# Appendix

1. Survey Details

Lucid provided the respondent panel and administered the conjoint experiment survey. At first, Lucid administered a pretest survey with 100 respondents. The pretest uncovered a possible issue with speeders, i.e., respondents who completed the survey too quickly. Fast completion may not be an issue in conjoint experiments because respondents are expected to know what factors are important to them so they can complete the tasks quickly. However, to increase confidence in the results, the full-sample survey included an attention-check question to ensure respondents knew what they were evaluating and were not selecting responses without reading the questions and features of each package. The full-sample survey elicited 2935 responses. However, 126 respondents disagreed with the consent, and 856 respondents failed the attention check question. Therefore, only 1953 respondents are included in the data analysis.

1. Attention Check

On average, respondents in the pretest conjoint survey took approximately seven minutes (426 seconds) to finish the survey. The median response time was 356 seconds, with a 95% confidence interval of 301-380 seconds. Speeding could concern anyone completing the survey in less than three minutes, which applied to 6% of the respondents. The full sample survey included an attention check question to reduce the possibility of speeders. After the conjoint experiment part of the survey, in which the respondents viewed and evaluated ten pairs of houses of worship, the respondents answered the following question:

In the previous ten pages, you answered questions regarding what types of buildings?

* Apartment buildings
* Schools
* Low-income housing
* Grocery stores
* Houses of worship
* Park district facilities
* Retirement homes

The attention check question is then a factual manipulation check (FMC) that can confirm whether the respondents paid attention to the critical components of the experiment (Kane and Barabas 2019). The attention check question eliminated 856 respondents who did not answer "Houses of worship" from the survey sample.[[1]](#endnote-1) The median response time of the remaining 1953 respondents was 437 seconds, 81 seconds higher than the response time in the pretest. The time should have increased because of the additional question, but less than 81 seconds. Some respondents finished the survey in less than three minutes, but the percentage was smaller than in the pretest (2.5% compared to 6%). Research shows that speeders add random noise to the survey but do not significantly change results (Greszki et al., 2015). Thus, especially after removing the respondents who failed the attention check, speeders should not significantly affect the validity of the results.

1. Survey Response Rate

[table A1 about here]

1. Characteristics of Survey Respondents

This section contains respondents’ descriptive characteristics. Lucid provided basic demographics (table A2). The remaining characteristics and views came from the conjoint survey experiment (tables A3 and A4). Table A5 compares the respondents who passed the attention check question and those who did not. Compared to the population data from the Census 2020, the sample in the experiment is within one percentage point of being nationally representative regarding education and gender. However, the sample is slightly younger, less affluent, and whiter than the US population.

The respondents who failed the attention check question also differed from those who did not (table A5). Respondents that failed were, on average, younger, less affluent, and less educated. Furthermore, fewer female, white, and Republican respondents failed the attention check. Such demographic disparity could have affected the results. On the other hand, those who passed the attention check questions, in terms of demographic characteristics, are also more likely to pay attention to local politics and actively engage in the zoning process. Therefore, it could be argued that the demographic disparity is not an issue because the attention check removed those respondents who would not be likely to engage in the process anyway.

[table A2 about here]

[table A3 about here]

[table A4 about here]

[table A5 about here]

1. Questions Wording

As required by the IRB, respondents first had to consent to participate in the survey conjoint experiment. The consent came before the survey introduction, and respondents could only participate in the survey if they agreed to the consent. After reading the consent, the respondents answered this question:

I have read the attached consent document. I have been given an opportunity to contact the researchers and ask questions, and my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this research.

* I agree and want to participate in the research study
* I do not agree and do not want to participate in the research study

Respondents who agreed to the consent then saw the following introduction:

We wish to study people's reactions to new houses of worship in their neighborhoods. You will see hypothetical proposed projects for your neighborhood on the following screens, similar to those proposed in towns, cities, and counties in the United States. As part of the application process, local governments take into account residents' concerns or support. Please review the proposed projects and indicate whether you would more likely support or oppose the new place of worship and whether you would contact your local officials to express your support or opposition.

The conjoint experiment followed. Table A6 shows a screenshot of the conjoint experiment. The screenshot is only an example of a possible combination of attributes. Each screen contained a fully randomized combination of attributes followed by two questions. One question asked whether the respondent would support each house of worship. The second question asked whether the respondent would contact a local official to express support or opposition. Each respondent reviewed ten screens of paired conjoint profiles.

[table A6 about here]

1. Conjoint Attributes

Table A7 shows all the features and levels of the conjoint experiment, and figure A1 shows that all levels were balanced.

[table A7 about here]

[figure A1 about here]

1. Results

This section contains tables with coefficient estimates, standard errors, and z-values for the key models. Table B8 shows results for a model displaying marginal means of all conjoint attributes (see figure 1 in the main text). Tables B9 and B10 present results for a model running marginal means of nongovernmental attributes by partisanship (see figure 2 in the main text), and tables B11 through B17 by ideology (figure 4 in the main text).

