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Additional Detail on Data and Measures

We analyze the December 18, 2018 release of the 2016 ANES Time-Series Study. Many of our decisions on how to construct the analytic sample, and then code our measures, have a parallel rationale to those undertaken for Morgan and Lee (2018), as explained in the online supplement to that article. Nonetheless, the goals of the current article are more wide ranging, and the data source is limited to only the “validated voter” subsample of the ANES. For these reasons, most of the same decisions must be re-explained because there are small differences that need to be documented.

ANES and the Restriction of the Sample to Validated Voters Only

The primary difference for the sample considered in this article is that the analysis is restricted to the subset of all ANES self-reported voters who were validated by a public records match to have actually voted. Enamorado, Fifield, and Imai (2018) explain the vote validation procedures implemented for the ANES.

The goal in using the vote-validated subset of the ANES is to head off criticism that groups like Obama-to-Trump voters did not actually vote. While it is always possible that respondents are misleading the ANES investigators on whom they voted for, the voter validation procedures can, to a reasonable degree of accuracy, eliminate from the sample individuals who claimed to have voted but did not. It is not possible to validate self-reported vote choices for particular candidates in the ANES, or any other data source, only whether individuals actually voted.
Details of the Analytic Sample

The ANES 2016 Time-Series Study \((N = 4,270)\) consists of two separate samples – both of which target a nationally representative sample of eligible voters in the United States – but that differ in the mode of interview (and, very slightly, in population coverage). One sample \((N = 1,180)\) consists of respondents who sat for face-to-face interviews, and the second sample \((N = 3,090)\) consists of respondents who took an internet-based survey.\(^1\) Although the target population and sampling methodologies are slightly different, both samples aim to represent English and Spanish speaking US citizens aged 18 or older (and, thus, likely eligible to vote). Both samples include data from two waves: pre-election and post-election. The pre-election surveys were conducted for two months prior to the general election (between September 7 and November 7, 2016), and the post-election surveys were conducted between November 9, 2016 and January 8, 2017.

Given our interest in analyzing the 2012 preferences of 2016 voters, we first restricted our analytic sample to the 3,648 respondents who completed both the pre- and post-election surveys, since the information on vote choice for the presidential election in 2016 could only be drawn from the post-election survey.\(^2\) We then further restricted the sample to respondents who were aged 23 or older at the time of the pre-election survey, thereby dropping an

\(^1\) In the December 18, 2018 release of the ANES 2016 Time-Series Study, the version we analyze for this article, one respondent from the previous release was deleted. Therefore, the initial sample size in this article differs by one respondent from Morgan and Lee (2018). Nonetheless, the deleted respondent reported not voting in the 2016 presidential election, and thus was not in the core analysis of Morgan and Lee (2018).

\(^2\) In addition, because of their incompatibility with the ANES panel weighting scheme, we excluded 23 ANES respondents who did not complete post-election interviews but whose presidential vote in 2016 could be determined because they voted early. Our sample includes other early voters who completed the post-election survey, and these are weighted appropriately to account for all early voters.
additional 187 respondents. The rationale for the exclusion by age is both substantive and methodological, as discussed in Morgan and Lee (2018).³

For most of our analysis, and unlike Morgan and Lee (2018), we excluded 1,323 respondents who were not validated as having voted by a public records match in 2016 (see Enamorado et al. 2018).⁴ After these exclusions, our analytic sample included 2,138 ANES respondents (631 from the face-to-face interview sample and 1,507 from the internet-based sample).

Decisions on Coding Small Amounts of Missing Data for Demographic Variables

Age. For the final analysis sample of validated voters, 52 respondents (2.4 percent) were missing information on age. We used best-subset regression imputation for age for these respondents, using information on their gender, race, region, education, and class. The imputed values have some variation but are almost certainly a bit closer to the mean of age than would be the case if all the genuine values were known. Because we are using age only as an interval-scaled adjustment variable, and the measure is valid for 97.6 percent of the sample, we are confident that a more elaborate imputation strategy would not improve the analysis appreciably.

³ We briefly bring back these younger respondents for a side analysis in this supplement, where we estimate the shares of types of Trump voters in 2016. See below.
⁴ Nonetheless, we do not follow the vote-validation categorization in one case. We continue to exclude respondents who self-reported that they did not vote in the 2016 presidential election, and this group includes 58 respondents who were validated as having voted in the 2016 election. These respondents are of three types that cannot be separated exactly: (1) those who were erroneously validated as having voted, (2) those who voted in the election but did not cast a vote in the presidential contest, and (3) those who forgot or refused to admit that they voted in the 2016 election.
Gender. For gender, 16 respondents did not provide an answer, but we were able to develop a reasonable categorization for many by using the interviewers’ observation included in the file as paradata. However, 7 respondents remained without a clear gender category, and we decided to include them in the category for female for three primary reasons. First, there were too few of them to create their own “missing” category, like we created for education and class. Second, gender is only an adjustment variable for our analysis and is not of fundamental interest for this particular article. Third, none of the remaining 7 were in our focal category of Obama-to-Trump voters. Instead, 5 were Obama-Clinton voters, 1 was a Romney-Trump voter, and 1 was a “don’t know/refused” in 2012 who voted “other” in 2016. Altogether, we decided that the simplest solution was to place these 7 voters in the “female” category, since the vote information is most consistent with such a placement. In an unreported side analysis, we determined that moving these respondents into the “male” category would have no discernible effects on the core of the analysis.

Race. For this article, we define the whiteness of central concern to be “white only and non-Hispanic,” and we use the acronym of WONH for this group. Respondents in this category indicated that they do not consider themselves to have any type of Hispanic ethnicity/ancestry when responding to the Hispanic ethnicity question, and they selected only “white” from among the options for race. Accordingly, multiracial whites and white Hispanics are both excluded from the constructed category of WONH for this article.

Among the 2,138 respondents in the core analytic sample, 20 respondents were missing information on race (i.e., did not provide a response for any of the options for race). Of these 20 respondents, 2 respondents were also missing information on Hispanic ethnicity. We took the
following decisions for these 20 respondents. Given our focus on a single indicator for WONH, we were able to determine that 11 of the 20 respondents missing on race did not belong to the WONH group because these 11 respondents indicated that they had some type of Hispanic ethnicity. We cannot further determine whether the remaining 9 respondents should be categorized as WONH (because we do not know their race, even though they indicated that they did not have Hispanic ethnicity). After contemplation, we decided to categorize this group of respondents as not in the WONH group, which is the core group considered in the article. For the analysis with all respondents, they are included. For analysis restricted to WONH respondents, they are excluded.

