Appendix A: U.S. Experiment Design

Sample Recruitment

In our initial experiment conducted in the United States, our respondents were recruited through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (AMT) crowdsourcing interface. This provided a quickly accessible, and inexpensive pool of survey respondents at the cost of potential external validity challenges due to differences in the types of workers active on AMT and the U.S. population in general. Previous research has noted that AMT samples do cover a relatively wide cross-section of the United States population, but tend to under-represent some groups and over-represent others. Notably, AMT samples tend to over-sample Democrats and under-sample Republican respondents. This creates problems for both the generalizability of our results and our ability to precisely estimate sub-group effects.

To address this issue, we used a two-stage recruitment process for our study. Before administering the experimental vignettes, we first recruited a larger sample of 2,000 candidate respondents using a low-cost task that asked respondents a series of baseline demographic questions. Of these 2,000 respondents, 1,968 respondents completely filled out all of the survey questions. From this group, we selected respondents to re-contact in order to administer the actual experimental vignette.

Respondents were chosen from our initial recruitment pool such that our final sample resembled, as closely as possible, the United States population with respect to key demographic characteristics. Typically, population weighting methods rely on a census to create demographic targets. However, we specifically are interested in obtaining representativeness in on variables like party identification and political ideology. To obtain our population targets, we instead used the 2016 Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES) Common Content – a sample of voters in the United States. While the CCES is not a complete census, it is designed to be as representative as possible of the United States voting-age population via sample weighting and its sample size is sufficiently large (64,600) that its estimates of the party ID composition of the United States population are very precise. Even with weights, the margins of error (95%) of the sample estimates of party ID shares are less than half a percentage point.

We use six demographic variables in our selection procedure: age, gender, education, race, three-category party identification, and three-category political ideology. For the main variables on which we wanted to ensure near-exact balance, we generated quotas for strata defined by three of these covariates, three-category party identification, three-category political ideology and whether respondents have a four-year college degree. Since some of the strata defined by a full three-way interaction of these variables contained very few observations, we collapsed some of the original eighteen strata to yield fourteen feasible strata. Table A1 summarizes the number of respondents available to us in each stratum and the ideal target quotas we generated from the CCES data for exact balance, along with the actual number of respondents we were actually able to re-contact in our first contact wave.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party ID</th>
<th>Ideology</th>
<th>4-year Degree</th>
<th># in Candidate Pool</th>
<th>Target Quota (CCES)</th>
<th>Actual Quota</th>
<th>Actually Contacted (Wave 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Conservative or Moderate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Conservative or Moderate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Liberal or Moderate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Liberal or Moderate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For three of the strata, the number of available candidate respondents was insufficient to fill the quota. In each unfilled stratum, we recruited as many candidates as available and
distributed the remainder across the other strata and over-recruited respondents such that the
distribution of party identification in the sample still matched the marginal distribution in the
population. This way, while we are unable to get an exact match to the target population with
respect to all of the fine-grained strata, we still ensure that for the key pre-treatment covariate of
interest, party ID, sample and population are as close as possible.

Among strata with more candidates than necessary, we selected respondents to optimize
similarity to the target population on the remaining covariates. We tried to match the marginal
distribution for each of these covariates in sample to the marginal distribution observed in the
CCES target. We did this by generating 50,000 candidate samples of 1000 observations each.
For each candidate sample, we calculated the sum of squared deviations between the marginals
for our sample and the population marginals for all of the seven covariates. We then selected the
sample that had the lowest divergence value for re-contact. To improve efficiency in our search,
units were not sampled uniformly, but rather using weighted random sampling based on raking
weights. In other words, we up-weighted observations that were more common in the target
population and down-weighted rarer ones. We do not use the weights in our analysis due to the
potential for reduced power.

Table A2 plots the marginal distributions of the six covariates in the candidate pool, the
target population, our initial proposed 1,000 respondent candidate sample, and the actual sample
we obtained after two stages of recruitment. Because not all of the respondents we selected for
our candidate sample responded to the re-contact request, we had to re-sample new Mechanical
Turk workers from our original pool in order to reach our goal of 1,000 survey respondents. We
discuss our approach for selecting new respondents in greater detail in Appendix C. However, as
Table A2 shows, our final sample is relatively close to what we set out to recruit in our pre-
registration document. In general, we have reduced the divergence between our Mechanical Turk
sample and an “ideal” representative sample, particularly on partisan identification. Age remains
the category with the greatest divergence to the U.S. population – AMT workers are much
younger than the population as a whole. Unfortunately, we simply did not have enough
respondents 50-65+ to recruit. This is the biggest limitation of our sample and it is important to
note that our results do not generalize well to older U.S. voters.

