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**Complete Methods and Results for Survey Study in Wisconsin**

To examine the hypotheses above, we conducted a two-phase survey-based experiment. In *Phase 1*, we recruited participants from both rural and urban settings in Wisconsin. Regardless of where they came from, participants in Phase 1 a) completed a reverse-correlation task—a cognitive psychological instrument—that enabled us to estimate their mental representations of either ‘Milwaukeeans’ or ‘Madisonians,’ and b) freely listed the attributes that came to mind most readily when thinking Milwaukeeans and Madisonians, respectively. New participants in *Phase 2* then rated the mental representations and free response entries generated from Phase 1 on how negative they seemed and on how stereotypically Black vs. white they seemed. Of note, having mental representations from reverse-correlation experiments rated by naïve participants is standard practice for this experimental procedure (e.g., Brown-Iannuzzi et al. 2017). Likewise, having free-response entries rated by naïve participants is also a standard experimental procedure (Petsko and Bodenhausen, 2019). Data files, R scripts, and materials associated with this project are available on the Open Science Framework website (OSF: <https://tinyurl.com/ya6zj3sc>). Unless otherwise noted, we had more than 99% power to detect all positive effects and interactions reported in this paper (power was estimated by running Monte Carlo simulations on all mixed-linear models, whose specifications will be described in later sections; see Bolger, Stadler, & Laurenceau, 2012).

**Phase 1**

 *Participants*

Phase 1 had the aim of recruiting a total of *N* = 120 participants (*n* = 30 participants per cell is common in reverse-correlation experiments, which rely heavily on within-person observations; Dotsch & Todorov, 2012). In total, *N* = 122 participants completed Phase 1, of whom *n* = 62 were from rural parts of Wisconsin, and of whom *n* = 60 were from urban parts of Wisconsin. As demonstrated by Figure 1 (which also lists sampling demographics), participants in the rural sample lived in counties with varying ideological leanings. For example, Hillary Clinton received nearly 53 percent of the vote in Ashland County as compared to Burnett County, where 62 percent of voters cast a ballot for Donald Trump. Like Cramer, we also selected study locations that fell within different regions of the state and possessed varying demographic characteristics in terms of race and ethnicity, median household income, and total population (Cramer 2016; 29-31, 230-233; see also Miles and Huberman 1994, 28). We also ensured that over half of the participants in the rural sample lived north of Highway 8, a geographical boundary that figures prominently within Cramer’s work. Sixty-three percent of the rural sample resides in towns of less than 9,000 people in rural counties. Consistent with Cramer’s work (2016, 230-232), we also include some individuals who live in small towns that fall within metropolitan counties. For example, nine percent of the rural participants live in towns of less than 10,000 people within Pierce and St. Croix Counties, both of which fall within the Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Statistical Area. Similarly, six percent of the sample reside within small towns located in Winnebago County, which falls within the Oshkosh Metropolitan Statistical Area. Participants in the urban sample all lived in the metropolitan area of Milwaukee, the largest city in the State of Wisconsin. Cramer also observed several community meetings in Milwaukee and the surrounding suburbs (Cramer 2016, 230-233).

 In taking this approach, it is important to discuss limitations regarding the representativeness of the sample. There is no consistent approach for defining which locales are considered rural vs. urban, nor is there an established set of criteria that defines who is considered an average “rural American'' or even a “rural Wisconsinite.” Moreover, because Cramer understandably protected the identities of the individuals she spoke with in Wisconsin, we are also unable to compare our sample to hers. However, we do think we have a strong footing to explore the questions presented in this paper for one reason specifically: our rural sample is actually *more* liberal than we might expect given the 2016 vote share for Donald trump in the counties we visited. For example, on a scale from *0 = extremely liberal* to *10 = extremely conservative*, our rural respondents scored only slightly above the midpoint of the scale, on average (*M* = 5.24, *SD* = 2.47). Though notably, the rural sample was still significantly more conservative than the rural sample (*M* = 4.00, *SD* = 2.54; *p* = .008). Given the strong relationship between conservatism and increased rates of racial resentment (Kinder and Sanders 1996), we believe the results we present below actually represent a conservative test of our hypotheses. Moreover, since our aim is to assess the role of racial resentment within existing conceptions of rural consciousness, we prioritized obtaining a sample from places that appeared similar to those discussed within Cramer’s work.

