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I. Main content and literature review

1. Industrial diplomacy
Geza Feketekuty put forward the concept of commercial diplomacy in 1990s. He pointed out that Commercial Diplomacy is diplomacy with a commercial twist designed to influence foreign government policy and regulatory decisions that affect global trade and investment. Geza Feketekuty mainly investigated how a government conducts commercial diplomacy.

Cheng Dawei (2011) pointed out that industry associations were important actors in commercial diplomacy and that they involved various commercial activities on behalf of their members' interests which constitute industrial diplomacy. Industrial diplomacy has the following features: first, actors are industry associations. Second, industrial diplomacy includes trade and foreign investment policy making and settling trade disputes. Third, industrial diplomacy has the characteristics of collective action. Fourth, industrial diplomacy uses lobbying as a tool.

Industrial diplomacy is a new concept so there isn't much academic research on it. Many scholars have done research from the point of view of private governance, collective actions and industry lobbying. Olson's (1965) collective action theory provides the theoretical framework for the study on the behavior characteristics of industry associations. Guosheng Deng and Scott Kennedy (2010) have studied the lobbying activities conducted by large Chinese enterprises and trade associations. Frederick Mayer and Gary Gereffi (2010) have researched the participation in global economic governance by private entities.

2. Endogenous factors in industrial diplomacy
Those factors which mainly focus on the actual situation of industry associations and characteristics of industrial diplomacy are called endogenous factors. Such studies include: (1) association's resources. Barney (2001) divided resources into tangible resources and intangible resources. Tangible resources include the number of employees, establishment of institutions, the amount of capital and office expenses and intangible resources include leadership ability, academic structure, age structure and past experience of collective action. Lamberg (2004) held the view that more association's resources would more easily lead to collective action. (2) Association's nature of industry or market structure. Most scholars measure market structure conditions by industry concentration and enterprise size. Olson analyzed two levels of enterprise action, one is individual action and the other is collective action. He thought that enterprises with fewer employees, larger size and higher industry concentration could reduce the free ride phenomenon which could contribute to collective action. Lenway and Rehbein (1991) supported Olson's point and they also believed industry associations with fewer employees and larger size could take collective action more easily because the benefits of it could cover the whole industry. Song Yan (2007) studied the impact of Chinese enterprises heterogeneity on the anti-dumping decisions and the conclusion was not completely consistent with the findings of western scholars. (3) Path dependence. Path dependence reflects history's impact on current and future development. The background of the associations and the historical connections with government decide the action capability of association's industrial diplomacy. Grenzke's (1989)

3 http://www.commercialdiplomacy.org/site_userguide/faq2.htm#About%20ICDP
empirical examination has proved that industrial diplomacy is relevant to the support of government. In general, associations would have the higher dependence on the government with more significant, irreplaceable and scarce resources. (4) Governance. Tucker (2008) thought clear internal rules and high level trust would lead to collective action after analysis of self-regulation, rule of game, membership fees, credibility and trust of English associations.

3. Content of this paper
Current studies on Chinese industrial diplomacy have the following problems: (1) The studies in China are mainly in cases and events, or takes form of a detailed analysis of a region, which are lack of general description about Chinese industrial diplomacy (Chen Shengyong 2004 Yu Jianxing 2007) (2). Chinese industry association is a product of reform and opening up with short developing time, complex background and significant path dependent difference which is different from the association developing in western mature economy and that increases the difficulty in the study of the industry diplomacy (3). The scope, approach and method of Chinese industrial diplomacy have not been fully legitimately established, with the lack of standardization leading to research difficulties.

This article attempts to investigate the characteristics of collective action of Chinese industrial diplomacy which reflect the current situation of Chinese industrial diplomacy. This article chooses responding to anti-dumping measures as direct study object because it's too general to choose “Chinese industrial diplomacy” as dependent variable, hoping to discover the characteristics of Chinese industrial diplomacy through a specific behavior. The article mainly focuses on the industry association’s endogenous factors’ impact on responding to anti-dumping measures. The second part of it investigates in industry association’s endogenous factors and analyzes the possibility of being independent variable in order to put forward the basic hypothesces. The third part of it is empirical examination and the fourth part of it draws the conclusion on the Chinese industrial diplomacy and makes judgment on the development phase of Chinese industrial diplomacy by comparison between the USA and china.

4. Research approach
The study of this article is built on the basis of the questionnaire survey distributed to industry associations both in USA and China. As for China, we made the analysis by using SPSS 13.0 statistical software including factor analysis, correlation and regression analysis given the large sample. We tried to use the same questionnaire to do the research about the industry associations in Washington but the statistical analysis didn’t work. There are two reasons. One is the small size of Washington’s sample and the other is the big difference between China and the USA. Many industry associations in the USA could not answer questions with Chinese characteristics. For example, American associations didn’t know the meaning of public accumulation fund for housing construction as mentioned in the questionnaire. So this article didn’t do the empirical examination on the industrial diplomacy of American industry association

2 According to China enacted in 1999, revised 2002, "Housing Provident Fund Management Regulations", the housing provident fund is the state organs, state enterprises, urban collective enterprises, foreign-invested enterprises, urban private enterprises and other urban enterprises and institutions and service workers pay long-term housing savings deposit, is an important part of China's housing reform, the allocation of housing market, social, and institutionalized the main form
and only made qualitative judgment through the result.

II. Features of Chinese industry association, the proposal of endogenous factors and basic hypotheses

1. Features of Chinese industry associations

The development model of foreign industry association can be divided into two kinds: one is based on the mature market conditions called the Anglo-American “People management” model and the other is called the Japan-Germany “Political community co-management” model, emphasizing the absolute obedience to nation after individuals transfer their rights. So the industry associations are defined as the bridge between government and enterprises.

