|  |
| --- |
| Table 2: Rival Explanations: Electoral System, Centralization, Left Party Seats, Union |
| Density, and De-Industrialization |
| (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) |
| ∆Tradet−1 -0.668 -0.429 -2.431∗∗ -1.362 -1.376∗∗∗ |
| (0.458) (0.467) (1.055) (0.879) (0.482) |
| MDIt−1 0.045 -0.014 -0.278 -0.589∗∗ 0.177 |
| (0.416) (0.416) (0.262) (0.242) (0.609) |
| ∆MDIt−1 0.814 0.743 2.258∗∗∗ 2.839∗∗∗ -0.866 |
| (1.743) (1.741) (0.775) (0.821) (2.256) |
| GDPPerCapitat−1 0.472∗∗ 0.509∗∗∗ 0.556∗∗∗ 0.427∗∗∗ 0.776∗∗∗ |
| (0.187) (0.187) (0.137) (0.117) (0.273) |
| Spendingt−1 -0.233∗∗∗ -0.234∗∗∗ -0.071∗∗∗ -0.075∗∗∗ -0.253∗∗∗ |
| (0.014) (0.014) (0.018) (0.015) (0.013) |
| Tradet−1 X MDIt−1 -0.662∗ -0.641∗∗ -0.891∗∗ -1.184∗∗∗ -2.048∗∗∗ |
| (0.342) (0.324) (0.354) (0.314) (0.549) |
| ∆Tradet−1 X ∆MDIt−1 5.072 4.268 -39.462 -41.014 40.023  (18.142) (18.194) (25.394) (25.531) (25.338) |
| PRt−1 0.476  (0.359) |
| Tradet−1 X PRt−1 0.296  (0.334) |
| ∆Tradet−1 X ∆PRt−1 -11.343∗∗∗  (3.858) |
| Unitarismt−1 -0.695  (0.681) |
| Tradet−1 X Unitarismt−1 0.651  (0.536) |
| ∆Tradet−1 X ∆Unitarismt−1 -12.632∗  (6.579) |
| UnionDensityt−1 -0.086  (0.167) |
| Tradet−1 X UnionDensityt−1 -0.8∗∗  (0.393) |
| ∆Tradet−1 X ∆UnionDensityt−1 -14.819  (21.369) |
| LeftSeatst−1 0.208∗  (0.125) |
| Tradet−1 X LeftSeatst−1 0.441  (0.343) |
| ∆Tradet−1 X ∆LeftSeatst−1 -2.568  (4.755) |
| Industryt−1 0.007  (0.25) |
| ∆Industryt−1 -0.361  (0.469) |
| Tradet−1 X Industryt−1 0.151  (0.339) |
| ∆Tradet−1 X ∆Industryt−1 -2.183  (2.792) |
| R2 0.125 0.123 0.194 0.147 0.142 |
| adj.R2 0.115 0.114 0.17 0.131 0.133 |
| N 2224 2224 544 673 2736 |
| Standard errors in parentheses. For space constraints, estimates for land, dependency rates, levels of trade  and democracy are included but not displayed (all were indistinguishable from zero at 95% confidence). |
| ∗ (p ≤ 0.1), ∗∗ (p ≤ 0.05), ∗∗∗ (p ≤ 0.01) 28 |

perceptions and blame attributions around economic globalization in a way that weakens the compensatory responsiveness of welfare spending.

5 Conclusion

This study has presented individual- and state-level evidence that mass media functions as a political institution which conditions the domestic politics of economic globalization. Because the dominant social construction of economic globalization is that of an external constraint imposed on policymakers by impersonal and international forces, by amplifying this construction mass media decrease the accountability of national economic policymakers who pursue liberalization. Survey evidence from France shows that individuals most reliant on mass media are less likely to blame top national problems on incumbent governments, and more likely to blame international forces, for indirect and direct reasons. Mass media indirectly deflects blame away from incumbent governments and toward international forces by making individuals more aware of economic openness as a political issue, but it also directly decreases individuals’ propensities to blame incumbents relative to international forces (controlling for the awareness effect), most likely due to the responsbility-diffusing framing effects previously found in mass media studies. In turn, individuals who blame international forces rather than the government evaluate the government more favorably.

Cross-sectional, time-series data reveal that mass media is associated with a decrease in the relationship between economic openness and welfare-state spending, providing further evidence that mass media diffuses the domestic political pressure against liberalization that has historically elicited welfare-state compensation for aggrieved domestic groups. The state- level evidence is consistent with the individual-level evidence that mass media shifts blame attributions away from governments and toward international forces, which weakens the strategic pressure on national economic policymakers to provide welfare-state compensation to harmed domestic groups.
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The limitations of this study also point to avenues for future research on the attitudinal and behavioral mechanisms shaping the domestic politics of economic globalization. While I considered many dominant rival hypotheses through the use of statistical control vari- ables and the inclusion of alternative interaction terms, this article could not engage with all possible factors that may plausibly condition the relationships posited by the three hy- potheses presented. Thus, future research must investigate the sensitivity and conditionality of the general findings presented here. For instance, it seems likely that political parti- sanship might condition the relationship between media exposure and blame attributions, and/or the relationship between blame attributions and evaluations of government. Thus, rather than simply controlling for partisanship as above, future research might investigate whether these relationships are dampened or amplified under different conditions of citizen and government partisanship. Additionally, for the state-level findings, future research might investigate whether the conditioning effect of media on the globalization-welfare nexus is not itself conditional on region, national government partisanship, or various factors related to the national media environment (such as media concentration, ownership, etc.).

The findings have several implications for the study of international and comparative politics and for the prospects of democracy in a globalized world. First, the results provide some of the first evidence that mass media can be understood as a political institution that conditions the domestic politics of the global economy, thus placing on the agenda a source of cross-national and temporal variation typically omitted from previous analyses of com- parative and international political economy. As such, they contribute to current research agendas seeking more finely-tuned political accounts of the domestic effects of globalization (Kayser 2007, 341) and a better understanding of public opinion and voting behavior in the context of economic openness (Hellwig 2008; Freeman 2008). Specifically, the article suggests that mass media is an independent cause of voters discounting their evaluations of policy- makers (by increasing the probability they will identify economic openness as a top problem, but also by directly diffusing blame attributions toward international forces even holding
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