Departamento de Economía
Facultad de Ciencias Sociales
Universidad de la República

Documentos de Trabajo

Micro-foundations of individual preferences for protectionism in Canada and Uruguay

Natalia Melgar

Documento No. 17/07
Noviembre, 2007

Micro-foundations of individual preferences for protectionism in Canada and Uruguay

Ec. Natalia Melgar[1]
nmelgar@decon.edu.uy

Resumen

Aún cuando la mayoría de los economistas están de acuerdo en que el libre comercio es la solución más beneficiosa, el escenario común es la existencia de restricciones al comercio internacional. Los modelos de política comercial endógena describen contextos en los cuales los políticos ofrecen diferentes opciones de política y los votantes demandan estas políticas a partir de sus preferencias. El contexto institucional es el factor que determina la interacción entre estas ofertas y demandas y traslada esta interacción en políticas comerciales concretas. Por lo tanto, la primera cuestión relevante es ¿cuáles son los determinantes de las preferencias individuales por el libre comercio? y ¿qué factores económicos, culturales, sociales etc. modelan estas preferencias? El objetivo de este documento es responder estas preguntas en el caso concreto de Canadá y Uruguay; países que difieren en una gran variedad de características: Canadá es un país desarrollado con un gran mercado doméstico (pero relativamente pequeño si se lo compara con Estados Unidos con el cual integra el NAFTA) y Uruguay es un país en desarrollo con un mercado doméstico relativamente pequeño). La fuente de datos es el módulo de Identidad Nacional de la encuesta anual del *International Social Survey Program* (año 2003). A los encuestados se les preguntó su opinión sobre una gran variedad de tópicos como las preferencias por: comercio internacional, inmigración, afiliación política, patriotismo etc.. Adicionalmente, la encuesta incluye datos demográficos y socio-económicos. Con el objetivo de estimar el impacto de cada una de las variables sobre las preferencias por las políticas comerciales fueron estimados modelos probit. La principal conclusión de este documento es que la evidencia no apoyaría las conclusiones sobre la formación de preferencias a partir del modelo Hecksher-Ohlin mientras que elementos como la religión, la afiliación política y el nacionalismo así como algunas características demográficas tienen un impacto significativo en las preferencias por el comercio internacional.

Clasificación JEL: D01, F13
Palabras clave: Preferencias, microfundamentos, proteccionismo, racionalidad, ISSP.

[1] Researcher at the Department of Economics, School of Social Sciences, State University.

Abstract

Even when the majority of economists agree on the benefits of free trade, everywhere we turn to, trade is restricted. In contexts where politicians offer different policy options and voters demand them based on their individual preferences, one may ask what determines personal preferences on trade policy; which economic, cultural, social elements shape them. The goal of this paper is to answer these questions in the case of two different economies: Canada and Uruguay.

The data source is the module on National Identity (2003) which was carried out in accordance with the *International Social Survey Program*. Based on probit models, the main conclusion of this paper is that the evidence does not support the conclusions on preference formation of the Hecksher-Ohlin trade model, while elements such as religion, political preferences, and nationalism, as well as demographic characteristics, have a significant impact on trade policy preferences.

JEL classification: D01, F13
Keywords: Preferences, micro-foundations, protectionism, rationality, ISSP.

Introduction

Even when the majority of economists agree on the benefits of free trade, everywhere we turn to, international trade is restricted. Endogenous trade policy models describe political contexts where politicians offer different policy options and voters demand them based on their individual preferences. The institutional background determines how this supply and demand interact and translate into actual trade policies. Thus, one may ask what determines personal preferences on trade policy; which economic, cultural, social elements shape them. The goal in this paper is to answer these questions in the case of two economies: Canada and Uruguay. These countries differ in a great variety of factors: a developed country with a big domestic market (Canada) and an undeveloped country with a small domestic market (Uruguay).

The data source is the module on National Identity (2003) which was carried out in accordance with the *International Social Survey Program*. This survey asks respondents (approximately 1.000 in each country) their opinions on a great variety of issues, including trade preferences, immigration, patriotism, and politics. In addition, it includes demographic and socio economic data, such as age, gender, education, religiosity, political party, and others.

Probit models were estimated in order to study the impact of each of these variables on individual preferences on international trade policy. The main conclusion of the paper is that the empirical evidence does not support the conclusions on preference formation of the H-O trade model, while elements such as religion, political preferences, and nationalism, as well as demographic characteristics, have a significant impact on trade policy preferences.

The structure of the paper is as follows. The first section is theoretical in nature, and draw on the existing and well-developed theory on the subject. Section two is devoted to the description of the data used in this paper. Section three sketches the main features of the econometric methods applied in this analysis and the description of variables. Section four deals with the results. Finally, the conclusions are presented in section five.

1. Theoretical background: Micro-foundations of individual preferences for protectionism

1.1. Non economic factors

In analysing the determinants in international trade preferences, there are a number of non-economic elements that need to be taken into account, including: ideology, cultural and social background as well as demographic characteristics.

Firstly, regarding individual's ideology, person's political affiliation should be considered. One would expect that those who define themselves as belonging to the left would be more likely to support protectionist policies than those who identify with the right (Daniels and von der Ruhr, 2005).

A second element to consider is the person's religious denomination. Guiso, Sapienza and Zingales (2002) argue that religious beliefs do not necessarily affect their followers' attitudes towards the economic system “through literal messages found in sacred texts or in statements by religious leaders”, but rather that they affect attitudes as a “low-frequency variable” based on teachings and conditioned by the cultural background. Moreover, they argue that attitudes towards trade with "others" and accepting "others" differ among religious denominations. In their study for the United States, they find that Catholics, Baptists and Methodists are more likely to support trade restrictions, than those with no religious affiliation.

Additionally, O'Rourke and Sinnott (2001) state that values, attachment, and national identity play an important role in trade-policy preferences, due to the fact that such elements could translate into feelings of national superiority and antagonistic attitudes towards foreign products.

In this respect, there are different degrees of attachments to one's country, which defines the differences among patriotism, nationalism and chauvinism. Patriotism is the genuine feeling of attachment to one's country, while nationalism implies a greater devotion for one's country placing it above others countries; chauvinism is an extreme form of nationalism characterized by a feeling of superiority in regard to other nations (Mayda and Rodrik, 2001). Even when these three concepts are linked to national pride, they are clearly different. National pride and patriotism coexist, while nationalism goes far beyond national pride, although the latter is a prerequisite to the former. Thus, there is no contradiction between feelings such as national pride and cosmopolitism, while nationalism and cosmopolitism are in essence contradictory (Smith and Jarkko, 1999)

In consequence, patriotism is not contradictory to supporting free trade, while in the case of nationalism the relationship is ambiguous. It will depend on the person's intake on the consequences of free trade. If the person sees free trade as a positive-sum game, and therefore accepts that trade implies benefits for the country as a whole, one would expect "patriots" (those who care for the country as a whole and not consider distributive effects) to favour free trade; however, if the person perceives trade as a zero-sum game in which some nations win and others lose or if they consider that the social consequences could be adverse, they would be likely to support trade restrictions. Finally, those who consider their country better than others are more likely to prefer their country's isolation and therefore would support import-restrictive policies (Mayda et al., 2001).