*Procedure*

Much like Cramer, we recruited individuals to participate in this study by inviting ourselves into their lives (2016, 11), striking up conversations in public markets, cafés, and diners throughout the state. In taking this approach, our goal was not to obtain a perfectly representative sample, but to recruit participants in settings that mirrored Cramer’s study. Participants from the rural sample were recruited primarily in diners and cafés that agreed to allow us to chat with their customers. In most instances, the researcher would have a lengthy conversation with individuals before asking them to participate in a 25-minute study in exchange for a $10.00 gift card. These informal conversations frequently touched upon themes described by Cramer such as frustrations towards university employees and tourists who frequent certain areas of the state during the summer months. While we are unable to confirm that these locations were also visited by Cramer since she kept them anonymous, these conversations helped to confirm that we were recruiting individuals in the right spots.

Participants from the urban sample were recruited primarily from a public market in downtown Milwaukee. Recruiting participants from Milwaukee allowed for a rigorous test of our hypotheses due its racial and ethnic diversity. Consistent with existing work addressing the interconnectedness of racial tension and the diversification of metropolitan areas (Oliver 2010, Enos 2016), Cramer suggests that overt references to race and undeserving social welfare recipients were most pronounced in cities and suburbs (2016, 166). Thus, we would expect white Milwaukeeans to be more overtly racist than Madisonians due to the relative racial diversity. Against this backdrop, support for hypothesis 2, for example, would be especially impressive. This is because support for this hypothesis—that rural participants will harbor more racialized representations of urbanites than will urban participants—requires that rural respondents’ mental representations be *even more* racialized than those of a group that is already implicated in racialized thinking.

The most typical case of recruitment involved the researcher asking Milwaukeeans who were taking a break from shopping whether they would be willing to complete a 25-minute study in exchange for a $10.00 gift card. Soliciting agreement from participants in Milwaukee also required building rapport with participants, as in the case of the rural sample, which was typically done by engaging in small talk prior to inviting participants to complete the survey. Other participants in the urban sample were recruited via snowball sampling in which a particular participant nominated a friend or family member to complete the survey as well. All participants completed an IRB-approved consent form prior to participation, and all participants were likewise compensated with a gift card at the conclusion of their session.

The experiment itself—which was programmed into a tablet computer—began by assessing participants’ freely generated beliefs about the ‘typical attributes’ of Madisonians and Milwaukeeans, respectively (the presentation order of these two groups was randomized across participants). Specifically, participants were given the following prompt:

In the spaces below, please list the five attributes that come to mind most quickly when thinking of people who live in Madison [Milwaukee], Wisconsin. What are people from Madison [Milwaukee] like?

Below this prompt were five empty spaces where participants could nominate whatever attributes came to their minds most readily (procedure adapted from Petsko and Bodenhausen 2019).

 After assessing participants’ freely generated beliefs (i.e., stereotypes) about Milwaukeeans and Madisonians, they were then randomly assigned one of two conditions in what is called a reverse correlation experiment. These experiments, which are common in social and cognitive psychology, are specifically designed to allow researchers to create images that approximate participants’ mental representations of a target group. In our reverse-correlation experiment, participants were either assigned to a condition in which they called to mind their mental representation of a person from Madison, or they were instead assigned to a condition in which they called to mind their mental representation of a person from Milwaukee. In both conditions, participants were shown 300 pairs of blurry, black-and-white facial images. Every pair of images was created from the same base image (a race- and gender-ambiguous person’s face; created by Gallagher and Bodenhausen, 2020; see Figure 2, left-hand side). In each pair, one image was the result of adding a random visual noise pattern to the base image, and the other image was the result of subtracting that same random visual noise pattern from the same base image (see Figure 2, right-hand side). The creation of noise-imbued face pairs from this base image was conducted using the “rcicr” package in R. Depending on the experimental condition, participants either answered the question “Who looks more like a person from Madison, WI?” for every pair, or the question, “Who looks more like a person from Milwaukee, WI?” for every pair. The ordering of face pairs was randomized for each participant. After the task concludes, researchers can create composite images—which index participants’ mental representations of particular target groups—by averaging together all 300 faces from each pair of faces that each participant in each condition chose. For example, rural respondents’ mental representation of Milwaukeeans (depicted later, in Figure 3) was computed by averaging together every face (of 300 face pairs) that every rural participant in the Milwaukee condition chose during the reverse-correlation procedure. Averaging selections together in this way is critical, as it causes random visual noise across participants’ selections to cancel itself out, leaving in its place non-randomvisual noise—noise that reflects, in principle, how it is that participants mentally represented the target group in question.

