Respectability politics and straight support for LGB rights

Online appendix

Phil Jones

Department of Political Science and International Relations

University of Delaware

pejones@udel.edu

www.pejones.org

A1 Descriptive statistics

Table A1: Demographic and political characteristics of Study 1 sample (CCES 2018)

Gender			Party identity	
Male	48.7%		Democrat	41.9%
Female	51.3%		Independent	17.6%
			Republican	40.3%
Race/ethnicity				
White	70.6%		Ideology	
Black	11.6%		Very liberal	9.8%
Hispanic	10.7%		Liberal	11.1%
Asian	4.2%		Somewhat liberal	9.6%
			Middle of the road	24.9%
Education			Somewhat conservative	11.1%
No high school	7.1%		Conservative	17.6%
High school graduate	29.4%		Very conservative	15.8%
Some college	19.6%			
2 year degree	12.5%			
4 year degree	20.4%			
Post-graduate	10.9%			
Family income				
<$30,000	23.2%			
$30-60,000	28.2%			
$60-100,000	23.4%			
$100-150,000	10.1%			
>$150,000	5.0%			
Prefer not to say	9.5%			

Note: Weighted data, straight respondents only.

Table A2: Demographic and political characteristics of Study 2 sample (Qualtrics 2019–2020)

Gender		Party identity	
Male	47.1%	Democrat	46.2%
Female	52.9%	Independent	15.2%
		Republican	38.7%
Race/ethnicity[a]			
White	75.1%	Ideology	
Black	14.9%	Very liberal	7.6%
Hispanic	10.9%	Liberal	10.3%
Asian	6.6%	Somewhat liberal	8.5%
		Middle of the road	32.2%
Education		Somewhat conservative	13.1%
No high school	3.3%	Conservative	13.8%
High school graduate	23.0%	Very conservative	14.5%
Some college	22.6%		
2 year degree	12.6%		
4 year degree	24.9%		
Post-graduate	13.7%		
Family income			
<$30,000	28.6%		
$30-60,000	29.5%		
$60-100,000	18.0%		
$100-150,000	11.6%		
>$150,000	8.1%		
Prefer not to say	4.3%		

[a]Respondents could choose multiple racial/ethnic identities; categories are not exclusive.

Note: Unweighted data, straight respondents only.

A2 Details about the experiments

A2.1 Stimuli for Study 1

Respondents were asked to "read the news article below about a court case in a different state and then answer the following questions".

(a) Two-person condition

Boyfriends sue local baker for denying service

Two gay men are suing a local baker who refused to make a cake for their housewarming party. The Christian baker says that serving the men would violate his religious belief that homosexuality is a sin.

The two men have been in a relationship for two years. One of the men, Charles Mullins, ordered a cake to celebrate the couple buying a house together.

Baker Craig Jennings told him to look elsewhere. In court documents, Jennings argues that "Homosexuality is a sin. I shouldn't be forced to go against God's word".

At a press conference with Mullins and his boyfriend, lawyers for the ACLU said that state anti-discrimination laws require businesses to serve all customers, gay or straight.

Charles Mullins (r) with his boyfriend.
© Reuters

(b) Three-person condition

Boyfriends sue local baker for denying service

Three gay men are suing a local baker who refused to make a cake for their housewarming party. The Christian baker says that serving the men would violate his religious belief that homosexuality is a sin.

The three men have been in an open relationship for two years. One of the men, Charles Mullins, ordered a cake to celebrate the threesome buying a house together.

Baker Craig Jennings told him to look elsewhere. In court documents, Jennings argues that "Homosexuality is a sin. I shouldn't be forced to go against God's word".

At a press conference with Mullins and his boyfriends, lawyers for the ACLU said that state anti-discrimination laws require businesses to serve all customers, gay or straight.

Charles Mullins (r) with his boyfriends.
© Reuters

A2.2 Stimuli for Study 2

Respondents were asked to "read the text of a recent newspaper story below. It describes a court case that is about to start in a different state."