Additionally, Mayda et al. (2001) conclude that the variables that mostly influence preference formation are social status, relative income, values and attachments. In the particular case of income, they find that it is the scale in which people place themselves that influences preferences rather than absolute income. They find that those who consider themselves as "richer" tend to favour trade more than those who see themselves as "poorer". In regard to attachments, they find that those who feel closer to their neighbourhood, community, country or who define themselves as nationalists tend to be more protectionists.

Finally, there are many demographic variables that are relevant to explain trade policy preferences. For example, in regard to age and gender, previous empirical studies show that the elderly are more likely to support import-restrictive policies than younger people. The same can be said for women in comparison to men. Some empirical studies find that married people are also more likely to support trade restrictions.

1.2. Economic factors

A common scenario for international trade is the existence of restrictions on free trade, even when the majority of economists agree on the benefits of it, whatever the country's size or whatever the country's economic development. More particularly, relative small economies usually benefit more from openness given the relative smaller size of their domestic markets. Even more, there is a consensus among economists that this type of economies cannot grow steadily if it is not through opening its borders to the world[2]. For this reason, it is particularly relevant to study people's perception of economic policies in order to shed light about its micro-foundations and its rationality.

[2] As early as Adam Smith expressed in the "Wealth of Nations": *"In countries, besides, less extensive … they generally require the support of foreign trade. Without an extensive foreign market they could not well flourish,… in countries so moderately extensive as to afford but a narrow home market …"* (Book IV Chapter IX).

The question that inevitably arises is: why do governments choose trade policies that are apparently sub-optimal? The literature on this subject has tried to explain this phenomenon based on the idea that policy makers have objectives that differ from economic maximization. There are basically two trends in “endogenous” trade policy determination theory: the median-voter model and the interest group model.

The median-voter model supposes an uni-dimensional policy choice (for example, an import tariff to a particular good), the policy preferences are single-peaked and a given policy is voted directly or the government chooses the policy that better reflects the majority’s opinion on that subject. In this context, the policy chosen by the median voter cannot be dominated by any other alternative in a majority voting (Black, 1958). On the other hand, in the interest groups model, the economic interests are represented by organized lobby groups, and it is through their interaction with the government that trade policy is designed (Gawande and Krishna, 2001).

Both models describe a political context where politicians offer different policy options and voters demand policies based on their individual preferences, and the institutional background determines how this supply and demand interact and translate into actual trade policies (O’Rourke et al., 2001).

Thus, one may ask, what determines personal preferences on trade policy? Which economic, cultural, social elements affect them? The aim of this paper is to answer these questions.

International trade models provide a first approach to this issue. The two basic trade models are the Hecksher-Ohlin (H-O) model and the Ricardo-Viner (R-V) model. The H-O model supposes complete costless factor mobility across sectors and predicts that trade liberalization will benefit those who hold the relatively abundant factor and be detrimental to those who own the relatively scarce one. This implies that trade policy preference will differ among individuals depending on their relative factor endowment. On the other hand, the R-V model assumes the existence of sector-specific factors, and therefore predicts that individual trade policy preferences will depend on whether they are employed in an import-substituting or export industry (Gawande et al., 2001).

In the specific case of labour, these models should not be considered necessarily as opposites, since both models could be applicable depending on the individual time horizon. People with a relatively short time horizon will see themselves as immobile and therefore, their preferences will be those predicted by the R-V model, however, people with a long time horizon will take into account the possibility of inter-sector mobility and their preferences will be determined as described by the H-O model (Scheve and Slaugther, 2001).

In the H-O model with two goods, two production factors (skilled and unskilled labour) and two countries (country S abundant in unskilled labour and country N abundant in skilled labour), a reduction in trade barriers causes each country to specializes in the production of the good intensive in their relatively abundant factor, increasing the demand for this factor in its country and therefore its return. Consequently, wage inequality will decrease in country S and increase in country N. For this reason, unskilled workers in country S will support free trade while skilled workers will oppose it; however, in country N skilled workers will support free trade and unskilled workers will oppose it. In reference to trade policy preferences, based on this model one would expect that unskilled workers in developing countries (where unskilled labour is abundant) would prefer free trade while skilled workers would oppose it, and that the opposite would be true for developed countries, where skilled labour is abundant.

Mayda et al. (2001) make a comparative analysis of 23 countries and conclude that the evidence supports the H-O model. They find that people with higher endowments of human capital oppose trade restrictions only in countries that are abundant in human capital, like Germany and USA, while in Philippines, the poorest country in their sample, the opposite happens. The remaining countries in the sample are half way between those two extremes. Consequently, trade policy preferences not only depend on person's individual characteristics (years of schooling) but also to their country's (education level in the country).

However, in general the empirical evidence shows that both in developed and developing countries the more qualified is a person the less likely she or he is to oppose free trade. Moreover, trade liberalization in a developing country does not necessarily cause a reduction in wage inequality between skilled and unskilled workers, but quite the opposite. For example, in the case of Uruguay, Arim and Zoppolo (2000) show that the wage differences associated to formal education increased during the nineties, when the country was going through a process of increasing trade liberalization and regional integration. Moreover, they show that the demand for skilled labour increased both relatively to the demand for unskilled labour and in absolute terms.

One possible explanation of this phenomenon is that trade liberalization could increase direct foreign investment in the developing country, which could bring about the development of new activities that are intensive in skilled labour (Feenstra and Hanson, 1995). In the case of Uruguay, Arim et al. (2001) argue that trade liberalization and regional integration caused important changes in the country's productive structure and employment in each sector, decreasing the relevance of manufacture (both in GDP and employment) and increasing the importance of sector such as construction, financial services and other services for enterprises.

On the other hand, if skilled labour and capital are complementary in the exploitation of a specific natural resource, wage inequality in a developing country could increase with trade liberalization, which would explain why skilled workers in developing countries may prefer free trade. Additionally, people with higher education anywhere in the world may be more flexible and more able to deal with the rigors of the market, and therefore more likely to support trade liberalization (O'Rourke et al., 2001).

Furthermore, even in a model of two factors developing countries are not homogenous in terms of their factor endowments. In some of them a certain factor may be scarce relative to developed countries but abundant relative to others developing countries (O'Rourke et al., 2001), if trade liberalization intensifies trade with others developing countries with lower human capital endowment, wage inequality could increase as it happens in a developed country.

Finally, mobility both national and international should be considered. In respect to national mobility, the idea is that those willing or more able to reallocate within the country would be more optimistic regarding the dislocation implicit in trade liberalization than those who are immobile. In the case of international mobility, following Rodrik (1997), the argument is that globalization tends to favour production factors that are internationally mobile than those that are immobile, if unskilled labour is less mobile than skilled labour, unskilled workers everywhere will oppose free trade.

