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Sources for the Low-Skill Immigration Policy Dataset

Several primary and secondary sources were used to compile the data on the laws and are listed below by country.

ARGENTINA


Bastos de Ávila. *Immigration in Latin America*. Washington, DC: OAS, 1964
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Government of Argentina. *Citizenship and Nationality [Argentina]*. 1869


35 (1937), pp. 215–247


Migration. “Immigration in Argentina”. In: Migration 1.4 (1961), pp. 63–64


Migration Dialogue. Migration News. Davis, CA: University of California, Davis; German Marshall Fund of the United States, the University of California - Berkeley Center for German, and European Studies, 1994-2011


C. E. Solberg. Immigration and nationalism, Argentina and Chile, 1890-1914. Austin, TX: Published for the Institute of Latin American Studies by the University of Texas Press, 1970


**AUSTRALIA**

Blainey. *All for Australia*. North Ryde: Methuen Haynes, 1984


M. J. Gibney and R. Hansen. *Immigration and asylum from 1900 to the present*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2005


Migration Dialogue, Migration News


Plender, International migration law.
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**BRAZIL**

F. Amaral and W. Fusco. “Shaping Brazil: The Role of International Migration”. Migration Policy Institute. 2005

Baily, “The Italians and the Development of Organized Labor in Argentina, Brazil, and the United States 1880-1914”

Barnhart, “Citizenship and Political Tests in Latin American Republics in World War II”


Bastos de Ávila, *Immigration in Latin America*


Engerman and Sokoloff, “Once upon a time in the Americas: land and immigration policies in the New World”


Fields, “Closing Immigration Throughout the World”


Foerster, *The Italian emigration of our times*


La Cava, *Italians in Brazil*


Library of Congress Law Library. *Immigration law sanctions and enforcement in selected foreign countries Brazil, Egypt, Japan, Mexico, Sweden, and Switzerland*. 2006


Maurette, “Immigration and settlement in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay: I”

Maurette, “Immigration and settlement in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay: II”


Migration. “New Social Security Law in Brazil”. In: *Migration* 1.2 (1961), pp. 75–76

Migration Dialogue, *Migration News*

Morner and Sims, *Adventurers and proletarians: The story of migrants in Latin America*


Plender, *International migration law*.

Randall, “A comparative economic history of Latin America: 1500-1914; Volume 3: Brazil”


Tigner, “Japanese Immigration into Latin America: A Survey”


Tsuchida, “A History of Japanese Emigration from the 1860s to the 1990s”


**CANADA**


Borrie, *The European peopling of Australasia: A demographic history, 1788-1988*

M. Boyd and M. Vickers. “100 Years of Immigration in Canada”. In: *Canadian Social Trends* (2000), pp. 2–12

Carrothers, *Emigration from the British Isles, with special reference to the development of the overseas dominions*


D. C. Corbett. *Canada’s immigration policy; A critique*. Toronto: Published under the auspices of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs by University of Toronto Press, 1957

Gibney and Hansen, *Immigration and asylum from 1900 to the present*


Hastings, “Japanese Emigration and Assimilation in Brazil”

Hatton, “Emigration from the UK, 1870-1913 and 1950-1998”


Hawkins, *Critical years in immigration Canada and Australia compared*


King, *Mass migrations in Europe: The legacy and the future*


Madgwick, *Immigration into eastern Australia, 1788-1851*

Migration Dialogue, *Migration News*

Mills, “The immigration policies of the British dominions, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa”

Ongley and Pearson, “Post-1945 International Migration: New Zealand, Australia and Canada Compared”

Plender, *International migration law.*

Smith, *Commonwealth migration: Flows and policies*


Tsuchida, “A History of Japanese Emigration from the 1860s to the 1990s” Zolberg, *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America*

**FRANCE**


Foerster, *The Italian emigration of our times*


King, *Mass migrations in Europe: The legacy and the future*


Lynch and Simon, *Immigration the world over: Statutes, policies, and practices*

Migration Dialogue, *Migration News*


Plender, *International migration law.*

Tsuchida, “A History of Japanese Emigration from the 1860s to the 1990s”


Zolberg, A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America

GERMANY


Baldwin-Edwards and Schain, The politics of immigration in Western Europe


Foerster, The Italian emigration of our times

Geddes, The politics of migration and immigration in Europe


Hammar, European immigration policy: A comparative study


C. Joppke and Z. Rosenhek. “Contesting ethnic immigration: Germany and Israel compared”. In: European Journal of Sociology 43.03 (2003), pp. 301–335

King, Mass migrations in Europe: The legacy and the future
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Lynch and Simon, *Immigration the world over: Statutes, policies, and practices*


Migration Dialogue, *Migration News*

Plender, *International migration law.*


Zolberg, *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America*

**HONG KONG**


Government of Hong Kong. *The Aliens (Rights of Property) Ordinance, 1853 (Hong Kong)*. Nov. 1853

Government of Hong Kong. *The Chinese Immigration Ordinance, 1895, of Hong Kong*. Hong Kong, 1895

Government of Hong Kong. *Relating to the Naturalization to Aliens of Hong Kong*. Hong Kong, 1902
Government of Hong Kong. *Hong Kong Legislative Council Minutes, 20 August 1914*. Hong Kong, 1914

Government of Hong Kong. *Hong Kong Legislative Council Minutes, 30 December 1915*. Hong Kong, 1915


Migration Dialogue, *Migration News*


R. Settlage. “No Place to Call Home-Stateless Vietnamese Asylum-Seekers in Hong Kong”. In: *Geo.*
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**JAPAN**

Athukorala, “International Labour Migration in the Asian Pacific Region: patterns, policies and economic implications”

Brody, *Opening the door: Immigration, ethnicity, and globalization in Japan*


E. A. Chung. *Immigration and citizenship in Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010


Iguchi, “What We Can Learn from the German Experiences Concerning Foreign Labor”


Library of Congress Law Library, Immigration law sanctions and enforcement in selected foreign countries Brazil, Egypt, Japan, Mexico, Sweden, and Switzerland


D. H Mendel Jr. “Japan’s Taiwan Tangle”. In: Asian Survey (1964), pp. 1073–1084

Migration Dialogue, Migration News


Plender, International migration law.


Tsuchida, “A History of Japanese Emigration from the 1860s to the 1990s”


M. Weiner. “Japan in the age of migration”. In: Japan and Global Migration. London: Routledge, 2000, pp. 52–69


**KUWAIT**


J. Chalcraft. “Monarchy, migration and hegemony in the Arabian Peninsula”. Kuwait Programme on Development, Governance and Globalisation in the Gulf States. 2010


Migration Dialogue, *Migration News*


O. Winckler. “The immigration policy of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) states”. In: *Middle
Eastern Studies 33.3 (1997), pp. 480–493

Netherlands

Baldwin-Edwards and Schain, The politics of immigration in Western Europe

F. Caestecker and B. Moore. “The legal construction of policy towards aliens prior to 1933”. In: Refugees from Nazi Germany and the Liberal European States (2010), p. 193

F. Caestecker and B. Moore. “Female domestic servants as desirable refugees: Gender, labour needs and immigration policy in Belgium, The Netherlands and Great Britain”. In: European History Quarterly 41.2 (2011), p. 213


Fields, “Closing Immigration Throughout the World”


Geddes, The politics of migration and immigration in Europe


Hammar, European immigration policy: A comparative study

King, Mass migrations in Europe: The legacy and the future

L. Lucassen. “Administrative into social control: The aliens police and foreign female servants in the Netherlands, 1918-40”. In: *Social History* 27.3 (2002), pp. 327–342


Migration Dialogue, *Migration News*


Plender, *International migration law.*


H. van Amersfoort and R. Penninx. “Regulating Migration in Europe: The Dutch Experience, 1960-
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92”. In: *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 534 (1994), pp. 133–146


**NEW ZEALAND**


A. Binzegger. *New Zealand’s Policy on Refugees*. New Zealand Institute of International Affairs, 1980
W. D. Borrie. *Immigration to New Zealand, 1854-1938*. Canberra: Demography Program, Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University, 1991

Borrie, *The European peopling of Australasia: A demographic history, 1788-1988*


Carrothers, *Emigration from the British Isles, with special reference to the development of the overseas dominions*


Gibney and Hansen, *Immigration and asylum from 1900 to the present.*


Government of New Zealand, 2009


Hatton, “Emigration from the UK, 1870-1913 and 1950-1998”


M. Henry. “Border geostrategies: Imagining and administering New Zealand’s post World War One borders”. In: *New Zealand Geographer* 64.3 (2008), pp. 194–204


Madgwick, *Immigration into eastern Australia, 1788-1851*


Migration Dialogue, *Migration News*

Mills, “The immigration policies of the British dominions, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa”

Ongley and Pearson, “Post-1945 International Migration: New Zealand, Australia and Canada Compared”

Plender, *International migration law*.


Smith, *Commonwealth migration: Flows and policies*


B. Wearing. “Immigration Law in New Zealand and the USA: A Comparison of Recent Changes in New Zealand’s Immigration Law with Those Made in the USA”. Institute for Social Science Research. Los Angeles, 1990


Winkelmann, “Immigration Policies and their Impact: The Case of New Zealand and Australia”

Zolberg, *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America*
SAUDI ARABIA

Addleton, *Undermining the centre: The Gulf migration and Pakistan*


Bureš, *Main characteristic and development trends of migration in the Arab world*

Choucri, “Asians in the Arab world: labor migration and public policy”

Choucri and Brecke, *Migration in the Middle East: transformations, policies, and processes*

Dib, “Laws governing migration in some Arab countries”

Feiler, “Migration and recession: Arab labor mobility in the Middle East, 1982-89”


E. Kanovsky. *Migration from the poor to the rich Arab countries.* Tel Aviv: Dayan Center for Middle Eastern and African Studies, Shiloah Institute, Tel Aviv University, 1984

Kapiszewski, *Nationals and expatriates: population and labour dilemmas of the Gulf Cooperation Council States*

Kapiszewski, “Arab versus Asian migrant workers in the GCC countries”


Migration Dialogue, *Migration News*


Seccombe and Lawless, “Work camps and company towns: Settlement patterns and the Gulf oil industry.”

R. Silvey. “In the Margins of Riyadh: Indonesian Domestic Workers in Saudi Arabia”. In: *Migrants to the metropolis: the rise of immigrant gateway cities.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press,
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2008


**SINGAPORE**

Athukorala, “International Labour Migration in the Asian Pacific Region: patterns, policies and economic implications”

Athukorala, “International Labour Migration in East Asia: trends, patterns and policy issues”


Gallienne, *The whole thing was orchestrated: New Zealand’s response to the Indo-Chinese refugees exodus, 1975 to 1985*


A. Kaur. *International migration in Malaysia and Singapore since the 1880s: State policies, migration trends and governance of migration*. New England, NSW: The University of New England Asia Centre (UNEAC) for the Malaysia and Singapore Society of Australia, 2006

Migration Dialogue, *Migration News*


Yamashita, Transnational migration in East Asia: Japan in a comparative focus


**SOUTH AFRICA**


Borrie, The European peopling of Australasia: A demographic history, 1788-1988


Carrothers, Emigration from the British Isles, with special reference to the development of the overseas dominions


J. S. Crush and D. A. McDonald. *Transnationalism and New African Immigration to South Africa*. Cape Town: The Southern African Migration Porject (SAMP) and the Canadian Association for African Studies (CAAS), 2002


Fields, “Closing Immigration Throughout the World”

J. Foster. “‘Land of Contrasts’ or ‘Home We Have Always Known’?: The SAR&H and the Imaginary Geography of White South African Nationhood, 1910-1930”. In: *Journal of Southern African Studies* 29.3 (2003), pp. 657–680

Gibney and Hansen, *Immigration and asylum from 1900 to the present*


Government of South Africa. *Immigration Regulations [South Africa]*. 2005


28


Madgwick, *Immigration into eastern Australia, 1788-1851*


A. McDonald. “Hear no housing, see no housing immigration and homelessness in the new South Africa”. In: *Cities* 15.6 (1998), pp. 449–462

Migration. “New Plan Outlined to Encourage Immigration in South Africa”. In: *Migration* 1.3 (1961), pp. 53–54

Migration Dialogue, *Migration News*

Mills, “The immigration policies of the British dominions, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa”


Plender, *International migration law.*


Smith, *Commonwealth migration: Flows and policies*


Zolberg, *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America*

**SOUTH KOREA**


Athukorala, “International Labour Migration in East Asia: trends, patterns and policy issues”


