

Minorities at Risk

Monitoring the persecution
and mobilization of ethnic
groups worldwide

Minorities at Risk (MAR) Codebook Version 2/2009

A project of

CIDCM

Center for International Development
and Conflict Management



In affiliation with

START

National Consortium for the
Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism

A CENTER OF EXCELLENCE OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BASED AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

Minorities at Risk

Overview

The Minorities at Risk (MAR) project is a “university-based research project that monitors and analyzes the status and conflicts of politically-active communal groups in all countries with a current population of at least 500,000. The project is designed to provide information in a standardized format that aids comparative research and contributes to the understanding of conflicts involving relevant groups” (MAR project website. www.cidcm.umd.edu/mar). The project was founded in 1986 by Ted Robert Gurr, one of the preeminent scholars of political violence and ethnic conflict. Since 1988, the Center for International Development and Conflict Management (CIDCM) at the University of Maryland has hosted the project. In 2004, MAR Directorship was given to Jonathan Wilkenfeld. Professor Wilkenfeld is Director of the Center for International Development and Conflict Management (CIDCM) and a Professor in the Department of Government and Politics at the University of Maryland. In 2005, CIDCM entered into partnership with the National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START), also based at the University of Maryland, in continued support of MAR. Former and current funders of the project include the National Science Foundation, the United States Institute of Peace, the Hewlett Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, the State Failure (now Political Instability) Task Force and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

The Minorities at Risk dataset is the core component of the project. In addition to the dataset of quantitative indicators, narrative risk assessments, analytic summaries, and chronologies of events for included groups are available on the project website. The MAR website also provides information on related projects and a bibliography of published materials utilizing the dataset for analysis. Users of MAR data are encouraged to provide copies and citations of publications to project staff for listing on the website.

Historically, the focus of the MAR project has been “minorities at risk.” The project defined a “minority at risk” as an ethnopolitical group that:

- collectively suffers, or benefits from, systematic discriminatory treatment vis-à-vis other groups in a society; and/or
- collectively mobilizes in defense or promotion of its self-defined interests.

For the 2004-2006 update, criteria were re-developed as part of an effort to address issues of selection bias. The current criteria for this release are as follows:

- Membership in the group is determined primarily by descent by both members and non-members.
 - o The group may be a caste if membership is determined by descent and precludes public social mobility.
- Membership in the group is recognized and viewed as important by members and/or non-members. The importance may be psychological, normative, and/or strategic.
- Members share some distinguishing cultural features, such as common language religion and customs.
- One or more of these cultural features are practiced by a majority of the members of the group.
- The group has at least 100,000 members or constitutes one percent of a country’s population.

- For groups dropping below population thresholds after being included in the dataset, coding will continue for up to 10 years to determine if population rebounds. This is to avoid immediately excluding groups whose population drops specifically because of political actions (such as expulsion from the home country).

The project currently tracks 282 ethnopolitical groups that meet the above criteria. However, the project does not make claims regarding the comprehensiveness of the dataset. That is, there are ethnopolitical groups that meet the above criteria and are not included in the dataset.

MAR has grown through the tireless effort of many graduate assistants and several faculty associates. The project coordinators who have played a key role in sustaining the project since the mid-1980s include Monty G. Marshall, Scott McDonald, Shin-wha Lee, Michael Haxton, Anne Pitsch, Randi Mack, Michael Johns, Amy Pate and Carter Johnson. In 2007, the role of MAR Research Director was created as a full-time position to manage all data collection projects and to facilitate analysis of data products. Former project coordinator, Amy Pate, currently fills that position. The role of project coordinator was also moved to a full-time position, currently filled by Mary Michael. To provide guidance on groups to be included, new indicators, and data quality control issues, an advisory board was established for the MAR project in 1999. Several faculty affiliates -- many of them members of the advisory board -- have also provided leadership in procuring funding and in initiating data collection projects. These include Steve Saideman (McGill University), Victor Asal (SUNY-Albany) and Jóhanna Birnir (University of Maryland). Information on board members and activities is posted on the MAR website. Information about the current project staff can also be found on the website.

Users can communicate with the Minorities at Risk project by email at minpro@cidcm.umd.edu, an address that is managed by Project Coordinator Mary Michael. Alternatively, users can communicate via postal mail to Minorities at Risk Project, CIDCM, Tydings Hall, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-7231. Director Jonathan Wilkenfeld may be reached at jwilkenf@gvpt.umd.edu. Project Research Director Amy Pate may be reached at apate1@cidcm.umd.edu. MAR personnel may also be reached by phone at 301-405-7019. Additional contact information may be found on the project website at www.cidcm.umd.edu/mar.

Project History

The Minorities at Risk dataset has developed over five distinct phases. Phase I covered 227 communal groups which met the criteria for classification as a *minority at risk* for the years 1945-1989. Phase II covered 275 groups from 1990-1995, Phase III covered 275 groups from 1996-1998 and Phase IV covered 287 groups from 1998-2003. The release of the 2004-2006 data marks the beginning of Phase V, designated a new phase due to reformulation of the codebook. Additionally, as part of Phase V, the project will be releasing data on 100 additional ethnic groups, specifically to address issues of selection bias.

