

Supplementary Material: Annotated Bibliography

We assembled an annotated bibliography of articles published in the top three political science journals over the past decade that measure rurality. We have grouped the articles by rural operationalization.¹ The operationalizations fall into eight categories: **Archival**,² **Land Use Laws**, **Multiple Measures**, **Percent Urban**, **Population Density**, **Population Size**, **Self-Identification**, and the largest category, **Unclear**.

Archival

1. Acharya, A., Blackwell, M., and Sen, M. 2016. "The Political Legacy of American Slavery," *The Journal of Politics* 78(3), 621-641.

Operationalization: Rural is measured as county-level population density in 1860.

2. Pope, J.C. and Treier, S. 2015. "Voting for a Founding: Testing the Effect of Economic Interests at the Federal Convention of 1787," *The Journal of Politics* 77(2), 519-534.

Operationalization: Rural is measured as "percent of the state that is rural" from the 1790 Census. The authors do not provide information on how rural was defined in Eighteenth Century Censuses.

3. Gamm, G., and Kousser, T. 2013. "No Strength In Numbers: The Failure of Big City Bills," *American Political Science Review* 107(4), 663-678.

Operationalization: From the article, p. 670: "To identify legislators as rural, urban, or suburban, we studied census records and state-specific sources to reconstruct metropolitan areas for each year in our study. In metropolitan areas, we coded the large cities as "urban" and the remaining places as "suburban"; in the remainder of each state, medium-sized and large cities were "urban" and other places "rural." Given that legislative districts were difficult to reconstruct and often encompassed a range of localities, we coded each legislator as rural, urban, or suburban according to the location of his or her home address."

Land-Use Laws

1. Lubell, M., Feick, R.C., and Ramirez de la Cruz, E.E. 2009. Local Institutions and the Politics of Urban Growth, *American Journal of Political Science* 53(3), 649-665.

Operationalization: Rural is measured by the categorization of land-use laws.

¹We do not include "An Ill-Fitting Coat: Reforming US Political Boundaries for a Metropolitan Age" by Thompson (2018) because although it discusses rurality, it does not measure it.

²While "archival" itself is not an operationalization, we group together articles using archival data because their data limitations set these projects apart from the other citations.

Multiple Measures

1. Nall, C. 2015. "The Political Consequences of Spatial Policies: How Interstate Highways Facilitated Geographic Polarization," *The Journal of Politics* 77(2), 394 - 406.

Operationalization: The author controls for the geographic status (e.g., urban, suburban, or rural) of respondents using zip code level measures of population density and percent of residents living in a metropolitan area. Suburban counties are defined as those with geographic centroids 20 to 100 kilometers from the center of the 100 most populous cities in 1950.

Percent Urban

1. Broockman, D. E. 2013. "Black Politicians Are More Intrinsically Motivated to Advance Blacks Interests: A Field Experiment Manipulating Political Incentives," *American Journal of Political Science* 57(3), 521-536.

Operationalization: The author controls for "the rural and urban makeup of the districts" by including a variable for "the percent of the district which is urban." Urban is not defined.

2. Warshaw, C., Jonathan Rodden, J. 2012. "How Should We Measure District-Level Public Opinion on Individual Issues?," *The Journal of Politics* 74(1), 203-219.

Operationalization: The authors use Census data on the percent of residents that live in an urban area, measured at the congressional and state senate district levels.

Population Density

1. Cho, W. K. T., and Gimpel, J. G. 2010. "Rough Terrain: Spatial Variation in Campaign Contributing and Volunteerism," *American Journal of Political Science* 54(1), 7489.

Operationalization: The authors adjust their kernel size based on population density.

2. Primo, D. and Snyder, J. 2010. "Party Strength, the Personal Vote, and Government Spending," *American Journal of Political Science* 54(2), 354-370.

Operationalization: Rural is measured by population density at the state level.

3. Urban, C., Niebler, S. 2014. "Dollars on the Sidewalk: Should U.S. Presidential Candidates Advertise in Uncontested States?," *American Journal of Political Science* 58(2), 322-336.

Operationalization: Rural is measured by population density and is included in the kernel specification.

Population Size

1. Cramer Walsh, K. 2012. "Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective," *American Political Science Review* 106(3), 517-532.

Operationalization: This is qualitative (interview) evidence and makes no attempt to quantitatively measure rurality. Cramer specifies the population size of the locations she visited in the online appendix.

Self-Identification

1. Parker, C. 2009. "When Politics Becomes Protest: Black Veterans and Political Activism in the Postwar South," *Journal of Politics* 71(1), 113-131.

Operationalization: Rural measured as "Were you brought up mostly on a farm, in a town, in a small city, or in a large city?" Recoded such that 1= large city; else = 0.

Unclear

1. Broockman, D.E. and Butler, D.M. 2017. "The Causal Effects of Elite Position-Taking on Voter Attitudes: Field Experiments with Elite Communication," *American Journal of Political Science* 61(1), 208-221.

Operationalization: Rural is measured using authors' "own judgment" (Source: email exchange).

2. Caughey, D., Dougal, M. C., Schickler, E. "Policy and Performance in the New Deal Realignment: Evidence from Old Data and New Methods," *The Journal of Politics*, *Forthcoming*.

Operationalization: Survey respondents were coded as Urban/Rural/Farm. It is unclear whether this is self-identification or coding based on county, zip code, or some other unit of classification.

3. de Benedictis-Kessner, J. and Warshaw, C. 2019. "Politics in Forgotten Governments: The Partisan Composition of County Legislatures and County Fiscal Policies," *The Journal of Politics*, *Forthcoming*.

Operationalization: Footnote 7 implies that the authors consider counties rural when they have less than 150,000 people. In the appendix, they "divide our dataset into counties with more than 15% of the population is rural compared to counties where less than 15% of the population is rural" but rural is not defined.

4. Gonzalez Juenke, E.G., and Preuhs, R.R. 2012. "Irreplaceable Legislators? Rethinking Minority Representatives in the New Century," *American Journal of Political Science* 56(3), 705-715.

Operationalization: They use a "standard measure" of urban/rural, but do not specify what that standard measure is.

5. Hersh, E. D., Nall, C. 2016. "The Primacy of Race in the Geography of Income-Based Voting: New Evidence from Public Voting Records," *American Journal of Political Science* 60(2), 289-303.

Operationalization: The appendix includes an analysis that measures rural as the rural population proportion in the district. Rural population is not defined.

6. Lazarus, J. 2010. Giving the People What They Want? The Distribution of Earmarks in the U.S. House of Representatives, *American Journal of Political Science* 54(2), 338-353.

Operationalization: Variable is the "% of residents living in rural areas." Rural is not defined.