Mackey and Anderson, “Asylum law: Surrogate protection: Asian perspectives, challenges and contributions”

Migration Dialogue, *Migration News*


Yamashita, *Transnational migration in East Asia: Japan in a comparative focus*

**SWITZERLAND**


Baldwin-Edwards and Schain, *The politics of immigration in Western Europe*


Fields, “Closing Immigration Throughout the World”


King, Mass migrations in Europe: The legacy and the future


Library of Congress Law Library, Immigration law sanctions and enforcement in selected foreign countries Brazil, Egypt, Japan, Mexico, Sweden, and Switzerland

K. B. Mayer. “Postwar Migration from Italy to Switzerland”. In: International Migration Digest 2.1 (1965), pp. 5–13

Migration Dialogue, Migration News

Miller, “Political Participation and Representation of Noncitizens”

Plender, International migration law.
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TAIWAN

Athukorala, “International Labour Migration in the Asian Pacific Region: patterns, policies and economic implications”

Athukorala, “International Labour Migration in East Asia: trends, patterns and policy issues”


H. C. Hsia. “Prospects and Impasse of Multicultural Citizenship in the Era of Globalization: The Case of Immigrant Movement in Taiwan”. In: International Conference on Political Challenges and Democratic Institutions, organized by Department of Political Science, National Taiwan University. 2004

34


Migration Dialogue, Migration News


Settlage, “No Place to Call Home— Stateless Vietnamese Asylum-Seekers in Hong Kong”

Skeldon, “Recent Trends in Migration in East and Southeast Asia”


**UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY**

Baldwin-Edwards and Schain, The politics of immigration in Western Europe

Booth, The migration process in Britain and West Germany: Two demographic studies of migrant populations


Clarke, Immigration of workers into Australia, Canada, Sweden and the United Kingdom

Department of Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs, Australia and Immigration

Geddes, The politics of migration and immigration in Europe

Hammar, European immigration policy: A comparative study


Kelley and Trebilcock, *The making of the mosaic: A history of Canadian immigration policy*

King, *Mass migrations in Europe: The legacy and the future*


Lynch and Simon, *Immigration the world over: Statutes, policies, and practices*

Migration Dialogue, *Migration News*

Mills, “The immigration policies of the British dominions, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa”

Papademetriou and Hamilton, *Converging paths to restriction: French, Italian, and British responses to immigration*

Plender, *International migration law.*


Smith, *Commonwealth migration: Flows and policies*


Zolberg, *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America*

**UNITED STATES**


Freeman and Jupp, Nations of Immigrants: Australia, the United States, and International Migrants


Gibney and Hansen, Immigration and asylum from 1900 to the present

Hatton, “Emigration from the UK, 1870-1913 and 1950-1998”


King, Mass migrations in Europe: The legacy and the future

Migration Dialogue, Migration News


Tsuchida, “A History of Japanese Emigration from the 1860s to the 1990s”


Zolberg, *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America*
APPENDIX C

Additional Tables and Figures
### Additional Analysis for Chapter 3

Table C1: Standardized average of refugee and asylum policy regressed on trade policy after World War II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV: Immigration Policy</th>
<th>Post-World War II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade Policy (Tariffs)</td>
<td>-1.27 (1.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Cold War</td>
<td>17.61** (5.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Cold War * Trade Policy</td>
<td>-18.22** (6.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity</td>
<td>0.02 (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP growth (Maddison)</td>
<td>0.48 (0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>-0.16 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Time Trend</td>
<td>0.03*** (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.59* (1.18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Also included: country and year fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses. + p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001. *Trade Openness* is 1 minus the tariff rate from Clemens and Williamson (2004) and updated by the Author. Post-Cold War is an indicator taking the value of 0 from 1945 to 1991 and 1 from 1992 onwards. *GDP growth* is from Maddison (2011). *Polity* is the measure of regime type from Marshall, Gurr and Jaggers (2011). *War* is an indicator variable for war from Sarkees and Wayman (2010). *Linear time trend* is a time trend for each country.


Table C2: Immigration Policy Regressed on Shipping Technology & Economy Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV: Immigration Policy</th>
<th>(1) Rail Roads</th>
<th>(2) Containerization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>-0.05**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail*Small Economy</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail*Resource Economy</td>
<td>2.40***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Containerized Countries in the World</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container*#Containerized</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container*Small Economy</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Containerized Countries*Small Economy</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container*#Containerized*Small Economy</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container*Resource Economy</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Containerized Countries*Resource Economy</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container*#Containerized*Resource Economy</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP Growth</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Time Trend</td>
<td>-0.01***</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.03***</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(1.21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N          | 1715        | 516       |
| R²         | 0.78        | 0.30      |

Notes: Also included: country and year fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses. + p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001. Rail (10,000km) is the total number of rail miles in the country from Comin and Hobijn (2009). Containerized is an indicator as to whether the state has ports that can take container ships and # of Containerized Countries in World is the total number of countries that have adopted container ship ports, both are from Bernhofen, El-Sahli and Kneller (2013). GDP growth is from Maddison (2011). Polity is the measure of regime type from Marshall, Gurr and Jaggers (2011). War is an indicator variable for war from Sarkees and Wayman (2010). Linear time trend is a time trend for each country.
## Appendix C

Table C3: Immigration Policy Regressed on Shipping Technology Lagged by 1 Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV: Immigration Policy</th>
<th>(1) Rail Roads</th>
<th>(2) Rail Roads - 19th Century</th>
<th>(3) Containerization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail (10,000km, 1 year lag)</td>
<td>-0.05***</td>
<td>-0.04***</td>
<td>0.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containerized (1 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Containerized Countries in World (1 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containerized*# of Containerized Countries (1 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP Growth</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>0.20+</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear time trend</td>
<td>-0.01***</td>
<td>-0.01**</td>
<td>-0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.19***</td>
<td>1.21***</td>
<td>2.40+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>(1.27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Also included: country and year fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses. + p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001. Rail (10,000km, 1 year lag) is the total number of rail miles in the country from Comin and Hobijn (2009) lagged 1 year. Containerized (1 year lag) is an indicator as to whether the state has ports that can take container ships lagged 1 year and # of Containerized Countries in World (1 year lag) is the total number of countries that have adopted container ship ports lagged 1 year, both are from Bernhofen, El-Sahli and Kneller (2013). GDP growth is from Maddison (2011). Polity is the measure of regime type from Marshall, Gurr and Jaggers (2011). War is an indicator variable for war from Sarkees and Wayman (2010). Linear time trend is a time trend for each country.
Table C4: Immigration Policy Regressed on Shipping Technology Lagged by 5 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV: Immigration Policy</th>
<th>(1) Rail Roads</th>
<th>(2) Rail Roads - 19th Century</th>
<th>(3) Containerization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail (10,000km, 5 year lag)</td>
<td>-0.05***</td>
<td>-0.04***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containerized (5 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Containerized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries in World (5 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containerized* # of</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containerized Countries (5 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP Growth</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>0.19+</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear time trend</td>
<td>-0.01***</td>
<td>-0.01**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.21***</td>
<td>1.22***</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(1.09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N$                                     1780            572                434

$R^2$                                    0.78            0.44                0.20

Notes: Also included: country and year fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p < 0.10, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001. Rail (10,000km, 5 year lag) is the total number of rail miles in the country from Comin and Hobijn (2009) lagged 5 years. Containerized (5 year lag) is an indicator as to whether the state has ports that can take container ships lagged 5 years and # of Containerized Countries in World (5 year lag) is the total number of countries that have adopted container ship ports lagged 5 years, both are from Bernhofen, El-Sahli and Kneller (2013). GDP growth is from Maddison (2011). Polity is the measure of regime type from Marshall, Gurr and Jaggers (2011). War is an indicator variable for war from Sarkees and Wayman (2010). Linear time trend is a time trend for each country.
Table C5: Immigration Policy Regressed on Exchange Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV: Immigration Policy</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overvaluation</td>
<td>-0.20 (0.13)</td>
<td>-0.13 (0.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overvaluation* Small Economy</td>
<td>-0.29 (0.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overvaluation* Resource Economy</td>
<td>0.02 (0.20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Time Trend</td>
<td>-0.01** (0.00)</td>
<td>-0.01* (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity</td>
<td>0.02 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.02+ (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP Growth</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.18)</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>-0.05 (0.04)</td>
<td>-0.05 (0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.07 (0.35)</td>
<td>0.50 (0.58)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \begin{array}{rcc}
N & 574 & 574 \\
R^2 & 0.25 & 0.29 \\
\end{array} \]

Notes: Also included: country and year fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses. + \( p < 0.10 \), * \( p < 0.05 \), ** \( p < 0.01 \), *** \( p < 0.001 \). Overvaluation measures amount that the currency is over- or undervalued from Steinberg and Malhotra (2014). Overvaluation* Small Economy and Overvaluation* Resource Economy is the interaction of Overvaluation and the indicator for small or resource economy, respectively. The excluded category is large economies. GDP growth is from Maddison (2011). Polity is the measure of regime type from Marshall, Gurr and Jaggers (2011). War is an indicator variable for war from Sarkees and Wayman (2010). Linear time trend is a time trend for each country.
Table C6: Immigration Policy Regressed on Lagged Exchange Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV: Immigration Policy</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overvaluation (1 year lag)</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overvaluation* Small Economy (1 year lag)</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overvaluation* Resource Economy (1 year lag)</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overvaluation (5 year lag)</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overvaluation* Small Economy (5 year lag)</td>
<td>-0.48*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overvaluation* Resource Economy (5 year lag)</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Time Trend</td>
<td>-0.01*** -0.01* -0.01*** -0.01*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00) (0.00) (0.00) (0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01) (0.01) (0.01) (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP Growth</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.20) (0.21) (0.13) (0.14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.06*</td>
<td>-0.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.04) (0.04) (0.03) (0.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.32) (0.47) (0.29) (0.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N  | 574  | 574  | 523  | 523  |
R²  | 0.25 | 0.29 | 0.27 | 0.33 |

Notes: Also included: country and year fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses.  
+ p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001. Overvaluation (1 year lag)/ (5 year lag) measures amount that the currency is over- or undervalued lagged 1 and 5 years, respectively from Steinberg and Malhotra (2014). Overvaluation* Small Economy (1 year lag)/ (5 year lag) and Overvaluation* Resource Economy (1 year lag)/ (5 year lag) is the interaction of Overvaluation (1 year lag)/ (5 year lag) and the indicator for small or resource economy, respectively, lagged 1 and 5 years. The excluded category is large economies. GDP growth is from Maddison (2011). Polity is the measure of regime type from Marshall, Gurr and Jaggers (2011). War is an indicator variable for war from Sarkees and Wayman (2010). Linear time trend is a time trend for each country.
### Additional Analysis for Chapter 4

Table C7: The Effect of the FDI and Productivity on Groups’ Participation in Congressional Hearings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable:</th>
<th>Total Times Serving as a Witness or Placing a Submission</th>
<th>Average Per Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FDI (3 year lag)</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.04)</td>
<td>-0.05 (0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Added (3 year lag)</td>
<td>-0.00 (0.07)</td>
<td>0.20* (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.07+ (0.49)</td>
<td>-0.19 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations 190 190