Composite Variables for Data Reduction, and Question Wording for All Items

As noted in the main text of the article, our primary results are based on 92 separate outcome variables. The ANES questions, response scales, and other information on each item, are provided in Table S9. The table is organized by the order in which results are presented in Tables 2 through 5.

As discussed in the main article, we grouped 85 of these 92 outcome variables into 24 standardized composite variables, in order to reduce the dimensionality of the results for the main presentation (although see below in Tables S10-S13 supplementary results that use all indicators as well). Each of these 85 items is listed with the corresponding composite variable in Table S9, with all question wording and response scales provided.

5 Among these 9 respondents, none were Obama-to-Trump or Romney-to-Clinton voters. For these 9, 2 voted Obama-Clinton, 3 voted Romney-Trump, 1 voted for Obama in 2012 but refused to answer for the 2016 election, 1 refused to answer for the 2012 election and voted “other” in 2016, and 2 refused to answer for both elections.
**Rationale for Composite Variables.** We do not claim that the composite variables are formal scales. In nearly all cases, we simply follow prevailing practices in the literature for the construction of composite variables (although our sense is that the churn on the time-limited ANES survey instrument across years has hindered the development of a clear set of standards that has achieved a consensus). We cannot help, nonetheless, in differentiating our strategy a bit, and so in this section we detail our thinking about one particularly important set of measures.

The ANES has deployed a four-item, agree-disagree pseudo-battery on racial attitudes for many election cycles on its post-election survey. The statements are presented to respondents as

1. “Irish, Italians, Jewish and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special favors.”
2. “Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class.”
3. “Over the past few years, blacks have gotten less than they deserve.”
4. “It’s really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites.”

These items are often combined and labeled as a scale of “racial resentment,” and there is a methodological debate on whether this scaling is reasonable. The argument for such a scaling is based on classical test theory and asserts that items 1 and 4 are overt racial resentment items while items 2 and 3 are reversed items that measure the same underlying construct.

We take an alternative position, in part because there is reason to expect that responses to items 1 and 4 can trend independently of responses to items 2 and 3 (and more generally because we are not convinced that classical test theory should be invoked for only four items
and for a concept with three domains – one about obstacles faced, one about how much the
government should do to lessen the impact of those obstacles, and one about an amorphous
level of current desert, responses to which are probably shaped by the prior item on the
presence of structural obstacles).

Thus, because our interest is in developing a profile of group differences, without
reducing the full dimensionality of the data unnecessarily, we do not combine these four items
into a single scale. Instead, we combine items 1 and 4 into a composite variable that we label
“Blacks should work harder and should not receive favors.” We analyze this measure
alongside a composite for opposition to affirmative action based on other items. We then
combine item 2 with an additional two measures on perceptions of the level of current
discrimination against blacks and Hispanics, yielding a composite variable that we label “Blacks
and Hispanics confront racial obstacles.” Finally, we combine item 3 with two other measures
for a composite variable we label “Government should help blacks.” All of these decisions are
revealed Table S9.

What are the consequences of this decision? Not much, as can be inferred by examining
the indicator specific models in Tables S10-S13. Nonetheless, for skeptical readers, we have also
created a standardized four-item racial resentment scale and pumped it through the same
analysis routine. Recall the results in Table 4 in the main text, where we consider racial
attitudes for the subsample of WONH respondents only. If we were to add a row for a four-
item racial resentment scale, the numbers would read across such as row as:
Racial resentment (standardized composite of 4 variables) & 1.290 & 0.019 & 1.004 & -0.026 \\
 & (0.115) & (0.096) & (0.086) & (0.095) \\

For comparison, here is the row from Table 4 for the 2-item scale that uses only items 1 and 4 from above:

| Blacks should work harder and should not receive favors (standardized composite of 2 variables) | 1.270 | 0.066 | 0.951 | 0.007 |
| | (0.109) | (0.082) | (0.089) | (0.079) |

The results are nearly the same, and so in this case our principled alternative decision is not consequential for the pattern of conclusions. Like most everything in Table 4, the pattern for racial resentment is the same: Obama-to-Trump voters have racial attitudes that match closely those of Republican loyalists, not Democratic loyalists.

In all other cases, our categorization choices are standard, as best we can determine. But, because we cannot fully determine what the standards are, we are also completely transparent. First, we offer details in Table S9 for any readers who wish to consider alternatives. Second, we provide indicator-specific models in Tables S10-S13 so that readers can get a sense of how the results would change if the indicators were recombined in other ways.

**Construction of Composite Variables.** To create each composite variable, we used the following three-step procedure. First, all items in the composite were specified for a factor analysis, after which the first factor was extracted. Because the computed factor is based on the listwise-present sample of respondents across all items specified, in the second step we used best-subset linear regression to impute the factor from the same set of items. This second step filled in a (typically small) amount of missing data on the factor, using whatever items had valid data across all respondents (see Tables S10-S13 for Ns). The imputed factor then has a
valid value for all individuals who had a valid value for at least one item in the composite. In the third step, we standardized the factor to have mean of zero and a standard deviation of 1 across the full analytic sample (excluding the groups of voters who are not used in our core analysis, primarily Romney-to-Clinton voters and voters who voted for Clinton in 2016 but did not vote in 2012).

**Supplementary Results**

**Obama-to-Donald Voters and Romney-to-Clinton Voters**

Tables S1 bridges the ANES analysis in Morgan and Lee (2018) with the analysis reported in this article. Table S1 shows that restricting the sample to validated voters in the ANES does not appreciably alter the results or conclusions from the prior article. The rates of Obama-to-Donald voting are nearly the same. If anything, the results on 2016 voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age are more strongly aligned with the claim that white, working-class voters turned out in greater numbers for Trump than white voters not in the working class. This enhanced support for that article’s conclusions aligns with the turnout results in Morgan and Lee (2017) based on an analysis of CPS-VRS data. It is also consistent with past research by others that respondents with higher levels of education are usually thought to be more likely to claim that they have voted when they did not actually vote (perhaps because social desirability bias is highest for them).

Table S2 repeats the same analysis but flips attention to Clinton voters. We provide this table to forestall concerns that by ignoring Romney-to-Clinton voters in the core analysis of this article we are hiding a pattern of results that does not align with our main conclusions. Table S2
shows that this is not a concern. Romney-to-Clinton voters are much smaller in number and are not drawn disproportionately from members of the white working class. Likewise, 2016 Clinton voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age are less likely to be from the white working class (and, overall, she secured many fewer of these voters than did Trump, as can be seen from a comparison of Tables S1 and S2).