After participants completed the reverse-correlation task, they completed a demographic questionnaire and a 3-item measure of rural consciousness that was similar to what was included in the 2019 ANES Pilot Study (example item: “How many people who live in cities look down on those who live in small towns?”, from *1 = none* to *5 = all*; α = .60).

**Phase 2**

*Participants (i.e., Raters)*

Phase 2 had the aim of recruiting *N* = 300 raters from MTurk (*n* = 100 raters per between-person condition). In total, *N* = 301 raters completed Phase 2, of whom we excluded *n* = 9 (2.99%) for failing to indicate “yes” in response to the question, “Did you take this study seriously?” Remaining raters were mostly male (189 men, 103 women), mostly White (228 White, 31 Black, 16 Hispanic, 13 Asian, 2 American Indian, 2 multiracial), slightly more liberal than conservative (*M* = 4.67, *SD* = 3.16, on a scale from *0* = *Extremely Liberal* to *10 = Extremely Conservative*), and were 37.22 years old, on average (*SD*age = 11.20).

*Procedure*

Raters were evenly divided into three groups: (1) an image-rating group; (2) a free-response rating group that provided ratings of free-response negativity; or (3) a free-response rating group that provided ratings of free-response Afrocentrism.

 Raters in the *image-rating* group were shown four composite images, which were created from Phase 1’s reverse-correlation data. These four images index the rural and urban participants’ mental representations of ‘Milwaukeeans’ and ‘Madisonians,’ respectively (depicted in Figure 3). Thus, raters in the image-rating group saw four images defined by a 2 (sample: urban, rural) × 2 (target: Milwaukeean, Madisonian) matrix. Raters in the image-rating group saw all four images in a random order, and indicated, first, to what extent each image looked stereotypically Black (from *0* = *Very White* to *6 = Very Black*), and second, how positive vs. negative the images appeared (from *0* = *cold/unfavorable* and *100 = warm/favorable*).

 Raters in the *free-response rating* groups were each shown the free-response entries of 10 randomly selected rural participants from Phase 1, and 10 randomly selected urban participants from Phase 1. Thus, raters each saw 40 sets of free-response entries, with 10 corresponding to each cell in a 2 (sample: urban, rural) × 2 (target: Milwaukeean, Madisonian) matrix. Raters either provided ratings of how stereotypically Black each set of free-response entries seemed (on the same 7-point scale described above), or they provided ratings of how positive vs. negative each set of free-response entries seemed (on the same feeling thermometer measure described above).

**Results**

Results are broken down by the type of content from Phase 1 that was rated. Ratings of participants’ mental representations (i.e., composite images) are presented first; ratings of free-response entries are presented second. Ratings of mental representations, on the one hand, and of free-response entries, on the other, are presented separately because mental representations and free-response entries were rated by separate groups of participants in Phase 2.

**Mental Representation Ratings**

Figure 3 presents the composite images generated in Phase 1. Ratings of these images—on both their valence and on their Afrocentrism—were regressed onto within-person contrast codes representing the 2 (sample: urban, rural) × 2 (target type: Milwaukeean, Madisonian) within-person design of the image-rating study described in Phase 2. All analyses were conducted as multilevel models with just one random effect: a random effect of participant intercept, which adjusts for the fact that the 2 × 2 model described above was nested within person. These analyses were conducted using the “lmer” package in R. All unstandardized effect sizes (*M*diffs) are enclosed by 95 percent confidence intervals (CIs). Throughout the remainder of these results, we report standardized effect sizes as standardized betas (βs).[[1]](#footnote-1)