Multiple elements of the story were varied simultaneously. To make programming the survey easier, respondents were initially randomly assigned to view either the female or male teacher conditions, as identified by first names and pronouns. Within each of the teacher gender conditions, the number of people in the teacher's relationship, the status of the teacher's relationship, the teacher's race/ethnicity, the length of the teacher's relationship, and the age of the children in the school were all randomized, as shown in brackets below.

Female teacher version:

School sued for firing gay teacher

A local [elementary/middle/high] school teacher was fired after administrators learned about her [girlfriend/girlfriends], a new lawsuit claims. The school says keeping her on staff would violate their religious belief that homosexuality is a sin.

[Katelyn McGrath/Mariana Hernandez/Tanisha Washington], 33, has worked at Covenant Christian School since 2017. She has been in [a committed/an open] relationship with [another woman/two other women] for [three/six/ten] years.

Students asked about her home life, and she was honest about being part of [a/an open] same-sex [couple/threesome], she says. A parent complained, and the school let her go earlier this month. "Homosexuality is against the Bible's teaching," administrators said in a statement.

At a press conference with [McGrath/Hernandez/Washington] and her [girlfriend/girlfriends], lawyers said that employers should treat all employees equally, gay or straight.

Male teacher version:

School sued for firing gay teacher

A local [elementary/middle/high] school teacher was fired after administrators learned about his [boyfriend/boyfriends], a new lawsuit claims. The school says keeping him on staff would violate their religious belief that homosexuality is a sin.

[Jake McGrath/Alejandro Hernandez/Tyrone Washington], 33, has worked at Covenant Christian School since 2017. He has been in [a committed/an open] relationship with [another man/two other men] for [three/six/ten] years.

Students asked about his home life, and he was honest about being part of [a/an open] same-sex [couple/threesome], he says. A parent complained, and the school let him go earlier this month. "Homosexuality is against the Bible's teaching," administrators said in a statement.

At a press conference with [McGrath/Hernandez/Washington] and his [boyfriend/boyfriends], lawyers said that employers should treat all employees equally, gay or straight.

A2.3 Balance tables

Table A3: Mean and standard deviation of potential moderators, by condition (Study 1)

	Two-person condition		Three-person condition		Difference
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	in means
Ideology	.54	.33	.54	.31	.00
Party ID	.49	.37	.48	.37	−.01
LG feeling thermometer	.62	.33	.65	.32	.03

Note: Unweighted data, straight respondents only.

Table A4: Mean and standard deviation of potential moderators, by condition (Study 2)

	Two-person condition		Three-person condition		Difference
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	in means
Ideology	.56	.29	.55	.29	−.01
Party ID	.47	.39	.47	.39	.00

	Committed condition		Open condition		Difference
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	in means
Ideology	.56	.29	.55	.29	−.01
Party ID	.48	.39	.46	.39	−.02

Note: Unweighted data, straight respondents only.

A2.4 Attention and manipulation checks

Both studies included items to measure how much attention respondents had paid to the stimuli. The browser's back button was disabled so that they could not return to the story to verify their answers.

Study 1

As a manipulation check, respondents were asked about the nature of the gay men's relationship (the key information that was manipulated across conditions). As an attention check, respondents were also asked about the baker's religion (information that was *not* manipulated across conditions). Table A5 shows the results.

Table A5: Manipulation and attention checks, by condition (Study 1)

		Two-person condition	Three-person condition
The gay men in the news article were...	Not in a relationship	1.4%	1.3%
	In a two-person relationship	**86.0%**	17.4%
	In a three-person relationship	0.1%	**61.2%**
	Don't know/Not sure	12.6%	20.0%
The baker in the news article was...	Atheist/agnostic	1.1%	0.5%
	Christian	**80.0%**	**75.3%**
	Jewish	0.6%	0.2%
	Don't know/Not sure	18.3%	24.1%

Note: Weighted data, straight respondents only. Correct answers are shown in bold.