While defections from the 2012 Republican candidate to the 2016 Democratic candidate are certainly relevant to the overall voting pattern, they are of secondary importance for our purposes in this article. Our goal is to investigate how Trump assembled the particular coalition of voters that secured him a victory, and with that goal in mind it is the Trump voters who deserve the most focused attention.

The Distribution of Trump’s Voters

Among all respondents to the ANES post-election survey, Trump’s winning coalition of voters consisted of four primary groups, but the relative sizes of these groups depend on categorization decisions that we show here, and also whether vote validation information is used.6

Without vote validation and relying only on self-report data, the ANES data suggest that

- 66.4 percent (s.e. of 1.6) of his voters supported Romney in 2012
- 13.5 percent (s.e. of 1.3) supported Obama in 2012

---

6 For the calculation of the distributions in this section, we exclude 16 respondents who were validated as voters in 2012 and 2016, and who said they voted for Trump in 2016, but who refused to answer for whom they voted in 2012. However, we do include 1 respondent who was a validated voter for Trump in 2016, and who is not a validated voter for 2012. This person indicated “don’t know/refused” for whether he voted in 2012. Although it makes no discernible difference for the results in this section, we decided to categorize this single person as a member of the 21.3 percent of 2012 non-voters, and more specifically the 8.9 percent we call “clear cases of 2012 non-voters.” For this individual, muddled seems a better descriptor than clear.
14.9 percent (s.e. of 1.2) were eligible to vote in 2012 but did not vote
3.7 percent (s.e. of 0.8) were not eligible to vote in 2012 because of age

Incorporating 2012 and 2016 vote validation information, the ANES data suggest

- 61.9 percent (s.e. of 1.8) of his voters supported Romney in 2012
- 11.8 percent (s.e. of 1.4) supported Obama in 2012
- 21.3 percent (s.e. of 1.4) were eligible to vote in 2012 but did not vote
- 3.4 percent (s.e. of 0.9) were not eligible to vote in 2012 because of age

We can further subdivide the group of 2012 eligible voters who did not vote, yielding a total of six groups

- 61.9 percent (s.e. of 1.8) of his voters supported Romney in 2012
- 11.8 percent (s.e. of 1.4) supported Obama in 2012
- 21.3 percent (s.e. of 1.4) were eligible to vote in 2012 but did not vote
  - 8.9 percent (s.e. of 1.1) were eligible to vote in 2012 but coded by us as “did not vote” because they were not vote validated for 2012 and also self-reported that they did not vote for a candidate in 2012 (aka, “clear cases of 2012 non-voters”)
  - 9.1 percent (s.e. of 1.0) were eligible to vote in 2012 but coded by us as “did not vote” because they were not vote validated for 2012, and even though they self-reported that they did vote for a candidate in 2012 (aka, “2012 fakers”)
  - 3.2 percent (s.e. of 0.7) were eligible to vote in 2012 but coded by us “did not vote in 2012” because they self-reported that they did not vote in 2012, even though they were validated as having voted in the election (aka, either “mistaken 2012 validated voters” or “2012 validated voters who chose not to vote for president in 2012”)
- 3.4 percent (s.e. of 0.9) were not eligible to vote in 2012 because of age.

As can be seen in these results, there are choices to be made about how to use the vote validation information, when one seeks a distribution that incorporates 2012 turnout and vote

---

There is one exception. 10 post-election survey respondents under the age of 22 self-reported that they voted for a candidate in the 2012 presidential election. After determining that none of them were validated voters, we considered them to be ineligible to vote in the 2012 election based on age.
choices. In general, vote validation increases the sizes of the categories of non-voters, shifting voters out of both the Romney-Trump group and the Obama-to-Trump group.

Our estimate in the main article is that Obama-to-Trump voters were at least 9 percent of Trump’s 62.985 million voters, and thus we write of at least 5.7 million voters who gave him the victory in the Electoral College. This number uses the standard error above, resulting in the calculation of $11.8 - 2\times1.4 = 9.0$. (The corresponding upper bound with these numbers would be $11.8 + 2\times1.4 = 14.6$, for an upper bound estimate of 9.20 million based on the ANES validated voter sample.) It is worth remembering that the margins of victory were very small in four crucial states: Florida (112,911, a number equal to 2.4 percent of Trump’s voters), Pennsylvania (44,292, a number equal to 1.5 percent of Trump’s voters), Michigan (10,704, a number equal to 0.5 percent of Trump’s voters), and Wisconsin (22,748, a number equal to 1.6 percent of Trump’s voters). These vote totals are the basis of our claim that Obama-to-Trump voters were crucial for Trump’s victory in the Electoral College.

**Overlap and the Balance Achieved by Inverse Probability Weighting**

As shown in Tables S3 and S4, party loyalists of both types are sufficiently diverse that it is not difficult to weight them toward the distributions of Obama-to-Trump voters (or as we show below, 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age). Our logit specifications deliver weights that work quite well, and we use the same predictors to eliminate remaining imbalance for adjusted differences throughout the article and in this supplementary appendix. The first three columns of Tables S3 and S4 report balance that is relevant to the
models that utilize all respondents. The last three columns of each table report balance that is relevant to the models that utilize only WONH respondents, as presented in the main article.

**Modeled Differences for All Validated Voters (WONH and non-WONH Together)**

Tables S5-S8 are analogous to Tables 2-5 in the main article. The sample is augmented to include non-WONH voters. For these additional models, we also balance the WONH distribution by augmenting the logit specification using an indicator variable for WONH voters. The balance achieved by weighting is shown in the first three columns of Tables S3 and S4, but we also use the same measures that generate the weights as covariates in the final models.

Overall, augmenting the sample does not change the results dramatically, mostly because WONH voters are the largest contingent of Obama-to-Trump voters. A comparison of Tables 2 and S5 implies that Obama-to-Trump voters who are non-WONH are more likely to be conservative and to identify as Republicans (perhaps suggesting that they defected from the Republican party in 2012 to support Obama because of their enthusiasm for a multiracial black candidate). Nonetheless, the sample size of the ANES is too small to enable precise modeling of this group. We report the WONH results in the main article because they are at the core of the debate in which we are engaged.

**Indicator-Specific Results, and Additional Samples**

The next four (very long) tables in this supplement include results from the indicator-specific models, referenced in the main text of the article, and placed in order in the tables after the composite-based results. Tables S10 and S11 provide results for the comparison of Obama-to-Trump voters to both Obama-Clinton and Romney-Trump voters, and the two tables are
differentiated by whether the sample is restricted to WONH voters or not. These are the source
tables for the numbers presented in Tables 2-5 and in Tables S5-S8, which are in the rows that
are colored red in Tables S10 and S11.