Table A2: Marginal covariate distributions - target population and sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Republican</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Party ID</td>
<td>Candidate Pool</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Ideology</th>
<th>Candidate Pool</th>
<th>Population Target</th>
<th>Contacted Sample</th>
<th>Actual Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>0.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Candidate Pool</th>
<th>Population Target</th>
<th>Contacted Sample</th>
<th>Actual Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No High School</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college/2-year degree</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year degree</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Candidate Pool</th>
<th>Population Target</th>
<th>Contacted Sample</th>
<th>Actual Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Pool</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Target</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted Sample</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Sample</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design and randomization

Because we collected covariate information about our respondents prior to assigning treatment, we block-randomized treatment to improve covariate balance between treatment groups and increase the power of our design incorporating covariates predictive of the outcome variable. Within each of the fourteen strata outlined in Appendix A, we randomly allocated an equal number of respondents to each treatment condition for both experiments. We then took the remainder (for strata with sizes not divisible by four) and allocated them randomly such that exactly 250 observations would be in each of the four conditions. To further improve balance, we used a re-randomization procedure\(^3\) to generate an allocation with the lowest possible imbalance on the other covariates.

Our follow-up survey contained two experiments, one related to refugee policy which we discuss in the paper, and another similar experiment focusing on the use of torture which we omit to conserve space. President Trump had also endorsed soon after taking office. To provide one example, days after taking office President Trump stated that "When ISIS is doing things that no one has ever heard of, since medieval times, would I feel strongly about waterboarding? As far as I'm concerned, we have to fight fire with fire."\(^4\) We followed the same block randomization procedure for this second experiment. Respondents were randomly assigned the order in which they took these two experiments. After taking both experimental vignettes, respondents were asked whether the policy they considered in the first vignette (either use of torture or refugee policy) was against international law. Therefore half of our respondents, those who received the refugee vignette first, answered the follow-up manipulation check question.

Sample Attrition

Of the initial sample that we re-contacted for the actual experimental study, only 774 respondents successfully completed the experiment and responded to all questions. For the most part, the Mechanical Turk workers who failed to complete the experiment did not even begin the task and therefore were not exposed to treatment. In our first wave, among the 777 respondents who started the survey, 99.6% finished the survey. This high completion rate suggests that we should not be particularly concerned about inducing post-treatment bias by conditioning only on those respondents who completed the survey. Treatment is not meaningfully affecting whether respondents drop out of the study.

Our main attrition problem is therefore in the re-contacting stage. Not all respondents selected to be part of our follow-up sample chose to complete the survey. In order to fill our target quota of 1,000 survey respondents, we therefore had to re-draw new respondents from our candidate pool. As specified in the pre-registration plan, to construct the second contact wave, we sampled a new eligible worker with the same covariate profile from our pool of candidate respondents for each worker who failed to respond to our survey. Of course, in most cases an


identical worker could not be found. For some our rarer strata, we had already sampled every
single candidate observation available to us. In this case, we matched the missing worker to a
worker with the same partisan identification and the smallest possible number of mismatched
covariates.

When assigning treatment to these new observations, we wanted to ensure that treatment
assignments remained as balanced as possible within strata. For newly selected respondents who
were from the same stratum as the missing respondent, we assigned the same treatments
originally assigned to that missing respondent. For new observations that we sampled from
different strata, we carried out a new randomization procedure as per the original randomization
protocol, again ensuring that an even number of observations were assigned to each of the
treatments and that assignments were as uniform as possible within strata.

We deviated slightly from the protocol for practical purposes since we wanted to ensure
at least 1,000 total respondents after the second recruitment wave. Since we knew that response
rates to our follow-up survey were not 100%, the only way to guarantee that we met our quota
was to contact more potential respondents than we had survey slots. Therefore, instead of
matching each missing respondent to a single new candidate respondent, we matched them to
two possible candidates. This has the effect of inducing slightly more imbalance in our treatment
allocations as we could not guarantee that exactly one in each pair would respond to the survey.
However, for the most part, sample sizes across treatment conditions were generally uniform, as
shown in the results section of the main paper.