Chinese industry association has a diversity of patterns and its creation and path dependence are closely related. In the survey we have found the following means of creation of Chinese industry association (1). Restructuring of government department under the background of political and economic reform (2) established by the guidance of government (3) established by the guidance of Association of Industry and Commerce (4) established by the initiating of industry leaders or government’s old comrades who take charge of the industry (5) the spontaneous establishment of the industry.

The above means can be divided into three categories. The article defines the first category as “market endogenous” which is similar to the Anglo-American “People management” model represented by (5). Besides, the second category is called “government endogenous” which is restructured from government department represented by (1). Finally, the third category is named “middle type” with the characteristic of Japan-Germany model represented by (3) and (4).

2. Endogenous factors

The proposal of endogenous factors which affect Chinese enterprises’ responding to anti-dumping diplomacy should follow the basic logic from the general to the specific. “General” here means the diplomacy actions of responding to anti-dumping measures, so the general analysis framework and literature of affecting factors in industrial diplomacy can be referred to. “Specific” means the concrete conditions of the survey and we should take full account of the actual situation when setting endogenous factors and index according to research result.

As described in the first part of the paper, the factors related to the literature are associations' resources, path dependence, governance and association's nature of industry or market structure. We didn’t include association’s nature of industry or market structure in the survey because the focus of the investigation was association itself rather than the member of it. In addition, we found that the Chinese industry associations were established through complex paths, with various levels of governance and different resources, a situation with distinct Chinese characteristics. For example, the government endogenous association is complete with the board, president and vice president duties and the staff have regular institution establishment, but the
board is plenty of its name. The reason is that the main leaders are from the government with little contact with members. So the governance of the association couldn’t go well. Therefore, we decided not to solely rely on the literature when setting the factors.

According to the investigation and questionnaire, we combine the highly relevant indicators into common factors to reduce the target dimensions. The common factors (independent variables) are: (1) Associations’ capacity including number of stuff, number of directors and executive directors and registered capital. (2) Associations’ resources including system resources such as office space, staff income, assignment of labor contract and payment of social insurance. This part of resources is from the system security of market economy reflecting the depth and degree of reform. (3) Corporate governance including the time and background of formation, the way leaders generate, frequency of the board meeting and the public accumulation fund for housing construction. (4) Degree of supporting by members including directors to the meeting rate, members to the meeting rate and fee collection rate. (5) The degree of democratization including the way the secretary general generates and decision making power about objectives and development direction.

We make the following assumptions according to the consideration of the above independent variables:

Hypothesis 1: The capacity of industry association affects the industrial diplomacy on responding to anti-dumping measures. The greater the capacity, the more easily lead to the industrial diplomacy actions.

Hypothesis 2: The associations’ resources affect the industrial diplomacy on responding to anti-dumping measures. The more resources are, the stronger the capacity is.

Hypothesis 3: The perfect corporate governance would increase the industrial diplomacy ability of responding to anti-dumping measures.

Hypothesis 4: The supporting degree of association members affect the industrial diplomacy on responding to anti-dumping measures. The higher the supporting degree is, the stronger the capacity is.

Hypothesis 5: The higher democratization of industry association would increase the industrial diplomacy ability of responding to anti-dumping measures.

III. Empirical research

1. On the design, survey and statistics approaches of the questionnaire
   The questionnaire mainly focuses on current status of Chinese industrial associations, including such subjects as the legal person governance, responsibility status, supporting status, etc. A number of endogenous indices are impacting industrial diplomacy nowadays. The survey objects include all industrial associations nationwide lasting from the end of
September, 2009 to January, 2010. 934 valid receipts were collected in the end covering 29 provinces excluding Xinjiang and Tibet.

According to the research object of the paper, we shifted the 934 receipts: (1) Getting rid of a small number of non-economic associations; (2) Getting rid of service industrial associations in the samples; (3) Getting rid of other manufacturing industrial associations which had never suffered antidumping suits from the samples. 442 valid samples were left after the above processing.

The data were analyzed with the SPSS13.0 statistics software with analysis approaches including factor analysis, relevant analysis and recurrence analysis.

2. Factor analysis
Based on the valid samples, we incorporated the indices closely related in the questionnaire into common factor to reduce index dimension and make analysis easy to conduct. We should point out that we find there might be more common factors likely to be combined than what is designed in line with the literature and interview of the part two of the paper due to the large number of samples when conducting empirical statistics. We hold an open attitude to the finding and test all data involved.

The paper makes use of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett test of Sphericity that the SPSS13.0 provides. Calculation result shows the KMO is 0.713, larger than the analysis critical point of 0.6; Bartlett test of Sphericity shows 0.000 of probability, smaller than 0.001 (refer to table 1). The result of the two indicates that the sample fits factor analysis.

| Table 1 KMO of the indices and result of Bartlett test of Sphericity |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| sample measure              | 0.713                     |
| Bartlett test of Sphericity |                           |
| approximation               | 2984.877                  |
| freedom degree              | 630.000                   |
| notability probability      | 0.000                     |

Through the initial test of factor analysis, we used the SPSS13.0 for the factor analysis. And chose Analyze-Data Reduction-Factors and described statistical volume with various variables in Descriptives. And we chose matlab method in the Extraction with factors larger than 1 extracted. The Maxter is 25. With Varimax of Rotation and recurrence of Score, we got the first derivative to analyze Component Matrix. Payload of each index in factors were tested and payload with modulus larger or equal to 0.4 chosen. 13 factors in all were analyzed as shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 Factor payload matrix after index rotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 number of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of standing council member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affix of Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Column 8</th>
<th>Column 9</th>
<th>Column 10</th>
<th>Column 11</th>
<th>Column 12</th>
<th>Column 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td>primary income source</td>
<td><strong>0.671</strong></td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>-0.162</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>party organization</td>
<td><strong>0.443</strong></td>
<td>-0.225</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Correlation analysis

The correlation dependence refers to two kinds of phenomena with certain relations in the development change direction and the size aspect. But which one is the cause and which one is the result could not be determined. The paper makes correlation analysis on the 13 factors in order to explore the relation between various indices and the responding of the industrial association to antidumping suits. Pearson analysis approach is applied in the regard.

