

Comparative Political Studies

<http://cps.sagepub.com/>

Strategic Targeting : The Effect of Institutions and Interests on Distributive Transfers

Stephanie J. Rickard

Comparative Political Studies 2009 42: 670 originally published online 11

December 2008

DOI: 10.1177/0010414008328643

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://cps.sagepub.com/content/42/5/670>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Comparative Political Studies* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://cps.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://cps.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://cps.sagepub.com/content/42/5/670.refs.html>

>> Version of Record - Apr 9, 2009

[OnlineFirst Version of Record - Dec 11, 2008](#)

[What is This?](#)

Strategic Targeting

The Effect of Institutions and Interests on Distributive Transfers

Stephanie J. Rickard

Dublin City University

Virtually every government provides distributive transfers for electoral purposes. However, the level and form of such transfers vary dramatically across countries. Although transfers take many forms, they can generally be characterized as being either broad (providing benefits to large segments of the electorate) or narrow (targeting benefits only to select groups of voters). Variation in the form of distributive transfers across countries can be explained by voters' economic interests and domestic institutions. Voters' preferences over transfer form, shaped in part by the mobility of their assets, together with a country's electoral rules determine the benefits politicians gain from providing either broad or narrow transfers. Using new measures of transfer form, the author finds that although majoritarian systems are more prone to narrow transfers, proportional systems are more responsive to increases in voter demand for narrow transfers, all else equal.

Keywords: *distribution; electoral rules; subsidies; labor mobility*

Virtually every government provides distributive transfers for electoral purposes. However, the level and form of such transfers vary dramatically across countries. Cross-national variation in the level of (re)distributive transfers has generated significant research (e.g., Alesina, Glaeser, & Sacerdote, 2001; Bawn & Rosenbluth, 2006; Iversen & Soskice, 2006). Variation in transfer form has received relatively less scholarly attention.

Distributive transfers provide particularistic benefits to select groups (Collie, 1988). In practice, these groups may be more or less select. Broadly targeted transfers provide benefits to large groups of individuals who share

Author's Note: The author would like to thank Lawrence Broz, Steph Haggard, and David Lake for their invaluable feedback on this project.

general attributes. Examples of broad transfers include unemployment benefits made available to all persons regardless of their occupation or previous industry of employment and pensions made available to all persons of a certain age (Verdier, 1995). In contrast, narrowly targeted transfers provide benefits only to very select segments of the electorate. For example, industry-specific subsidies benefit only those voters whose assets (land, labor, or capital) are employed in the privileged industry. Although distributive transfers take many forms, they can generally be characterized as being either broad or narrow.

Governments' portfolios of distributive policies typically include broad and narrow transfers. However, it is frequently the case that one type of transfer tends to be privileged over the other. For example, the United Kingdom's portfolio of distributive policies during the late 1960s and early 1970s consisted primarily of narrow transfers. During this period, politicians implemented policies whose explicit objectives were to provide select benefits to narrow groups, such as individual industries and firms (Sharp & Shepherd, 1987). In contrast, Germany's portfolio of distributive policies consisted almost exclusively of broad transfers during this period. Transfers were generally made available to all industries in the manufacturing sector rather than a select few (Shepherd & Duchêne, 1983). In fact, German governments routinely refused to provide transfers to individual firms or industries during this period (Schatz & Wolter, 1987). Instead, politicians focused on building a comprehensive framework of broadly targeted distributive transfers called the *Soziale Marktwirtschaft* (Sharp & Shepherd, 1987).

Cross-national differences in transfer form persist today despite increased economic integration and restrictions on certain types of transfers embodied in international agreements, such as the World Trade Organization and the European Union. How can the variation in the form of distributive transfers across countries be explained?

The form of distributive transfers in a given country is influenced by both domestic institutions and domestic interests. Two sets of interests are of critical importance for transfer form: the economic interests of voters and the political interests of office holders and office seekers. Politicians prefer the transfer type with the greatest electoral benefits. The electoral benefits politicians gain from providing either broad or narrow transfers depend critically on voters' preferences over transfer form and the country's electoral rules. Voters prefer the transfer type that maximizes their income. The electoral rules shape the nature of electoral competition and identify those voters whose preferences matter the most for politicians' reelection chances. Taken together, electoral institutions and domestic interests shape the form of distributive transfers.

Examining the joint effect of domestic interests and institutions on the form of distributive transfers makes several important contributions to our understanding of the politics of (re)distribution. First, it provides a new empirical test of an important hypothesis proposed in the literature: that electoral rules affect the form of distributive transfers. Although this hypothesis has received considerable scholarly attention to date, it has been subjected to few empirical tests because of the difficulty of measuring transfer form. Second, this research introduces domestic interests to existing institutional explanations of transfer form. Domestic interests have been frequently overlooked in studies of the cross-national variance in transfer form (e.g., Lizzeri & Persico, 2001; Persson & Tabellini, 1999). Ignoring domestic interests may be relatively innocuous if politicians elected via different rules are equally responsive to voters' demands for various types of distributive transfers. If politicians elected via a particular set of rules are more responsive to voters' preferences over transfer form, overlooking voter demand may lead to inaccurate conclusions about the causal mechanism linking electoral rules to transfer form and inaccurate predictions of the effect of electoral rules. In short, taking institutions and interests together provides a more complete and accurate understanding of the provision of different types of transfers by electorally minded parties and politicians.

Existing Explanations

A sophisticated literature points to the importance of electoral institutions for transfer form (e.g., Lizzeri & Persico, 2001; Milesi-Ferretti, Rostagno, & Perotti, 2002; Persson & Tabellini, 1999, 2000, 2003). In these studies, politicians (and parties) are generally assumed to be office-seeking. To maximize their chances of reelection, politicians work to target distributive transfers to those voters most critical to their reelection chances. The identity of these voters is determined by the country's electoral rules. For example, the voters most critical to a politician's reelection chances in a plurality-rule, single-member district system are those in the politician's geographically defined electoral district. Under plurality electoral rules, politicians are assumed to need 50% plus one of the votes to win reelection. To secure this outcome, politicians' optimal strategy is to provide transfers to only those voters in their electoral districts (Persson & Tabellini, 1999, 2000, 2003).

Majoritarian electoral rules tend to be closely associated with single-member electoral districts. This empirical regularity provides further incentives for electorally minded politicians (and parties) in majoritarian systems to provide narrow transfers. Single member districts tend to be smaller than multimember districts (Powell & Vanberg, 2000). The influence of narrow, particularistic groups is greater in smaller districts (Alt & Gilligan, 1994; Magee, Brock, & Young, 1989; Mansfield & Busch, 1995; Rogowski, 1997). McGillivray (2004) provided the following illustrative example: An industry with 100 employees represents 10% of the electorate in a district with 1,000 voters. The same industry represents only 0.1% of the electorate in a district of 100,000 voters. In the larger district, refusing to provide targeted benefits to the industry is unlikely to affect the politician's reelection chances because the industry is only 0.1% of the representative's electorate. As a result, the smaller electoral districts (both in terms of seats and size) typically found in majoritarian systems provide politicians with additional electoral incentives to target benefits to narrow segments of the electorate.

