

Step 4: Concern about current reputation and *future* ratings

- Countries frequently react to the report (E/5)
- The most common reaction is cooperation (E/5)
- Image-reactions are more common than economic reactions (E/5)
- Harsher ratings get more reactions, even if not correlated with aid (E, Q/5)
- Reactions to the graded TIP report are far greater than to the non-rated human rights report section on TIP (E, Q/5)
- More aid does not correlate with more reactions (E, Q/5)
- Countries tend to compare themselves with a geographic or other identity-based peer group (E, Q/5)
- Countries that have ratified the Palermo Protocol are more likely to have reactions (E, Q/5)
- Reactions are more likely when there is more domestic media coverage (E, Q/5)
- Officials object more often in public than in private (E, Q/5)

Step 5: Efforts to improve bad ratings or *maintain* good ones

- Law enforcement has increased since 2001 (Q/3)
- Countries tend to pass laws just in time for the internal reporting deadline for the TIP report (Q/6)
- Inclusion in report and tier status correlates with criminalization (Q/6)
- Countries that have documented reactions to the TIP report are more likely to criminalize (Q/6)
- Countries that receive TIP grants are more likely to criminalize (Q/7)
- Countries that criminalize show more sustained changes in prevention and protection (Q/6)
- IGOs and NGOs attribute effectiveness to the TIP report (C/6)
- NGOs attribute importance and positive influence to the US efforts (Q/6)
- US efforts have influenced the content of laws, norms, domestic institutions and implementation (C/6, 8)

Conditioning factors (C,Q/7)

- *Pros:* Strong interlocutors • Economic leverage • Concern with international image • Active third parties • TIP events
- *Cons:* Official TIP complicity • Government instability • Differing norms • Competing political priorities • Lack of US credibility