The Militarized Interstate Confrontation (MIC) Codebook

Douglas M. Gibler   *University of Alabama, dmgibler@ua.edu*
Steven V. Miller   *Stockholm University, steven.miller@ekohist.su.se*

This document provides variable information for the Truly Dyadic Dyad-Year version of the Militarized Interstate Confrontation (MICTDD) datase, 1816-2014. This dataset is built upon the framework established by the MIC dataset, and users should consult that codebook and dataset for expanded definitions and additional information. Any questions or errors should be reported to the authors.

July 13, 2023

Citation

We ask that users of this dataset cite the following article and note the version number of the data they are using in their study:

- D. M. Gibler and S. V. Miller, 'The Militarized Interstate Confrontation (MIC) Dataset, 1816-2014." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Forthcoming.

Rationale for a Truly Dyadic, Dyad-Year (TDD) Confrontation Dataset

Most studies use research designs that employ dyadic analyses, but naive creations of dyadic participant data are often error prone in terms of which states fought which states and when. For many long and complex wars there is no way to determine yearly variations in conflict years, highest action codes, and fatalities attributed to each state. This leads to invariant measures of highest actions and fatalities across conflict years, and approximately 30% of the data constitute false positive indicators of dyadic conflict. We change this by introducing the first-ever "truly-dyadic, dyad-year dataset" (TDD).[1]

The TDD provides yearly coding of conflicts in either non-directed or directed format. We code the highest action of each state toward the other in the dyad. We also code the fatality ranges of each state, as caused by the other state in the dyad. This dataset dataset differs substantially from either a naive dyadic application of the CoWMID data or the new DYMID and dyadic war data.

Determining Fatalities during Complex Battles

We had problems identifying fatality ranges in surprisingly few cases. There is good battle fatality data in secondary sources of most wars. However, there still remained cases where noting the number of forces killed by allied groups was difficult to determine. In these cases we followed battle information whenever possible and used those reviews to guide our coding. When we had no guide to estimated fatalities by fighting force, we relied on the number of troops fighting in the battle and their level of coordination to determine percentages of likely fatalities. For example, the invasion of Belgium was initiated by Germany against a combined Belgian, French, British, and Dutch force, with ample coordination, across all battle lines. The Germans lost just over 10,000 troops in the invasion, so we allotted dyadic fatalities caused by each force according to their percentage of troops fighting. Thus, Belgian forces were attributed as having killed approximately 22% of the German troops, the French over 72%, the British almost 7%, and the Dutch over 5%. We also used this method of estimation to re-examine our inferences from secondary sources when some doubt remained in our coding.

Data Files Associated with the Truly Dyadic, Dyad-Year (TDD) Confrontation Dataset

We provide the following files for users of the TDD Data. We advertise the data of interest in the list below first as the more accessible comma-separated values file (.csv), but we also have the same data available in a Stata data file format (.dta) or an R serialized data frame (.rds). Please note that we are constantly revising these data; users should report the version number

---

[1] **?** offer a dyadic dataset of wars and disputes. However, our review below suggests this error-prone data provides only an attempt to limit the number of dyads that never fought. Its coverage of fatalities and highest actions also make the data not dyadic and not very useful.

of the dataset used in any research. Future releases of the TDD Data will come with a text file summarizing changes to the data.

- `mic-tdd-[version].csv`: This is a directed confrontation-year version of the TDD-MID data. Users can easily convert this directed confrontation-year version of the data to a non-directed confrontation-year data set by retaining only those observations where the Correlates of War state code in the `ccode2` column is greater than the Correlates of War state code in the `ccode1` column.

Variables Included in the Truly Dyadic, Dyad-Year (TDD) Confrontation Dataset

We include the following variables in the TDD data:

- `micnum`: The confrontation number for each case, as originally established by CoWMID for each case. Note that we have also added numerous confrontation cases that are not in the CoW data as disputes. These cases begin with `confrontnum` values in the 9000's to demonstrate completely new cases.

- `ccode1`: This is the CoW country code for the smaller-numbered state (non-directed data) or focal state (directed data).

- `ccode2`: This is the CoW country code for the higher-numbered state (non-directed data) or target state (directed data).

- `year`: The year of the confrontation, with values ranging from 1816 to 2010. There are no missing year values; if the year of a militarized action could not be determined, the action was not coded.

- `dyfatalmin1`: This is an estimate of the minimum number of military battle-deaths in the confrontation-dyad-year for ccode1.

- `dyfatalmax1`: This is an estimate of the maximum number of military battle-deaths in the confrontation-dyad-year for ccode1.

- `dyfatalmin2`: This is an estimate of the minimum number of military battle-deaths in the confrontation-dyad-year for ccode2.

- `dyfatalmax2`: This is an estimate of the maximum number of military battle-deaths in the confrontation-dyad-year for ccode2.

- `dyhiact1`: The highest level of militarized action for ccode1 in the confrontation-dyad-year. Note that this scale is actually not ordinal, however. Possible values [with `hostlev` in brackets] include the following: 0 No militarized action [1] 1 Threat to use force [2], 2 Threat to blockade [2], 3 Threat to occupy territory [2], 4 Threat to declare war [2], 5 Threat to use CBR weapons [2], 6 Threat to join war, 7 Show of force [3], 8 Alert [3], 9 Nuclear alert [3], 10 Mobilization [3], 11 Fortify border [3], 12 Border violation [3], 13 Blockade [4], 14 Occupation of territory [4], 15 Seizure [4], 16 Attack [4], 17 Clash [4], 19 Use of CBR weapons [4], and 22 War Battle [5].

- `dyhiact2`: The highest level of militarized action for ccode2 in the confrontation-dyad-year. Note that this scale is actually not ordinal, however. Possible values [with `hostlev` in brackets] include the following: 0 No militarized action [1] 1 Threat to use force [2], 2

Threat to blockade [2], 3 Threat to occupy territory [2], 4 Threat to declare war [2], 5 Threat to use CBR weapons [2], 6 Threat to join war, 7 Show of force [3], 8 Alert [3], 9 Nuclear alert [3], 10 Mobilization [3], 11 Fortify border [3], 12 Border violation [3], 13 Blockade [4], 14 Occupation of territory [4], 15 Seizure [4], 16 Attack [4], 17 Clash [4], 19 Use of CBR weapons [4], and 22 War Battle [5].

- `dyhostlev1`: The highest recorded hostility level for ccode1 in the confrontation-dyad-year. Again, this scale should not be treated as ordinal. Possible values include the following: 1 No militarized action, 2 Threat to use force, 3 Display of force, 4 Use of force, and 5 War.

- `dyhostlev2`: The highest recorded hostility level for ccode2 in the confrontation year. Again, this scale should not be treated as ordinal. Possible values include the following: 1 No militarized action, 2 Threat to use force, 3 Display of force, 4 Use of force, and 5 War.

- `numevents`: The number of events initiated between `ccode1` and `ccode2` in the dyadic confrontation-year. Data are available only for confrontations between 1946 and 2014.

- `version`: The MICTDD version number. We are constantly reviewing and updating our datasets, and we ask users of our data to always report which version number of the data they are using in their research.

References

Maoz, Zeev, Paul L Johnson, Jasper Kaplan, Fiona Ogunkoya and Aaron P Shreve. 2019. "The dyadic militarized interstate disputes (MIDs) dataset version 3.0: Logic, characteristics, and comparisons to alternative datasets." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 63(3):811–835.