

**The Teaching, Research, and
International Policy Project**

Policy Article Codebook

Last revision: August 29, 2016

Policy Journal Database Codebook

The TRIP project is in the process of coding the population of articles published in Foreign Policy and Foreign Affairs from 2000-2015.

Methods

Given time and resource constraints, we developed the following process for determining each of the variable values for each article: Each coder reads the article's abstract, skims the article (paying particular attention to headings within the text and to any tables, graphs, or illustrations), and reads the introduction and conclusion. If the author explicitly declares his/her paradigm, methods, issue area, 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 coders have to read more closely to infer the value of the variables. If there are some variables that cannot be coded using this process, the coder reads the article more closely. On average, each article should take 10 minutes to code.

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 all the variables 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 in an article, however, then a senior coder would independently code that observation and had the authority to change the value of any other variable.

Criteria for selecting articles to code

Foreign Policy

1. **The article is not written by an FP staff writer or editor.** We code all articles that are not written by FP staff, and we also code those articles that are written by FP staff who are IR scholars. The idea is to omit articles that are written by those permanent staff that lack a university affiliation. This would not include contributing editors and columnists, who often are also academics. For example, Rosa Brooks is a contributing editor and columnist at FP, but she also holds a university affiliation. If the article has a byline *and* at the end of the article there is a description of the author indicating that he or she is an academic with a university affiliation, then we code it. Simply having a PhD is not sufficient. Be careful: many pieces have bylines, but they are simply collections of boxes or photographs. We are not coding these collections of boxes or photos, just actual articles.
2. **The article is at least one reasonably full page in length.** Most articles by contributors are at least two pages, but occasionally there is a shorter one.
3. **We do not include:**
 - a. Interviews
 - b. Boxes or "In Boxes" (with or without a byline), unless they meet the criteria above

- c. Photograph collections
- d. Infographics (with or without a byline), unless they meet the criteria above
- e. Editorial: be careful because the article by the editor in each issue is labeled “column.” In recent issues, at least, this editorial begins on the last page of the magazine.
- f. Letters to the editor
- g. Advertisement supplements
- h. Special advertising sections
- i. The FP survey (unless it is accompanied by an article that meets the criteria above)
- j. The Things They Carried
- k. The Leading Global Thinkers
- l. Sponsored Reports
- m. Indexes—such as Failed State Index, Globalization Index, Terrorism Index, etc. (with or without a byline), unless they meet the criteria above

Foreign Affairs:

1. Code all “Essays”, **except**:
 - a. Interviews
 - b. Infographics
 - c. Articles without bylines
 - d. Reviews
 - e. Responses
2. Coders should review topics in all other articles that are included in each issue. If article titles sound like they might not be categorized as IR (for example, articles on the rise of big data, Bolivia’s Waterless Lake, or The legal future of “net neutrality”), add these to the designated spreadsheet for PIs to review. A senior researchers will use their own judgement to mark “not IR” for irrelevant articles and these will not be coded. Code **only IR** articles in each issue.

Arbitration

Arbitrators need to ensure that they review and save “Academic Knowledge” changes before submitting arbitrated values into the database.

Variables Coded for Each Article

ID (pubID) - A unique number identifying the article in the TRIP dataset.

DOI (DOI) - Digital identifier of article

Title (Title) - This is the full title of the article.

International Relations (is_IR) - Is the article an IR article? See section above on criteria for selecting articles.

Journal Name (journal) - We code all international relations (IR) articles in the following journals:

FP= *Foreign Policy*

FA= *Foreign Affairs*

Year (year) - The year in which the article was published.

Volume (volume) - Volume number corresponding to the journal in which the article was published.

Number (number) - Issue number of journal in which the article was published.

Author's name (A#_Name) - We enter the standardized name of all authors listed. Example: Joseph S. Nye.

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* or *beliefs* 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 11 and 12 (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.

All values are Yes or No.

Material (Material) - This variable captures the article's use of material factors, in either the independent or dependent variables. 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.