**Estimation**

All treatment effects were estimated using a weighted average of the within-strata
differences-in-means weighted by the size of each stratum. This recovers an unbiased estimate of
the average treatment effect and has a variance lower than that of a fully-randomized experiment
if strata are predictive of the outcome. Formally, let \( \bar{Y}_a^s \) denote the average outcome for a unit
assigned to treatment condition \( a \) in stratum \( s \). Our estimator for the treatment effect of
assignment to treatment \( a \) relative to treatment \( b \), \( \hat{\tau}_{ab} \) is

\[
\hat{\tau}_{ab} = \sum_{s=1}^{S} \frac{N_a^s + N_b^s}{N_a + N_b} \times \left( \bar{Y}_a^s - \bar{Y}_b^s \right)
\]

where \( S \) denotes the total number of strata, \( N_a \) denotes the number of units assigned to treatment
condition \( a \), and \( N_a^s \) denotes the number of units assigned to treatment \( a \) in stratum \( s \).

We estimate the variance of the treatment effect using an unbiased and consistent
stratified estimator.\(^5\)

\[
\text{Var}(\hat{\tau}_{ab}) = \sum_{s=1}^{S} \left( \frac{N_a^s + N_b^s}{N_a + N_b} \right)^2 \times \left( \frac{\sigma_{a,s}^2}{N_a^s} + \frac{\sigma_{b,s}^2}{N_b^s} \right)
\]

\(^5\) Miratrix, Luke W., Jasjeet S. Sekhon, and Bin Yu. "Adjusting treatment effect estimates by post-stratification in
randomized experiments." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 75.2 (2013):
369-396.
where $\sigma_{a,s}^2$ denotes the sample variance estimator for units in stratum $s$ assigned to treatment $a$.

$$\sigma_{a,s}^2 = \frac{1}{N_a^s - 1} \times \sum_{i: S_i = s, T_i = a} (Y_i - \bar{Y}_a^s)^2$$

with $i: S_i = s, T_i = a$ denoting all units indexed by $i$ assigned treatment $a$ and in stratum $s$.

We use analogous estimators for both the sub-group effects and treatment interaction effects (tests for differences between two ATEs). For the exploratory results concerning beliefs in the legality of torture or the refugee ban in the Republican sub-group, some of our original strata do not have sufficient observations to yield consistent variance estimates as we need a minimum of two observations to compute a sample variance. Therefore, for those estimates, we used only two strata: college-educated and non-college-educated.
Appendix B: U.S. Experiment - Recruitment Survey

First, we would like to ask you a few general questions about your background. Please remember that you can choose not to answer any question.

QSEX: What is your sex or current gender?
   1   Female
   2   Male
   3   [OPEN-ENDED BOX]

QAGE: What is your age?
   [TEXT BOX - VERIFY THAT AGE > 17]

QRACE: What is your ethnicity? Select all that apply.
   1) Black
   2) White
   3) Hispanic
   4) Asian
   5) Native American
   6) Other (specify)

QEDUCATION: What is the last grade of school or year of college that you have completed?
   1   None, or grade 1-8
   2   High school incomplete (Grades 9-11)
   3   High school graduate (Grade 12 or GED certificate)
   4   Technical, trade, or vocational school AFTER high school
   5   Some college, no 4-year degree (including associate degree)
   6   College graduate (B.S., B.A., or other 4-year degree)
   7   Post-graduate training or professional schooling after college (e.g., master's degree, Ph.D, law school, medical school)

QEMPLOY: Are you currently employed?
   1   Employed full-time
2 Employed part-time
3 Unemployed, looking for work
4 Unemployed, not looking for work
5 Retired
6 Student
7 Other

QINCOME: Last year, that is in 2016, what was your total family income from all sources, before taxes?
1 Less than $10,000
2 10 to under $20,000
3 20 to under $30,000
4 30 to under $40,000
5 40 to under $50,000
6 50 to under $75,000
7 75 to under $100,000
8 100 to under $150,000
9 $150,000 or more

QTURNOUT: In talking to people about elections, we often find that a lot of people were not able to vote because they weren’t registered, they were sick, or they just didn’t have time. How about you – did you vote in the last presidential election in 2016?
1 Yes, I voted
2 No, I did not vote
3 I don't remember

QVOTE: [IF VOTED] For whom did you vote in the last presidential election in 2016?
1 Donald Trump
2 Hillary Clinton
3 Other [OPEN RESPONSE]

QPARTY: In politics TODAY, do you consider yourself a Republican, Democrat, or Independent?
1 Republican
2 Democrat
3 Independent

QPARTYLIN: [ASKED IF PARTY=3 or NO RESPONSE] As of today do you lean more to the Republican Party or more to the Democratic Party?
1 Republican
2 Democrat

QIDEO: In general, would you describe your political views as...
1 Very conservative
2 Conservative
3 Moderate
4 Liberal, OR
5 Very liberal?

