The use of drones to hunt and kill suspected terrorists have generated growing controversy resulting in the military and commercial sector. Specifically, the word “drone” is often portrayed as a loaded term conjuring up negative connotations, including (Whitlock & Gellman, 2013):

- Undermining the technology’s capability while fueling al-Qaeda propaganda
- Reducing people’s support for the technology’s use during humanitarian crises

Our aim was to investigate how the words “drone”, “remotely piloted aircraft (RPA)”, and “unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV)” (all which are used to describe the same technology) influence peoples’ acceptance and accurate portrayal of this technology.

To what extent do you think it is acceptable or unacceptable to use a [drone, RPA, UAV] in EACH of the following situations:

- Outside traditionally recognized war zones
- Inside traditionally recognized war zones
- Covert operations

Current results are statistically underpowered. We believe that with additional participants, we will see significant effects of words on the acceptance of this technology. What a technology is called, especially if it already maps onto conceptual knowledge, affects mainstream opinions of weaponry.