The Impact Of Leadership Turnover On Trading Relations Between States

Posted on July 31, 2022

Introduction

Fiona McGillivray and Alastair Smith's article "The Impact of Leadership Turnover on Trading Relations Between States" asks why trade between countries sometimes changes sharply when political leaders leave office and why the effect differs across political systems. The article's central insight is that international economic relations are not governed only by impersonal state interests. Leaders make commitments, build reputations, reward supporters, and face domestic institutions that affect whether partners expect agreements to continue. (McGillivray & Smith, 2004)

The original review correctly identifies domestic institutions and leader-specific punishment as important, but it occasionally overstates the results by saying democratic leaders are generally less likely to cheat. The article makes a more specific argument: leadership change has different consequences depending on the size of the winning coalition and the institutional ability to hold leaders accountable. A strong analysis should explain the theory, hypotheses, dyadic trade design, findings, limitations, and continuing relevance without treating a 2004 statistical relationship as a universal law.

The Research Puzzle

Traditional international-relations theories often treat the state as a continuing actor whose preferences remain relatively stable. Governments change, but treaties, geography, firms, and strategic interests persist. Yet trading partners sometimes punish a country after a leader violates cooperation, and relations may recover when that leader leaves.

The puzzle is why turnover restores trade in some regimes but disrupts it in others. If punishment is directed at the state, replacing one leader should not matter. If cooperation depends entirely on personal trust, every turnover should create uncertainty. McGillivray and Smith propose that domestic institutions determine which logic dominates.

Leader-Specific Punishment

A leader-specific punishment strategy responds to defection by reducing cooperation while the offending leader remains in power, then restoring relations after that leader leaves. This strategy can deter opportunism because the leader personally bears the cost through reduced economic benefits, political support, or resources.

The strategy requires outsiders to identify who controls policy and to believe that a successor is not bound to the predecessor’s behavior. It is more plausible where leaders have personal discretion and where policy is closely tied to the ruling coalition.

Selectorate Theory

The article draws on selectorate theory, which distinguishes the selectorate—the people with some role in choosing leaders—from the winning coalition whose support is essential for a leader to remain in office. The size of the winning coalition affects whether leaders rely more on public goods or private benefits to maintain power.

In systems with large winning coalitions, leaders generally need broad support and have incentives to provide public policies, economic performance, and credible cooperation. In systems with small coalitions, leaders may survive by distributing private benefits to a narrow group. International trade can provide resources for either strategy.

Democratic Institutions

Democracies usually have larger winning coalitions, competitive elections, legislative constraints, independent media, and more transparent policy processes. These features can make national commitments less dependent on one person. A trading partner may expect institutions, firms, and voters to support continuity even when leadership changes.

Turnover can still create uncertainty. New governments may revise tariffs, sanctions, environmental standards, or alliances. The claim is comparative: institutionalized democracies may experience smaller leader-specific trade disruption than personalist or narrow-coalition systems.

Autocratic Institutions

Autocracy is not one uniform category. Military regimes, monarchies, dominant-party systems, and personalist dictatorships differ in succession rules and institutional constraint. The article’s logic is strongest where an individual leader can direct trade and distribute benefits personally.

If a leader defects from cooperation, partners may target that leader. When the leader is removed, trade can recover because the successor can establish a new relationship. In a stable party-based autocracy, however, policy may persist despite turnover. Later research should therefore disaggregate regime types.

Main Hypotheses

The broad expectation is that leadership change can reduce trade because it disrupts relationships and creates uncertainty. The institutional hypothesis qualifies this effect. In large-coalition systems, turnover should have less impact because policy is constrained and reputations are more institutional. In small-coalition systems, the identity of the leader matters more, and turnover may restore trade following punishment.

These hypotheses connect domestic political survival with international economic behavior. They move beyond the simple statement that democracies trade more or that autocrats are unreliable. (Mansfield et al., 2002)

Dyadic Trade Data

The authors use dyadic data, meaning observations of trade between pairs of states over time. This structure allows them to examine whether exports or imports change around leadership turnover while accounting for characteristics of both countries and their relationship.