(1) Relevant analysis of the 13 factors and responding to antidumping action

With Analyze – Correlate – Bivariate, we chose two indices of factors to be analyzed and whether or not to organize enterprises to respond. Then we chose Pearson in Correlation Coefficients and got the notability level and relevant coefficient. Conclusion was reached: 5 factors in all passed the test, closely related to whether or not to respond to antidumping, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Table of Relevant Coefficient of Factors and Whether or Not to Respond to Antidumping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether or not the association organize enterprises to respond to antidumping</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.121*</td>
<td>0.282**</td>
<td>-0.142**</td>
<td>0.099***</td>
<td>0.118*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*indicates statistically significant relationship at 0.05 level
**indicates statistically significant relationship at 0.01 level
***indicates significance level of F4 under 0.05 and over 0.07, which can be regarded basically relevant

According to the factor survey, we define the 5 factors respectively: F1: association capacity; F2: system resources; F3: legal person governance; F4: support degree of members; F10: democracy construction.
(2) Possible interpretation of correlation analysis of index factors

The correlation coefficient of F2 factor reaches 0.282, ranking in the first place among all the five factors. F2 directly reflexes the relation of system resources of industrial associations and industrial diplomacy. And this relation indirectly reflexes the maturity of Chinese market economy. Chinese industrial association starts to present characteristics of industrial associations of mature market economy. Reasons are as follows: market economy needs system guarantee. Social security refers to system providing society with basic guarantee and shows the system features of market economy. The soundness degree of social security reflexes levels of socialist market economy. The two indices of whether to purchase social insurance and whether to sign labor contract in F2 show a correlation. If industrial associations apply social insurance and labor security mechanism, possibility of industrial diplomacy may increase. The two indices of staff monthly income and work place show effects of industrial associations fund capability on industrial diplomacy.

The unexpected conclusion of the empirical test of F5, F6, F7 and F9 is different from the previously anticipated close relevance between these factors that shows government support and whether respond to anti-dumping suits may be effectively organized. The test result proves the difference, indicating government influence over industrial associations is not obvious. Possible explanations are: first, except small number of anti-dumping cases of industrial products related to national livelihood and valued by government, responses to anti-dumping suits of majority products are all organized by market forces and industrial associations; second, government is not fit for the response role due to its special identity and does not play significant part in its participation; third, this result proves that Chinese industrial associations are getting rid of dependence on government and becoming major market players. The F2 test is proved accordingly.

The absolute value of correlation coefficient of the F3 legal person factor is 0.142, ranking in the second place in the five factors. But minus relation is shown between the factor and dependent variables. In order to further study reasons for the minus relation, we made correlation analysis on all initial factors of F3 and found there existed close relation between the availability of house fund and proportion of staff with Bachelor’s degree and the dependent variables. The finding is in line with the hypothesis of the paper. The correlation coefficient of proportion of staff with Bachelor’s degree is 0.117, indicating response to anti-dumping requires high level of knowledge of staff. The correlation coefficient of the availability of house fund is 0.14, showing strong positive correlation and the unique reality of Chinese industrial associations. The reality is collective actions of industrial diplomacy in responding to anti-dumping may be possible only when internal problems of the associations are resolved.

The F3 indices for frequent and effective council meeting and on-behalf-of-member-will election model do not show the positive correlation between factors and dependent variables. This does not completely in line with the research hypothesis of the paper, indicating the complex internal situation of Chinese industrial associations. Further study need to be made. The paper will not make deeper hypothec interpretations.
Of the indices included in F1 associations, registered fund size shows the capital scale of the associations. The number of council members and standing council members shows their influence power. And the staff number shows human resource scale. The correlation of the factor and association capability in response to antidumping ranks the third among all the five. The effect of registered capital on the association capital scale and that of staff number on the association human resource scale are obvious.

The council members and standing council members are usually famous entrepreneurs and experts in the specialized field. The bigger the scale of these members is, the higher the proportion to involve in reputable scholars accompanying with influence scale. The survey indicates that national industrial associations transforming from the state ministries or their internal sectors are at a favorable stage in the above indices. The probable explanation is that the left social network and communication channels exert the exceptional advantage in response to antidumping.

The correlation coefficient of the factor which implies democratization construction is 0.118, ranking the forth among the five. The construction of democracy plays a relatively independent and important role in legal person governance of the industrial association. If selection of secretary-general and the power of decision-making are dominated in hands of minority, the representativeness of associations in the industry will be weakened or even eliminated, the ability to respond to anti-dumping will be greatly weakened.

The correlation coefficient of the factor which implies the degree of members’ support is 0.099, the lowest among the five factors with a 0.07 significance level. Because of the narrow distant to 0.5 and the probability of explainable economic variables, we assume it passed the significant test. The correlation of F4 factor and response to anti-dumping can be explained as follows:

Response to anti-dumping is a collective action; an agreement of units is a necessary requirement to start a collective action. The greater the support from association members, the less resistance to collective action, therefore, the probability of effective response to anti-dumping will be raised.