Version 1.2

Revised: 8/19/2016

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). **All values are Yes or No.**

Time period (Time_1–Time_9) - 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. However, given that the length of these articles is quite short, the amount of evidence required will not be as great as when coding an academic journal article. Coders should ask themselves, “If I were trying to learn about an event or policy issue in a particular time period, would I want to read this article?” If the answer is yes, then include the time period for the article. In general, the coder asks, 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 historical 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 Time_None 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 Time_8. Conversely, if the article describes the discipline’s effect on an empirical event, the time period of that event would also be coded as Time_8. If the article being coded is a review essay, then it is coded as Time_None unless the author of the review essay includes new empirical evidence in the essay. Variables are coded as *Yes* in cases where the time period was used and *No* when absent. **All values are Yes or No.**

- **Time_1:** Pre-history to 476 AD. Captures ancient civilizations, including Egypt and Greece, and extends to the fall of the Roman Empire.
- **Time_2:** 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.
- **Time_3:** 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.
- **Time_4:** June 28, 1914 to June 28, 1919. Captures World War I and extends to the signing of the Treaty of Versailles.
- **Time_5:** June 28, 1919 to September 1, 1939. Captures the inter-war period and extends to the German invasion of Poland.
- **Time_6:** September 1, 1939 to August 1945. Captures World War II, including V-E and V-J Days in 1945
- **Time_7:** 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.

- **Time_8:** Nov. 9, 1989 to September 10, 2001. Captures the post-Cold War era.
- **Time_9:** September 11, 2001 to present. Captures the events of September 11 and the post-9/11 world.
- **Time_None:** None/Not Applicable

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

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.

No
Yes
N/A

Policy Prescription (PolicyPrescription) - 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. In the case that the author prescribes policy options it does not have to limited solely to members of governments. Prescriptions can be recommended to members of governments as well as IGOs, NGOs, etc... in order to fulfill the requirements for this variable. 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. **All values are Yes or No.**

Issue Area (IssueArea) - This nominal measure includes sub-fields of IR as well as values for other sub-fields of political science so that we can track non-IR articles in IR journals. The value of this variable reflects the primary issue area to which the article contributes.

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 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.

- **International Security**: refers to articles that describe causes of international conflict or interstate war. This does not include civil war or other forms of intra-state conflict.
- **International Political Economy**: refers to articles that describe international economic phenomena including trade, development, and global markets. IPE does include the effects of international issues on domestic economies, and these would not be coded as American or Comparative politics.
- **Human Rights**: refers to articles that discuss international human rights issues. This includes topics like the rights of disadvantaged groups, as well as studies on human rights offenses, including genocide.
- **Environment**: refers to articles that describe causes of environmental and ecological change, including international cooperation to limit human causes of climate change or damage to plant and animal populations.
- **Health**: refers to articles that describe global health issues, such as international cooperation to combat pandemics, to eradicate diseases or to improve maternal and infant health.
- **IR theory**: refers to articles that primarily discuss and debate the theories and paradigms of international relations. These articles may discuss other issue areas, but their main concern is to advance more general theories.
- **US Foreign Policy**: refers to articles that discuss U.S. decision making on foreign policy issues. Articles that discuss purely domestic policy should be coded as American Politics.
- **Comparative Foreign Policy**: refers to articles that 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.
- **History of the IR Discipline**: refers to articles that discuss the current state or history of the IR discipline. This includes the history of paradigm shifts as well as current patterns in IR research (ie gender citation gap, TRIP, academia-policy gap).
- **Philosophy of Science**: refers to articles that primarily discuss the foundations and purpose of science. These articles may discuss epistemology, or how scientific IR is or should be. Articles that focus on arguing for or against positivism in IR will be coded as philosophy of science.
- **International Law**: refers to articles that describe the creation and enforcement of international laws and the function of international legal bodies, such as the ICJ or the ECJ.
- **Other**: refers to articles that describe a specific issue area that is not listed here but could not be applied to other issue areas in the manner of a general article.
- **General (or non-specific)**: refers to an article that makes an argument or develops a model about IR that could then be applied to more than one of the issue areas (yet it does not specify whether it is International Security, International Political Economy, Health, etc.). This includes articles that employ pure game theory without describing another issue area.