Responses to the question about the gay men's relationship status suggest that the manipulated information was largely received by respondents. 86% of those in the two-person condition correctly identified the number of people in the relationship, as did 61% of those in the three-person condition.

Responses to the question about the baker's religion indicate that attention to the stimulus was similar across conditions (recall that his religion was not manipulated in the experiment). 80% of the two-person condition, and 75% of the three-person condition, correctly identified the baker as Christian (this difference is not statistically significant). This suggests that there were similar levels of attentiveness to the stimulus across conditions.

Study 2

As a manipulation check, respondents were asked about the nature of the teacher's relationship (information that was manipulated across conditions). As an attention check, respondents were asked about the religious affiliation of the school in the case. Table A6 shows the results.

Table A6: Manipulation and attention checks, by condition (Study 2)

		Two-person condition	Three-person condition
The teacher in the news story was…	Not in a relationship	5.7%	5.1%
	In a two-person relationship	**75.2%**	27.1%
	In a three-person relationship	6.6%	**54.1%**
	Don't know/Not sure	12.5%	13.6%
The school in the news story was was…	Not religiously affiliated	9.0%	10.5%
	A Christian school	**74.4%**	**70.9%**
	A Jewish school	2.5%	2.6%
	Don't know/Not sure	14.0%	16.0%

Note: Unweighted data, straight respondents only. Correct answers are shown in bold.

As in Study 1, majorities in both conditions correctly identified one key piece of manipulated information: 75% of those in the two-person condition identified the teacher as in a monogamous relationship; 54% in the three-person condition identified them as in a polyamorous relationship. Due to space limitations on the omnibus surveys, items assessing the manipulation of other features were not included.

Attention to other elements of the news story was consistent across conditions: 74% of those in the two-person condition, and 71% of those in the three-person condition, correctly identified the school as Christian affiliated. This again suggests that attention to the news story was consistent across conditions.

A3   Survey items

A3.1   Study 1

Support the gay men's case: If you were deciding this case, would you

- Definitely side with the baker

- Probably side with the baker

- Probably side with the gay men

- Definitely side with the gay men

Support required service: Business owners like the baker in the case should be

- Allowed to refuse services to gay people if it violates their religious beliefs

- Required to provide services to gay people as they would to all other customers

How strongly do you feel that business owners should be [allowed to refuse services to gay people if it violates their religious beliefs/required to provide services to gay people as they would to all other customers]?

- A little

- Moderately

- Very strongly

Support LGB rights: Do you support or oppose laws that allow gay and lesbian people to...Get married; Adopt children; Serve in the military

- Strongly oppose

- Somewhat oppose

- Somewhat support

- Strongly support

Felt angry, disgusted, proud: We are interested in how people react to the news article you read. Please rate how you felt when reading the story about this court case: Angry; Disgusted; Proud.
Slider ranging from "Did not feel this at all" to "Felt this very strongly".

Felt similar to the gay men: How similar to you did you feel the people described in the news article were? The gay men.
Slider ranging from "Not at all similar to me" to "Extremely similar to me".

LG thermometer ratings: Please rate how cold or warm you feel toward each group. Ratings below 50 degrees mean that you feel unfavorable or cold toward the group. Ratings above 50 degrees mean that you feel favorable or warm toward the group. Gays and lesbians.
Slider ranging from 0 to 100.

A3.2 Study 2

Support the gay teacher's case: If you were deciding this case, would you

- Definitely side with the school

- Probably side with the school

- Probably side with the gay teacher

- Definitely side with the gay teacher

Felt similar to the gay teacher: How similar to you did you feel the people described in the news story were? The gay teacher.
Slider ranging from "Not at all similar" to "Extremely similar".

Felt angry, disgusted, proud: We are interested in how people react to the news story you read. Please rate how you felt when reading the story about this court case: Angry; Disgusted; Proud.
Slider ranging from "Didn't feel at all" to "Felt very strongly".

Support LGB rights: Do you support or oppose laws that allow gay and lesbian people to...Get married; Adopt children; Serve in the military

- Strongly oppose

- Somewhat oppose

- Somewhat support

- Strongly support

Support LGB job protections: Do you support or oppose laws that would protect lesbian, gay, and bisexual people against job discrimination?

