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Introduction

The political economy of production

Two phenomena:

- Backlash against globalization (e.g. Bisbee et. al 2020, Colantone & Stanig 2018; Dal Bo et. al 2018; Guiso et. al 2017; Hays, Lim, & Spoon 2019; Inglehart & Norris 2016; Mutz 2018)

- Support for left, far-right, populist parties (e.g. Im et. al 2019, Gingrich 2019; Anelli et. al 2018; Kurer & Palier 2019, Girdon & Hall 2017)
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↑ global production & automation change:

▶ Firm production strategies

▶ Link between firms and employees (e.g. Carrier)
How do global production and automation affect the economic well-being and preferences of workers?

- Occupation vulnerability to labor replacement affects
  - Economic well-being
  - Support for openness and redistribution
  - Support for left parties and right populist parties
- Survey data from ISSP for developed democracies 1995-2016 (thanks to Jane Gingrich)
Winners and losers

Global production
- Factor: Skilled vs. unskilled
- Industry: Exporting vs. import competing
- Firm: Trading vs. non-trading
- Occupation: Routine and offshorable

Technological change
- Factor: Skill biased
- Industry: Adoption of ICT, robots
- Firm: Automated or not
- Occupation: Routine, computerization/automation
Background on the tasks approach

- Tasks: discrete units of work
- Production of good/service requires combination of tasks
- Factors of production perform tasks (labor, capital)
- Lowest cost input used
Firms’ labor-replacing production strategies

- Substitute domestic labor with capital or foreign labor
- Policies shape relative cost domestic labor; use of labor-replacing production techniques
  - ↑ openness lowers cost foreign labor
  - Tax rates, institutions, incentives ↓ cost capital
- Optimize production over bundles of policies
Which tasks are vulnerable to labor replacement?

1. Routine
   - Both global production (Owen & Johnson 2017) & automation (Gingrich 2019, Theweissen & Rueda 2019)
   - Rule-following, script based

2. Predictable
   - Computer or machine
   - Non-routine but predictable physical and personal tasks

3. Offshorable: increases exposure to global production
Vulnerability to automation/global production

1. Low/Low
   - NR, unpredictable or non-offshorable
   - Childcare, hairdresser, management

2. Low/High
   - Routine, unpredictable, offshorable
   - Accountant, programmer, draughtperson

2. High/Low
   - NR, predictable
   - Warehouse, cashier, ticketing agent

3. High/High
   - NR, unpredictable, non-off
   - Bookkeeper, production

NR = Non-routine; Off = offshorable
Empirical expectations

↑ Vulnerability to labor-replacement:
   ↓ Income (log and relative)
   ↓ Job security
   ↑ Trade protection
   ↑ Hostility toward multinationals
   ↑ Support redistribution
   ↑ Left parties
   ↑ Right populist parties

** Similar effects expected for routineness and predictability
Research design

Data

Sample 20 advanced economies in the ISSP 1995-2016

Components of vulnerability

- $R_q$: Occupation quintile of routine task intensity (Acemoglu & Autor 2011, Goos et al 2014)
- $P_q$: Occupation quintile of predictability
  - Residual of computerization (Frey & Osbourne 2017) regressed on RTI
- Offshorability: $= 1$ if offshorable (Blinder 2009)

Vulnerability index

$Vulnerability = (R_q + P_q + ((R_q - 3) \times Off)/11).$
Measures of routineness, predictability, and vulnerability

Note: The size of the bubble is proportional to occupational vulnerability for selected occupations. Sample is 352 occupations at 4-digit ISCO-88 level for which data is available. Dashed lines represent the means of routineness and predictability.
Economic implications

Note: 95% confidence intervals. Controls for unemployment, union membership, female, age, rural, unemployment rate, educational degree dummy. Country and year fixed effects.
Results

Policy preferences

Note: 95% confidence intervals. Ordered logit with country and year fixed effects. Controls for unemployment, union membership, female, age, rural, unemployment rate, educational degree dummy.
Results

Partisan preference: Marginal effect of vulnerability

Note: 95% confidence intervals. Multinomial logit with country and year fixed effects. Controls for unemployment, union membership, female, age, rural, unemployment rate, educational degree dummy.
Discussion

- Preferences in many areas driven by same phenomena
- Limitations of managed trade, incentive policies
- Welfare linked to type of work rather than firm
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- Preferences in many areas driven by same phenomena
- Limitations of managed trade, incentive policies
- Welfare linked to type of work rather than firm
- Robustness
  - Alternative measures of IV, role domestic context, pre-/post-Great Recession
  - Use ESS to account for other channels of exposure (e.g. geography, immigration)
Discussion

**Big picture**

Reorganization of production $\rightarrow$ reorganization of politics

- Political influence of firms and (vs.?) workers
- Role of domestic institutions
- How do governments encourage/discourage automation?
- Variation in policy bundles (openness, tax policy, redistribution)
Additional slides
Countries in sample

ISSP: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and the United States.
Question wording

- Job security: “Do you worry about the possibilities of losing your job?”
- Trade: “[Country] should limit imports to protect jobs”
- MNC: “Large international businesses are doing more and more damage to local business”
- Redistribution: “Do you think it is the government’s responsibility to reduce income differences between the rich and poor” (Should not be...should be)
## Summary statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability index</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTI</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-7.81</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>170705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictability</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>170705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log monthly income (USD)</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>-11.51</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>170705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative income</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>170105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease find new job</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit trade</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit MNCs</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support redistribution</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Family</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>132442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union member</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>170705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>26.09</td>
<td>170705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vulnerability by educational attainment in the ISSP
Partisan preferences: Marginal effects continued