Next, we would like to ask you a few short questions about government and international relations. Many people don't know the answers to these questions, but even if you're not sure we would like you to make your best guess.

[RANDOMIZE]

QKNOW1). Which of the following countries are members of the United Nations? (Select all that apply)
   a. The United States
   b. China
   c. Canada
   d. Japan

QKNOW2). Where is the International Court of Justice located?
   a. New York, United States
   b. Paris, France
   c. London, England
   d. The Hague, Netherlands

QKNOW3). Which U.S. president was the chief advocate for the League of Nations?
a. Woodrow Wilson  
b. Richard Nixon  
c. Jimmy Carter  
d. Thomas Jefferson

QKNOW4). On which of the following areas does the U.S. federal government currently spend the least?

a. Foreign aid  
b. Medicare  
c. National defense  
d. Social security

QKNOW5). Which party has the most members in the House of Representatives in Washington D.C.?

a. Democratic Party  
b. Republican Party

QKNOW6). Who has the final responsibility to decide if a law is constitutional or not?

a. President  
b. Congress  
c. Supreme Court  
d. Electoral College
Appendix C: U.S. Experiment – Follow-up Survey

[RANDOMIZE ORDER OF QUESTION 1 AND 2]

Question 1

There is currently a debate about whether the United States government should consider using severe forms of psychological and physical abuse, such as 'waterboarding' and other coercive techniques, in interrogations of detainees. Currently, the United States government does not allow the use of such methods for intelligence collection.

[RANDOMLY ASSIGN RESPONDENT TO ONE OF FOUR CONDITIONS BELOW]

Treatment 1.1: [NO TEXT]

Treatment 1.2: These forms of abuse are outlawed by the Convention Against Torture, a legally binding international treaty to which the United States is committed.

Treatment 1.3: During the 2016 Election campaign, President Trump advocated for using these forms of abuse in interrogation on the grounds that they are an effective means of collecting information and are necessary for fighting terrorism.

Treatment 1.4: These forms of abuse are outlawed by the Convention Against Torture, a legally binding international treaty to which the United States has committed. During the 2016 Election campaign, President Trump advocated for using these forms of abuse in interrogation on the grounds that they are an effective means of collecting information and are necessary for fighting terrorism. [RANDOMIZE ORDER OF THESE TWO SENTENCES]

Q1: Do you think the U.S. should refrain from using severe psychological and physical forms of detainee abuse, even if it makes it more difficult to collect intelligence information from detainees?

   A) Definitely yes
   B) Probably yes
   C) Probably no
   D) Definitely no

[getNext page]

Question 2

There is currently a debate about whether the United States should limit the entry of refugees from certain predominantly Muslim countries.

[RANDOMLY ASSIGN RESPONDENT TO ONE OF FOUR CONDITIONS BELOW]

Treatment 2.1: [NO TEXT]
Treatment 2.2: Discrimination against refugees on the basis of nationality is outlawed by the Refugee Convention of 1951 and its 1967 protocol, legally binding international treaties to which the United States is committed.

Treatment 2.3: During the 2016 Election campaign, President Trump advocated for limiting the entry of refugees from certain predominantly Muslim countries on the grounds that these measures are necessary for the national security of the United States and to protect the citizens of the United States from terrorist attacks.

Treatment 2.4: Discrimination against refugees on the basis of nationality is outlawed by the Refugee Convention of 1951 and its 1967 protocol, legally binding international treaties to which the United States is committed. During the 2016 Election campaign, President Trump advocated for limiting the entry of refugees from certain predominantly Muslim countries on the grounds that these measures are necessary for the national security of the United States and to protect the citizens of the United States from terrorist attacks. [RANDOMIZE ORDER OF THESE TWO SENTENCES]

Q2: Do you think the United States should limit the entry of refugees from certain countries, even if it means turning away vetted refugees?