In proportional (PR) systems, politicians and parties are believed to have fewer electoral incentives to supply narrow transfers (Lizzeri & Persico, 2001; Persson & Tabellini, 2003; Rogowski, 1987, 1997). Parties competing under PR electoral rules do not win elections district by district. As such, no single district is critical to the electoral success of a party (McGillivray, 2004). Instead, parties work to maximize their aggregate vote share because this determines the number of legislative seats the party will control. By targeting transfers to a broad segment of the electorate, parties are able to buy the electoral support of a wide range of voters dispersed across electoral districts. This is precisely the type of electoral support that is most beneficial to parties competing in multimember districts under PR rule.

To illustrate this, consider the following example. If a country has an unemployment rate of 10%, a party could potentially secure 10% of the national vote share by promising increased unemployment benefits. However, such a transfer might buy 3% of the vote share in one district and 30% in another, depending on the pattern of unemployment. This cross-district disparity does not matter to parties competing in PR systems. However, for parties in two-party, plurality systems it is wasteful to buy votes this way. They will massively overbuy in some districts obtaining much more than the necessary 50% plus one votes needed to win under plurality electoral rules.

In sum, existing research on the form of distributive transfers focuses primarily on the importance of electoral rules. The general expectation derived from much of this research is that majoritarian systems will have more narrow transfers than PR systems. Although empirical tests of this expectation

are limited because of the dearth of cross-nationally comparable measures of transfer form, the evidence that does exist is mixed. For example, Persson and Tabellini (2003) found that PR systems spend relatively more on broad transfers, measured by government spending on social security and welfare spending as a percentage of GDP. In contrast, Rogowski and Kayser (2002), and Chang, Kayser, and Rogowski (2008) find evidence to suggest that PR systems provide relatively more narrow transfers. They show that PR electoral systems are associated with higher levels of consumer prices. Higher consumer prices may reflect narrow transfers delivered to particular groups, such as individual industries (Bawn & Rosenbluth, 2006).

Simple two-country comparisons are also ambiguous. For example, the United Kingdom and Belgium both targeted approximately 50% of their manufacturing transfers to individual industries during the 1990s, according to the Commission of the European Communities' *Survey on State Aid* (2002), despite the fact that they have dissimilar electoral institutions. Furthermore, the amount spent on narrow transfers relative to broad has changed over time in the United Kingdom although the country's electoral rules have remained constant (Commission of the European Communities' *Survey on State Aid*, 2002). The pattern of distributive transfers across countries and over time suggests that electoral institutions alone cannot fully explain the observed variation in transfer form. Domestic interests must also be taken into consideration.

Argument

Domestic interests and electoral institutions shape the form of distributive transfers. Politicians interested in maximizing their chances of (re)election work to provide the type of transfer with the greatest electoral benefits. The electoral benefits of different types of transfers are jointly determined by the country's electoral rules and voters' preferences over transfer form. Voters prefer the type of transfer that maximizes their income. The type of transfer that maximizes voters' income depends critically on their mobility. Voters who find it prohibitively costly to move to a new group prefer transfers that target benefits only to their current group. The optimal transfer for immobile voters would provide benefits to their group up to the point where marginal benefit equals the group's share of marginal cost and no benefits at all to any other group (Bawn & Rosenbluth, 2006). Voters able to move freely between groups are relatively less interested in narrowly targeted

transfers. In short, voters' preferences over transfer form depend critically on their mobility and more precisely the mobility of their income earning assets.

Mobility, particularly with respect to factors of production such as land, labor, and capital, plays a critical role in theories of trade politics (e.g., Hiscox, 2002; Jones, 1971; O'Rourke & Sinnott, 2001; Rogowski, 1989; Stolper & Samuelson, 1941). Indeed, factor mobility is regarded as crucial for understanding the political-economic origins of a wide range of trade and industrial policies because the economic interests of asset owners are shaped by their ability to shift assets between uses (Grossman & Levinsohn, 1989). Factor mobility reflects the costs of moving assets between uses in the domestic economy. These costs are often referred to as adjustment costs. I focus here on the adjustment costs facing workers because in most countries, the median voter earns the majority of their income from labor rather than land or capital assets (Kono, 2008; Mayer, 1984).¹ The costs of adjustment that workers face include the search costs involved in finding a new job, the costs of retraining, the potential obsolescence of their skills, and the loss of rents specific to their current job.

Workers' preferences over transfer form vary systematically with the adjustment costs they face (Alt, Frieden, Gilligan, Rodrik, & Rogowski, 1996; Verdier, 1995; Zahariadis, 2001). Workers facing high-adjustment costs prefer narrowly targeted transfers. The incomes of workers stuck in their current industry because of prohibitively high-adjustment costs are tied directly to the profits of the industry (or firm) in which they work. If the fortunes of that industry decline, workers unable to leave because of high-adjustment costs receive lower rates of return. Given this, workers facing high-adjustment costs are particularly concerned with protecting the returns in the industry in which they are currently employed.

Although both broad and narrow transfers could, in theory, serve to insulate industry returns from market pressures, narrow transfers are preferred to broad transfers because they maximize the incomes of immobile (specific) workers. The rents generated by narrow transfers are shared among fewer people than those from broad transfers. As such, the per-person benefits of narrow transfers are greater than the per-person benefits of broad transfers (Alt & Gilligan, 1994). Furthermore, these benefits tend not to be arbitraged away by new entrants because of the high barriers to entry that exist in industries characterized by specific workers (Frieden, 1991). Workers employed in other industries need to invest resources to obtain the skills required to enter the privileged industry. If the rents are high enough,

workers may be willing to make such an investment. However, acquiring such skills takes time. In the short term, the skills required for employment in industries characterized by specific labor prevents workers from rushing into the industry to take advantage of industry-specific rents.

Narrowly targeted transfers are less beneficial to mobile workers. Narrow transfers, such as industry-specific subsidies and/or trade protections, benefit only those workers currently employed in the privileged industry. If workers move out of that industry to take a new job, they lose the benefits of the narrow transfer, which instead becomes a pure tax. Given this, the expected benefits of narrow transfers are discounted by voters who are able to move out of a given industry with relative ease.² Mobile workers prefer broad programs that allocate benefits to large segments of the labor market without reference to industry or occupation. Such programs allow workers to continue to enjoy the benefits even after moving to a new industry.

The preferences of individual workers' over transfer form vary with the adjustment costs they face. Does this individual-level variation produce systematic variation across countries? There are several reasons to expect so. First, workers in a given country face a set of common adjustment costs. These common costs stem from country-specific characteristics, such as the level of industrialization and the regulatory barriers to occupational and geographic relocation imposed by federal and local governments (Edin & Zetterberg, 1992; Fung & Staiger, 1996; Hiscox & Burgoon, 2000; Krueger & Summers, 1987; Parsons, 1972). For example, early stages of industrialization often bring major innovations in transportation that lower the cost of labor movement and diminish the importance of geography to the economy (Hiscox, 2002). This is evident even in small countries such as Belgium where the extension of the rail network in the late 1800s dramatically increased labor movement between regions and sectors (Huberman, 2004). Technological innovations in methods of production also have important implications for country-specific adjustment costs. The introduction of labor-saving technology and production line technology increases the ease with which workers can shift between manufacturing industries (Sokoloff, 1986). These technological innovations also increase the demand for unskilled workers thereby lowering the costs of moving into the industrial sector from other sectors of the economy, like agriculture. Later stages of industrialization, often characterized by moves from assembly-line to continuous-process technology and dramatic technological advances in robotics, required more skilled workers thereby increasing the costs of adjustment (Hiscox, 2002).³

Some portion of the total adjustment costs facing any given worker is common to all workers in that country, regardless of their individual characteristics. These common adjustment costs vary cross-nationally and can explain in part the incentives for politicians to provide one type of distributive transfer rather than another. Politicians are more willing to supply a particular type of transfer where there is greater voter demand for it.

