Supplementary Files

I. Survey Text

For public respondents...

According to reports by U.S. intelligence officers and independent investigative reporters, we now have conclusive evidence that a major U.S. multinational firm with a subsidiary in Guatemala is hiring abusive private security contractors in Guatemala City. These contractors are pressuring small business owners to give up their assets below market value. The company has significant financial holdings in the United States, and several thousand American jobs depend on the success of the firm.

[Control treatment: no further information]

[Low obligation treatment: The United States has previously participated in a regional meeting that suggested general guidelines for governments to deal with disreputable firms based on the Responsibilities of Transnational Corporations (RTC).]

[High obligation treatment: The United States has previously signed an international treaty where the U.S. made a commitment to deal with disreputable firms based on the Responsibilities of Transnational Corporations (RTC).]

Freezing the firm's assets will effectively shut down the firm and cost thousands of American jobs. Most of the American workers who lose their jobs will find it difficult to get a new job in the near future. Do you approve or disapprove of the U.S. government nonetheless freezing the firm's financial assets in the United States?

- Strongly approve
- Approve
- Somewhat approve
- Neither approve nor disapprove
- Somewhat disapprove
- Disapprove
- Strongly disapprove

Please write a couple sentences to explain your opinion. Your opinion is very important to us and we want to understand it.

For elite respondents...

According to reports by U.S. intelligence officers and independent investigative reporters, we now have conclusive evidence that a major U.S. multinational firm with a subsidiary in Guatemala is hiring abusive private security contractors in Guatemala City. These contractors are pressuring small business owners to give up their assets below market value. The company has significant financial holdings in the United States, and several thousand American jobs depend on the success of the firm.

[Control treatment: no further information]

[High obligation treatment: The United States has previously signed an international treaty where the U.S. made a commitment to deal with disreputable firms based on the Responsibilities of Transnational Corporations (RTC).]

[High obligation & public support treatment: The United States has previously signed an international treaty where the U.S. made a commitment to deal with disreputable firms based on the Responsibilities of Transnational Corporations (RTC). According to a recent poll, a majority of likely voters support freezing the firm's assets.]

Freezing the firm's assets will effectively shut down the firm and cost thousands of American jobs. Most of the American workers who lose their jobs will find it difficult to get a new job in the near future. Do you approve or disapprove of the U.S. government nonetheless freezing the firm's financial assets in the United States?

- Strongly approve
- Approve
- Somewhat approve
- Neither approve nor disapprove
- Somewhat disapprove
- Disapprove
- Strongly disapprove

Please explain in a couple sentences your reasoning. Your opinion is very important to us and we want to understand it.

II. Miscellaneous Tables

Table 1: Survey Sample Characteristics

Gender	
Male	0.450
Female	0.550
Age	
18-29	0.326
30-44	0.427
45-64	0.215
65 +	0.033
Education	
High school or below	0.111
Some college	0.233
College/university	0.450
Graduate/professional school	0.204
Race/Ethnicity	
Hispanic/Latino	0.050
Non-Hispanic White	0.778
African American	0.087
Political leanings	
Liberal	0.533
Neutral	0.185
Conservative	0.281

Table 2: Elite Survey Sample Characteristics

Gender	
Male	0.712
Female	0.288
Age	
18-29	0.027
30-44	0.301
45-64	0.521
65 +	0.151
Education	
High school or below	0.082
Some college	0.041
College/university	0.397
Graduate/professional school	0.411
Race/Ethnicity	
Non-Hispanic White	0.740
Hispanic/Latino	0.041
African American	0.123
Political leanings	
Liberal	0.521
Conservative	0.452
Independent	0.027

Table 3: Public Survey Balance across Treatments

	Treatment Conditions		
	Control	Low obligation	High obligation
Gender			
Male	0.436	0.464	0.450
Female	0.564	0.536	0.550
Age			
18-29	0.360	0.349	0.271
30-44	0.417	0.421	0.441
45-64	0.209	0.200	0.236
65 +	0.014	0.030	0.052
Education			
High school or below	0.095	0.115	0.122
Some college	0.237	0.209	0.253
College/university	0.412	0.498	0.437
Graduate/professional school	0.256	0.174	0.188
Race/Ethnicity			
Non-Hispanic White	0.791	0.757	0.786
Hispanic/Latino	0.062	0.043	0.048
African American	0.062	0.111	0.087
Political leanings			
Liberal	0.559	0.515	0.528
Neutral	0.147	0.204	0.201
Conservative	0.294	0.281	0.271

