the field of IR, not because we believe it is analytically the cleanest choice. Further, excluding neo-liberal institutionalism from the liberal paradigm would inhibit comparisons to other work in the field that has attempted to catalog trends in IR.

¹¹ For an alternative approach that includes the DV as part of the coding criteria for paradigm, see Vasquez, *The Power of Power Politics*.

¹² For the first systematic empirical study along these lines see Vasquez, *The Power of Power Politics*.

officials authorized to act in the name of the state;¹³ (3) the nature of the international system (including state behavior and patterns of conflict and cooperation) is defined by the configuration of state preferences rather than the distribution of power or the dominant system of economic production; (4) as a result of shifting patterns of preferences states may develop shared norms and institutions, which serve some of the functions typical of institutions within domestic politics (see Moravcsik 2003; Doyle 1983; Keohane 1984; and Keohane and Nye 1977). Liberals often highlight the importance of the following causal variables (and at least one should appear for any article to be coded as “liberal”): domestic institutions, the preferences of societal actors and trans-national actors, the relative competitiveness of economic producers in the international market, economic interdependence, international law, regimes, international institutions, ideas, and beliefs.

We code an article as Marxist if it is based on the following assumptions: (1) economic actors are the dominant unit of analysis in international politics; (2) the international system is hierarchic; and (3) mechanisms of domination perpetuate underdevelopment. Marxist approaches tend to focus on class structure, the global capitalist system, and the role of elites within that system as the primary causal variables in their explanations. Some Marxist approaches do invoke the role of “cultural hegemony,” but these ideas reflect the interests of the dominant economic class within society.

We code an article as constructivist if its authors assume that the identity of agents and the reality of institutions are socially constructed. Constructivists employ many IVs that are typical of Liberalism—such as regimes, norms, identities, and institutions—and even sometimes with realists or Marxists. In addition to the causal variables they share with other paradigms, constructivists frequently examine organizational culture, discursive processes, and principled beliefs as explanatory variables. Constructivists certainly are associated with the “ideational turn” in IR research, but they have no monopoly on ideational explanations and many articles that invoke the importance of ideas do not fit within the constructivist paradigm. We include constructivism as the fourth major research paradigm in IR not because it is perfectly analogous to the other three paradigms,¹⁴ but because it has become the fourth major category for organizing research by IR scholars (Katzenstein et al 1999; Nye 2003). While the term “constructivism” does not enter the IR lexicon until the 1990s, articles that share the features described above published prior to the use of the term “constructivist” can still be coded as “constructivist.” For example, Wendt’s work in the late 1980s is coded as constructivist even when he and others are giving it different names.

¹³ Hence, both the underlying structure of preferences among potential governing coalitions, and the specific domestic rules that structure political bargaining and transmit demands are crucial to determining the preferences of a state in IR.

¹⁴ In fact, unlike Realism, Liberalism, and Marxism, Constructivism does not suggest any particular substantive model of politics or human behavior. As Adler (2002) explains, constructivism is not “yet another IR ‘ism’, paradigm, or fashion.” Instead, constructivism is a “meta-physical stance, a social theory, and an IR theoretical and empirical perspective.” Hence, constructivism may be less a paradigm or theory of politics than a meta-theoretical approach within which a variety of specific theories could be built. This leaves open the possibility of a “liberal-constructivist” or a “realist-constructivist approach to IR.

We also employ a “non-paradigmatic” category, which captures articles that do advance or test a coherent theory, but do not fit comfortably within one of the four major paradigms outlined above. We do not imply by this choice that the previous four paradigms are superior to alternatives in the IR literature—such as feminism, English School, post-modernism, cognitive psychology, or a host of other potential rivals—but only recognize the fact that the first four paradigms are the most prominent and frequently discussed in the IR literature.

Those articles that do not employ any theory at all are coded as “atheoretic.” Generally, these atheoretic articles are purely descriptive or test inductively derived hypotheses that are not related to any theory or paradigm.

