



## International Hierarchy and Functional Differentiation of States Dataset

### CODEBOOK

Version 1.0

December, 2021

This is a codebook to the International Hierarchy and Functional Differentiation of States dataset, which is based on the expert survey conducted by a MGIMO University research team in Fall, 2021. It is part of a broader study which is expected to be published in MGIMO Review of International Relations in early 2022. It will contain methodology of data collection and analysis, as well as an interpretation of the results. Please cite the academic paper when using this dataset in your research. The dataset is available under Creative Commons Attribution.

The archive with the dataset consists of the following files and a folder:

Filename	Description
plots	<p>A folder with 20 high-res plots based on the dataset. Inside there are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a pie diagram (Relevance.png) on the relevance of categorisation of states into superpowers, great (major) powers, middle powers and small states,</li> <li>• a bar plot (alt_categorizations.png) on relevant alternative categorizations of states showing the share of experts who marked one of those, for full text see below,</li> <li>• a scatter plot (Corr_weighted.png) of power status index against roles index,</li> <li>• a bar plot with power status index (Powers_weighted.png),</li> <li>• a bar plot on the importance of various valued attributes according to the experts (Criteria_weighted.png),</li> <li>• 15 bar plots on revisionism (file prefix “revisionists”), public goods provision (prefix “provider”) and functional roles index (prefix “roles”). Each of the three groups consists of one accumulative plot and four subsystem plots (for environmental subsystem - “green”, for economic subsystem - “economy”, for security subsystem - “security”, for humanitarian subsystem - “human”) plots.</li> </ul>
questionnaire.pdf	A .pdf file analogous to the online survey questionnaire. Note that questions 14-18 are part of another study.
states.xlsx	Aggregated survey data by state in .xlsx format. See column description below.
states.csv	Aggregated survey data by state in .csv format. See column description below.
criteria.xlsx	Survey data on the relevant valued attributes for stratificational differentiation of states (international

	hierarchy) in .xlsx format. The columns correspond to different power status categories. Each cell can be read as follows: “<cell value> share of experts think that criterion <row> is important to be considered a <column>”. See row interpretation below.
criteria.csv	Survey data on the relevant valued attributes for stratificational differentiation of states (international hierarchy) in .csv format. The columns correspond to different power status categories. Each cell can be read as follows: “<cell value> share of experts think that criterion <row> is important to be considered a <column>”. See row interpretation below.
correl_spearman.csv	A .csv table with Spearman correlation coefficients for all variables in the “states” table. The same variable names are used (also see table below).
correl_spearman.xlsx	A .xlsx table with Spearman correlation coefficients for all variables in the “states” table. The same variable names are used (also see table below).
correl_spearman_p.xlsx	A .xlsx table with p-values of Spearman correlation coefficients for all variables in the “states” table. The same variable names are used (also see table below).
correl_spearman_p.csv	A .csv table with p-values of Spearman correlation coefficients for all variables in the “states” table. The same variable names are used (also see table below).
question_10_other_categorisations.txt	Other categorisations experts chose to add as important in Q10.
question_8_other_criteria.txt	Other power status criteria experts chose to add as important in Q8.
question_6_why_irrelevant.txt	Reasons why some experts evaluated categorisation of states into small, middle, great and superpowers as irrelevant in Q6.
codebook_en.pdf	This codebook.

#### Valued attributes (rows in “criteria” table)

Answers to Question 7 “What criteria would you say are essential to determine whether or not a state can be considered a superpower/ great power/ middle power (multiple choice)” are coded as follows.

Row name	Valued attribute (as asked in the questionnaire)
----------	--

criterion_autonomy	Autonomy in foreign policy decision-making
criterion_prestige	International prestige
criterion_military	Military might
criterion_nuclear	Nuclear arsenal
criterion_agenda	Influence on international agenda
criterion_io	Engagement with international organisations
criterion_economy	Size of economy
criterion_sufficiency	Self-sufficiency in critical technologies and strategic resources
criterion_tech	Technological development
criterion_institutions	Efficiency of domestic institutions
criterion_human	Human capital
criterion_culture	Cultural influence (language, cuisine, movies, etc.)
criterion_green	Commitments and progress in Green Transition
criterion_allies	Network of friends and allies
criterion_geography	Advantageous geographical location
criterion_selfposition	Declared position on one's own power status

#### State-associated variables (columns in “states” table)

Most results of the survey are aggregated in the “states” table, where the bulk of the dataset is presented. The variables used there are described below.

