**Online Appendix for “The Costs of Conflict and Support for the Use of Force: Accounting for Information Equivalence in Survey Experiments”**

**Section A: Survey Instruments**

2016 CCES

Respondents were randomly assigned to one of two conditions (manipulations in bold)

The following scenario is hypothetical, but closely resembles real events:

American intelligence satellites are tracking a leader of the Islamic State militant group, who moves frequently to avoid detection. American military forces are positioned to attack his suspected hiding places, which are heavily-defended compounds located in farming villages. At some locations, unmanned American drones armed with missiles circle overhead. At others, small units of American ground forces are poised nearby, ready to attack. Military commanders believe that both drones and ground troops have an equal chance of killing the militant leader.

Poor weather—clouds and rain—make it difficult to track the militant leader. A sudden break in the weather reveals that the leader is approaching a hide out where **[drones/ground troops]** are ready to attack.

Post-Treatment Questions

Do you support or oppose this attack?

1. I very strongly oppose this attack
2. I somewhat oppose this attack
3. I lean toward opposing this attack
4. I am neutral on this attack
5. I lean toward supporting this attack
6. I somewhat support this attack
7. I very strongly support this attack

2018 CCES

Respondents were randomly assigned to one of two conditions (manipulations in bold)

The following scenario is hypothetical, but closely resembles real events:

American satellites are tracking a group of Islamic State militants in a foreign country. The militants move frequently between hiding places to avoid detection. American military forces are positioned to attack suspected hiding places, which are heavily-defended compounds located in farming villages.

At some compounds, unmanned American drones armed with missiles circle overhead, ready to strike if militants appear. At others, small units of American ground forces are poised nearby to attack should militants appear. Military commanders believe that both drones and ground troops have an equal chance of killing the militants.

Poor weather—clouds and rain—make it difficult for the satellites to track the militants. A sudden break in the weather reveals that the militants are approaching a compound where **[drones/ground troops]** are ready to attack. American military commanders authorize an attack on this compound.

Post-Treatment Questions

Do you support or oppose this attack?

1. I very strongly oppose this attack
2. I somewhat oppose this attack
3. I lean toward opposing this attack
4. I am neutral on this attack
5. I lean toward supporting this attack
6. I somewhat support this attack
7. I very strongly support this attack

2019 Mturk

Respondents were randomly assigned to one of two conditions (manipulations in bold)

The following scenario is hypothetical, but closely resembles real events. Please read closely before going to the next page.

American satellites are tracking a group of Islamic State militants in a foreign country. The militants move frequently between hiding places to avoid detection. American military forces are positioned to attack suspected hiding places, which are heavily-defended compounds located in farming villages.

At some compounds, unmanned American drones armed with missiles circle overhead, ready to strike if militants appear. At others, small units of American ground forces are poised nearby to attack should militants appear. Military commanders believe that both drones and ground troops have an equal chance of killing the militants.

Poor weather—clouds and rain—make it difficult for the satellites to track the militants. A sudden break in the weather reveals that the militants are approaching a compound where **[drones are ready to attack. The use of drones means that no American military personnel would be placed at risk/ground troops are ready to attack]**. American military commanders authorize an attack on this compound.

 Post-Treatment Questions

Do you support or oppose this attack?

1. I very strongly oppose this attack
2. I somewhat oppose this attack
3. I lean toward opposing this attack
4. I am neutral on this attack
5. I lean toward supporting this attack
6. I somewhat support this attack
7. I very strongly support this attack

How many American military personnel casualties do you expect will result from this attack?

1. None at all
2. A little
3. Some
4. A lot

**Section B: Experimental Results**

Table A1: Bivariate OLS Regression - Weighted Troops Treatment Effect (Drones Condition as Omitted Category, Robust Standard Errors)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2016CCES(Weighted) | 2018CCES(Weighted) | 2019Mturk(Unweighted) |
| Variable | b/se | b/se | b/se |
| Troops Condition | -0.007(0.024) | 0.018(0.023) | -0.027(0.019) |
| Constant | 0.767\*\*\*(0.016) | 0.609\*\*\*(0.017) | 0.605\*\*\*(0.014) |
| R2 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| N | 805 | 879 | 922 |
| Min. Detectable Effect | 0.051 | 0.056 | 0.053 |

\*\*\*Significant at α<0.001

NOTE: Minimum detectable effect assumes α=0.05, β=0.80.