In 2006, MAR project staff conducted a review of the approximately 400 variables that had been part of the various phases of the MAR project with special attention to the 125 variables that were the focus of Phase IV. Project staff identified several categories of variables: those

most frequently used in scholarly analysis; those somewhat used in scholarly analysis; and those only rarely used or not used at all in scholarly analysis. Additionally, project staff also noted what variables were central to multiple theories of ethnic conflict. Based on the analysis, a total of 71 variables were selected as being “core” variables. Of the “core” variables, some -- including the most frequently used variables in past analyses -- are unchanged from previous phases of the MAR dataset. Other variables were reformulated to facilitate either collection or statistical analysis of the data. Finally, several variables were added to the dataset. Throughout the following codebook, variables will be marked as one of the following:

- * Variable is unchanged from Phase IV. Variable name, variable levels and specification of levels are the same. Coding can be considered continuous with Phase IV data.
- ** Variable levels re-specified from Phase IV. The variable name and levels are largely unchanged. However, levels are better specified, with more specific information to denote between different coding levels. This category also includes variables where the levels have been shifted. Coding should not be considered continuous with Phase IV data, although coding requires only minor changes to be continuous.
- *** Variable reformulated. These variables measure concepts previously measured by other variables in Phase IV. However, they have been reformulated into new variables in order to facilitate either collection or analysis of the data. Coding should not be considered continuous with Phase IV data.
- **** New variable. These variables measure concepts not previously measured by other variables in Phase IV. However, the concepts measured were identified as being of interest by users of MAR data and project staff.

Project staff are currently reviewing past coding systematically in order to release a single, integrated dataset coded on an annual basis from 1980 through 2006. This effort focuses initially on variables in the first 2 categories, with some attention given to reformulated variables. Back-coding of new variables and reformulated variables that can not be constructed from previously coded data will not be undertaken until funding sources can be procured for such an endeavor.

Variables in the MAR dataset fall into several categories. The first category is identification variables and, in combination, uniquely identify observations in the dataset. The second category includes variables that rarely change or change only slowly. These “static” variables include many of the cultural characteristics of the group as well as their geographic dispersion. In the future, these variables will be updated every 8-10 years. The third -- and largest -- category is dynamic indicators of the ethnic group’s status and behavior.

Research Protocol

Coders for the project are primarily graduate and undergraduate students who have undergone a rigorous training procedure. All coding is then reviewed by senior editors and by the research director before public release. The project has not yet assessed inter-coder reliability. All coding is conducted using open-source information. As much as is possible, coders rely on multiple sources for each code assigned. Details on coding conventions for specific variables are contained within the description of variables below.

Researchers are encouraged to carry out their own consistency and validity checks on indicators they use or adapt from the MAR dataset. Project staff would greatly appreciate being appraised of the results of such analysis. Furthermore, MAR users are encouraged to notify project staff of any discrepancies found in the data for further evaluation.

Resources and Documentation

The Minorities at Risk Project maintains hard copy files for Phases I through III of the project and computer records for Phases IV and V (although the documentation files for the first two phases may be incomplete for some groups). The project archives currently contain:

- Phase I codesheets and group summaries
- Phase II chronologies for a subset of Phase I groups
- Phase III codesheets, overviews, chronologies and risk assessments
- Maps of most Phase III groups, showing areas of geographic concentration
- Selected hard-copy source materials for Phases I and II
- Codebooks and coding conventions for Phases I, III and IV
- Hard copies of selected publications using MAR data
- Access database of Phase IV coding
- Access database of Phase V coding

Individual researchers can gain access to these materials by arrangement with the project coordinator.

The 1999-2000 and 2001-2003 data were released contained with the MARGene program. With the reformulation of the codebook in Phase V, the MARGene program has been discontinued. The project is moving to a web-based platform for the creation of customized datasets. However, the data contained with MARGene and the program itself will be archived.

Citing MAR

For use of the quantitative data, MAR can be cited as follows:

Minorities at Risk Project. 2009. "Minorities at Risk Dataset." College Park, MD: Center for International Development and Conflict Management. Retrieved from <http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/mar/data.aspx> on: [date here].

I. Group characteristics

A. Group Identity

- i. NUMCODE* Ethnic group case identifier, (country code + group id)
- ii. Group* Full name of MAR ethnic group
- iii. CCODE* Country ID number
The Correlates of War (Singer and Small) country identification number
- iv. Country* Country in which the group resides
- v. Region* Minorities at Risk Project region ID
 - 0 Western democracies and Japan
 - 2 Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union
 - 3 Asia
 - 5 North Africa and the Middle East
 - 6 Sub-Saharan Africa
 - 7 Latin America and the Caribbean
- vi. Year* Year of Observation

B. Group Population codes:

Population estimates include at least one year of data. The average of disparate sources is generally reported. Source for country population is the CIA World Factbook.

- i. GPOP** Group's population
- ii. CPOP** Country's population
- iii. GPRO* Group proportion of country population (to 4 decimal places, e.g., 0.1729)

C. Measures of distinctiveness

These are static variables and are generally the same for all years being coded. The comparison group for the following indicators is the largest (plurality or majority) ethnic group in the state.

