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Motivation: How do People Reason about Trade and Trade Policy?

1. How do people perceive and understand trade and trade policy?
   - Efficiency gains?
   - Distributional impacts (workers, firms, and consumers)?

2. Which factors shape their support for different trade policies?
   - Material self-interest?
   - Broader social and economic concerns?
   - Trade restrictions vs. compensatory redistribution?

Address these questions using surveys and experiments.
The Factors Shaping Views on Trade Policy

Views on trade policy: trade restrictions and compensatory redistribution

---

Self-interest (perceived and objective)

I. As a Consumer
   - Impact on prices
   - Impact on variety

II. As a Worker

Exposure through:
   - Occupation
   - Sector
   - Local labor market
   - Human capital (education)

Broader economic & social concerns

III. Perceived efficiency effects of trade

IV. Perceived distributional impacts of trade

V. Patriotism, partisanship, geopolitical concerns

---

A

B

C

Social Economics Surveys and Experiments

- Surveys have been used for a long time for measurement & statistics.

  We now have high-quality admin data on many variables (income, family situation, employment, etc.)

- Yet, some things remain invisible in data other than survey data (even great data!): perceptions, attitudes and beliefs, knowledge, and reasoning.

  Critical role in social, economic, and political outcomes.

- Revealed preference approach – our holy grail – can be challenging due to lack of data and identifying variation.

  We often do not “reveal” our beliefs, attitudes, perceptions, etc. on important issues with our micro, observed behaviors.

- Surveys are more than a measurement tool. Control of data generating process. “Creating your own identifying variation and uncovering the invisible.”
Using Surveys

- Survey answers are correlated with real-world behaviors (see Fehr et al. (2020), Tannenbaum et al. (2020), Funk (2016), and Hainmueller et al. (2015), and the review in Stantcheva (2022)).
- If used well, approach can be applied to many settings and questions (including as complement to other approaches).
- New mobile technologies & platforms offer opportunities.
- For the results to be reliable, it is critical that these surveys are well-designed, carefully calibrated, and deployed on appropriate samples.
- **Comprehensive guide**: “How to Run Surveys: A guide to creating your own identifying variation and revealing the invisible.” (socialeconomicslab.org/how-to-run-surveys/)
Surveys and Sample

Data collection: 2 surveys of US residents between 18 and 70.

Survey 1: 1,771 respondents between August and September 2019.

Survey 2: 2,148 respondents between November and December 2020.

Question design: balanced and benchmarking, images, minimize sensitive questions.

Avoiding selection: Recruit respondents without revealing topic or our identity.

Careless responses: timer on each page; attention check questions.

Feedback post-survey: 80% thought was unbiased; 12% thought was left-wing biased; 8% right-wing.
Survey 1 Structure

Background of Respondent:
- Gender, age, income, education, family situation, political views, media exposure, patriotism.

Open-ended Questions:
- Main considerations, goals of trade policy, shortcomings, effects of tariffs.

Knowledge about Trade:
- What is an import tariff? From which countries do the U.S. import?

Informational and Pedagogical Videos

Redistribution | Efficiency | Economist | No Video
---|---|---|---
\[ \frac{1}{9} \] | \[ \frac{1}{9} \] | \[ \frac{2}{9} \] | \[ \frac{5}{9} \]

Reasoning about Trade – Generic Phrasing:
- Distributional impacts: Which groups have benefited from trade?
- Efficiency effects: Did trade make firms in the U.S. more competitive?

Reasoning about Trade – Personalized Phrasing:
- Distributional impacts: Have you benefited from trade?
- Efficiency effects: Did trade make firms in your sector more competitive?

Policy Views:
- Support for free trade or trade restrictions: should the U.S. aim at reducing barriers?
- Compensatory redistribution: should the government invest more in retraining programs for those hurt by trade?
- General redistribution: should the government invest more in better schools for children from low-income families?

Views on Government
There are often both **winners** and **losers** from trade.

When there is more trade, all **households** who **consume** the imported goods can gain from it. The benefits from increased trade can be perceived by a **large group**, throughout the country.

