

ONLINE APPENDIXES

Appendix A: Question Wording

Trade Preferences

As you may know, international trade has increased substantially in recent years. This increase is due to the lowering of trade barriers between countries, that is, tariffs or taxes that make it more difficult or more expensive to buy and sell things across international borders. Do you think government should try to encourage international trade or try to discourage international trade? Do you believe that globalization, especially the increasing connections of our economy with others around the world, is good or bad for the United States? Should foreign companies be encouraged or discouraged from investing in the United States, for example, by building one of their factories in this country? Do you favor or oppose the federal government in Washington negotiating more free trade agreements like NAFTA? Do you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable or very unfavorable opinion of the WTO, the World Trade Organization? [All measured on four-point scales.]

Perceived Effect of Trade on U.S. Economy

Thinking about the increasing amount of trade between the U.S. and other countries, do you think this has helped the United States economy, hurt the United States economy, or has it not affected the U.S. economy? [five-point scale: Helped the economy a lot to Hurt the economy a lot.]

Active Involvement in World Affairs

Next we have some questions about what role the United States should play with respect to the rest of the world. The U.S. needs to play an active role in solving conflicts around the world. The U.S. government should just try to take care of the well-being of Americans and not get involved with other nations. It is essential for the United States to work with other nations to solve problems, such as overpopulation, hunger, and pollution. It will be best for the future of the country if we stay out of world affairs. The United States has the responsibility to play the role of “world policeman,” that is, to fight violations of international law and aggression wherever they occur. [All measured on a five-point scale: Strongly agree to Strongly disagree.]

Ethnocentrism

Where would you rate [blacks/whites/Hispanic-Americans] in general on this scale?
[Hardworking versus Lazy] [Efficient versus Wasteful] [Trustworthy versus Untrustworthy]

Concern about Future Effects of Trade

How worried are you, personally, that you or someone in your household could lose a job because of the increasing amount of trade? Responses ranged on a four-point scale from “not worried at all (1) to “very worried” (4).

Personal Unemployment

All respondents in the panel were currently in the labor force. Employment status was assessed as follows: “Which statement best describes your current employment status?” (LIST: I work as a paid employee, I am self-employed, I am an owner or partner in a small business, professional practice or farm, I work at least 15 hours a week without pay in a family business or farm, I am unemployed, temporarily laid off, but looking for work, I am retired, I am disabled, I am a homemaker, Other). Respondents were considered unemployed if they indicated that they were “unemployed” or “temporarily laid off, but looking for work.”

Import-Dominant and Export-Dominant

Data on exports and imports are taken from the U.S. International Trade Commission (2008). We used version 2.8.4. (Bureau of Economic Analysis, http://www.bea.gov/industry/gdpbyind_data.htm).

Skill level/Average Annual Wage

We asked individuals, “In your current or most recent job, what kind of work do you do?” Each respondent’s occupation was then coded using the U.S. Department of Labor’s Standard Occupational Classification system. (For a list of the three-digit industry classifications, see the U.S. Census Bureau (2008a). Data compiled by the Department of Labor’s Bureau of Labor Statistics was used to calculate average annual wage.

Note that our sample is representative of the distribution of workers across industries in the U.S. population as a whole. We compared the distribution of respondents across industries in our sample to the distribution in the U.S. population, using data provided by the U.S. Census Bureau (2008b). For each industry, the percentage of respondents in our sample is much the same as the percentage of the U.S. workforce.

Appendix B. Probability of Attrition from Panel in Post-Recession Wave by Demographics

	(1)	
	Probability of Attrition	(se)
25-34	-0.002	(0.195)
35-44	0.176	(0.188)
45-54	0.053	(0.183)
55-64	0.277	(0.196)
65-74	0.524	(0.308)
75+	0.437	(0.587)
Some HS, no diploma	-0.138	(0.504)
HS Graduate	-0.223	(0.477)
Some College	-0.270	(0.483)
Associate Degree	-0.556	(0.500)
Bachelor's Degree	-0.725	(0.482)
Master's Degree	-0.658	(0.493)
Professional Degree	-0.895	(0.617)
Doctorate Degree	-0.955	(0.618)
Male	0.046	(0.093)
Union	-0.013	(0.140)
Unemployed	0.249	(0.227)
Import	-0.148	(0.151)
Export	0.067	(0.192)
Constant	0.452	(0.498)
Log Likelihood	-1356.85	
Likelihood Ratio	$\chi^2(19) = 38.4$	
Pseudo R ²	0.014	
N	1998	