- i. LANG** Different language group
 - 0 Linguistic assimilation with plurality group:
Group has same language as plurality (e.g., Arab Shi'a and Arab Sunni in Iraq) or most of the group (>90%) no longer speaks native language but has assimilated to language of dominant group (e.g., German Americans, native Hawaiians)
 - 1 Group speaks multiple languages, at least one different from plurality group:
Members of group speak different languages (e.g., Southern Sudanese in Sudan) or part of group is assimilated to plurality but part still speaks native language.
 - 2 Group speaks primarily one language, different from plurality group:
Plurality of group speaks the same language AND it is different from plurality group language (e.g., Kurds in Turkey or Iraq)
 - 99 No basis for judgment

- ii. CUSTOM* Different group customs (marriage, family, dress, etc.)
- 0 Same social customs as plurality
 - 1 Different social customs from plurality
 - At least a significant minority (>25%) of ethnic group population follows different social customs from the plurality group in the country. Examples of different social customs include polygamy vs. monogamy; nomadic or semi-nomadic lifestyles vs. settled; etc. Also coded here are groups that are nominally the same religion as the plurality group but have significantly different practice (e.g., incorporation of traditional religion into Islamic or Christian practice).
 - 99 No basis for judgment
- iii. BELIEF** Different group religion
- 0 Same religion as plurality
 - The plurality of the group (>90%) is the same religion as the plurality group (e.g., Basques in Spain are Roman Catholic like most Spaniards)
 - 1 Different sect within same religion as plurality
 - Same major religion, but different sect (e.g., Roman Catholic Irish in Northern Ireland vs. Protestants; Sunni Arabs in Iraq vs. Shi'a Arabs in Iraq)
 - 2 Different religion
 - Totally distinct religions (e.g., Palestinians are Muslim or Christian vs. Jewish Israelis; Christians in Iran vs. Shi'a Muslims)
 - 99 No basis for judgment
- iv. RELIGS1** Specific religion: Plurality religion of group
- 1 Roman Catholic
 - 2 Orthodox
 - 3 Protestant
 - 4 Other Christian sect
 - 5 Sunni Islam
 - 6 Shi'a Islam
 - 7 Other Islamic sect
 - 8 Buddhist
 - 9 Animist
 - 10 Other
 - 99 No basis for judgment
- v. RACE** Different physical appearance
- 0 No physical differences in appearance
 - 1 Physically distinguishable subtype of same racial stock
 - (e.g., Korean vs. Japanese; Greek vs. German)
 - 2 Different racial stock from the dominant group with substantial intermixture
 - (e.g., Chinese v. Malay; Black or Indio v. European)
 - 3 Different racial stock, little or no intermixture
 - 99 No basis for judgment

NOTE: For the variable RACE (which like most of the Group Characteristics variables is a way to measure how easily distinguishable members of the minority are from members of the plurality), MAR uses the concept of continental (or geographic) race. This identifies the geographic origins of the group. Evolutionary biology has found little support for the concept of race in a strictly genetic sense; however, as a social construct with some basis in differences in physical appearance, it is useful. The five racial types MAR uses are:

Asiatic

Mongolian, Chinese, Japanese, Malay, SE Asian peoples, Polynesians, Micronesians

African

Indigenous peoples of sub-Saharan Africa

Europoid

European peoples, indigenous peoples of North Africa (Berbers, Egyptians), Middle Eastern peoples (Arabs, Persians), some Central and South Asian peoples (Pashtuns, Baluchis)

Indio/Amerindian

Indigenous peoples of North and South America

Oceanic/Pacific

Melanesians, Papuans, aboriginals of Australia and New Zealand

The main sources used to develop these guidelines are:

Nei, Masatoshi and Arun K Roychoudhury. 1993. "Evolutionary Relationships and Human Populations on a Global Scale." *Molecular Biology and Evolution*. 10:5. 927-943,

Zhivotovsky, Lev A., Noah A. Rosenberg, and Marcus W. Feldman. 2003. "Features of Evolution and Expansion of Modern Humans, Inferred from Genomewide Microsatellite Markers." *American Journal of Human Genetics*. 72:1171-1186.

C. Group Concentration:

- i. GROUPCON* Group spatial distribution
 - 0 Widely dispersed
 - 1 Primarily urban or minority in one region
 - 2 Majority in one region, others dispersed
 - 3 Concentrated in one region
 - 99 No basis for judgment

- ii. GC119* Urban/rural distribution
 - 1 Mainly rural (>80%)
 - 2 Mostly rural (60-80%)
 - 3 Mixed urban/rural
 - 4 Mostly urban (60-80%)
 - 5 Mainly urban (>80%)
 - 99 No basis for judgment

- iii. GC2** Regional base:
 A spatially contiguous region larger than an urban area that is part of the country, in which 25% or more of the minority resides and in which the minority constitutes the predominant proportion of the population
 0 No
 1 Yes
 -99 No basis for judgment
- iv. GC6B** Proportion of group members in regional base
 0 No regional base
 1 <50%
 2 50-75%
 3 >75%
 -99 No basis for judgment
- v. GC7** Proportion of group living outside regional base
 0 No regional base
 1 >50%
 2 25-50%
 3 <25%
 -99 No basis for judgment
- vi. GC10** Transnational dispersion -- kindred groups
 0 The group has no close kindred across an international border
 1 The group has close kindred across a border which does not adjoin its regional base (including groups that have transnational kindred but not a regional base)
 2 The group has close kindred in one country which adjoins its regional base
 3 The group has close kindred in more than one country which adjoins its regional base
 -99 No basis for judgment
- vii. GC11** Transnational dispersion -- kindred groups in power
 0 Kindred have no access to political power (no kindred abroad)
 1 Kindred are outside political ruling coalition but are not barred from power
 2 Kindred are in ruling coalition
 3 Kindred dominate state coalition
 -99 No basis for judgment