[tables B8 through B17 about here]

This section also includes figure B2 for AMCEs of all variables and their corresponding results in table B18. The AMCE is the marginal effect of each attribute "averaged over the joint distribution of the remaining attributes" (Hainmueller, Hopkins and Yamamoto 2013, 10). Thus, the AMCE represents the average effect of an attribute, such as the size of the house of worship, on the probability of support for that house of worship. The effect is relational and depends on the selected base category. The AMCE of each attribute tells us how much more likely the respondent was to support a new house of worship with each feature level compared to the base level. The base level of each feature is denoted as a dot on the 0.0 line without a confidence interval. All other feature levels' estimates show how much more likely a house of worship with that attribute will be supported than the base attribute.

Figure B2 shows that not all features and feature levels differ statistically from the base feature level. Respondents indicated a statistically significant preference for a Christian church over a Mormon church (*β* = -0.61, *p* < 0.01), synagogue (*β* = -0.41, *p* < 0.01), and mosque (*β* = -0.7, *p* = 0.01), downtown (*β* = 0.07, *p* = 0.02) over residential location, small over medium (*β* = - 0.06, *p* = 0.02) and large size (*β* = - 0.11, *p* < 0.01), and neighbors' support or no involvement over their opposition (*β* = - 0.1, *p* < 0.01).

However, since conjoint experiments test a large number of hypotheses, they are prone to producing false positives (Liu and Shiraito 2023). To address this issue, table B18 also includes results corrected for multiple tests using the adaptive shrinkage (Ash) method (Stephens 2017). After this correction, some estimates and their significance levels changed, and the changed values are underlined in the table. The results still show a statistically significant preference for the St. John Christian Church over the other houses of worship, although the estimates for the Hindu temple and mosque slightly reduced after the correction. Respondents preferred the Christian church over the Mormon church (*β* = -0.61, *p* < 0.01), synagogue (*β* = -0.41, *p* < 0.01), Hindu temple (*β* = -0.63, *p* < 0.01), and mosque (*β* = -0.66, *p* < 0.01). Similarly, the downtown location is still preferred over the residential area (*β* = 0.03, *p* < 0.1), and respondents rejected houses of worship that neighbors opposed more than those on which neighbors did not express their opinions (*β* = -0.096, *p* < 0.01). Regarding size, only a small house of worship is statistically preferable to a large house of worship (*β* = -0.095, *p* < 0.01). None of the government variables remained statistically significant after the correction.

[figure B2 about here]

[table B18 about here]

Finally, this section also includes figure B3, showing marginal means by ideology after aggregating liberals and conservatives. Showing the results by dichotomous ideology variable helps compare the results to results by Republicans and Democrats (figure 2 in the main text). These figures show very similar results. Tables B19 and B20 display results for the model in figure B3.

1. Additional Findings

The main text focuses on the impact of nuisance and bias on the decision to resist new houses of worship. However, the conjoint experiment also included three attributes to test for the impact of local officials and neighbors. A deeper discussion of these attributes in the main text is omitted because the two features concerning local officials (*GovControl* and *Officials*) cannot be interpreted on their own since they interact with each other and with respondent's partisanship, and figure C4 depicts the interaction is busy and does not lead to clear conclusions.

Figure C4 depicts the interaction between the partisanship of the local officials and their attitude toward the new house of worship by the respondent's partisanship. Figure C5 depicts the differences between Republican and Democratic respondents and shows whether these differences are statistically significant. The differences are statistically significant whenever the confidence interval does not cross the 0.0 line. Since all statistically significant differences are to the left of the line, the figure tells us that, consistent with previous figures, Democrats are more likely to support new houses of worship than Republicans.

Based on the public opinion and framing literature, we should see respondents supporting the proposals more whenever local officials of their party identification approve the proposal or frame the house of worship positively. Vice versa, we should see lower support for houses of worship that local officials of the same partisanship do not approve of or whenever the local officials are concerned. Figure C4 shows that some interactions are in line with this expectation. For example, democratic respondents display the highest support for houses of worship that the democratic mayor and Republican council support and one that nonpartisan officials view as a great addition to the neighborhood. However, Democratic respondents also show higher support for projects that a democratic mayor and council find disturbing to the neighborhood or projects that a republican mayor and democratic council think will mean a loss of revenue for the town.

Regarding Republican respondents, figure C4 displays the highest support for new houses of worship when nonpartisan and republican officials approve of the project because it is a great addition to the neighborhood. Republican respondents show the lowest support for the houses of worship that republican officials are concerned about due to the loss of revenues, which is consistent with the expectation. At the same time, republican respondents also show lower support for projects that republican officials support. Overall, no clear pattern regarding frames and officials' attitudes emerges.

[Figure C4 about here]

[Figure C5 about here]

Table A1. Survey Response Rate for Pretest and Full-Sample Conjoint Survey

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Survey | Started survey | Declined consent | Attention check fail | Final count |
| Pretest | 104 | 4 | NA | 100 |
| Full-sample survey | 2935 | 126 | 410 | 1953\* |

\* The remaining respondents started the survey but stopped before answering the attention check question.