Note: Omitted categories for age and education are age 18-24 and those with no high school, respectively. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Appendix C: Demographics of Panel Respondents Compared to Current Population Surveys

	CPS 2007	2007 Trade Panel	CPS 2009	2009 Trade Panel
<u>Educational Attainment</u>				
No high school diploma	10.8%	7.2	9.8	4.6
High school or equivalent	29.8	30.1	29.0	26.5
Some college, less than 4-yr degree	29.2	25.4	30.0	27.7
Bachelor's degree or higher	30.3	37.4	31.4	41.2
<u>Income</u>				
\$1 to \$4,999 or loss	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2
\$5,000 to \$9,999	1.9	2.9	1.8	0.4
\$10,000 to \$14,999	3.0	2.7	2.9	1.6
\$15,000 to \$24,999	8.4	8.1	8.1	5.1
\$25,000 to \$34,999	9.6	10.3	9.2	9.8
\$35,000 to \$49,999	14.2	18.3	13.4	10.9
\$50,000 to \$74,999	20.3	25.8	20.0	25.2
\$75,000 and over	41.5	30.8	43.6	45.7
<u>Age</u>				
18-24	13.2	9.1	12.9	5.4
25-34	21.8	20.3	21.8	19.7
35-44	23.3	23.8	22.2	20.9
45-54	23.3	28.1	23.2	29.4
55-64	14.1	15.6	15.0	20.2
65-74	3.4	2.6	4.9	3.7

75+	0.9	0.5	1.0	0.8
<u>Gender</u>				
Male	53.1	53.3	52.8	53.2
Female	46.9	46.7	47.2	46.8
<u>Race</u>				
White alone	82.0	85.3	81.9	85.4
Black or African American alone	11.1	6.2	11.2	6.6
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	0.8	0.5	0.8	0.5
Asian alone	4.5	2.8	4.5	2.5
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4
Two or more races	1.3	4.9	1.4	4.6
<u>Hispanic Origin</u>				
Non-Hispanic Origin	86.3	89.9	86.0	90.7
Hispanic Origin	13.7	10.1	14.0	9.3

Note: CPS values are among those who are working either full or part time.

Appendix D: Weighted Analyses

Table D1: The Impact of Rising Unemployment on Change in Support for Trade

	(1)	(2)
Change in Personal Unemployment	-0.126 (0.127)	-0.018 (0.133)
Change in Personal Unemployment × Import Dominant (2007)		-0.856* (0.345)
Change in Personal Unemployment × Export Dominant (2007)		0.073 (0.245)
Occupational Wage (2007) × Wave	-0.106 (0.083)	-0.104 (0.084)
Wave	0.984 (0.875)	0.955 (0.883)
Constant	2.729** (0.017)	2.731** (0.017)

Note: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$.

Table D2: The Impact of Changes in Ethnocentrism, in Active Involvement in World Affairs, and in Concern about Trade's Future Impact on Change in Support for Trade

	(1)	(2)
Change in Personal Unemployment	0.026 (0.148)	0.044 (0.147)
Change in Personal Unemployment × Import Dominant (2007)	-0.938** (0.351)	-0.965** (0.361)
Change in Personal Unemployment × Export Dominant (2007)	0.136 (0.211)	0.097 (0.208)
Change in Support for Active Involvement in World Affairs	0.106** (0.041)	0.099* (0.042)
Change in Ethnocentrism	-0.039 (0.036)	-0.047 (0.035)
Change in Concern about Future Effects of Trade		-0.057* (0.027)
Union (2007) × Wave		-0.253** (0.090)
Wave	-0.135** (0.032)	-0.099** (0.033)
Constant	2.426** (0.121)	2.558** (0.142)

Note: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$.