For Tables S12 and S13, we then offer parallel results for the group of 2016 Trump voters
who were eligible to vote in 2012 but did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age. Although
these results suggest many nuanced patterns, a reasonable overall interpretation is that these
voters are more similar to Republican loyalists who voted in both 2012 and 2016 than were
Obama-to-Trump voters (see Table 1 and also our final set of conclusions in the main article).
Thus, while they may include within their ranks some voters who represent the small turnout
surge considered in Morgan and Lee (2017), our sense is that the bulk of these voters are of the
regular variety and should be thought of as the typical “churn” that characterizes our
presidential elections, with roughly similar proportions of types of eligible voters participating
each election, but not necessarily the same voters. More detailed consideration of these results
would certainly be worthwhile, and they are provided for readers so inclined.

**Multiple Regression Results for Demonstration and Critique**

In our final set of results, we offer estimates from many-cause, multiple-regression models in
Tables S14 and S15. We offer these final results only to convince the reader that the usage of
regressions of the conventional sort does more harm than one might expect when seeking to
understand the role that cross-pressured voters played in the 2016 regression.

In Table S14, we present results from eighteen logit models. The outcome variable for
each model is voting for Trump in 2016. The models are estimated for WONH voters only, and
all models adjust for age, gender, region, education, and class. The focal predictor variables are fourteen variables that were selected to represent the predictors from Tables 3-5, and we limited them to fourteen variables to fit the table on one page only for efficiency of presentation.

For the first two columns, we stack results from fourteen separate models, one for each focal predictor (i.e., a model that specifies the variable in the row label as a predictor, along with covariates for age, gender, region, education, and class). For the middle two columns, we stack results from three separate models. The first specifies the predictors for economic interests together, the second racial attitudes, and the third immigration attitudes. The final two columns present results from a single model that specifies all fourteen focal predictor variables and is, for this table, the veritable kitchen-sink model. The numbers in the cells are the average probability differences associated with a one-unit change (usually a standard deviation) in each of the fourteen variables, as well as the standard errors of these average probability differences.

Columns 1, 3, and 5 use the full sample of WONH voters validated for 2016, and columns 2, 4, and 6 use a sample further restricted to non-defectors only. The restricted sample drops Obama-to-Clinton voters and Romney-to-Trump voters.8

The table reveals two clear patterns. First, there is a striking similarity between the results in each pair of columns, and regardless of how many associations are estimated at the same time. The results appear to be determined by party loyalists only. Second, the sensible and easy-to-interpret associations in the first two columns are progressively washed out as

8 For consistency with other analyses in the article, we also remove from the full sample as well as the restricted sample a few individuals who self-reported that they were Obama-to-Trump or Romney-to-Clinton voters, but who were validated voters only in 2016. Thus, as was the case for other tables, these self-reported switchers were not retained in the analysis as genuine switchers.
more predictors are specified at the same time. It is nearly impossible for us to interpret what these net associations mean when all are estimated at the same time for the final kitchen sink model, but readers may see more clarity than we do.

Table S15 then presents average probability differences of voting for Trump that are analogous to those in Table S14. But, for Table S15, six indicator variables (for the 7 possible categories) of party identification are included in all models. As a result, all estimated average probability differences are smaller because of the known strong association between party identification and vote choice. In addition, the similarities within pairs of columns decline a bit for the following reasons. Defectors have centrist party identifications, as shown above, but, as Table S14 shows, tend to lie gently within the cloud of points. When the defectors are in the models, and party identification is specified to partial out the partisans, the associations between predictors and vote choices are just a bit stronger because of the net covariation contributed by the lingering centrists. Thus, when the defectors are dropped, the net associations decline slightly. For this reason, the differences between Tables S14 and S15 are generated by the regression specification, which may or may not be appropriate, depending on one’s position on whether voters express their centrist tendencies because they are indicating that they are about to defect from the party identification implied by their prior vote. Our position is that Table S14 provides a clearer perspective on what these types of models accomplish, as we now explain.

Why have we not included these models in the main text? We do not believe they are worth the space in a substantive article such as ours because they do not provide sufficient
insight. In fact, multiple regression does not deliver as much general insight as others have claimed for the following two reasons: variable anthropomorphism and interior thresholds.

For the first, it is clear that variables do not determine election outcomes. Not only do variables not vote, but many variables are measures that have been invented by social scientists to categorize individuals. These variables are “behind the back” factors that are valuable to social scientists in our research but are not usually part of the self-justifications that individuals construct when deciding how to cast their votes. Accordingly, no social scientists actually maintain that “white nativism,” “racial resentment,” or “social dominance orientation” determine election outcomes by structuring deliberate choices by voters.

We do not object to such measures, and indeed many of these measures represent the successes of professional social science in providing useful characterizations of individual behavior. In our analysis in the main text, we attempt to avoid too much anthropomorphism by organizing our analysis as comparisons between types of voters, primarily Obama-to- Trump voters versus party loyalists, but also groups defined by sociodemographic characteristics. As such, the outcome measures are used to characterize groups of voters, defined by (mostly fixed) attributes and the votes that they cast.

If one reads how regression methodology is employed in much of the work on the 2016 election that has pushed the group-identity and status-threat perspectives, the variables we treat as outcomes to be differenced are instead causes that determine how the votes were cast, as if voters are divisible agglomerations of different amounts of each variable who can be sliced and diced and recombined for the rows of a regression table. In these models, cross-pressured
voters are the ones most violently pulled apart and implicitly redistributed across rows of a regression table.

It is somewhat surprising to see the continued prominence of this style of work, especially for an election that is so vital for the social sciences to understand. In sociology, the downside of these approaches has been broadly appreciated at least since the publication of Lieberson (1985) and Abbott (1988). Moreover, political science has its own rich theoretical tradition of vote-choice models at the individual level, attuned to electoral coalitions forged by appeals to the median voter. In recognition of this literature, as well as advances in perspectives on causal inference, many political methodologists have called for changes in empirical work (see, e.g., Sekhon 2009).