A) Definitely yes  
B) Probably yes  
C) Probably no  
D) Definitely no

[NEXT PAGE]

[ASK IF RESPONDENT WAS ASSIGNED TO TORTURE QUESTION FIRST]

In the first question, you were asked to consider if the United States government should consider using severe forms of psychological and physical abuse, such as 'waterboarding' and other coercive techniques, in interrogations of detainees.

Q3: Do you consider these forms of psychological and physical abuse to be illegal under international law?

A) Definitely yes  
B) Probably yes  
C) Probably no  
D) Definitely no

[ASK IF RESPONDENT WAS ASSIGNED TO REFUGEE QUESTION FIRST]

In the first question, you were asked to consider if the United States government should limit the entry of refugees from certain countries.
Q4: Do you consider restrictions on allowing refugees to enter the United States that are made on the basis of a refugee's country of nationality to be illegal under international law?

A) Definitely yes
B) Probably yes
C) Probably no
D) Definitely no
Appendix D: U.S. Experiment - Pre-registered Hypotheses:

*International law hypotheses:* The international law treatment will reduce support for torture and for nationality-based restrictions on refugee admissions.

- H1a: On average, respondents exposed to the law treatment exclusively will be less likely to state that the U.S. should use severe forms of detainee abuse in interrogation compared to those exposed to neither treatment.

- H1b: On average, respondents exposed to the law treatment exclusively will be less likely to state that the U.S. should limit the entry of refugees from certain countries compared to those exposed to neither treatment.

*Presidential/partisan hypotheses:* The Trump cue will increase support for both of the endorsed policies.

- H2a: On average, respondents exposed to the Trump treatment exclusively will be more likely to state that the U.S. should use severe forms of detainee abuse in interrogation compared to those exposed to neither treatment.

- H2b: On average, respondents exposed to the Trump treatment exclusively will be more likely to state that the U.S. should limit the entry of refugees from certain countries compared to those exposed to neither treatment.

*Nation of Laws hypotheses:* the joint effect of the law and Trump treatments is not additive, but rather interactive: the average effect is closer to that of the law treatment or even larger in magnitude as respondents that would positively respond to the Trump cue in isolation react negatively to Trump’s endorsement when it is explicitly paired with a statement that the policy is contrary to U.S. international law obligations.

- H3a: The average effect of exposure to the Trump treatment alone relative to exposure to neither treatment on support for the use of severe detainee abuse will be greater than the average effect of exposure to the joint Trump/law treatment compared to exposure to the law treatment alone.

- H3b: The average effect of exposure to the Trump treatment alone relative to exposure to neither treatment on support for limits on refugee entry from certain countries will be greater than the average effect of exposure to the joint Trump/law treatment compared to exposure to the law treatment alone.

*Partisan moderator hypotheses:* respondents’ party identification will moderate the Trump and joint Trump/Law effects.

- H4a: On average, the effect of the Trump treatment (relative to neither exposure) on support for the use of severe detainee abuse will be greater for Republicans than for Democrats.

- H4b: On average, the effect of the Trump treatment (relative to neither exposure) on support for limits on refugee entry from certain countries will be greater for Republicans than for Democrats.
• H5a: The difference between the effect of the Trump treatment (relative to neither exposure) and the joint Trump/Law treatment (relative to exposure to law alone) on support for the use of severe detainee abuse will be larger for Republicans than for Democrats.

• H5b: The difference between the effect of the Trump treatment (relative to neither exposure) and the joint Trump/Law treatment (relative to exposure to law alone) on support for limits on refugee entry from certain countries will be larger for Republicans than for Democrats.
Appendix E: Australia Experiment – Design

Our Australian experiment was designed as a follow-up study to the original U.S. study to examine whether the results could generalize beyond the U.S. context alone. Instead of a crowdsourcing platform, we chose to field our survey on a commercial opt-in panel where respondents are pre-screened by a reputable survey firm. We partnered with YouGov, a popular public opinion survey firm with relatively broad global reach. Our experiment was conducted on a sample of 2017 adult Australian panel participants in July-August of 2018.