Table A2. Respondents' Characteristics Provided by Lucid

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Count |
| Age | 0 | 1 |  | 1953 |
| 18-29 |  |  | 0.22 |  |
| 30-39 |  |  | 0.2 |  |
| 40-49 |  |  | 0.18 |  |
| 50-59 |  |  | 0.15 |  |
| 60+ |  |  | 0.25 |  |
| Gender (1=female) | 0 | 1 | 0.52 | 1953 |
| Income (7=$45,000-49,999) | 0 | 23 | 7.52 | 1897 |
| Ethnicity (1=yes) |  |  |  | 1924 |
| White |  |  | 0.72 |  |
| Black |  |  | 0.12 |  |
| Asian |  |  | 0.05 |  |
| Hispanic | 0 | 1 | 0.12 | 1940 |
| Bachelor's degree | 0 | 1 | 0.36 | 1953 |
| Partisanship (0=strong democrat) | 0 | 6 | 2.72 | 1953 |
| Region | 0 | 1 |  | 1953 |
| Northeast |  |  | 0.19 |  |
| Midwest |  |  | 0.2 |  |
| South |  |  | 0.39 |  |
| West |  |  | 0.22 |  |

Table A3. Respondents' Characteristics from the Survey

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Count |
| Employment (0=employee) | 0 | 7 | 1.99 | 1739 |
| Ideology (0= extremely liberal) | 0 | 6 | 3.04 | 1734 |
| Urban (0)/ rural (2) | 0 | 2 | 0.86 | 1920 |
| Religion | 0 | 1 |  | 1926 |
| Protestant |  |  | 0.26 |  |
| Roman Catholic |  |  | 0.19 |  |
| Mormon |  |  | 0.02 |  |
| Orthodox |  |  | 0.01 |  |
| Jewish |  |  | 0.03 |  |
| Muslim |  |  | 0.02 |  |
| Buddhist |  |  | 0.01 |  |
| Hindu |  |  | 0.01 |  |
| Atheist |  |  | 0.04 |  |
| Agnostic |  |  | 0.05 |  |
| Just Christian |  |  | 0.17 |  |
| Religious services attendance (0=never) | 0 | 8 | 2.72 | 1926 |
| Own/rent (0=own) | 0 | 2 | 0.44 | 1888 |
| Building (0= detached single-family house) | 0 | 5 | 0.71 | 1870 |

Table A4. Respondents' Views from the Survey

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Count |
| Social distance (0=extremely uncomfortable) | 0 | 4 |  | 1913 |
| Christian |  |  | 3 |  |
| Muslim |  |  | 2.07 |  |
| Jewish |  |  | 2.49 |  |
| Hindu |  |  | 2.13 |  |
| Sikh |  |  | 2.01 |  |
| Mormon |  |  | 1.99 |  |
| Atheist |  |  | 1.87 |  |
| Muslim American resentment (0=low resentment) | 0 | 6 | 3.65 | 1898 |
| Environmental protection | 0 | 7 | 3.23 | 1893 |

Table A5: Descriptive Characteristics of Those Who Passed and Failed the Attention Check Question

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Passed | Failed |
| Age (mean, years) | 45.19 | 34.04 |
| Gender (1= female) | 0.52 | 0.43 |
| Income (7=$45,000 – 49,999) | 7.52 | 5.48 |
| White (1=yes) | 0.72 | 0.62 |
| Bachelor’s degree (1=yes) | 0.36 | 0.28 |
| Partisanship (0= strong democrat) | 2.72 | 2.17 |

Table A6: Conjoint Experiment Example Screen

Table

Description automatically generated

Table A7: Features and Levels of the Conjoint Experiment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Feature | Levels |
| House of worship (HoW) | 1. Al-Salam Mosque 2. Shree Swaminarayan Hindu Temple 3. Synagogue Beth Shalom 4. St. John Christian Church 5. The Mormon Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints |
| Congregants' residence | 1. Mostly out of town 2. Mostly inside the town |
| HoW's location | 1. Residential area 2. Residential area, bordering a business district 3. Business park 4. Downtown |
| HoW's size | 1. Small (fits 100 worshippers) 2. Medium (fits 500 worshippers) 3. Large (fits 1000 worshippers) |
| HoW's architecture | 1. Converted residential property 2. Traditional for the religion 3. Former church |
| Local government control | 1. Democratic Mayor and Council 2. Democratic Mayor and Republican Council 3. Republican Mayor and Democratic Council 4. Republican Mayor and Council 5. Nonpartisan Mayor and Council 6. Nonpartisan Council and Manager |
| Local officials | 1. Have not discussed the application yet 2. View the place of worship as a great addition to the neighborhood 3. Will approve the permit because places of worship are protected by the law 4. Are concerned that the place of worship will be disturbing to the neighborhood 5. Are concerned about the loss of revenue since religious institutions don't pay taxes 6. Oppose the application 7. Support the application 8. Mixed support |
| Neighbors' reaction | 1. 200 neighbors signed a petition opposing the application 2. 200 neighbors sent a letter of support to the local officials 3. No neighbors involved |