The losers from trade are generally a **smaller group**, often concentrated in one place or industry. However, their losses can be very large, and therefore more **visible**.
Efficiency Effects Treatment

When there is more trade between the two countries, companies in the car sector from country A will be able to export more of the goods and services they produce and increase their profits.

Firms in the clothing sectors will not be able to export much because they cannot produce as cheaply as the firms in country B. In these sectors, companies may close down because of the new foreign competition.

More trade can also increase learning between firms and people in countries A and B as well as the diffusion of knowledge and technology. This can make all firms and people more productive.

In a larger market, domestic industries have to be more efficient to remain competitive.
Imagine that a country, that we call country A, starts trading more with a foreign country, called country B.

In a larger market, domestic industries have to be more efficient to remain competitive. This can raise U.S. firms’ productivity and spur long-run economic growth.

Imagine that the U.S. starts trading more with a foreign country, called country X.

The government can try and reduce the losses by helping U.S. workers in the sectors hurt by trade such as the clothing sector.
Survey 2 Structure

Background of Respondent:
Gender, age, income, education, family situation, political views, media exposure, patriotism.

Views on Government

1/3

Priming Treatment: Own Job Risks

1/3

Priming Treatment: Own Consumption

1/3

Control Group

Policy Views:

➢ Support for free trade or trade restrictions: should the U.S. aim at reducing barriers?
➢ Compensatory redistribution: should the government invest more in retraining programs for those hurt by trade?
➢ General redistribution: should the government invest more in better schools for children from low-income families?
What are the main considerations that come to your mind when you think about the U.S. trading with foreign countries and how your job has been affected by it? [Open ended]

Since 2000, more than 5 million jobs in the manufacturing sectors have been lost. One of the causes behind this decline is the increased competition with foreign countries that pay lower wages to their workers. How serious of a threat do you think trade with foreign countries pose for the future of your sector?

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? “Because of trade and the resulting competition with foreign countries that pay lower wages to their workers, my wage has not grown as fast as it would otherwise have”?

How likely do you think it is that, over the next 10 years, your job will be outsourced, offshored, or automated because of competition with foreign countries?
Own Consumption (Priming) Treatment

Imagine the U.S. did not trade goods and services with other countries. What are the main things you feel like you’d be missing? [Open-ended]

Can you think of some goods only produced in foreign countries that you regularly buy and consume because of trade with foreign countries? Please describe. [Open-ended]

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

• Trade with other countries has decreased the prices of the goods I regularly buy by increasing competition among firms.

• Trade with other countries has increased the variety of the goods I have access to in ordinary stores.
Descriptive Statistics:
Knowledge and Policy Views
Views on Trade Policy

• Trade policy is multifaceted:

Trade restrictions.

Redistribution policy: compensatory redistribution (targeted, e.g., direct assistance, retraining programs, or transfers) or general redistribution (indirect, income-targeted policies, e.g., transfers or wage subsidies).

• Most respondents (63%) are supportive of free trade.

• Preferred policy to help workers in declining industries: direct assistance and retraining (53%), production subsidies (11%), and import restrictions (36%).

• Many respondents believe the government should be responsible for regulating trade (61%), and ensuring the stability of the dollar (75%).
(a) From Which Country Does the U.S. Import the Most?

- China: 71%
- Canada: 7%
- Brazil: 1%
- France: 1%
- Germany: 1%
- India: 1%
- Ireland: 0%
- Italy: 1%
- Japan: 4%
- Mexico: 7%
- Netherlands: 1%
- South Korea: 1%
- Switzerland: 1%
- Taiwan: 1%
- United Kingdom: 4%

(b) From Which Country Does the U.S. Export the Most?

- China: 44%
- Canada: 19%
- Brazil: 1%
- France: 1%
- Germany: 2%
- India: 2%
- Ireland: 0%
- Italy: 1%
- Japan: 5%
- Mexico: 14%
- Netherlands: 0%
- South Korea: 1%
- Switzerland: 0%
- Taiwan: 0%
- United Kingdom: 9%
Share of Correct Answers to Trade-Related Knowledge Questions

- Know what a quota is: 48% correct
- Know what an import tariff is: 80% correct
- Believe prices abroad ↑ if export tax ↑: 64% correct
- Believe US prices ↑ if import tariff ↑: 66% correct
- Even if US can produce goods at lower cost, may still make sense to import: 71% correct
Diffuse Consumer Gains and Concentrated Job Losses
Perceived Personal Impacts as Consumers