10) Paradigms taken seriously by author or used as alternative explanation (Paradigm

Taken Seriously). This variable captures which paradigms are discussed in a serious way—that is, treated as alternative explanations, used to derive testable hypotheses or used to frame the research question. A simple “straw-man” depiction of an alternative paradigm does not qualify as “taken seriously.” Instead, the reader needs to learn something about the utility, internal logic, or scope conditions of the alternative paradigm (or a specific model following from some alternative paradigm), in order to be categorized as “taken seriously.” The fact that a particular model or theory has implications for a given paradigm does not mean that the article takes that paradigm seriously. With one exception, we DO NOT allow the same paradigm to be selected for #11 as for #10. For example, if an author is advancing a “defensive realist” approach and he/she tests an alternative “offensive realist” approach, then the coder would select “realist” for #10 but not for #11.¹⁵ The one exception in which we DO allow the same paradigm to be chosen for #10 and #11 is when the value selected in both cases is “non-paradigmatic,” and the paradigm or non-paradigmatic explanation advanced (#10) and the paradigm or non-paradigmatic explanation taken seriously (#11) is different. If no other paradigms are taken seriously in an article then the coder should click on “Atheoretic/None.”

11) Synthesis (Synthesis). This variable refers to whether or not the authors attempt to synthesize explanations from two or more paradigms. Here, we are primarily interested in the article’s main independent variables. Thus, we treat an article as synthetic if the IVs are drawn primarily from two or more distinct paradigms. We do *not* repeat paradigms here. So, if an article is synthesizing a liberal approach with a constructivist one and we have already coded the main paradigm as liberal (for variable #10), we only select constructivism. If we encounter an article where we are unsure which is the *main* paradigm and which is the “synthesized” paradigm, we choose the first paradigm mentioned as main paradigm and the second paradigm mentioned as synthesized. So, for this variable (#12) we select the synthesized paradigm only.

Realism
Liberalism
Marxism

¹⁵ While there is certainly some value to measuring the amount of intra-paradigmatic debate, our purpose is to measure the degree to which scholars advancing one paradigm are simultaneously engaging or taking seriously arguments from alternative paradigms. Of course, “Non-Paradigmatic” theories can be “taken seriously” or synthesized with one or more of the big four and we capture this in our coding.

Constructivism
No synthesis
Non-paradigmatic

Synthesis is different from variable #11 (other paradigms taken seriously). Certainly, there can be no synthesis if an author does not take seriously more than one paradigm. Variable #12 does not capture the use of more than one paradigm, however, but whether there is conscious bridge building between/among distinct paradigms. To count as an effort at synthesis, the argument must take into account the assumptions and the outlook (or worldview) of another paradigm. In most cases this will involve taking the explanatory variables from different paradigms and integrating them as part of a single explanation. Thus, the use only of an imported methodology (an econometric technique, or formal model) is not sufficient to be considered a synthesis because it does not extend to the worldview put forward by the article. However, if an article combines insights from one of the big four paradigms (Realism, Liberalism, Marxism, and Constructivism) with some other theoretical approach normally classified as “Non-Paradigmatic” (such as Feminism, Cognitive Psychology, Long Cycle Theory, etc...), then we code this as synthesis.

12) **Ideational (Ideational)**. This variable measures whether ideational factors are explanatory variables or a focus of inquiry within the article being coded. Any article where *ideas, beliefs, perceptions, learning, norms, identity, knowledge, or personality traits* play a central role in the argument, whether as independent or dependent variable, is coded as ideational (NB: If the word *perception* can be replaced with either "calculation" or "expectation" and still mean the same thing, the variable is not ideational). First, we code an article as "ideational" if its IVs evoke these *non-material* explanations. In instances where the scholar evokes both material and ideational IVs (such as Walt 1987), we give a value of "yes" to both questions 13 and 14 (so, in Walt's case, we code that famous article on the "balance of threat" as "yes" because he evokes one ideational variable in addition to three more prominent material IVs).