Figure A1: Frequency of Levels' Appearance in Conjoint Profiles



Table B8. Results for the Marginal Means Model (Figure 1 in the Main Text)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| feature | level | estimate | std. error | z |
| worship | Mormon Church | 0.538 | 0.011 | 3.443 |
|  | Synagogue | 0.588 | 0.011 | 8.28 |
|  | Christian Church | 0.682 | 0.01 | 18.651 |
|  | Hindu Temple | 0.531 | 0.011 | 2.782 |
|  | Mosque | 0.516 | 0.011 | 1.431 |
| residence | Outsiders | 0.57 | 0.009 | 7.76 |
|  | Insiders | 0.571 | 0.009 | 7.924 |
| location | Residential/ business | 0.568 | 0.01 | 6.915 |
|  | Residential | 0.566 | 0.01 | 6.789 |
|  | Downtown | 0.583 | 0.01 | 8.678 |
|  | Business | 0.566 | 0.01 | 6.775 |
| size | Small | 0.584 | 0.009 | 8.842 |
|  | Medium | 0.57 | 0.009 | 7.462 |
|  | Large | 0.559 | 0.009 | 6.181 |
| architecture | Traditional | 0.572 | 0.009 | 7.677 |
|  | Former church | 0.577 | 0.009 | 8.319 |
|  | Converted residence | 0.563 | 0.009 | 6.663 |
| government control | R Mayor and D Council | 0.573 | 0.01 | 7.134 |
|  | R Mayor and Council | 0.561 | 0.01 | 5.874 |
|  | Nonpartisan Mayor and Council | 0.575 | 0.01 | 7.35 |
|  | Nonpartisan Council and Manager | 0.582 | 0.01 | 7.99 |
|  | D Mayor and R Council | 0.572 | 0.01 | 6.953 |
|  | D Mayor and Council | 0.561 | 0.01 | 5.875 |
| officials | Approve - protected by law | 0.576 | 0.011 | 6.902 |
|  | Approve - great addition | 0.582 | 0.011 | 7.616 |
|  | Support | 0.579 | 0.011 | 7.3 |
|  | Oppose | 0.556 | 0.011 | 5.12 |
|  | Mixed support | 0.572 | 0.011 | 6.645 |
|  | Not discussed | 0.569 | 0.011 | 6.238 |
|  | Concerned - disturbing | 0.563 | 0.011 | 5.687 |
|  | Concerned - loss of revenue | 0.569 | 0.011 | 6.309 |
| neighbors | Neighbors oppose | 0.555 | 0.009 | 5.851 |
|  | Neighbors support | 0.577 | 0.009 | 8.308 |
|  | Neighbors not involved | 0.579 | 0.009 | 8.475 |

Table B9. Results for Democrats from the Marginal Means by Partisanship Model (Figure 2 in the Main Text)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | feature | level | estimate | std. error | z |
| Democrat | architecture | Traditional | 0.617 | 0.014 | 8.469 |
| Democrat |  | Former church | 0.624 | 0.013 | 9.182 |
| Democrat |  | Converted residence | 0.61 | 0.014 | 7.995 |
| Democrat | location | Residential/ business | 0.611 | 0.014 | 7.74 |
| Democrat |  | Residential | 0.612 | 0.014 | 7.861 |
| Democrat |  | Downtown | 0.628 | 0.014 | 9.164 |
| Democrat |  | Business | 0.615 | 0.014 | 8.042 |
| Democrat | neighbors | Neighbors oppose | 0.604 | 0.014 | 7.491 |
| Democrat |  | Neighbors support | 0.624 | 0.013 | 9.225 |
| Democrat |  | Neighbors not involved | 0.622 | 0.014 | 8.894 |
| Democrat | residence | Outsiders | 0.618 | 0.013 | 8.882 |
| Democrat |  | Insiders | 0.615 | 0.013 | 8.851 |
| Democrat | size | Small | 0.63 | 0.014 | 9.416 |
| Democrat |  | Medium | 0.618 | 0.014 | 8.661 |
| Democrat |  | Large | 0.601 | 0.014 | 7.201 |
| Democrat | worship | Mormon Church | 0.558 | 0.017 | 3.489 |
| Democrat |  | Synagogue | 0.644 | 0.015 | 9.522 |
| Democrat |  | Christian Church | 0.679 | 0.014 | 12.488 |
| Democrat |  | Hindu Temple | 0.6 | 0.016 | 6.334 |
| Democrat |  | Mosque | 0.603 | 0.016 | 6.595 |