*Negativity Ratings*

Subjecting (reverse-scored) feeling thermometer ratings to the 2 × 2 analysis described above reveals strong support for H1. Rural participants’ composite images were rated as more negative, on average, than those of urban participants, *M*diff = 10.49, 95% CI[7.74, 13.24], β = 0.49, *F*(1, 297) = 56.09, *p* < .001 (see Figure 5, left-hand side). In other words, rural participants indeed harbored more negative representations of urbanites than did urban participants. In addition to this main effect, the model revealed a second main effect, which was that composite images of Milwaukeeans tended to be rated as more negative, on average, than those of Madisonians, *M*diff = 7.54, 95% CI[4.80, 10.29], β = 0.35, *F*(1, 297) = 28.98, *p* < .001. In other words, all participants tended to harbor more negative mental representations of Milwaukeeans than of Madisonians. This model revealed no two-way interaction between these two effects, *p* = .84, *R*2 < .01.

*Afrocentrism Ratings*

Subjecting Afrocentrism ratings to the same 2 × 2 analysis described above revealed strong support for H2. That is, the amount by which Milwaukeean composite images looked “Blacker” than Madisonian composite images was larger when the images were generated by rural participants [*M*diff = 2.45, 95% CI[2.11, 2.80], β = 1.33, *F*(1, 297) = 194.32, *p* < .001] than when the images were generated by urban participants [*M*diff = 1.77, 95% CI[1.42, 2.11], β = 0.96, *F*(1, 296) = 101.22, *p* < .001], interaction *p* = .006, *R2 =* .03 (see Figure 6, left-hand side).[[2]](#footnote-2) This is to say that rural participants indeed harbored *more racialized* representations of urbanites than urban participants did. Furthermore, and in support of H3, decomposing this interaction revealed that composite images of Milwaukeeans were rated as significantly “Blacker” when generated by the rural sample than when generated by the urban sample: *M*diff = 1.27, 95% CI[0.93, 1.62], β = 0.69, *F*(1, 297) = 52.32, *p* < .001—an effect that held when controlling for the rural (vs. urban) sample’s tendency to represent Milwaukeeans with more negative-looking facial features: *M*diff = 1.21, 95% CI[0.86, 1.56], β = 0.65, *F*(1, 306) = 45.77, *p* < .001. Thus, there was clear evidence not only that the rural sample (vs. the urban sample) represented urbanites in more racialized ways, but that they also represented Milwaukeeans, specifically, as looking more stereotypically Black. Moreover, the rural sample’s tendency to represent Milwaukeeans as looking “Black” was not reducible to their tendency to represent Milwaukeeans with negative-looking features.

**Free-Response Ratings**

Figure 4 presents word clouds (for illustrative purposes) of the free-response entries that were collected in Phase 1. Ratings of these free-response entries—on both their negativity and on their Afrocentrism—were regressed onto within-person contrast codes representing the 2 (sample: urban, rural) × 2 (target type: Milwaukeean, Madisonian) within-person design of the free-response rating studies described in Phase 2. All analyses were conducted as multilevel models with two random effects: a random effect of participant intercept, which adjusts for the fact that the 2 × 2 model was nested within person, and a random effect of stimulus intercept, which adjusts for the fact that ratings were also nested within particular stimuli (i.e., which sets of free response entries from Phase 1 that participants in Phase 2 were randomly assigned). These analyses were conducted using the “lmer” package in R.

*Negativity Ratings*

Subjecting (reverse-scored) feeling thermometer ratings to the 2 × 2 analysis described above also revealed strong support for H1, as is reported in our manuscript. Rural participants’ free-response entries were rated as more negative, on average, than those of urban participants, *M*diff = 10.32, 95% CI[5.68, 14.97], β = 0.39, *F*(1, 117) = 18.96, *p* < .001 (see Figure 5, right-hand side). In addition to this main effect, this analysis revealed a sample × target interaction. The nature of this interaction was that the tendency for rural folks’ free-response entries to be rated more negatively than urban folks’ free-response entries was more pronounced when the free-response entries were describing Milwaukeeans [*M*diff = 12.66, 95% CI[7.85, 17.48], β = 0.48, *F*(1, 134) = 26.58, *p* < .001] than when the free-response entries were describing Madisonians [*M*diff = 7.98, 95% CI[3.17, 12.80], β = 0.30, *F*(1, 134) = 10.57, *p* = .001], interaction *p* < .001, *R*2 < .01. Unlike the analysis on mental representation negativity, this analysis revealed no main effect of target group, which is to say that on average, free-response entries about Milwaukeeans were no more negative than those listed about Madisonians, *p* = .11.