Views on trade policy:
- trade restrictions and compensatory redistribution

Self-interest (perceived and objective)

- Impact on prices
- Impact on variety

Exposure through:
- Occupation
- Sector
- Local labor market
- Human capital (education)

As a Consumer

As a Worker

Broader economic & social concerns

- Perceived efficiency effects of trade
- Perceived distributional impacts of trade
- Patriotism, partisanship, geopolitical concerns
Perceived Personal Impacts as Consumers

**Own consumption impact**
- Trade ↑ variety of goods they buy
- Trade ↓ prices of goods sold in US
- Trade ↓ prices of goods they buy

**Own job impact**
- Their job is negatively impacted by trade
- Their job likely to be outsourced or offshored
- Trade is very serious threat to future of their sector

**Overall impact**
- They are worse off from trade
- They are better off from trade

Share of respondents who believe that...
Perceived Personal Impacts as Workers

Views on trade policy: trade restrictions and compensatory redistribution

Self-interest (perceived and objective)

I. As a Consumer
   - Impact on prices
   - Impact on variety

II. As a Worker

Exposure through:
   - Occupation
   - Sector
   - Local labor market
   - Human capital (education)

Broader economic & social concerns

III. Perceived efficiency effects of trade

IV. Perceived distributional impacts of trade

V. Patriotism, partisanship, geopolitical concerns
Perceived Personal Impacts as Workers

**Own consumption impact**
- Trade ↑ variety of goods they buy
- Trade ↓ prices of goods sold in US
- Trade ↓ prices of goods they buy

**Own job impact**
- Their job is negatively impacted by trade
- Their job likely to be outsourced or offshored
- Trade is very serious threat to future of their sector

**Overall impact**
- They are worse off from trade
- They are better off from trade

Share of respondents who believe that...
Overall Impact from Trade

Own consumption impact
- Trade $\uparrow$ variety of goods they buy
- Trade $\downarrow$ prices of goods sold in US
- Trade $\downarrow$ prices of goods they buy

Own job impact
- Their job is negatively impacted by trade
- Their job likely to be outsourced or offshored
- Trade is a very serious threat to future of their sector

Overall impact
- They are worse off from trade
- They are better off from trade

Share of respondents who believe that...
The Link between Perceived and Actual Exposure to Trade

Correlation between Perceived and Objective Exposure Measures

Measure of Exposure
- Routine occupation
- Local labor market
- Comparative advantage occupation
- Routine occ. x Tradable sect.
- Offshorable occ. x Tradable sect.
- Routine x Offshorable occupation
- Tradable sector
- Local lab. mkt x Tradable sect.
- Local lab. mkt x Routine occ. x Tradable sect.
- College Degree
Self-interest and Support for Free Trade

Views on trade policy: trade restrictions and compensatory redistribution

Self-interest (perceived and objective)

I As a Consumer

II As a Worker

Exposure through:
- Impact on prices
- Impact on variety

III Perceived efficiency effects of trade

IV Perceived distributional impacts of trade

V Patriotism, partisanship, geopolitical concerns

Broader economic & social concerns
Perceptions of consumer gains are not correlated with support for free trade
Perceptions of consumer gains are not correlated with support for free trade.

Consumption gains
- Trade decreases prices of consumer goods
- Treatment: Own Consumption

Job impacts
- Comparative advantage occupation
- Routine & offshorable occupation
- Tradable sector
- Perceived exposure (being worse-off from trade)
- College
- High-income
- Treatment: Own Job Risks
Own job risks are significantly correlated with support for free trade.
Own job risks are significantly correlated with support for free trade

Consumption gains
- Trade decreases prices of consumer goods
- Treatment: Own Consumption

Job impacts
- Comparative advantage occupation
- Routine & offshorable occupation
- Tradable sector
- Perceived exposure (being worse-off from trade)
- College
- High-income
- Treatment: Own Job Risks
Own job risks are significantly correlated with support for free trade.
Finding 1: Perceived job risks matter more for policy views than potential consumer gains.