Table B10. Results for Republicans from the Marginal Means by Partisanship Model (Figure 2 in the Main Text)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | feature | level | estimate | std. error | z |
| Republican | architecture | Traditional | 0.539 | 0.016 | 2.446 |
| Republican |  | Former church | 0.557 | 0.015 | 3.71 |
| Republican |  | Converted residence | 0.52 | 0.016 | 1.228 |
| Republican | location | Residential/ business | 0.542 | 0.016 | 2.551 |
| Republican |  | Residential | 0.538 | 0.016 | 2.372 |
| Republican |  | Downtown | 0.547 | 0.016 | 2.882 |
| Republican |  | Business | 0.527 | 0.016 | 1.664 |
| Republican | neighbors | Neighbors oppose | 0.523 | 0.016 | 1.446 |
| Republican |  | Neighbors support | 0.546 | 0.016 | 2.883 |
| Republican |  | Neighbors not involved | 0.548 | 0.016 | 3.013 |
| Republican | residence | Outsiders | 0.539 | 0.015 | 2.553 |
| Republican |  | Insiders | 0.539 | 0.015 | 2.549 |
| Republican | size | Small | 0.551 | 0.016 | 3.133 |
| Republican |  | Medium | 0.532 | 0.016 | 2.042 |
| Republican |  | Large | 0.533 | 0.016 | 2.093 |
| Republican | worship | Mormon Church | 0.541 | 0.019 | 2.175 |
| Republican |  | Synagogue | 0.556 | 0.019 | 3.03 |
| Republican |  | Christian Church | 0.727 | 0.016 | 14.263 |
| Republican |  | Hindu Temple | 0.458 | 0.019 | -2.223 |
| Republican |  | Mosque | 0.41 | 0.019 | -4.724 |

Table B11. Results for Extreme Liberals from the Marginal Means by Ideology Model (Figure 4 in the Main Text)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Feature | level | estimate | std. error | z |
| Extremely Liberal | worship | Christian Church | 0.722 | 0.033 | 6.76 |
|  |  | Mormon Church | 0.582 | 0.039 | 2.13 |
|  |  | Synagogue | 0.745 | 0.032 | 7.75 |
|  |  | Hindu Temple | 0.709 | 0.035 | 5.912 |
|  |  | Mosque | 0.743 | 0.033 | 7.463 |
| Extremely Liberal | residence | Outsiders | 0.699 | 0.029 | 6.881 |
|  |  | Insiders | 0.702 | 0.028 | 7.11 |
| Extremely Liberal | location | Residential | 0.695 | 0.031 | 6.291 |
|  |  | Residential/ business | 0.686 | 0.032 | 5.774 |
|  |  | Downtown | 0.71 | 0.031 | 6.832 |
|  |  | Business | 0.711 | 0.032 | 6.628 |
| Extremely Liberal | size | Small | 0.713 | 0.03 | 7.046 |
|  |  | Medium | 0.705 | 0.03 | 6.873 |
|  |  | Large | 0.682 | 0.031 | 5.825 |
| Extremely Liberal | architecture | Traditional | 0.693 | 0.031 | 6.289 |
|  |  | Former church | 0.706 | 0.029 | 7.112 |
|  |  | Converted residence | 0.702 | 0.03 | 6.635 |
| Extremely Liberal | neighbors | Neighbors not involved | 0.709 | 0.029 | 7.133 |
|  |  | Neighbors oppose | 0.684 | 0.03 | 6.145 |
|  |  | Neighbors support | 0.708 | 0.029 | 7.086 |

Table B12. Results for Liberals from the Marginal Means by Ideology Model (Figure 4 in the Main Text)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | feature | level | estimate | Std. error | z |
| Liberal | worship | Christian Church | 0.704 | 0.027 | 7.604 |
|  |  | Mormon Church | 0.569 | 0.031 | 2.191 |
|  |  | Synagogue | 0.671 | 0.029 | 5.943 |
|  |  | Hindu Temple | 0.64 | 0.028 | 5.02 |
|  |  | Mosque | 0.63 | 0.029 | 4.412 |
| Liberal | residence | Outsiders | 0.64 | 0.025 | 5.601 |
|  |  | Insiders | 0.645 | 0.024 | 6.027 |
| Liberal | location | Residential | 0.63 | 0.027 | 4.845 |
|  |  | Residential/ business | 0.636 | 0.027 | 5.099 |
|  |  | Downtown | 0.663 | 0.026 | 6.336 |
|  |  | Business | 0.642 | 0.027 | 5.311 |
| Liberal | size | Small | 0.655 | 0.026 | 5.958 |
|  |  | Medium | 0.651 | 0.026 | 5.825 |
|  |  | Large | 0.622 | 0.026 | 4.729 |
| Liberal | architecture | Traditional | 0.65 | 0.025 | 6.119 |
|  |  | Former church | 0.654 | 0.026 | 5.964 |
|  |  | Converted residence | 0.625 | 0.026 | 4.853 |
| Liberal | neighbors | Neighbors not involved | 0.65 | 0.025 | 6.009 |
|  |  | Neighbors oppose | 0.623 | 0.026 | 4.627 |
|  |  | Neighbors support | 0.655 | 0.025 | 6.216 |