For interior thresholds, we mean that vote choices are binary acts, and thus threshold crossing decisions. Often, regression results are written up as if the regression coefficients work in deterministic fashion for all voters, including cross-pressured ones and party loyalists. For example, the fact that white, working-class voters are more prejudiced against non-whites and also more likely to favor Trump must therefore mean that one of the reasons they voted for Trump was because of active consideration of how their prejudice matched Trump’s. It appears to be impossible, following this line of thinking, that these voters could fail to recognize their own prejudice, which may simply be a part of a constellation of attitudes that characterizes their social networks and group affiliations. Nor could they appear to recognize their prejudice but decide to hold that prejudice aside when picking a candidate that they felt would best represent their economic interests, which led them to candidates in 2012 and 2016 from different parties.
In other words, in research of this type it appears impossible for an individual to make a threshold-crossing decision without using all of the dimensions that the researchers have specified in their regression models, or to combine any of them in a way that cannot be read off the regression coefficients altogether. This type of analysis is all the more compromised when it is recognized – as Table S14 suggests – that the regression coefficients for the 2016 election were determined mostly by party loyalists, whose minds were made up many months before election day.

We do not want to close by leaving the impression that regression methods are never appropriate for use. That is clearly not the case, and many areas of the social sciences have been advanced when they are used skillfully, including political science and political sociology. However, the outcomes of close elections are different, and require care in analysis.

Understanding the multidimensional orientation of a cloud of points, and then using all of the slopes of the cloud to construct a full causal narrative, is unlikely to elucidate the decisive factors at the individual level (i.e., the decisions of voters who joined the winning coalition, but almost did not). A perfectly specified regression model could do so, if backed by a causal graph that all can accept as compelling, and with careful attention to voter-level heterogeneity of effects. That is not what has been offered in the regression work on the 2016 election, and we are pessimistic that a full structural model of this type can be offered with the sorts of data sources that are available.
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Table S1. Percentage rates of Obama-to-Trump voting and of Trump voting in 2016 among those who did not vote in 2012

| Voters in 2016 | All | Validated voters only | All | Validated voters only | All | Validated voters only |
|---------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| **All voters** | 12.7| 13.4                  | 46.3| 41.3                  | N/A| N/A                   |
| Raw N         | 152 | 99                    | 159 | 214                   |
| **WONH voters only** | | | | | | |
| Working class | 27.1| 26.9                  | 58.4| 58.9                  | 25.9| 24.8                  |
| Raw N         | 45  | 29                    | 43  | 58                    |
| Not working class | 13.1| 13.0                  | 62.5| 49.4                  | 74.1| 75.2                  |
| Raw N         | 82  | 51                    | 89  | 134                   |
| Working class (broad measure) | 28.6| 28.4                  | 59.6| 59.5                  | 29.6| 28.3                  |
| Raw N         | 49  | 32                    | 48  | 63                    |
| Not working class (broad measure) | 11.8| 11.7                  | 62.0| 48.6                  | 70.4| 71.7                  |
| Raw N         | 78  | 48                    | 84  | 129                   |

*Source:* ANES 2016 Time Series Study (December 18, 2018 release)

*Notes:* Standard errors are in parentheses, and the raw N is the unweighted number of respondents in the corresponding cell of the table. All percentage calculations are based on weighted results, and we exclude 6 respondents who were missing information on education and class. Respondents are considered non-voters for the 2012 presidential election if they were either not validated as a voter or even though validated as a voter reported on the post-election survey that they did not vote (i.e., we assume they were either incorrectly validated or voted in the election but did not vote specifically in the presidential contest). The results in columns 1, 3, 5, and 6 are trivially different from those in Morgan and Lee (2018) because after revisiting our coding decisions, with access to the validated data, we decided to move 1 respondent from the “did not vote” category to “don’t know” for 2016 and 2 respondents from the “other” candidate category to “did not vote” in 2012.
Table S2. Percentage rates of Romney-to-Clinton voting and of Clinton voting in 2016 among those who did not vote in 2012

| Voters in 2016          | Percentage voting for Clinton in 2016 among those who: |  |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---|
|                         | Voted Romney in 2012 AND Voted in 2016                 | Did not vote in 2012 AND Voted in 2016 | Percentage of all WONH voters in 2016 Validated voters in 2016 Only |
| All voters              | All          | Validated voters only | All          | Validated voters only | All          |  |
|                        | All          |                        | All          |                        |  |
| All voters             | 5.5          | 4.9                    | 41.1         | 48.9                    | N/A          | N/A          |
| Raw N                  | (0.9)        | (0.9)                  | (3.3)        | (2.3)                   |  |
| Working class          | 5.4          | 4.5                    | 23.7         | 27.8                    | 25.9         | 24.8         |
| Raw N                  | (1.7)        | (1.9)                  | (6.2)        | (4.6)                   |  |
| Not working class      | 5.5          | 4.7                    | 30.1         | 41.0                    | 74.1         | 75.2         |
| Raw N                  | (1.2)        | (1.0)                  | (4.0)        | (2.9)                   |  |
| Working class (broad measure) | 4.7         | 3.9                    | 25.0         | 27.1                    | 29.6         | 28.3         |
| Raw N                  | (1.5)        | (1.6)                  | (5.8)        | (4.5)                   |  |
| Not working class (broad measure) | 5.8         | 4.9                    | 29.8         | 42.2                    | 70.4         | 71.7         |
| Raw N                  | (1.2)        | (1.0)                  | (4.1)        | (2.9)                   |  |

Source: ANES 2016 Time Series Study (December 18, 2018 release)
Notes: See Table S1.
Table S3. Balance achieved by inverse probability weights alone, when weighting all three groups to the distribution of Obama-to-Donald Trump voters

|                      | All validated voters only | WONH validated voters only |
|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
|                      | Obama and Clinton | Obama and Trump | Romney and Trump | Obama and Clinton | Obama and Trump | Romney and Trump |
| **Age in years**     | 59.26 | 59.80 | 59.09 | 60.99 | 60.99 | 61.50 |
| **Female**           | 0.52  | 0.53  | 0.51  | 0.50  | 0.53  | 0.51  |
| **WONH**             | 0.79  | 0.79  | 0.77  | --    | --    | --    |
| **Region**           |        |       |       |       |       |       |
| Northeast            | 0.24  | 0.24  | 0.24  | 0.24  | 0.26  | 0.25  |
| Midwest              | 0.30  | 0.32  | 0.30  | 0.38  | 0.38  | 0.39  |
| South                | 0.33  | 0.31  | 0.32  | 0.29  | 0.27  | 0.27  |
| West                 | 0.13  | 0.13  | 0.13  | 0.09  | 0.09  | 0.09  |
| **Education**        |        |       |       |       |       |       |
| HS or less           | 0.48  | 0.50  | 0.51  | 0.47  | 0.48  | 0.48  |
| Some college         | 0.31  | 0.30  | 0.29  | 0.30  | 0.29  | 0.30  |
| BA or more           | 0.21  | 0.20  | 0.19  | 0.22  | 0.22  | 0.21  |
| Missing              | 0.00  | 0.01  | 0.01  | 0.00  | 0.01  | 0.01  |
| **EGP class**        |        |       |       |       |       |       |
| I                    | 0.05  | 0.05  | 0.05  | 0.06  | 0.06  | 0.06  |
| II                   | 0.19  | 0.19  | 0.18  | 0.18  | 0.19  | 0.19  |
| IIIa                 | 0.12  | 0.12  | 0.12  | 0.13  | 0.13  | 0.13  |
| IIIb                 | 0.11  | 0.12  | 0.11  | 0.13  | 0.14  | 0.13  |
| IVa                  | 0.03  | 0.03  | 0.03  | 0.02  | 0.02  | 0.02  |
| V                    | 0.07  | 0.08  | 0.08  | 0.07  | 0.09  | 0.08  |
| VI                   | 0.16  | 0.16  | 0.18  | 0.14  | 0.10  | 0.15  |
| VIIa                 | 0.15  | 0.15  | 0.16  | 0.18  | 0.16  | 0.15  |
| VIIb                 | 0.01  | 0.01  | 0.01  | 0.01  | 0.01  | 0.01  |
| Military             | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00  |
| Missing              | 0.11  | 0.10  | 0.10  | 0.08  | 0.09  | 0.09  |
| **Raw N**            | 711   | 99    | 621   | 470   | 80    | 577   |