Table 4: Elite Survey Balance across Treatments

	Treatment Conditions		
	Control	High Obligation	High Obligation + Public Support
Gender			
Male	0.708	0.760	0.667
Female	0.292	2 0.240	0.333
Age			
18-29	0.000	0.080	0.000
30-44	0.375	0.280	0.250
45-64	0.583	0.360	0.625
65 +	0.042	0.280	0.125
Education			
High school or below	0.167	0.040	0.042
Some college	0.000	0.000	0.125
College/university	0.375	0.360	0.458
Graduate/professional school	0.417	0.480	0.333
Race/Ethnicity			
Non-Hispanic White	0.833	0.760	0.625
Hispanic/Latino	0.000	0.000	0.125
African American	0.042	0.160	0.167
Political leanings			
Liberal	0.583	0.440	0.542
Conservative	0.375	0.560	0.417
Independent	0.042	0.000	0.042

Table 5: Public Survey Results (OLS)

	Public (Model 1)	Public (Model 2)
Low obligation	0.008	0.016
	(0.028)	(0.027)
High obligation	0.094***	0.097***
	(0.028)	(0.027)
PID		−0.013*
		(0.008)
Age		0.002*
		(0.001)
Male		0.021
		(0.023)
Education		−0.011
		(0.008)
Employed		−0.031
		(0.029)
Income		0.006
		(0.004)
Asian		0.111*
		(0.059)
Hispanic/Latino		0.138**
		(0.061)
Other		0.103
		(0.078)
White		0.091**
		(0.040)
Knowledge		0.122*
		(0.073)
Political involvement		0.011
		(0.009)
Cooperative internationalism		0.297***
		(0.061)
Military internationalism		0.054
		(0.054)
Isolationism		0.005
		(0.054)
Constant	0.553***	0.181*
	(0.020)	(0.094)
Observations	675	675
R^2	0.021	0.116
Adjusted R^2	0.018	0.093
Residual Std. Error	0.293 (df = 672)	0.282 (df = 657)
F Statistic	7.144*** (df = 2; 672)	5.055*** (df = 17; 657)

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

The reference group is the control condition in which the respondent received no information about RTNC. PID represents individual respondents' political leaning with 0 being liberal and 1 being conservative. The reference group for race was black. The dependent variable was converted to percentage points. 1 signifies a shift of 100 percentage points in favor of compliance.

Table 6: Elite Survey Results (OLS)

	Elite (Model 3)	Elite (Model 4)
High obligation	0.169**	0.208**
	(0.065)	(0.078)
High obligation + public support	0.382***	0.403***
	(0.066)	(0.078)
Age		−0.0005
		(0.003)
Male		0.060
		(0.069)
Education		−0.040
		(0.033)
Black		0.028
		(0.157)
Hispanic		0.169
		(0.192)
White		0.116
		(0.112)
PID		−0.142
		(0.109)
Cooperative internationalism		−0.031
		(0.036)
Military internationalism		0.009
		(0.029)
Isolationism		−0.001
		(0.038)
Massachusetts		0.009
		(0.082)
Senate		−0.002
		(0.084)
Experience		−0.0001
		(0.004)
Constant	0.444***	0.575*
	(0.047)	(0.304)
Observations	73	73
R^2	0.325	0.378
Adjusted R^2	0.305	0.214
Residual Std. Error	0.229 (df = 70)	0.243 (df = 57)
F Statistic	16.821*** (df = 2; 70)	2.306** (df = 15; 57)
Note:		*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

The reference group is the control condition in which the respondent had no information about RTNC. PID represents individual respondents' political leaning with 0 being liberal and 1 being conservative. The reference group for race was black. Massachusetts represents whether the respondent was an elected official in Massachusetts as opposed to Georgia. Senate represents whether the respondent was a state senator or not. Political experience represents years in elected office. The dependent variable was converted to percentage points. 1 signifies a shift of 100 percentage points in favor of compliance.

Table 7: Public Survey Results (Order Logistic Regression)

	Public (Model 5)	Public (Model 6)
Low obligation	0.029	0.070
	(0.169)	(0.171)
High obligation	0.525***	0.563***
	(0.170)	(0.174)
Age		0.014**
		(0.006)
Male		0.198
		(0.143)
Education		−0.067
		(0.048)
Employed		−0.149
		(0.179)
Income		0.030
		(0.024)
Asian		0.753**
		(0.376)
Hispanic/Latino		0.851**
		(0.389)
Other		0.661
		(0.505)
White		0.567**
		(0.254)
PID		−0.087*
		(0.048)
Knowledge		0.760
		(0.462)
Political involvement		0.091
		(0.060)
Cooperative internationalism		1.962***
		(0.397)
Military internationalism		0.356
		(0.354)
Isolationism		0.151
		(0.345)
Observations	675	675
Note:		*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

The reference group in is the control condition in which respondents were provided no information about RTNC. PID represents individual respondents' political leaning with 0 being liberal and 1 being conservative. The reference group for race was black. The dependent variable is in the original 7-point Likert-scale ranging from 0 to 6.