Variable	Description
states	Name of a state.
ISO_code	Official ISO 3166-1 numeric code of a state (for compatibility with other datasets).
Alpha3_Code	Official ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 code of a state (for compatibility with other datasets).
COW_ccode	Correlates of war’s country code (for compatibility with other datasets).
power_cats	Power status category a state belongs to according to the predominant expert opinion calculated from power status index. “Superpower” - above or equal to 3.5 power status index, “Great (Major) power” - power status index between 2.5 and 3.5, “Middle power” - power status index between 1.5 and 2.5 or “Small power” - power status index below 1.5.
power_rates	Power status index of a state. A float between 1 and 4 (if accounting for microstates, the minimal threshold could be 0). It is calculated as a weighted average of individual scores a state received from experts.
Agreement_among_experts	Share of experts who support the predominant opinion on a state’s categorisation by power status. A positive float below or equal to 1.
roles	Roles index of a state, a float between 0 and 4. It is calculated as a sum of roles_green, roles_security, roles_economy and roles_human.

roles_green	Share of experts who think that a state plays a key role on the global environmental agenda.
roles_security	Share of experts who think that a state plays a key role in international security.
roles_economy	Share of experts who think that a state plays a key role in the global economy.
roles_human	Share of experts who think that a state plays a key role on the global humanitarian agenda.
revisionists	Revisionism index of a state, a float between 0 and 4. It is calculated as a sum of revisionists_green, revisionists_security, revisionists_economy and revisionists_human.
revisionists_green	Share of experts who think that a state is revisionist (as opposed to status quo) on the global environmental agenda.
revisionists_security	Share of experts who think that a state is revisionist (as opposed to status quo) in international security.
revisionists_economy	Share of experts who think that a state is revisionist (as opposed to status quo) in the global economy.
revisionists_human	Share of experts who think that a state is revisionist (as opposed to status quo) on the global humanitarian agenda.
provider	Public goods provision index of a state, a float between 0 and 4. It is calculated as a sum of provider_green, provider_security, provider_economy and provider_human.
provider_green	Share of experts who think that a state is a provider (as opposed to free-rider) on the global environmental agenda.
provider_security	Share of experts who think that a state is a provider (as opposed to free-rider) in international security.
provider_economy	Share of experts who think that a state is a provider (as opposed to free-rider) in the global economy.
provider_human	Share of experts who think that a state is a provider (as opposed to free-rider) on the global humanitarian agenda.

### Alternative categorizations

These categorizations were among possible options for experts in Q10.

Short name (in plot)	Full name (in questionnaire)
Global/Regional	Global powers, Regional powers, Local powers
Development	Developed countries, developing countries, countries with transition economy
Nuclear status	The Nuclear Club (5 countries), unofficial Nuclear Club (Pakistan, India, North Korea, Israel), countries which have abandoned nuclear weapons, countries without nuclear weapons
North/South	Countries of Global North, Countries of Global South
Order-maker/taker	Order-maker, order-taker
The West, the Rest	The West, the Rest

Core/Periphery	Core states, semi-periphery states, periphery states
1st/3rd world	First World, Second World, Third World

### **Number of Experts in Different Questions**

Not all experts (of whom there were 76) answered all the questions. The table below shows how many experts answered the questions relevant to this research.

<b>Question number</b>	<b>Expert responses collected</b>
Q1-Q5	76
Q6	7
Q7	76
Q8	12
Q9 (status)	76
Q10	76
Q11 (roles)	75
Q12 (provision)	63
Q13 (revisionism)	63

### **Email text**

When sending an invitation to participate in the survey (via a Google Forms email) the following text was used.

TITLE

“MGIMO University Survey on International Hierarchy”

TEXT

“Dear colleagues,

A research team from MGIMO University is conducting a worldwide expert survey. We study small, middle and great powers to better understand what determines a state's position in the international hierarchy.

We would greatly appreciate your participation. It will take an estimated 20-25 minutes to complete the survey.

The survey is available at: <https://forms.gle/SyJatSyM417DXbfP6>

Should you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

--

Sincerely,  
Ivan Safranchuk,  
Head of the Research Team on International Hierarchy

Institute for International Studies,  
MGIMO University  
Moscow, Russia”

### **Contact information**

Ivan A. Safranchuk, Director of the Center for Eurasian Studies at MGIMO-University’s Institute for International Studies.

For correspondence: Office 4101, 76 Vernadsky Prospect, Moscow 119454, Russia.  
Email: [i.safranchuk@inno.mgimo.ru](mailto:i.safranchuk@inno.mgimo.ru)

Alexander D. Nesmashnyi, Analyst at the Center for Eurasian Studies at MGIMO-University’s Institute for International Studies.

For correspondence: Office 4101, 76 Vernadsky Prospect, Moscow 119454, Russia.  
Email: [a.d.nesmashnyj@my.mgimo.ru](mailto:a.d.nesmashnyj@my.mgimo.ru), [alexnesmash@yandex.com](mailto:alexnesmash@yandex.com)

Vera M. Zhornist, Analyst at the Center for Eurasian Studies at MGIMO-University’s Institute for International Studies.

For correspondence: Office 4101, 76 Vernadsky Prospect, Moscow 119454, Russia.  
Email: [v.m.zhornist@my.mgimo.ru](mailto:v.m.zhornist@my.mgimo.ru)