In concurrence with the views of Bailey (2001), Broz (2005), and others, I assume that voters need not organize for their economic interests to shape policy outcomes. This is because rival politicians have incentives to activate latent interests if elected representatives pay too little attention to them (Arnold, 1992; Bailey, 2001; Denzau & Munger, 1986). Rational legislators forestall such attacks by serving these voters preemptively. As a result, voters need not mobilize, organize, or unionize for their economic interests to shape the form of distributive transfers.⁴ Politicians calculate the distributional effects of different transfer types on the voting constituencies within their districts. They then work to provide the type of transfers that reflect these interests, even in the absence of direct voter influence, organization, or lobbying.

However, voters' economic interests are only one of the factors that determine the electoral benefits of providing narrowly targeted transfers. Electoral institutions also matter. The primary causal mechanism linking electoral rules and transfer form in previous research is electoral competition, as discussed above. There is, however, another causal mechanism through which electoral institutions may influence transfer form that has gone largely unnoticed due to the lack of attention to voters' interests, namely, responsiveness. Politicians elected via different rules may vary in their responsiveness to voters' preferences. For example, Powell and Vanberg (2000) argued that politicians in PR systems are more responsive to voters' preferences than politicians in majoritarian systems. They demonstrated that a closer correspondence exists between the median voter's preferences and those of the median legislator in PR systems (Powell & Vanberg, 2000). One explanation for this may be that the position of the median voter is more closely represented by a party in multiparty PR systems, as demonstrated by Cox (1990). If politicians in PR systems are more responsive to voters' preferences, increased demand for narrow transfers should result in relatively larger increases in the number of narrow transfers in PR systems, as compared to majoritarian systems.

In addition to being more responsive, politicians in PR systems may also be better able to provide narrow transfers in response to surges in voter demand for these types of transfers. One reason for this may be that PR

systems tend to have more veto players than majoritarian systems (Cox & McCubbins, 2001). If each veto player is interested in passing a narrow transfer for a different constituency, the chances of success for any given demand may be quite high as each player promises support for others' narrow transfers in return for support for their own (Cox & McCubbins, 2001).

The higher frequency of multiparty coalitions in PR systems may also increase the ability of politicians to respond to surges in demand for narrow transfers. Previous research demonstrates that multiparty coalitions behave differently than single-party coalitions, even when the same interests are represented (Bawn & Rosenbluth, 2006). Although single-party governments are held accountable for all of their policy decisions (Cox, 1990), parties in a multiparty coalition governments are less accountable given the difficulty of assigning blame to any single party in a coalition government. Multiparty governments are likely able to provide many more narrow transfers than single-party governments because although the costs of providing many narrow transfers may be detrimental to the country as a whole, each party in a coalition government can shirk responsibility for these costs.⁵

Because politicians elected via PR rules tend to be relatively more responsive to voters' preferences and may be better able to supply narrow transfers, I expect increased voter demand for narrow transfers to have a relatively larger effect on the number of narrow transfers in PR countries, holding all else constant. As voter demand for narrow transfers grows, the number of narrow transfers will increase in both PR and majoritarian countries. However, the increase will be relatively larger in PR countries, all else equal. I test this expectation using two new measures of narrow transfers discussed in the following section.

Empirical Measures

Empirical research on transfer form has been limited due to the dearth of cross-nationally comparable measures. Measuring transfer form is difficult given the myriad distributive policies including subsidies, regulations, taxes, and trade policies. An ideal measure of narrow transfers would estimate the total amount of all such transfers provided by any type of policy. However, such a measure has proven virtually impossible to construct (Bawn & Rosenbluth, 2006; Duchêne & Shepherd, 1987; McGillivray, 2004; Mény & Wright, 1986). In an attempt to overcome this limitation, Rogowski and Kayser (2002) used national price levels to estimate aggregate economic distortions caused by distributive policies. Similarly, McGillivray (2004)

used industry stock prices in an attempt to measure industry protection. One advantage of these measures is that they arguably capture different types of targeted transfers. However, these measures also capture many other factors that have nothing to do with (re)distribution or transfer form, such as transportation costs and market size (McGillivray, 2004; Rodriguez & Rodrik, 2000).

Measuring only one type of narrow transfer has proven no easier. For example, cross-national comparisons of industry subsidies are believed to be suspect even where the bases seem to relate to the same categories of expenditures (Duchêne & Shepherd, 1987). Furthermore, government expenditures on subsidies generally do not convey the focused impact of selective measures, which is the concept of interest here.

Given these difficulties, it is no surprise then that existing measures of narrow transfers are rather rudimentary. Milesi-Ferretti, Perotti, and Rostagno (2002), for example, estimated government spending on narrowly targeted transfers using the sum of social security payments and other transfers to families, plus subsidies to firms. Persson and Tabellini (2003) operationalized targeted transfers as government spending on pensions and unemployment insurance payments. Both measures have serious drawbacks. The first conflates more narrowly targeted transfers with broader transfers. The second closely approximates the operational definition of broad (rather than narrow) transfers. The limitations of these and other existing measures illustrate the difficulty of estimating the frequency and generosity of narrowly targeted transfers in a cross-nationally comparable manner.⁶

In an attempt to overcome these measurement limitations, I use two novel measures of narrow transfers made possible by international monitoring of domestic transfers. International agreements, such as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the World Trade Organization (WTO), and the European Union limit the ways in which national governments can target distribution. For example, rules negotiated as part of the GATT/WTO restrict the provision of narrow transfers to select segments of a country's economy. As early as the Tokyo Round of 1979, the use of narrowly targeted subsidies by national governments was restricted by Articles VI, XVI, and XXIII. Since then, international restrictions on narrow domestic transfers have been significantly strengthened, clarified, and expanded. For example, the WTO Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (Articles 1 through 9) explicitly bans government subsidies targeted exclusively to individual industries or firms in the manufacturing sector.

Despite these restrictions, some governments choose to provide narrow transfers in violation of their international treaty obligations.⁷ The provision of illegal narrow transfers is monitored by international producers. Narrow transfers provided to a single industry in one country increase the competitiveness of that industry's products on the international market. Producers facing this increased competition will sound a fire alarm in their respective country lobbying their home government to take action at the international level (McCubbins & Schwartz, 1984). Such action can take one of two forms. First, extra duties (i.e., countervailing duties) can be imposed against illegally subsidized products. Second, formal complaints can be filed with the GATT/WTO Dispute Settlement Body. Complaints may seek both the withdrawal of the illegal narrow transfer and compensation for its adverse effects.

Countervailing duties (CVDs) and complaints filed over narrow transfers are used here to estimate the relative frequency of narrowly targeted transfers in defendant countries.⁸ Arguably, countries facing more CVDs and complaints have more narrow transfers. Of course, there are many factors that influence the circumstances under which countries choose to impose CVDs or file complaints (e.g., Allee, 2008; Reinhardt, 2000). Given this, it is unlikely that every instance of narrow transfers is captured by these measures. However, there is no reason to believe that this biases in favor of the argument made here. In fact, the nonrandom noise contained in these measures of narrow transfers likely makes it more difficult to find support for the argument.

Although the vast majority of all complaints filed with the GATT/WTO have at issue a narrowly targeted transfer (80% during the period from 1980 to 1994; 66% from 1995 to 2003), I systematically code and exclude complaints filed over other issues to increase the validity of this measure. Details on the coding criteria and exclusion decisions are reported in the appendix.