- Strongly oppose

- Somewhat oppose

- Somewhat support

- Strongly support

A4 Mean scores by condition for all dependent variables

A4.1 Study 1

Table A7: Mean score by two/three-person relationship conditions and ATE, Study 1

	Mean in two-person relationship condition	Mean in three-person relationship condition	ATE of two-person relationship condition	*p*-value
Felt similar to the gay men	0.29	0.27	0.02	.536
Support the gay men's case	0.45	0.49	−0.04	.236
Support required service	0.50	0.54	−0.04	.274
Support LGB rights	0.66	0.68	−0.02	.497
Felt angry	0.52	0.50	0.02	.536
Felt disgusted	0.51	0.51	−0.01	.841
Felt proud	0.28	0.28	0.00	.989

Note: Straight respondents only. *p*-values of ATEs from two-tailed t-test.

A4.2 Study 2

Table A8: Marginal mean in committed/open relationship conditions and AMCE, Study 2

	Marginal mean in committed relationship condition	Marginal mean in open relationship condition	AMCE of committed relationship condition	p-value
Support for the gay teacher's case	0.54	0.55	−0.01	.589
Felt similar to the gay teacher	0.44	0.45	−0.01	.335
Support LGB job protections	0.65	0.66	−0.00	.949
Felt angry	0.54	0.54	−0.01	.474
Felt disgusted	0.54	0.55	−0.00	.714
Felt proud	0.34	0.36	−0.02	.089
Felt sympathy for teacher	0.63	0.63	−0.00	.671
Support for LGB rights	0.65	0.66	−0.00	.723

Note: Straight respondents only. p-values of AMCEs from two-tailed t-test.

Table A9: Marginal mean in two/three-person relationship conditions and AMCE, Study 2

	Marginal mean in two-person relationship condition	Marginal mean in three-person relationship condition	AMCE of two-person relationship condition	*p*-value
Support for the gay teacher's case	0.57	0.52	0.05	.000
Felt similar to the gay teacher	0.47	0.42	0.04	.000
Support LGB job protections	0.66	0.64	0.02	.158
Felt angry	0.56	0.52	0.03	.003
Felt disgusted	0.56	0.53	0.03	.020
Felt proud	0.34	0.35	−0.01	.420
Felt sympathy for teacher	0.67	0.59	0.08	.000
Support for LGB rights	0.66	0.65	0.01	.618

Note: Straight respondents only. *p*-values of AMCEs from two-tailed t-test.

A5 LGB respondents in Study 1

By chance, the CCES module used in Study 1 happened to include a relatively large number of respondents who identified as LGB (N=120). While excluded from the main analysis — since H1 is specified in terms effects on straight people — we can also assess how LGB people responded to the experiment.

Table A10: Mean score by two/three-person relationship conditions and ATE, Study 1, LGB respondents

	Mean in two-person relationship condition	Mean in three-person relationship condition	ATE of two-person relationship condition	*p*-value
Support the gay men's case	0.74	0.74	0.00	.999
Felt similar to the gay men	0.64	0.61	0.03	.767
Felt angry	0.67	0.68	−0.02	.801
Felt disgusted	0.56	0.55	0.01	.896
Felt proud	0.33	0.33	0.00	.971
Support required service	0.80	0.79	0.02	.833
Support LGB rights	0.92	0.91	0.01	.863

Note: LGB respondents only. *p*-values of ATEs from two-tailed t-test.

As we would expect, LGB respondents were on average more supportive than straight respondents of the gay men, their case, and LGB rights. However, among LGB respondents, there is no evidence that the different presentation of the men's relationship had an effect. None of the differences in means between the two- and three-person relationship condition are substantively or statistically significant. As with straight respondents, LGB respondents' attitudes were unaffected by the men's relationship status.

A6   Heterogeneous treatment effect analyses for Figure 2

Coefficients from the regression models below are simulated to estimate the heterogeneous treatment effects shown in Figure 2.