4. Regression analysis

Regression analysis based on the correlation analysis can help indicate the direction of this correlation and figure out the exact relationship between dependent variable measuring the effectiveness of response to anti-dumping and designed indices. We use multiple regression analysis in this part; the objects are the indices that passed the significant test. And stepwise regression analysis is used to deal with colinearity problems. Detailed results are as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>factor</th>
<th>Un-standardized</th>
<th>Standardized</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We can see from Table 4 that four factors are used in regression model, F4 is excluded. The order is F2, F3, F1, and F10. According to the previous analysis, these four factors to some extent represent their indices, meaning the four factors will help explain the effectiveness of industrial associations to response to anti-dumping. And the square of R is 0.118, F-value is 12.186. We still assume that the square of R has a good degree of fitting. All T-values are smaller than 0.05, some even 0.01, which shows these indices should be included in regression equation.

The regression equation is:

Whether industrial associations can respond effectively to anti-dumping = 0.205 + 0.282 × resources of associations – 0.142 × legal person governance + 0.121 × volume of associations + 0.118 × construction of democracy

IV. Conclusion and estimation on the development phase of Sino-U.S diplomatic ties

1. Results of empirical analysis
The conclusion of the empirical analysis proves hypothesis 1, hypothesis 2, hypothesis 4 and hypothesis 5 of the paper, except hypothesis 3. However, after the correlation analysis for all the factors of F3, hypothesis 3 has been testified partly. To sum up, the inner-born factors of the industry association affect the diplomacy.

There still exist some defects: Firstly, there is no model for the empirical analysis, but analysis respectively for all the index of the questionnaire, which lacks systematicity. Secondly, some questions of the questionnaire are lack of objectivity, but full of subjectivity, therefore, some estimating results lack the support of evidence. Thirdly, regression analysis demonstrates the factor of corporate governance and industry diplomacy has negative correlation. Although we have analyzed the relativity of all the factors, this paper has not explained the reason of the negative correlation.

2. Investigation on American industry association and initial estimation on the phase of Chinese industry diplomacy development

In August, 2011, we visited ten American industry associations. Although it makes sense in statistics to survey American associations with questionnaires for Chinese associations, it doesn’t
work in reality. This paper can only draw the conclusion based on the investigation of American associations.

(1). American industry associations stem from the folk, in simpler way than the Chinese associations. And the American associations are established on voluntary basis by members.

(2). American associations operate independently, and take charge of their own decisions, finance, personnel and assignment. Ordinarily, the operating activities are conducted by the directors on board according to the regulations. The finance comes from membership fees. The guidance for membership fee is decided by the all the members and directors according to the expenditures. In contrast, Chinese industry associations are under control of industry chief department and government agency. And the key point is not industry diplomacy but the organization itself, which leads to the fact that Chinese associations are lack of independence and tend to be hampered.

(3). American industry associations build up their reputation through protecting the interest of corporations and have few administrative restrains on members. They maintain their appeal to members by lobbies in Congress and the White House and litigate legal proceedings for the businesses. Interest exchange is the core attraction of these associations.

(4). American industry association decides the content of diplomacy through democratic ways. For instance, US-China Business Council gets to know the need of 200 members through questionnaires before testifying the direction of diplomacy.

(5). The fact that American industry ascertains the diplomacy emphases demonstrates that American industry diplomacy steps in the mature phases. According to the collective action theory, it is not easy for industry diplomacy to act collectively. It is thought that the key point for collective action is to decide the diplomacy topic. Steel Manufactures Association use ‘Wacry’ to describe the key issue.

Compare to American industry diplomacy, Chinese industry diplomacy is still in the primary phase, which is supported by our positive analysis. Among all factors, F2 and F1 have the biggest influence on industry diplomacy. It demonstrates that whether or not to buy insurance, or to sign the contract, monthly revenue and stuff quantity affect Chinese industry diplomacy actions. Industry associations have to solve the revenue problem so as to pay attention to the diplomacy. Although F10 proves that democratic construction affects Chinese industry diplomacy, however, it is not obvious. F4 has not been chosen into the regression equation. But it may be the most important factor for actions of American industry associations.
References:

程大为，商务外交应用及案例，中国人民大学出版社，2011 年。
宋妍等，“异质性与行业反倾销应诉的集体行动”，管理前沿，2007 年第三期。
郑小勇，“行业协会对集群企业外生性集体行动的作用机理研究”，社会学研究，2008 年第六期。
张建军、张志学。“中国民营企业家的政治战略”，管理世界，2005年第7期。
陈勇等，“温州民间商会—自主治理的制度分析”，管理世界，2004年第2期。
郁建兴等，“温州商会的例外与不例外”，浙江大学学报，2007年第6期。
一．本文的研究内容及文献综述

1. 行业外交

Geza Feketekuty在20世纪90年代提出了商务外交的概念，指出商务外交是指与商务有关的外交，旨在影响外国政府与全球贸易和投资相关的政策和管理决策。Geza Feketekuty主要考察了政府主体如何进行商务外交活动。

程大为(2011)指出行业协会是商务外交的重要行为者，行业协会以自身利益为出发点，参与各种商务外交事件或活动便构成了行业外交。行业外交具有如下特点：第一，行为者是行业协会；第二，行业协会围绕贸易和投资政策的制定、贸易争端的解决等商务外交内容展开；第三，行业协会具有集体行动的特点；第四，行业协会使用游说等工具。