Table B13. Results for Slight Liberals from the Marginal Means by Ideology Model (Figure 4 in the Main Text)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | feature | level | estimate | Std. error | z |
| Slightly Liberal | worship | Christian Church | 0.68 | 0.034 | 5.345 |
|  |  | Mormon Church | 0.551 | 0.037 | 1.371 |
|  |  | Synagogue | 0.66 | 0.034 | 4.746 |
|  |  | Hindu Temple | 0.61 | 0.036 | 3.009 |
|  |  | Mosque | 0.588 | 0.036 | 2.464 |
| Slightly Liberal | residence | Outsiders | 0.605 | 0.031 | 3.391 |
|  |  | Insiders | 0.629 | 0.029 | 4.383 |
| Slightly Liberal | location | Residential | 0.613 | 0.032 | 3.535 |
|  |  | Residential/ business | 0.632 | 0.032 | 4.091 |
|  |  | Downtown | 0.616 | 0.032 | 3.607 |
|  |  | Business | 0.605 | 0.033 | 3.182 |
| Slightly Liberal | size | Small | 0.655 | 0.031 | 4.968 |
|  |  | Medium | 0.615 | 0.03 | 3.849 |
|  |  | Large | 0.579 | 0.034 | 2.339 |
| Slightly Liberal | architecture | Traditional | 0.6 | 0.032 | 3.116 |
|  |  | Former church | 0.638 | 0.03 | 4.543 |
|  |  | Converted residence | 0.613 | 0.031 | 3.692 |
| Slightly Liberal | neighbors | Neighbors not involved | 0.619 | 0.031 | 3.826 |
|  |  | Neighbors oppose | 0.592 | 0.032 | 2.86 |
|  |  | Neighbors support | 0.638 | 0.031 | 4.528 |

Table B14. Results for Moderates from the Marginal Means by Ideology Model (Figure 4 in the Main Text)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | feature | level | estimate | Std. error | z |
| Moderate | worship | Christian Church | 0.631 | 0.017 | 7.881 |
|  |  | Mormon Church | 0.52 | 0.018 | 1.105 |
|  |  | Synagogue | 0.548 | 0.017 | 2.816 |
|  |  | Hindu Temple | 0.506 | 0.018 | 0.317 |
|  |  | Mosque | 0.507 | 0.018 | 0.416 |
| Moderate | residence | Outsiders | 0.543 | 0.015 | 2.861 |
|  |  | Insiders | 0.542 | 0.015 | 2.8 |
| Moderate | location | Residential | 0.542 | 0.016 | 2.624 |
|  |  | Residential/ business | 0.531 | 0.016 | 1.906 |
|  |  | Downtown | 0.559 | 0.016 | 3.726 |
|  |  | Business | 0.538 | 0.016 | 2.351 |
| Moderate | size | Small | 0.554 | 0.016 | 3.456 |
|  |  | Medium | 0.533 | 0.015 | 2.131 |
|  |  | Large | 0.541 | 0.016 | 2.582 |
| Moderate | architecture | Traditional | 0.546 | 0.016 | 2.915 |
|  |  | Former church | 0.542 | 0.015 | 2.741 |
|  |  | Converted residence | 0.54 | 0.016 | 2.517 |
| Moderate | neighbors | Neighbors not involved | 0.55 | 0.016 | 3.194 |
|  |  | Neighbors oppose | 0.528 | 0.016 | 1.796 |
|  |  | Neighbors support | 0.549 | 0.016 | 3.147 |

Table B15. Results for Slight Conservatives from the Marginal Means by Ideology Model (Figure 4 in the Main Text)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | feature | level | estimate | std. error | z |
| Slightly Conservative | worship | Christian Church | 0.709 | 0.033 | 6.338 |
|  |  | Mormon Church | 0.584 | 0.037 | 2.252 |
|  |  | Synagogue | 0.616 | 0.036 | 3.194 |
|  |  | Hindu Temple | 0.566 | 0.037 | 1.791 |
|  |  | Mosque | 0.489 | 0.038 | -0.282 |
| Slightly Conservative | residence | Outsiders | 0.593 | 0.031 | 3.011 |
|  |  | Insiders | 0.592 | 0.031 | 2.94 |
| Slightly Conservative | location | Residential | 0.586 | 0.033 | 2.603 |
|  |  | Residential/ business | 0.596 | 0.033 | 2.853 |
|  |  | Downtown | 0.631 | 0.032 | 4.05 |
|  |  | Business | 0.559 | 0.035 | 1.692 |
| Slightly Conservative | size | Small | 0.623 | 0.032 | 3.823 |
|  |  | Medium | 0.604 | 0.032 | 3.234 |
|  |  | Large | 0.551 | 0.033 | 1.523 |
| Slightly Conservative | architecture | Traditional | 0.587 | 0.033 | 2.672 |
|  |  | Former church | 0.614 | 0.032 | 3.553 |
|  |  | Converted residence | 0.577 | 0.032 | 2.386 |
| Slightly Conservative | neighbors | Neighbors not involved | 0.619 | 0.032 | 3.739 |
|  |  | Neighbors oppose | 0.577 | 0.033 | 2.356 |
|  |  | Neighbors support | 0.582 | 0.032 | 2.527 |