YouGov samples are opt-in but often used to estimate population-level quantities. Because the sample itself is not a random draw from the target population, the survey observations are typically weighted to match known population targets on a number of potentially predictive covariates. For our experiment, YouGov provided raking weights to match the population distributions of adult Australians on education and gender (joint) and region. The question then is whether researchers should estimate the sample average treatment effect (SATE) without weighting or use weights to estimate the population average treatment effect (PATE). This is not an inconsequential choice, but at present, there is little guidance to researchers as to which choice they should make. While the presence of treatment effect heterogeneity may make the PATE a more attractive quantity, reliable estimation of the PATE from a convenience sample is much more difficult. Franco et. al. note that while the SATE can be estimated in an unbiased matter simply under randomized treatment assignment, obtaining an unbiased estimate of the PATE requires additional assumptions. Specifically, estimates of the PATE are biased when there exist unobserved factors associated with treatment effect heterogeneity and sample selection. Moreover, using weights can introduce further bias by inducing covariate imbalances between treated and untreated groups, especially when calculated for the sample as a whole rather than within treatment strata. Finally, weighting leads to a loss of precision, which can be particularly severe when there are a few respondents receiving large weights, and complicates variance estimation. Franco et. al. recommend that even when researchers are interested in the PATE, they always report estimates of the SATE. Miratrix et. al. also found in a number of experimental settings SATE and PATE rarely differ by too much and that the gains in generalizability of estimating the PATE are often outweighed by the drawback of increased variance. For the purposes of our experiments, we focus exclusively on estimating the SATE and do not use the provided survey sampling weights.

Unlike our U.S. experiment, due to the constraints of the survey platform, we could not assign treatment randomly within covariate strata. Rather, treatment conditions were fully randomized across all respondents. However, we did observe some covariates that we noticed were strongly predictive of the outcome: namely, party identification and age. To improve precision, we use a post-stratification estimator based on strata constructed from the party ID and age variables. While the actual estimation procedure is the same as discussed in Appendix A in that we estimate the treatment effects within each stratum of the pre-treatment covariate and

---


average based on the relative strata sizes, it differs from proper stratification or blocking in that the randomization scheme does not utilize the strata. Despite the absence of design-enforced balance, Miratrix et al. argue that post-stratification performs about as well as blocking when the latter is not an available option.\textsuperscript{8} Table A3 presents the specific age-party strata we use in the Australian experiment along with the distribution of treatment conditions within each stratum. In total, we have 33 unique strata with three party ID variables and 11 age brackets.\textsuperscript{9}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Party ID} & \textbf{Age} & \textbf{No cue} & \textbf{Both cues} & \textbf{Law Cue} & \textbf{Leader Cue} & \textbf{Total} \\
\hline
Coalition & 18-24 & 13 & 20 & 13 & 14 & 60 \\
\hline
Coalition & 25-29 & 16 & 13 & 14 & 9 & 52 \\
\hline
Coalition & 30-34 & 16 & 16 & 17 & 18 & 67 \\
\hline
Coalition & 35-39 & 20 & 13 & 8 & 14 & 55 \\
\hline
Coalition & 40-44 & 17 & 11 & 19 & 10 & 57 \\
\hline
Coalition & 45-49 & 17 & 11 & 19 & 10 & 58 \\
\hline
Coalition & 50-54 & 17 & 6 & 19 & 14 & 56 \\
\hline
Coalition & 55-59 & 10 & 13 & 12 & 11 & 46 \\
\hline
Coalition & 60-64 & 23 & 11 & 13 & 14 & 61 \\
\hline
Coalition & 65-69 & 14 & 20 & 19 & 24 & 77 \\
\hline
Coalition & 70+ & 31 & 39 & 33 & 24 & 127 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Australian Experiment: Treatment Distribution in Strata}
\end{table}


\textsuperscript{9} Respondents are actually given four party ID choices in the survey. We coarsen respondents who affiliate with either the Liberal or the National party to a single “Coalition” party ID since these two parties act in a cooperative partnership in government.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>70+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>65-69</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>70+</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Australia Experiment – Survey Text

Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as Liberal, Labor, National or what?

A) Australian Labor Party
B) Liberal Party of Australia
C) National Party of Australia
D) Other

Question 1

There is currently a debate about whether the Australian government should continue to detain refugees and asylum seekers attempting to reach Australia by boat in processing centers located in Papua New Guinea and Nauru.

[Randomly assign respondent to one of four conditions below]

[Treatment 1.1:] [No text]

[Treatment 1.2:] The Government of Prime Minister Malcom Turnbull, leader of the Liberal party, has defended this policy on the grounds that it is necessary to secure the border and deter human smugglers.

[Treatment 1.3:] According to a report by the United Nations Human Rights committee, this policy violates the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, an international treaty which Australia has ratified.