Second, in addition to causal variables, some articles seek to **explain** changes in the culture or identity of some group or actor in IR. So, for example, an article might seek to explain a new norm of environmentalism among IO bureaucrats. In this case the DV is ideational and thus the article is coded "yes" for this variable. Hence, if the DV, the IV, or the major concepts (the evaluative framework) used in an article are ideational, then it receives a "yes" for this variable.

13) **Material (Material)**. This variable captures the article's use of material factors, in either the independent or dependent variables. As with the “ideational” variable, this variable is dichotomous, with either a “yes” or “no” value.

Material variables are non-ideational and refer to ascriptive characteristics of actors or the structures in which actors are embedded (states, organizations, corporations, class structure, physical capital, etc.), what actors pursue, and what drives their behavior. They can be physical endowments, such as land or capital, or they can describe capabilities, such as military capability, physical location, or natural resource endowments. They also can include

formal and objective rules or formal organizations and institutions.

In an article that does not contain “variables,” evaluative frameworks that emphasize material components will be coded as “yes” (for example policy analysis that highlights the importance of military capabilities).

15) Epistemology (Epistemology). This variable seeks to answer the question, by what criteria does the author establish knowledge claims?

0-Positivist

1-Non-positivist/interpretivist/post-positivist

We code articles as positivist if they implicitly or explicitly assume that theoretical or empirical propositions are testable, make causal claims, seek to explain and predict phenomena, assume that research is supported by empirical means, and aspire to the use of a scientific method. Generally, these articles present and develop theory, derive hypotheses from their theory, and test them using data (empirical observations from the world). Nevertheless, we code an article as positivist, even when it does not explicitly employ the scientific method, if scientific principles are used to judge the validity of a study or the author is defending a concept of social science that uses these methods to establish knowledge claims. We also code an article as positivist if it employs game theoretic methods. Because game theoretic studies explore the ways in which strategic interactions among rational players produce outcomes, it fits our definition of positivism as making causal claims and seeking to explain and predict outcomes. Finally, we code an article as positivist if it describes a scientific research project—such as POLITY, COW, KEDS, or TRIP—and/ or explains coding rules and evidence collection procedures. Although these articles do not test hypotheses, make causal claims, or use evidence to make inferences, they clearly are part of a positivist research agenda.

We code articles as non-positivist/interpretivist/post-positivist if they implicitly or explicitly employ interpretative, critical or normative methods, reject the possibility of or are not primarily concerned with establishing causal relationships through the systematic collection and analysis of empirical evidence, strive for "thick description"(Geertz), or make explicit normative judgments about policy or behavior. We code an article as non-positivist if the author attempts to represent a world which is empirically determinable but does not adhere to the rules of positivism (hypotheses, scientific method etc.).

An article evaluating the claim of another author (for example, a review essay) is coded as employing the same epistemological stance as the reviewed article, unless the article being reviewed is challenged on epistemic grounds (a review of a positivist work is assumed to be positivist unless the author critiques the epistemological approach used by the author of the book, in which case it is coded "non-positivist/post-positivist").

16) Time period (Time Period). We classify each article in terms of its temporal domain. This variable reflects the time period of the subject or cases studied by the author in depth; individual

anecdotes about particular historical events are not considered when coding this variable. From which historical eras are cases selected and evidence drawn? We code each time period as a dummy variable. We have selected date ranges that correspond to specific historic eras as discussed by historians and IR scholars. None of these dates should be taken as epistemological boundaries and the number of years within each time period varies dramatically. Obviously, individual articles often draw upon historical data from more than one of these time periods, and our coding scheme allows us to capture such choices by coding multiple periods. Articles about the history of the discipline are coded as Timena unless they also evaluate some empirical claims. For example, if the article discusses an empirical event such as the end of the Cold War having an effect on the discipline, it would be coded as Timepcw. Conversely, if the article describes the discipline's effect on an empirical event, the time period of that event would also be coded as Timepcw. If the article being coded is a review essay, then it is coded as Timena unless the author of the review essay includes new empirical evidence in the essay. The values for this variable are listed below:

- **Pre-history to 476 AD.** Captures ancient civilizations, including Egypt and Greece, and extends to the fall of the Roman Empire.
0—No
1—Yes
- **476 to Oct. 1648.** Captures late antiquity, the early and high Middle Ages, as well as the early modern period in Europe. It extends to the end of the Thirty Years' War and the signing of the Peace of Westphalia.
0-No
1—Yes
- **Oct. 1648 to June 28, 1914.** Captures the Enlightenment period, Age of Colonization, the American and French Revolutions, Napoleonic Wars, the first two Balkans wars, and extends to the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand in Sarajevo.
0—No
1—Yes
- **June 28, 1914 to June 28, 1919.** Captures World War I and extends to the signing of the Treaty of Versailles.
0—No
1—Yes
- **June 28, 1919 to September 1, 1939.** Captures the inter-war period and extends to the German invasion of Poland.
0—No
1—Yes
- **September 1, 1939 to August 1945.** Captures World War II, including V-E and V-J Days in 1945
0—No
1—Yes

- **September 1945 to November 9, 1989.** Captures the Cold War period, including the origins of “containment” as the official policy of the United States toward the Soviet Union, the consolidation of the United Nations, and decolonization. It ends with the fall of the Berlin Wall.
 - 0—No
 - 1—Yes

- **Nov. 9, 1989 to September 10, 2001.** Captures the post-Cold War era.
 - 0—No
 - 1—Yes

- **September 11, 2001 to present.** Captures the events of September 11 and the post-9/11 world.
 - 0—No
 - 1—Yes

- **None/Not Applicable**
 - 0—No
 - 1—Yes

17) Contemporary Timeframe (Contemporary Time Frame). This variable reflects whether the article analyzes events within ten years of the publication date.

- 0—No
- 1—Yes
- 2—N/A

For instance, if an article written in 1981 used data from 1973, we would code this as “Yes.” If an article from 1995 used data from 1980, however, it would receive a value of “No.” If the article does not concern specific time periods at all, it receives an “N/A.” The N/A designation allows us to expand or restrict the denominator when specifying the ratio of articles that address contemporary empirical questions. Some might argue that purely theoretical articles with no empirical content should be removed when making such a comparison. Our coding rule permits both measures to be constructed. If you click N/A for the previous variable (Time Period), then you must click N/A for this variable as well.

18) Policy Prescription (Policy Prescription). Does the author make explicit policy prescriptions in the article? We only record a value of “yes” if the article explicitly aims its prescriptions at policymakers. A prescription for further research on some topic does not qualify, but a prescription that the government ought to change its foreign policy or increase funding for certain types of research does qualify. The fact that a model has implications that are relevant for policy makers does not count as a policy prescription. A throwaway line in the conclusion does not qualify as a policy prescription.

19) Issue Area (Issue Area). This nominal measure includes sub-fields of IR: International Security, International Political Economy, Human Rights, the Environment, Health, IR theory, US Foreign Policy, Comparative Foreign Policy, History of IR Discipline, Philosophy of Science

and International Law. In addition to issue areas within IR, we have values for other sub-fields of political science so that we can track non-IR articles in IR journals. Issue area is denoted by a dichotomous variable for each option and reflects the primary issue area to which the article contributes. The possible issue areas are:

| | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| International Security | International Law |
| International Political Economy | Other |
| Human Rights | General (or non-specific) |
| Environment | International Organization |
| Health | Methodology |
| IR theory | Comparative Politics |
| US Foreign Policy | American Politics |
| Comparative Foreign Policy | Political Theory |
| History of the IR Discipline | |
| Philosophy of Science | |