*Afrocentrism Ratings*

Subjecting Afrocentrism ratings to the same analysis as above revealed strong support for H2. That is, the amount by which free-response entries listed for Milwaukeeans seemed “Blacker” than free-response entries listed for Madisonians was larger when the entries were generated by rural participants [*M*diff = 0.84, 95% CI[0.72, 0.96], β = 0.57, *F*(1, 3258) = 194.94, *p* < .001] than when they were generated by urban participants [*M*diff = 0.30, 95% CI[0.18, 0.41], β = 0.20, *F*(1, 3257) = 25.12, *p* < .001], interaction *p* < .001, *R2 =* .01 (see Figure 6, right-hand side). This is to say that rural participants indeed listed *more racialized* content about city dwellers than urban participants did. Furthermore, decomposing this interaction revealed that the free-response entries listed for Milwaukeeans were rated as seeming more stereotypically Black when generated by the rural sample than when generated by the urban sample: *M*diff = 0.42, 95% CI[0.25, 0.59], β = 0.29, *F*(1, 195) = 24.18, *p* < .001. Thus, there was clear evidence not only that the rural sample (vs. the urban sample) thought of city dwellers in more racialized ways, but that they also—in support of H3—characterized Milwaukeeans as possessing “Blacker” attributes.

In order to weigh the evidence in favor of H4—that that the tendency for rural participants to harbor more racialized impressions of urbanites in general, and to harbor “Blacker” impressions of Milwaukeeans specifically, would be exaggerated when rural participants score high (vs. low) in rural consciousness—we replicated the 2 (sample: urban, rural) × 2 (target type: Milwaukeean, Madisonian) analysis described in the preceding paragraph, but we made a modification. In particular, we added the following predictors to the original 2 × 2 model: (1) how high in rural consciousness (z-standardized at the level of Phase 1 participants) the Phase 1 participant who generated each stimulus set was; and (2) the interactions between this new predictor and each contrast from the original 2 × 2 model. In effect, this analytic strategy allowed us to examine whether any of the findings reported in the preceding paragraph significantly depended on Phase 1 participants’ rural consciousness levels.

 This new analysis yielded strong support for H4. First, this analysis revealed a significant three-way interaction between sample (urban, rural), target type (Milwaukeaen, Madisonian), and Phase 1 participants’ rural consciousness levels (three-way interaction: *p* < .001). Decomposing this interaction revealed that rural participants’ tendency to racialize city-dwellers—to think of Milwaukeeans as “Black” and Madisonians as “white”—was significantly moderated by how highly they scored on rural consciousness (two-way interaction: *p* = .002[[3]](#footnote-3)). For example, when rural respondents scored one standard deviation above the sample mean, the tendency described above was larger (*M*diff = 1.01, 95% CI[0.86, 1.16], β = 0.69, *F*(1, 3147) = 178.44, *p* < .001) than it was when they scored one standard deviation below (*M*diff = 0.62, 95% CI[0.42, 0.83], β = 0.43, *F*(1, 3146) = 35.92, *p* < .001). Thus, there was evidence that rural folks’ tendency to racialize city dwellers was more pronounced among those higher in rural consciousness. In addition, the amount by which rural folks (vs. urban folks) characterized Milwaukeeans by stereotypically Black attributes was also moderated by participants’ rural consciousness levels (two-way interaction: *p* = .002[[4]](#footnote-4)). That is, this tendency was exacerbated among participants who scored one standard deviation above the mean on rural consciousness(*M*diff = 0.73, 95% CI[0.48, 0.97], β = 0.49, *F*(1, 184) = 32.73, *p* < .001). However, this tendency was absent among participants who scored one standard deviation below the mean on rural consciousness (*M*diff = 0.17, 95% CI[-0.09, 0.42], β = 0.11, *F*(1, 192) = 1.64, *p* = .20). In other words, rural (vs. urban) respondents’ tendency to associate Milwaukeeans with Blackness was contingent on respondents’ levels of rural consciousness—so much so that this bias was exacerbated when rural folks scored high in rural consciousness, but no longer detectable when rural folks scored low.