$R^2$ 0.000 0.017

Notes: All models include industry fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses. + $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. FDI (3 year lag) is the amount of outward FDI in the industry lagged 3 year from Bureau of Economic Analysis (2012). Value Added (3 year lag) is the real value added per worker (logged) lagged 3 years from Bartelsman and Gray (2013).
Table C8: The Effect of the Trade Openness on the Proportion of Issues that Firms List on Lobbying Disclosure Form that are on Immigration Lobbying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV: % of Issues on Immigration</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
<th>(11)</th>
<th>(12)</th>
<th>(13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TTariff (5 year lag)</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Wage Import Penetration (2 year lag)</td>
<td>-0.02**</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Wage Import Penetration (1 year lag)</td>
<td>-0.02*</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Wage Import Penetration (3 year lag)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Wage Import Penetration (4 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Penetration from China (1 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02*</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Penetration from China (2 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.03*</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Penetration from China (3 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Penetration from China (4 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Penetration (1 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.00**</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Penetration (2 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.00*</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Penetration (3 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.00+</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Penetration (4 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>0.03+</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>0.03+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. + p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001. Tariff (5 year lag) is the tariff per industry lagged 5 years from Schott (2010). Low-Wage Import Penetration (X year lag) is import penetration in each industry from low-wage countries; Import Penetration from China (X year lag) is the import penetration by Chinese goods; and Import Penetration (X year lag) is total import penetration; all are lagged X year and are from Bernard, Jensen and Schott (2006).
Table C9: The Effect of FDI on the Proportion of Issues that Firms List on Lobbying Disclosure Form that are on Immigration Lobbying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV: % of Issues on Immigration</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real Outward FDI (logged, 1 year lag)</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Outward FDI (logged, 2 year lag)</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Outward FDI (logged, 3 year lag)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Outward FDI (logged, 4 year lag)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Outward FDI (logged, 5 year lag)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. + $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. Real Outward FDI (logged, X year lag) is real outward foreign direct investment by the industry (logged) lagged X year from Bureau of Economic Analysis (2012).
Table C10: The Effect of Productivity Gains on the Proportion of Issues that Firms List on Lobbying Disclosure Form that are on Immigration Lobbying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Factor Total Productivity Index (3 year lag)</td>
<td>-0.08**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Factor Total Productivity Index (1 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.07*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Factor Total Productivity Index (2 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Factor Total Productivity Index (4 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Factor Total Productivity Index (5 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.09+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Factor Total Productivity Index (1 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.07+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Factor Total Productivity Index (2 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Factor Total Productivity Index (3 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.08**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Factor Total Productivity Index (4 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Factor Total Productivity Index (5 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.09+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Value Added (logged, 1 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Value Added (logged, 2 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Value Added (logged, 3 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Value Added (logged, 4 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Value Added (logged, 5 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.12**</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.12**</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.16+</td>
<td>0.15+</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.15+</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. + p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001. Real Value Added (logged, X year lag) is real value added per workers in the industry (logged) lagged X year; 5 Factor Productivity Index (1 year lag) is an index of all five factors of production (production and non-production workers, energy, materials and capital) in the industry lagged X year; and 4 Factor Productivity Index (1 year lag) is an index of four factors of production (with materials and energy combined in one measure) lagged X year. All productivity data is from Bartelsman and Gray (2013).
How Lobbying Groups Influence Each Other

Finally, I examine how the lobbying by one group influences the lobbying of other groups. The literature on lobbying suggests that interest groups will respond to lobbying by opposing groups with more lobbying if they think that those groups threaten their interests, and will respond to lobbying by groups with similar aims with less lobbying.¹ I examine this using a vector autoregressive model and find some evidence that some sectors and interest groups, but not all, respond to lobbying by other groups.

I ran a vector autoregression model on the first difference of the proportion of lobbying issues on immigration (Table C11). Lag lengths of one lag and three lags were statistically significant but only the model with one lag was stable. The tradable sector seems the most responsive to other groups according to Granger causality tests. More lobbying by the non-tradable sector, unions, and left-leaning groups is associated with less lobbying by the tradable sector the following year. This may be because non-tradable and left-leaning groups have similar preferences as the tradable sector and so the tradable sector free-rides on their activity. More lobbying by the high-skill sector is associated with more lobbying from the tradable sector the following year, suggesting that the low-skill intensive tradable sector may try to counter drives to make immigration policy more skill focused. There is no effect of right-leaning organizations on the tradable sector. Lobbying by left-leaning groups also seems to be responsive to lobbying by other groups according to the Granger causality tests. Lobbying by the tradable sector is associated with increased lobbying by left-leaning groups the following year, suggesting a bandwagoning effect. In contrast, left-leaning groups lobby less the following year if the non-tradable and right-leaning sectors lobbying more. According to the Granger causality tests there is little effect of the lobbying by other groups on the non-tradable sector, the high-skill sector, unions, and right-leaning groups. Thus, there is some evidence that these groups respond to lobbying by each other but it is clear that their lobbying is driven by other factors as well.

¹Baumgartner and Jones (2009), Drutman (2015).
### Table C11: Vector Autoregressive Model of Lobbying

| Equation          | Excluded           | $\chi^2$  | df | Prob > $\chi^2$ | Coef.  | Std. Err. | Prob > $|z|$ |
|-------------------|--------------------|-----------|----|-----------------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| Tradables         | Non-Tradables      | 22.024    | 1  | 0.000           | -0.425 | 0.090     | 0.000     |
| Tradables         | High-Skill         | 4.9025    | 1  | 0.027           | 0.754  | 0.340     | 0.027     |
| Tradables         | Unions             | 4.5266    | 1  | 0.033           | -1.163 | 0.547     | 0.033     |
| Tradables         | Right-Leaning      | 1.719     | 1  | 0.190           | -0.049 | 0.038     | 0.190     |
| Tradables         | Left-Leaning       | 14.154    | 1  | 0.000           | -0.476 | 0.127     | 0.000     |
| Tradables         | ALL                | 39.684    | 5  | 0.000           |        |           |           |
| Non-Tradables     | Tradables          | 0.28108   | 1  | 0.596           | -0.414 | 0.781     | 0.596     |
| Non-Tradables     | High-Skill         | 0.2424    | 1  | 0.622           | 0.644  | 1.308     | 0.622     |
| Non-Tradables     | Unions             | 1.3412    | 1  | 0.247           | -2.433 | 2.101     | 0.247     |
| Non-Tradables     | Right-Leaning      | 0.90796   | 1  | 0.341           | -0.138 | 0.144     | 0.341     |
| Non-Tradables     | Left-Leaning       | 0.29753   | 1  | 0.585           | -0.265 | 0.487     | 0.585     |
| Non-Tradables     | ALL                | 4.5483    | 5  | 0.473           |        |           |           |
| High-Skill        | Tradables          | 0.00446   | 1  | 0.947           | -0.014 | 0.206     | 0.947     |
| High-Skill        | Non-Tradables      | 0.32599   | 1  | 0.568           | -0.052 | 0.092     | 0.568     |
| High-Skill        | Unions             | 0.66854   | 1  | 0.414           | -0.454 | 0.555     | 0.414     |
| High-Skill        | Right-Leaning      | 0.10748   | 1  | 0.743           | 0.013  | 0.038     | 0.743     |
| High-Skill        | Left-Leaning       | 5.1757    | 1  | 0.023           | -0.292 | 0.129     | 0.023     |
| High-Skill        | ALL                | 6.0678    | 5  | 0.300           |        |           |           |
| Unions            | Tradables          | 1.3646    | 1  | 0.243           | -0.139 | 0.119     | 0.243     |
| Unions            | Non-Tradables      | 0.14952   | 1  | 0.699           | 0.020  | 0.053     | 0.699     |
| Unions            | High-Skill         | 1.8394    | 1  | 0.175           | 0.270  | 0.199     | 0.175     |
| Unions            | Right-Leaning      | 0.91856   | 1  | 0.338           | 0.021  | 0.022     | 0.338     |
| Unions            | Left-Leaning       | 0.97243   | 1  | 0.324           | -0.073 | 0.074     | 0.324     |
| Unions            | ALL                | 3.1859    | 5  | 0.671           |        |           |           |
| Right-Leaning     | Tradables          | 0.61474   | 1  | 0.433           | 1.107  | 1.411     | 0.433     |
| Right-Leaning     | Non-Tradables      | 0.0504    | 1  | 0.822           | -0.141 | 0.628     | 0.822     |
| Right-Leaning     | High-Skill         | 1.2874    | 1  | 0.257           | -2.681 | 2.363     | 0.257     |
| Right-Leaning     | Unions             | 0.9696    | 1  | 0.325           | 3.735  | 3.793     | 0.325     |
| Right-Leaning     | Left-Leaning       | 1.6483    | 1  | 0.199           | 1.128  | 0.879     | 0.199     |
| Right-Leaning     | ALL                | 3.4348    | 5  | 0.633           |        |           |           |
| Left-Leaning      | Tradables          | 43.958    | 1  | 0.000           | 1.297  | 0.196     | 0.000     |
| Left-Leaning      | Non-Tradables      | 41.811    | 1  | 0.000           | -0.563 | 0.087     | 0.000     |
| Left-Leaning      | High-Skill         | 0.42539   | 1  | 0.514           | -0.214 | 0.327     | 0.514     |
| Left-Leaning      | Unions             | 0.83182   | 1  | 0.362           | 0.479  | 0.526     | 0.362     |
| Left-Leaning      | Right-Leaning      | 7.3384    | 1  | 0.007           | -0.0978988 | 0.0361391 | 0.007     |
| Left-Leaning      | ALL                | 62.035    | 5  | 0.000           |        |           |           |

**Notes:** This table presents the results of a vector autoregression model with one lag of the change in lobbying effort by different groups. Lobbying effort was measured as the proportion of lobbying issues that are on immigration and was first-differenced to create stationary series. Lag lengths of either 1 lag or 3 lags were statistically significant but only the model with 1 lag was stable. The first three columns present the Granger causality test for the exclusion of the lag of lobbying effort by the other groups and the next three present the coefficient and standard errors from the VAR for that variable.
## Additional Analysis for Chapter 5

