

Supporting Information for “Can Rising Powers Reassure? Shifting
Power, Foreign Economic Policy, and Perceptions of Revisionist
Intent”

October 2024

1 About the elite survey

We included our experiment on a longer survey of U.S. foreign policy elites. Our partners gathered the names and contact information for 12,557 individuals working at think tanks or non-governmental organizations in the United States working on issues related to U.S. foreign policy. 1,276 individuals answered at least one question on the survey and 813 individuals completed our experiment.

To be included in the sample, respondents had to be employed at one of 174 non-governmental organizations or 75 of the most influential U.S.-based IR think tanks tracked by the 2019 Global Go To Think Tank Index Report. Examples of think tanks included: Center for Strategic and International Studies, Heritage Foundation, Center for American Progress, German Marshall Fund of the US, and Center For New American Security. Examples of NGOs included: National Endowment for Democracy, Oxfam-America, The Carter Center, World Wildlife Fund. At organizations that work on more than issues of relevance to U.S. foreign policy, only those employees are listed as working on foreign policy issues were surveyed.

The elite experiment vignette differed in the following minor ways from that fielded on the public. First, we assumed a working knowledge of global governance institutions and so did not spell out what the IMF and World Bank actually do. Second, we did not remind respondents of the location of the recipient countries (Dominican Republic and Haiti). Third, the introduction to the experiment read somewhat differently. The elites saw, “Below we will describe the behavior of a hypothetical country. Please consider how you might feel about the country’s motives and how the United States might be affected by this country’s behavior.” The public saw, “Below we will describe a country and give you some information about its foreign policy choices. Please consider how you might feel about the country’s motives and its ability to sway the future foreign policy choices of countries outside the United States.”

Table 1: Self-reported organization type among think tank and NGO respondents

Org. type	N	%
A non-governmental organization	307	37.8%
A think tank	275	33.8%
Both	157	19.3%
No response	10	1.2%
Other	64	7.9%
Total	813	-

Table 2: Rank distribution among think tank and NGO respondents

Rank	N	%
Junior	25	3.1%
Associate	55	6.8%
Mid-level	188	23.1%
Senior	460	56.6%
Board Member	10	1.2%
Other	63	7.7%
No response	12	1.5%
Total	813	-

All NGOs that undertake research, advocacy, or implementation work that “crosses borders” and are potentially influenced or affected by US foreign policy decisions were included in the final list.

2 Demographics

Public demographics

Table 3: Distribution of demographics in public sample

Label	DLABSS	CCES Benchmark (2020)
Gender		
Male	321 (58.58%)	48.5%
Female	164 (29.93%)	51.5%
Other/Prefer not to say	63 (11.50%)	0%
Income		
Less than \$30,000	100 (18.25%)	26.1%
Between \$30,000 and \$59,999	103 (18.80%)	25.41%
Between \$60,000 and \$120,000	169 (30.84%)	25.67%
More than \$120,000	90 (16.42%)	11.74%
Prefer not to say	86 (15.69%)	11.08%
Race		
Asian	5 (0.91%)	4.29%
Black	6 (1.09%)	12.86%
Hispanic	7 (1.28%)	9.86%
Indigenous	6 (1.09%)	0.69%
White	452 (82.48%)	68.76%
Other	20 (3.65%)	3.54%
Prefer not to say	52 (9.49%)	0%
Age		
18–29	25 (4.56%)	21.04%
30–39	52 (9.49%)	15.93%
40–49	47 (8.58%)	13.73%
50–59	103 (18.80%)	17.56%
60–69	132 (24.09%)	17.94%
70+	132 (24.09%)	13.8%
Prefer not to say	57 (10.40%)	0%
Party ID		
Democrat	139 (25.36%)	42.2%
Independent/Other	169 (30.84%)	19.85%
Republican	162 (29.56%)	37.95%
Prefer not to say	78 (14.23%)	0%
Region		
Northeast	102 (18.61%)	18%
Midwest	97 (17.70%)	21.62%
South	160 (29.20%)	39.28%
West	134 (24.45%)	21.1%
No response	55 (10.04%)	0%
Education		
No high school diploma	2 (0.36%)	8.85%
High school graduate	86 (15.69%)	28.56%
Some college	0 (0.00%)	21.36%
2 year degree	60 (10.95%)	10.19%
4 year degree	167 (30.47%)	19.67%
Post-grad	182 (33.21%)	11.37%
Prefer not to say	51 (9.31%)	0%

Think Tank/NGO demographics

Table 4: Demographic distribution for elite sample.