- **International Organization**: refers to articles that describe the functioning of international organizations, such as the UN, World Bank, or IMF. These articles may mention how IOs have effects on other issue areas, but are primarily concerned with how IOs reach decisions and function.
- **Methodology**: refers to articles that discuss how best to use particular methodologies within IR research. They sometimes argue for or against qualitative or quantitative analysis, or suggest ways to improve data collection. These articles may test these methodologies on another issue area, but are not primarily concerned with describing non-methodological
- **Comparative Politics**: refers to articles that compare the domestic phenomena of different states, but also include articles that analyze the domestic politics of any state other than the U.S. This is not a subfield of IR, but should be selected if the DV does not cross international borders, such as civil wars or domestic elections.
- **American Politics**: refers to articles that focus on domestic aspects of American politics (ie gerrymandering, American elections). If the DV refers to US-specific policy that exists outside the domestic political sphere, this should be coded as US Foreign Policy.
- **Political Theory**: refers to articles that discuss topics including the philosophical foundations of political ideals, the duties of citizens, and government legitimacy. This includes authors like Machiavelli, Locke, Plato, Aristotle, and Kant.

Level of Analysis (Level) “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.**¹ Purely game theoretic articles that do not address any particular level of analysis but instead refer to any type player are coded as “No levels of analysis.” Articles may be coded “yes” for multiple levels. **All values are Yes or No.**

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, 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

¹ 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) and all articles published after 2006 were coded using this new language. Users of the data should keep this change in mind when analyzing data.

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 variables.

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. **All values are Yes or No.**

Quantitative (Methodology_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 yet methods such as factor analysis, ANOVA, and cross-tabs etc... are used to relate to a hypothesis.

Qualitative (Methodology_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 Qualitative.” Anecdotal evidence that is not gathered or presented in a systematic way does *not* count

as a “Qualitative” methodology, but as “Descriptive Qualitative.”²

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 or engage theoretical arguments 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 (Methodology_FormalModeling) - 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 (Methodology_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 (Methodology_AnalyticNonFormal) - 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 Statistics (Methodology_DescriptiveStats) This approach uses numerical information to describe contemporary or historical trends or events in IR. No attempt is made to present systematic evidence, test a hypothesis or develop broader theoretical generalizations. Descriptive statistics are typically stand alone measures of some outcome or some explanatory variable that are not linked through any quantitative

² Similarly, Bennett et al. (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).

method (such as a crosstab, factor analysis, regression, etc...) We do not code an article as descriptive if it employs any of the empirical methods described above (such as quant, qual, formal, counterfactual, or analytical / non-formal approach).

Descriptive Qualitative (Methodology_DescriptiveQual) This approach uses non-quantitative empirical evidence to describe contemporary or historical events in IR. No attempt is made to present systematic evidence, test a hypothesis or develop broader theoretical generalizations. Descriptive qualitative evidence is typically composed of anecdotal examples that are not collected or presented in a systematic way. Descriptive qualitative is distinct from Qualitative methods as described above.³ We do not code an article as Descriptive Qualitative if it employs any of the empirical methods described above (such as quant, qual, formal, counterfactual, or analytical / non-formal approach).

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

Experimental (Methodology_Experimental) - This category includes articles which use experimental research designs or simulations to test or defend their claims. (Since simulations are included, users should note that not all articles included in this category employ random assignment of the explanatory variables).