Table C12: The Effect of the Alternate Coding of Direct Elections on Senators’ Preference for Immigration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV: Proportion of Votes for Open Immigration</th>
<th>Model 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Rail</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Rail</td>
<td>0.41 (3.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rail*State Rail</td>
<td>0.01 (0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South*US Rail</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt West*US Rail</td>
<td>0.04*** (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West*US Rail</td>
<td>-0.00 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South*State Rail</td>
<td>-12.56+ (6.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt West*State Rail</td>
<td>81.97** (26.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West*State Rail</td>
<td>-128.20*** (26.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South<em>US Rail</em>State Rail</td>
<td>0.20 (0.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt West<em>US Rail</em>State Rail</td>
<td>-2.39*** (0.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West<em>US Rail</em>State Rail</td>
<td>2.14*** (0.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Elections (Alternate Coding)</td>
<td>-0.10+ (0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South*Financial Integration (est)</td>
<td>-0.12 (0.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt West*Financial Integration (est)</td>
<td>0.85*** (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West*Financial Integration (est)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Grains</td>
<td>-1.92* (0.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value added</td>
<td>-3.00 (2.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Foreign-Born</td>
<td>1.18 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Foreign-Born$^2$</td>
<td>-1.48 (2.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Tariff</td>
<td>4.69** (1.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Time Trend</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.09 (0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>3168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Includes senator fixed effects and year fixed effects. Robust standard errors clustered by Congress in parentheses. $+ p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001$. US Rail is the total rail in the US (10,000km), from Comin and Hobijn (2009). State Rail is the number of rail miles in the state (from Census Bureau (Various Years)) divided by the state size (from Carter et al. (2006)). Direct Elections (Alternate Coding) is an indicator for direct elections only for state that changed their election laws with passage of the 17th Amendment, from Lapinski (2004). Financial Integration (est) is the coefficient of variation for interest rates from Davis (1965) and uses the five year average from 1910-1914 for 1915-1936. % Grains is the percent of grains produced in the state, from Haines, Fishback and Rhode (2014). Value Added is the real value added per worker (logged) from Census Bureau (Various Year). Weighted Tariff is the tariff rate weighted by employment; tariff data from Census Bureau (Various Yearsb) and employment data from Ruggles et al. (2010). % Foreign-Born and % Foreign-Born$^2$ is the percentage of foreign born in the state and its square from Ruggles et al. (2010). South is defined as in the US Census; Mt. West and West is defined as by ICPSR. State Size, Horses and Mules, % Grains, Value Added, State Employment by Industry, and Foreign-Born are from the last census year.
Table C13: The Effect of the Transcontinental Railroad and Placebos on Senators’ Preference for Immigration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV: Proportion of Votes for Open Immigration</th>
<th>(1) 1869</th>
<th>(2) 1870</th>
<th>(3) 1865</th>
<th>(4) 1868</th>
<th>(5) 1871</th>
<th>(6) 1872</th>
<th>(7) 1873</th>
<th>(8) 1881</th>
<th>(9) 1897</th>
<th>(10) 1914</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Foreign-Born From China</td>
<td>6.85*</td>
<td>6.85*</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.02)</td>
<td>(3.02)</td>
<td>(4.65)</td>
<td>(3.97)</td>
<td>(3.05)</td>
<td>(3.05)</td>
<td>(3.05)</td>
<td>(3.54)</td>
<td>(2.62)</td>
<td>(1.73)</td>
<td>(1.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869 Indicator</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869 Indicator *% Foreign-Born</td>
<td>-6.72*</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870 Indicator</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870 Indicator *% Foreign-Born</td>
<td>-6.72*</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
<td>(3.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865 Indicator (Omitted)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868 Indicator</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868 Indicator *% Foreign-Born</td>
<td>-4.13</td>
<td>(5.15)</td>
<td>(5.15)</td>
<td>(5.15)</td>
<td>(5.15)</td>
<td>(5.15)</td>
<td>(5.15)</td>
<td>(5.15)</td>
<td>(5.15)</td>
<td>(5.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871 Indicator</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871 Indicator *% Foreign-Born</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872 Indicator</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872 Indicator *% Foreign-Born</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873 Indicator</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873 Indicator *% Foreign-Born</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
<td>(2.74)</td>
<td>(2.74)</td>
<td>(2.74)</td>
<td>(2.74)</td>
<td>(2.74)</td>
<td>(2.74)</td>
<td>(2.74)</td>
<td>(2.74)</td>
<td>(2.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881 Indicator</td>
<td>-0.10**</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881 Indicator *% Foreign-Born</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>(1.98)</td>
<td>(1.98)</td>
<td>(1.98)</td>
<td>(1.98)</td>
<td>(1.98)</td>
<td>(1.98)</td>
<td>(1.98)</td>
<td>(1.98)</td>
<td>(1.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897 Indicator</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897 Indicator *% Foreign-Born</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>(2.70)</td>
<td>(2.70)</td>
<td>(2.70)</td>
<td>(2.70)</td>
<td>(2.70)</td>
<td>(2.70)</td>
<td>(2.70)</td>
<td>(2.70)</td>
<td>(2.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914 Indicator</td>
<td>-0.38***</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914 Indicator *% Foreign-Born</td>
<td>-2.95</td>
<td>(3.06)</td>
<td>(3.06)</td>
<td>(3.06)</td>
<td>(3.06)</td>
<td>(3.06)</td>
<td>(3.06)</td>
<td>(3.06)</td>
<td>(3.06)</td>
<td>(3.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Time Trend</td>
<td>-0.01***</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.84***</td>
<td>0.84***</td>
<td>0.92***</td>
<td>0.92***</td>
<td>0.94***</td>
<td>0.94***</td>
<td>0.97***</td>
<td>0.86***</td>
<td>0.88***</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>4627</td>
<td>4627</td>
<td>4627</td>
<td>4627</td>
<td>4627</td>
<td>4627</td>
<td>4627</td>
<td>4627</td>
<td>4627</td>
<td>4627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. + p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001. % Foreign-Born From China is the number of foreign-born from China as a percent of total population from Ruggles et al. (2010). XXXX Indicator is an indicator variable taking the value 0 before year XXXX and 1 for that year and all years after. XXXX Indicator *% Foreign-Born is the interaction of the two variables.
Table C14: The Effect of Different Measures of Free Trade on Senators’ Preference for Immigration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV: Proportion of Votes for Open Immigration</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pen 5 (1 year lag)</td>
<td>-0.14***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen 5 (2 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.12**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen 5 (3 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.15***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen 5 (4 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.17***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen 5 (5 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.19***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen China (1 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.17***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen World (1 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Deficit (1 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tariff (1 year lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.71***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-7.40***</td>
<td>-8.50***</td>
<td>-8.86***</td>
<td>-10.40***</td>
<td>-10.45***</td>
<td>-7.42***</td>
<td>-7.34***</td>
<td>-7.69***</td>
<td>-25.44***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.49)</td>
<td>(2.15)</td>
<td>(1.90)</td>
<td>(1.96)</td>
<td>(1.99)</td>
<td>(1.48)</td>
<td>(1.53)</td>
<td>(1.48)</td>
<td>(3.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>3054</td>
<td>2952</td>
<td>2850</td>
<td>2749</td>
<td>2735</td>
<td>3054</td>
<td>3054</td>
<td>3054</td>
<td>1421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: All models include senator fixed effects. Robust standard errors clustered by Congress in parentheses. \( + p < 0.10, \ast p < 0.05, \ast\ast p < 0.01, \ast\ast\ast p < 0.001 \). \( \text{Pen 5 (X year lag)} \) is the import penetration in each industry from low-wage countries lagged X years (from Bernard, Jensen and Schott (2006)) weighted by the percent employed in that industry in the senators’ state (from Ruggles et al. (2010)). \( \text{Pen China (1 year lag)} \) is the import penetration in each industry from China lagged 1 year (from Bernard, Jensen and Schott (2006)) weighted by the percent employed in that industry in the senators’ state (from Ruggles et al. (2010)). \( \text{Pen World (1 year lag)} \) is the import penetration in each industry from the entire world lagged 1 year (from Bernard, Jensen and Schott (2006)) weighted by the percent employed in that industry in the senators’ state (from Ruggles et al. (2010)). \( \text{Trade Deficit (1 year lag)} \) is the trade deficit in the industry lagged 1 year (from Bernard, Jensen and Schott (2006)) weighted by the percent employed in that industry in the senators’ state (from Ruggles et al. (2010)). \( \text{Tariiff (1 year lag)} \) is the tariff for the industry lagged 1 year (from Bernard, Jensen and Schott (2006)) weighted by the percent employed in that industry in the senators’ state (from Ruggles et al. (2010)). Also included but not shown: \( \text{Agricultural Sector, Average World Capital Openness, Value Added, Value of Agricultural Equipment, Welfare Per Capita, \% Union, \% Foreign Born, \% Foreign Born}^2, \text{GDP growth} \), and a linear time trend.
Additional Analysis for Chapter 7

Figure C1: Border Entry and Enforcement Regulations

Note: Lower values of both border entry and enforcement regulation signify greater restrictions and greater enforcement, respectively. The loess-smoothed line shows the relationship between the two variables. Data coded by Author; see Appendix A for details.
APPENDIX D

Codebook for Congressional Testimony on Immigration

The following additional information was added to Baumgartner and Jones (2013)’s dataset on Congressional Hearings.

Additional Information to be Collected

**Individual** 1 if hearing focuses on the immigration status of a single individual (and do not complete coding the hearing); 0 if hearing does not focus on a single individual

**Petition** 1 if hearing includes a petition(s) with 10+ signatures of unaffiliated individuals or organizations OR a letter(s) of support signed by 10+ unaffiliated individuals OR 10+ substantively very similar letters from organizations/individuals of the same type (almost like form letters, potentially though not necessarily submitted together) OR 10+ letters from the general public without any affiliation collected by a witness/submitting organization/congressman OR many letters of support/a list of submissions not printed in the hearing document (do not code each of these as a separate submission); 0 if hearing does not include mass support documents
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- Separate letters adding up to a petition/letters of support may amalgamate over the entire course of the hearing, even if inserted over multiple days.
- A submission from an umbrella organization is coded as a single submission, even if subsidiaries are listed/sign.
- A petition may be coded from a witness’s submitted statement if it is a submission and not supporting evidence.
- Any document(s) coded as a petition is not coded as a submission.

**Petition Notes** Enter brief note on the nature of the petition, unaffiliated individuals versus organizations, affiliation type of signees, and number of petitions in a given hearing.

**Witnesses** Number of witnesses; if no witnesses, enter “0”

**Submissions** Number of submissions for the record, if no submissions, enter “0”

**Witness1, Witness2, Witness3, etc.** Code for type of witness (see below)

**Submission1, Submission2, Submission3, etc.** Code for type of organization submitting

**Witness/Submission Codes**

1. Chemicals and related manufactures, pharmaceuticals, health products, petroleum products, oil and gas.

2. Earths, earthenware, and glassware – e.g. china, glass ware, pottery.

3. Semi-skill Manufacturing – e.g. automotive, misc manufacturing & distributing, steel production, electronics mfg & services, defense aerospace, defense electronics, electronics mfg & services, misc communications/electronics, misc defense, misc energy, mining.

4. Wood and manufacture of – e.g. furniture.

5. Sugar, molasses, and manufacture of – e.g. sugar and other confectionary substances.

6. Tobacco and manufacture of – e.g. cigarettes, cigars.
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7 Agriculture – agricultural services/product, livestock, crop production & basic processing, dairy, forestry & forest products, poultry & eggs, fisheries & wildlife, food, food processing & sales including canning, farmers’ organizations (i.e., national farmers union), farm bureaus/farm trade associations

8 Spirits, wine and other beverages – e.g. breweries, soda manufacturing, but not vineyards (those go under 7)

9 Textiles – any type of textile from yarn to finished product, cotton, wool, synthetic

10 Mining – not oil or gas

11 NA

12 NA

13 NA

14 Paper and books – e.g. paper and newsprint

15 Sundries – any other misc. good that is produced

16 NA

17 NA

18 NA

19 NA

20 Construction – e.g. building materials & equipment, construction services, general contractors, home builders, real estate, special trade contractors

21 Travel to the US/ transportation – air transport, sea transport, railroads, trucking, shipping to US, container transports
22 Public sector – e.g. civil servants, public officials, unions for government employees; When a (noncommittee member) congressperson serves as a witness or provides a submission, include state and party affiliation in notes. Refers to US public sector only. All representatives of foreign public sectors are coded as 47 – foreign government officials. For task Forces/commissions/appointed committees:

- If all potentially public sector, code as public sector
- If clearly includes non public sector members and mission/testimony makes coding clear, code based on task

23 Utilities – e.g. electric utilities, telephone utilities

24 Wholesale trade

25 Services/Non-tradable (high-skill) – e.g. management consulting, finance, IT, accountants, business services, commercial banks, credit unions, insurance, misc finance, securities & investment, telecom services & equipment, finance/credit companies, environmental svcs/equipment, savings & loans, computers/internet, investor immigration, tv/movies/music, education (including research centers at universities if those are not left- or right-leaning, or health), non-profit, media/news corporations, law (except immigration-specific firms), human resource management, single industry (non-union) associations involving professionals in industries above

26 Retail – e.g. any retail organization

27 Lodging/hospitality and restaurants – e.g. restaurants and hotels

28 Services/Non-tradable (low-skill) – e.g. waste management, salon

29 Recreation – e.g. casinos/gambling, recreation/theme parks/live entertainment

30 Health Care – e.g. health professionals, health services/HMOs, hospitals/nursing homes, misc health including health care relevant research institutes, social work, medical schools

31 Public Sector – Agriculture – e.g. USDA, state/county extension agents
32 NA

33 NA

34 NA

35 NA

36 NA

37 NA

38 NA

39 NA

40 Right-leaning/ Nativist Single Issue Group – Veterans of foreign wars, American Legion, Daughter of the American Revolution, War of 1812, NumbersUSA, right-leaning university research centers. (No public sector organizations.)