II. Group status

A. Historical autonomy and separatism indicators

- i. AUTLOST* Index of lost political autonomy, based on year of autonomy loss, magnitude of change and group status prior to loss of autonomy.
 $AUTLOST = (MAGN+PRSTAT-1)/YEARWT$
- ii. YEARWT** Based on year of most recent loss of autonomy. If no loss of autonomy, then based on most recent transfer of centralized authority.
- 0 No history of autonomy or transfer
 - 1 <25 years ago
 - 2 25-49 years ago
 - 3 50-74 years ago
 - 4 75-99 years ago
 - 5 >100 years ago
- iii. MAGN** Magnitude of change
- 0 No history of autonomy or transfer
 - 1 Transfer only centralized authority
 - 2 Loss of short-term autonomy (<10 years) under colonial rule
 - 3 Loss of long-term autonomy
- iv. PRSTAT** Group status prior to change
- 0 No history of autonomy or transfer only
 - 1 Autonomous but acephalous
Groups that lack centralized authority structures (e.g., many indigenous groups whose highest level of political structure was the village) or acted autonomously from centralized political structures.
 - 2 Part of larger segment of group OR province in another state or territory
Groups that are part of a larger segment with independence or autonomy (e.g., Albanians in Kosovo and Macedonia) or groups that have their own province in another state or colonial territory
 - 3 Traditional centralized authority OR autonomous region or province OR autonomous people under colonial rule
 - 4 State or republic
Groups that previously had independent states (e.g., Tuva in Russia)
- v. AUTONEND* Year/decade/century autonomy was lost
- vi. TRANSYR* Year/decade/century transferred

- vii. SEPX** Separatism index
- 0 None
 - 1 AUTLOST>0 but no separatist (independence/revanchist) or autonomy movements in past 50 years
 - 2 Separatist or autonomy movement that persisted as an active political force for at least 5 years in the past 50 years, but not in the past 25 years
 - 3 Active separatist or autonomy movements in the past 25 years
 - 99 No basis for judgment
- viii. SEPKIN* Active separatism (independence or autonomy movements) among kin groups
- 0 No
 - 1 Yes
 - 99 No basis for judgment

B. Disadvantages

- i. EMIG** Emigration for political or economic reasons
- 0 Condition not present
 - 1 Condition minor
Affects less than 1% of group population
 - 2 Condition of medium significance
Affects between 1 and 10% of group population
 - 3 Condition serious
Affects more than 10%
 - 99 No basis for judgment
- ii. DISPLACE**** Internal displacement for political or economic reasons
- 0 Condition not present
 - 1 Condition minor
Affects less than 1% of group population
 - 2 Condition of medium significance
Affects between 1 and 10% of group population
 - 3 Condition serious
Affects more than 10%
 - 99 No basis for judgment

- iii. POLDIS* Political discrimination index
- 0 No discrimination
 - 1 Neglect/remedial polices:
Substantial under-representation in political office and/or participation due to historical neglect or restrictions. Explicit public policies are designed to protect or improve the group's political status.
 - 2 Neglect/no remedial policies
Substantial under-representation due to historical neglect or restrictions. No social practice of deliberate exclusion. No formal exclusion. No evidence of protective or remedial public policies.
 - 3 Social exclusion/neutral policy
Substantial under-representation due to prevailing social practice by dominant groups. Formal public policies toward the group are neutral or, if positive, inadequate to offset discriminatory social practices.
 - 4 Exclusion/repressive policy
Public policies (formal exclusion and/or recurring repression) substantially restrict the group's political participation by comparison with other groups. (Note: This does not include repression during group rebellions. It does include patterned repression when the group is not openly resisting state authority.)
 - 99 No basis for judgment
- iv. ECDIS* Economic discrimination index
- 0 No discrimination
 - 1 Neglect/remedial polices
Significant poverty and under-representation in desirable occupations due to historical marginality, neglect, or restrictions. Public policies are designed to improve the group's material well being.
 - 2 Neglect/no remedial policies
Significant poverty and under-representation due to historical marginality, neglect, or restrictions. No social practice of deliberate exclusion. Few or no public policies aim at improving the group's material well-being.
 - 3 Social exclusion/neutral policy
Significant poverty and under-representation due to prevailing social practice by dominant groups. Formal public policies toward the group are neutral or, if positive, inadequate to offset active and widespread discrimination.
 - 4 Exclusion/repressive policy
Public policies (formal exclusion and/or recurring repression) substantially restrict the group's economic opportunities by contrast with other groups.
 - 99 No basis for judgment
- v. CULPO1* Restrictions on religion
- 0 No restrictions
 - 1 Activity informally restricted
The activity is restricted by widespread but informal social practice (e.g., by discrimination against people who follow group religion)
 - 2 Activity somewhat restricted
 - 3 Activity sharply restricted
 - 99 No basis for judgment