For “Comparative Foreign Policy” we include articles that actually compare the foreign policy processes of different states, but also include articles that analyze the foreign policies of any state other than the U.S. So, an article on the foreign policy of Italy is coded as #7, Comparative Foreign Policy. But an article on U.S. decision making on foreign policy issues is #6, U.S. Foreign Policy. The option “General” refers to an article that makes a “general” argument about IR that could apply to more than one of the issue areas (yet it does not specify whether it is International Security, International Political Economy, Health, etc.). If more than one issue area is specifically addressed in a substantive manner, the most prominent issue area or one listed first is coded (assuming the article is not “general”). **In general, the DV determines the issue area.** So, an article that explains how war influences trade patterns is coded as an IPE article. An article that explains how trade patterns influence the probability of war is coded as an International Security article. Note that we capture more specific information that is often closely related to issue area in variable #23, “Substantive Focus.” Variable #23 allows multiple substantive areas to be selected. So, in the examples offered above both articles would be tagged as addressing both “inter-state war” and “international trade.” Users of the database can thus sort articles either based on broad “issue area” variable or on the more specific “substantive focus” variable.

20) Level of analysis (Level of analysis) “Level of analysis” refers to the unit of study. We adopt Kenneth Waltz’s use of three levels of analysis and enter a “yes” or “no” in the appropriate column for each level. **We record a “yes” when an author locates her IV at that level.** Articles may be coded “yes” for multiple levels.¹⁶

Level 1 refers to the individual level of analysis and includes such independent variables as: personality, perceptions, beliefs, images, values, human nature, bias, accidents, timing,

¹⁶ In June 2009 this language was changed from “**We record a “yes” when an author locates either her IV or DV at that level.**” When we made this change we had already coded and reconciled 50% of the articles in the database from 1980-2006. So, all articles in an issue numbered 1 or 3 were coded using the old language. All articles in an issue numbered 2 or 4 (or 5 and 6 in the case of JCR) were coded using this new language. Users of the data should keep this change in mind when analyzing data.

means/ ends calculations, group processes (such as groupthink), and any other factors specific to the individual decision makers and/ or the decision-making process.

Level 2 refers to the nation-state level of analysis and includes such independent variables as: regime type, regime stability, partisan politics, economic system, governmental structure, bureaucratic interests and bargaining, standard operating procedures, national culture, national resources, geography, and any other factors internal to the state.

Note that these are coded as level 2 variables only when they are ascriptive, not when they are interactive or distributional. Geography, resources, regime type, and other variables may be considered level 3 when causality inheres in the distribution of these variables across the international system. For example, the statement, “The fact that the United States is a democracy explains the development of its foreign policy,” is coded as a level 2 argument, but the statement, “The increasing number of democracies in the international system during this historical period explains the declining number of interstate wars,” is coded as level 3.

Level 3 refers to the international level of analysis and includes such independent variables as: anarchy, security dilemma dynamics, the offense/defense balance, the distribution or balance of power, specific catalytic events that are external to the actor whose policy is being explained, action/ reaction processes, international market forces, international institutions and norms, transnational actors, and any other factors external to the state, including the distribution across the international system of any level 1 or 2 variable

21) Methodology (Methodology). This is a nominal measure of whether the study uses quantitative (statistics), qualitative (case studies), formal modeling (calculus, game theory, spatial modeling), or some other methodological approach. Many articles utilize more than one methodology. For example, an article with a formally modeled theory as well as a case study would be coded for both formal modeling and qualitative analysis. Review essays take on the methodology of the book/books that they are reviewing unless the review is claiming that the methods used in the book are inappropriate. Again, for each methodology employed, we record a “no” (0) or a “yes” (1) in the appropriate column.

Quantitative: this methodology involves numerical values for *both* the IVs and DVs and some way of *linking* the IV and DV values. Hence, articles that contain only descriptive statistics that illustrate an empirical trend do not qualify and instead should be categorized as “descriptive” as explained below. To qualify as a quantitative methodology, an article must include some attempt by the author to relate his/her quantitative data to an actual hypothesis. Note: this variable is coded as quantitative even if more advanced statistical techniques (such as regression analysis) are *not* used.