41 Left-leaning/ Human Rights/Children’s Rights/ Refugee Single Issue Group/Pro-Immigration Groups/Civil Rights/Pacifist/Aid or Relief/ left-leaning university research centers. (No public sector organizations.) Also includes:

- Includes most non-nativist women’s groups
- In refugee-focused/aid organizations: left-leaning if not clearly ethnic, i.e. American Aid Societies for Needy and Displaced Persons of Central and Southeastern Europe, American Middle East Relief
- Includes groups working on migrants' behalf

42 Labor unions except unions for government employees (those get categorized as a 22). In the case of “farm worker organizations,” only a few are farmworkers’ unions: United Farm Workers/United Farmworkers Union, Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, National Farm Workers Association, National Farm Labor Union AFL
43 General Business associations – e.g. Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, multi-industry development associations, any business organization you cannot allocate to a more specific industry

44 Misc - international organizations, personal appeals, fraternal lodges not fitting in other categories

45 Minority/ Ethnic/Cultural Groups – e.g. Jewish groups, Armenian groups, Hungarian-American groups, German groups, Irish groups. Minority organizations do not have to represent a minority specific to a single country, i.e. Kurdish Human Rights Watch and American-Arab Anti-Discrimination League. Any American-xxxx organization, i.e. National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference. Other notes on the category

• Minority before ideological or aid group, i.e. American Relief for Germany
• Public servants representing their minority rather than simply their public office – e.g. Congressional Hispanic/Black Caucuses
• Includes migratory (farm) workers with no other affiliation

46 Religious groups – e.g. Methodists, Catholics. Other notes:

• Minority before religious before left-right
• Religion or minority before left-leaning/right-leaning or aid group
• If the church name specially includes a minority/ethnic reference, code the church as minority/ethnic; if no explicit minority reference, code the church as religious
• For larger religious organizations or denominations, determine whether or not they are minority-specific regardless of the organization name

47 Foreign government officials. Includes former foreign government officials, e.g. a former ambassador.
Notes on witness/submission codes:

- Think tanks/research organizations: categorize left- or right-leaning if possible, otherwise miscellaneous
- If a professor is testifying on behalf of an organization, code the affiliation of that organization; otherwise code based on education category
- Objectively left- or right-leaning before professional services, i.e. immigration judge associations, Center for Gender and Refugee Studies at a university, etc.
- Objectively left- or right-leaning before misc international (i.e. UNHCR)
- Minority before religious before left-right
  - However, whether minority/religious/ideology or business interest depends on the mission of the group (i.e., Physicians for Human Rights = Left-Leaning; Baptist Health System = Health)

Who Counts as a Witness

- Multiple individuals testify as a group:
  - From different organizations = Count as a witness for each organization
  - From same organization = 1 witness IF
    - Witnesses testify under the same heading and/or
    - Witnesses are introduced as one group of witnesses by the chairperson and/or
    - Second witness states at the beginning of his testimony that he does not need to add anything to the other witness
- If several individuals from same organization testify separately: count as multiple witnesses
- Count as “testify separately” if above points do not apply and IF two (or more) individuals from the same organization:
are introduced as separate witnesses,
and/or have their own heading in the hearing transcript,
and even if oral testimony is separate but they submit a single joint written statement

- Briefings or panels held within the hearing follow the rules above
- An individual submits a statement and also testifies: only count as a witness
- A witness submits letters from other individuals working at his organization: single witness, no submissions
- If a single individual testifies multiple times within a single hearing: single witness
- If missing pages in hearing, include missing witnesses based on TOC and other testimony
- Representatives/Senators: A congressperson that serves as a witness – and is labeled as a witness – is coded as a witness
  - Committee members performing their duties as part of the (sub)committee should not be listed as witnesses as long as they are not explicitly introduced as such
  - Congresspersons that are not members of the specific (sub)committee are coded as witnesses
  - Opening statements by full committee chairperson/member for subcommittee = not witness

What Counts as a Submission

- A congressman puts a report from a non-profit or private sector organization into the record
- A congressperson from the full committee – but not the subcommittee – submits a letter/statement
- Letters/telegrams from any affiliated individual, submitted to the committee (members) (unless only an introduction to a government report)
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- Private sector letters in response to an invitation to testify/submit

- If a witness, the committee or any congressperson has received/collection comments/letters from external organizations, including all letters in the appendix

- All full letters 1- not from a witness and 2- not affiliated with a witness’s specific organization
  - Full letters do not have to directly address the hearing, only the hearing topic

- If only supporting evidence, do not code (see rules in next section, i.e. internal memos)

- If submission(s) meet petition/letter(s) of support 10+ standard, code as petition/letter(s) of support and not as a submission

- If submissions do not meet petition/letter(s) of support standard (10+ etc.) then code each letter/comment as a separate submission

- Same individual submits more than one letter over the course of the hearing – only count once

- Letter from a (different) subagencies within a witness’s organization: submission unless clearly provided by the witness

- Same hearing: CIO witnesses and Textile Workers Union, CIO counts as submission

- Same hearing: Secretary of Homeland Security witnesses and CBP counts as submission

- Individuals from same organization separately submit letters: count as separate submissions (except in case of witness from organization providing letters from others in the organization)

- Two to nine organizations of the same type submitting a submission together: single submission
  - If any of these organizations submit a separate submission, do not code

- Two to nine organizations of different types submitting a submission together: code single submission according to majority type; if not clear dominating theme among the organizations, code as misc.
– If any of these organizations submit a separate submission, do not code

• Submissions from congressperson that are not members of the specific (sub)committee are coded

• If the hearing transcript 1- notes a future submission (that fits the above guidelines) and 2- does not note that the submission was never received, then the lack of submission is considered the fault of the record keepers (not the committee) and the potential submission is coded

Supporting Evidence (Not Coded)

• A witness, submission, or congressman quotes or adds editorials, op-eds, articles, laws, minutes from other meetings, resolutions, etc. to the record

  – Includes internal memos/letters that do not address the hearing specifically – such as letters 1- from members of Congress to government agencies, 2- from one government agency/governor/secretary to another government agency or institution, 3- letters sent within the same government organization

  – Includes forwarded letters submitted to other hearings

  – Includes public sector submitting letters/answers in response to a request from the committee/members of the committee

• A witness or submission includes a report - from their own organization or another

• A witness or submission quotes a letter that is not submitted in full

• A congressman puts a report produced by a government agency into the record

• Witness, a congressman, or the committee has received/collected 10+ comments/letters from the general public (any individual submitting a letter/comment sans any affiliation) – code as a petition/letter of support

• Letter from (sub)organization of testifying individual: not a submission

• Q&A sessions are not coded unless new witnesses/submissions are introduced
**Affiliation**

- Retired or no longer part of an organization:
  
  - If introduced with a current affiliation and a former affiliation, code current affiliation
  
  - If introduced as a “former XYZ,” code former affiliation
    
    * Likely that the person is asked to testify because of their knowledge of that organization/ industry due to their prior position and should be coded as representing that organization/ industry
  
  - If not introduced as “former XYZ,” code as misc.

- When given, use organizational affiliation to code, not testimony.

- When no organizational affiliation is given:

  - Code by profession if profession is listed in heading (e.g. farmer = agriculture, doctor = health, attorney = professional services)
  
  - If no affiliation or profession listed and the testimony clearly shows the individual's profession, code according to profession

- If witness's affiliation type differs based on level of specificity, code at lowest level - e.g. Delta Council = general business, Delta Council Agriculture Committee = agriculture

- Witness was invited by an organization to testify, code as that organization

- Witness has multiple affiliations:

  - of the same type, list multiple and only code once main affiliation,
  
  - of different types and clearly representing a single type/organization, list all but only code testifying affiliation
  
  - of different types and not clearly representing a single type, code all affiliations separately and note
Each organization in the lobbying data from the Center for Responsive Politics (N.d.) was coded as one of the following:

1. Chemicals and related manufactures, pharmaceuticals, health products, petroleum products, oil and gas

2. Earths, earthenware, and glassware – e.g. china, glass ware, pottery

3. Semi-skill Manufacturing – e.g. automotive, misc manufacturing & distributing, steel production, electronics mfg & services, defense aerospace, defense electronics, electronics mfg & services, misc communications/electronics, misc defense, misc energy, mining

4. Wood and manufacture of – e.g. furniture

5. Sugar, molasses, and manufacture of – e.g. sugar and other confectionary substances

6. Tobacco and manufacture of – e.g. cigarettes, cigars

7. Agriculture – agricultural services/ product, livestock, crop production & basic processing, dairy, forestry & forest products, poultry & eggs, fisheries & wildlife, food, food processing & sales
including canning, farmers’ organizations (i.e., national farmers union), farm bureaus/farm trade associations

8  Spirits, wine and other beverages – e.g. breweries, soda manufacturing, but not vineyards (those go under 7)

9  Textiles – any type of textile from yarn to finished product, cotton, wool, synthetic

10 Mining – not oil or gas

11 NA

12 NA

13 NA

14 Paper and books – e.g. paper and newsprint

15 Sundries – any other misc. good that is produced

16 NA

17 NA

18 NA

19 NA

20 Construction – e.g. building materials & equipment, construction services, general contractors, home builders, real estate, special trade contractors

21 Travel to the US/ transportation – air transport, sea transport, railroads, trucking, shipping to US, container transports

22 Public sector – e.g. civil servants, public officials, unions for government employees; When a (noncommittee member) congressperson serves as a witness or provides a submission, include state and party affiliation in notes. Refers to US public sector only. All representatives of foreign public sectors are coded as 47 – foreign government officials. For task Forces/commissions/appointed committees:
• If all potentially public sector, code as public sector
• If clearly includes non public sector members and mission/testimony makes coding clear, code based on task

23 Utilities – e.g. electric utilities, telephone utilities

24 Wholesale trade

25 Services/Non-tradable (high-skill) – e.g. management consulting, finance, IT, accountants, business services, commercial banks, credit unions, insurance, misc finance, securities & investment, telecom services & equipment, finance/credit companies, environmental svcs/equipment, savings & loans, computers/internet, investor immigration, tv/movies/music, education (including research centers at universities if those are not left- or right-leaning, or health), non-profit, media/news corporations, law (except immigration-specific firms), human resource management, single industry (non-union) associations involving professionals in industries above

26 Retail – e.g. any retail organization

27 Lodging/hospitality and restaurants – e.g. restaurants and hotels

28 Services/ Non-tradable (low-skill) – e.g. waste management, salon

29 Recreation – e.g. casinos/gambling, recreation/theme parks/live entertainment

30 Health Care – e.g. health professionals, health services/HMOs, hospitals/nursing homes, misc health including health care relevant research institutes, social work, medical schools

31 Public Sector – Agriculture – e.g. USDA, state/county extension agents

32 NA

33 NA

34 NA

35 NA
36 NA

37 NA

38 NA

39 NA

40 Right-leaning/ Nativist Single Issue Group – Veterans of foreign wars, American Legion, Daughter of the American Revolution, War of 1812, NumbersUSA, right-leaning university research centers. (No public sector organizations.)

41 Left-leaning/ Human Rights/Children’s Rights/ Refugee Single Issue Group/Pro-Immigration Groups/Civil Rights/Pacifist/Aid or Relief/ left-leaning university research centers. (No public sector organizations.) Also includes:

- Includes most non-nativist women’s groups
- In refugee-focused/aid organizations: left-leaning if not clearly ethnic, i.e. American Aid Societies for Needy and Displaced Persons of Central and Southeastern Europe, American Middle East Relief
- Includes groups working on migrants’ behalf

42 Labor unions except unions for government employees (those get categorized as a 22). In the case of “farm worker organizations,” only a few are farmworkers’ unions: United Farm Workers/United Farmworkers Union, Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, National Farm Workers Association, National Farm Labor Union AFL

43 General Business associations – e.g. Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, multi-industry development associations, any business organization you cannot allocate to a more specific industry

44 Misc - international organizations, personal appeals, fraternal lodges not fitting in other categories
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45 Minority/Ethnic/Cultural Groups – e.g. Jewish groups, Armenian groups, Hungarian-American groups, German groups, Irish groups. Minority organizations do not have to represent a minority specific to a single country, i.e. Kurdish Human Rights Watch and American-Arab Anti-Discrimination League. Any American-xxxx organization, i.e. National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference. Other notes on the category

- Minority before ideological or aid group, i.e. American Relief for Germany
- Public servants representing their minority rather than simply their public office – e.g. Congressional Hispanic/Black Caucuses
- Includes migratory (farm) workers with no other affiliation

46 Religious groups – e.g. Methodists, Catholics. Other notes:

- Minority before religious before left-right
- Religion or minority before left-leaning/right-leaning or aid group
- If the church name specially includes a minority/ethnic reference, code the church as minority/ethnic; if no explicit minority reference, code the church as religious
- For larger religious organizations or denominations, determine whether or not they are minority-specific regardless of the organization name

47 Foreign government officials. Includes former foreign government officials, e.g. a former ambassador.
Codebook for Trade Association Articles

Country, File, and Coder Identifiers

file_name Name of the file that coded

organization Name of the organization the file comes from

- National Textile Association: type in “NTA”
- American Iron and Steel Institute: type in “ISI”
- Western Growers Association: type in “WGA”

title Title of the article

year Year of article

month Month of article. If no month is mentioned, enter “99”

day Day of article. If no day is mentioned, enter “99”

notes Any notes coder thinks are relevant
coder  Initials of coder

date_of_coding  The date an article was coded.

- Format: YYYY-MM-DD
- Note: Set the number format in Excel to ‘Text’.

General remarks

In the following, you will find three variables per set:

- The first is a dichotomous variable that codes whether the phenomenon of interest (such as trade, low-skill immigration, or technology) is mentioned in the article. Enter “1” if it is mentioned, and “0” otherwise. In the latter case, the following two variables are to be coded “99”.

- The second variable, *dir, assesses whether there have been changes in this phenomenon (e.g., did overall trade increase? Did fewer foreign companies invest in the United States?). The value “1” indicates positive changes – i.e., improvements or increases – whereas a value of “-1” indicates negative changes – i.e., decreases or declines. If there is no change (mentioned), or if it remains unclear whether the change was positive or negative, enter a “0”.

