Supplementary Appendices for "International Law, Military Effectiveness, and Public Support for Drone Strikes"

The following is the list of appendices included below:

- Supplementary Appendix A: Instrument for TESS/GfK Survey (September 2013)
- Supplementary Appendix B: Instrument for mTurk Follow-up Survey (November 2013)
- Supplementary Appendix C: Comparison of Survey Samples to Benchmarks of U.S. Adult Population
- Supplementary Appendix D: Codebook Describing Variables from TESS/GfK Survey
- Supplementary Appendix E: Codebook Describing Variables from mTurk Survey

Supplementary Appendix A: Instrument for TESS/GfK Survey (September 2013)

The survey was fielded September 6-23, 2013 by the survey research firm GfK (formerly Knowledge Network) through funding provided by Time-sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences (TESS).[1]

Background Information given to all respondents (control group only receives this prompt)
There has been a lot of recent discussion about the use of unmanned aerial vehicles, also known as drones, by the United States to target suspected militants.

Treatment groups then receive one of the following additional prompts that varies the issue frame (sovereignty / civilians / effectiveness), or source (UN / NGO / U.S. Government). Treatments involving the UN or NGO are associated with "con" issue frames (violating sovereignty; violating civilians; ineffective), and the U.S. government associated with "pro" issue frames (complying with sovereignty; complying with civilians; effective) respectively.

International Law #1: Jus ad Bellum (Sovereignty)

IO Violate
The United Nations Special Rapporteur for Human Rights and Counterterrorism has indicated that these strikes violate international law because they break the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the country where the attack takes place.

NGO Violate
The non-governmental organization (NGO) Human Rights Watch has indicated that these strikes violate international law because they break the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the country where the attack takes place.

U.S. Government Comply
The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has indicated that these strikes do not violate international law because they are an act of self-defense against individuals plotting attacks against Americans.

International Law #2: Jus in bello (Civilian Conduct)

IO Violate
The United Nations Special Rapporteur for Human Rights and Counterterrorism has indicated that these strikes violate international law because they do not take necessary measures to prevent the death of civilians.

[1] Data collected by Time-sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences, NSF Grant SES-0818839, Jeremy Freese and James Druckman, Principal Investigators.

NGO Violate
The non-governmental organization Human Rights Watch has indicated that these strikes violate international law because they do not take necessary measures to prevent the death of civilians.

U.S. Government Comply
The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has indicated that these strikes do not violate international law because they take necessary measures to prevent the death of civilians.

Military Effectiveness
IO Ineffective
The United Nations Special Rapporteur for Human Rights and Counterterrorism has indicated that the strikes trigger anti-US sentiment and help militants recruit new members, making Americans less safe.

NGO Ineffective
The non-governmental organization Human Rights Watch has indicated that the strikes trigger anti-US sentiment and help militants recruit new members, making Americans less safe.

U.S. Government Effective
The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has indicated that the strikes have been instrumental in killing suspected militants and making Americans safer.

Respondents are then asked the following questions.

Question #1: Support for drones. The wording for the first question is the same for all respondents.
Do you approve or disapprove of the use of drone strikes by the United States?
Approve strongly / Approve somewhat / Neither approve nor disapprove / Disapprove somewhat / Disapprove strongly

Question #2: Credibility of the source. The wording for the second question differs based on the source of the elite source. Because the control group received no elite source, respondents in this group were not asked this question.

To what extent do you believe (the United Nations Special Rapporteur for Human Rights and Counterterrorism / Human Rights Watch / the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff) is a credible source on the topic of drone strikes?
Very credible / Somewhat credible / Neither credible nor not credible / Somewhat not credible / Not very credible

Supplementary Appendix B: Instrument for mTurk Follow-up Survey (November 2013)

The follow-up survey was fielded November 20-23, 2013 with participants recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk (mTurk).

Background Information given to all respondents (control group only receives this prompt)
There has been a lot of recent discussion about the use of unmanned aerial vehicles, also known as drones, by the United States to target suspected militants.

The instrument only involves a single treatment group, which receives the following additional prompt focusing on violation of the treatment of civilians.
Several human rights groups recently reported that these drone strikes by the United States violate international law because they have killed many civilians.

All respondents are then asked the following questions.

Question #1: Support for drones
Do you approve or disapprove of the use of drone strikes by the United States?
Approve strongly / Approve somewhat / Neither approve nor disapprove / Disapprove somewhat / Disapprove strongly

Question #2: Morality
Do you think it is morally wrong for the United States to use drone strikes?
Yes, they are morally wrong / No, they are not morally wrong

Question #3: U.S. image
How much do you agree or disagree that drone strikes hurt America's image in the world?
Agree strongly / Agree somewhat / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree somewhat / Disagree strongly

Question #4: Recruitment
How much do you agree or disagree that drone strikes trigger anti-Americanism and help terrorists recruit new members?
Agree strongly / Agree somewhat / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree somewhat / Disagree strongly

Question #5: Special Forces
Do you approve or disapprove of replacing American drone strikes with alternatives that increase the risk of American casualties, such as sending in special forces?
Agree strongly / Agree somewhat / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree somewhat / Disagree strongly