[Treatment 1.4:] The Government of Prime Minister Malcom Turnbull, leader of the Liberal party, has defended this policy on the grounds that it is necessary to secure the border and deter human smugglers. According to a report by the United Nations Human Rights committee, this policy violates the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, an international treaty which Australia has ratified. [Randomize order of these two sentences]

Q1: Do you think the Australian should end its policy of detaining refugees and asylum seekers in these offshore processing centers even if it means that more refugees and asylum seekers might attempt to arrive in Australia?

A) Definitely yes
B) Probably yes
C) Probably no
D) Definitely no
On a scale of 1 to 5, how would you describe Australian-Indonesian relations in the Timor and Arafura Seas?

1) Very cooperative
2) Somewhat cooperative
3) Neither cooperative nor conflictual
4) Somewhat conflictual
5) Very conflictual

Thinking about the past five years, would you say Australian-Indonesian relations in the Timor and Arafura Seas are getting more or less conflictual?

1) Much more cooperative
2) Somewhat more cooperative
3) No change
4) Somewhat more conflictual
5) Much more conflictual

Some people say Australia needs to put many more resources into securing its borders with other countries; others think this is not necessary. How do you feel about the resources going to Australian border security?

1) Significantly more resources are necessary
2) Somewhat more resources are necessary
3) No change is necessary
4) Somewhat fewer resources are necessary
5) Significantly fewer resources are necessary

4. In an earlier question, you were asked to consider whether the Australian government should end its policy of detaining refugees and asylum seekers in offshore processing centers in Papau New Guinea and Nauru.

Do you consider this detention policy to be illegal under international law?

A) Definitely yes
B) Probably yes
C) Probably no
D) Definitely no
Appendix G: India Experiment – Design

Our India experiment was also designed as a follow-up study to the U.S. study. We also used a commercial opt-in panel maintained by a prominent Indian market research firm. Our experiment was conducted on a sample of 1491 adult Indian respondents in July-August of 2018. A total of 1469 respondents responded to the outcome question and the covariate questions that we use for post-stratification.

As in the Australia survey, we do not use any survey weights to adjust the survey-level responses to national-level targets. In this case, none were provided by the survey firm. It is worth noting that the demographics of our sample differ considerably from a nationally representative survey due to the interview mode – as an exclusively online opt-in sample, our sample skews younger and better educated and consists primarily of Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) supporters. We are therefore cautious to not generalize from our sample treatment effect estimates too much to the Indian population as a whole. We post-stratify to improve precision on a combination of age and party identification strata. In contrast to our Australia sample, age was measured at a slightly less fine-grained level, with only five rather than 11 age brackets. Also, because some of our party ID strata are too small, we coarsen some of the party-age interactions to ensure that at least two observations from each treatment condition are in each stratum.

Table A4: India Experiment: Treatment Distribution in Strata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party ID</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>No cue</th>
<th>Both cues</th>
<th>Law Cue</th>
<th>Leader Cue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC</td>
<td>45+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: India Experiment – Survey Text

QGENDER: What is your gender?

1) Male
2) Female
3) Other [OPEN RESPONSE]

QAGE What is your age?

1) 0-17
2) 18-24
3) 25-34
4) 35-44
5) 45-54
6) 55+

QINCOME What is your annual household income?

1) Under 90,000 INR
2) 90,001 – 200,000 INR
3) 200,001 – 500,000 INR
4) 500,001 – 1,000,000 INR
5) Above 1,000,000 INR
6) Prefer not to answer

QEMPLOY What is your employment status?

1) Employed – Full-time
2) Employed – Part-time
3) Student
4) Homemaker
5) Unemployed
6) Other

QSTATE In which state or union territory of India do you currently live?

[TEXT DROPDOWN MENU WITH OPTIONS:]

Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Telangana, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, West Bengal, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Daman and Diu, Delhi, Lakshadweep, Puducherry

[NEW PAGE]
Q1: As you may know, national parliamentary elections are scheduled for next year. What party would you like to lead the next government – the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), the Indian National Congress (INC) party, another party or none of the above?

1) Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP)
2) Indian National Congress (INC) party
3) Another party
4) None of the above

There is currently a debate about whether the Indian government should deport about 40,000 Rohingya refugees and asylum seekers who have crossed into India from Myanmar without authorization by the Indian government.

[RANDOMLY ASSIGNED RESPONDENT TO ONE OF FOUR CONDITIONS BELOW]

Treatment 1.1: [NO TEXT]

Treatment 1.2: The Government of Prime Minister Narendra Modi, a member of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), supports deportation, arguing that the unauthorized immigration of Rohingya migrants to India threatens India's national security.