  - Note that it does not qualify as a change if the article merely mentions that increases or decreases in the variable of interest are necessary or desirable in the future. In this case, enter “0” for the respective *dir variable and code the respective *opin variable “1” if an increase is depicted necessary/ desirable, and “-1” if a decrease is necessary/desirable (see below).

  - It does not count as change if the article predicts changes in the future. Changes refer exclusively to changes in the past. That is, even if one or both chambers of Congress have passed a bill already, we do not code this as a change unless the President has signed it or is very likely to do so.
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For some indicators, it is easier to discern whether changes have taken place, while for others, we need to rely on the perceptions of the respective organization. For instance, while trade data can unequivocally show whether imports or exports have changed, changes in international competition are less quantifiable (although changes in trade agreements or reductions in (non-) tariff barriers to trade are possible indicators of changes in this indicator).

Therefore, we often code changes as they are perceived or believed to be true by the respective organization. Therefore, it does not matter whether the reported changes have taken place over the course of a month, year, or decade, for instance. To code changes, we use the time frame presented in the article.

For the quantifiable variables (above all trade, imports, exports, immigration, low-skill immigration, high-skill immigration), changes refer to changes in absolute numbers, not to changes in relative market shares. That is, if the amount of goods shipped overseas increases, but at the same time the share of US exports in all world exports declines, we still code exports as increasing.

- The third variable, *opin, codes the opinion expressed in the article about these changes (e.g., does the article welcome the increase in FDI? Is it negative about the increased amount of goods imported)? “1” reflects positive evaluations, and “-1” negative ones, with “0” reflecting a neutral, factual view.

  - If an article presents arguments both in favor and opposed to the changes coded previously, or if no opinion is expressed, enter “0” for the *opin variable.
  - If the preceding *dir variable is coded nonzero, the *opin variable codes how the respective organization evaluates the changes coded previously.
  - If the preceding *dir variable is coded “0,” the *opin variable codes what type of changes are desirable in the future.

Note that for both the *dir and *opin variables, you should only consider the information provided in the article; do not interpret.
If you find an article that cannot be coded in any of the following categories, or if you find a document that contains more than one article, not the relevant article, or an incomplete article, please mark this article and insert a note under “Notes”. Also, please let us know about that.

Files whose name ends in _XXX do not have to be coded. These files have previously been determined to be uncodable.

All of the following variables focus on the US economy. It is possible that an article mentions changes in a variable of interest abroad. For instance, it might underscore that technology has improved in Europe, that more immigrants enter the European Union, or that China is attracting more foreign direct investment. In all these instances, code the respective first variable with “1” (e.g., technology, immigration, or FDI mentioned), but do not code the changes as mentioned in the article. Instead, code how these changes affect the US economy, if these effects are made explicit in the article. For instance, it is likely that the use of an improved technology abroad or increased FDI inflow to foreign countries increases international economic competition for the US, whereas we cannot say that technology is improving or FDI are decreasing at the same time in the US. If an article deals with the economic situation abroad, code international competition as mentioned.

Also, note that an article might mention changes within the US economy from the perspective of a foreign country. However, try to view all changes from the perspective of the US economy. For instance,

- imports from the US into another country = exports from the US,
- the Yen, Mark, or Pound appreciates against the Dollar = the Dollar depreciates against these currencies, or
- increased co-operation between European countries in the buildup of the European Community = increased international competition.

In the following, we will present a list of questions to describe the various indicators further. Note that this list of questions is not exhaustive.
Trade

Notes: This first set of variables codes whether trade is mentioned in the article. Trade can be any exchange of goods or services between two countries. Both imports and exports count. Besides the direct exchange of goods and services, this variable also captures trade agreements, trade regulations, or trade barriers, and their impact on trade. Trade captures developments expressed in both the exports and imports variables. That is, whenever an article talks about exports, imports, or both, trade has to be coded as well. Changes depicted in the exports and imports variables need to be reflected in the coding of the trade variables as well. That is, for instance, if imports are increasing and an article welcomes these changes, while it does not talk about exports, trade should be coded as increasing as well, with a positive opinion.

trade If yes to any of the below, enter a “1”. If no to all of the above, enter a “0”

- Does the article mention anything about trade between two foreign countries?
- Does the article mention anything about trade between the US and another country?
- Does it mention anything about exports?
- Does it mention anything about imports?
- Does it mention anything about tariffs or quotas?
- Does it mention anything about subsidies, foreign or domestic, and their impact on trade?
- Does it mention anything about other non-tariff barriers?
  - Additional notes: besides quotas, non-tariff barriers could be product standards, export subsidies, intellectual property rights, or other regulations.
- Does it mention anything about protection from foreign competition?
- Does it mention anything about regulations concerning interstate (that is, between two US federal states) commerce?
- Does it mention anything about country of origin labeling?
– Additional note: country of origin labeling (COOL) is a protective measure, so if the article mentions that COOL is increasing that is protectionism and if it is decreasing that is for more openness.

• Does it mention that international competition in trade is replaced by international co-operation in trade?
  – For instance, does it mention anything about international trade negotiations, trade agreements, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the World Trade Organization (WTO), or the impact thereof?
  – Additional note: International competition/co-operation needs to refer to trade. See below on how to code international economic competition more generally.

• Does it mention the impact of transportation on trade / exports / imports?

• Does it mention if the exchange rate between the US dollar and other currencies has changed and that this has affected trade/ exports/ imports?

`trade_dir` What does the group think is happening on trade?

• Does it mention that trade is opening?
  – Examples: Fewer restrictions? Is international competition replaced by international co-operation (leading to increases the volume of goods traded)? Is the volume of goods traded increasing, even though regulations remain unchanged? Is trade relaxation mentioned? Are there changes in transportation that have a positive impact on trade / exports / imports?
  – If yes, enter a “1”

• Does it mention that trade is closing?
  – Examples: More restrictions? Is there less international co-operation, but increased competition? Is the volume of goods traded decreasing, even though regulations remain unchanged? Are there changes in transportation that have a negative impact on trade / exports / imports?
  – If yes, enter a “-1”
• Is it neutral?
  – Examples: Does the article state that trade is neither opening nor closing? Does the volume of goods traded remain the same? No changes mentioned?
  – If yes, enter a “0”
• If trade is not mentioned, enter a ”99”

• Additional notes:
  – As outlined above, COOL is a protective measure. Hence, increases in COOL (i.e., more protection, less trade) should be coded with “-1” and decreases (i.e., less protection, more trade) with “1”.
  – If both exports and imports are mentioned, trade does not refer to net exports, but to the total amount of goods and services traded. That is, if, for instance, imports have increased and exports remained the same, trade has increased as well.
  – If exports and imports have changed in different directions (that is, one has increased, the other one has decreased), we cannot code changes in the absolute number of goods and services shipped and trade_dir should be “0” unless the article provides precise estimates of these changes.

**trade_opin** What does the organization think about these changes?

• Is the article positive about the developments in trade measured with trade_dir? Does it say that trade should increase?
  – Examples: Is the article positive about certain regulations or increases in trade? Does it welcome increased trade opportunities or new trade regulations / agreements? Does it say that trade should increase?
  – If yes, enter a “1”
• Is it negative? Does it say that trade should decrease?
  – Examples: Is the article negative about either increasing imports or decreasing exports? Does it reject existing subsidies abroad? Is it critical about trade negotiations?
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- If yes, enter a “1”

- Is it neutral? Just factual about trade? No opinion expressed?
  - If yes, enter a “0”

- If trade is not mentioned, enter a ”99”

Exports

Notes: This set of variables codes whether exports are mentioned in the article. Exports mean all bilateral relations between two countries in which US goods or services are shipped to another country in exchange for foreign capital. Besides the direct exchange of goods and services, this variable also captures trade agreements, trade regulations, trade barriers, or international competition, and their impact on exports.

exports If yes to any of the below, enter a “1”. If no to all of the below, enter a “0”.

- Does it mention anything about exports or the possibility of exporting from the US to another country?
- Does it mention exports from one country to another?
- Does it mention a foreign government’s subsidies on certain product that affect US exports, or vice versa?
- Does it mention more exports due to a Most Favored Nation Clause?
- Does it mention expanding export markets abroad?
- Are there changes in transportation that have an impact on exports?
- Does it mention foreign tariffs that affect US exports?
- Does it mention the effects of trade negotiations or a trade agreement on exports?
- Does it mention that a foreign currency is appreciating (depreciating) against the US Dollar, which will affect exports from the US to that country positively (negatively)?

exports_dir : What does the organization think is happening to exports?
• Does it mention that exports are increasing?
  – Examples: More opportunities for exporting? Is a ban on a US product lifted in a foreign country? Are there trade negotiations that have led to more opportunities for exporting, for example by reducing existing tariffs or quotas? Does it mention that export markets abroad have expanded? Getting new or more access to a foreign market? Is the amount of goods exported increasing? Do changes in transportation increase (i.e., facilitate) exports?
  – If yes, enter a “1”

• Does it mention that exports are decreasing?
  – Examples: Fewer opportunities for exporting? Less goods exported? Increased protectionism abroad? Does it mention declining market access abroad? Do changes in transportation decrease (i.e., hurt or impede) exports?
  – If yes, enter a “-1”

• Is it neutral?
  – Examples: Does the article state that exports are neither increasing nor decreasing? No changes mentioned?
  – If yes, enter a “0”

• If exports are not mentioned, enter a “99”

• Additional notes: Possibly, an article mentions absolute increases (decreases) in exports, but decreases (increases) in the relative market share of the respective sector. In this case, code as increases (decreases) in exports. Also, if an article mentions imports from the United States into another country, this should be coded as exports from the US.

exports_opin  What does the organization think about the changes in exports?

• Is the article positive? Does it welcome the changes in exports? Does it say that exports should increase?
  – If yes, enter a “1”
• Is it negative about the changes in exports? Does it say that exports should decrease?
  – If yes, enter a “-1”

• Is it neutral? Just factual about exports? No opinion expressed?
  – If yes, enter a “0”

• If exports are not mentioned, enter a “99”

## Imports

*Notes:* This set of variables codes whether imports are mentioned in the article. Imports mean all bilateral relations between two countries in which foreign goods or services are shipped into the US in exchange for US capital. Besides the direct exchange of goods and services, this variable also captures trade agreements, trade regulations, trade barriers, or international competition, and their impact on imports.

**imports** If yes to any of the below, enter a “1”. If no to all of the below, enter a “0”.

• Does it mention anything about imports or the possibility of importing from another country to the US?

• Does it mention goods or services a country imports from another country?

• Does it mention more imports due to a Most Favored Nation clause?

• Does it mention a foreign government’s subsidies on certain products that affect US imports, or vice versa?

• Are there changes in transportation that have an impact on imports?

• Does it mention tariffs that affect US imports?

• Does it mention production conditions abroad that affect US imports?

• Does it mention the effects of trade negotiations or a trade agreement on imports?

• Does it mention that a foreign currency is appreciating (depreciating) against the US Dollar, which will lead to more expensive (cheaper) imports from that country to the US?
imports_dir What does the organization think is happening to imports?

- Does it mention that imports are increasing?
  - Examples: More opportunities for importing? Is the amount of goods imported (in absolute numbers) increasing? Are there trade negotiations that have led to increases in imports into the US? Is the country becoming less protectionist? Do changes in transportation increase (i.e., facilitate) imports?
  - If yes, enter a “1”

- Does it mention that imports are decreasing?
  - Examples: Fewer opportunities for importing? Less goods imported? Is the country becoming more protectionist? Do changes in transportation decrease (i.e., hurt or impede) imports?
  - If yes, enter a “-1”

- Is it neutral? Does the article state that imports have remained the same?
  - If yes, enter a “0”

- If imports are not mentioned, enter a “99”

- Additional Notes: Possibly, an article mentions absolute increases (decreases) in imports, but less (more) demand of a respective sector compared to the rest of the world. In this case, code as increases (decreases) in. Also, if an article mentions exports from another country into the United States, this should be coded as imports to the US.

imports_opin What does the organization think about the changes in exports?