**Complete Methods and Results for 2019 ANES Pilot Study Analyses**

The results from our survey study described above, as striking as they are, are based on data from an admittedly small sample of participants. Although the sample we used was large enough to obtain reliable estimates of participants’ mental representations (Dotsch & Todorov, 2012), this sample was by no means large enough to warrant generalization to the U.S. as a whole. However, as noted previously, a measure of rural consciousness was included in the ANES 2019 Pilot Study. Thus, we were able to use ANES 2019 Pilot data—as a supplement to our own data—to examine a) whether rural consciousness indeed predicts the political preferences it is purported to predict (e.g., an aversion to redistributive economic policies), b) whether rural consciousness is correlated with explicit racism (i.e., racial resentment), and c) whether rural consciousness continues to predict political preferences after controlling for explicit racism. If rural consciousness overlaps with racialized thinking, as we have been arguing, then rural consciousness should predict outcomes of interest less strongly when controlling for racial resentment than when not.

**Computing Major Variables**

 **Rural consciousness.** Participants in the ANES 2019 Pilot Study completed one of two variants of the rural consciousness scale. Some participants completed a variant in which the questions on the scale *explicitly* invoked a comparison between rural folks and urban folks (e.g., “Compared to people who live in cities, do people living in small towns have a harder time or an easier time getting ahead than others?”), whereas others were asked a version in which the scale in which the comparison to city-dwellers was not invoked (e.g., “do people living in small towns have a harder time or an easier time getting ahead than others?”). Because the former was more relevant to the main study we conducted—in that it captured resentful attitudes toward those who live in cities—this was the scale that we used in all ANES data analyses. The four items on this scale hung well together (α = .60) and were averaged into a composite index.

 **Main DVs.** The three main dependent variables that we presented in our paper were *approval for Donald Trump*, support for *free college*, and support for *inequality reduction*. Approval for Donald Trump was measured with four items (approval for his job as president, his handling of foreign relations, his handling of immigration, and his handling of the economy). These four items held well together (α = .98) and correlated very strongly with feeling thermometer ratings toward Trump (*r* = .94, *p* < .001). Thus, these items were averaged into a composite index of Trump approval.

 The latter two dependent variables were the only two issues in the ANES 2019 Pilot that seemed directly relevant to economic redistribution. Support for free college was measured with a single item (“Do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose guaranteeing free tuition at public colleges or universities for anyone admitted? The $79 billion per year cost would be paid for with higher taxes.”; from *1 = oppose a great deal* to *7 = favor a great deal*). Support for inequality reduction was also measured with one item (“How important is it that our elected officials pass laws and regulations that reduce the income differences between rich people and poor people?”; from *1 = not at all important* to *5 = extremely important*).

 **Main covariate.** The purpose of the ANES 2019 Pilot analyses was to examine whether rural consciousness became a weaker predictor of the main DVs once participants’ racism was controlled for. Our measure of racism was the racial resentment scale. Racial resentment was measured with four items in the ANES 2019 Pilot (e.g., “Irish, Italians, Jewish, and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special favors.”; from *1 = disagree strongly* to *5 = agree strongly*). These items held well together (α = .89) and were thus averaged into a single composite index.

 **Other variables.** Finally, created a measure of a few other constructs that we thought might be useful for examining the validity of the rural consciousness measure—that is, for examining whether it really correlates with what it is theoretically purported to correlate with. The other variables we examined were whether someone *lives* *or grew up* in a rural part of the country, *anti-elitism*, *populism*, and *faith in experts*. Whether participants lived or grew up in rural locations was measured on a scale from *1 = currently live [grew up] in a city* to *4 = currently live [grew up] in a rural area*.

 Anti-elitism was measured with a 4-item scale that included items like, “Because of the rich and powerful, it becomes difficult for the rest of us to get ahead.” Agreement with these items was reliable (α = .73), and they were thus averaged into a single composite. Populism was measured with a 3-item scale that included items like, “The people, and not politicians, should make our most important policy decisions.” These three items slightly low on reliability (α = .58) but were nevertheless averaged into a single index. Finally, faith in experts was measured via agreement with items like “In general, how important should science be for making government decisions?” These three items were reliable with each other (α = .73), and were thus averaged into a composite index.