Qualitative: this approach includes primarily case studies. Most qualitative evidence is organized in a systematic manner for the purpose of testing a hypothesis, providing a systematic approach to illustrating path dependence, examining a deviant case not explained by prevalent theories, or for generating new hypotheses or theories. Detailed historical descriptions that do not employ qualitative evidence for the purpose of theory building or theory testing do not qualify as a qualitative method. Instead, those articles are categorized,

as explained below, as “descriptive.” Anecdotal evidence that is not presented in a systematic way does *not* count as a qualitative methodology.¹⁷

King, Keohane and Verba (1994) argue that “quantitative and qualitative traditions are only stylistic and are methodologically and substantively unimportant” (4). We remain agnostic about the substance of this claim; consequently, our qualitative label captures two types of qualitative research, those which abide by strict rules of inference as defined in King, Keohane and Verba, and those which test hypotheses through broader forms of qualitative evidence. As such, the use of descriptive statistics embedded within an historical narrative can be part of a qualitative argument. Further, non-positivist approaches, such as textual analysis that go beyond simple description, are also coded as qualitative methodology.

Formal Modeling: this methodology may take either or both of two forms: (1) formal, derived mathematical equations or (2) use of diagrams (such as game theoretic decision trees and spatial models). A simple arrow diagram does *not* count as formal modeling; nor does a regression equation. The use of brief examples to illustrate the empirical implications of a formal model does not count as a separate methodology. However, if the article rigorously tests hypotheses generated from the formal model (for example using statistics or case studies), then the appropriate methodology is coded in addition to formal modeling (for example, quantitative and qualitative, respectively, in the examples above).

Counterfactual: this approach requires the explicit use of a subjective conditional in which the antecedent is known or supposed for purposes of argument to be false. While any article implicitly uses counterfactual reasoning when making a causal inference (King et al. 1994), we aim to capture the explicit use of a counterfactual method as articulated in Fearon (1991) or Tetlock (1996).

Analytic/Non-formal Conceptual: this approach attempts to illuminate features of IR or IR theory without reference to significant empirical evidence or a formal model. (Wendt, Dessler, and Waltz are all examples of analytical/non-formal conceptual articles). We do not code an article this way if it employs any of the empirical methods described above. This means that articles with a significant non-formal theoretical component DO NOT get coded as “Analytic/Non-formal” even if they make a significant theoretical contribution. (For example, Lake 2006).

Descriptive: this approach uses quantitative or qualitative information to describe contemporary or historical trends or events in IR. No attempt is made to test a hypothesis or develop broader theoretical generalizations. We do not code an article as descriptive if it employs any of the empirical methods described above.

Policy Analysis: This category includes articles whose primary purpose is the evaluation of options available to policy makers to respond to a specific policy problem.

¹⁷ Similarly, Bennett (2003) distinguishes between the systematic uses of qualitative data to test hypotheses, which is characteristic of the case study method, from pure descriptive recounting of events. For a thoughtful and more expansive view of different tools employed in qualitative research, see Munck (2004).

Experimental: This category includes articles which use experimental research designs or simulations to test or defend their claims.

22) Region under study (Region under study). If an article *specifically* employs evidence from a particular region or country/countries within that region, then that region receives a “1.” If more than one region is mentioned, we indicate each region covered with a “1.” If the study concerns all regions of the world (such as an article about total IMF lending) and *does not make references to particular regions/countries*, we code it as global. If an article is coded as “global” because of a large n study that includes a large number of regions, we still select particular regions if the article also contains a case study or otherwise focuses on those regions in greater depth. If an article’s theory claims to explain *all* global phenomena, but only selects evidence for specific countries/regions, we only select those specific regions. For instance, an article claims that all states balance power within the international system and has two case studies—one case study examines US-Soviet relations during the Cold War and the other examines India, Pakistan and China. We select “US”, “FSU”, “East Asia” and “South Asia”. However, if an article claims to explain all cases of human rights regimes and gathers data on the entire population of human rights regimes, we select “global” even if there has never been a human rights regime in East Asia or Antarctica. Similarly, if the study intends to be global in nature but data limitations restrict the number of regions covered (there is no good data on infant mortality in Oceania), it is still coded as “Global.” The idea here is not to arbitrarily limit the designation “global” based on the distribution of data on certain topics. If the sample of the researcher is indeed global and would select cases for analysis from all regions if they were available, then we code the article as “global.” If an article focuses on the foreign policy behavior of actor X in country Y, we click the boxes for the regions of both countries. So, if an article analyzes the U.S. military surge in Iraq, we click both “US” and “Middle East/North Africa.”