Table 8: Elite Survey Results (Ordered Logistic Regression)

	Elite (Model 7)	Elite (Model 8)
High obligation	1.228**	1.735***
	(0.528)	(0.633)
High obligation + public support	3.545***	3.850***
	(0.694)	(0.755)
Age		0.004
		(0.018)
Male		0.549
		(0.524)
Education		−0.386
		(0.246)
Black		0.961
		(1.209)
Hispanic		1.827
		(1.458)
White		1.394
		(0.867)
PID		−1.003
		(0.780)
Cooperative internationalism		−0.154
		(0.257)
Military internationalism		0.149
		(0.209)
Isolationism		0.192
		(0.289)
Massachusetts		−0.129
		(0.574)
Senate		−0.268
		(0.624)
Observations	73	73

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

The reference group in all of the models was the control condition in which respondents were provided no information about RTNC. PID represents individual respondents' political leaning with 0 being liberal and 1 being conservative. The reference group for race was Asian. The dependent variable is in the original 7-point Likert-scale ranging from 0 to 6. Massachusetts represents whether the respondent was an elected official in Massachusetts as opposed to Georgia. Senate represents whether the respondent was a state senator or not. Political experience represents years in elected office.

Table 9: Elite Mechanisms (Multinomial Logit Regression)

	Dependent variable: causal mechanism		
	Market	Morality	Reputation
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Treatment	0.596	0.641	1.753***
	(0.486)	(0.437)	(0.548)
Constant	−1.238	−0.829	−3.728***
	(0.931)	(0.824)	(1.248)
Akaike Inf. Crit.	190.309	190.309	190.309

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
For each 1 unit change in the predictor variable, the logit of the dependent variable relative to the reference group will change by its respective coefficient estimate. The coefficient estimate is in log-odds units. The reference group for the dependent variable is the information causal mechanism. The primary independent variable of interest, treatment assignment, is coded in sequential order: 0 representing the control treatment, 1 representing the high obligation treatment, and 2 representing the high obligation and public support treatment.

Table 10: Elite Mechanisms with Covariates (Multinomial Logit Regression)

	Dependent variable: causal mechanism		
	Market	Morality	Reputation
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Treatment	1.169	0.912	3.171***
	(0.712)	(0.578)	(0.969)
Age	0.028	0.056	−0.091
	(0.045)	(0.042)	(0.074)
Male	1.223	0.275	6.088**
	(1.053)	(0.831)	(2.465)
Education	−0.475	−0.431	0.427
	(0.493)	(0.445)	(0.897)
Black	−1.827	−2.124	−2.013
	(1.856)	(1.387)	(2.047)
Asian	17.190***	13.074***	15.104***
	(1.309)	(1.436)	(1.902)
Hispanic	−5.314***	16.417***	17.687***
	(0.000)	(1.100)	(1.100)
PID	−0.079	−0.680	−2.079
	(1.767)	(1.370)	(1.879)
Cooperative internationalism	−0.190	0.419	0.733
	(0.489)	(0.452)	(0.877)
Military internationalism	−0.079	0.237	−0.490
	(0.432)	(0.393)	(0.526)
Isolationism	−0.836	−0.119	0.537
	(0.573)	(0.450)	(0.728)
Massachusetts	−0.535	0.687	−0.550
	(1.464)	(1.120)	(1.728)
Senate	0.453	−0.149	−3.256
	(1.236)	(0.947)	(2.059)
Experience	−0.030	−0.076	0.192*
	(0.069)	(0.065)	(0.106)
Constant	−0.446	−4.794	−11.602
	(3.987)	(3.689)	(7.157)
Akaike Inf. Crit.	215.870	215.870	215.870

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

For each 1 unit change in the predictor variable, the logit of the dependent variable relative to the reference group will change by its respective coefficient estimate. The coefficient estimate is in log-odds units. The reference group for the dependent variable is the information causal mechanism. The reference group for race was white. The primary independent variable of interest, treatment assignment, is coded in sequential order: 0 representing the control treatment, 1 representing the high obligation treatment, and 2 representing the high obligation and public support treatment. PID represents individual respondents' political leaning with 0 being liberal and 1 being conservative. Massachusetts represents whether the respondent was an elected official in Massachusetts as opposed to Georgia. Senate represents whether the respondent was a state senator or not. Political experience represents years in elected office.