Supplementary Appendix C: Comparison of Survey Samples to Benchmarks of U.S. Adult Population

Table C1: Comparison of Characteristics of the National Population to the Sample for GfK Drones Experiment (September 2013)

	Adult U.S. Population (%)	GfK Sample (%)	Absolute Deviation (%)
Sex			
Male	48	50	2
Female	52	50	2
Average deviation			2
Age (years)			
18-24	11	10	1
25-34	17	15	2
35-44	16	17	1
45-54	18	18	0
55-64	17	20	3
65 or older	20	20	0
Average deviation			1
Education			
No high school diploma	11	7	4
High school diploma	31	33	2
Some college	29	26	3
College degree	30	33	3
Average deviation			3
Income			
Less than $10,000	6	4	2
$10,000-$24,999	16	12	4
$25,000-$49,999	25	23	2
$50,000-$74,999	19	20	1
$75,000-149,999	25	32	7
$150,000 or more	9	9	0
Average deviation			3
Marital Status			
Married	55	55	0
Not married	45	45	0
Average deviation			0
Race			
White	82	73	9
Non-White	18	27	9
Average deviation			9
Region			
Midwest	23	23	0
Northeast	20	19	1
South	32	36	4
West	25	23	2
Average deviation			2
Total average deviation			2

Note: Benchmarks for adult U.S. population drawn from the September 2013 series of the Current Population Survey (CPS).
Sums for particular variables may not equal to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table C2: Comparison of Characteristics of the National Population to the Sample for mTurk Follow-up Experiment (November 2013)

	Adult U.S. Population (%)	mTurk Sample (%)	Absolute Deviation (%)
Sex			
Male	48	60	12
Female	52	40	12
Average deviation			12
Age (years)			
18-24	11	29	18
25-34	17	48	31
35-44	17	14	3
45-54	18	6	12
55-64	17	4	13
65 or older	20	0.5	19.5
Average deviation			16
Education			
No high school diploma	11	3	8
High school diploma	30	10	20
Some college	29	45	16
College degree	30	44	14
Average deviation			15
Race			
White	82	78	4
Non-White	18	22	4
Average deviation			4
Region			
Midwest	23	22	1
Northeast	20	21	1
South	32	34	2
West	25	23	2
Average deviation			2
Total average deviation			11

Note: Benchmarks for adult U.S. population drawn from the November 2013 series of the Current Population Survey (CPS). Unlike for the GfK data, this table does not include values for income or marital status, since neither was asked in the mTurk survey.
Sums for particular variables may not equal to 100 percent because of rounding.

Supplementary Appendix D: Codebook Describing Variables from TESS/GfK Survey

GROUP: Indicator for experimental conditions, where 1 = Control group; 2 = UN/Sovereignty; 3 = HRW/Sovereignty; 4 = Government/Sovereignty; 5 = UN/Civilians; 6 = HRW/Civilians; 7 = Government/Civilians; 8 = UN/Effectiveness; 9 = HRW/Effectiveness; 10 = Government/Effectiveness. Note: For the tables and figures reported in the article, the Human Rights Watch (HRW) treatments are referred to by a more generic non-governmental organization (NGO) label. The same applies to other relevant variables in the codebook below.

UNSOV: 1 = UN/Sovereignty experimental condition; 0 = Otherwise.

HRWSOV: 1 = HRW/Sovereignty experimental condition; 0 = Otherwise.

GOVTSOV: 1 = Government/Sovereignty experimental condition; 0 = Otherwise.

UNCIV: 1 = UN/Civilians experimental condition; 0 = Otherwise.

HRWCIV: 1 = HRW/Civilians experimental condition; 0 = Otherwise.

GOVTCIV: 1 = Government/Civilians experimental condition; 0 = Otherwise.

UNEFF: 1 = UN/Effectiveness experimental condition; 0 = Otherwise.

HRWEFF: 1 = HRW/Effectiveness experimental condition; 0 = Otherwise.

GOVTEFF: 1 = Government/Effectiveness experimental condition; 0 = Otherwise.

LAWSOV: 1 = If respondent received the sovereignty treatment; 0 = Otherwise.

LAWCIV: 1 = If respondent received the civilians treatment; 0 = Otherwise.

EFFECT: 1 = If respondent received the effectiveness treatment; 0 = Otherwise.

ELITE: Indicator for the source of actor treatment, where 0 = Control (no source); 1 = UN; 2 = HRW; 3 = Government.

UN: 1 = If respondent received the UN treatment; 0 = Otherwise.

HRW: 1 = If respondent received the HRW treatment; 0 = Otherwise.

GOVT: 1 = If respondent received the government treatment; 0 = Otherwise.

DRONES: Approval for use of drone strikes, where 1 = Disapprove strongly; 2 = Disapprove somewhat; 3 = Neither approve nor disapprove; 4 = Approve somewhat; 5 = Approve strongly.

DRONES3: 3-level version for approval of drone strikes, where 0 = Disapprove; 1 = Neither approve nor disapprove; 2 = Approve.