Measuring voters' preferences over transfer form is equally difficult. Voters facing high-adjustment costs prefer narrow transfers, as argued above. To estimate the common adjustment costs facing workers in a given country, I measure the dispersion in wages across industries by calculating the coefficient of variation for wage rates across manufacturing industries.⁹ Data are from Freeman and Oostendorp's Occupational Wages around the World Database. These data benefit from an improved version of Freeman and Oostendorp's (2001) standardization procedure, which includes country-specific data correction factors.¹⁰

The dispersion in wages across industries (interindustry wage differentials) is a commonly used and widely accepted measure of labor specificity

(e.g., Dickens & Katz, 1987; Edin & Zetterberg, 1992; Gibbons & Katz, 1992; Hiscox, 2002; Katz & Summers, 1989; Krueger & Summers, 1987). This measure is favored because it closely approximates the theoretical concept of interest (the elasticity of substitution), which is not itself directly observable (Hiscox, 2002). The assumption is that when adjustment costs are low, wage differentials should be arbitrated away by the movement of workers between industries. Workers have incentives to move between industries to maximize their income. They do so only when the costs of adjustment are not prohibitively high. The movement of workers between industries (or even just the potential for it) should equalize returns to similar types of workers across industries.¹¹ High interindustry wage differentials are therefore taken as evidence of high-adjustment costs.

Although interindustry wage differentials are widely used to estimate labor specificity, there are reasons to exercise caution when using this measure. Most fundamentally, some part of interindustry wage differentials may reflect heterogeneity in labor skill levels rather than actual adjustment costs. To minimize this possibility, I calculate wage differentials using only those industries employing workers with similar skill levels. Specifically, I calculate the coefficient of variation for wage rates across the 15 manufacturing industries characterized by Wood (1994) as being average or low-skill industries. Doing so maximizes the sample size and minimizes sample selection bias. It also reduces the heterogeneity of workers' skills thereby minimizing the effect of skill variation on interindustry wage differentials. Eliminating high-skill industries may have the unintended consequence of excluding those workers facing the highest adjustment costs (if skills are positively correlated with adjustment costs). Excluding high-skill industries likely makes it more difficult to find evidence in support of my argument because those workers with the greatest interest in narrow transfers are missing from the sample.¹²

Empirical Model

Two sets of models are estimated using different dependent variables. The first, Complaints, measures the total number of complaints filed with the GATT/WTO against a country alleging the provision of a narrow transfer in a given year. The second, CVDs, measures the total number of countervailing duties imposed against a given country in a given year. Given the discrete nonnegative properties of both variables, it is appropriate to use an event count procedure to model the process. Here, I use the negative binomial

model because both count variables are overdispersed.¹³ The negative binomial model allows for overdispersion and includes parameters for unobserved variance in the number of disputes across countries (King, 1989; Long, 1997).

One might argue that the zero inflated negative binomial model is more appropriate for this analysis given the excessive number of zeros in both count variables.¹⁴ However, the large number of zeros may be the result of unobserved heterogeneity (Cameron & Trivedi, 1998; Long, 1997). Unobserved heterogeneity can cause overdispersion and also an increase in the proportion of zeros. The negative binomial model can account for the overdispersion and the excess zeros in the raw data. The negative binomial model responds to the underprediction of zeros in the Poisson regression model by increasing the conditional variance without changing the conditional mean (Long, 1997). In contrast, zero modified count models change the mean structure to explicitly model the production of zero counts. This is done by assuming that zeros can be generated by a different process than positive counts. However, the theory advanced here does not suggest that the zeros are generated by a different process. Given this, it is difficult to justify theoretically the use of the zero-inflated negative binomial model. I do, however, test to see if estimating a zero-inflated negative binomial model would produce dramatically different results.¹⁵ No significant bias appears to be introduced by estimating the more theoretically sound negative binomial model rather than the zero-inflated model.

The base sample is an unbalanced panel with yearly observations from 1980 to 2003. These data are used in a pooled time-series cross-section analysis with country-years as observations. Countries are included only during those years in which they are GATT/WTO members and only high-functioning democracies are included in the sample.¹⁶ This allows for correct estimates of the effect of electoral rules and minimizes the cross-national variance in the costs of noncompliance with GATT/WTO restrictions on narrowly targeted transfers (Mansfield, Milner, & Rosendorff, 2002). All reported models are estimated using robust standard errors clustered by country. These standard errors adjust for the fact that observations for each country are unlikely to be independent. The failure to account for clustering may underestimate the standard errors on the estimated coefficients for the country-level variables (Moulton, 1990). All models include a lagged dependent variable to take account of serial correlation.¹⁷

The base model includes several important control variables.¹⁸ Previous research suggests that some complaints are filed in retaliation for previous complaints (Busch & Reinhardt, 2002). To account for this, a dichotomous

variable labeled *Plaintiff* indicates those country-years in which a complaint or CVD was filed by the country. The WTO regime differs from the GATT regime in several important ways. Therefore, an indicator variable, WTO (coded one for years during the WTO regime and zero otherwise) is included in all estimated models.

Countries with majoritarian electoral rules tend to have relatively larger economies. It may be possible to find a spurious positive correlation between majoritarian electoral rules and illegal narrow transfers if large countries are less concerned with the international costs of noncompliance. To correctly estimate the effect of majoritarian electoral rules on targeted transfers and minimize the cross-national variance in the costs of noncompliance, the log of GDP is included to control for a country's size.

Several additional economic variables are also included.¹⁹ Exports, calculated as the amount of goods and services exported as a percentage of GDP (logged), is included because international scrutiny of a country's domestic transfers increases as a country's exports increase. The GDP per capita is included because developed countries have historically used the GATT/WTO dispute settlement procedures more often than less-developed countries. Also, the costs of noncompliance may vary systematically with economic development making it important to control for development.

The yearly rate of economic growth is included because slower economic growth may spur demands for narrow transfers in an attempt to insulate the rates of return in a particular industry from market pressures. Economic growth may also capture indirectly the effect of various economic shocks. To test for this, I include separately two different measures of external shocks to traded sectors of the economy: import growth and terms of trade. One might expect greater demand for narrow transfers in countries facing increased import competition or deteriorating terms of trade.²⁰ In addition, violating international restrictions during times of adverse economic conditions may not entail the same reputation costs as doing so under normal economic conditions (Drazen, 1997).