2. 行业外交的内生性因素

从行业协会的自身实际情况出发，考察行业外交的特点，我们将这些自身要素称之为内生性因素。这类研究包括：(1) 行业协会的资源(association's resources)。Barney(2001)将资源分为有形(tangible)资源和无形(intangible)资源，有形资源指协会的雇员人数、机构设置、资本量、办公室经费等，无形资源指领导人的能力、学历结构、年龄结构、过去集体行动的经验等。Lamberg等(2004)认为协会资源越多，越容易导致行业协会的集体行动。(2) 行业协会的行业性质(nature of industry)或市场结构(market structure)。多数学者认为行业集中度、企业规模大小来衡量市场结构状况。奥尔森分析了企业两个层次的行动，一是企业的个体行动(individual action)，二是集体行动，他认为成员少、企业规模大、行业集中度高的行业协会能够最大程度上减少搭便车，利于集体行动的发生。Lenway and Rehbein(1991)支持奥尔森的观点，认为企业大、成员数量少的行业协会便于开展集体行动，因为集体行动的好处可以覆盖到全行业。宋妍等(2007)研究了中国企业之间的异质性对行业反倾销决策的影响，结论不完全与西方学者的研究发现一致。(3) 路径依赖(Path dependence)。路径依赖反映的是历史对现在和将来发展的影响，行业协会的形成历史，与政府的渊源决定了协会行业外交的行动能力。Grenzke(1989)的实证分析得出行业协会行业外交行动与政府的支持有关。一般来说，资源越重要、越稀缺、越不可替代，协会对政府的依赖程度就越高。(4) 治理水平。Tucker(2008)分析了英国行业协会的内部管理(self-regulation)、游戏规则(rule of the game)、会员费(membership fees)、信用(credibility)、信任(trust)等多种治理要素，认为内部规则清晰、会员信任程度高会导致集体行动的产生。

3. 本文的研究内容

目前对中国行业外交的研究存在以下问题：(1) 中国国内的研究或是案例性的、事件性的，或是对某一地区的详细分析(陈剩勇，2004；郁建兴，2007)，缺乏对中国行业外交一般性、整体性的描述。(2) 中国行业协会是中国改革开放之后的产物，发展时间短，缺乏背景复杂，路径依赖差异显著，不同于西方成熟市场经济中发展起来的行业协会，这加大了行业外交研究的难度。(3) 中国行业外交的范围、方式、方法尚未得到立法充分确定，行业外交具有不规范性，这造成了研究困难。
本文试图挖掘中国行业外交集体行动的特点，反映中国行业外交的一般现状。鉴于选择“中国行业外交”作为研究的因变量过于笼统，本文选择了“反倾销应诉”作为直接研究对象，希望通过这样一个具体行为透视中国行业外交的特点。本文重点研究行业协会内生性因素对“反倾销应诉”的影响，文章第二部分将研究行业协会内生性因素，并分析其作为自变量的可能性，进而提出本文的基本研究假设。第三部分是实证分析。第四部分得出关于中国行业外交的研究性结论，并通过中美行业外交的对比判断中国行业外交的发展阶段。

4. 研究方法

本文的研究建立在对中美两个国家行业协会的问卷调查基础上，其中对中国的问卷调查样本量大，可以对数据的分析采用SPSS13.0统计软件进行，分析方法包括因子分析、相关分析和回归分析。我们试图用相同的调查问卷对华盛顿的行业协会做调查，但无法进行统计分析，这是因为：第一，华盛顿的样本量偏小；第二，中美行业协会差异巨大，很多美国行业协会看到我们具有中国特色的调查问卷后都表示无法回答问题。例如，中国问卷上问及了住房公积金等问题，这对于美国协会来说，简直不知道在谈论什么问题。鉴于此，本文没有对美国行业协会的行业外交做实证性分析，而是利用调查结果对美国行业外交作出了定性的判断。

二. 中国行业协会的特点、内生性因素的提出与基本假设

1. 中国行业协会的特点

国外行业协会的发展模式可以分为两种：一是建立在成熟的市场条件下的英美“民管”模式，二是德国和日本的“政社共管”模式，强调个人让渡权利后对国家的绝对服从，行业协会被定义为政府与企业的桥梁。

中国行业协会的模式具有多样性，其产生与路径依赖密切相关。在调查中我们发现中国行业协会的产生途径包括：（1）在经济政治体制改革背景下，由政府部门转制而成；（2）由政府引导成立；（3）由工商联主导成立；（4）由行业内领军人物或政府主管该行业的老同志倡导发起；（5）行业内自发组建。以上途径产生的协会可以分为三类，第一类以（5）为代表，是行业内自发组建的，类似美英的“民营”模式，本文定义为“市场内生型”。第二类以（1）为代表，是直接从政府机构转化而来的，本文称之为“政府内生型”。第三类由（2）、（3）、（4）组成，具有日德模式的特点，本文将其定义为“中间型”。

2. 内生性因素的提出

提出影响中国企业应诉反倾销行业外交行动的内生性因素及指标需要遵循从一般到特殊的基本逻辑。这里，“一般”是指应诉反倾销属于行业外交行动，那么，行业外交行动影响因素的一般性分析框架和文献资料是可以被借鉴的。“特殊”是指此次调查问卷所研究的具体情况，内生性影响因素和指标的设定需充分考虑调查访谈的实际情况，根据调查发现设定。