- vi. CULPO2^{***} Restrictions on use of language or language instruction
- 0 No restrictions
 - 1 Activity informally restricted
The activity is restricted by widespread but informal social practice (e.g., by discrimination against people who speak the group's language)
 - 2 Activity somewhat restricted
 - 3 Activity sharply restricted
 - 99 No basis for judgment

NOTE: For CULPO1 and CULPO2, the following guidelines apply:

1. These items are included only if the communal group is treated differently than others. These items are not included if restrictions apply to everyone in the population because of the type of regime or other factors.
2. Public restrictions that apply to all citizens because they are necessary for the common good are not restrictions even if they violate the religious norms of the communal group, (e.g. requirements that families have only one child, or that all children be vaccinated).
3. Lack of public support for group cultural activities is not a restriction unless public support is provided to similar activities by other groups.
4. Discrimination anywhere in the country is sufficient to code a discrimination variable--even if the group is not discriminated against in the region where they are concentrated.
5. These variables are often time invariant and are inferred to exist if they existed in the recent past. However, variable values are changed based on events that have altered the situation.

C. Group organization and representation

NOTE: Minorities at Risk Organizational Behavior (MAROB) includes additional information on organizations. For more information please see the data page of the MAR website: <http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/mar/data.asp>

- i. GOJPA^{*} Group organization for joint political action
- 0 No political movements or organizations represent group interests
 - 1 Group interests promoted by umbrella organizations
 - 2 Group interests promoted by one or more conventional political parties or movements
 - 3 Group interests promoted mainly by conventional movements or parties but also by militant organizations with limited support
 - 4 Group interests promoted mainly by militant organizations but also by some conventional organizations
 - 5 Group interests promoted only by militant organizations
 - 99 No basis for judgment

NOTE: For GOJPA, the following guidelines apply:

1. For each year, the highest type of group representation is reported (none, umbrella, conventional, militant).
2. The variable reports whether the organization acts on behalf of the minority group and whether it does so from within or outside the country. Actions by international organizations/international non-governmental organizations are not reported (e.g., Cultural Survival, development organizations, Amnesty International).
3. Minority-based NGOs, (e.g., community organizations working for health care, education, other social services, etc.) are reported as "group interests are promoted by umbrella organizations..."
4. If there is an even split between militant and conventional organizations, the higher one is reported (militant).

Conventional movements and parties are those that rely mainly on non-coercive political techniques such as organization-building; education and consciousness-raising symbolic action; participating in electoral politics; interest representation to officials; organizing peaceful protests; etc

Militant movements and parties are those that rely substantially on coercive political techniques such as obtaining funds, supplies, and members by use or threat of force; use of threats and violence against state officials and rival organizations; guerrilla and civil war; defending and administering rebel-held zones; etc.

- ii. AUTON2* Group autonomy status:
Does group have administrative autonomy (i.e., control of political and bureaucratic structures in an autonomous region). Autonomy must be legally recognized by home government.
0 No
1 Yes
-99 No basis for judgment
- iii. AUTGAIN* Year group gained autonomy
- iv. AUTPRO* Percentage of group in autonomous region
- v. LEGISREP**** Group representation in legislative branch of central government
0 No
1 Yes
Representation may be through individual group members who belong to non-ethnically based parties or by representation through ethnically based parties.
-99 No basis for judgment
- vi. EXECREP**** Group representation in executive branch of central government
0 No
1 Yes
Representation may be through individual group members who belong to non-ethnically based parties or by representation through ethnically based parties.
-99 No basis for judgment
- vii. GUARREP**** Group is guaranteed representation in central government
0 No
1 Yes
Guaranteed positions in the central government (e.g., appointed positions in cabinet, appointed positions in legislature, guaranteed elected positions in legislature, etc.)
-99 No basis for judgment

D. Grievances:

For each type of grievance, the HIGHEST level of grievance expressed by group representatives is reported (e.g., if the majority of a group desires autonomy but a radical faction desires independence, the code under POLGR is 4, NOT 3). Values are based on statements and actions by group leaders and members or observations of grievances by third parties.

- i. POLGR^{***} Highest level of political grievance
 - 0 No political grievances expressed
 - 1 Political grievances focused on ending discrimination
 - 2 Political grievances focused on creating or strengthening remedial policies
 - 3 Political grievances focused on creating or strengthening autonomous status
 - 4 Political grievances focused on creating separate state for group or revanchist change in borders
 - 99 No basis for judgment

- ii. ECGR^{***} Highest level of economic grievance
 - 0 No economic grievances expressed
 - 1 Economic grievances focused on ending discrimination
 - 2 Economic grievances focused on creating or strengthening remedial policies
 - 99 No basis for judgment

- iii. CULGR^{***} Highest level of cultural grievance
 - 0 No cultural grievances expressed
 - 1 Cultural grievances focused on ending discrimination
 - 2 Cultural grievances focused on creating or strengthening remedial policies
 - 99 No basis for judgment

III. External support

A. Kindred group support

Kindred group support includes support from diaspora members (e.g., Kurds from Turkey now working in Germany are part of the Kurdish diaspora) and support from close kindred outside the country (e.g., Albanians in Albania supporting Kosovar Albanians or Albanians in Macedonia).