Although these control variables are not unrelated, standard tests show acceptable levels of multicollinearity.²¹ Their inclusion in a single model does not introduce undue bias. The results are reported in Table 1

Results

Adjustment costs, measured by interindustry wage differentials, are positively associated with narrow transfers, as expected. Increased adjustment

Table 1
Negative Binomial Model of Narrow Transfers

	Complaints		CVDs			
	1	2	3	1.1	2.1	3.1
Domestic politics						
L.Majoritarian	1.464 (0.815)*	1.486 (0.763)*	5.218 (1.093)***	0.779 (0.614)	0.811 (0.603)	1.661 (0.860)***
L.Adjustment costs	0.046 (0.011)***	0.195 (0.027)***			0.01 (0.011)	0.049 (0.039)
L.Majoritarian*			-0.157 (0.030)***			-0.046 (0.041)
L.Adjustment costs						
International politics						
L.Plaaintiff	0.061 (0.307)	-0.035 (0.244)	-0.063 (0.23)	0.437 (0.939)	0.348 (0.934)	0.296 (0.926)
WTO regime	0.582 (0.364)	0.688 (0.352)*	0.483 (0.35)	0.521 (0.377)	0.514 (0.391)	0.325 (0.326)
Economics						
L.Exports (nlog)	-0.116 (0.618)	0.032 (0.429)	0.364 (0.415)	0.206 (0.567)	0.262 (0.567)	0.422 (0.523)
L.Growth (nlog)	0.424 (0.201)**	0.398 (0.197)**	0.443 (0.178)**	-0.165 (0.187)	-0.166 (0.186)	-0.145 (0.17)
L.GDP (nlog)	0.445 (0.159)***	0.41 (0.148)***	0.595 (0.167)***	0.161 (0.193)	0.157 (0.188)	0.242 (0.226)
L.GDP per capita (nlog)	0.345 (0.229)	0.793 (0.263)***	0.726 (0.261)***	-0.199 (0.29)	-0.112 (0.29)	-0.158 (0.286)
L.Dependent variable	0.365 (0.186)**	0.32 (0.128)**	0.299 (0.118)***	0.75 (0.167)***	0.757 (0.166)***	0.77 (0.167)***
Constant	-19.08 (4.78)***	-23.85 (3.93)***	-32.78 (3.86)***	-5.75 (4.34)	-6.86 (4.38)	-9.83 (5.79)*
Alpha	0.09 (0.06)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1.25 (0.93)	1.2 (0.94)	1.14 (0.8)
Observations	317	317	317	318	318	318
# of countries	39	39	39	39	39	39
McFadden's <i>R</i> -squared	0.31	0.33	0.37	0.11	0.12	0.13

Note: Estimated using a negative binomial model. Robust standard errors clustered by country are reported in parentheses. CVD = Countervailing duties.

*significant at the .1 level in a two-tailed test. **significant at the .05 level in a two-tailed test. ***significant at the .01 level in a two-tailed test.

Table 2
Percentage Increase in the Expected Number of Narrow Transfers

Adjustment Costs	E(Complaints)		E(CVDs)	
	Majoritarian	PR	Majoritarian	PR
10 → 25 percentile	17**	100**	1	19
25 → 50 percentile	26**	175**	2.2	32
50→75 percentile	39**	418**	2.8	63
75 → 90 percentile	60**	905**	6.2	140

Note: Estimated via CLARIFY using Models 3 and 3.1 from Table 1 (King, Tomz, & Wittenberg, 2000; Tomz, Wittenberg & King, 2001). All control variables are held constant at their median values. The interaction term along with both constitutive terms (L.Majoritarian and L.Adjustment costs) were modified for each simulation. CVD = Countervailing duties.

** indicates that the increase is statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

costs increase the expected number of narrow transfers in both majoritarian and PR systems. However, the increase is relatively larger in PR systems as demonstrated in Table 2, which reports the percentage increase in the expected number of narrow transfers.²² As adjustment costs increase from the 10th percentile to the 25th percentile, the expected number of Complaints increases by 17% in majoritarian countries in a given year and 100% in PR countries. Although politicians in both systems are responsive to increased demand for narrow transfers (spurred by higher-adjustment costs), politicians in PR systems are relatively more responsive. The difference in responsiveness across the two systems is even greater at higher levels of labor specificity. As adjustment costs increase from the 75th to the 90th percentile, the expected number of Complaints increases by 60% in majoritarian systems in a given year; the increase is greater than 900% in PR systems. Although politicians elected via majoritarian rules are not deaf to increased voter demand for narrow transfers, politicians in PR systems appear to be far more responsive, all else equal.

Given this, it may be possible that under certain circumstances PR systems will provide more narrow transfers than majoritarian systems. When voter demand for narrow transfers is very high, for example, one might expect to see more narrow transfers in PR countries. I find some evidence of this in Table 3, which reports the expected number of narrow transfers in PR and majoritarian countries across various levels of labor specificity.²³ When adjustment costs are quite high (90th percentile), there are more narrow transfers in PR countries than majoritarian countries, all else equal.²⁴

Table 3
Expected Number of Narrow Transfers

Adjustment costs	E(Complaints)		E(CVDs)	
	Majoritarian	PR	Majoritarian	PR
10 percentile (7.4)	.075 (.042)	.002 (.001)	.137 (.073)	.036 (.021)
25 percentile (11.9)	.088 (.047)	.004 (.003)	.138 (.073)	.043 (.019)
50 percentile (18.2)	.111 (.057)	.011 (.007)	.141 (.074)	.057 (.022)
75 percentile (26.8)	.155 (.079)	.057 (.03)	.145 (.081)	.093 (.052)
90 percentile (38.6)	.248 (.137)	.573 (.323)	.154 (.096)	.224 (.273)

Note: Estimated via CLARIFY using Models 3 and 3.1 from Table 1 (King, Tomz, & Wittenberg 2000; Tomz, Wittenberg, & King 2001). All control variables are held constant at their median values. The interaction term along with both constitutive terms (L.Majoritarian and L.Adjustment costs) were modified for each simulation. For example, L.Majoritarian was set equal to 1, L.Adjustment costs was set equal to 11.9, and the interaction term (L.Majoritarian*L.Adjustment costs) was set equal to 11.9 to estimate the expected number of narrow transfers in countries with majoritarian electoral rules and adjustment costs equal to 11.9 (25th percentile). Standard errors are reported in parentheses. CVD = Countervailing duties.

This is arguably because politicians in PR systems are more responsive to surges in voter demand for narrow transfers and better able to supply narrow transfers than politicians in majoritarian systems.

In general, however, majoritarian systems tend to be more prone to narrow transfers than PR systems. Moving from a PR system to a majoritarian system increases the expected number of narrow transfers (Complaints) by 288% in a given year, holding all else constant.²⁵ When adjustment costs fall below the 90th percentile, the expected number of narrow transfers is greater in majoritarian systems. This finding is consistent with arguments by Persson and Tabellini (1999, 2000, 2003), Lizzeri and Persico (2001), and others and points to the potential independent effect of electoral rules on transfer form. The incentives to provide narrow transfers appear to exist in majoritarian countries even when there is little voter demand for such transfers. For example, when adjustment costs fall in the 10th percentile, majoritarian systems continue to provide more narrow transfers than PR systems. This is arguably because the voters critical to a politician's (and a party's) electoral success in majoritarian systems are concentrated in select, geographically defined electoral districts. Electorally minded politicians competing for office in these systems have incentives to provide narrowly targeted transfers to these voters in the hope that they will reward them with their electoral support.

Although electoral rules play an important role in shaping the form of distributive transfers, they are only one determinant. Voters' demands also matter. Greater voter demand for narrowly targeted transfers increases the number of narrow transfers in any given country. However, the increase is relatively larger in PR countries. Although majoritarian systems are generally more prone to narrow transfers, PR systems are more responsive to surges in demand for narrow transfers. This finding is remarkably robust; introducing other possible variables of interest such as the relative strength of industry unions or external shocks does not change the key findings.²⁶ Furthermore, I find similar results using an alternative measure of adjustment costs, namely, the rate of labor movement.²⁷ These results are also strikingly similar across the two measures of narrow transfers, although only statistically significant at conventional levels when narrow transfers are measured using Complaints. The similarities between the models estimated using Complaints and CVDs are rather surprising given the large substantive differences between the processes and politics surrounding CVDs and GATT/WTO complaints. Future research using new measures of narrowly targeted transfers is needed to confirm the generalizability of these results. Given the difficulty of measuring narrowly targeted transfers in a cross-nationally comparable manner, these findings represent an important first step to understanding the interactive effect of electoral institutions and domestic interests on the form of distributive transfers.