*Source:* ANES 2016 Time Series Study (December 18, 2018 release)
Table S4. Balance achieved by inverse probability weights alone, when weighting all three groups to the distribution of new 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age (see results for differences in Tables S12 and S13)

|                      | All validated voters only |               |               | WonH validated voters only |               |               |
|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|
|                      | Obama and Clinton         | No 2012 vote, then Trump | Romney and Trump | Obama and Clinton         | No 2012 vote, then Trump | Romney and Trump |
| Age in years         | 46.39                     | 46.53         | 46.48         | 46.96                     | 46.65         | 46.34         |
| Female               | 0.49                      | 0.50          | 0.50          | 0.52                      | 0.51          | 0.51          |
| WONH                 | 0.90                      | 0.91          | 0.90          | --                        | --            | --            |
| Region               |                           |               |               |                           |               |               |
| Northeast            | 0.13                      | 0.15          | 0.14          | 0.11                      | 0.14          | 0.12          |
| Midwest              | 0.20                      | 0.22          | 0.23          | 0.20                      | 0.22          | 0.23          |
| South                | 0.51                      | 0.47          | 0.47          | 0.52                      | 0.48          | 0.49          |
| West                 | 0.16                      | 0.16          | 0.16          | 0.16                      | 0.16          | 0.16          |
| Education            |                           |               |               |                           |               |               |
| HS or less           | 0.27                      | 0.28          | 0.30          | 0.32                      | 0.30          | 0.31          |
| Some college         | 0.38                      | 0.41          | 0.40          | 0.38                      | 0.41          | 0.40          |
| BA or more           | 0.30                      | 0.30          | 0.29          | 0.27                      | 0.29          | 0.29          |
| Missing              | 0.04                      | 0.01          | 0.01          | 0.02                      | 0.01          | 0.01          |
| EGP class            |                           |               |               |                           |               |               |
| I                    | 0.07                      | 0.06          | 0.07          | 0.07                      | 0.06          | 0.07          |
| II                   | 0.23                      | 0.21          | 0.21          | 0.20                      | 0.20          | 0.20          |
| IIIa                 | 0.09                      | 0.08          | 0.07          | 0.08                      | 0.09          | 0.07          |
| IIIb                 | 0.13                      | 0.13          | 0.12          | 0.15                      | 0.14          | 0.13          |
| IVab                 | 0.06                      | 0.07          | 0.06          | 0.05                      | 0.07          | 0.06          |
| V                    | 0.11                      | 0.12          | 0.11          | 0.11                      | 0.12          | 0.11          |
| VI                   | 0.06                      | 0.06          | 0.07          | 0.05                      | 0.06          | 0.07          |
| VIIa                 | 0.13                      | 0.14          | 0.17          | 0.15                      | 0.14          | 0.17          |
| VIIb                 | 0.00                      | 0.00          | 0.00          | 0.00                      | 0.00          | 0.00          |
| Military             | 0.01                      | 0.01          | 0.01          | 0.00                      | 0.01          | 0.01          |
| Missing              | 0.12                      | 0.11          | 0.11          | 0.14                      | 0.11          | 0.11          |
| Raw N                | 709                       | 214           | 626           | 466                       | 193           | 581           |

Source: ANES 2016 Time Series Study (December 18, 2018 release)
| Attachment and political identity: | Raw difference | Adjusted difference |
|----------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Party identification (7-point scale from 1 for strong Democrat to 7 for strong Republican) | 2.495 | 2.631 | 2.495 | 2.631 |
| Conservative ideology and affect (standardized composite of 4 variables) | 0.942 | 0.822 | 0.942 | 0.822 |
| Union involvement and affect (standardized composite of 2 variables) | 0.002 | -0.113 | 0.002 | 0.770 |

| Political engagement: | Raw difference | Adjusted difference |
|----------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Political interest (standardized composite of 9 variables) | -0.412 | -0.399 | -0.412 | -0.399 |
| Rich control politics (standardized composite of 2 variables) | -0.170 | -0.327 | 0.215 | -0.170 | -0.327 | 0.215 |
| Days per week talk about politics with family or friends (scale from 0 to 7 days) | -1.232 | -1.022 | -1.022 | -1.022 |
| Decided how to vote within one month of the election (indicator variable) | 0.316 | 0.271 | 0.229 | 0.316 | 0.271 | 0.229 |

| Quondam complex: | Raw difference | Adjusted difference |
|------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Value tradition and the past (standardized composite of 4 variables) | 1.020 | 0.815 | -0.240 | 1.020 | 0.815 | -0.240 |
| Accept changes in morality (standardized composite of 2 variables) | -0.636 | -0.545 | 0.358 | -0.636 | -0.545 | 0.358 |
| Country needs free thinkers who will have the courage to defy traditional ways (5-point agreement scale) | 0.087 | 0.193 | 0.342 | 0.087 | 0.193 | 0.342 |

Source: ANES 2016 Time Series Study (December 18, 2018 release)

