**ELECTRONIC APPENDIX (Data Details and Sources)** for Cathie Jo Martin and Duane Swank, “Gonna Party Like It’s 1899.”

**EMPLOYERS’ SCOPE**
Existence and scope (i.e., density) of national peak association of employers for circa 1900, 1914, 1925, 1938, and 1955. Coding scale: 1.00 = none or minimum, 2.00 = moderate, 3.00 = high (where coding is done in .5 increments). Sources: for 1900-1938, Crouch (1993) and European country-specific sources cited therein; multi-country surveys of employers, especially Windmuller and Gladstone (1984); and additional country-specific studies of the political economy of economic development in non-European cases: Australia (e.g., Maddock and McClean 1987; Forster 1964; 1970); Canada (e.g., Coleman 1986; Marr and Patterson 1980); New Zealand (e.g., Hawke 1985; Mabbitt 1995); United States (e.g., contributions to Engerman and Gallman 2000).

**EMPLOYERS’ PEAK POWERS**
Degree of power (e.g., control of strike/lockout calls, support funds; bargaining strategy) of national peak association of employers for circa 1900, 1914, 1925, 1938, and 1955. Coding scale: 1.00 = none or minimum, 2.00 = moderate, 3.00 = high (where coding is done in .5 increments). Sources: for 1900-1938, Crouch (1993) and European country-specific sources cited therein; multi-country surveys of employers, especially Windmuller and Gladstone (1984); and additional country-specific studies of the political economy of economic development in non-European cases: Australia (e.g., Maddock and McClean 1987; Forster 1964; 1970); Canada (e.g., Coleman 1986; Marr and Patterson 1980); New Zealand (e.g., Hawke 1985; Mabbitt 1995); United States (e.g., contributions to Engerman and Gallman 2000).

**EMPLOYERS’ PEAK ASSN POLICY INTEGRATION**
Degree of integration of national peak association of employers in national policy process for circa 1900, 1914, 1925, 1938, and 1955. Coding scale: 1.00 = none or minimum, 2.00 = moderate, 3.00 = high (where coding is done in .5 increments). Sources: for 1900-1938, Crouch (1993) and European country-specific sources cited therein; multi-country surveys of employers, especially Windmuller and Gladstone (1984); and additional country-specific studies of the political economy of economic development in non-European cases: Australia (e.g., Maddock and McClean 1987; Forster 1964; 1970); Canada (e.g., Coleman 1986; Marr and Patterson 1980); New Zealand (e.g., Hawke 1985; Mabbitt 1995); United States (e.g., contributions to Engerman and Gallman 2000).

**CENTRALIZATION OF BARGAINING**
Centralization of collective bargaining between unions and employers circa 1900, 1914, 1925, 1938, and 1955. Coding scale: 1.00 = none or minimum, 2.00 = moderate, 3.00 = high (where coding is done in .5 increments). Source: for 1900-1938, Colin Crouch, *Industrial Relations and European State Traditions*. New York: Oxford University Press, Clarendon, 1993.; multi-country surveys of employers and industrial relations history (e.g., John Windmuller and Alan Gladstone, eds., *Employers Associations and Industrial Relations*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1984); and country-specific sources.
UNION CENTRALIZATION
Powers (e.g., strike funds, appointment of officials in constituent unions, strategy) of national peak association of labor for circa 1900, 1914, 1925, 1938, and 1955. Coding scale: 1.00 = none or minimum, 2.00 = moderate, 3.00 = high (where coding is done in .5 increments). Source: for 1900-1938, Colin Crouch, *Industrial Relations and European State Traditions*. New York: Oxford University Press, Clarendon, 1993.; multi-country surveys of employers and industrial relations history (e.g., John Windmuller and Alan Gladstone, eds., *Employers Associations and Industrial Relations*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1984); and country-specific sources.

EMPLOYERS ORGAN FOR COLLECTIVE GOODS
Employers’ cooperation to provide collective business goods (skills/training systems, export marketing strategy and related, coordination for industrial development and competitiveness). Ordinal scale: 1 = little or no coordination among employers for collective business goods; 2 = moderate coordination (e.g., cooperation for skills, development, competitiveness within one sector; cooperation in primarily one area such as skills/training); 3 = relative extensive cooperation among employers in two or more areas of collective goods in several economic sectors.

Sources: for 1900-1938, Crouch (1993) and European country-specific sources cited therein; multi-country surveys of employers, especially Windmuller and Gladstone (1984); and additional country-specific studies of the political economy of economic development in non-European cases: Australia (e.g., Maddock and McClean 1987; Forster 1964; 1970); Canada (e.g., Coleman 1986; Marr and Patterson 1980); New Zealand (e.g., Hawke 1985; Mabbitt 1995); United States (e.g., contributions to Engerman and Gallman 2000).

FINANCE PRODUCER
Ordinal scale of finance-producer linkages based on (1) reliance by industry on bank loans vs securities markets and (2) detailed economic histories of financial systems that assess degree of long-term bank-industry linkages and coordination.

1 = industrial sector investment finance exhibits relatively strong reliance on securities, or mix of securities, retained profits and non-bank finance; bank finance focused on short-term credit for commercial operations of industry; banks do not, to any significant extent, hold securities; long-term formal and informal relationships between banks and industrial customers limited

2 = some bank finance of long-term investment of industry (e.g., some universal banks within banking); banks underwrite and hold securities of industrial customers to moderate extent; security markets of moderate importance

3 = fully developed universal banking: strong long-term interlocks between banks and industry; banks underwrite and extensively hold securities; banks make investment loans to industry and otherwise provide long-term finance as well as provide short-term commercial credit to industrial customers.
Quantitative indicators of bank lending versus security markets for the 1900-1930s period are available for nine of 16 nations from Goldsmith (1985): Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Norway, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and the United States. Additional data on stock market capitalization and bank lending for most historic country decades points are from Rajan and Zingales (2003), national statistical yearbooks, and/or country studies (see below).

Core sources for decade-by-decade assessment of finance-producer linkages:

Australia: Butlin (1987); Forster (1964).
Canada: Drummond (1986); Marr and Patterson (1980); Raynauld (1967); Sweeny (1997).
Finland: Lindgren (1997).
Italy: De Rosa (1997); Toniola (1995); Vasta and Baccini (1997).
New Zealand: Hawke (1985)
Switzerland: Cassis (1995; 1997)
UK/Britain: Capie (1995); Newton (2003); Ross (1995)
United States: Chernow (1990); Vitols (2001); White (1986; 2000)

Data Source References


UK: Edward Elgar.