Table A2: Bivariate OLS Regression - Unweighted Troops Treatment Effect (Drones Condition as Omitted Category)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2016CCES(Unweighted) | 2018CCES(Unweighted) | 2019Mturk(Unweighted) |
| Variable | b/se | b/se | b/se |
| Troops Condition | -0.015(0.018) | 0.025(0.020) | -0.027(0.019) |
| Constant | 0.751\*\*\*(0.013) | 0.607\*\*\*(0.014) | 0.605\*\*\*(0.014) |
| R2 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| N | 805 | 879 | 922 |

\*\*\*Significant at α<0.001

Table A3: Multivariate OLS Regression - Weighted Troops Treatment Effect (Drones Condition as Omitted Category, Robust Standard Errors)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2016CCES(Weighted) | 2018CCES(Weighted) | 2019Mturk(Unweighted) |
| Variable | b/se | b/se | b/se |
| Troops Condition | -0.009(0.023) | 0.021(0.023) | -0.022(0.018) |
| Race(White) | -0.019(0.029) | 0.052(0.029) | 0.041(0.021) |
| Age | 0.003\*\*\*(0.001) | 0.003\*\*\*(0.001) | 0.004\*\*\*(0.001) |
| Gender (Male) | 0.081\*\*\*(0.024) | 0.068\*\*(0.023) | 0.008(0.019) |
| FamilyIncome | 0.004(0.004) | 0.009\*\*(0.004) | 0.008\*\*(0.003) |
| Ideology | 0.014(0.012) | 0.050\*\*\*(0.009) | 0.044\*\*\*(0.008) |
| Constant | 0.559\*\*\*(0.054) | 0.161\*\*\*(0.048) | 0.257\*\*\*(0.046) |
| R2 | 0.073 | 0.141 | 0.070 |
| N | 730 | 802 | 922 |

\*Significant at α<0.05

\*\*Significant at α<0.01

\*\*\*Significant at α<0.001

Table A4: 2019 Mturk – Effect of Drone Treatment on Support for Attack and Expectation of Military Casualties (0-1 Scales, Robust Standard Errors)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Drones Condition | TroopsCondition | Difference(SE) |
| Support for Attack | 0.61 | 0.58 | **-0.03****(0.02)** |
| Expected Military Casualties | 0.19 | 0.46 | **0.26\*\*\*****(0.02)** |
| N | 922 |  |  |

\*\*\*Significant at α<0.001, two-tailed test

Table A5: MTurk 2019 – Distribution of Responses on Expected Military Casualties by Condition

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Drones Condition | TroopsCondition |
| Label |  |  |
| None at all | 66.7% | 15.5% |
| A little | 11.9% | 39.4% |
| Some | 17.8% | 37.7% |
| A lot | 3.6% | 7.3% |
| N | 445 | 477 |

Table A6: MTurk 2019 – Distribution of Responses on Expected Civilian Casualties by Condition

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Drones Condition | TroopsCondition |
| Label |  |  |
| None at all | 13.0% | 14.1% |
| A little | 39.3% | 33.3% |
| Some | 37.3% | 38.8% |
| A lot | 10.3% | 13.8% |
| N | 445 | 477 |

Table A7: Experimental Results by Veteran Status (Weighted, Robust Standard Errors)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2016 CCES | 2018 CCES |
|  | Veteran | Non-Veteran | Veteran | Non-Veteran |
| Variable | b/se | b/se | b/se | b/se |
| Troops Condition | -0.063(0.049) | -0.003(0.026) | -0.008(0.055) | 0.016(0.025) |
| Constant | 0.854\*\*\*(0.032) | 0.758\*\*\*(0.018) | 0.765\*\*\*(0.042) | 0.590\*\*\*(0.018) |
| R2 | 0.019 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.001 |
| N | 103 | 702 | 119 | 760 |