Table B16. Results for Conservatives from the Marginal Means by Ideology Model (Figure 4 in the Main Text)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Feature | level | estimate | std. error | z |
| Conservative | worship | Christian Church | 0.716 | 0.025 | 8.581 |
|  |  | Mormon Church | 0.593 | 0.029 | 3.162 |
|  |  | Synagogue | 0.568 | 0.03 | 2.267 |
|  |  | Hindu Temple | 0.473 | 0.031 | -0.886 |
|  |  | Mosque | 0.431 | 0.031 | -2.23 |
| Conservative | residence | Outsiders | 0.554 | 0.024 | 2.206 |
|  |  | Insiders | 0.556 | 0.024 | 2.322 |
| Conservative | location | Residential | 0.541 | 0.026 | 1.57 |
|  |  | Residential/ business | 0.557 | 0.027 | 2.135 |
|  |  | Downtown | 0.561 | 0.027 | 2.244 |
|  |  | Business | 0.563 | 0.026 | 2.383 |
| Conservative | size | Small | 0.56 | 0.026 | 2.302 |
|  |  | Medium | 0.561 | 0.025 | 2.433 |
|  |  | Large | 0.545 | 0.026 | 1.755 |
| Conservative | architecture | Traditional | 0.557 | 0.026 | 2.207 |
|  |  | Former church | 0.576 | 0.025 | 3.103 |
|  |  | Converted residence | 0.533 | 0.026 | 1.28 |
| Conservative | neighbors | Neighbors not involved | 0.561 | 0.025 | 2.404 |
|  |  | Neighbors oppose | 0.552 | 0.025 | 2.069 |
|  |  | Neighbors support | 0.553 | 0.026 | 2.061 |

Table B17. Results for Extreme Conservatives from the Marginal Means by Ideology Model (Figure 4 in the Main Text)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Feature | level | estimate | std. error | z |
| Extremely Conservative | worship | Christian Church | 0.755 | 0.031 | 8.311 |
|  |  | Mormon Church | 0.434 | 0.038 | -1.725 |
|  |  | Synagogue | 0.464 | 0.038 | -0.947 |
|  |  | Hindu Temple | 0.32 | 0.036 | -4.944 |
|  |  | Mosque | 0.294 | 0.034 | -5.986 |
| Extremely Conservative | residence | Outsiders | 0.466 | 0.029 | -1.17 |
|  |  | Insiders | 0.454 | 0.028 | -1.607 |
| Extremely Conservative | location | Residential | 0.447 | 0.031 | -1.7 |
|  |  | Residential/ business | 0.472 | 0.031 | -0.908 |
|  |  | Downtown | 0.457 | 0.031 | -1.39 |
|  |  | Business | 0.464 | 0.032 | -1.126 |
| Extremely Conservative | size | Small | 0.44 | 0.03 | -1.987 |
|  |  | Medium | 0.459 | 0.03 | -1.355 |
|  |  | Large | 0.481 | 0.031 | -0.635 |
| Extremely Conservative | architecture | Traditional | 0.471 | 0.031 | -0.958 |
|  |  | Former church | 0.449 | 0.03 | -1.717 |
|  |  | Converted residence | 0.46 | 0.031 | -1.28 |
| Extremely Conservative | neighbors | Neighbors not involved | 0.469 | 0.029 | -1.05 |
|  |  | Neighbors oppose | 0.432 | 0.03 | -2.252 |
|  |  | Neighbors support | 0.478 | 0.031 | -0.704 |

Figure B2. AMCEs of All Variables



Table B18. Results for the AMCE Model (Figure B2)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| feature | level | estimate | std.error | adjusted estimate | adjusted SD |
| worship | Christian Church | 0 | NA | 0 | 0.155 |
|  | Mormon Church | -0.612\*\*\* | 0.042 | -0.61\*\*\* | 0.04 |
|  | Synagogue | -0.41\*\*\* | 0.042 | -041\*\*\* | 0.04 |
|  | Hindu Temple | -0.644\*\*\* | 0.046 | -0.634\*\*\* | 0.038 |
|  | Mosque | -0.701\*\*\* | 0.047 | -0.663\*\*\* | 0.028 |
| residence | Outsiders | 0 | NA | 0 | 0.155 |
|  | Insiders | 0.006 | 0.022 | 0.0002 | 0.004 |
| location | Residential | 0 | NA | 0 | 0.155 |
|  | Residential/ business | 0.004 | 0.03 | 0.0002 | 0.007 |
|  | Downtown | 0.071\*\* | 0.03 | 0.03\* | 0.039 |
|  | Business | 0.004 | 0.03 | 0.0002 | 0.007 |
| size | Small | 0 | NA | 0 | 0.155 |
|  | Medium | -0.063\*\* | 0.027 | -0.025 | 0.035 |
|  | Large | -0.107\*\*\* | 0.029 | -0.095\*\*\* | 0.028 |
| architecture | Traditional | 0 | NA | 0 | 0.155 |
|  | Former church | 0.021 | 0.027 | 0.001 | 0.008 |
|  | Converted residence | -0.036 | 0.026 | -0.004 | 0.014 |
| government | Non-partisan Mayor and Council | 0 | NA | 0 | 0.155 |
| control | R Mayor and D Council | -0.009 | 0.035 | -0.0005 | 0.009 |
|  | R Mayor and Council | -0.065\* | 0.036 | -0.015 | 0.031 |
|  | Non-partisan Council and Manager | 0.019 | 0.036 | 0.001 | 0.01 |
|  | D Mayor and R Council | -0.019\* | 0.035 | -0.001 | 0.01 |
|  | D Mayor and Council | -0.069 | 0.037 | -0.016 | 0.033 |
| officials | Not discussed | 0 | NA | 0 | 0.155 |
|  | Approve - protected by law | 0.033 | 0.042 | 0.003 | 0.015 |
|  | Approve - great addition | 0.07\* | 0.041 | 0.014 | 0.031 |
|  | Support | 0.056 | 0.042 | 0.008 | 0.024 |
|  | Oppose | -0.047 | 0.04 | -0.005 | 0.019 |
|  | Mixed support | 0.02 | 0.042 | 0.001 | 0.012 |
|  | Concerned - disturbing | -0.015 | 0.042 | 0.001 | 0.011 |
|  | Concerned - loss of revenue | 0.008 | 0.041 | 0.0005 | 0.01 |
| neighbors | Neighbors not involved | 0 | NA | 0 | 0.155 |
|  | Neighbors oppose | -0.105\*\*\* | 0.026 | -0.096\*\*\* | 0.023 |
|  | Neighbors support | -0.006 | 0.026 | -0.0003 | 0.006 |