- US
- Canada and Western Europe
- Latin America (including Mexico)
- Sub-Saharan Africa
- FSU/Soviet Union/Eastern Europe, including Central Asian states, except for Afghanistan
- Middle East/North Africa
- East Asia (incl. China)
- South Asia (including Afghanistan)
- Southeast Asia
- Oceania
- Antarctica
- Global
- None/purely theoretical

These categories contain the following countries:

US includes: United States of America

Canada and Western Europe includes:

Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Canary Islands (Spain), Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Vatican City

Latin America and Caribbean includes:

Antigua, Argentina, Aruba, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Cayman Islands, Chile, Columbia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, French Guiana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Martinique, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, St. Kitts & Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent & the Grenadines, Trinidad & Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela, [All possessions, ex. St. Barts, Guadeloupe, Bermuda, Puerto Rico

Sub-Saharan Africa includes:

Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros Islands, Cote d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast), Democratic Republic of Congo (Kinshasa), Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Republic of Congo (Brazzaville), Rwanda, Sao Tome & Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe

FSU/Soviet Union/ Eastern Europe, including Central Asian states, except

Afghanistan includes:

Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, East Germany (German Democratic Republic) from 1949 to 1990, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Middle East/North Africa includes:

Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco (incl. Western Sahara), Bahrain, Gaza & West Bank, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey (incl. Turkish Cyprus), United Arab Emirates (Abu Dhabi, Dubai, etc.), Yemen

East Asia includes:

China, Hong Kong, Japan, Mongolia, North Korea, South Korea, Taiwan, Tibet

South Asia includes:

Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka

Southeast Asia includes:

Brunei, Cambodia, East Timor, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar/Burma, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam

Oceania includes:

Australia, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, French Polynesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Zealand, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu

23) **Substantive Focus (Substantive Focus).** This variable receives a 0 or 1 for each value in the list below. The variable captures the substantive focus of the article, often measured as the DV under study, but could also include other issues addressed in the article. This variable is broader than the issue area variable above where coders were forced to choose just one issues area. An article may have more than one substantive focus. Unlike all other variables in this codebook, the values of these variables for coder #1 and #2 do not have to match in order for the data to be sunk into the database. So, this variable captures the substantive focus of the article broadly conceived. If a reader is likely to learn something about trade, IOs, and foreign aid by reading a single article, then the coder can select all three of those values from the list below. Hence, some articles will have as many as 2-6 different values selected for this variable. Values are selected from the following list:

- Environment
- WMD proliferation and Arms Control
- Inter-state war
- Economic Interdependence
- Regional integration
- International (intergovernmental) organization(s)
- Terrorism
- Trade
- Balance of power
- International law
- North-South relations
- Development
- Alliances
- Transnational actors/ NGOs
- International regimes/International norms
- Regime type
- Foreign policy
- Weapon systems, defense spending and arms races
- Bargaining, Deterrence and strategy

- Sanctions
- Diplomacy
- Foreign Aid, lending and debt
- Monetary policy
- Domestic Politics
- Intra-state conflict/Civil war
- Interstate Crisis (international conflict short of war)
- Public Opinion
- Migration/Immigration
- Public Health/Infectious Disease
- Study of the IR Discipline
- Military/Humanitarian Intervention or peace-keeping
- Ethnicity and/or Religion¹⁸
- Other: _____

24. Author’s Affiliation (A1 Institution – A6 Institution). This variable records the author’s institutional affiliation (Harvard University, the Rand Corporation, etc...). In almost all journals for all years, this information is provided on the first page of the article or in the “About Authors” or “Contributors” section in the front or back matter. If this information is missing, the author’s CV should be located and coder should determine the affiliation of the author at the time of publication. The **Name** of the affiliation is entered (e.g. Oxford University, United States Department of State, American Red Cross, RAND Corporation, etc...). If an author is affiliated with multiple institutions, list only the primary affiliation. Use as a standard the institution as named in US News and World Report.