Conclusion

Virtually every government provides distributive transfers for electoral purposes. However, the level and form of such transfers vary dramatically across countries. In some countries, distributive transfers tend to go to broadly defined groups of voters. In others, the benefits of distributive transfers go to narrow, select groups. What explains the cross-national variation in transfer form? The answer proposed here points to the importance of domestic politics. Together, electoral institutions and domestic economic interests shape the form of distributive transfers and explain, in part, the variation in transfer form across countries.

Politicians seeking to maximize their (re)election chances work to provide the type of transfer with the greatest electoral benefits. The electoral benefits of different types of transfers are determined in part by the country's electoral rules. Narrow transfers provide relatively greater

benefits to politicians in majoritarian systems because of the nature of electoral competition in these systems. However, electorally minded politicians in both systems respond to voters' preferences over transfer form. Voters' preferences over the form of distributive transfers are determined by the costs of moving their primary income earning asset (most often labor) between uses in the domestic economy. As the costs of adjustment increase, voter demand for narrow transfers grows. As demand grows, the number of narrow transfers increases in both PR and majoritarian systems. However, the rate of increase is relatively greater in PR systems suggesting that politicians elected via PR rules are relatively more responsive to voter demand.

This finding suggests a possible resolution to the debate over which electoral system is most prone to narrow transfers and may help to explain previous mixed results. Although Persson and Tabellini (2003) found that PR systems spend relatively more on broad transfers, the findings of Rogowski and Kayser (2002), and Chang, Kayser, and Rogowski (2008) suggested that PR systems provide relatively more narrow transfers. The argument made here suggests that both outcomes are possible depending on voters' preferences over transfer form. In general, majoritarian systems tend to provide more narrow transfers than PR systems. However, PR systems are more responsive to surges in voter demand for narrow transfers. When voter demand for narrow transfers is high, PR systems may have more narrow transfers than majoritarian systems because politicians in PR systems are relatively more responsive to voter demand and better able to supply narrow transfers.

In Rogowski's studies, the countries in question are all economically developed. In contrast, Persson and Tabellini examined as many as 80 countries with various levels of economic development. The difference in samples has important implications for voter's preferences over transfer form. In developed economies, the adjustment costs facing workers tend to be quite high (Hiscox, 2002). As a result, voter demand for narrow transfers is likely high in Rogowski's sample of countries. When voter demand for narrow transfers is high, we might reasonably expect to see more narrow transfers in PR countries because of the closer correspondence between the interests of the voters and the legislators in PR systems and because politicians may be better able to supply narrow transfers. In short, Rogowski et al.'s findings are fully consistent with the argument made here—an argument that may help to resolve the debate over which electoral system is most prone to narrow transfers and further our understanding of the politics of (re)distribution.

Appendix

Details of the Construction of *Complaints* Variable

Complaints measures the cumulative number of complaints filed against a GATT/WTO member country alleging the existence of an illegal narrow transfer in a given year. I systematically identify and exclude those complaints that were not filed in response to alleged illegal narrow transfers including (a) complaints over broad transfers and/or policies that affect a wide range of goods, producers, or industries, including, for example, the 1982 dispute between the United States and the European Community over the value added tax (VAT) threshold; (b) complaints related to the enforcement of intellectual property rights; (c) complaints filed against the European Community/European Union unless it is quite clear which European Community/European Union member country the complaint is primarily in response to; (d) complaints related to antidumping measures. Antidumping measures are imposed by governments in response to a foreign firm's policy rather than a foreign government's policy; (e) complaints that are explicitly political in nature, including, for example, the 1985 complaint filed by Nicaragua against the United States in response to the trade embargo imposed by the Reagan Administration; (f) complaints related to nonmanufacturing transfers in order to ensure consistency with the countervailing duties measure and the measure of inter-industry wage differentials. Complaints over countervailing duties are included only after carefully examining the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the World Trade Organization (GATT/WTO) Panel Reports to correctly identify the country initially accused of having the illegal narrow transfer. Complaints filed by multiple countries over a single illegal narrow transfer are counted against the defendant country only once. The author and a research assistant independently coded the universe of GATT/WTO complaints using the same criteria. The percentage agreement between the two coders was 99%.

Notes

1. Focusing on the adjustment costs facing labor has several other advantages. First, labor is relatively immobile across national borders (Rodrik, 2000). This allows us to ignore the possibility that the preferences of internationally immobile workers differ from those of internationally mobile workers (Hiscox, 2004). Second, the adjustment costs facing labor have received significant scholarly attention and consensus exists as to how to estimate these costs.

2. It is important to note that this argument is different from, but wholly consistent with, Estevez-Abe, Iversen, and Soskice (2001) who argued that broad transfers induce workers to invest in specific skills. Once workers have these specific skills, they demand narrow transfers.

3. Institutional complementarities may reinforce cross-national variation in adjustment costs. In countries with high-adjustment costs, institutions develop that make use of the industry-specific skills available in the labor market (Hall & Soskice, 2001).

4. Unions may help to increase the probability that the demands of certain groups of voters are translated into policy outcomes. With respect to transfer form, the role of unions would

likely depend on the characteristics of unions' members. Industry unions are more likely to push for narrow transfers than nationally centralized unions representing workers from different industries. Unfortunately, due to data limitations, it is not possible to test this expectation for the entire sample of countries under investigation here.

5. Some argue that aggregate government spending is higher with multiparty coalition government because of this dynamic (e.g., Bawn & Rosenbluth, 2006; Persson, Roland, & Tabellini, 2003). Given this, it may be the case that proportional (PR) systems spend more than majoritarian systems on both narrow and broad transfers.

6. Additional attempts to measure narrow transfers include civilian spending (Swank, 1988) and overall government expenditures as a percentage of GDP (Bawn & Rosenbluth, 2006). Neither measure closely approximates the concept of interest here.

7. They may do so because of the domestic electoral benefits.

8. Data are from Allee (2008), Hudec (1993), Reinhardt (1996), and the WTO (2005).

9. I also employ a second measure of adjustment costs as a robustness test. This measure, estimates the rate of labor movement across manufacturing industries and into and out of the manufacturing sector (Seddon & Wacziarg, 2001). Using this alternative measure, I find strikingly similar results. Higher adjustment costs increase the number of narrow transfers in any given country; the increase is relatively larger in PR countries. These results are available from the author upon request.

10. See Oostendorp (2005) for more details.

11. This is a simple application of the law of one price.

12. To test for this possibility, I reestimate all models using a measure of interindustry wage differentials calculated for all manufacturing industries, regardless of skill type. I find similar results to those found using only average or low skill industries. These are available on request.

13. The mean of countervailing duty (CVD) is equal to 0.12; the standard deviation is 0.42. The mean value of Complaints is 0.17; the standard deviation is 0.55. Although the unconditional variance is greater than the unconditional mean for both count variables, the dispersion parameter, alpha, is equal to zero in several of the estimated models. When alpha is equal to zero, the negative binomial distribution is equivalent to a Poisson distribution.

14. 88% of the sample country-years have no complaints and 91% have no CVDs.

15. I use a country's exports to predict zero counts.

16. Only countries with a Polity score greater than 5 are included in the sample. Data are from Marshall and Jagers (2003).