Region Under Study. (Variable names in bold below) If an article *specifically* employs evidence from or about a particular region or country/countries within that region, we list the region. A single short mention of a country, a case, or a region is not sufficient to select a value for this variable. Instead, the reader needs to learn something about the country or region in question. Coders should ask themselves, “If I were trying to learn about an event or policy issue in a particular country or region, would I want to read this article?” If the answer is yes, then include that region for the article being coded. If more than one region is covered in the article, we list each region. 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 enter values for these variables pertaining to 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 code this article with the following values: 0, 4, 6, and 7. 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 code this as “global” even if there has

³ Similarly, Bennett et al. (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).

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.” **All values are Yes or No.**

These categories contain the following countries (**Variable name in bold**):

- United States of America (**Region_UnitedStates**)
- Canada and Western Europe (**Region_CanadaWestEurope**)
 - 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 (**Region_LatinAmerica**)
 - 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 (**Region_SubSaharanAfrica**)
 - 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, South Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe
- FSU/Soviet Union/ Eastern Europe, including Central Asian states, except Afghanistan (**Region_FSUEasternEurope**).
 - 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 (**Region_MiddleEastNorthAfrica**)
 - 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 (**Region_EastAsia**)
 - China, Hong Kong, Japan, Mongolia, North Korea, South Korea, Taiwan, Tibet
- South Asia (**Region_SouthAsia**)
 - Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka
- Southeast Asia (**Region_SoutheastAsia**)
 - Brunei, Cambodia, East Timor, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar/Burma, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam
- Oceania (**Region_Oceania**)
 - Australia, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, French Polynesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Zealand, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu
- Antarctica (**Region_Antartica**)
- Global (**Region_Global**)
- None (**Region_None**)

Substantive Focus (Variable name in bold) This variable captures the substantive focus of the article, often measured as the DV used or major topic addressed. There may be multiple values in this column—that is, 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.⁴ So, this variable captures the substantive focus of the article broadly conceived. Hence, articles may average 3-4 different values selected for this variable. The rule of thumb/question that coders were supposed to ask themselves was: “If you were a scholar interested in trade (for example), is this an article you would like to return in a search for articles on trade?” **All values are Yes or No.**

- **Alliances (Focus_Alliances):** These are military alliances, not IOs or trade agreements (NATO, not NAFTA).

⁴ This policy for substantive focus was modified slightly on September 10th, 2012. The previous policy did not allow senior coders to correct against incorrect codes for substantive focus. The new policy allows senior coders this privilege.

- Balance of Power (**Focus_BalanceofPower**): This can include military and latent power.
- Bargaining, Deterrence, and Strategy (**Focus_BargainingDeterrenceStrategy**): This includes explicit mentions of game theory, geopolitical strategy and negotiating techniques. This does not include all mentions of intl negotiations.
- Development (**Focus_Development**)
- Diplomacy (**Focus_Diplomacy**): These refer to international negotiations and summits in which actual diplomats are involved. General foreign policy is not included.
- Domestic Politics (**Focus_DomesticPolitics**): This includes elections, political parties, and selectorate theory. A comparative politics issue area does not mean you should also automatically check domestic politics.
- Economic Interdependence (**Focus_EconomicInterdependence**)
- Environment (**Focus_Environment**)
- Ethnicity and/or Religion (**Focus_EthnicityReligion**)⁵
- Foreign Aid, Lending and Debt (**Focus_ForeignAid**): Not FDI or capital investments (those are trade).
- Foreign Policy (**Focus_ForeignPolicy**): This should only refer to articles about specific, nameable policies, e.g. Obama's "Pivot Towards Asia" or "Containment". Just because the article talks about IR-related issues does not mean you should check foreign policy.
- Gender (**Focus_Gender**)
- Military/Humanitarian Intervention or Peace-keeping (**Focus_Humanitarian**)
- International Intergovernmental Organizations (**Focus_IGO**)
- Inter-state Crisis (international conflict short or war) (**Focus_InterstateCrisis**)
- Inter-state War (**Focus_InterstateWar**): Some authors are not clear as to whether general "conflict" is specifically inter-state crisis and/or inter-state war. In these cases, use your best judgment based on the framing of the article, or on the cases.
- International Law (**Focus_IntlLaw**)
- Intra-state Conflict / Civil War (**Focus_IntrastateConflict**)
- Study of the IR Discipline (**Focus_IRDiscipline**): This includes significant discussion of methodology, epistemology, or the development of IR as a field (Paradigms, the great debates). These topics should exist outside of a literature review.
- International Regimes / International Norms (**Focus_IntlRegimes**): This refers to beliefs and taboos that exist in the international sphere.
- Migration/Immigration (**Focus_Migration**)
- Monetary Policy (**Focus_MonetaryPolicy**): This refers to exchange rates, inflation, and central banks.
- Transnational Actors / NGOs (**Focus_NGO**)
- North-South Relations (**Focus_NorthSouthRelations**): These articles discuss interactions between the 'Global North and South,' or the West vs the Non-West, as in dependency theory.
- Public Health/Infectious Disease (**Focus_PublicHealth**)
- Public Opinion (**Focus_PublicOpinion**): These articles include polling data and discussions of domestic support of policies.