25. Author’s Rank. (A1 Rank – A6 Rank). We enter the academic or professional rank of each author in the order in which their names appear on the article. This variable records the author’s academic rank at the time the article was published. It can take one of 13 values listed below. **Author Rank (A1 Rank-A6 Rank).** Coders should include the entire title. Highest academic rank should appear first and should correlate with the author’s affiliation and affiliation type (e.g. Harvard University; Johns Hopkins University – Gov Dept; IR Dept – Professor; Associate Professor). If multiple ranks appear, separate with a semi-colon Possible ranks in order of academic precedence include:

Adjunct Professor/Adjunct Instructor
 Assistant Professor

¹⁸ This value was added in June 2009. So, it was not an option for articles reconciled before that date. If users want to use this variable they should only analyze articles from volumes 2 and 4 from 1980-2006.

Associate Lecturer
Associate Professor
Emeritus
Full Professor¹⁹
Instructor
Instructor/Lecturer
Other
Post-Doctoral Fellow
Student
Visiting Instructor/Visiting Assistant Professor
Not Available

26. Author's Gender. (A1 Gender – A6 Gender). This is recorded for all authors of an individual article. If an author's gender cannot be determined by his/her name, then we attempt to discover the author's gender through a literature search, web search, or contacting the author directly. The gender will be recorded as **0 (male) or 1 (female)**.

Comment Field: This field can be used to make general comments on the article. Coders may use this field to help the third coder resolve potential disagreements. For example, if a coder recognizes an important but easy to miss piece of an article, one could highlight it in the comment section so that the third coder does not miss it. The other standard uses of the comment section follow:

1. If an article is not an IR article but it must be coded because of the journal that it is in, then the coder indicates this by writing "Comparative Politics" or "American Politics" or "Economics" as the first line in the comment section. (This rule is irrelevant for the new version of the coding interface where we mark this variable under issues area).
2. If the article is part of a "Controversy" or a "Response" to a previous article published in the journal, the coder indicates that in the comment section.

Methods

Given time and resource considerations, we developed the following process for determining each of the variable values: We read an article's abstract, skim the article (paying particular attention to headings within the text and to any tables, graphs, or illustrations), and read the introduction and conclusion. If the author explicitly declares his/her epistemology, paradigm, methods, etc., then we take this as a cue, but the articles are categorized strictly according to the rules in this codebook, not the self-expressed identity of the author. Quite often, the author's commitments are implicit and we have to read more closely to infer the value of the variables. If there are some variables that can

¹⁹ Deans, Chancellors, and Provosts should be coded as full professors unless otherwise indicated in the title.

not be coded using this process, we read the article more thoroughly. On average, each article takes 12-15 minutes to code.

To ensure inter-coder reliability among our coders, we had two initial test rounds of coding, in which all researchers coded the same sample of 100 articles. We compared our results and discussed discrepancies, which allowed us to clarify our rules and procedures. Once we collectively improved our coding, we divided the journals among the researchers so that each article was assigned to two independent coders. If both coders independently came to the same conclusion about the value of a particular variable within an article, then we accepted the observation as part of the final data set. If any two coders disagreed on the value of any observation, however, then a senior coder would independently code that observation.

Bibliography

Bennett, Andrew, Barth and Rutheford. 2003. "Do We Preach What We Practice? A Survey of Methods in Political Science Journals and Curricula." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, July.

Katzenstein, Keohane and Krasner. 1998. "International Organization and the Study of World Politics." *International Organization* 52, 4, 645-685.

Keohane, Robert. 1984. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

King, Gary, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Moravcsik, Andrew. 2003. "Theory Synthesis in International Relations: Real Not Metaphysical." *International Studies Review* (5): 131-136.

Vasquez, John A. 1999. *The Power of Power Politics: From Classical Realism to Neotraditionalism*. Cambridge University Press.