- i. KINSUP^{***} Any kindred group support
0 No
1 Yes
For each year in which a subtype of support is reported.
-99 No basis for judgment
- ii. KINMATSUP^{***} Kindred group material, non-military, support
Any financial or material support that is not used for military purposes (e.g. humanitarian aid (in the form of money or goods); development aid (in the form of money or goods); funding for civic, cultural or political associations; etc.).
0 No
1 Yes
-99 No basis for judgment
- iii. KINPOLSUP^{***} Kindred group political support
Reported when members of kindred groups provide members for monitoring elections, ceasefires, etc. on behalf of group members; when exile or diaspora members vote for ethnically based parties in expatriate elections; when members of kindred groups hold protests on behalf of group members; when members of kindred groups host talks/ negotiations between ethnic kin and government of home country.
0 No
1 Yes
-99 No basis for judgment
- iv. KINMILSUP^{***} Kindred group military support
Reported when kindred group members provide funds for military supplies, sanctuaries or safe havens for armed fighters; military training in exile; advisory military personnel; active combat units; or cross-border raids or rescue missions for ethnic group.
0 No
1 Yes
-99 No basis for judgment

B. Foreign state and state-led actor (IGOs) support

Includes support given by the governments of individual states (e.g., the United States, Sweden, South Africa) AND support given by intergovernmental organizations and their agencies (e.g., the UN, the European Union, NATO, World Bank, World Food Programme, UNICEF, etc.).

- i. STASUP^{***} Any foreign state or IGO support
0 No
1 Yes
For each year in which a subtype of support is reported.
-99 No basis for judgment

- ii. STAMATSUP^{***} Foreign state/IGO material, non-military, support
Any financial or material support that is not used for military purposes (e.g. humanitarian aid (in the form of money or goods); development aid (in the form of money or goods); funding for civic, cultural or political associations; etc.).
- 0 No
1 Yes
-99 No basis for judgment
- iii. STAPOLSUP^{***} Foreign state/IGO political support
Reported when state actors provide personnel for monitoring elections, ceasefires, etc. on behalf of group members; when state actors host talks/ negotiations between ethnic group and government of home country; when state actors levy sanctions against government for treatment of ethnic minority.
- 0 No
1 Yes
-99 No basis for judgment
- iv. STAMILSUP^{***} Foreign state/IGO military support
Reported when state actors provide funds for military supplies, sanctuaries or safe havens for armed fighters; military training in exile; advisory military personnel; active combat units; or cross-border raids or rescue missions for ethnic group.
- 0 No
1 Yes
-99 No basis for judgment

C. Non-state actor (non-kindred) support

Non-state actors are predominantly non-governmental organizations (e.g., the Red Cross, Amnesty International, Gates Foundation), but also include prominent individuals (e.g., Jimmy Carter, Bono), religious organizations (e.g., the Catholic Church), and transnational criminal and terrorist networks (e.g., al Qaeda). These variables do not include cases where the non-state actor is predominantly made up of kindred group members.

- i. NSASUP^{***} Any non-state actor support
- 0 No
1 Yes
For each year in which a subtype of support is reported.
-99 No basis for judgment
- ii. NSAMATSUP^{***} Non-state actor material, non-military, support
Any financial or material support that is not used for military purposes. Examples include humanitarian aid (in the form of money or goods); development aid (in the form of money or goods); funding for civic, cultural or political associations; etc.
- 0 No
1 Yes
-99 No basis for judgment

- iii. NSAPOLSUP^{***} Non-state actor political support
 Reported when non-state actors provide personnel for monitoring elections, ceasefires, etc. on behalf of group members; when state actors host talks/negotiations between ethnic group and government of home country; when non-state actors levy sanctions against government for treatment of ethnic minority.
 - 0 No
 - 1 Yes
 - 99 No basis for judgment

- iv. NSAMILSUP^{***} Non-state actor military support
 Reported when non-state actors provide funds for military supplies, sanctuaries or safe havens for armed fighters, military training in exile, advisory military personnel, active combat units, or cross-border raids or rescue missions for ethnic group.
 - 0 No
 - 1 Yes
 - 99 No basis for judgment

IV. Group conflict behavior

A. Intracommunal conflict

i. INTRACON^{**} Presence of intracommunal conflict

- 0 No
- 1 Yes
For each year in which intracommunal conflict reported.
- 99 No basis for judgment

NOTE: The following variables are based on which pair of antagonists had the highest level of conflict for a given year. The highest level of conflict for any one year is reported in FACTCC1 and the name of the conflicting factions of the ethnic group is reported for that year in FACTSEV1. The second-highest level of conflict for any one year is reported in FACTCC2, and the name of the conflicting faction is reported for that year in FACTSEV2, etc. An antagonistic pair can move between variables (e.g., an antagonistic faction can be reported in FACTCC1 for one year and in FACTCC3 for another). Only the 3 pairs of groups with the highest levels of conflict are reported.