如本文第一部分介绍，文献中涉及的因素有：行业协会资源、路径依赖、治理水平、行业协会所处的行业性质或市场结构。但本次调查并没有涉及到“行业协会所处的行业性质或市场结构”这个因素，原因是我们考察的焦点是协会本身而非协会内部成员企业的情况。调查还发现，中国行业协会形成路径复杂、治理水平参差不齐，资源状况不同，具有鲜明的中国特色。例如，政府内生型行业协会虽然组织齐全，设有理事会、会长、副会长等职务，其
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根据中国1999年颁布、2002年修订的《住房公积金管理条例》，住房公积金是指国家机关、国有企业、城镇集体企业、外商投资企业、城镇私营企业及其他城镇企业、事业单位及其在职职工缴存的长期住房储金，是中国住房改革的重要内容，是住房分配市场化、社会化、制度化的主要形式。
工作人员也具有事业编制，但理事会往往空有其名，由于主要领导来自政府，协会与会员联系少，协会治理并不通畅。因此，在因子设定上我们决定并不能够完全依赖文献。

根据调查情况及问卷内容，我们将调查问卷中相关度较高的指标合并成公因子，以降低指标维度，方便分析。梳理出来的主要公因子（即自变量因素）有：（1）协会容量，指标有工作人员数量、理事数量、常务理事数量、注册资金。（2）协会资源，包括协会“制度性资源”，如办公场所、工作人员收入、是否签订劳动合同、是否缴纳社会保险。这部分资源来自于市场经济条件下健全的制度保障，反映了改革深度和市场化程度。（3）法人治理，指标有成立时间、成立背景、本科以上人员比例、领导人产生方式、理事会召开次数、是否有住房公积金。（4）会员支持程度，指标有理事到会率、会员到会率、会费收取率。（5）民主化程度，指标有秘书长产生方式、宗旨与发展方向问题的决策权。

鉴于对以上自变量的设计与考察，我们提出如下假设：

假设 1. 行业协会自身容量规模会影响应诉反倾销行动，容量越大越容易发生行业外交行动。

假设 2. 行业协会的资源，会影响应诉反倾销的行业外交行动能力，资源越多，能力越强。

假设 3. 行业协会法人治理越完善越会增强应诉反倾销行业外交行动能力。

假设 4. 行业协会会员支持程度会应诉反倾销行业外交行动，支持程度越高，集体行动的意愿就越强。

假设 5. 行业协会民主化程度越高越会增强协会应诉反倾销的行业外交行动能力。

三、实证研究

1. 问卷设计、调研及统计方法的说明

问卷是针对中国行业协会目前的状况而设计的，内容包括行业协会的法人治理、职能发挥状况、会员支持情况等，囊括了目前影响行业外交的众多内生性指标。问卷的调查对象包括全国所有行业协会，调查时间从 2009 年 9 月底持续至 2010 年 1 月，共收到有效回执 934 份，覆盖全国除新疆和西藏以外的 29 个省份。

根据本文的研究目的，我们对 934 份有效回执进行了筛选：（1）去除样本中少部分非经济类协会；（2）去除样本中的服务业行业协会。（3）去除样本中未遭遇反倾销诉讼的其他制造业行业协会。经过上述样本处理程序之后，得到有效样本 442 份。

对数据的分析采用 SPSS13.0 统计软件进行，分析方法包括因子分析、相关分析和回归分析。

2. 因子分析

针对有效样本，我们将调查问卷中相关度较高的指标合并成公因子，以降低指标维度，方便调查分析。应该指出，进行实证统计时，由于样本数据多，我们发现可能合并的公因子要多于本文第二部分根据文献和访谈所设计的。对此，我们保持开放的态度，对所有数据进行检验。

本文采用 SPSS13.0 中所提供的 KMO 样本测试法（Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy）和巴特利球体检验法（Bartlett test of Sphericity）对所有变量的相关矩阵进行检验。计算结果显示 KMO 值为 0.713，大于 0.6 的可因子分析临界点；巴特利球体检验的显著性概率为 0.000，小于 0.001（见表 1）。二者的取值说明样本适合进行因子分析。

### 表 1  指标的 KMO 和巴特利球体检验结果

鉴于反倾销这一贸易措施不适用于服务业企业，故将服务业协会去除。
通过因子分析先期检验后，运用 SPSS13.0 进行因子分析。选择 Analyze - Data Reduction – Factors，在 Descriptives 中选择各变量描述统计量，在 Extraction 中选择主成分法，因子提取的原则为特征根大于 1，最大收敛迭代次数为 25，在 Rotation 中选择方差最大旋转，在 Score 中选择回归法，得到一阶因子分析载荷矩阵后，考察各个指标在因子中的载荷，载荷达到绝对值大于等于 0.4 的指标入选，共分析出 13 个因子。如表 2 所示。

表 2 指标旋转后的因子负载矩阵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>指标</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
<th>F6</th>
<th>F7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>工作人员数量</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>常务理事数量</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>-0.255</td>
<td>-0.157</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>理事数量</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>-0.808</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>注册资金</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>-0.449</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>是否购买社会保险</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>是否签订劳动合同</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>-0.267</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>工作人员月收入</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>办公场所</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>一年召开理事会次数</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>-0.244</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>成立背景</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>成立时间</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>-0.440</td>
<td>-0.138</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
<td>-0.123</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>本科以上人员比例</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>-0.425</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>是否享受住房公积金</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>会长副会长产生方式</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 年会费收取率</td>
<td>-0.164</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>理事会到会率</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>会员大会到会率</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>-0.188</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>决策独立程度</td>
<td>-0.336</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人事独立程度</td>
<td>-0.227</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>秘书长是否为专职</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>-0.155</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>对业务主管单位看法</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>政府的支持程度</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.171</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>是否对外投资</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>是否经营实体</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>是否有公务员</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>-0.149</td>
<td>-0.231</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