**Main Findings**

 Was it the case that rural consciousness correlated with other variables in theoretically reasonable ways? Indeed, it was. As one might expect, those living (*r* = .17, *p* < .001) and growing up (*r* = .15, *p* < .001) in more rural areas reported higher levels of rural consciousness than those living and growing up in more urban areas. In addition, rural consciousness correlated with higher levels of anti-elitism (*r* = .11, *p* < .001), higher levels populism (*r* = .28, *p* < .001), and decreased faith in experts (e.g., scientists: *r* = –.15, p < .001). As one might expect, those scoring higher on rural consciousness also reported higher approval ratings for Donald Trump (*r* = .18, *p* < .001), and they reported less favorable attitudes toward redistributive economic policies. For example, those scoring higher on rural consciousness reported more negative attitudes toward laws promoting guaranteed tuition for all admitted students at public colleges and universitates (*r* = –.22, *p* < .001). Moreover, they reported more negative attitudes toward laws that would reduce income differences between rich people and poor people (*r* = –.20, *p* < .001). The bulk of the evidence, therefore, suggests that people who were more rurally consciousness were indeed more rural, more distrustful of political elites and experts, and more averse to redistributive economic policies.

 Did rural consciousness also correlate with explicit racism? It appears so, yes. Those higher in rural consciousness tended to report higher levels of racial resentment, which captures negative attitudes toward Black Americans (*r* = .21, *p* < .001). In addition, racial resentment was itself correlated with some of the very outcomes that rural consciousness is purported to explain. Like rural consciousness, racial resentment correlated positively with approval for Donald Trump (*r* = .69, *p* < .001), and racial resentment also correlated negatively with both support for guaranteed college tuition (*r* = –.59, *p* < .001) and reducing income differences between rich and poor people (*r* = –.57, *p* < .001). Correlational patterns like these raise an interesting question: If rural consciousness correlates with racial resentment, and if racial resentment in turn correlates with political preferences, might it be possible that predictive power of rural consciousness is attributable to its overlap with racial resentment? In order to examine this question, we conducted a series of simultaneous regressions (see Table 1, manuscript). In these simultaneous regressions, we predicted each of three outcomes—approval for Donald Trump, attitudes toward free college tuition, and attitudes toward reducing inequality between the rich and poor—by a) rural consciousness by itself, and by b) rural consciousness controlling for racial resentment. These analyses revealed that across the board, rural consciousness became a weaker predictor of political preferences when racial resentment was included as a covariate. In other words, much of the ability of rural consciousness to predict political preferences may be due to its association with racial resentment.

**Correlation Matrix of All Study Variables**

 In the paper, we present correlations while adjusting for the “weight” variable in the ANES 2019 Pilot Study data set. The ANES recommends adjusting for this variable if researchers wish to generalize their findings to the U.S. population, as the ANES Pilot Study itself was a non-probability sample. Below, we report the correlation matrix between all variables discussed above (Table S1).

Table S1.

*Correlation Matrix of all Main Variables Analyzed from the ANES 2019 Pilot Study*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Rural****Consciousness** | **Racial Resentment** | **Trump Approval** | **Free College** | **Reduce Inequality** | **Anti- Elitism** | **Populism** | **Faith in Experts** | **Live Rural** |
| **RC** | --- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **RR** | .21\*\*\* | --- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TA** | .18\*\*\* | .69\*\*\* | --- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **FC** | -.22\*\*\* | -.59\*\*\* | -.60\*\*\* | --- |  |  |  |  |  |
| **RI** | -.20\*\*\* | -.57\*\*\* | -.61\*\*\* | .65\*\*\* | --- |  |  |  |  |
| **AE** | .11\*\*\* | -.29\*\*\* | -.42\*\*\* | .37\*\*\* | .50\*\*\* | --- |  |  |  |
| **Pop** | .28\*\*\* | .18\*\*\* | .08\*\* | -.06\* | -.02ns | .35\*\*\* | --- |  |  |
| **FE** | -.15\*\*\* | -.50\*\*\* | -.53\*\*\* | .38\*\*\* | .42\*\*\* | .22\*\*\* | -.17\*\*\* | --- |  |
| **LR** | .17\*\*\* | -.16\*\*\* | .12\*\*\* | -.05ns | -.09\*\*\* | -.01ns | .06\* | -.08\*\* | --- |
| **YR** | .15\*\*\* | -.09\*\*\* | .06\* | -.04ns | -.05\* | -.01ns | .06\* | -.03ns | .43\*\*\* |

*Note.* YR = youth rural. \* *p* < .05. \*\* *p* < .01. \*\*\* *p* < .001. ns = not statistically significant. Correlations reported here also control for the ANES 2019 Pilot variable “weight,” which the ANES recommends if researchers wish to generalize their findings to the U.S. population. Of note, the coefficients reported here do not change much when this variable is not included as a covariate.