Trade flows are influenced by economic size, distance, alliances, conflict, exchange rates, global cycles, and trade agreements. Statistical models must control for such factors so that leadership change is not merely standing in for recession, war, or regime collapse.

Measurement of Leadership Change

Leadership turnover appears simple but is difficult to measure consistently. A democratic election, palace coup, death in office, party replacement, and military seizure all count as changes but carry different information. Scheduled succession may reassure markets; violent turnover may damage infrastructure and expectations.

The article’s aggregate approach supports a general theory, but future research should distinguish regular and irregular turnover, ideological distance between leaders, and whether bureaucratic and party institutions remain intact.

Measurement of Institutions

Winning-coalition and selectorate measures translate complex political systems into variables suitable for comparison. This provides theoretical clarity but inevitably simplifies. Formal voting rules may not reveal actual elite bargaining, corruption, military influence, or personal networks.

Institutional measures should therefore be interpreted as models, not literal counts of every supporter. Robustness tests using alternative democracy, constraint, and regime-type measures can strengthen confidence.

Principal Findings

The article finds that leadership turnover affects trade differently across institutional settings. The effect of change in democracies is less pronounced, while turnover in smaller-coalition systems can restore trading relations that had been reduced under a particular leader. This pattern is consistent with leader-specific punishment.

The result does not mean trade always falls after turnover or that every autocratic successor receives immediate trust. It indicates an average conditional relationship within the data and model. Individual cases can differ because of war, sanctions, ideology, debt, resource dependence, or institutional collapse.

Why Trade Partners Punish

States may reduce trade after contract violation, expropriation, aggressive behavior, or failure to honor political bargains. Some actions are formal sanctions; others emerge through licensing, procurement, finance, or firm expectations. Punishment can signal that cooperation has consequences.

Targeting a leader rather than an entire population may be strategically attractive, but trade restrictions often impose diffuse harm on workers and consumers. The political mechanism should not be confused with an ethical endorsement of sanctions.

Reputation

The article contributes to debates about whether states or leaders carry reputations. A state has institutions, treaties, and historical patterns, but decision-makers also learn about individual leaders. Personal reputation matters most when authority is concentrated and succession can change policy.

Reputation is issue-specific. A government may honor trade contracts while violating security commitments, or maintain tariff policy while changing human-rights positions. Researchers should avoid treating trustworthiness as one permanent national trait.

Domestic Coalitions and Trade

Trade creates winners and losers. Exporters, import-competing industries, consumers, workers, and regions have different interests. Leadership turnover can change which coalition has influence. A new government may protect agriculture, pursue industrial policy, or reduce barriers for consumer benefit.

The selectorate framework captures survival incentives, but detailed case analysis can reveal the organizations behind policy. Business associations, unions, militaries, parties, and state-owned enterprises may shape continuity beyond the leader.

Strengths of the Article

The article integrates comparative politics, international relations, and political economy. Its theory produces testable expectations rather than merely observing that leaders matter. Dyadic trade data connect political change with measurable economic behavior.

It also avoids a purely regime-level explanation. Instead of saying democracies are inherently trustworthy, it explains how coalition size and accountability affect incentives. This mechanism can generate new research on sanctions, investment, alliances, and disputes.

Limitations

First, observational data cannot eliminate every alternative explanation. Leadership turnover may occur during crises that independently reduce trade. Statistical controls help but do not create random assignment. Second, aggregate trade may hide product-level change. Strategic commodities, consumer goods, and intermediate inputs may respond differently.

Third, the historical period and country coverage matter. Global value chains, digital trade, multinational firms, and modern sanctions have changed the structure of commerce. Fourth, regime categories can hide variation. Fifth, the model may understate bureaucratic, legal, and corporate continuity.