Summing up, if some of the model's assumptions are lifted (more than two factors, international flows of production factors, links between trade and technology transfers, etc.) the theoretical result regarding trade liberalization and wages becomes ambiguous (O'Rourke et al., 2001) and therefore, so do its conclusions regarding trade policy preferences.

2. The data

The data source is the module on National Identity (2003) which was carried out in accordance with the *International Social Survey Programme*.

In Uruguay the survey was carried out by the Department of Economics (*dECON)* of the School of Social Sciences (State University) in cooperation with the Institute of Statistics of the School of Economics (State University), in the context of the ISSP programme. The fieldwork was carried out in August of 2004 by the team of conduct and opinion studies of *dECON.* It was financed by the University of Pennsylvania.

In Canada the survey was carried out by Carleton Survey Centre, (Carleton University, Ottawa).

The survey asks respondents their opinions on a great variety of issues, including trade preferences, immigration, patriotism, and politics, as well as demographic and socio-economic information, such as age, gender, education, religiosity and others.

The question used in the survey to identify respondent's trade preferences is:

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement:
"Respondent's country" should limit the import of foreign products
in order to protect its national economy?

Insert Table 1: Answer by country

Table 1 shows the distribution of answers in the sample. In both countries most people agree or agree strongly with the statement.

It could be argued that the last part of the question ("…*in order to protect its national economy*") could cause a bias in favour of protectionism, given that it implies that limiting imports is a way of protecting the economy and therefore, something positive. However, there are two arguments that partially cancel out this critic. Firstly, this is the usual speech used to defend protectionist policies and therefore they are the usual terms used to discuss the matter, and thus the question would not induce necessarily the person to answer in a particular way. And secondly, the goal in this paper is to analyse the relationship between this variable and others and not estimate the absolute level of support for protectionism, and thus it is less vulnerable to this type of bias (O'Rrourke et al., 2001).

3. The probit model

The model aims at determining how different individual characteristics affect the formation of favourable opinions towards protectionism. In this respect, probit models were estimated[3]. The description of the variables included is below.

The dependent variable seeks to grasp citizen's opinions on protectionism and it is defined as follow: Protect = *"respondent's country" should limit the import of foreign products in order to protect its national economy:* 1 if respondent "agree" or "agree strongly" and

[3] The probit command in STATA version 8 was used for this estimation.

0 if respondent “disagree” or “disagree strongly”.

The independent variables included in the model are:

1. Variable that reflects human capital.
   Educ = level of education[4].
   educ2 = 1 if above lowest qualification and 0 in other case,
   educ3 = 1 if higher secondary completed or above higher secondary level and 0 in other case,
   educ4 = 1 if university degree completed and 0 in other case.

2. Variable reflecting subjective income position or social status.
   Topbot = self-placement in a scale of income from 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest).

3. Variables that reflect political ideology.
   Right = 1 if identifying with the right and 0 in other case.
   Political parties[5] = 1 if respondent’s favourite political party is the included political party and 0 in other case.
   No_pparty = 1 if respondent has no political party preferences and 0 in other case.

4. Variables that reflect religion.
   Rcatholic = 1 if respondent’s religion group is *roman catholic* and 0 in other case.
   Protestant = 1 if respondent’s religion group is *protestant* and 0 in other case.
   Religion = 1 if the person attends religious services every week or more and 0 in other case.
   Noreligion = 1 if respondent has no religion group and 0 in other case.

5. Variables related to patriotism, nationalism and chauvinism.
   Natattach *(how important is to feel “respondent’s nationality”)* = 1 being very important or fairly important and 0 in other case.
   Natpride *(respondent would rather be a citizen of “respondent’s country” than of any other country in the world)* = 1 being agree or agree strongly and 0 in other case.
   Natsup (*the world would be a better place if people from other countries were more like people at “respondent’s country”)* = 1 being agree or agree strongly and 0 in other case.

[4] Educ1 was omitted due to collinearity.
[5] In the case of Canada, Progressive Conservative was the political party selected and in the case of Uruguay, National Party was selected.

6. Variables that reflect national pride of particulars characteristics of the country (*how proud are you of "respondent's country" in* ...)

   Artspride (…*arts and literature achievements?*) = 1 being very proud or somewhat proud and 0 in other case.

   Dempride (…*the way democracy works?)* = 1 being very proud or somewhat proud and 0 in other case.

   Econpride (…*economic achievements?)* = 1 being very proud or somewhat proud and 0 in other case.

   Sciencepride (…*scientific and technological achievements?*) = 1 being very proud or somewhat proud and 0 in other case.

   Sportpride (…*achievements in sports?)* = 1 being very proud or somewhat proud 0 and in other case.

7. Variables that reflect attitudes towards minorities groups.

   Min_trad = 1 if respondent agree or agree strongly with helping minorities groups to preserve traditions and 0 in other case.

8. Variables reflecting employment status.

   Empft = 1 if being employed full time and 0 in other case.

   Empctpr = 1 if being self-employed and 0 in other case.

   Privemp = 1 if working in a private enterprise and 0 in other case.

   Unemployed = 1 if unemployed and 0 in other case.

   Union2 = 1 if belonging to an union and 0 in other case.

9. Other socio-demographic variables considered.

   Age = age group[6].

   age02 = 1 if respondent's is between 31 and 45 years old and 0 in other case,

   age03 = 1 if respondent's is between 46 and 55 years old and 0 in other case,

   age04 = 1 if respondent's is between 56 and 70 years old and 0 in other case,

   age05 = 1 if respondent's is 71 years old or more and 0 in other case.

   Ethnic *(family origin, ethnic group or identity)* = 1 if respondent's ethnic group is the group indicated and 0 in other cases[7].

   Gender = 1 being a woman and 0 being a man.

[6] Age01 was omitted due to collinearity.

[7] In the case of Canada the following dummies were included: uk_ethnic (for English, England & Wales, United Kingdom or England answers) and fr_ethnic (for French or France answers). In the case of Uruguay, the following dummies were included: sp_ethnic (for Spanish, Castilian or Castellano answers) and it_ethnic (for Italian or Italy answers).

Married (first variable on marital state) = 1 if married or living as married and 0 in other case.

Single (second variable on marital state) = 1 if being single and 0 in other case.

Insert Table 2: Statistical Information

[1) Canada, 2) Uruguay and 3) General]

Tables 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 summarize the statistical information of the variables included in the models (the selected statistics are: maximum and minimum values, mean, standard deviation and percentiles 10, 50 and 90).

The phenomenon to model is discrete, the unobserved or latent variable is y* (degree of support to protectionism from foreign products) which is related to the independent observed variables (x_i).

$$y_i^* = x_i\beta + \varepsilon_i$$

Where: $\varepsilon / x \sim N(0,1)$

And it is assumed that the observed categories are related to the latent variable in the following way:

$$y_i = \begin{cases} 0 \quad if \quad y_i^* < \tau_1 \\ 1 \quad if \quad \tau_1 \leq y_i^* \end{cases}$$

Where: τ_1 is a "cut point" (a parameter estimated).