⁵ 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, and then all articles after 2006.

- Regime Type (**Focus_RegimeType**): This refers to domestic regime type (democracy, autocracy) or domestic regime transition.
- Regional Integration (**Focus_RegionalIntegration**): This includes the EU, ASEAN, &c.
- Sanctions (**Focus_Sanctions**)
- Terrorism (**Focus_Terrorism**)
- Trade (**Focus_TradeFDI**): This includes FDI.⁶
- Weapons Systems, Defense Spending, and Arms Races (**Focus_WeaponSystems**)
- WMD Proliferations and Arms Control (**Focus_WMDProliferation**)
- Other (**Focus_Other**)

Academic Knowledge (AcadKnowledge) This variable attempts to capture whether the author explicitly references or draws upon an academic publication, academic evidence, (an academic data set or findings from a dataset would count, but a dataset from USAID or USTR would not), or an argument/concept that originates in whole or in part within the ivory tower. While policymakers and citizens are unlikely to read peer reviewed academic journals, the knowledge in these journals may still shape the public and policy discourse when transmitted through more widely read policy journals. The first decision of the coder is a simple yes or no -- that is, does the coder identify an explicit reference to some knowledge that originated in the IR academy? Values for this variable:

1. No Explicit Reference to Academic Ideas in the Article.
2. Yes. Academic International Relations Knowledge is Referenced.

If the coder selects “yes”, the coder must keep track of which sections of text refer to academic knowledge by copy and pasting it into a separate Word document or Google Sheet.

*Note: Coders should review the text after pasting, to ensure that it accurately reflects the wording of the article. Occasionally, including when working with PDFs, the copy-and-paste function produces errors, missing words, or additional characters.

We will use these pasted pieces of text that represent academic contributions in policy journals to train the computer to find similar references automatically. While coders should not be constrained by this illustrative list below, here are the types of things that a coder might deem worthy of flagging:

- **Concepts:** Democratic Peace, Clash of Civilizations, Rational Policy Model, Organizational Culture, Bureaucratic Politics Model, Soft Power, Containment, Interdependence, etc...
- **Methods:** Field Experiment, Statistical Model, Agent-Based Model, Case Study, Participant Observation, Ethnography, etc...
- **Findings:** Aid promotes economic growth, Ethnically divided societies fight more wars, Democratic Administrations sign more trade agreements, Trade promotes human rights,

⁶ Until 4/2016, FDI was unofficially coded in the trade category for lack of a better fit elsewhere. Since then, this is the official coding rule.

etc...