- Is the article positive? Does it welcome the changes in imports? Does it say imports should increase?
  - If yes, enter a “1”

- Is it negative about the changes in imports? Does it say imports should decrease?
  - If yes, enter a “-1”
• Is it neutral? Just factual about imports? No opinion expressed?
  - If yes, enter a “0”

• If imports are not mentioned, enter a “99”

**Domestic Competition**

*Notes:* This set of variables captures competition (as opposed to co-operation) between firms and industries within the United States, especially competition between different regions or states of the country. Increased *domestic competition* between firms or industries might reduce the prices for consumers, but it could lead businesses that are less productive or have higher costs to close. On the other hand, increased co-operation could allow the less productive businesses or those with higher costs to stay open. Also note, domestic competition could refer to businesses owned by people in the US – for example competition between Ford and GM or businesses that produce in the US but are owned by foreign companies – for example, competition between Ford and a Toyota plant in the US.

**dom_competition** If yes to any of the below, enter a “1”. If no to all of the below, enter a “0”.

• Does it mention any thing about domestic competition?

• Does it mention any thing about collusion? About working together to create stable prices?

• Does it mention any thing about cooperating on business?

• Does it mention cooperation on market share? Which markets a firm sells in?

• Does it mention “low-wage areas” in the US?
  
  - *Note:* It suffices if the article describes the idea behind low-wage areas. It is not necessary that the term “low-wage area” be mentioned explicitly in the article.

• Does it mention a domestic black market?

• Does it mention more competition due to increased foreign direct investment into another US state?
• Does it mention monopolies exploiting their preferential position in a specific sector of the US economy?

• Does it mention competitive advantages – lower wages, cheaper electricity costs, less regulation in some US states – of certain branches of the domestic industrial sector at the expense of other branches?
  – If yes to any of the above, enter a “1”
  – If no to all of the above, enter a “0”

• Additional notes: Sometimes, articles might mention that certain sectors, US states, or regions are hit by, e.g., strikes, wage increases, unemployment, labor shortages and the like. These factors are only coded as affecting domestic competition if the article states these factors explicitly in connection with domestic competition.

**dom_comp_dir** What does the organization think is happening to domestic competition?

• Does it mention that domestic competition is increasing?
  – If yes, enter a “1”

• Does it mention that domestic competition is decreasing?
  – If yes, enter a “-1”

• Is it neutral? Does it mention that domestic competition remains the same?
  – If yes, enter a “0”

• If domestic competition is not mentioned, enter a ”99”

• Additional notes: Changes in domestic competition depend on the perspective. One federal state’s improved competitiveness equals another state’s deteriorated position. In coding changes in domestic competition, follow the perspective presented in the article.

**dom_comp_opin** What does the organization think about the changes in domestic competition?

• Is the article positive? Is the level of or the change in domestic competition mentioned to be good or fair? Does it say domestic competition should increase?
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If yes, enter a “1”

• Is it negative? Is the level of or the change in domestic competition described as unfair? Should it be changed? Does it say domestic competition should decrease?
  – If yes, enter a “-1”

• Is it neutral? Just factual about domestic competition? No opinion expressed?
  – If yes, enter a “0”

• If domestic competition is not mentioned, enter a “99”

International Competition

Notes: This set of variables captures competition (as opposed to co-operation) between the United States and another country / other countries. Increased international competition threatens domestic firms and might spark protectionism and / or reduce overall trade. Also, without protectionism, it could decrease prices that consumers pay, leading to lower profits for these businesses; with protection it could increase prices. More international co-operation, on the other hand, is associated with less protectionism, more trade (at least between the countries co-operating with each other), and lead to higher prices and profits for these businesses if they collude with each other and lower prices if they compete with each other. Often, it might be argued that domestic co-operation is required to compete internationally successfully. International competition is clearly linked to the competitiveness of the US industry. That is, whenever an article refers to international competitiveness, code international competition accordingly.

int_competition If yes to any of the below, enter a “1”. If no to all of the below, enter a “0”.

• Does it mention any thing about international competition?

• Does it mention any thing about the way foreign companies work?

• Does it mention any thing about the way a foreign economic works / is structured / has been developing recently / is growing?

• Does it mention “low-wage areas” overseas?
• Does it mention new regulations abroad that pose a threat to the competitiveness of
domestic firms on the international market (e.g., minimum wages, working hours, non-
tariff barriers, ...)?

• Does it mention domestic or foreign subsidies and their impact on international compe-
tition?

• Does it mention the effects of a reciprocal trade agreement on international competition?

• Does it mention international trade negotiations, trade agreements, the GATT, the
WTO, or international dispute settlement mechanisms?

• Does it mention another country’s improving or declining competitiveness (e.g., access
to new resources, cheap labor, or higher wages)?

• Does it mention another country’s improved technology or human capital?

• Does it mention co-operation between foreign countries?

• Does it mention the need to co-operate internationally?

• Does it mention the need to protect national industries?

• Additional notes: Sometimes, articles might mention that the US economy or an econ-
omy abroad is hit by, e.g., strikes, wage increases, inflation, unemployment, labor short-
ages and the like. These factors are only coded as affecting international competition if
the article states these factors explicitly in connection with international competition.
The connection between these conditions and international competition has to be made
explicit.

\textbf{int\_comp\_dir} What does the organization think is happening to international competition?

• Does it mention that international competition is increasing?
  - Examples: Do wage increases in the US decrease its international competitiveness?
  Does it mention that the playing field between two countries is becoming more
  level because the US loses a comparative advantage? For instance, a compara-
tive advantage could be lost because US companies provide more benefits to their
workers, resource prices increase, or a technological advantage over another country is lost. Is the US Dollar appreciating against another currency, which hurts an export-oriented industry?

- If yes, enter a “1”

• Does it mention that international competition is decreasing?

  - Examples: Does it mention that the international position of the US industry has improved relatively because a foreign country’s economy is struck by strikes, wage increases, among others? Is the level of international competition decreasing because exchange rates are changing?
  - If yes, enter a “-1”

• Is it neutral? Does it mention that international competition remains the same?

  - If yes, enter a “0”

• If international competition is not mentioned, enter a ”99”

**int_comp_opin** What does the organization think about the changes in international competition?

• Is the article positive? Is the change in international competition mentioned to be good or fair? Does it say international competition should increase?

  - If yes, enter a “1”

• Is it negative? Is level change in international competition described as unfair? Does it say that international competition should decrease?

  - If yes, enter a “-1”

• Is it neutral? Just factual about international competition? No opinion expressed?

  - If yes, enter a “0”

• If international competition is not mentioned, enter a ”99”
Immigration

Notes: Immigration refers to movements of people from foreign countries into the United States. These variables, however, measure also bills concerning immigration, and the extent to which an industry or the government aim at attracting a certain number of immigrants. Immigrants enter the country often temporarily only, e.g., in the harvest season. Immigration covers all different types of immigrants: low-skill, high-skill, refugees, undocumented (“illegal”) immigrants, and asylum seekers, but also prisoners of war (POW). Below you will be asked to code whether the immigration variable refers to low-skill or high-skill immigrants directly. If the article specifies low or high-skill immigrants, you will enter a “1” for both this question and the question referring to the skill level, and code the *_dir and *opin variables as specified below. The overall immigration variables should be coded as long as any type of immigration is mentioned.

immigration If yes to any of the below, enter a “1”. If no to all of the below, enter a “0”.

- Does it mention immigrants coming into the US?
- Law or policy aimed specifically to attract or repel immigrants?
- Change in this policy?
- Does it mention foreign labor?
- Does it mention treaties between the governments of the US and another countries to attract (repel) foreign labor (so-called Bilateral Labor Migration Treaties, BLMT)?
- Does it mention the possibility of obtaining citizenship for immigrants? Giving legal status to undocumented immigrants?
- Does it mention that workers are immigrants or foreigners?
- Does it mention visa regulations, visa restrictions, new visa for immigrants, or (a change in) the number of naturalizations? Amnesty laws?
- Does it mention refugees, asylum seekers, undocumented immigrants, prisoners of war, or foreigners in work camps?

immi_dir What does the organization think is happening to immigration?
• Is immigration increasing?
    – If yes, enter a “1”
• Is immigration decreasing?
  – Examples: Fewer immigrants admitted to the US? Fewer people getting US citizenship? A more restrictive policy toward immigrants? Are fewer visa granted to certain immigrant groups? An existing BLMT is not extended?
    – If yes, enter a “-1”
• Is it neutral on whether immigration is increasing or decreasing? No changes mentioned?
    – If yes, enter a “0”
• If immigration is not mentioned, enter a ”99”

immi_opin What does the organization think about the changes in immigration?
• Is the article positive about the developments measured previously? Does it say that immigration should increase?
  – If yes, enter a “1”
• Is it negative about them? Does it say that immigration should decrease?
  – If yes, enter a “-1”
• Is it neutral? Just factual about immigration? No opinion expressed?
  – If yes, enter a “0”
• If immigration is not mentioned, enter a ”99”
Low-skill immigration

Notes: Low-skill immigrants are those people who do not have specific skills that allow them to work only in certain areas. Often, low-skill immigrants work in factories at assembly lines, are farm workers, or work in the low-skill service sector (fast-food industry, hotels, etc.). Their work does not require a high level of education or specific training.

ls_immigration If yes to any of the below, enter a “1”. If no to all of the below, enter a “0”.

- Does it mention low-skill immigrants into the US?
- Law or policy aimed specifically to attract or repel low-skill immigrants?
- Change in this policy?
- Citizenship for low-skill immigrants? Amnesty laws? Granting residence permit to undocumented immigrants or refugees?
- Does it mention that low-skill workers are immigrants or foreigners?
- Does it mention refugees, undocumented immigrants, Prisoners of War (POW), or foreigners in work camps?
- Does it mention foreign farm laborers? Does it mention Mexican workers in the US?
- Does it mention visa restrictions or liberations for immigrants?
- Does it mention the H-2A Visa program?
  - H-2A Visa is a visa for temporary or seasonal agricultural work in the US.
- Does it mention specific bills (e.g., AgJOBS) aimed at changing the number of immigrants in the United States?

ls_immi_dir What does the organization think is happening to low-skill immigration?

- Is low-skill immigration increasing?
immigrants that are granted official documentation or that are naturalized if certain conditions are met?

– If yes, enter a “1”

• Is low-skill immigration decreasing?

  – Examples: Less low-skill immigrants admitted to the US? Fewer low-skill people getting US citizenship? A more restrictive policy toward low-skill immigrants? Are fewer visa granted to certain low-skill immigration groups?
  
  – If yes, enter a “-1”

• Is it neutral on whether low-skill immigration is increasing or decreasing? Does it remain unclear?

  – If yes, enter a “0”

• If low-skill immigration is not mentioned, enter a ”99”

ls_immi_opin What does the organization think about the changes in low-skill immigration?

• Is the article positive about the developments measured previously? Does the article say that low-skill immigration should increase? Does it express the need for more low-skill labor

  – If yes, enter a “1”

• Is it negative about them? Does the article say that low-skill immigration should decrease?

  – If yes, enter a “-1”

• Is it neutral? Just factual about low-skill immigration? No opinion expressed?

  – If yes, enter a “0”

• If low-skill immigration is not mentioned, enter a ”99”
High-skill immigration

Notes: High-skill immigrants are those people who possess specific skills that allow them to work only in certain areas. For instance, high-skill immigrants work in IT, academia, business administration, financial markets, etc. Their work requires a high level of education or special training.

**hs_immigration** If yes to any of the below, enter a “1”. If no to all of the below, enter a “0”.

- Does it mention high-skill immigrants into the US?
- Does it mention visas aimed at attracting high-skill immigrants? Does it mention student exchange programs?
- Law or policy aimed specifically to attract or repel high-skill immigrants?
- Citizenship for high-skill immigrants?
- Does it mention that high-skill workers are immigrants or foreigners?
- Does it mention the need to attract more foreign high-skill workers because demand for them is higher than supply in the US?