Table A11: Treatment effects, by respondents' ideology, Study 1

	Support the gay men's case	Felt similar to the gay men	Support required service
Constant	0.92 (0.03)***	0.47 (0.04)***	0.99 (0.04)***
Two-person relationship	0.01 (0.04)	0.03 (0.05)	0.01 (0.05)
Ideology	−0.78 (0.06)***	−0.36 (0.05)***	−0.84 (0.08)***
Two-person relationship × ideology	−0.06 (0.07)	−0.04 (0.07)	−0.08 (0.09)
R^2	0.43	0.15	0.42
N	833	829	827

***$p < 0.001$, **$p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, †$p < 0.1$

Table A12: Treatment effects, by respondents' party identity, Study 1

	Support the gay men's case	Felt similar to the gay men	Support required service
Constant	0.81 (0.03)***	0.39 (0.03)***	0.89 (0.03)***
Two-person relationship	−0.05 (0.05)	0.02 (0.05)	−0.06 (0.05)
Party identity	−0.63 (0.05)***	−0.23 (0.04)***	−0.69 (0.05)***
Two-person relationship × party identity	0.03 (0.07)	−0.01 (0.07)	0.05 (0.08)
R^2	0.32	0.08	0.32
N	851	848	845

***$p < 0.001$, **$p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, †$p < 0.1$

Table A13: Treatment effects, by respondents' LG thermometer rating, Study 1

	Support the gay men's case	Felt similar to the gay men	Support required service
Constant	0.10 (0.04)**	0.01 (0.02)	0.17 (0.05)***
Two-person relationship	−0.00 (0.05)	0.07 (0.04)†	−0.04 (0.07)
LG thermometer	0.63 (0.05)***	0.42 (0.04)***	0.59 (0.06)***
Two-person relationship × LG thermometer	−0.03 (0.08)	−0.07 (0.07)	0.02 (0.10)
R^2	0.27	0.17	0.21
N	879	876	873

$^{***}p < 0.001$, $^{**}p < 0.01$, $^{*}p < 0.05$, $^{\dagger}p < 0.1$

A7 Additional heterogeneous treatment analyses

A7.1 Study 1

Here I present additional analyses of potential heterogeneous treatment effects. For Study 1, I show how the treatment effects are moderated by:

- Respondent's area type (based on respondents' description of the area they live in, coded as a continuous variable: "rural" (=0); "town" (=1); "suburb" (=2); or "city" (=3)).

- The number of same-sex couples per 1,000 households in the respondent's state (estimates based on analysis of Census data by the Williams Institute (2019).) This is intended as a proxy for the visibility of the LGB community in a state, and ranges from 2.27 in North Dakota to 8.36 in Vermont.

- Respondent gender (the CCES offered only "male" or "female" options)

- Whether the respondent identified as born-again or not

Table A14: Treatment effects, by respondent's area type, Study 1

	Support the gay men's case	Felt similar to the gay men	Support required service
Constant	0.41 (0.04)***	0.22 (0.03)***	0.43 (0.05)***
Two-person relationship	−0.07 (0.06)	0.01 (0.05)	−0.05 (0.07)
Area type	0.05 (0.02)*	0.03 (0.01)†	0.06 (0.02)*
Two-person relationship × area type	0.02 (0.03)	0.00 (0.02)	0.01 (0.03)
R^2	0.03	0.01	0.03
N	876	873	870

*** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, † $p < 0.1$

Table A15: Treatment effects, by number of same-sex couples in respondent's state, Study 1

	Support the gay men's case	Felt similar to the gay men	Support required service
Constant	0.46 (0.09)***	0.32 (0.07)***	0.43 (0.11)***
Two-person relationship	−0.07 (0.12)	−0.16 (0.10)	0.04 (0.15)
Number of same-sex couples	0.01 (0.02)	−0.01 (0.01)	0.02 (0.02)
Two-person relationship × number of same-sex couples	0.01 (0.02)	0.03 (0.02)†	−0.01 (0.03)
R^2	0.00	0.01	0.01
N	879	876	873

