**Effects of socio-demographic variables on respondents’ opinions**

**Table S1:** Details of significance testing for models fitting the effect of socio-demographic variables on respondents’ opinions of the idea of a brownfield site in their local area.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Demographic variable | Model F | P |
| Gender | 3.35 | 0.0674 |
| Age | 4.37 | **0.0016** |
| Social grade | 3.89 | **0.0488** |
| Region | 1.34 | 0.2026 |
| Employment status | 3.19 | **0.0071** |
| Children at home | 2.02 | 0.1333 |
| Parent/guardian status | 0.46 | 0.4956 |
| Dog ownership | 2.35 | 0.0958 |
| Settlement size | 1.17 | 0.3199 |
| Settlement tenure | 0.24 | 0.9461 |
| Home ownership | 0.90 | 0.5175 |
| Home tenure | 0.51 | 0.7682 |

**Table S2**: Details of significance testing for models fitting the effect of self-identifying with various relevant stakeholder groups on respondents’ opinions of the idea of a brownfield site in their local area. Rankings ranged from 1 (“Very negative”) to 5 (“Very positive”), so a positive effect size indicates that the option was more preferred by respondents who self-identified as belonging to the stakeholder group, and *vice versa*.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Affiliation | N (affiliates) | Effect size | s.e. of effect size | F | P |
| Conservation organisation (member of staff) | 8 | -0.32 | 0.32 | 0.99 | 0.3208 |
| Conservation organisation (volunteer) | 36 | 0.26 | 0.15 | 2.85 | 0.0917 |
| Conservation organisation (member/supporter) | 248 | -0.03 | 0.06 | 0.26 | 0.6105 |
| Local authority (e.g. councillor) | 23 | -0.23 | 0.19 | 1.44 | 0.2306 |
| Community organisation (e.g. Neighbourhood Watch) | 70 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.8897 |
| Farmer (or agriculture-related business) | 10 | 0.46 | 0.29 | 2.57 | 0.1093 |
| Renewable energy industry | 10 | 0.06 | 0.29 | 0.04 | 0.8404 |

**Table S3**: Details of post-hoc Tukey tests for models listed as significant in Tables S1–2. Rankings ranged from 1 (“Very negative”) to 5 (“Very positive”), so a positive effect size indicates that the option was more preferred by respondents who belonged to the first socio-demographic option in each comparison, and *vice versa*.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Independent variable | Options under comparison | Effect size | s.e. of effect size | t | P |
| Age | 25-34 – 18-24 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.40 | 0.995 |
|  | 35-44 – 18-24 | 0.19 | 0.09 | 2.20 | 0.175 |
|  | 45-54 – 18-24 | 0.14 | 0.09 | 1.62 | 0.476 |
|  | 55+ – 18-24 | -0.01 | 0.08 | -0.15 | 1.000 |
|  | 35-44 – 25-34 | 0.16 | 0.07 | 2.34 | 0.128 |
|  | 45-54 – 25-34 | 0.11 | 0.07 | 1.59 | 0.494 |
|  | 55+ – 25-34 | -0.05 | 0.06 | -0.83 | 0.919 |
|  | 45-54 – 35-44 | -0.05 | 0.07 | -0.77 | 0.938 |
|  | 55+ – 35-44 | -0.20 | 0.06 | -3.64 | **0.002** |
|  | 55+ – 45-54 | -0.15 | 0.06 | -2.75 | **0.045** |
| Social grade | C2DE – ABC1 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 1.97 | **0.049** |
| Employment status | Other – Full time student | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.69 | 0.981 |
|  | Retired – Full time student | -0.03 | 0.10 | -0.31 | 1.000 |
|  | Unemployed – Full time student | 0.14 | 0.13 | 1.05 | 0.890 |
|  | Working full time – Full time student | 0.11 | 0.10 | 1.05 | 0.889 |
|  | Working part time – Full time student | 0.20 | 0.11 | 1.78 | 0.456 |
|  | Retired – Other | -0.11 | 0.08 | -1.45 | 0.676 |
|  | Unemployed – Other | 0.06 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.996 |
|  | Working full time – Other | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.34 | 0.999 |
|  | Working part time – Other | 0.11 | 0.09 | 1.32 | 0.757 |
|  | Unemployed – Retired | 0.17 | 0.10 | 1.77 | 0.458 |
|  | Working full time – Retired | 0.14 | 0.05 | 2.92 | **0.037** |
|  | Working part time – Retired | 0.23 | 0.06 | 3.56 | **0.004** |
|  | Working full time – Unemployed | -0.03 | 0.09 | -0.33 | 0.999 |
|  | Working part time – Unemployed | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.56 | 0.992 |
|  | Working part time – Working full time | 0.09 | 0.06 | 1.48 | 0.658 |