

Supplementary Appendix:

Dyadic Clustering in International Relations

Jacob Carlson, Trevor Incerti, and P.M. Aronow

A Appendix

Contents

Statistical Programming Suite	A1
Supplementary Figures and Tables	A2

Statistical Programming Suite

The statistical programming suite for DCR estimation is currently available. To access the source code for the `dcr` command for Stata (version 15 or higher), clone its GitHub repository:

```
git clone git@github.com:jscarlson/stata-dcr.git
```

To access the `dcr` package for R, run:

```
devtools::install_github("jscarlson/dcr")
```

Supplementary Figures and Tables

Table A.1: Dyadic Data Summary Statistics, Study Level

Study	Observations	Data Start Year	Data End Year	Number of Unique Dyads
Arel-Bundock (2017)	3971	2012	2012	2161
Bermeo (2017)	20275	1973	1988	1614
Bermeo and Leblang (2015)	33116	1993	2008	3129
Carter and Poast (2020)	40002	1948	2011	560
Colgan (2014)	213454	1949	1999	37310
Colgan and Weeks (2015)	804434	1951	2000	28410
Copelovitch and Putnam (2014)	101	1926	1986	92
Dietrich (2016)	10605	2006	2011	2417
Efrat and Newman (2016)	13818	1996	2012	2574
Fang, Johnson, and Leeds (2014)	585467	1816	2000	21133
Goemans and Schultz (2017)	153370	1958	1998	102
Horowitz and Stam (2014)	113992	1875	2000	27079
Kinne (2018)	253296	1981	2010	10909
McDonald (2015)	525114	1817	2000	13938
Powell (2015)	433	1948	2006	40
Pratt (2018)	1177	2002	2012	108
Renshon (2016)	1237676	1818	2001	39389
Schneider and Tobin (2020)	4760	1976	2009	756
Shelef (2016)	344	1945	1995	155
Sommerer and Tallberg (2019)	37989	1971	2009	2080
Weisiger (2016)	36322	1823	2001	81
Weisiger and Yarhi-Milo (2015)	1187663	1816	2000	33255

Note: summary statistics for each study computed using data from a representative (usually the first) reanalyzed model, as analytic samples and data often vary by model.

Table A.2: Primary Results, Study Level

Study	Subfield	Secondary Subfield	Primary Relationship Tested	KEVs	Sig.→Sig.	Sig.→Insig.	Insig.→Sig.	Insig.→Insig.	Avg. SER
Arel-Bundock (2017)	IPE	International finance	Treaty shopping and domestic tax rates	6	0.833	0.167	0	0	2.739
Bermeo (2017)	IPE	Foreign aid	(Donor spillovers and) foreign aid	173	0.445	0.249	0	0.306	2.187
Bermeo and Leblang (2015)	IPE	Foreign aid	(Immigration and) foreign aid	29	0.655	0.207	0	0.138	2.2
Carter and Poast (2020)	IPE	Trade	Physical barriers and legal trade flows	8	0	0.375	0.5	0.125	1.099
Colgan (2014)	IOs/International Law	IO efficacy	IO membership and member behavior	9	0.111	0.889	0	0	3.269
Colgan and Weeks (2015)	Security	Conflict	(Revolution and) likelihood of conflict	24	1	0	0	0	1.526
Copelovitch and Putnam (2014)	IOs/International Law	IO efficacy	Rational design theory/international agreement formation	45	0.422	0.111	0.111	0.356	0.898
Dietrich (2016)	IPE	Foreign aid	Variety of capitalism and foreign aid delivery method	36	0.194	0.139	0	0.667	1.511
Efrat and Newman (2016)	IOs/International Law	IO efficacy	Likelihood of deferring to another country's laws	4	0.5	0.5	0	0	4.158
Fang, Johnson, and Leeds (2014)	Security	Conflict	(Alliances and) likelihood of conflict	1	0	1	0	0	1.691
Goemans and Schultz (2017)	Security	Conflict	Ethnic politics and territorial claims	170	0.394	0.041	0.088	0.476	0.955
Horowitz and Stam (2014)	Security	Conflict	(Leader military experience) and likelihood of conflict	3	0.333	0	0	0.667	1.895
Kinne (2018)	Security	Alliance formation	Determinants of defense cooperation agreements	6	0.833	0	0	0.167	1.301
McDonald (2015)	Security	Conflict	(Democracy and) likelihood of conflict	41	0.488	0.195	0	0.317	1.432
Powell (2015)	Security	Conflict	(Islamic law and) likelihood of conflict	16	0.188	0	0.062	0.75	0.908
Pratt (2018)	IOs/International Law	IO efficacy	Likelihood of deferring to another IO	18	0.389	0.222	0.111	0.278	1.426
Renshon (2016)	Security	Conflict	(International status and) likelihood of conflict	20	0.9	0.05	0	0.05	1.291
Schneider and Tobin (2020)	IPE	International finance	Domestic spillovers and international bailout	18	0.333	0	0.056	0.611	0.999
Shelef (2016)	Security	Conflict	(Type of territorial dispute and) likelihood of conflict	9	0.889	0	0	0.111	1.071
Sommerer and Tallberg (2019)	IOs/International Law	IO design	IO connectivity and convergence of governance rules	15	0.2	0	0	0.8	1.212
Weisiger (2016)	Security	Conflict	Determinants of conflict duration	28	0.143	0.607	0	0.25	3.268
Weisiger and Yarhi-Milo (2015)	Security	Conflict	(Past actions and) likelihood of conflict	12	0.75	0.167	0.083	0	1.311
Average-of-Averages (= ISFW)					0.455	0.224	0.046	0.276	1.743