Research has highlighted the diffuse consumer gains and concentrated job losses from trade.

I directly show the impact of these two considerations on people’s views about trade.

Respondents perceive consumer gains from trade as vague and diffuse.

A minority of respondents feels directly threatened by trade via their job but this exposure is pivotal for their views on trade.

⇒ perceived job risks matter more than potential consumer gains.
Efficiency versus Equity Concerns and the Importance of Compensatory Redistribution
The Role of Perceived Efficiency Effects of Trade

Views on trade policy: trade restrictions and compensatory redistribution

Self-interest (perceived and objective)

I As a Consumer
- Impact on prices
- Impact on variety

II As a Worker

Exposure through:
- Occupation
- Sector
- Local labor market
- Human capital (education)

III Perceived efficiency effects of trade

IV Perceived distributional impacts of trade

V Patriotism, partisanship, geopolitical concerns

Broader economic & social concerns

A

B

C

I

II

III

IV

V
Many Respondents Think Trade has Positive Efficiency Effects

- Both countries better off when trading: 68%
- Trade ↑ GDP growth of the U.S.: 62%
- Trade ↑ innovation in the U.S.: 69%
- Trade ↑ competition in the U.S.: 61%
Effect of Perceived Efficiency Effects on Policy Views: Support for Free Trade

Beliefs
- Trade increases innovation, competitiveness, and GDP
- Large companies won more than small ones
- High-income HHs benefited more than low-income HHs
- Sector switch easier if high-skill
- Trade major reason for rise in inequality
- Trade major reason for unemployment and hurts US workers
- Possible to compensate losers through policies

Experimental effects
- Distributional treatment
- Economist (=Efficiency + Distributive)
The Role of Perceived Distributional Impacts of Trade

Views on trade policy: trade *restrictions* and compensatory *redistribution*

**Self-interest** (perceived and objective)
- As a Consumer
  - Impact on *prices*
  - Impact on *variety*
- As a Worker
  - Perceived efficiency effects of trade
  - Perceived distributional impacts of trade

**Broader economic & social concerns**
- Patriotism, partisanship, geopolitical concerns

**Exposure** through:
- Occupation
- Sector
- Local labor market
- Human capital (education)
Respondents Understand that Trade Can Have Adverse Distributional Impacts

### Distributional impacts

**Impacts through the labor market**

- Overall trade helped U.S. workers: 50%
- Trade is a major reason for unemployment & decline of industries: 79%
- High-skilled workers can easily change sector: 63%
- Low-skilled workers can easily change sector: 37%
- The main cause for loss of manufacturing jobs is: 47% Trade, 42% Automation

**Impact on inequality**

- Trade is a major reason for the rise in inequality: 66%
- More trade can make all better off (losers can be compensated): 62%
- Low-income households gained from trade: 20%
- Middle-income households gained from trade: 23%
- High-income households gained from trade: 61%
- Small businesses gained from trade: 19%
- Large corporations gained from trade: 67%
Effect of Perceived Distributional Impacts on Policy Views: Support for Free Trade

Efficiency Effects

- Trade increases innovation, competitiveness, and GDP

Experimental effects

- Efficiency effects treatment

Distributional Effects

- Large companies won more than small ones
- High-income HHs benefited more than low-income HHs
- Sector switch easier if high-skill
- Trade major reason for rise in inequality
- Trade major reason for unemployment and hurts US workers
- Possible to compensate losers through policies

Experimental effects

- Distributional treatment
- Economist

(=Efficiency + Distributive)
Effect of Perceived Distributional Impacts on Policy Views: Support for Redistribution

Efficiency Effects
- Beliefs
  - Trade increases innovation, competitiveness, and GDP

Experimental effects
- Efficiency effects treatment

Distributional Effects
- Beliefs
  - Large companies won more than small ones
  - High-income HHs benefited more than low-income HHs
  - Sector switch easier if high-skill
  - Trade major reason for rise in inequality

- Experimental effects
  - Trade major reason for unemployment and hurts US workers
  - Possible to compensate losers through policies

Distributional treatment
- Economist
  (=Efficiency + Distributive)
Finding 2: Efficiency versus equity concerns and the importance of compensatory redistribution

People care about the broader efficiency gains and adverse distributional consequences from trade beyond their own material self-interest.