- **Datasets:** Correlates of War, AidData, POLITY, SCAD, World Value Survey, etc... (Not Freedom House, not OECD data, not UN data, not official government statistics). The former are all datasets produced by scholars, but the later (in parentheses) are examples of datasets produced by governments or international organizations.
- **Academics:** Waltz, Keohane, Mearsheimer, Feaver, Fearon, Finnemore, Huntington, Doyle, Axelrod, Sikkink, Avant, Nye, etc... When you see proper nouns, confirm that there is some piece of evidence, an idea, or a hypothesis that is explicitly referenced.
 - If Joe Nye is mentioned as a policy advisor, this does not count as an explicit reference to academic knowledge. However, if his book is mentioned, if some idea he advanced in a book/article is referenced to, or if he is referred to as an academic (i.e. “professor Joe Nye wrote...”), then include it.
- **Universities and academic institutions:** If the author refers to the research or publication of an institution, such as a study they conducted or a report they produced.

The coder should cut no more than three blocks of text total, and each block of text should refer to a different academic reference. These blocks of text should be 1-2 sentences, focusing only on the words that convey the academic idea. If the coder recognizes more than three blocks of text that draw upon academic knowledge, then the coder should focus only on the blocks of text that most clearly reference academic knowledge.

For example, a coder may want to include the following block of text: “As many liberal scholars have argued, increased trade and investment between states is likely to reduce the incentives for either state to act aggressively toward the other, thus reducing the probability of war between them.”

After submitting the coderound, the coder needs to return to the main list of publications to add the academic knowledge to the publication. Click on the ID of the article to change the publication. On a page titled “Change publication”, the coder will see a section under “Authors” titled “Academic Knowledge.” The coder should cut and paste the text into the dialogue boxes from their Word document or Google Sheet. If the coder has more than one block of text, meaning that the article refers to more than one academic publication, evidence, or argument, the coder will need to click “Add another Academic Knowledge”. After this action, the coder will be able to submit another block of text. Coders can do this up to three times, pasting three different blocks of text that refer to three different academic references.

When the second coder goes to input their three blocks of text, the coder should not review the previous blocks of text input by the first coder. The second coder should paste any blocks of text they collected on the Word document or Google Sheet, regardless if it duplicates a concept / idea or uses replicated words / phrases.

Notes field: This field can be used to make general comments on the article. Coders may use this field to help the third coder (arbitrator) resolve potential disagreements. For example, if a coder recognizes an important but easy to miss element of an article, one could highlight it in the notes section so that the third coder does not miss it.

Bibliography

Adler, Emanuel. "Constructivism and international relations." *Handbook of international relations* 95 (2002).

Bennett, Andre, Aharo Barth, and Kennet R. Rutherford. "Do we preach what we practice? A survey of methods in political science journals and curricula." *Political Science and Politics* 36, no. 03 (2003): 373-378.

Doyle, Michael W. "Kant, liberal legacies, and foreign affairs." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 12, no. 3 (1983): 205-235.

Fearon, James D. "Counterfactuals and hypothesis testing in political science." *World politics* 43, no. 2 (1991): 169-195.

Geertz, Clifford. "Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture." *Readings in the philosophy of social science* (1994): 213-231.

Katzenstein, Peter J., Robert O. Keohane, and Stephen D. Krasner. "International organization and the study of world politics." *International Organization* (1998): 645-685.

Keohane, Robert O. *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy*. Princeton University Press, 1984

Keohane, Robert Owen, and Joseph S. Nye. *Power and interdependence: World politics in transition*. 2nd ed. Boston: Little, Brown, 1977..

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton University Press, 1994.

Moravcsik, Andrew. "Theory Synthesis in International Relations: real not metaphysical." *International Studies Review* 5, no. 1 (2003): 131-136.

Munck, Gerardo L. "Tools for qualitative research." *Rethinking social inquiry: Diverse tools, shared standards* (2004): 105-121.

Tetlock, Philip Eyrikson, and Aaron Belkin, eds. *Counterfactual thought experiments in world politics: Logical, methodological, and psychological perspectives*. Princeton University Press, 1996.

Vasquez, John A. *The power of power politics: from classical realism to neotraditionalism*. No. 63. Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Walt, Stephen M. *The origins of alliances*. Cornell University Press, 1987.

Version 1.2

Revised: 8/19/2016