***$p < 0.001$, **$p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, †$p < 0.1$

Table A16: Treatment effects, by respondent's gender, Study 1

	Support the gay men's case	Felt similar to the gay men	Support required service
Constant	0.44 (0.03)***	0.27 (0.03)***	0.46 (0.04)***
Two-person relationship	−0.06 (0.05)	−0.00 (0.04)	0.00 (0.06)
Woman respondent	0.09 (0.05)*	0.00 (0.03)	0.15 (0.05)**
Two-person relationship × woman respondent	0.04 (0.06)	0.03 (0.05)	−0.08 (0.07)
R^2	0.02	0.01	0.02
N	879	876	873

***$p < 0.001$, **$p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, †$p < 0.1$

Table A17: Treatment effects, by respondent's born-again identification, Study 1

	Support the gay men's case	Felt similar to the gay men	Support required service
Constant	0.58 (0.03)***	0.30 (0.02)***	0.64 (0.03)***
Two-person relationship	−0.03 (0.04)	0.03 (0.03)	−0.05 (0.04)
Born-again	−0.30 (0.04)***	−0.11 (0.03)**	−0.33 (0.05)***
Two-person relationship × born-again	−0.03 (0.06)	−0.07 (0.05)	−0.00 (0.07)
R^2	0.14	0.05	0.12
N	873	870	867

*** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, † $p < 0.1$

A7.2 Study 2

To assess potential heterogeneous treatment effects in Study 2, I turn to a standard linear regression framework. As independent variables, I include all levels of the conjoint experiment. I interact the committed relationship condition and the two-person relationship condition with each of:

- Respondent's party identity

- Respondent's ideology

- Respondent's gender

- The number of same-sex couples per 1,000 households in the respondent's state

The Qualtrics surveys used in Study 2 did not include measures of the respondent's thermometer rating of LG people or measures of the type of area the respondent lived in, as used in Study 1.

Table A18: Treatment effects, by respondent's party identity, Study 2

	Felt similar to gay teacher	Support gay teacher's case	Support LGB job protections
Constant	0.55 (0.02)***	0.71 (0.02)***	0.78 (0.02)***
Two-person relationship	−0.05 (0.02)**	−0.05 (0.02)**	−0.02 (0.02)
Committed relationship	−0.01 (0.02)	−0.00 (0.02)	−0.02 (0.02)
Party identity	−0.13 (0.03)***	−0.25 (0.03)***	−0.22 (0.03)***
× Two-person relationship	0.02 (0.03)	−0.00 (0.03)	−0.00 (0.03)
× Committed relationship	0.01 (0.03)	−0.00 (0.03)	0.04 (0.03)
Male teacher	−0.01 (0.01)	−0.01 (0.01)	−0.00 (0.01)
Black teacher	0.01 (0.01)	−0.00 (0.02)	−0.02 (0.01)
Latinx teacher	−0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.02)	−0.01 (0.01)
6 year relationship	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.01)
10 year relationship	0.01 (0.01)	−0.00 (0.02)	−0.00 (0.01)
Middle school	−0.03 (0.01)*	−0.03 (0.02)*	−0.03 (0.01)†
High school	−0.01 (0.01)	−0.02 (0.02)	−0.00 (0.01)
Adj. R^2	0.02	0.07	0.05
N	3,438	3,438	3,438