Treatment 1.3: According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, expelling Rohingya would violate principles of customary international law by returning refugees to a country where they face the threat of violence.

Treatment 1.4: The Government of Prime Minister Narendra Modi, a member of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), supports deportation, arguing that the unauthorized immigration of Rohingya migrants to India threatens India's national security. According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, expelling Rohingya would violate principles of customary international law by returning refugees to a country where they face the threat of violence.

Q1: Do you think the Indian government should expel all Rohingya who have entered India without authorization?

A) Definitely yes
B) Probably yes
C) Probably no
D) Definitely no

[NEW PAGE]
Consider India’s border with Myanmar. On a scale of 1 to 5, how would you describe India-Myanmar relations at the international border?

1) Very cooperative
2) Somewhat cooperative
3) Neither cooperative nor conflictual
4) Somewhat conflictual
5) Very conflictual

[NEW PAGE]

Thinking about the past five years, would you say India’s relations at the border with Myanmar are getting more or less conflictual?

1) Much more cooperative
2) Somewhat more cooperative
3) No change
4) Somewhat more conflictual
5) Much more conflictual

[NEW PAGE]

Consider India’s border with China. On a scale of 1 to 5, how would you describe Chinese-Indian relations at the international border?

1) Very cooperative
2) Somewhat cooperative
3) Neither cooperative nor conflictual
4) Somewhat conflictual
5) Very conflictual

[NEW PAGE]

[RANDOMLY ASSIGN RESPONDENT TO ONE OF THREE CONDITIONS BELOW]

Treatment 1.1: [NO TEXT]

Treatment 1.2: While India and China have agreed to maintain communication between their militaries, in recent years, India has significantly reinforced and extended the border fence with China.
Treatment 1.3: While India and China have agreed to maintain communication between their militaries, in recent years, China has significantly reinforced and extended the border fence with India.

Thinking about the past five years, would you say India’s relations at the border with China are getting more or less conflictual?

1) Much more cooperative
2) Somewhat more cooperative
3) No change
4) Somewhat more conflictual
5) Much more conflictual

[NEW PAGE]

Consider India’s border with Pakistan. On a scale of 1 to 5, how would you describe Indian-Pakistani relations at the international border?

1) Very cooperative
2) Somewhat cooperative
3) Neither cooperative nor conflictual
4) Somewhat conflictual
5) Very conflictual

[NEW PAGE]

[RANDOMLY ASSIGN RESPONDENT TO ONE OF THREE CONDITIONS BELOW]

Treatment 1.1: [NO TEXT]

Treatment 1.2: While India and Pakistan have agreed to maintain communication between their militaries, in recent years, India has significantly reinforced and extended the border fence with Pakistan.

Treatment 1.3: While India and Pakistan have agreed to maintain communication between their militaries, in recent years, Pakistan has significantly reinforced and extended the border fence with India.

Thinking about the past five years, would you say India’s relations at the border with Pakistan are getting more or less conflictual?

1) Much more cooperative
2) Somewhat more cooperative
3) No change
4) Somewhat more conflictual
5) Much more conflictual

[NEW PAGE]

Finally, consider India’s border with Bangladesh. On a scale of 1 to 5, how would you describe Indian-Bangladeshi relations at the international border?

1) Very cooperative
2) Somewhat cooperative
3) Neither cooperative nor conflictual
4) Somewhat conflictual
5) Very conflictual

[NEW PAGE]

[RANDOMLY ASSIGN RESPONDENT TO ONE OF THREE CONDITIONS BELOW]

Treatment 1.1: [NO TEXT]

Treatment 1.2: While India and Bangladesh have agreed to maintain communication between their militaries, in recent years, India has significantly reinforced and extended the border fence with Bangladesh.

Thinking about the past five years, would you say India’s relations at the border with Bangladesh are getting more or less conflictual?

1) Much more cooperative
2) Somewhat more cooperative
3) No change
4) Somewhat more conflictual
5) Much more conflictual

[NEW PAGE]

In an earlier question, you were asked to consider whether the Indian government should deport about 40,000 Rohingya refugees and asylum seekers who have crossed into India from Myanmar without the Indian government's permission.

Do you consider the deportation of Rohingya in India to be against international law?

A) Definitely yes
B) Probably yes
C) Probably no
D) Definitely no