**hs_immi_dir** What does the organization think is happening to high-skill immigration?

- Is high-skill immigration increasing?
  - Examples: More high-skill immigrants admitted to the US? More high-skill people getting US citizenship? A more open policy toward high-skill immigrants? Are more visa granted to certain high-skill immigrant groups?
  - If yes, enter a “1”

- Is high-skill immigration decreasing?
  - Examples: Less high-skill immigrants admitted to the US? Fewer high-skill people getting US citizenship? A more restrictive policy toward high-skill immigrants? Are fewer visa granted to certain high-skill immigrant groups?
  - If yes, enter a “-1”
• Is it neutral on whether high-skill immigration is increasing or decreasing? Does it remain unclear?
  – If yes, enter a “0”

• If high-skill immigration is not mentioned, enter a ”99”

**hs_immi_opin** What does the organization think about the changes in high-skill immigration?

• Is the article positive about the developments measured previously? Does it mention that more high-skill immigrant labor is necessary to fulfill all orders or ensure a certain level of production? Does it say that high-skill immigration should increase?
  – If yes, enter a “1”

• Is it negative about it? Does it say that high-skill immigration should decrease?
  – If yes, enter a “-1”

• Is it neutral? Just factual about high-skill immigration? No opinion expressed?
  – If yes, enter a “0”

• If high-skill immigration is not mentioned, enter a ”99”

**Enforcement**

*Notes:* The *enforcement* variables measure enforcement of immigration policies. Often, certain regulations are passed by national or state legislatures, but the extent to which these regulations are enforced varies considerably. For example, immigration might be strictly limited but not enforced to a great extent. This could lead to a large number of migrants entering the country without proper documentation. That is, the number of immigrants entering a country is also a function of enforcement. Note the difference between the immigration and the enforcement variables: the former refers to specific bills or regulations aimed that changing the official number of immigrants allowed in the country and thereby regulating migration flows. The latter refers to measures taken to enforce these formal rules and influence migrations flows without changing official laws and regulations. For instance, it captures whether government authorities are trying to reduce the
number of new immigrants *within the existing legal framework* by increasing border patrols or creating legal sanctions for employers who hire undocumented immigrants. Enforcement measures can also make it harder for undocumented immigrants to obtain fraudulent documents and thereby reduce the number of undocumented immigrants entering the country.

**enforcement** If yes to any of the below, enter a “1”. If no to all of the below, enter a “0”.

- Does it mention enforcement of immigration laws?
- Border patrols or new fencing across the border?
- Legal ramifications?
- Raids on farms?
- Fines?
- E-verify (a computer system that checks the status of workers)?
- New id cards, passports, or other official identification documents (green cards, birth certificates, social security cards etc.)?
- Ways to protect employers from fines?

**enforce_dir** What does the organization think is happening to enforcement?

- Is enforcement increasing?
  - If yes, enter a “1”
- Is enforcement decreasing?
  - Examples: Fewer raids etc?
  - If yes, enter a “-1”
- Is it neutral on whether it is increasing or decreasing?
  - If yes, enter a “0”
- If enforcement is not mentioned, enter a ”99”
enforce_opin What does the organization think about the changes in enforcement?

- Is the article positive about these developments? Does it say that enforcement should increase?
  - Examples: Does the article welcome the increased number of border patrols? Does it advocate improved ID cards that are harder to falsify?
  - If yes, enter a “1”

- Is it negative about enforcement? Does it say that enforcement should decrease?
  - Examples: Does the article criticize the authorities for not supplying the Border Patrol with adequate funds?
  - If yes, enter a “-1”

- Is it neutral? Just factual about enforcement? No opinion expressed?
  - If yes, enter a “0”

- If enforcement is not mentioned, enter a ”99”

Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) – Inflows

Notes: Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) describes capital flows from one country to another. This capital is used to invest in existing companies or build new factories abroad. Often, these new factories are part of Multi-National Corporations (MNCs). FDI can boost economic growth in the host country (i.e., the country in which capital is invested), especially where domestic capital is sparse. As international capital gets more and more mobile, investors’ choices as to in which countries they wish to invest have increased. Therefore, potential host countries have to offer the best economic and investment conditions possible in order to compete successfully for FDI. For these reasons, international competition for FDI is severe. Inflows of FDI mean all investments from foreign companies or investors in the US.

infl_fdi If yes to any of the below, enter a “1”. If no to all of the below, enter a “0”.

- Does it mention foreign direct investment in the US?
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- Does it mention foreign companies or investors investing in the US?
- Moving production from another country to the US?
- Is it about the US offering incentives to move from another country to the US?
- How to do business in the US compared to another country?
- Promises of doing business in the US?

**infl_fdi_dir** What does the organization think is happening to inflows of FDI?

- Are FDI inflows increasing?
  - Examples: More companies moving to the US? Is the US attracting more investment from abroad?
  - If yes, enter a “1”

- Are FDI inflows decreasing?
  - Examples: Fewer companies moving to the US? Is the US attracting less foreign investment?
  - If yes, enter a “-1”

- Is it neutral on whether it is increasing or decreasing?
  - If yes, enter a “0”

- If FDI is not mentioned, enter a “99”

**infl_fdi_opin** What does the organization think about the changes in inflows of FDI?

- Is the article positive? Does it welcome the changes in / current state of FDI inflows? Does it say that FDI inflows should increase?
  - If yes, enter a “1”

- Is it negative about the changes in / current state of FDI inflows? Does it say that FDI inflows should decrease?
  - If yes, enter a “-1”
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- Is it neutral? Just factual about FDI inflows? No opinion expressed?
  - If yes, enter a “0”
- If FDI is not mentioned, enter a ”99”

**Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) – Outflows**

*Notes: Outflows of FDI mean all investments from US companies or investors in another country.*

`outfl_fdi` If yes to any of the below, enter a “1”. If no to all of the below, enter a “0”.

- Does it mention foreign direct investment from the US in another country?
- US companies investing abroad? US companies building new factories abroad?
- Does it mention branches of US banks overseas that facilitate economic investment in the host country?
- Moving production to another country?
- Is it about another country offering incentives to move?
- How to do business in another country?
- Perils of doing business in another country?
- Additional notes: If it is not discernible whether the article refers to FDI inflows or outflows, or if the article mentions FDI in general, enter a “9”. Then, answer the following two questions referring to FDI in general.

`outfl_fdi_dir`: What does the organization think is happening to outflows of FDI?

- Are FDI outflows increasing?
  - Examples: More companies moving abroad? Do foreign countries attract more FDI from the US? Domestic countries deciding to move abroad due to bad conditions in the US?
  - If yes, enter a “1”
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- Are FDI outflows decreasing?
  - Examples: Fewer companies moving abroad? Do foreign countries attract less FDI from the US?
  - If yes, enter a “1”

- Is it neutral on whether FDI outflows are increasing or decreasing?
  - If yes, enter a “0”

- If FDI outflows are not mentioned, enter a ”99”

outfl_fdi_opin What does the organization think about the changes in outflows of FDI?

- Is the article positive? Does it welcome the changes in / current state of FDI outflows? Does it say that US companies should invest more abroad?
  - If yes, enter a “1”

- Is it negative about the changes in / current state of FDI outflows? Does it say that US companies should invest less abroad?
  - If yes, enter a “-1”

- Is it neutral? Just factual about FDI outflows? No opinion expressed?
  - If yes, enter a “0”

- If FDI outflows are not mentioned, enter a ”99”

Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) – interstate flows

Notes: While FDI is mostly conceptualized as capital moving from one country to another, we can also investigate FDI flows within one country. We define interstate FDI flows as all investments from one US state to another. These flows are assessed with the following three variables. Additionally, we are interested in cross-state competition for FDI: e.g., are special programs in certain US states that aim at attracting more international FDI relative to the FDI attracted by other states?

inter_fd If yes to any of the below, enter a “1”. If no to all of the below, enter a “0”.

• Does it mention investment flowing from one US state to another? US companies moving into a different US state?

• Is it about another state offering incentives to move?

• Does any of the following affect investment flows from one state to another: Are regulations for business better in another state? Lower minimum wage? No unions? Fewer restrictions on child or female labor?
  
  – *Note:* This would be coded under domestic competition as well.

• How to do business in another state?

• Perils of doing business in another state?

**inter_fdi_dir:** What does the organization think is happening to flows of interstate FDI?

• Are interstate FDI flows increasing?
  
  – Examples: Certain US states attracting more FDI or trying to attract more FDI from other US states?
  
  – If yes, enter a “1”

• Are interstate FDI flows decreasing?
  
  – Examples: Fewer companies moving within the US? Fewer companies moving within the country?
  
  – If yes, enter a “-1”

• Is it neutral on whether interstate FDI flows are increasing or decreasing?
  
  – If yes, enter a “0”

• If interstate FDI flows are not mentioned, enter a ”99”

**inter_fdi_opin** What does the organization think about the changes in interstate FDI?

• Is the article positive? Does it welcome the changes in / current state of interstate FDI flows? Does it say that interstate FDI should increase?
  
  – If yes, enter a “1”
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- Is it negative about the changes in / current state of interstate FDI flows? Does it say that interstate FDI should decrease?
  - If yes, enter a “-1”

- Is it neutral? Just factual about interstate FDI flows? No opinion expressed?
  - If yes, enter a “0”

- If interstate FDI flows are not mentioned, enter a ”99”

Productivity – Technology

*Notes:* An improved technology such as a new machine can usually be used to save labor, reduce the costs of production, and/or increase the output per worker employed (i.e., increase the efficiency of production). The variable *technology* measures whether the article mentions any such technology. As usual the article needs to make the connection between this technology and changes in productivity explicit.

**product_tech** If yes to any of the below, enter a “1”. If no to all of the below, enter a “0”.

- Is it about a new labor saving technology?
- Is it about a new way to increase production, given constant inputs (resources, capital, and labor)?
- Does it mention how technology is changing?
- Does it mention how technology might change costs, the quantity produced, or product prices?
- Additional notes: that it does not count here if an article is merely descriptive about an industry (e.g., overall production of steel has increased, or more and more goods in a particular industry have been sold).

**product_tech_dir:** What does the organization think is happening to technology?

- Is technology increasing?
Examples: More ways to use machines, save labor, or increase production, given fixed inputs? Does the article mention increased efficiency in a sector?

- If yes, enter a “1”

- Note that a mere increase in production should not be coded as improvement in technology if this increase in production is also accompanied by an increase in inputs.

- Is technology decreasing or unavailable?
  - If yes, enter a “-1”

- Is it neutral on whether it is increasing or decreasing / unavailable?
  - If yes, enter a “0”

- If technology is not mentioned, enter a ”99”

**product_tech_opin** What does the organization think about the changes in technology?

- Is the article positive? Does it welcome the changes in technology? Does it mention the need to have a new technology?
  - If yes, enter a “1”

- Is it negative about the changes in technology? Does it say that technology should decrease?
  - If yes, enter a “-1”

- Is it neutral? Just factual about technology? No opinion expressed?
  - If yes, enter a “0”

- If technology is not mentioned, enter a ”99”

**Productivity – Human Capital**

*Notes:* Apart from technological inventions, a firm can also invest in human capital to increase productivity. These investments describe all measures undertaken to improve the education of a
firm’s workforce, their skills, their health, or any other measure that is not related to technology but aimed at improving output per worker and overall efficiency.

product_hc: If yes to any of the below, enter a “1”. If no to all of the below, enter a “0”.

- Does the article mention improvements in working conditions or access to sanitation in the firm or workers’ housing that affect the workers’ ability to work?
- Does it mention that workers’ satisfaction is associated with higher productivity?
- Does it mention the effect of better education on productivity?
- Does it mention the need to improve health standards in a factory in order to reduce sick days and improve overall output per worker?
- Additional notes: that it does not count here if an article is merely descriptive about an industry (e.g., overall production of steel has increased, or more and more goods in a particular industry have been sold) or about the working and/or living conditions of the workforce. The article needs to make the connection between human capital / living conditions and productivity explicit.

product_hc_dir: What does the organization think is happening to human capital?

- Is productivity increasing due to changes in human capital?
  - Examples: Better education of the workforce? Increased satisfaction? Better sanitation?
  - If yes, enter a “1”
  - Note that a mere increase in production should not be coded as improvement here if this increase in production is also accompanied by an increase in inputs.

- Is productivity deteriorating due to changes in human capital?
  - If yes, enter a “-1”
  - Note that some of the articles make productivity changes due to investments in human capital seem necessary or aspirational. If, in this case, better human capital is unavailable, it is perceived as a “loss” and should therefore be coded with “-1”.
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• Is it neutral on whether it is increasing or decreasing / unavailable?
  – If yes, enter a "0"

• If human capital is not mentioned, enter a "99"

`product_hc_opin`: What does the organization think about the changes in human capital?

• Is the article positive? Does it welcome the changes in human capital? Does it mention the need to improve human capital / the living and working conditions of the workforce?
  – If yes, enter a "1"

• Is it negative about the changes in human capital? Does it mention the need to decrease human capital / the living and working conditions of the workforce?
  – If yes, enter a "-1"

• Is it neutral? Just factual about human capital? No opinion expressed?
  – If yes, enter a "0"

• If human capital is not mentioned, enter a "99"