The 2004 Context

The article was published during a period of expanding globalization, growing trade institutions, and post–Cold War optimism, though conflict and political transition remained common. Its data largely precede recent developments such as large-scale supply-chain securitization, digital services, pandemic disruption, and intensive use of financial sanctions.

This does not make the theory obsolete. It means the theory should be retested under new conditions rather than applied mechanically.

Contemporary Relevance

Leadership turnover remains important when elections produce uncertainty about tariffs, industrial subsidies, export controls, or trade agreements. Firms may delay investment until they understand the new government. Markets also assess whether campaign promises will survive legislative, judicial, and bureaucratic constraints.

In personalist systems, succession can create greater uncertainty because policy information is concentrated. It can also provide an opportunity to reset relations. The article helps explain why foreign governments distinguish between pressure on a current leader and long-term isolation of a country.

Global Value Chains

Modern trade involves components crossing borders several times. Leadership-driven restrictions can affect firms in third countries, creating network effects not captured fully by bilateral totals. Dependence on a particular supplier can make trade resilient because switching is costly, or fragile because governments view dependence as a security risk.

Future research can use product-level and firm-level data to examine whether turnover changes sourcing, inventories, contracts, and investment before it changes total trade.

Trade Agreements and Institutions

International institutions can reduce the personal effect of leadership change by creating rules, dispute procedures, and expectations. However, agreements are not self-enforcing. Domestic leaders decide whether to comply, renegotiate, or withdraw.

The interaction between international and domestic institutions is therefore important. A democratic leader constrained at home may still challenge an agreement if the political coalition rewards it. An autocratic state may maintain stable trade through strong bureaucratic or party institutions.

Follow-Up Research Design

A modern replication could combine leader data with product-level trade, sanctions, trade-policy announcements, election timing, and measures of personalism. It could distinguish regular elections, term-limited transitions, coups, deaths, and revolutionary change. Event-study methods could examine expectations before turnover and adjustment afterward.

Researchers should test whether results differ for democracies, party autocracies, monarchies, military regimes, and personalist systems. Qualitative cases could identify whether foreign partners explicitly targeted a leader or whether trade changed through market fear.

Policy Implications

Governments seeking stable trade should build institutions that outlast leaders: transparent rules, professional customs agencies, reliable courts, legislative oversight, and credible dispute mechanisms. Personal relationships can facilitate agreement, but dependence on them creates succession risk.

Foreign partners should distinguish between a leader, a governing coalition, and the population. Punishment designed to change elite incentives should be evaluated for humanitarian and strategic effects. Restoring cooperation after turnover may encourage accountability, but premature trust can reward continuity disguised as change.

Conclusion

McGillivray and Smith explain leadership turnover by connecting international trade with domestic political survival. Their argument is not simply that new leaders disrupt commerce. It is that the effect depends on institutions. In large-coalition systems, commitments are more likely to be embedded in broad political and legal structures, so turnover has a smaller average effect. In narrow-coalition systems, trade and punishment can become more leader-specific, allowing relations to recover when the leader changes. (Mesquita et al., 2003)

The article's theoretical clarity and dyadic evidence make it an important contribution, but its conclusions are conditional. Regime type, succession method, economic crisis, trade agreements, firms, and product networks can alter outcomes. The strongest lesson is that states are neither perfectly permanent actors nor collections of isolated personalities. International trade is shaped by the interaction of leaders, coalitions, institutions, and partners' expectations.

Works Cited

McGillivray, F., & Smith, A. (2004). The impact of leadership turnover on trading relations between states. *International Organization, 58*(3), 567–600. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818304583054

Bueno de Mesquita, B., Smith, A., Siverson, R. M., & Morrow, J. D. (2003). *The Logic of Political Survival*. MIT Press.

Mansfield, E. D., Milner, H. V., & Rosendorff, B. P. (2002). Why democracies cooperate more. *International Organization, 56*(3), 477–513.