For example, for a given value of x, the probability of being protectionist (y = 1) corresponds to the region of the distribution where y* falls in $[\tau_1, \infty]$:

$$\Pr(y = 1|x) = \Pr(\tau_1 \leq y_1^* \ |x) = \Pr(\tau_1 < x\beta + \varepsilon) = \Pr(\tau_1 - x\beta < \varepsilon)$$

The standard formula for this probability in ordinal models is:

$$\Pr(y = 1|x) = 1 - F(\tau_1 - x\beta)$$

Assuming that F(.) is a normal distribution (with error variance equal to one), the estimation models used are probit models.

The estimated parameters in probit models do not provide direct information on the relationship between the independent and dependent variables (Long, 2001). Substantive interpretations are usually based on the prediction of probabilities and functions of these probabilities[8]. These predictions are made for different groups of individuals and the marginal effects of the independent variables are calculated. If the independent variable is binary, the marginal effect is the change from not having a particular characteristic to having it.

With the estimation of probit models, the impact of variables such as age, gender, human capital, attachments among others, on individual preferences on trade policy will be established for Canada and Uruguay. Those estimations are relevant, firstly because it is relevant to analyse the rationality behind individual trade preferences and secondly, this research considers two different countries but both of them are economies with relatively little internal markets with respect the group of countries in theirs regional trade agreements (NAFTA in the case of Canada and MERCOSUR in the case of Uruguay). Consequently, the similarities in results are as relevant as the differences.

4. Results

In general, the results are the expected according to the theoretical framework and previous empirical studies.

Insert Table 3: Probit models

Insert Table 4: Partial effects

Table 3 shows the three models estimated and table 4 reports the change in the probability for an infinitesimal change in each independent, continuous variable and, by default, the discrete change in the probability for dummy variables.

4.1. Country-specific models

Firstly, the highest level of education has a negative coefficient in the estimated model, which means that only those people who have completed university are less likely to prefer import-restrictive policies and regarding education, there are no differences among others groups. As this results repeats in both models and given that Canada is a developed country and Uruguay is a developing country, it can be concluded that this result does not support the H-O model.

[8] Programs designed by J. Scott Long and Jeremy Freese (2001) are used in these calculations.

Secondly, in both cases relative economic status also affects trade preferences significantly: individuals who place themselves higher in the income scale tend to be fewer protectionists, than those who place themselves lower in the scale (this is due to the negative sign).

Additionally, political options are determinants of trade preferences. In both models, those who identify with the right are less likely to support protectionism, while in the case of Uruguay, union membership does affect international trade preferences (with positive sign). In the case of Uruguay the favourite political party matters; citizens who prefer the “National Party” are less likely to favour protectionist policies. Moreover, in the Uruguayan case, it is also significant having no favourite political party. Consequently, people who have no preferred political party tend to prefer import-restrictive policies.

Only in the case of Canada religious groups and the degree of religiosity (measured by weekly attendance to religious services) does influence the formation of preferences for free trade or protectionism. When religious groups are considered, such as: “Roman Catholic” and “Protestant”, it was found that only the latter is significant (with negative sign). This result implies that Canadians citizens whose favourite religious group is “Protestant” tend to prefer free trade. Moreover, there are no differences among people whose religious group is “Roman Catholic” or other and those who do not identify with a specific religious group. Furthermore, the degree of religiosity influences on trade preferences with opposite direction. This result implies that if a Canadian citizen attends religious services weekly or more frequently it increases the chances of preferring import-restrictive policies. In the case of Uruguay, none of those variables are significant which means that Uruguayans attitudes towards free trade or protectionism are not determined by religion.

Moreover, feelings related to patriotism and nationalism affect preferences as expected. In the case of Uruguay, feelings of attachment to or pride of one’s country are not significant. This result indicates that patriotism and nationalism are not contradictory with non-protectionist preferences. However, in the case of Canada, it was found that patriotism makes people more likely to prefer free trade while nationalism has the opposite effect. Regarding chauvinism, strong feelings of national superiority are positively correlated with protectionist preferences in both cases.

Additionally, for both countries, pride of the: a) democratic system, b) economic achievements, c) arts and literature achievements and d) achievements in sports, are not feelings which determine people preferences toward international trade. However, in the case of Uruguay, pride of scientific and technological achievements has significant coefficient (with positive sign). This result means that it is expected that people support restrictions to free trade if they pride themselves on scientific and technological achievements.

On the other hand, in the case of Uruguay it is likely that a person supports free trade if he or she believes that his / her country has to help minorities groups to maintain their traditions.

Regarding employment status, it is worth noting that none of such variables are significant.

Finally, regarding socio-demographic variables, the models show that only in the case of Canada, gender is significant in preferences formation, indicating that women tend to be more protectionist than men. For both countries, four dummy variables representing different age groups were included but they are no significant as well as those variables on marital status and ethnic groups.

4.2. Joint-model

Firstly, levels (three and four) of education are significant and have negatives coefficients in the estimated model, which means that those with higher education are more likely to support free trade.

Secondly, relative economic status has the expected effect on international trade preferences. Once again, individuals who place themselves higher in the income scale tend to be fewer protectionists than those who place themselves lower in the scale (this is due to the negative sign).

As before the model shows that political options are determinants of international trade preferences. Those who identify with the right are less likely to support protectionism and union membership has the opposite effect. However, having or not a favourite political party does not make any differences in preferences formation.

Furthermore, the variables that reflect religion and religiosity have no effects on preferences for import-restrictive policies and the same happen with the variables regarding employment status.

Feelings related to patriotism and nationalism affect preferences as expected. Feelings of attachment to or pride of one's country are not significant. Regarding chauvinism, strong feelings of national superiority are positively correlated with protectionist preferences.

Moreover, pride of the: a) democratic system, b) economic achievements, c) arts and literature achievements and d) achievements in sports are not feelings which determine people preferences towards international trade. However, it is expected that people support restrictions to free trade if they pride themselves on scientific and technological achievements (due to the positive sign).

Socio-demographic variables influence preferences formation in different ways. The estimated model shows that gender is significant, indicating that women tend to be more protectionist than men. Four dummy variables representing different age groups were included but they are no significant as well as those variables on marital status.

Last but not least, country of residence matters. The model shows that Canadians citizens are less likely to support protectionism policies than Uruguayans citizens. Given the degree of development of both countries, it was one of the most important hypotheses of this paper.

4.3. Probabilities

In order to compare the probability of having favourable opinions towards protectionism in each country and for citizens with different characteristics, probabilities of being protectionist for the entire sample and for each country were computed.

After estimating probit models, *prvalue* command in STATA computes the probabilities at specific values of the independent variables. By default, the discrete and marginal change is calculated holding all other variables at their mean.

An individual taken randomly from the sample has a probability of 79,8% of favouring trade restrictions and of 20,2% of supporting free trade. This result changes greatly if we consider citizen from different countries. For example, a Canadian citizen has 26,5% chance of being not protectionist and 73,5% of supporting restrictions. In the other extreme, for an Uruguayan citizen the probability of being protectionist is 86,5%. It is worth noting that there is a notorious difference between these two countries in terms of their GDP per capita; citizens in the richer country of the sample (Canada) are less likely to support restrictive trade policies than their counterparts in the poorer country (Uruguay).