表 2 续
在确定这 13 个因子并求出相应的因子值之后，便可再利用 SPSS 软件对这 13 个因子代
替初始变量指标进行相关和回归分析，从而得到本文想要说明的问题。

3. 相关分析
相关关系是指两类现象在发展变化的方向与大小方面存在一定的关系，但不能确定这
两类现象之间哪个是因哪个是果。为探求调查表中各指标与行业协会组织企业应诉反倾销之
间的关系，本文对 13 个因子进行相关分析，本部分采用 Pearson 相关系数分析法。

（1）13 个因子与应诉反倾销行动的相关性分析
选择 Analyze – Correlate – Bivariate，在 Variables 中选取要分析的因子与“是否组织企
业应诉反倾销”两个指标，Correlation Coefficients 中选择 Pearson，得到显著性水平和相关
系数。对 13 个因子指标均做上述过程，得出结论：共有 5 个因子通过了显著性水平检验，
与是否组织应对反倾销关系密切，如表 3 所示。

表 3 因子与是否组织应对反倾销相关系数表

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>因子</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>协会是否组织企业应对反倾销</td>
<td>0.121*</td>
<td>0.282**</td>
<td>-0.142**</td>
<td>0.099***</td>
<td>0.118*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

注：
1. *表示在 0.05 的水平上显著相关
2. **表示在 0.01 的水平上显著相关
3. ***表示 F4 未达到 0.05 的显著性水平，但达到了 0.07，也可视为基本相关

根据因子的调查内容，我们把这 5 个因子分别定义为：F1：协会容量，F2：制度性资源，
F3：法人治理，F4：会员支持程度，F10：民主化建设。

（2）关于指标因子相对性分析的可能解释
F2 因子的相关系数达到了 0.282，在全部五个因子中排第一位，F2 直接反映了行业协会
制度性资源与行业外交行动的关系，而这一关系间接反映了中国市场经济的成熟，中国行业协会
开始具备了成熟市场经济中行业协会的特点。这是因为：市场经济需要制度保障，社会
保障是社会依法建立的对社会成员基本生活予以保障的制度，是市场经济发展的制度特
点，它的健全、完备程度反映了社会主义市场经济的发展程度。F2 因子调查中所呈现的结果反映了
中国行业协会正成为依赖制度保障的市场主体。F2 因子中“是否购买社会保险”和“是否
签订劳动合同”两个指标反映了如果行业协会纳入社会保险和劳动保障制度体系，会增加
行业外交的可能性。“工作人员月收入”和“办公场所”两个指标反映了行业协会资金条件对
行业外交的影响。

本次实证检验结论较为出人意料的对 F5、F6、F7、F9 的检验，原先预计体现政府对行
业协会支持程度的 F5、F6、F7、F9 因子会与应诉反倾销有较大关联，但检验
结果并非如此，说明政府对行业协会的影响不明显。对此，有可能的解释主要是：首先，除
少部分关乎国计民生的工业品的反倾销案件受到政府重视外，其余大部分商品的反倾销应对都由市场力量和行业协会力量自行组织；其次，政府由于自身特点不适合作为反倾销应诉主体，在参与的反倾销应诉案例中并没有起到太大的作用；第三，这一结果恰恰证明了中国行业协会正逐步摆脱对政府的路径依赖，成为市场主体，证明了 F2 的检验。

F3 法人治理因子的相关系数绝对值为0.142，在全部五个因子中排第二位，但是该因子和因变量呈现负相关。为了进一步研究负相关产生的原因，我们将 F3 全部初始因子做了相关性分析，我们将 F3 中是否有住房公积金和本科以上人员比例这些指标与因变量正相关性高，与本文的研究假设一致。本科以上学历人员比例的相关系数为0.117，这一因子反映了应诉反倾销对参与人员的资质水平有较高要求。是否有住房公积金的相关系数是0.14，该指标呈现出强烈的正相关关系，反映了中国行业协会独特的现实，即只有解决好行业协会的内部问题，才能产生应诉反倾销这类行业外交的集体行动。

F3 因子中能够经常有效地召开理事会、领导人选举方式体现会员意愿等指标未能很好地说明因子和因变量的正相关关系，这和本文的研究假设不完全一致，说明中国行业协会内部治理状况复杂，仍需要我们做更深入的研究，本文不再做进一步假设性解释。

F1 协会容量所包含的指标中，注册资金数量可以反映协会资本规模，理事数量、常务理事数量可以反映协会影响力规模，工作人员数量可以反映协会人力规模。该因子与协会组织应对反倾销能力的相关性在五个因子中居于第三位。注册资金对于协会资本规模的影响以及工作人员数量对于协会人力规模的影响显而易见，协会的理事和常务理事一般都由业内知名的企业家和专家学者组成，理事和常务理事的规模大，则协会将行业中的知名人士囊括的比率就会相应较高，其影响力规模也就较大。调查中我们发现更多地由国家部委及部委内部单位转换而来的全国性行业协会明显占有这几个指标上的优势，而且由于全国性协会拥有许多其身份仍为行政管理机关所减弱的老关系和老渠道，协会在行业协会对反倾销的集体行动上拥有地方性协会所不能比拟的路径优势，这也是协会容量因子与协会组织应诉反倾销能力相关的可能的解释。

F10 民主化建设因子的相关系数为 0.118，在全部五个因子中排第四位。民主化建设在行业协会法人治理中处于相对独立和重要的地位。如果秘书长的人选以及重大事项的决策权为少数人或少数企业所把持，协会在全行业的代表性就会削弱甚至消失，组织应对反倾销的能力就会大大削减。