Many respondents believe in positive efficiency gains in the form of higher competitiveness, innovation, and growth.

Respondents also understand that trade can have adverse distributional consequences.

Agreement on some of the winners from trade, namely large companies and high-income households.

More pessimism and disagreement on how trade benefits workers, people with low incomes, and the middle class and how it shapes inequality and unemployment.
Finding 2: Compensatory redistribution is crucial

Belief that is most predictive of support for open trade is that trade generates a variety of efficiency gains.

People who believe that those hurt by trade can be helped using other tools (i.e., compensatory redistribution) do not oppose free trade, even if they are convinced that it will entail adverse distributional consequences. Instead, they support more redistribution.

Findings highlight that the two facets of trade policy (trade barriers & compensatory policies) are driven by different considerations and are indissociable in people’s minds.

Need to provide such redistribution and ensure citizens understand it if support for free trade is to be maintained.
The Direct and Indirect Roles of Exposure to Trade
Exposure to trade shapes beliefs about broader impacts of trade

Views on trade policy: trade restrictions and compensatory redistribution

Self-interest (perceived and objective)

As a Consumer

I

• Impact on prices
• Impact on variety

As a Worker

II

Exposure through:
• Occupation
• Sector
• Local labor market
• Human capital (education)

Broader economic & social concerns

III

Perceived efficiency effects of trade

IV

Perceived distributional impacts of trade

V

Patriotism, partisanship, geopolitical concerns
Exposure to trade shapes beliefs about broader efficiency impacts of trade

- Both countries better off when trading: 47% believe both are better off, 78% believe one country is better off.
- Trade ↑ GDP growth of the U.S.: 37% believe trade leads to growth, 72% believe it does not.
- Trade ↑ innovation in the U.S.: 45% believe trade increases innovation, 72% believe it does not.

**Respondent feels:**
- Better off from trade
- Worse off from trade
Exposure to trade shapes beliefs about broader distributional impacts of trade

- **Distributional Impacts**
  - More trade can make all better off (losers can be compensated)
    - Better off: 46%
    - Worse off: 71%
  - Trade is not a major reason for the rise in inequality
    - Better off: 24%
    - Worse off: 36%
  - Overall trade helped U.S. workers
    - Better off: 22%
    - Worse off: 60%
  - Small businesses gained from trade
    - Better off: 4%
    - Worse off: 25%
  - Large corporations gained from trade
    - Better off: 66%
    - Worse off: 75%

Respondent feels:
Better off from trade
Worse off from trade
The Direct Effect of Exposure from Self-Interest

Self-interest (perceived and objective)

As a Consumer
- Impact on prices
- Impact on variety

As a Worker

Exposure through:
- Occupation
- Sector
- Local labor market
- Human capital (education)

Broader economic & social concerns

Views on trade policy:
- trade restrictions and compensatory redistribution

Perceived efficiency effects of trade

Perceived distributional impacts of trade

Patriotism, partisanship, geopolitical concerns
Those who perceive they are worse off from trade support less free trade because they believe that...

- Trade has not decreased prices
- It is impossible to compensate losers through policies
- Trade has not increased innovation, competitiveness and GDP
- Do not support government intervention in the economy
- Trade is a major reason for unempl. and hurts US workers
- Other mechanisms
- It hurts them (direct effect of self-interest)
Those who are in **routine & offshorable occupations** support less free trade because they believe that...

- Trade has not increased innovation, competitiveness and GDP
- It is impossible to compensate losers through policies
- Do not support government intervention in the economy
- Trade has not decreased prices
- Other mechanisms
- It hurts them (direct effect of self-interest)
Those who are in **tradable sectors** support less free trade because they believe that...

- It is impossible to compensate losers through policies
- Trade has not increased innovation, competitiveness and GDP
- Trade is a major reason for unempl. and hurts US workers
- Trade has not decreased prices
- Other mechanisms
- It hurts them (direct effect of self-interest)
Those who are in **comparative advantage occupations** support more free trade because they believe that...