17. Although including the lagged dependent variable is arguably most correct, I reestimated all models without the lagged dependent variable to see what, if any, temporal dynamics may have been obscured by the inclusion of the lagged dependent variable. The coefficients on the key variables of interest are virtually unchanged. This is likely because most of the variation in the key variables of interest (majoritarian and adjustment costs) is cross-sectional. For example, no country in my sample changes their electoral rules during the period under study.

18. All control variables are lagged one year to take into account the delay between the implementation of an illegal narrow transfer and the international reaction. I experimented with different lag structures and did not find any significant difference for the key variables of interest (majoritarian and adjustment costs), arguably because these variables tend to be relatively time invariant making the specific lag structure less important.

19. Data on all economic variables come from the World Development Indicators (2005).

20. Neither measure is a robust predictor of narrow transfers. For this reason and space constraints, models that include import growth and terms of trade are not reported here but are

available from the author on request. Importantly, the estimated coefficient on the key variables of interest did not change significantly when these measures were included.

21. The variance inflation factor (VIF) is less than 4 for all variables included in the models, as recommended by Huber, Ragin, and Stephens (1993).

22. Estimated via CLARIFY using Models 3 and 3.1 from Table 1 (King, Tomz, & Wittenberg, 2000; Tomz, Wittenberg, & King, 2001). All control variables are held constant at their median values. The interaction term along with both constitutive terms (L.Majoritarian and L.Adjustment costs) were modified for each simulation.

23. In every case, the expected number of narrow transfers is quite small. This is because the modal number of transfers in any given country-year is zero. However, this does not mean that the substantive effect of voter preferences and electoral institutions is small. It simply demonstrates that the likelihood of seeing a complaint or CVD in any given year in any given country is relatively low.

24. This difference is not statistically significant at conventional levels.

25. This effect is estimated via CLARIFY using Model 2 from Table 1. All other variables are held constant at their median value. This effect is statistically significant at the .1 level in a two-tailed test.

26. Although these results are not reported here, they are available from the author on request. The relative strength of industry unions is measured for developed countries using data from Golden, Lange, and Wallerstein (2006). Specifically, I calculate the ratio of unaffiliated union membership to confederal union membership. I measure external shocks using the percentage change in imports and the net barter terms of trade (WDI, 2005). These variables are not statistically significant at conventional levels.

27. Specifically, I use Wacziarg and Wallack (2004)'s EM2 measure that calculates the overall manufacturing employment loss or gain as the percentage change in total manufacturing employment for the past two years. Higher rates of labor movement are taken as indicators of lower-adjustment costs. These results are available from the author on request.

References

Alesina, A., Glaeser E., & Sacerdote, B. (2001). *Why doesn't the United States have a European-style welfare state?* NBER Working Paper No. 8524. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Allee, T. (2008). *Legal incentives and domestic rewards: The selection of trade disputes for GATT/WTO dispute resolution.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Illinois.

Alt, J., & Gilligan, M. (1994). The political economy of trading states. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 2, 165-192.

Alt, J., Frieden, J., Gilligan, M., Rodrik, D., & Rogowski, R. (1996). The political economy of international trade: Enduring puzzles and an agenda for inquiry. *Comparative Political Studies*, 29, 689-717.

Arnold, R. D. (1992). *The Logic of congressional action.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Bailey, M. (2001). Quite influence: The representation of diffuse interests on trade policy, 1983-1994. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 26, 45-80.

Bawn, K., & Rosenbluth, F. (2006). Short versus long coalitions: Electoral accountability and the size of the public sector. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50, 251-265.

Broz, J. L. (2005). Congressional politics of international financial rescues. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49, 479-496.

Busch, M. L., & Reinhardt, E. (2002). Testing international trade law: Empirical studies of GATT/WTO dispute settlement. In D. M. Kennedy & J. D. Southwick (Eds.), *The political economy of international trade law: Essays in honor of Robert Hudec* (pp. 457-481). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, C. A., & Trivedi, P. K. (1998). *Regression analysis of count data*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Chang, E. C. C., Kayser, M. A., & Rogowski, R. (2008). Electoral systems and real prices: Panel evidence for the OECD countries, 1970–2000. *British Journal of Political Science*, 38, 739-751.

Collie, M. P. (1988). The legislature and distributive policy making in formal perspective. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 13, 427-458.

Commission of the European Communities. (2002). *Eighth survey on state aid in the European Union*. Brussels: European Commission.

Cox, G. (1990). Centripetal and centrifugal incentives in electoral systems. *American Journal of Political Science*, 34, 903-935.

Cox, G., & M. McCubbins. (2001). The institutional determinants of economic policy outcomes. In S. Haggard & M. McCubbins (Eds.), *Presidents, parliaments, and policy*. (pp. 21-63). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dickens, W., & Katz, L. (1987). Inter-industry wage differences and industry characteristics. In K. Lang & J. Leonard (Eds.), *Unemployment and the structure of labor markets*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Denzau, A., & Munger, M. (1986). Legislators and interest groups: How unorganized interests get represented. *American Political Science Review*, 80, 89-106.

Drazen, A. (1997). *Policy signaling in the open economy: A re-examination*. NBER Working Paper No. 5892.

Duchêne, F., & Shepherd, G. (1987). *Managing industrial change in Western Europe*. New York: F. Pinter.

Edin, P., & Zetterberg, J. (1992). Interindustry wage differentials: Evidence from Sweden and a comparison with the United States. *American Economic Review*, 82, 1341-1349.

Estevez-Abe, M., Iversen, T., & Soskice, D. (2001). Social protection and the formation of skills: A reinterpretation of the welfare state. In P. Hall & D. Soskice (Eds.), *Varieties of capitalism: The challenges facing contemporary political economies* (pp. 145-183). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Freeman, R. B., & Oostendorp, R. H. (2001). The occupational wages around the world data file. *International Labour Review*, 140, 379-102.

Frieden, J. (1991). Invested interests: The politics of national economic policies in a world of global finance. *International Organization*, 45, 425-451.

Fung, K. C., & Staiger, R. (1996). Trade liberalization and trade adjustment assistance. In M. B. Canzoneri, W. J. Ethier, & V. Grilli (Eds.), *The new transatlantic economy* (pp. 265-286). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gibbons, R., & Katz, L. (1992). Does unmeasured ability explain inter-industry wage differentials? *Review of Economic Studies*, 59, 515-535.

Golden, M., Lange, P., & Wallerstein, M. (2006). *Union centralization among advanced Industrial Societies: An empirical study*. Available at <http://www.shelley.polisci.ucla.edu/>

Grossman, G. M., & Levinsohn, J. A. (1989). Import competition and the stock market return to capital. *American Economic Review*, 79, 1065-1087.

Hall, P., & Soskice, D. (2001). An introduction to varieties of capitalism. In P. Hall & D. Soskice (Eds.), *Varieties of capitalism: The institutional foundations of comparative advantage* (pp.1-68). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hiscox, M. J. (2002). *International trade and political conflict: Commerce, coalitions and mobility*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hiscox, M. J. (2004). International capital mobility and trade politics: Capital flows and political coalitions. *Economics and Politics*, 16, 253-285.

Hiscox, M. J., & Burgoon, B. (2000). *Trade openness and political compensation*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington DC.

Huber, E., Ragin, C., & Stephens, J. D. (1993). Social democracy, Christian democracy, constitutional structure and the welfare state. *American Journal of Sociology*, 99, 711-749.