Notes: Standard errors of the differences are in parentheses. The sample is restricted to those aged 23 or older in 2016, so that those who were ineligible to vote in 2012 because of age were excluded. The raw N varies slightly by outcome but is usually 809 for the first and third columns and 720 for the second and fourth columns, with the same 99 Obama-to-Trump voters in both sets of differences. Full details are provided below in the extended tables.
Table S6 (for comparison with Table 3). Differences in material and economic interests

| Personal and family conditions: | Raw difference | Adjusted difference |
|---------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Economic vulnerability (standardized composite of 4 variables) | 0.717 | 0.038 |
| (0.132) | (0.147) |
| 0.605 | 0.066 |
| (0.140) | (0.138) |
| Economic policy predisposition: | -0.511 | 0.884 |
| (0.114) | (0.130) |
| -0.425 | 0.688 |
| (0.100) | (0.115) |
| Economic libertarianism (standardized composite of 6 variables) | 0.640 | -0.606 |
| (0.100) | (0.102) |
| 0.528 | -0.579 |
| (0.097) | (0.100) |
| Effects of trade and environmental policy: | 0.740 | 0.184 |
| (0.098) | (0.110) |
| 0.546 | 0.162 |
| (0.094) | (0.095) |
| Global trade is a threat (standardized composite of 4 variables) | 0.858 | -1.427 |
| (0.271) | (0.281) |
| 0.650 | -1.402 |
| (0.248) | (0.221) |
| Environmental protection harms jobs (7-point scale) | -0.937 | 0.293 |
| (0.104) | (0.114) |
| -0.804 | 0.333 |
| (0.124) | (0.093) |
| Increasing opportunity and equality | -0.366 | -0.418 |
| (0.140) | (0.143) |
| -0.414 | -0.438 |
| (0.134) | (0.120) |

Source: ANES 2016 Time Series Study (December 18, 2018 release)

Notes: See Table S5.
Table S7 (for comparison with Table 4). Differences in racial affect and policies to address racial inequality

|                                | Raw difference | Adjusted difference |
|--------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
|                                | From Obama-Clinton voters | From Romney-Trump voters | From Obama-Clinton voters | From Romney-Trump voters |
| **Racial affect:**             |                |                     |                           |                           |
| Positive black racial affect (standardized composite of 4 variables) | -0.845 (0.129) | 0.000 (0.131) | -0.746 (0.114) | -0.033 (0.104) |
| Positive Hispanic racial affect (standardized composite of 3 variables) | -0.344 (0.161) | -0.067 (0.152) | -0.253 (0.145) | -0.076 (0.115) |
| Positive white racial affect (standardized composite of 3 variables) | 0.607 (0.150) | 0.187 (0.164) | 0.499 (0.133) | 0.140 (0.134) |
| **Views of racial obstacles and discrimination:**                     |                |                     |                           |                           |
| Blacks and Hispanics confront racial obstacles (standardized composite of 3 variables) | -0.737 (0.122) | 0.351 (0.119) | -0.566 (0.109) | 0.357 (0.107) |
| Discrimination against whites (5-point scale, differing from measure in main text) | 0.455 (0.119) | -0.055 (0.132) | 0.382 (0.116) | 0.031 (0.135) |
| **Policies to address racial differences:**                          |                |                     |                           |                           |
| Government should help blacks (standardized composite of 3 variables) | -1.177 (0.104) | 0.149 (0.095) | -0.966 (0.082) | 0.050 (0.087) |
| Blacks should work harder and should not receive favors (standardized composite of 2 variables) | 1.152 (0.090) | 0.065 (0.079) | 0.913 (0.068) | 0.006 (0.077) |
| Opposition to affirmative action (standardized composite of 2 variables) | 0.727 (0.104) | -0.319 (0.102) | 0.450 (0.099) | -0.288 (0.078) |
| **White domination and solidarity:**                                  |                |                     |                           |                           |
| Majoritarian racial dominance (standardized composite of 2 variables) | 0.770 (0.113) | -0.092 (0.118) | 0.495 (0.093) | -0.073 (0.111) |
| Important that whites work together to change laws unfair to whites (not asked of non-whites) | -- | -- | -- | -- |

Source: ANES 2016 Time Series Study (December 18, 2018 release)

Notes: See Table S5.
Table S8 (for comparison with Table 5). Differences in attitudes toward immigrants and the economic consequences of immigration

|                                          | Raw difference |         | Adjusted difference |         |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------|---------|---------------------|---------|
|                                          | From Obama-Clinton voters | From Romney-Trump voters | From Obama-Clinton voters | From Romney-Trump voters |
| **Attitudes toward immigrants:**        |                |         |                     |         |
| Positive immigration affect             | -0.928         | -0.030  | -0.723              | 0.029   |
| (standardized composite of 6 variables) | (0.109)        | (0.125) | (0.082)             | (0.086) |
| Negative views of unauthorized immigrants | 0.920         | -0.164  | 0.826               | -0.133  |
| (standardized composite of 2 variables) | (0.134)        | (0.130) | (0.102)             | (0.111) |
| **Economic consequences of immigration:** |                |         |                     |         |
| Immigrants take jobs and hurt economy   | 0.918          | 0.048   | 0.742               | 0.096   |
| (standardized composite of 2 variables) | (0.118)        | (0.133) | (0.115)             | (0.132) |
| Number of immigrants should be increased | -1.047         | 0.103   | -0.930              | 0.064   |
| (5-point scale)                         | (0.138)        | (0.133) | (0.119)             | (0.119) |

*Source:* ANES 2016 Time Series Study (December 18, 2018 release)

*Notes:* See Table S5.
### Table S9. Question wording and groups of items for composite variables, sorted in the order presented in the tables [Note: Table continues on multiple pages.]

| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s) | Response Scales | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| V161158x           | N/A                          | Party identification (7-point scale from 1 for strong Democrat to 7 for strong Republican) | Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as [a Democrat, a Republican / a Republican, a Democrat], an independent, or what? | 1. Strong Democrat  
2. Not very strong Democrat  
3. Independent-Democrat  
4. Independent  
5. Independent-Republican  
6. Not very strong Republican  
7. Strong Republican | Pre | No |
| V161126            | Conservative-liberal self-rating on pre-election survey (7-point scale) | We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Here is a seven-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative? Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven’t you thought much about this? | 1. Extremely liberal  
2. Liberal  
3. Slightly liberal  
4. Moderate, middle of the road  
5. Slightly conservative  
6. Conservative  
7. Extremely conservative | | Pre | No |
| V162171            | Conservative-liberal self-rating on post-election survey (7-point scale) | I’d like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days. I’ll read the name of a person and I’d like you to rate that person using something we call the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable and warm toward the person. Ratings between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you don’t feel favorable toward the person and that you don’t care too much for that person. You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don’t feel particularly warm or cold toward the person. If we come to a person whose name you don’t recognize, you don’t need to rate that person. Just tell me and we’ll move on to the next one. | 0. Don’t feel favorable/Don’t care 100. Favorable/Warm | | Post | Yes |