Figure B3: Marginal Means of Nongovernmental Attributes by Ideology



Table B19. Results for Liberals from the Marginal Means by Ideology Model (Figure B3)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | feature | level | estimate | std. error | z |
| Liberal | architecture | Traditional | 0.647 | 0.017 | 8.84 |
|  |  | Former church | 0.663 | 0.016 | 9.97 |
|  |  | Converted residence | 0.643 | 0.017 | 8.77 |
| Liberal | location | Residential/ business | 0.649 | 0.017 | 8.59 |
|  |  | Residential | 0.643 | 0.017 | 8.32 |
|  |  | Downtown | 0.662 | 0.017 | 9.59 |
|  |  | Business | 0.649 | 0.018 | 8.5 |
| Liberal | neighbors | Neighbors oppose | 0.631 | 0.017 | 7.72 |
|  |  | Neighbors support | 0.664 | 0.016 | 10.12 |
|  |  | Neighbors not involved | 0.657 | 0.016 | 9.62 |
| Liberal | residence | Outsiders | 0.645 | 0.016 | 8.96 |
|  |  | Insiders | 0.656 | 0.016 | 9.99 |
| Liberal | size | Small | 0.671 | 0.017 | 10.19 |
|  |  | Medium | 0.656 | 0.016 | 9.51 |
|  |  | Large | 0.625 | 0.017 | 7.23 |
| Liberal | worship | Mormon Church | 0.567 | 0.02 | 3.31 |
|  |  | Synagogue | 0.687 | 0.018 | 10.25 |
|  |  | Christian Church | 0.702 | 0.018 | 11.44 |
|  |  | Hindu Temple | 0.651 | 0.019 | 8 |
|  |  | Mosque | 0.648 | 0.019 | 7.81 |

Table B20. Results for Conservatives from the Marginal Means by Ideology Model (Figure B3)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | feature | level | estimate | std. error | z |
| Conservative | architecture | Traditional | 0.541 | 0.017 | 2.44 |
|  |  | Former church | 0.551 | 0.017 | 3.06 |
|  |  | Converted residence | 0.525 | 0.017 | 1.45 |
| Conservative | location | Residential/ business | 0.542 | 0.017 | 2.43 |
|  |  | Residential | 0.528 | 0.017 | 1.65 |
|  |  | Downtown | 0.55 | 0.018 | 2.87 |
|  |  | Business | 0.534 | 0.018 | 1.92 |
| Conservative | neighbors | Neighbors oppose | 0.526 | 0.017 | 1.53 |
|  |  | Neighbors support | 0.539 | 0.017 | 2.31 |
|  |  | Neighbors not involved | 0.552 | 0.017 | 3.13 |
| Conservative | residence | Outsiders | 0.54 | 0.016 | 2.5 |
|  |  | Insiders | 0.537 | 0.016 | 2.32 |
| Conservative | size | Small | 0.544 | 0.017 | 2.57 |
|  |  | Medium | 0.545 | 0.017 | 2.66 |
|  |  | Large | 0.528 | 0.017 | 1.66 |
| Conservative | worship | Mormon Church | 0.544 | 0.02 | 2.21 |
|  |  | Synagogue | 0.552 | 0.02 | 2.6 |
|  |  | Christian Church | 0.726 | 0.017 | 13.45 |
|  |  | Hindu Temple | 0.458 | 0.02 | -2.04 |
|  |  | Mosque | 0.41 | 0.02 | -4.49 |

Figure C4. Interaction of Local Officials' Partisanship and Their Attitudes by Respondents' Partisanship



Figure C5. The Difference between Democrats and Republicans from Figure C2



1. 410 respondents selected incorrect answers, and the rest of the respondents did not answer the question. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)