	General probabilities	
	prvalue, x( ) rest(mean)	
	Pr (y = NoProtect)	Pr (y = Protect)
Canada	0,2652	0,7348
Uruguay	0,1351	0,8649
General	0,2021	0,7979

In general, if we randomly select a woman from the sample, the probability of her being protectionist is greater than if we selected any individual regardless of their gender; this result is repeated for each country and for the joint model.

	Gender	
	prvalue, x(gender=1) rest(mean)	
	Pr (y = NoProtect)	Pr (y = Protect)
Canada	0,1452	0,8548
Uruguay	0,1259	0,8741
General	0,1463	0,8537

In both countries the fact of being highly qualified increases the chances of not being protectionist and reduces the probability of being protectionist. Given the fact that this outcome appears both in a developed and a developing country, the result does not support the H-O model.

	Human capital	
	prvalue, x(educ4=1 educ3=0 educ2=0) rest(mean)	
	Pr (y = NoProtect)	Pr (y = Protect)
Canada	0,4535	0,5465
Uruguay	0,2227	0,7773
General	0,3384	0,6616

Identifying with the right reduces the probability of favouring protectionism. Being member of an union has the same impact in direction as being a woman; it increases the chances of preferring protectionists policies.

	Political affiliation	
	prvalue, x(right=1) rest(mean)	
	Pr (y = NoProtect)	Pr (y = Protect)
Canada	0,4369	0,5631
Uruguay	0,1905	0,8095
General	0,2936	0,7064

	Union membership	
	prvalue, x(union2=1) rest(mean)	
	Pr (y = NoProtect)	Pr (y = Protect)
Canada	0,2388	0,7612
Uruguay	0,0917	0,9083
General	0,1595	0,8405

If an individual's preferred religious group is "protestant", the probability of being protectionist is greater than the probability of supporting free trade. Regarding religiosity, this variable was significant in the case of Canada and it had a positive sign; this result is in concordance with the increase in the probability of favouring protectionist policies.

	Religion and religiosity		***Religion***		***Religiosity***	
	prvalue, x(protestant=1 religion=1 no_religion=0 rcatholic=0) rest(mean)		prvalue, x(protestant=1 no_religion=0 rcatholic=0) rest(mean)		prvalue, x(religion=1 no_religion=0) rest(mean)	
	Pr (y = No Protect)	Pr (y = Protect)	Pr (y = No Protect)	Pr (y = Protect)	Pr (y = No Protect)	Pr (y = Protect)
Canada	0,2591	0,7409	0,3604	0,6396	0,1694	0,8306
Uruguay	0,1320	0,8680	0,1054	0,8946	0,1526	0,8474
General	0,2358	0,7642	0,2378	0,7622	0,1917	0,8083

National pride and feelings of national superiority (nationalism and chauvinism) increases the probability of supporting trade restrictions and reduces the probability of opposing them. The same result was found in the case of people who pride themselves on scientific and technological achievements. However, while the former is stronger in the case of Canada the latter is stronger in the case of Uruguay.

	Patriotism, nationalism and chauvinism	
	prvalue, x(natattach=0 natpride=1 natsup=1) rest(mean)	
	Pr (y = NoProtect)	Pr (y = Protect)
Canada	0,0487	0,9513
Uruguay	0,1045	0,8955
General	0,0952	0,9048

	Pride of scientific and technological achievements	
	prvalue, x(sciencepride=1) rest(mean)	
	Pr (y = NoProtect)	Pr (y = Protect)
Canada	0,2644	0,7356
Uruguay	0,1089	0,8911
General	0,1832	0,8168

The higher individuals place themselves in the social scale, the lower their probability of being protectionist and the higher their probability of opposing import restrictions. Therefore, in order to compare the impact of this variable in both countries; the probabilities were computed for all available levels. As the tables below show, the general result is repeated in all cases.

	Status					
	prvalue, x(topbot="indicated level") rest(mean)					
	Canada		Uruguay		General	
	Pr (y=NoProtect)	Pr (y=Protect)	Pr (y=NoProtect)	Pr (y=Protect)	Pr (y=NoProtect)	Pr (y=Protect)
topbot=1	0,1133	0,8867	0,0856	0,9144	0,1117	0,8883
topbot=2	-	-	0,0984	0,9016	-	-
topbot=3	0,1742	0,8258	0,1126	0,8874	0,1545	0,8455
topbot=4	-	-	0,1281	0,8719	-	-
topbot=5	0,2528	0,7472	0,1451	0,8549	0,2070	0,7930
topbot=6	0,2982	0,7018	0,1635	0,8365	0,2368	0,7632
topbot=7	0,3469	0,6531	0,1834	0,8166	0,2688	0,7312
topbot=8	-	-	0,2048	0,7952	-	-
topbot=9	0,4515	0,5485	0,2275	0,7725	0,3386	0,6614
topbot=10	-	-	0,2516	0,7484	-	-

Based on these results two extreme profiles of citizens were defined; one with protectionist characteristics and second, other with the characteristics of a non-protectionist.

Canada

Protectionist profiles			***Non- protectionist profiles***		
	Pr (y = NoProtect)	Pr (y = Protect)		Pr (y = NoProtect)	Pr (y = Protect)
prvalue, x(gender=1 **educ2=1** educ3=0 educ4=0 **topbot=1** protestant=0 religion=1 right=0 natattach=0 natpride=1 natsup=1) rest(mean)	0,0001	0,9999	prvalue, x(gender=0 educ2=0 educ3=0 **educ4=1** right=1 **topbot=9** protestant=1 religion=0 noreligion=0 rcatholic=0 natattach=1 natpride=0 natsup=0) rest(mean)	0,9992	0,0008
prvalue, x(gender=1 **educ2=1** educ3=0 educ4=0 **topbot=3** protestant=0 religion=1 right=0 natattach=0 natpride=1 natsup=1) rest(mean)	0,0003	0,9997	prvalue, x(gender=0 educ2=0 educ3=0 **educ4=1** right=1 **topbot=7** protestant=1religion=0 noreligion=0 rcatholic=0 natattach=1 natpride=0 natsup=0) rest(mean)	0,9981	0,0019
prvalue, x(gender=1 educ2=0 **educ3=1** educ4=0 **topbot=1** protestant=0 religion=1 right=0 natattach=0 natpride=1 natsup=1) rest(mean)	0,0006	0,9994			
prvalue, x(gender=1 educ2=0 **educ3=1** educ4=0 **topbot=3** protestant=0 religion=1 right=0 natattach=0 natpride=1 natsup=1) rest(mean)	0,0014	0,9986			

In the case of Canada, a "typical" protectionist citizen has a much greater probability of being protectionist (almost 100%) than that of opposing protectionism. Such a citizen is characterized for being a woman with a low educational level, who does not identify with the right or with Protestant religious group but who does attend frequently to religious services, with feelings of national pride and superiority and who sees herself as poor. On the other hand, a "typical" non-protectionist citizen is an educated man (levels three or four), who identifies with the right and with Protestant religious group but does not attend to religious services frequently, who sees himself as rich and who has no feelings of national pride nor superiority.