Huberman, M. (2004). *Small was beautiful: Belgian workers and free trade before 1914*. Unpublished Manuscript, Université de Montréal, Canada.

Hudec, R. (1993). *Enforcing international trade law: The evolution of the modern GATT legal system*. Salem, NH: Butterworth Legal Publishers.

Iversen, T., & Soskice, D. (2006). Electoral institutions and the politics of coalitions: Why some democracies redistribute more than others. *American Political Science Review*, 100, 165-181.

Jones, R. W. (1971). A three-factor model in theory, trade and history. In J. Bhagwati, R. Jones, R. Mundell, & J. Vanek (Eds.), *Trade, balance of payments and growth* (pp. 3-21). Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Katz, L. F., & Summers, L. H. (1989). Industry rents: Evidence and implications. In M. N. Baily & C. Winston (Eds.), *Brookings papers on economic activity, microeconomics* (pp. 209-275). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

King, G. (1989). Variance specification in event count models: From restrictive assumptions to a generalized estimator. *American Journal of Political Science*, 33, 762-784.

King, G., Tomz, M., & Wittenberg, J. (2000). Making the most of statistical analyses: Improving interpretation and presentation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 44, 347-361.

Kono, D. (2008). Democracy and trade discrimination. *The Journal of Politics*, 70, 942-955.

Krueger, A. B., & Summers, L. H. (1987). Reflections on the inter-industry wage structure. In K. Lang & J. Leonard (Eds.), *Unemployment and the structure of labor markets* (pp. 17-47). London: Basil Blackwell.

Lizzeri, A., & Persico, N. (2001). The provision of public goods under alternative electoral incentives. *American Economic Review*, 91, 225-245.

Long, J. S. (1997). *Regression models for categorical and limited dependent variables*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Magee, S. P., Brock, W. A., & Young, L. (1989). *Black hole tariffs and endogenous policy formation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Mansfield E., & Busch, M. (1995). The political economy of nontariff barriers: A cross national analysis. *International Organization*, 49, 723-749.

Mansfield, E. D., Milner, H. V., & Rosendorff, P. B. (2002). Why democracies cooperate more: Electoral control and international trade agreements. *International Organization*, 56, 477-513.

Marshall, M. G., & Keith, J. (2003). *POLITY IV. Political regime characteristics and transitions, 1800-2003*. Retrieved from <http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/polity/>

Mayer, W. (1984). Endogenous tariff formation. *American Economic Review*, 74, 970-985.

McCubbins, M. D., & Schwartz, T. (1984). Congressional oversight overlooked: Police patrols versus fire alarms. *American Journal of Political Science*, 28, 165-179.

McGillivray, F. (2004). *Privileging industry: The comparative politics of trade and industrial policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mény, Y., & Wright, V. (1986). State and steel in Western Europe. In Y. Mény & V. Wright (Eds.), *The politics of steel: Western Europe and the steel industry in the crisis years (1974-84)* (pp.1-110). Berlin, Germany: de Gruyter.

Milesi-Ferretti, G. M., Perotti R., & Rostagno, M. (2002). Electoral systems and public spending. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117, 609-665.

Moulton, B. (1990). An illustration of a pitfall in estimating the effects of aggregate variables on micro units. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 72, 334-338.

O'Rourke, K. H. & Sinnott, R. (2001). The determinants of individual trade policy preferences: International survey evidence. *Brookings Trade Forum 2001*, 157-206.

Oostendorp, R. H. (2005). *The standardized ILO October inquiry 1983-2003*. Unpublished manuscript. Free University Amsterdam.

Parsons, D. O. (1972). Specific human capital: An application to quit rates and layoff rates. *Journal of Political Economy*, 80, 1120-1143.

Persson, T., Roland, G., & Tabellini, G. (2003). *How do electoral rules shape party structures, government coalitions, and economic policies?* Unpublished Paper. Bocconi University.

Persson, T., & Tabellini, G. (1999). The size and scope of government: Comparative politics with rational politicians. *European Economic Review*, 43, 699-735.

Persson, T., & Tabellini, G. (2000). *Political economics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Persson, T., & Tabellini, G. (2003). *The economic effects of constitutions*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Powell, G. B., & Vanberg, G. S. (2000). Election laws, disproportionality and median correspondence: Implications for two visions of democracy. *British Journal of Political Science*, 30, 383-411.

Reinhardt, E. (1996). *Posturing parliaments: Ratification, uncertainty, and international bargaining*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, New York.

Reinhardt, E. (2000). *Aggressive multilateralism: The determinants of GATT/WTO dispute initiation, 1948-1998*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Washington, DC.

Rodriguez, F., & Rodrik, D. (2000). Trade policy and economic growth: A skeptic's guide to the cross-national evidence. In B. Bernanke & K. Rogoff (Eds.), *NBER macroeconomics annual 2000* (pp. 261-324). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rodrik, D. (2000). How far will international economic integration go? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14, 177-86.

Rogowski, R. (1987). Trade and the variety of democratic institutions. *International Organization*, 41, 203-222.

Rogowski, R. (1989). *Commerce and coalitions: How trade affects domestic political alignments*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rogowski, R. (1997). *Pork, patronage, and protection: How geographic concentration affects representation of interests in small-district systems*. Paper presented at the 93rd Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC.

Rogowski, R., & Kayser, M. A. (2002). Majoritarian electoral systems and consumer power: Price-level evidence from the OECD countries. *American Journal of Political Science*, 46, 526-539.

Schatz, K. W., & Wolter, F. (1987). *Structural adjustment in the Federal Republic of Germany*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Office.

Sharp M., & Shepherd, G. (1987). *Managing change in British industry*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Office.

Shepherd, G., & Duchêne, F. (1983). Introduction: Industrial change and intervention in Western Europe. In G. Shepherd, F. Duchêne, & C. Saunders (Eds.), *Europe's industries: public and private strategies for change* (pp. 1-25). New York: Frances Pinter.

Sokoloff, K. (1986). Productivity growth in manufacturing during early industrialization: Evidence from the American northeast, 1820-1860. In L. Engerman & R. E. Gallman (Eds.), *Long-term factors in American economic growth* (pp. 679-736). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stolper, W., & Samuelson, P. (1941). Protection and real wages. *Review of Economic Studies*, 9, 58-73.

Swank, D. H. (1988). The political economy of government domestic expenditure in the affluent democracies, 1960-80. *American Journal of Political Science*, 32, 1120-1150.

Tomz, M., Wittenberg, J., & King, G. (2001). *CLARIFY: Software for interpreting and presenting statistical results*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Verdier, D. (1995). The politics of public aid to private industry: The role of policy networks. *Comparative Political Studies*, 28, 3-42.

Wacziarg, R., & Wallack, J. S. (2004). Trade liberalization and intersectoral labor movements. *Journal of International Economics*, 64, 411-439.

Wood, A. (1994). *North-south trade, employment and inequality: Changing fortunes in a skill-driven world*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

World Bank. 2005. *World Development Indicators (WDI) Data File*. Retrieved November 13, 2008, from <http://devdata.worldbank.org/wdi2005/cover.htm>

World Trade Organization (WTO). 2005. *Chronological list of disputes cases*. Retrieved November 13, 2008, from http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/dispu_status_e.htm

Zahariadis, N. (2001). Asset specificity and state subsidies in industrialized countries. *International Studies Quarterly*, 45, 603-616.

Stephanie J. Rickard is a lecturer in the School of Law and Government at Dublin City University. Her research interests include redistribution, globalization, and the politics of international trade.