Table A.3: Reanalysis for Models without (C)RSEs

Study	KEVs	Sig.→Sig.	Sig.→Insig.	Insig.→Sig.	Insig.→Insig.	Avg. SER
Kinne (2018)	4	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.25	1.03
Copelovitch and Putnam (2014)	45	0.42	0.11	0.11	0.36	0.90
Fang, Johnson, and Leeds (2014)	1	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.69

Note: repeated dyad CRSEs computed as comparison to DCRSEs.

Table A.4: Reanalysis for Models with Fixed Effects for both Dyad Members

Study	KEVs	Sig.→Sig.	Sig.→Insig.	Insig.→Sig.	Insig.→Insig.	Avg. SER
Carter and Poast (2020)	8	0.00	0.38	0.50	0.12	1.10
Shelef (2016)	9	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.11	1.07
Bermeo and Leblang (2015)	1	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.13

Table A.5: Small-Sample Corrected Results, Various Levels of Aggregation

Aggregation	Category	Studies	KEVs	SER ^a	Sig.→Sig. ^b	Sig.→Insig. ^b	Insig.→Sig. ^b	Insig.→Insig. ^b
Year	2014	4	58	1.94	0.21	0.51	0.02	0.26
	2015	5	122	1.48	0.62	0.11	0.03	0.24
	2016	5	97	2.27	0.50	0.28	0.00	0.22
	2017	3	349	1.97	0.55	0.15	0.03	0.27
	2018	2	24	1.38	0.58	0.14	0.06	0.22
	2019	1	15	1.23	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.80
	2020	2	26	1.01	0.11	0.19	0.33	0.37
Subfield	IOs/International Law	5	91	2.21	0.31	0.36	0.04	0.29
	IPE	6	270	1.78	0.39	0.19	0.11	0.31
	Security	11	330	1.52	0.53	0.20	0.02	0.26
All	All	22	691	1.75	0.44	0.23	0.05	0.28

Note: this reanalysis applies a small-sample correction to the final estimates of DCRSEs. This correction is equivalent to multiplying the final estimates of standard error by $\sqrt{N/(N-1)}$, where N is the number of unique dyad members in the analytic sample. Correspondingly, when computing p -values, the test statistic is compared to a t-distribution with degrees-of-freedom = $N - 1$. For the purposes of producing a true apples-to-apples comparison, original standard error estimates of reanalyzed studies are similarly treated with a small-sample correction that is equivalent to multiplying the final estimates of standard error by $\sqrt{N_c/(N_c-1)}$, where N_c is the number of unique clusters in the analytic sample; the test statistic is likewise compared to a t-distribution with degrees-of-freedom = $N_c - 1$.

^a “SER” denotes an ISFW average of SERs for a given level of aggregation.

^b “Sig.→Sig.,” “Sig.→Insig.,” “Insig.→Sig.,” and “Insig.→Insig.” denote ISFW proportions of p -values that change significance levels in these respective ways for a given level of aggregation.