***$p < 0.001$, **$p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, $^{\dagger}p < 0.1$

Table A19: Treatment effects, by respondent's ideology, Study 2

	Felt similar to gay teacher	Support gay teacher's case	Support LGB job protections
Constant	0.51 (0.03)***	0.80 (0.03)***	0.88 (0.03)***
Two-person relationship	−0.07 (0.02)**	−0.06 (0.03)*	−0.03 (0.02)
Committed relationship	0.03 (0.02)	0.03 (0.03)	0.02 (0.02)
Ideology	−0.05 (0.03)	−0.37 (0.04)***	−0.37 (0.03)***
× Two-person relationship	0.04 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)
× Committed relationship	−0.07 (0.04)†	−0.06 (0.04)	−0.03 (0.04)
Male teacher	−0.01 (0.01)	−0.01 (0.01)	−0.00 (0.01)
Black teacher	0.02 (0.01)	−0.01 (0.01)	−0.02 (0.01)
Latinx teacher	−0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	−0.02 (0.01)
6 year relationship	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.02 (0.01)
10 year relationship	0.01 (0.01)	−0.01 (0.01)	−0.00 (0.01)
Middle school	−0.03 (0.01)*	−0.02 (0.01)	−0.02 (0.01)
High school	−0.01 (0.01)	−0.01 (0.01)	−0.00 (0.01)
Adj. R^2	0.01	0.10	0.10
N	3,541	3,541	3,541

*** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$, † $p < 0.1$

Table A20: Treatment effects, by respondent's gender, Study 2

	Felt similar to gay teacher	Support gay teacher's case	Support LGB job protections
Constant	0.50 (0.02)***	0.52 (0.02)***	0.61 (0.02)***
Two-person relationship	−0.01 (0.02)	−0.03 (0.02)	0.00 (0.02)
Committed relationship	−0.03 (0.02)	−0.02 (0.02)	−0.01 (0.02)
Woman respondent	−0.03 (0.02)†	0.12 (0.02)***	0.11 (0.02)***
× Two-person relationship	−0.06 (0.02)*	−0.04 (0.03)†	−0.03 (0.02)
× Committed relationship	0.03 (0.02)	0.02 (0.03)	0.01 (0.02)
Male teacher	−0.01 (0.01)	−0.00 (0.01)	−0.00 (0.01)
Black teacher	0.02 (0.01)	−0.01 (0.02)	−0.02 (0.01)
Latinx teacher	−0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.02)	−0.01 (0.01)
6 year relationship	0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.02)	0.02 (0.01)
10 year relationship	0.01 (0.01)	−0.01 (0.02)	−0.01 (0.01)
Middle school	−0.03 (0.01)*	−0.02 (0.02)	−0.02 (0.01)
High school	−0.01 (0.01)	−0.01 (0.02)	−0.00 (0.01)
Adj. R^2	0.01	0.02	0.02
N	3,533	3,533	3,533

***$p < 0.001$, **$p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, †$p < 0.1$

Table A21: Treatment effects, by number of same-sex couples in respondent's state, Study 2

	Felt similar to gay teacher	Support gay teacher's case	Support LGB job protections
Constant	0.35 (0.04)***	0.46 (0.04)***	0.58 (0.04)***
Two-person relationship	0.06 (0.04)	0.10 (0.05)*	0.08 (0.04)†
Committed relationship	0.04 (0.04)	0.03 (0.05)	−0.04 (0.04)
Number of same-sex couples	0.02 (0.01)*	0.01 (0.01)†	0.01 (0.01)*
× Two-person relationship	−0.00 (0.01)	−0.01 (0.01)	−0.01 (0.01)
× Committed relationship	−0.01 (0.01)	−0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
Male teacher	−0.01 (0.01)	−0.00 (0.01)	−0.00 (0.01)
Black teacher	0.02 (0.01)	−0.01 (0.02)	−0.02 (0.01)
Latinx teacher	−0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.02)	−0.01 (0.01)
6 year relationship	0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.01)
10 year relationship	0.01 (0.01)	−0.01 (0.02)	−0.01 (0.01)
Middle school	−0.03 (0.01)*	−0.02 (0.02)	−0.02 (0.01)
High school	−0.01 (0.01)	−0.01 (0.02)	0.00 (0.01)
Adj. R^2	0.01	0.00	0.00
Num. obs.	3,517	3,517	3,517

$^{***}p < 0.001$, $^{**}p < 0.01$, $^*p < 0.05$, $^\dagger p < 0.1$

References

LGBT Demographic Data Interactive. (January 2019). Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law.