Uruguay

Protectionist profiles			***Non- protectionist profiles***		
	Pr (y = NoProtect)	Pr (y = Protect)		Pr (y = NoProtect)	Pr (y = Protect)
prvalue, x(**educ2=1** educ3=0 educ4=0 **topbot=1** min_trad=0 right=0 no_pparty=0 union2=1 natsup=1 sciencepride=1) rest(mean)	0,0211	0,9789	prvalue, x(educ2=0 educ3=0 educ4=1 **topbot=10** min_trad=1 right=1 no_pparty=1 union2=0 natsup=0 sciencepride=0) rest(mean)	0,8017	0,1983
prvalue, x(**educ2=1** educ3=0 educ4=0 **topbot=3** min_trad=0 right=0 no_pparty=0 union2=1 natsup=1 sciencepride=1) rest(mean)	0,0303	0,9697	prvalue, x(educ2=0 educ3=0 educ4=1 **topbot=9** min_trad=1 right=1 no_pparty=1 union2=0 natsup=0 sciencepride=0) rest(mean)	0,7794	0,2206
prvalue, x(educ2=0 **educ3=1** educ4=0 **topbot=1** min_trad=0 right=0 no_pparty=0 union2=1 natsup=1 sciencepride=1) rest(mean)	0,0220	0,9780	prvalue, x(educ2=0 educ3=0 educ4=1 **topbot=8** min_trad=1 right=1 no_pparty=1 union2=0 natsup=0 sciencepride=0) rest(mean)	0,7557	0,2443
prvalue, x(educ2=0 **educ3=1** educ4=0 **topbot=3** min_trad=0 right=0 no_pparty=0 union2=1 natsup=1 sciencepride=1) rest(mean)	0,0315	0,9685	prvalue, x(educ2=0 educ3=0 educ4=1 **topbot=7** min_trad=1 right=1 no_pparty=1 union2=0 natpride=0 natsup=0 sciencepride=0) rest(mean)	0,7307	0,2693

A "typical" protectionist Uruguayan citizen has a much greater probability of being protectionist than that of opposing protectionism. In all cases, such a citizen is characterized for having a low level of education, member of an union, with feelings of national superiority and pride of scientific and technological achievements, who believes that minorities groups have to adapt to his or her country's traditions and who does not identify with the right but has a favourite political party and who sees himself / herself as poor. On the contrary, a "typical" non-protectionist is a university educated person, who identifies with the right but has no favourite political party and does not belong to an union, who sees herself / himself as rich, who has no feelings of national superiority nor pride of scientific and technological achievements and who thinks that the his / her country has to help minorities to preserve their traditions.

General

Protectionist profiles			***Non- protectionist profiles***		
	Pr (y = NoProtect)	Pr (y = Protect)		Pr (y = NoProtect)	Pr (y = Protect)
prvalue, x(gender=1 educ2=1 educ3=0 educ4=0 **topbot=1** right=0 union2=1 natsup=1 sciencepride=1) rest(mean)	0,0268	0,9732	prvalue, x(gender=0 educ2=0 educ3=0 **educ4=1** **topbot=9** right=1 union2=0 natsup=0 sciencepride=0) rest(mean)	0,8650	0,1350
prvalue, x(gender=1 educ2=1 educ3=0 educ4=0 **topbot=3** right=0 union2=1 natsup=1 sciencepride=1) rest(mean)	0,0419	0,9581	prvalue, x(gender=0 educ2=0 educ3=0 **educ4=1** **topbot=7** right=1 union2=0 natsup=0 sciencepride=0) rest(mean)	0,8166	0,1834
			prvalue, x(gender=0 educ2=0 **educ3=1** educ4=0 **topbot=9** right=1 union2=0 natsup=0 sciencepride=0) rest(mean)	0,7737	0,2263
			prvalue, x(gender=0 educ2=0 **educ3=1** educ4=0 **topbot=7** right=1 union2=0 natsup=0 sciencepride=0) rest(mean)	0,7091	0,2909

As one might expect for the sample, a "typical" protectionist person has a much greater probability of being protectionist than that of opposing protectionism. Such a citizen is characterized for being a woman with a low level of education, who does not identify with the right, member of an union, with feelings of national superiority and pride of scientific and technological achievements, who sees herself as poor. On the other hand, a "typical" non-protectionist is a man with university degree completed or above higher secondary level, who identifies with the right and does not belong to an union, who sees himself as rich and who has no feelings of national superiority or pride of scientific and technological achievements.

5. Conclusions

The first conclusion is that non-economic factors are relevant in the formation of international trade preferences. It was found that non-economic characteristics such as national pride, feelings of national superiority and pride of scientific and technological achievements, political affiliation, among others, have a great impact on trade policy preferences. Regarding country of residence it was found that it is significant, a person who lives in Canada is less likely to support protectionists policies than a person who lives in Uruguay.

Regarding economic characteristics, it was found that relative income is what matters in the formation of preferences towards international trade and it is not relevant the absolute income and variables reflecting employment status does not result significant.

It was found that those with higher levels of education are less likely to support import-restrictive policies. Moreover, this result is found in all the countries in the sample, both developed and developing countries. Therefore, it does not support the conclusions of the H-O model: the result is consistent with this model in the case of Canada (a developed country) but not for Uruguay (a developing country), given that according to the model skilled workers in developing countries should be more likely to support protectionism. In consequence, the rationality behind these preferences must originate somewhere else than factor endowment, or they reflect a different perception of the impact of free trade than the one predicated by the H-O model.

Two extreme profiles of citizens were defined: a "typical" protectionist and a "typical" non-protectionist; and the probabilities for each profile were calculated. For the sample as a whole, while a "typical" protectionist is an uneducated woman, who does not identify with the right, member of an union, with feelings of national pride and superiority, and who sees herself as poor; a "typical" non-protectionist is a university educated man, who identifies with the right and does not belong to an union, who sees himself as rich and who has no feelings of national pride nor superiority.

References

Arim, R. & G. Zoppolo (2000): “Remuneraciones Relativas y Desigualdad en el Mercado de Trabajo. Uruguay: 1986-1999”. Thesis, School of Economics (State University, Uruguay).

Black, D. (1958): “The Theory of Committees and Elections”. Cambridge University Press.

Daniels, J. P., & Marc von der Ruhr (2005): “God and the Global Economy: Religion and Attitudes Towards Trade and Immigration”.

Feenstra, R. & G. Hanson (1995): “Foreign Investment. Outsourcing and Relative Wages”. NBER, working paper 5121. National Bureau of Economic Research.

Gawande, K. & P. Krishna (2001): “The Political Economy of Trade Policy: Empirical Approaches”. Working paper 2001-38. Brown University.