- It is possible to compensate losers through policies: 13% of the gap explained.
- Trade has increased innovation, competitiveness and GDP: 10% of the gap explained.
- Trade has decreased prices: 4% of the gap explained.
- Other mechanisms: 2% of the gap explained.
- It hurts them (direct effect of self-interest): 71% of the gap explained.
A Note on the Special Role of Education

- College-educated respondents systematically perceive higher efficiency gains from trade.

- They also perceive less adverse distributional effects from trade.

- Finally, they also support free trade and redistribution significantly more.

Higher support for trade among the college-educated is in line with the factor endowment model (and self-interest) if education is taken as a proxy for human capital.
Finding 3: The indirect and direct effects of exposure to trade

As we saw, respondents’ trade-related experiences, as captured by their subjective and objective exposures through their work (their sector, occupation, and local labor market), are significantly correlated with their support for trade restrictions.

In fact, personal exposure shapes not only respondents’ assessment of how trade affects them but also their perceptions of the broader efficiency and distributional impacts of trade on others and the US.

Both the direct and the indirect effects are important.

A decomposition shows that the indirect effect is 30-60%.
Conclusion

- Respondents perceive gains from trade as consumers to be vague and unclear but perceive potential losses as workers to be concentrated and salient.

- People’s policy views on trade do not only reflect self-interest. Respondents also care about trade’s distributional and efficiency impacts on others and the US economy.

- Respondents’ experience, as measured by their exposure to trade through their sector, occupation, and local labor market, shapes their policy views directly (through self-interest) and indirectly by influencing their understanding and reasoning about the broader efficiency and distributional impacts of trade.
Thank you!
APPENDIX
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29 years old</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years old</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years old</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years old</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69 years old</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-$19,999</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$39,999</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-$69,999</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000-$109,999</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$110,000+</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year college degree</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-school graduate or less</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian-American</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent and other</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted for Clinton at the 2016 presidential election</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted for Trump at the 2016 presidential election</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td></td>
<td>2148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support for Free Trade and Redistribution (Definitions)

*Support for free trade* captures whether the respondent thinks that the U.S. should aim to reduce trade barriers.

*Support for Redistribution* measures support for redistribution policy. It is constructed following the methodology of Kling, Liebman, and Katz. It consists of an equally weighted average of the z-scores of all redistribution-related variables and is further divided by its standard deviation.

Higher for respondents who agree that the best tools to help workers are more generous transfers and direct assistance to workers (rather than restricting imports or subsidizing production in their industry) and who want to increase spending on support and retraining programs for workers displaced by international competition and trade. It is also increasing in support for more general (non-trade specific) redistributive spending such as help for those out of work, better schools for children from low-income families, and wage subsidies.
Perceptions of consumer gains and support for redistribution

**Consumption gains**
- Trade decreases prices of consumer goods
- Treatment: Own Consumption

**Job impacts**
- Comparative advantage occupation
- Routine & offshorable occupation
- Tradable sector
- Perceived exposure (being worse-off from trade)
- College
- High-income
- Treatment: Own Job Risks
Own job risks and support for redistribution

Consumption gains
- Trade decreases prices of consumer goods
- Treatment: Own Consumption

Job impacts
- Comparative advantage occupation
- Routine & offshorable occupation
- Tradable sector
- Perceived exposure (being worse-off from trade)
- College
- High-income
- Treatment: Own Job Risks
A Note on the Special Role of Education

Support for Free Trade

Consumption gains
- Trade decreases prices of consumer goods
- Treatment: Own Consumption

Job impacts
- Comparative advantage occupation
- Routine & offshorable occupation
- Tradable sector
- Perceived exposure (being worse-off from trade)
- College
- High-income
- Treatment: Own Job Risks
A Note on the Special Role of Education

Support for Redistribution

Consumption gains
- Trade decreases prices of consumer goods

Treatment: Own Consumption

Job impacts
- Comparative advantage occupation
- Routine & offshorable occupation
- Tradable sector
- Perceived exposure (being worse-off from trade)
- College
- High-income
- Treatment: Own Job Risks
What do you think would be the effects on the U.S. Economy if barriers to trade, such as tariffs, were increased?
Keywords (1/2) Negative