\*\*\*Significant at α<0.001

Table A8: Experimental Results by Partisanship (Weighted, Robust Standard Errors)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2016 CCES | 2018 CCES |
|  | Democrats | Republicans | Democrats | Republicans |
| Variable | b/se | b/se | b/se | b/se |
| Troops Condition | -0.001(0.032) | -0.027(0.031) | 0.041(0.034) | -0.009(0.036) |
| Constant | 0.729\*\*\*(0.024) | 0.863\*\*\*(0.021) | 0.515\*\*\*(0.026) | 0.738\*\*\*(0.021) |
| R2 | 0.000 | 0.004 | 0.006 | 0.000 |
| N | 371 | 280 | 391 | 347 |

\*\*\*Significant at α<0.001

Table A9: Randomization Check – Probit Predicting Assignment to Condition using Demographic Variables (Drones Condition as omitted category)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2016 CCES(Weighted) | 2018CCES(Weighted) | 2019Mturk(Unweighted) |
| Variable | b/se | b/se | b/se |
| Race (white) | -0.067(0.161) | 0.098(0.125) | -0.035(0.093) |
| Age | -0.001(0.004) | -0.003(0.003) | -0.004(0.004) |
| Gender (male) | -0.050(0.126) | -0.187(0.104) | -0.071(0.084) |
| Family Income | -0.022(0.019) | 0.020(0.016) | -0.015(0.013) |
| Ideology | 0.016(0.048) | -0.003(0.037) | 0.010(0.038) |
| Constant | 0.114(0.291) | -0.006(0.220) | 0.317(0.201) |
| Prob>Chi2 | 0.818 | 0.343 | 0.702 |
| R2 | 0.004 | 0.007 | 0.002 |
| N | 736 | 806 | 921 |

Table A10: Descriptive Statistics across All Three Studies – Standardized Differences in Means

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | N | Mean | SD | Cohen’s D[95% CI] | Equivalence Test P-ValuesΔ=0.08 |
| 2016 CCES | Drones Condition | 413 | 0.767 | 0.262 | 0.028[-0.110, 0.166] | Pr(T > t1) = 0.000Pr(T > t2) = 0.000 |
| Troops Condition | 392 | 0.760 | 0.260 |
| 2018 CCES | Drones Condition | 439 | 0.609 | 0.300 | -0.060[-0.192, 0.072] | Pr(T > t1) = 0.000Pr(T > t2) = 0.003 |
| Troops Condition | 440 | 0.627 | 0.293 |
| 2019 MTurk | Drones Condition | 445 | 0.605 | 0.294 | 0.093[-0.036, 0.223] | Pr(T > t1) = 0.003Pr(T > t2) = 0.000 |
| Troops Condition | 477 | 0.578 | 0.284 |

**Section C: Notes on Recommended Reporting Standards**

The text of the manuscript addresses the primary points outlined in the Recommended Reporting Standards for the *Journal of Experimental Political Science*. However, some outstanding clarifications are included below for those points that are not explicit in the manuscript.

**Subjects and Context**

* Across all three surveys, respondents are selected based on their willingness to participate and their status as U.S. citizens over the age of 18.
* No screeners were used to filter out respondents beyond questions asking them to affirm their status as U.S. citizens 18 or older.
* All surveys were administered online.
* The cooperation rate 3 for the 2016 CCES was 0.848. For the 2018 CCES it was 0.882. The cooperation rate is not available for the 2019 MTurk study.

**Allocation Method**

* Simple randomization was used across all three experiments with no restrictions or blocking.
* Randomization was conducted using the Qualtrics randomizer.
* Randomization occurred at the individual level.
* Participants were unaware of the treatment group they had been assigned to.

**Treatments**

* No deception was used.
* Treatments took roughly 30 seconds to read.
* Method of delivery: internet.

**Other Information**

* All studies were approved by the University of North Carolina at Charlotte Internal Review Board.
* Research partially funded by the University of North Carolina at Charlotte Department of Political Science and Public Administration.