Guiso, L., P. Sapienza & L. Zingales (2002): “People’s Opium? Religion and Economic Attitudes”. NBER, working paper 9237. National Bureau of Economic Research.

Mayda, A. & D. Rodrik (2001): “Why Are Some People (and Countries) More Protectionist than Others?” NBER, working paper 8461. National Bureau of Economic Research.

O´Rourke, K. & R. Sinnott (2001): “The Determinants of Individual Trade Policy Preferences: International Survey Evidence”. Economic papers 2001-06. Trinity College, Dublin.

Rodrik, D. (1997): “Has Globalization Gone too far?. Institute for International Economics, Washington DC.

Scheve, K. & M. Slaughter (2001): “What Determines Individual Trade-policy Preferences?” Journal of International Economics 54 (2001) 267-292.

Smith, T. W. & L. Jarkko (1998): “National Pride: A Cross-national Analysis”, National Opinion Research Center/University of Chicago, GSS Cross-national Report Number 19.

ANNEX

Table 1 – Answer by country

Country	NoProtect	Protect	**Total**
Canada (ca)	305	597	902
Uruguay (uy)	136	767	903
Total	441	1,364	1,805

Table 2 – Statistical information

2.1 CANADA							
variable	**max.**	**min.**	**mean**	**standard deviation**	**p10**	**p50 (median)**	**p90**
protect	1	0	.662	.473	0	1	1
gender	1	0	.454	.498	0	0	1
age02	1	0	.216	.412	0	0	1
age03	1	0	.233	.423	0	0	1
age04	1	0	.248	.432	0	0	1
age05	1	0	.146	.353	0	0	1
married	1	0	.758	.428	0	1	1
single	1	0	.105	.307	0	0	1
educ2	1	0	.112	.316	0	0	1
educ3	1	0	.542	.498	0	1	1
educ4	1	0	.260	.439	0	0	1
topbot	9	1	5.261.287	1.569.214	3	6	7
min_trad	1	0	.244	.430	0	0	1
ca_noreligion	1	0	.121	.327	0	0	1
ca_rcatholic	1	0	.392	.489	0	0	1
ca_protestant	1	0	.238	.426	0	0	1
religion	1	0	.242	.428	0	0	1
right	1	0	.169	.374	0	0	1
prog_conservative	1	0	.368	.483	0	0	1
no_pparty	1	0	.186	.389	0	0	1
union2	1	0	.627	.484	0	1	1
natattach	1	0	.919	.273	1	1	1
natpride	1	0	.966	.183	1	1	1
natsup	1	0	.809	.394	0	1	1
econpride	1	0	.767	.423	0	1	1
sciencepride	1	0	.883	.322	0	1	1
sportpride	1	0	.837	.370	0	1	1
dempride	1	0	.785	.411	0	1	1
artspride	1	0	.778	.416	0	1	1
privemp	1	0	.293	.455	0	0	1
empft	1	0	.449	.498	0	0	1
empctpr	1	0	.082	.274	0	0	0
unemployed	1	0	.017	.128	0	0	0
uk_ethnic	1	0	.344	.475	0	0	1
fr_ethnic	1	0	.327	.469	0	0	1

2.2 URUGUAY							
variable	**max.**	**min.**	**mean**	**standard deviation**	**p10**	**p50 (median)**	**p90**
protect	1	0	.849	.358	0	1	1
gender	1	0	.593	.492	0	1	1
age02	1	0	.284	.451	0	0	1
age03	1	0	.132	.338	0	0	1
age04	1	0	.192	.394	0	0	1
age05	1	0	.131	.337	0	0	1
married	1	0	.442	.497	0	0	1
single	1	0	.310	.463	0	0	1
educ2	1	0	.312	.464	0	0	1
educ3	1	0	.260	.439	0	0	1
educ4	1	0	.098	.297	0	0	0
topbot	10	1	4.456.462	1.659.192	2	5	6
min_trad	1	0	.367	.482	0	0	1
uy_noreligion	1	0	.336	.473	0	0	1
uy_rcatholic	1	0	.504	.500	0	1	1
uy_protestant	1	0	.075	.263	0	0	0
religion	2	0	.243	.619	0	0	1
right	1	0	.264	.441	0	0	1
national_party	1	0	.208	.406	0	0	1
no_pparty	1	0	.248	.432	0	0	1
union2	1	0	.260	.439	0	0	1
natattach	1	0	.972	.166	1	1	1
natpride	1	0	.910	.286	1	1	1
natsup	1	0	.580	.494	0	1	1
econpride	1	0	.255	.436	0	0	1
sciencepride	1	0	.585	.493	0	1	1
sportpride	1	0	.719	.450	0	1	1
dempride	1	0	.588	.492	0	1	1
artspride	1	0	.745	.436	0	1	1
privemp	1	0	.439	.496	0	0	1
empft	1	0	.421	.494	0	0	1
empctpr	1	0	.337	.473	0	0	1
unemployed	1	0	.071	.257	0	0	0
sp_ethnic	1	0	.336	.472	0	0	1
it_ethnic	1	0	.162	.368	0	0	1

2.3 GENERAL							
variable	**max.**	**min.**	**mean**	**standard deviation**	**p10**	**p50 (median)**	**p90**
protect	1	0	.756	.430	0	1	1
gender	1	0	.521	.500	0	1	1
age02	1	0	.249	.432	0	0	1
age03	1	0	.185	.388	0	0	1
age04	1	0	.221	.415	0	0	1
age05	1	0	.139	.346	0	0	1
married	1	0	.607	.489	0	1	1
single	1	0	.203	.402	0	0	1
educ2	1	0	.208	.406	0	0	1
educ3	1	0	.407	.491	0	0	1
educ4	1	0	.182	.386	0	0	1
topbot	10	1	4.849.437	1.664.867	3	5	7
min_trad	1	0	.303	.460	0	0	1
no_religion	1	0	.224	.417	0	0	1
rcatholic	1	0	.446	.497	0	0	1
protestant	1	0	.160	.367	0	0	1
religion	2	0	.245	.528	0	0	1
right	1	0	.214	.410	0	0	1
no_pparty	1	0	.216	.411	0	0	1
union2	1	0	.451	.498	0	0	1
natattach	1	0	.944	.229	1	1	1
natpride	1	0	.940	.238	1	1	1
natsup	1	0	.699	.459	0	1	1
econpride	1	0	.523	.500	0	1	1
sciencepride	1	0	.740	.439	0	1	1
sportpride	1	0	.781	.414	0	1	1
dempride	1	0	.691	.462	0	1	1
artspride	1	0	.762	.426	0	1	1
privemp	1	0	.363	.481	0	0	1
empft	1	0	.436	.496	0	0	1
empctpr	1	0	.204	.403	0	0	1
unemployed	1	0	.043	.202	0	0	0
ca	1	0	.522	.500	0	1	1

Table 3 – Probit models.