ii. FACTCC1^{**} Names of intracommunal antagonists with highest level of conflict

iii. FACTSEV1^{**} Severity of conflict for first pair of antagonists

- 0 No conflict
- 1 Sporadic violent attacks
Attacks without weapons (e.g., brawls), knives, or few small arms (e.g., one or two handguns).
- 2 Series of bombings/assassinations
- 3 Substantial rioting
- 4 Sporadic armed clashes
Attacks with multiple firearms, automatic weapons, or heavy weaponry (mortars, shelling, etc.)
- 5 Protracted communal warfare
More than 6 clashes a year between antagonists
- 99 No basis for judgment

iv. FACTCC2^{**} Names of intracommunal antagonists with second-highest level of conflict

v. FACTSEV2^{**} Severity of conflict for second pair of antagonists

- 0 No conflict
- 1 Sporadic violent attacks
Attacks without weapons (e.g., brawls), knives, or few small arms (e.g., one or two handguns).
- 2 Series of bombings/assassinations
- 3 Substantial rioting
- 4 Sporadic armed clashes
Attacks with multiple firearms, automatic weapons, or heavy weaponry (mortars, shelling, etc.)
- 5 Protracted communal warfare
More than 6 clashes a year between antagonists
- 99 No basis for judgment

vi. FACTCC3** Names of intracommunal antagonists with third-highest level of conflict

vii. FACTSEV3** Severity of conflict for third pair of antagonists

- 0 No conflict
- 1 Sporadic violent attacks
Attacks without weapons (e.g., brawls), knives, or few small arms (e.g., one or two handguns).
- 2 Series of bombings/assassinations
- 3 Substantial rioting
- 4 Sporadic armed clashes
Attacks with multiple firearms, automatic weapons, or heavy weaponry (mortars, shelling, etc.)
- 5 Protracted communal warfare
More than 6 clashes a year between antagonists
- 99 No basis for judgment

B. Intercommunal conflict

For intercommunal conflict, note the following:

1. For each year, open hostilities between the minority group and other communal groups are reported
2. Open conflicts with other minorities and the majority or dominant group are reported not conflicts with the state or with dominant groups exercising state power except when the state cannot control such groups.

i. INTERCON* Presence of intercommunal conflict

- 0 No
- 1 Yes
For each year in which intercommunal conflict reported.
- 99 No basis for judgment

NOTE: The following variables are based on which antagonist had the highest level of conflict for a given year. The highest level of conflict for any one year is reported in CCGROUP1SEV and the name of the antagonist is reported for that year in CCGROUP1. The second-highest level of conflict for any one year is reported in CCGROUP2SEV, and the name of the antagonist is reported for that year in CCGROUP2 etc... An antagonist can move between variables (e.g., one organization can be recorded in CCGROUP1 for one year and in CCGROUP3 for another). If more than 3 antagonists in a given year, mention in notes but do not code. Only the 3 pairs of groups with the highest levels of conflict are reported.

ii. CCGROUP1** Name of group with highest level of conflict

iii. CCGROUP1SEV** Level of conflict with CCGROUP1

- 0 No conflict
- 1 Individual acts of harassment, no fatalities
- 2 Political agitation, campaigns urging authorities to impose restrictions on group
- 3 Sporadic violent attacks by gangs or other small groups
Attacks without weapons (e.g., brawls), knives, or few small arms (e.g., one or two handguns) involving fewer than 20 people.
- 4 Anti-group demonstrations, rallies, marches
- 5 Communal rioting, armed attacks
Attacks with multiple firearms, automatic weapons, or heavy weaponry (mortars, shelling, etc.) OR attacks without weapons (e.g., brawls), knives, or few small arms (e.g., one or two handguns) involving more than 20 people
- 6 Communal warfare
More than 6 clashes a year between antagonists
- 99 No basis for judgment

iv. CCGROUP2** Name of group with second-highest level of conflict

v. CCGROUPSEV2** Level of conflict with CCGROUP2

- 0 No conflict
- 1 Individual acts of harassment, no fatalities
- 2 Political agitation, campaigns urging authorities to impose restrictions on group
- 3 Sporadic violent attacks by gangs or other small groups
Attacks without weapons (e.g., brawls), knives, or few small arms (e.g., one or two handguns) involving fewer than 20 people.
- 4 Anti-group demonstrations, rallies, marches
- 5 Communal rioting, armed attacks
Attacks with multiple firearms, automatic weapons, or heavy weaponry (mortars, shelling, etc.) OR attacks without weapons (e.g., brawls), knives, or few small arms (e.g., one or two handguns) involving more than 20 people
- 6 Communal warfare
More than 6 clashes a year between antagonists
- 99 No basis for judgment

vi. CCGROUP3** Name of group with third-highest level of conflict

vii. CCGROUPSEV3** Level of conflict with CCGROUP3

- 0 No conflict
- 1 Individual acts of harassment, no fatalities
- 2 Political agitation, campaigns urging authorities to impose restrictions on group
- 3 Sporadic violent attacks by gangs or other small groups
Attacks without weapons (e.g., brawls), knives, or few small arms (e.g., one or two handguns) involving fewer than 20 people.
- 4 Anti-group demonstrations, rallies, marches
- 5 Communal rioting, armed attacks
Attacks with multiple firearms, automatic weapons, or heavy weaponry (mortars, shelling, etc.) OR attacks without weapons (e.g., brawls), knives, or few small arms (e.g., one or two handguns) involving more than 20 people
- 6 Communal warfare
More than 6 clashes a year between antagonists
- 99 No basis for judgment

C. Protest

Protest and rebellion follow these guidelines:

1. Protest and rebellion initiated by organizations that claim to represent the group's interests and directed against governments that claim to exercise authority over the group is reported for each year in which it occurs.
2. The de facto government is recognized for the purposes of these data. "Government" is defined as the body that exercises authority/control over the ^{majority} of the country. For example, Taliban was the de facto government in Afghanistan in 2000 even though it was not recognized by the world community.
3. Protests on behalf of the group that take place outside of the group's home country are not included.
4. The most serious manifestation of each type of protest or rebellion is reported for each year.
5. Positive evidence is used to report these variables. These data do not assume that action from one year carries over into the next.
6. Protest and rebellion are distinct and may occur without the other.
7. General protests or rebellions (i.e. those carried out by the general populace as opposed to only group members) are reported if a) group members are present in substantial numbers, and b) the anti-regime action includes issues of particular concern to the group.
8. General protest or rebellion severity counts all participants, not just group members.

i. PROT*

Protest

- 0 None reported
- 1 Verbal opposition
Requests by a minority-controlled regional group for independence (public letters, petitions, posters, publications, agitation, court action, etc.).
- 2 Symbolic resistance
Sabotage, symbolic destruction of property OR political organizing activity on a substantial scale (e.g. sit-ins, blockage of traffic).
- 3 Small demonstrations
A few demonstrations, rallies, strikes, and/or riots, the largest of which has total participation of less than 10,000
- 4 Medium demonstrations
Demonstrations, rallies, strikes, and/or riots, the largest of which has total participation between 10,000 and 100,000
- 5 Large demonstrations
Demonstrations, rallies, strikes, and/or riots, the largest of which has total participation over 100,000
- 99 No basis for judgment

D. Rebellion

i. REB*

Rebellion

- 0 None reported
- 1 Political banditry, sporadic terrorism (fewer than 6 events)
- 2 Campaigns of terrorism (more than 6 events)
- 3 Local rebellions
Armed attempts to seize power in a locale except cases that are the beginning of a protracted guerrilla or civil war during the reported year.
- 4 Small-scale guerrilla activity
Includes all three of the following traits
 - fewer than 1000 armed fighters
 - sporadic armed attacks (less than 6 reported per year)
 - attacks in a small part of the area occupied by the group (or in one or two other locales)
- 5 Intermediate guerrilla activity
Includes one or two of the defining traits of large-scale activity and one or two of the defining traits of small-scale activity
- 6 Large-scale guerrilla activity
Includes all three of the following traits
 - more than 1000 armed fighters
 - frequent armed attacks (more than 6 reported per year)
 - attacks affecting large part of the area occupied by group
- 7 Civil war
Protracted civil war fought by rebel military
Has all the characteristics of large-scale guerrilla activity, plus rebels control large scale base areas that are secure over time
- 99 No basis for judgment

E. Government repression of group

Government repression follows these guidelines:

1. Each variable is reported at the highest level of repression directed at the relevant part of the group's population.
2. The de facto government is recognized here. "Government" is defined as the body that exercises authority/control over the majority of the country. For example, Taliban was the de facto government in Afghanistan even though it was not recognized by the world community.
3. These tactics may be used by any government agencies, at any level, including but not limited to the military, police, and special security services.
4. Only those actions that are carried out are reported. Threats of action are not reported.

i. REPGENCIV*** Repression of group civilian populations (those not engaging in violent or nonviolent political activities)

- 0 None reported
- 1 Surveillance:
e.g., domestic spying, wiretapping, etc.
- 2 Harassment/containment
e.g., saturation of police/military presence, militarized checkpoints targeting members of group, curfews, states of emergency
- 3 Nonviolent coercion
e.g., arrests, show-trials, property confiscation, exile/deportation
- 4 Violent coercion, short of killing
e.g., forced resettlement, torture
- 5 Violent coercion, killing
e.g., systematic killings, ethnic cleansing, reprisal killings
- 99 No basis for judgment

ii. REPNVIOL*** Repression of group members engaged in nonviolent collective action (e.g., politicians, human rights leaders, nonviolent protesters, etc.)

- 0 None reported
- 1 Surveillance:
e.g., domestic spying, wiretapping, etc.
- 2 Harassment/containment
e.g., saturation of police/military presence, militarized checkpoints targeting members of group, curfews, states of emergency, closing down political publications/offices
- 3 Nonviolent coercion
e.g., arrests, show-trials, property confiscation, exile/deportation
- 4 Violent coercion, short of killing
e.g., forced resettlement, torture, non-lethal force used against protesters
- 5 Violent coercion, killing
e.g., systematic killings, ethnic cleansing, reprisal killings, lethal force used against protesters
- 99 No basis for judgment

- iii. REPVIOL^{***} Repression of group members engaged in violent collective action (e.g., guerrillas, rioters)
- 0 None reported
 - 1 Surveillance:
e.g., domestic spying, wiretapping, etc.
 - 2 Harassment/containment
e.g., saturation of police/military presence, militarized checkpoints targeting members of group, curfews, states of emergency
 - 3 Nonviolent coercion
e.g., arrests, show-trials, property confiscation, exile/deportation
 - 4 Violent coercion, short of killing
e.g., forced resettlement, torture
 - 5 Violent coercion, killing
e.g., systematic killings, ethnic cleansing, reprisal killings, military campaigns against rebels
 - 99 No basis for judgment