**Negative Price:**
(hit, destroy, bad, negat, suffer, disast, disa, downfal, detriment, recess, depress, troubl, unhappi, hurt, harm, hit, loos, lost, damag, pay, worst, wors, fragil, pay, cost, impact) & (consumer, peopl, citizen, household, american, us), (increas, higher, high, up, rais, more, soar) & (price, cost), pay, inflationa, inflat, expens, hard & purchas, afford, less & cheap;

**Negative Efficiency:**
(destroy, bad, negat, suffer, disast, disa, downfal, detriment, depress, troubl, unhappi, hurt, harm, kill, death, shrink, declin) & (effici, compet, competit, innov, technolog, growth, economi), (increas, higher, high, up, rais, more, soar) & tax, ineffici, recess, depress, loss, economi & (collaps, down, shrink, hurt, crash, wors, slowdown, hamper, slow, hinder, negat), (slow, reduc) & growth, decreas & gdp;

**Negative Distributive:**
(hit, destroy, bad, affect, negat, suffer, disast, disa, downfal, detriment, recess, depress, troubl, unhappi, hurt, harm, hit, loos, lost, damag, pay, worst, wors, fragil, pay, cost, out & work) & (manufactur, farmer, busi, busine, busin, job, firm, poor, poorer, middleclass, middl & class, workingclass, compani, bottom, industri, lower & class, sector), layoff, bankrupt, bankruptci, poor & poorer;

**Negative Labor:**
(hit, destroy, bad, negat, suffer, disast, disa, downfal, detriment, recess, depress, troubl, unhappi, hurt, harm, hit, loos, lost, damag, pay, worst, wors, loss) & (labor, job, unemploy, salari, union, wage, outsourc, worker, employe, employ, manufactur, manufact, manufacur, manufactur, manufactur), (increas, high) & unemploy, retrain, (decreas, low, lower) & (salari, wage, employ), (few, fewer, lessen) & job;
Positive...:

Words included: good, posit, benefit, benefici, better, thrive, strengthen, improv, stronger, help, nice, great, bolster, improv, increas;
Words excluded: catastroph, loss, lose, destroy, bad, negat, suffer, disast, disastr, downfal, detriment, depress, troubl, unhappi, hurt, harm, kill, death, shrink, declin, lost, price, cost, afford, expens, (pay & more), inflat;

...Reallocation:

own, ourselv, domest, work, job, farmer, demand, local, (product, buy, protect, support, good, posit, benefit, benefici, better, thrive, strengthen, improv, stronger, help, nice, great, economy) & (our, usa, america, american, us);

...Levelling of Trade Relations:

fair, (other & countri), china, chines;

...without Justification:

Answers in the Positive section that were neither in Reallocation nor in Levelling of Trade Relations.
When you think about trade policy and whether the U.S. should put some restrictions on trade with other countries, such as tariffs, what are the main considerations that come to your mind?
Efficiency:
- effici, compet, competit, innov, technolog, ineffici, growth, gdp, tax, economi, (more & varieti), (stock & market);

Price:
- cost, price, afford, (pay & more), inflationa, inflat, expens, (impact, suffer, affect, hurt, effect, hit, loos, lost, pay) (consum, citizen, peopl, american, household);

Fair Trade & Int. Relations:
- fair, unfair, imbal, balanc, justic, equal, (even & (share, valu)), reciproc, cooper, (mutual & (benefit, benefici)), equit, (take & advantag), (play & field) china, retali, retaliatori, ((other, foreign, those, relat, relationship, certain) & countri), mexico, (intern & trade), negoti, renegoti, (advantag & us), (trade & war), isol, isolation, isolationist, (world & economi), (pay & back), cheat;

Distributive:
- ((impact, suffer, affect, hurt, effect, hit, loos, lost, difficult, difficulti, problem, horribl) & (farmer, busi, busine, busin, firm, poor, poorer, middleclass, (middl & class), industri, sector)), winner, loos, corpor, workingclass, ((expens, under) & (busi, busin, busine)), (lower & class), (better & compani);

Protectionism:
- ((made) & (usa, america, us)), ((buy, protect, support) & (usa, america, american, local)), ((restrict, tariff) & (fine, good, need, use, reason, some, necessari));

Labor:
- labor, job, unemploy, salari, union, wage, outsourc, worker, employe, employ, retrain.