	CANADA	URUGUAY	GENERAL
	protect	protect	protect
gender	0.707***	0.100	0.423***
	[0.177]	[0.156]	[0.112]
age02	0.036	0.027	-0.018
	[0.307]	[0.199]	[0.170]
age03	0.155	0.317	0.186
	[0.292]	[0.274]	[0.187]
age04	-0.250	0.067	-0.133
	[0.279]	[0.248]	[0.186]
age05	0.213	0.072	0.177
	[0.349]	[0.303]	[0.227]
married	-0.085	0.243	0.151
	[0.276]	[0.187]	[0.154]
single	0.325	0.091	0.274
	[0.374]	[0.239]	[0.202]
educ2	-0.112	-0.312	-0.270
	[0.429]	[0.190]	[0.169]
educ3	-0.541	-0.330	-0.404**
	[0.369]	[0.212]	[0.175]
educ4	-1.089***	-0.563**	-0.756***
	[0.401]	[0.284]	[0.208]
topbot	-0.136**	-0.078*	-0.100***
	[0.062]	[0.044]	[0.035]
min_trad	0.080	-0.286*	-0.095
	[0.197]	[0.147]	[0.117]
noreligion	-0.339	-0.163	-0.130
	[0.278]	[0.323]	[0.195]
rcatholic	-0.154	-0.123	-0.170
	[0.222]	[0.313]	[0.172]
protestant	-0.490**	0.036	-0.271
	[0.242]	[0.392]	[0.198]
religion	0.391*	-0.178	0.009
	[0.214]	[0.117]	[0.117]
right	-0.571**	-0.324*	-0.385***
	[0.268]	[0.168]	[0.134]
prog_conservative	-0.344	-	-
	[0.221]	-	-
national_party	-	-0.369**	-
	-	[0.178]	-
no_pparty	-0.213	-0.413**	-0.146
	[0.277]	[0.177]	[0.132]
union2	0.213	0.298*	0.278**
	[0.205]	[0.174]	[0.123]
natattach	-0.924**	-0.038	-0.369
	[0.450]	[0.417]	[0.325]
natpride	1.057**	0.136	0.308
	[0.507]	[0.258]	[0.225]
natsup	0.708***	0.285*	0.378***
	[0.219]	[0.154]	[0.126]
econpride	-0.093	-0.159	-0.091
	[0.233]	[0.166]	[0.137]
sciencepride	0.032	0.324*	0.281*
	[0.359]	[0.169]	[0.150]
sportpride	-0.228	-0.258	-0.182
	[0.229]	[0.176]	[0.136]
dempride	0.054	-0.188	-0.078
	[0.215]	[0.155]	[0.125]
artspride	-0.098	-0.067	-0.087
	[0.220]	[0.190]	[0.149]

privemp	-0.017	-0.149	-0.051
	[0.194]	[0.200]	[0.137]
empft	-0.026	-0.089	0.007
	[0.222]	[0.171]	[0.132]
empctpr	-0.385	-0.138	-0.132
	[0.298]	[0.203]	[0.152]
unemployed	0.023	0.050	0.155
	[0.807]	[0.281]	[0.358]
uk_ethnic	0.064	-	-
	[0.206]	-	-
fr_ethnic	-0.064	-	-
	[0.226]	-	-
sp_ethnic	-	0.099	-
	-	[0.168]	-
it_ethnic	-	-0.099	-
	-	[0.192]	-
ca	-		-0.478***
	-		[0.177]
Constant	1.502*	1.929***	1.620***
	[0.800]	[0.695]	[0.506]
Observations	513	563	1076
Robust standard errors in brackets			
* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%			

Table 4 – Partial effects

	CANADA	URUGUAY	GENERAL
	protect	protect	protect
gender	0.224***	0.022	0.117***
	[0.053]	[0.034]	[0.030]
age02	0.012	0.006	-0.005
	[0.100]	[0.042]	[0.047]
age03	0.050	0.060	0.048
	[0.091]	[0.045]	[0.046]
age04	-0.086	0.014	-0.038
	[0.100]	[0.051]	[0.055]
age05	0.066	0.015	0.046
	[0.101]	[0.061]	[0.055]
married	-0.028	0.052	0.042
	[0.089]	[0.040]	[0.043]
single	0.099	0.019	0.071
	[0.105]	[0.049]	[0.049]
educ2	-0.038	-0.071	-0.079
	[0.149]	[0.045]	[0.052]
educ3	-0.172	-0.078	-0.116**
	[0.113]	[0.055]	[0.052]
educ4	-0.389***	-0.153*	-0.248***
	[0.143]	[0.091]	[0.076]
topbot	-0.045**	-0.017*	-0.028***
	[0.020]	[0.009]	[0.010]
min_trad	0.026	-0.064*	-0.027
	[0.063]	[0.034]	[0.033]
noreligion	-0.119	-0.036	-0.037
	[0.103]	[0.073]	[0.056]
rcatholic	-0.051	-0.027	-0.047
	[0.074]	[0.068]	[0.048]
protestant	-0.174*	0.008	-0.081
	[0.091]	[0.081]	[0.063]
religion	0.119**	-0.038	0.002
	[0.060]	[0.025]	[0.032]
right	-0.205**	-0.075*	-0.114***
	[0.102]	[0.041]	[0.043]
prog_conservative	-0.114		-
	[0.074]		-
national_party	-	-0.088*	-
	-	[0.046]	-
no_pparty	-0.073	-0.101**	-0.042
	[0.098]	[0.047]	[0.039]
union2	0.070	0.059*	0.074**
	[0.068]	[0.031]	[0.032]
natattach	-0.217***	-0.008	-0.087
	[0.066]	[0.086]	[0.063]
natpride	0.399**	0.031	0.094
	[0.187]	[0.062]	[0.075]
natsup	0.259***	0.064*	0.112***
	[0.085]	[0.035]	[0.039]
econpride	-0.030	-0.035	-0.025
	[0.074]	[0.039]	[0.038]
sciencepride	0.011	0.072*	0.082*
	[0.120]	[0.039]	[0.046]
sportpride	-0.071	-0.051	-0.048
	[0.067]	[0.032]	[0.034]
dempride	0.018	-0.040	-0.021
	[0.072]	[0.032]	[0.034]
artspride	-0.032	-0.014	-0.023
	[0.070]	[0.039]	[0.039]

privemp	-0.006	-0.032	-0.014
	[0.064]	[0.044]	[0.038]
empft	-0.008	-0.019	0.002
	[0.073]	[0.037]	[0.036]
empctpr	-0.137	-0.030	-0.037
	[0.112]	[0.046]	[0.044]
unemployed	0.008	0.010	0.040
	[0.262]	[0.058]	[0.087]
uk_ethnic	0.021	-	
	[0.067]	-	
fr_ethnic	-0.021	-	-
	[0.075]	-	-
sp_ethnic	-	0.021	-
	-	[0.034]	-
it_ethnic	-	-0.022	-
	-	[0.044]	-
ca	-	-	-0.136***
	-	-	[0.052]
Observations	513	563	1076
Robust standard errors in brackets			
* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%			