F4 会员支持程度因子的相关系数为 0.099，是全部五个因子中的最低值，且显著性水平为 0.07，原则上没有通过显著性检验，但考虑到其与 0.05 的水平并没有太大的差距，且经济变量分析中应优先考虑经济变量的解释性，因此也将其视作通过检验。F4 因子与应诉反倾销的相关性可以解释为：组织企业应诉反倾销是集体行动事件，集体行动的各单位达成一致是开始集体行动的必要条件。行业协会的会员支持程度高，组织集体行动的阻力就会相对小，有效应诉反倾销的概率就会提高。

3. 回归分析

在相关分析的基础上进一步进行回归分析，将有利于指明相关关系的方向，从整体上更加清晰地把握协会能否有效组织应对反倾销这个因变量与诸多指标之间精确的关系。本部分采用多元回归分析，对象为因子分析后通过显著性水平检验的因子，考虑到因子之间可能存在多重共线性的问题，本文采用逐步回归法，逐步剔除不重要的自变量，消除多重共线性问题。

选择 Analyze – Regression – Liner，方法中选择逐步回归法（Stepwise），因变量为“协会是否组织应对反倾销”，自变量为 F1, F2, F3, F4, F10。具体结果如表 4 所示。

表 4 因子对是否组织应对反倾销的逐步回归分析
从表4中可以看出，5个因子中有4个进入了回归模型，最初检验在0.05水平上不显著的F4因子支持程度没有入选。首先进入的是F2因子，其后依次是F3、F1、F10这三个因子。通过前面的分析，这四因子较好地代表了它们的底层指标，说明这四因子对于解释行业协会能否有效应诉反倾销都有帮助。同时，回归方程的调整R方为0.118，F检验值为12.186。R方值虽然有些偏低，但考虑到回归所含因子应优先突出其经济解释性，因而认为回归方程达到了显著水平，拟合度较好。各指标的t检验均小于0.05，部分小于0.01，表明各指标均应出现在回归方程中。

由以上分析可以得出回归方程：
行业协会能否有效组织应诉反倾销 = 0.205 + 0.282 ×协会资源 – 0.142 ×法人治理 + 0.121 ×协会容量 + 0.118 ×民主化建设

### 四、结论及对中美行业协会外交发展阶段的判断

#### 1. 实证分析的结论

实证分析的结论证明了本文的假设1，假设2，假设4和假设5，并未证明假设3，但是，对假设3中F3全部初始因子做了相关性分析后，假设3当了部分证明。总之，行业协会内生性诸要素对行业外交有影响。

本部分研究仍存在一些不足：第一，实证分析部分并没有建立起经济模型，而是对调查问卷的各相关指标分别进行分析，系统性不强。第二，调查问卷的部分题目客观性不足，主观性过强，使部分估计得出的结果没有得到实证的支持。第三，回归分析结果F3法人治理因子和行业外交行动呈负相关关系，虽然我们针对该公因子的全部因子进而做了相关性分析，找出了与本文研究假设一致的相关因子，但本文并未解释整体上呈负相关的原因。

#### 2. 对美国行业协会的考察与对中国行业外交发展阶段的初步判断

2011年8月，我们走访了近十家美国行业协会，虽然用中国调查问卷同样调查美国协会在统计学上具有意义，但在实践中，这种方法行不通。本文只能根据美国协会的实地考察，得出如下关于美国行业协会的一般性认识：

(1) 美国行业协会是民间性质，比中国行业协会的路径来源简单。美国行业协会发起自愿、会员驱动。

(2) 美国行业协会组织自立，经费自筹。美国行业协会在决策、财务、人事和分配等方面享有充分的自主权。一般而言，美国行业协会日常活动由全体会员选举出的理事会按
照协会章程开展。行业协会的运行经费来源主要是会费。会费交纳标准，通常由全体会员或理事会根据共同讨论的预算决定，以支定收。而中国行业协会必须由行业主管部门和政府机关双重管理，且这种双重管理的重点不是协会的行业外交活动，而是组织本身。这直接导致我国的行业协会缺乏独立性，在行业外交中受到诸多牵制。

（3）美国行业协会通过维护企业利益树立自己在行业外交中的权威。美国协会对会员没有行政约束，主要是通过在国会和白宫为企业进行游说以及在法院帮助企业打官司等具体业务来增强对企业的吸引力，通过利益交换将企业紧密地团结在自己的周围。

（4）美国行业协会能依赖民主方式确定行业外交的内容。例如，1973年成立的US-China Business Council每年都通过调查问卷的方式了解其200多家会员的利益需求，并根据需求确定协会行业外交的重点。

（5）美国行业协会确定行业外交核心议题的能力说明美国行业外交进入了发展的成熟阶段。根据奥尔森的集体行动理论，行业协会产生行业外交的集体行动并不容易。被调查的美国行业协会多认为，确定行业外交行动议题是产生集体行动力的关键。Steel Manufactures Association用“Warcry”来形容什么是核心议题。

与美国行业外交相比，中国行业外交处于发展的初级阶段。我们的实证分析支持了这一判断。所有因子中 F2 制度性协会资源和 F1 协会容量对行业外交的影响力大，这说明是否购买社会保险、是否签订劳动合同、工作人员月收入、工作人员数量等这类行业协会的成立初期所面临的问题正在最大程度上影响着中国行业协会的行业外交行动。行业协会只有解决好工作人员收入等基础性问题才能关注行业外交。虽然 F10 指标说明民主化建设已经开始对中国行业外交产生影响，但是，影响并不显著。F4 会员支持程度因子在本次实证分析中却没有入选回归方程，而该因子可能是影响美国行业协会行动的最关键因素。
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