	Think Tank/NGO Sample (N=813)
Gender	
Male	426 (52.40%)
Female	251 (30.87%)
Prefer not to say	136 (16.73%)
Race	
Asian	42 (5.17%)
Black	43 (5.29%)
Hispanic	0 (0.00%)
Indigenous	1 (0.12%)
White	447 (54.98%)
Other	107 (13.16%)
Prefer not to say	173 (21.28%)
Age	
18–29	46 (5.66%)
30–39	121 (14.88%)
40–49	148 (18.20%)
50–59	159 (19.56%)
60–69	111 (13.65%)
70+	62 (7.63%)
Prefer not to say	166 (20.42%)
Political Party	
Democratic	311 (38.25%)
Independent/Other	185 (22.76%)
Republican	44 (5.41%)
Prefer not to say	273 (33.58%)
Education	
B.A. or B.S.	64/473 (13.53%)
Master’s	0/473 (0.00%)
M.D.	10/473 (2.11%)
J.D.	29/473 (6.13%)
Ph.D.	236/473 (49.89%)
Other	22/473 (4.65%)
Prefer not to say	112/473 (23.68%)

3 Results tables

Models are estimated via OLS. The original scales were seven point Likert-style “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” scales with a “neither agree nor disagree option” in the middle. For the binary models, we dichotomize the scale so that a 100 represents any level agreement while a 0 represents neither or any level of disagreement.

3.1 Results tables for models presented in main text

In the text, we first discuss the main effect of each treatment. We then discuss the results of models in which we interact the treatments with each other in order to produced disaggregated estimates.

Table 5: Results for think tank sample presented in text

	Nat sec. threat	Change rules	More influence	Public influence	Elite influence
	-	-	-	-	-
(Intercept)	57.30*** (5.27)	75.56*** (4.56)	38.64*** (5.22)	70.45*** (4.89)	90.00*** (3.18)
SQ Rhetoric	1.11 (7.22)	-10.56 (6.61)	-2.99 (7.08)	-5.11 (6.82)	-0.89 (4.45)
SQ Behavior	-21.02** (6.96)	-24.68*** (6.55)	22.97** (6.97)	9.19 (6.20)	-0.62 (4.31)
Dominican Republic	-3.46 (7.21)	-3.44 (6.35)	0.79 (7.10)	-2.19 (6.71)	-6.35 (4.84)
SQ Rhet.*SQ Behav.	-13.15 (9.56)	-7.32 (9.39)	6.03 (9.74)	11.46 (8.56)	-4.65 (6.49)
SQ Rhet.*Dom. Rep.	0.18 (9.98)	8.53 (9.11)	5.08 (9.82)	6.93 (9.35)	6.02 (6.52)
SQ Behav.*Dom. Rep.	4.67 (9.76)	12.18 (9.26)	4.91 (9.65)	1.39 (8.70)	9.27 (6.23)
SQ Rhet.*SQ Behav.*Dom. Rep.	-5.86 (13.39)	-19.84 (13.20)	-17.18 (13.77)	-13.01 (12.19)	-8.17 (9.28)
Num.Obs.	808	811	805	808	809
R2	0.082	0.104	0.062	0.024	0.008

** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.001

Table 6: Results tables for public sample presented in text

	Nat sec. threat	Change rules	More influence	Elite influence
	-	-	-	-
(Intercept)	41.27*** (6.25)	61.29*** (6.24)	24.59*** (5.56)	90.32*** (3.79)
SQ Rhetoric	-2.56 (8.83)	-12.90 (8.94)	-3.62 (7.62)	-6.45 (6.04)
SQ Behavior	-7.94 (8.66)	-20.02** (8.83)	23.03** (8.43)	-6.20 (5.99)
Dominican Republic	7.34 (8.62)	7.63 (8.26)	3.79 (7.66)	-5.19 (5.63)
SQ Rhet.*SQ Behav.	-9.25 (11.64)	-0.52 (12.03)	-7.29 (11.32)	7.13 (8.63)
SQ Rhet.*Dom. Rep.	-2.30 (12.34)	-12.27 (12.18)	3.37 (10.86)	2.57 (8.83)
SQ Behav.*Dom. Rep.	-6.83 (12.05)	0.33 (12.10)	-12.95 (11.66)	10.29 (8.26)
SQ Rhet.*SQ Behav.*Dom. Rep.	-3.86 (16.32)	5.03 (16.88)	8.76 (16.24)	2.76 (11.76)
Num.Obs.	531	532	531	532
R2	0.049	0.077	0.030	0.015

** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.001

3.2 Results with pre-treatment controls

In these models, we also control for potentially relevant pre-treatment demographic characteristics. Gender is a binary variable that takes on a value of 0 if the respondent is male and 1 if the respondent is female. Ideology is a three point scale from 1 (conservative) to 3 (liberal) with “middle of the road” in between. Education is on an integer scale ranging from 1 (no high school) to 5 (advanced degree). Age is recorded in years since birth.

Table 7: Results for think tank sample, binary DVs

	Nat sec. threat	Change rules	More influence	Public influence	Elite influence
	w/ ctrls	w/ ctrls	w/ ctrls	w/ ctrls	w/ ctrls
(Intercept)	37.10 (34.23)	60.78 (32.45)	13.05 (33.72)	35.21 (30.95)	80.62*** (23.47)
SQ Rhetoric	-0.10 (8.50)	-15.45** (7.71)	0.78 (8.19)	-6.35 (7.91)	0.42 (5.33)
SQ Behavior	-13.09 (8.18)	-25.05*** (7.56)	20.64** (8.05)	8.46 (7.16)	1.73 (5.17)
Dominican Republic	4.22 (8.34)	-0.07 (7.08)	0.97 (8.53)	-1.74 (7.85)	-3.33 (5.51)
Age	0.33** (0.15)	0.20 (0.15)	0.00 (0.15)	0.34** (0.12)	0.06 (0.10)
Female	-4.70 (4.17)	-8.64** (4.24)	-12.07** (4.25)	-2.13 (3.75)	-6.96** (3.03)
Ideology (3-pt, L to R)	8.44** (3.00)	2.51 (2.89)	-6.10** (3.04)	-1.95 (2.66)	-4.27** (2.01)
Education	-1.93 (6.71)	1.18 (6.50)	7.86 (6.61)	4.61 (6.00)	2.79 (4.82)
SQ Rhet.*SQ Behav.	-22.34** (11.02)	-5.99 (10.79)	10.93 (11.14)	16.94 (9.64)	-3.84 (7.51)
SQ Rhet.*Dom. Rep.	-1.64 (11.42)	11.52 (10.25)	0.16 (11.34)	8.22 (10.73)	6.39 (7.28)
SQ Behav.*Dom. Rep.	-7.79 (11.18)	6.78 (10.44)	11.77 (11.17)	3.58 (9.95)	7.29 (6.98)
SQ Rhet.*SQ Behav.*Dom. Rep.	8.04 (15.32)	-14.39 (15.09)	-23.36 (15.80)	-12.18 (13.58)	-8.98 (10.30)
Num.Obs.	611	612	609	612	611
R2	0.111	0.128	0.089	0.054	0.024

** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.001

Table 8: Results for think tank, original scale DVs

	Nat sec. threat	Change rules	More influence	Public influence	Elite influence
	w/ ctrls	w/ ctrls	w/ ctrls	w/ ctrls	w/ ctrls
(Intercept)	4.01*** (0.89)	5.97*** (0.91)	2.72** (0.88)	3.80*** (0.84)	5.43*** (0.76)
SQ Rhetoric	-0.06 (0.22)	-0.53** (0.22)	0.06 (0.22)	-0.15 (0.21)	-0.08 (0.19)
SQ Behavior	-0.52** (0.21)	-0.82*** (0.22)	0.79*** (0.21)	0.47** (0.20)	-0.14 (0.18)
Dominican Republic	0.04 (0.22)	-0.23 (0.23)	0.14 (0.22)	-0.05 (0.21)	-0.17 (0.19)
Age	0.01** (0.00)	0.01** (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.01 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Female	-0.01 (0.11)	-0.13 (0.12)	-0.21 (0.11)	-0.08 (0.11)	-0.14 (0.10)
Ideology (3-pt, L to R)	0.28*** (0.08)	0.09 (0.08)	-0.20** (0.08)	-0.02 (0.08)	-0.11 (0.07)
Education	-0.03 (0.18)	-0.17 (0.18)	0.29 (0.17)	0.20 (0.17)	0.12 (0.15)
SQ Rhet.*SQ Behav.	-0.47 (0.30)	0.02 (0.30)	0.14 (0.30)	0.35 (0.28)	0.02 (0.26)
SQ Rhet.*Dom. Rep.	-0.06 (0.30)	0.27 (0.30)	-0.22 (0.29)	0.08 (0.28)	0.29 (0.25)
SQ Behav.*Dom. Rep.	-0.07 (0.29)	0.25 (0.30)	0.09 (0.29)	0.05 (0.28)	0.36 (0.25)
SQ Rhet.*SQ Behav.*Dom. Rep.	0.01 (0.42)	-0.48 (0.43)	-0.09 (0.41)	-0.21 (0.39)	-0.49 (0.36)
Num.Obs.	611	612	609	612	611
R2	0.129	0.125	0.122	0.074	0.016

** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.001

Table 9: Results tables for public, binary DVs

	Nat sec. threat	Change rules	More influence	Elite influence
	w/ ctrls	w/ ctrls	w/ ctrls	w/ ctrls
(Intercept)	15.22 (13.29)	41.65** (14.18)	61.72*** (13.57)	90.54*** (10.42)
SQ Rhetoric	-0.73 (9.34)	-16.42 (9.14)	-8.83 (8.42)	-4.05 (6.49)
SQ Behavior	-5.85 (9.04)	-22.95** (9.13)	16.24 (8.87)	-5.30 (6.66)
Dominican Republic	13.34 (9.07)	9.43 (8.44)	-4.46 (8.13)	-1.67 (6.13)
Age	0.23 (0.15)	0.16 (0.15)	-0.34** (0.15)	-0.05 (0.11)
Female	-7.10 (4.70)	-15.53** (4.79)	6.55 (4.70)	-11.12** (3.86)
Ideology (3-pt, L to R)	7.70** (2.60)	6.58** (2.57)	-11.04*** (2.54)	-2.32 (2.04)
Education	-0.50 (2.08)	1.11 (2.00)	2.84 (1.91)	2.44 (1.61)
SQ Rhet.*SQ Behav.	-11.51 (12.30)	2.39 (12.44)	0.87 (11.91)	4.70 (9.27)
SQ Rhet.*Dom. Rep.	-9.81 (12.97)	-8.29 (12.40)	7.58 (11.58)	-2.77 (9.42)
SQ Behav.*Dom. Rep.	-15.25 (12.62)	-0.45 (12.63)	-10.16 (12.11)	6.28 (9.20)
SQ Rhet.*SQ Behav.*Dom. Rep.	5.28 (17.29)	-0.15 (17.65)	2.22 (16.97)	10.46 (12.71)
Num.Obs.	460	461	460	461
R2	0.094	0.145	0.109	0.046

** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.001

Table 10: Results for public, orig. scale

	Nat sec. threat	Change rules	More influence	Elite influence
	w/ ctrls	w/ ctrls	w/ ctrls	w/ ctrls
(Intercept)	2.95*** (0.49)	4.23*** (0.37)	4.42*** (0.44)	5.95*** (0.34)
SQ Rhetoric	0.04 (0.28)	-0.40 (0.24)	0.07 (0.27)	-0.19 (0.21)
SQ Behavior	-0.12 (0.29)	-0.45 (0.23)	0.63** (0.28)	-0.41 (0.25)
Dominican Republic	0.42 (0.27)	0.36 (0.22)	0.12 (0.28)	0.13 (0.21)
Age	0.02** (0.01)	0.01 (0.00)	-0.01** (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Female	-0.33** (0.16)	-0.44*** (0.13)	0.28 (0.15)	-0.41** (0.13)
Ideology (3-pt, L to R)	0.34*** (0.09)	0.33*** (0.07)	-0.44*** (0.08)	-0.07 (0.07)
Education	-0.09 (0.07)	-0.06 (0.05)	0.12** (0.06)	0.06 (0.05)
SQ Rhet.*SQ Behav.	-0.79 (0.40)	-0.45 (0.33)	0.02 (0.36)	0.10 (0.32)
SQ Rhet.*Dom. Rep.	-0.34 (0.40)	-0.27 (0.33)	-0.28 (0.39)	-0.30 (0.32)
SQ Behav.*Dom. Rep.	-0.34 (0.41)	-0.05 (0.33)	-0.36 (0.39)	0.04 (0.34)
SQ Rhet.*SQ Behav.*Dom. Rep.	0.46 (0.58)	0.24 (0.49)	0.43 (0.53)	0.41 (0.45)
Num.Obs.	460	461	460	461
R2	0.141	0.219	0.160	0.058

** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.001

4 Balance tests

In the main text, we report estimates based on regression models that include only our treatment indicators (and their interaction) as the independent variables. To check for balance, we estimate models that predict potentially relevant pre-treatment characteristics (age, gender, ideology, and education level) as a function of treatment. The results show that balance across treatment conditions was quite good. Only in the case of gender in the think tank sample do we see evidence of a potentially important imbalance. Women are over represented somewhat in the SQ Rhetoric/Not SQ Behavior treatment condition. But, as the results above show, controlling for gender does not alter any of the conclusions that we draw about our treatments. Ideology is a three point scale from 1 (conservative) to 3 (liberal) with “middle of the road” in between. Education is on an integer scale ranging from 1 (no high school) to 5 (advanced degree). Age is recorded in years since birth.

Table 11: Predicting demographic features as a function of treatment assignment (Think Tank Sample).

	Age	Ideology	Education	Female
(Intercept)	49.82*** (1.07)	1.50*** (0.05)	4.94*** (0.02)	0.29*** (0.04)
SQ Rhetoric	-0.57 (1.52)	-0.10 (0.07)	-0.05 (0.03)	0.11** (0.05)
SQ Behavior	-0.90 (1.53)	0.01 (0.07)	-0.03 (0.03)	0.08 (0.05)
SQ Rhet.*SQ Behav.	1.67 (2.17)	0.13 (0.10)	0.04 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.07)
Num.Obs.	650	691	679	679
R2	0.001	0.007	0.005	0.011

** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.001

Table 12: Predicting demographic features as a function of treatment assignment (Public Sample).

	Age	Ideology	Education	Gender
(Intercept)	59.17*** (1.36)	2.13*** (0.08)	3.86*** (0.10)	0.31*** (0.04)
SQ Rhetoric	-1.53 (1.94)	-0.09 (0.12)	0.03 (0.14)	0.04 (0.06)
SQ Behavior	-0.81 (2.00)	-0.16 (0.12)	0.07 (0.14)	0.07 (0.06)
SQ Rhet.*SQ Behav.	1.94 (2.78)	0.27 (0.16)	-0.08 (0.20)	-0.10 (0.09)
Num.Obs.	491	488	497	489
R2	0.001	0.007	0.001	0.003

** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.001