For exploratory reasons, we also computed a correlation matrix specifically among non-White respondents in the 2019 ANES Pilot Study. Because we would have only had *N* = 487 non-White respondents if we had used the selected rural consciousness measure, here we combined both rural consciousness measures (the one that mentions cities, and the one that does not) by z-standardizing each of them and combining them into a single index. This enabled us to estimate all correlation coefficients among *N* = 947 non-White respondents instead of only *N* = 487 non-White respondents (see Table S2, for all correlation coefficients).

Of note, non-White participants do not exhibit a significant association between rural consciousness and racial resentment (*r* = .05, *p* = .13), nor do they exhibit a significant association between rural consciousness and Trump Approval (*r* = .03, *p* = .30). Nevertheless, non-White respondents who scored higher in rural consciousness were more anti-elitist (*r* = .19, *p* < .001) and reported less favorable attitudes toward both free-college (*r* = -.11, *p* < .001) and reducing economic inequality between the rich and the poor (*r* = -.09, *p* = .005). Thus, although rural consciousness did not predict racial resentment among non-White respondents, it did continue to predict both anti-elitism and an aversion to redistributive economic policy.

Table S2.

*Correlation Matrix of all Main Variables among Non-White Respondents from the ANES 2019 Pilot*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Rural****Consciousness** | **Racial Resentment** | **Trump Approval** | **Free College** | **Reduce Inequality** | **Anti- Elitism** | **Populism** | **Faith in Experts** | **Live Rural** |
| **RC** | --- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **RR** | .05ns | --- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TA** | .03ns | .60\*\*\* | --- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **FC** | -.11\*\*\* | -.52\*\*\* | -.50\*\*\* | --- |  |  |  |  |  |
| **RI** | -.09\*\* | -.51\*\*\* | -.52\*\*\* | .55\*\*\* | --- |  |  |  |  |
| **AE** | .19\*\*\* | -.37\*\*\* | -.39\*\*\* | .31\*\*\* | .40\*\*\* | --- |  |  |  |
| **Pop** | .26\*\*\* | .06ns | .03ns | -.01ns | <.01ns | .37\*\*\* | --- |  |  |
| **FE** | -.10\*\* | -.31\*\*\* | -.29\*\*\* | .23\*\*\* | .28\*\*\* | .19\*\*\* | -.11\*\*\* | --- |  |
| **LR** | .07\* | .10\*\* | .12\*\*\* | -.03ns | -.04ns | -.07\* | -.01ns | -.05ns | --- |
| **YR** | .05ns | .06ns | .08\* | .02ns | -.01ns | -.02ns | .01ns | -.03ns | .48\*\*\* |

*Note.* YR = youth rural. \* *p* < .05. \*\* *p* < .01. \*\*\* *p* < .001. ns = not statistically significant. Correlations reported here also control for the ANES 2019 Pilot variable “weight,” which the ANES recommends if researchers wish to generalize their findings to the U.S. population. Of note, the coefficients reported here do not change much when this variable is not included as a covariate.

1. Standardized betas were obtained by z-standardizing outcomes and then regressing these z-standardized outcomes onto the models described throughout. Because all models’ contrasts were orthogonal to each other, summed to zero, and had a range of one, standardized betas can be interpreted similarly to Cohen’s *d*s. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. According to Monte Carlo simulations, our design afforded only 75.5% power to detect an interaction effect as small as the one reported here. However, we replicate this particular interaction effect in the free-response ratings section, below. There, our power for detecting this same interaction effect exceeded 99%. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. According to Monte Carlo simulations, our design and sample size gave us approximately 92.00% power to detect this particular effect. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. According to Monte Carlo simulations, our design and sample size gave us approximately 83.33% power to detect this particular effect. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)