DRONES2: Dichotomous version for approval of drone strikes, where 0 = Disapprove; 1 = Approve. Note: Neither approve nor disapprove coded as missing.

CREDIBLE: Credibility of elite source, where 1 = Not very credible; 2 = Somewhat not credible; 3 = Neither credible nor not credible; 4 = Somewhat credible; 5 = Very credible.

CREDIBLE3: 3-level version for credibility, where 0 = Not credible; 1 = Neither credible nor not credible; 2 = Credible.

CREDIBLE2: Dichotomous version for credibility, where 0 = Not credible; 1 = Credible. Note: Neither credible nor not credible coded as missing.

MALE: 1 = Male; 0 = Female.

PPAGECAT: 1 = 18-24 years; 2 = 25-34 years; 3 = 35-44 years; 4 = 45-54 years; 5 = 55-64 years; 6 = 65 years or older.

PPEDUCAT: 1 = Less than high school; 2 = High school; 3 = Some college; 4 = Bachelor's degree or higher.

INCOME6: 1 = Less than $10,000; 2 = $10,000-$24,999; 3 = $25,000-$49,999; 4 = $50,000-$74,999; 5 = $75,000-$149,999; 6 = $150,000 or more.

MARRIED: 1 = Married; 0 = Not married.

WHITE: 1 = White; 0 = Non-white.

PARTYID7: 1 = Strong Democrat; 2 = Not strong Democrat; 3 = Leans Democrat; 4 = Independent; 5 = Leans Republican; 6 = Not strong Republican; 7 = Strong Republican.

IDEOLOGY7: Political ideology, where 1 = Extremely liberal; 2 = Liberal; 3 = Slightly liberal; 4 = Moderate; 5 = Slightly conservative; 6 = Conservative; 7 = Extremely conservative.

POLINT: 1 = Not at all interested; 2 = Slightly interested; 3 = Somewhat interested; 4 = Very interested.

MILITARY: Respondent's military background, where 1 = Some form of military experience (active duty in armed forces, previous active duty, or trained for national reserves or guard); 0 = Otherwise.

REGION: Region of the country in which the respondent lives, where 1 = Northeast; 2 = Midwest; 3 = South; 4 = West.

ACTIVIST: Political activism, where 1 = Engaged in any of the following activities over the previous 12-month period (attended a protest or rally, contacted a government official, volunteered or worked for a political campaign, donated to a campaign, served on a community board, or worked with others to solve a community problem); 0 = Otherwise.

WEIGHT: Post-stratification weights.

Supplementary Appendix E: Codebook Describing Variables from mTurk Survey

GROUP: Indicator for experimental groups, where 1 = Civilian deaths treatment; 0 = Control.

DRONES5: Approval for use of drone strikes, where 1 = Disapprove strongly; 2 = Disapprove somewhat; 3 = Neither approve nor disapprove; 4 = Approve somewhat; 5 = Approve strongly.

MORAL: Morality of drone strikes, where 1 = Morally wrong; 0 = Not morally wrong.

STANDING5: View that drone strikes hurt the image of the United States in the world, where 1 = Disagree strongly; 2 = Disagree somewhat; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = Agree somewhat; 5 = Agree strongly.

RECRUIT5: View that drone strikes help recruitment of militants, where 1 = Disagree strongly; 2 = Disagree somewhat; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = Agree somewhat; 5 = Agree strongly.

SPECIAL5: Approval on replacing drone strikes with special forces, where 1 = Disapprove strongly; 2 = Disapprove somewhat; 3 = Neither approve nor disapprove; 4 = Approve somewhat; 5 = Approve strongly.

MALE: 1 = Male; 0 = Female.

AGECAT: 1 = 18-24 years; 2 = 25-34 years; 3 = 35-44 years; 4 = 45-54 years; 5 = 55-64 years; 6 = 65 years or older.

EDUC: 1 = Less than high school; 2 = High school; 3 = Some college; 4 = Bachelor's degree or higher.

REGION: Region of the United States in which respondent lives, where 1 = Northeast; 2 = Midwest; 3 = South; 4 = West.

WHITE: 1 = White; 0 = Non-white.

PARTYID7: Partisan identification, where 1 = Strong Democrat; 2 = Not strong Democrat; 3 = Leans Democrat; 4 = Independent; 5 = Leans Republican; 6 = Not strong Republican; 7 = Strong Republican.

IDEOLOGY7: Political ideology, where 1 = Extremely liberal; 2 = Liberal; 3 = Slightly liberal; 4 = Moderate; 5 = Slightly conservative; 6 = Conservative; 7 = Extremely conservative.

POLINT4: 1 = Not at all interested; 2 = Slightly interested; 3 = Somewhat interested; 4 = Very interested.

MILITARY: Respondent's military background, where 1 = Some form of military experience (active duty in armed forces, previous active duty, or trained for national reserves or guard); 0 = Otherwise.

ACTIVIST: Political activism, where 1 = Engaged in any of the following activities over the previous 12-month period (attended a protest or rally, contacted a government official, volunteered or worked for a political campaign, donated to a campaign, served on a community board, or worked with others to solve a community problem); 0 = Otherwise.