V162097 Feeling thermometer for liberals (0-100 scale, reversed)
Table S9. Question wording and groups of items for composite variables, sorted in the order presented in the tables [Note: Table continues on multiple pages.]

| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s) | Response Scales | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|--------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| V162101            | Feeling thermometer for conservatives (0-100 scale) | I’d like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days. I’ll read the name of a person and I’d like you to rate that person using something we call the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable and warm toward the person. Ratings between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you don’t feel favorable toward the person and that you don’t care too much for that person. You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don’t feel particularly warm or cold toward the person. If we come to a person whose name you don’t recognize, you don’t need to rate that person. Just tell me and we’ll move on to the next one. (How would you rate:) Conservatives | 0. Don’t feel favorable/Don’t care 100. Favorable/Warm | Post | No |
| V161302            | You or anyone in household belong to a labor union (indicator variable) | Do you or anyone else in this household belong to a labor union or to an employee association similar to a union? | 1. Yes 2. No | Pre | N/A |
| V162098            | Feeling thermometer for labor unions (0-100 scale) | I’d like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days. I’ll read the name of a person and I’d like you to rate that person using something we call the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable and warm toward the person. Ratings between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you don’t feel favorable toward the person and that you don’t care too much for that person. You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don’t feel particularly warm or cold toward the person. If we come to a person whose name you don’t recognize, you don’t need to rate that person. Just tell me and we’ll move on to the next one. (How would you rate:) Labor Unions | 0. Don’t feel favorable/Don’t care -100. Favorable/Warm | Post | No |
Table S9. Question wording and groups of items for composite variables, sorted in the order presented in the tables [Note: Table continues on multiple pages.]

| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s)                                                                 | Response Scales                                                                 | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| V161003            | Often pay attention to government and politics (5-point scale) | How often do you pay attention to what’s going on in government and politics? | 1. Always 2. Most of the time 3. About half the time 4. Some of the time 5. Never | Pre                                                                         | Yes                      |
| V161004            | Interested in following political campaigns (3-point scale) | Some people don’t pay much attention to political campaigns. How about you? Would you say that you have been [very much interested, somewhat interested or not much interested/ not much interested, somewhat interested or very much interested] in the political campaigns so far this year? | 1. Very much interested 2. Somewhat interested 3. Not much interested | Pre                                                                         | Yes                      |
| V161008/ V161009   | Pay attention to news about national politics (5-point scale) | V161008: During a typical week, how many days do you watch, read, or listen to news on TV, radio, printed newspapers, or the Internet, not including sports? V161009: IF NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDING MEDIA NEWS IS MORE THAN 0: How much attention do you pay to news about national politics on TV, radio, printed newspapers, or the Internet? | 1. A great deal 2. A lot 3. A moderate amount 4. A little 5. None at all | Pre                                                                         | Yes                      |
| V161145            | Care who wins presidential election (5-point scale) | How much do you care who wins the presidential election this fall? | 1. A great deal 2. A lot 3. A moderate amount 4. A little 5. Not at all | Pre                                                                         | Yes                      |
| V162018a           | Joined a protest in past 12 months (indicator variable) | During the past 12 months, have you joined in a protest march, rally, or demonstration, or have you not done this in the past 12 months? | 1. Have done this in past 12 months 2. Have not done this in the past 12 months | Post                                                                        | N/A                      |
| V162018b           | Political interest (standardized composite of 9 variables) | Signed a petition in past 12 months (indicator variable) | During the past 12 months, have you signed a petition on the Internet or on paper about a political or social issue, or have you not done this in the past 12 months? | Post                                                                        | N/A                      |
| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s)                                                                 | Response Scales                                      | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| V162141            | Bought or boycotted a product or service in past 12 months (5-point scale) | In the past 12 months, how often have you either bought or declined to buy a certain product or service because of the social or political values of the company that provides it? | 1. Never  
2. Once in a while  
3. About half the time  
4. Most of the time  
5. All the time | Post | No |
| V162256            | Interest in politics (4-point scale) | How interested would you say you are in politics? | 1. Very interested  
2. Somewhat interested  
3. Not very interested  
4. Not at all interested | Post | Yes |
| V162257            | Closely follow politics in media (4-point scale) | And how closely do you follow politics on TV, radio, newspapers, or the Internet? | 1. Very closely  
2. Fairly closely  
3. Not very closely  
4. Not at all | Post | Yes |
| V162220            | Rich control politics (standardized composite of 2 variables) | Rich people buy elections (5-point scale) | In your view, how often do the following things occur in this country’s elections? Rich people buy elections | 1. All of the time  
2. Most of the time  
3. About half of the time  
4. Some of the time  
5. Never | Post | Yes |
| V162265            | Most politicians care about interests of rich and powerful (5-point scale) | In your view, how often do the following things occur in this country’s elections? ‘Most politicians care only about the interests of the rich and powerful.’ | 1. Agree strongly  
2. Agree somewhat  
3. Neither agree nor disagree  
4. Disagree somewhat  
5. Disagree strongly | Post | Yes |
| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s)                                                                 | Response Scales                                      | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| V162174/ V162174a | N/A                         | Days per week talk about politics with family or friends (scale from 0 to 7 days) | V162174: Do you ever discuss politics with your family or friends? V162174a: IF EVER DISCUSSES POLITICS WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS: How many days in the past week did you talk about politics with family or friends? | 0. Zero days 1. One day 2. Two days 3. Three days 4. Four days 5. Five days 6. Six days 7. Seven days | Post          | No            |
| V162036a          | N/A                         | Decided how to vote within one month of the election (indicator variable) | How long before you voted did you decide that you were going to vote the way you did? | Clustered into 14 different Periods                 | Post          | N/A           |
| V161152           |                             | US position in the world weaker in past year (3-point scale) | Turning to some other types of issues facing the country. During the past year, would you say that the United States’ position in the world has grown weaker, stayed about the same, or has it grown stronger? | 1. Weaker 2. Stayed about the same 3. Stronger | Pre           | Yes           |
| V162125x          | Value tradition and the past (standardized composite of 4 variables) | Feels good to see the American flag (7-point scale) | When you see the American flag flying does it make you feel good, bad, or neither good nor bad? Does it make you feel [extremely good, moderately good, or a little good / a little good, moderately good, or extremely good] / Does it make you feel [extremely bad, moderately bad, or a little bad / a little bad, moderately bad, or extremely bad]? | 1. Extremely good 2. Moderately good 3. A little good 4. Neither good nor bad 5. A little bad 6. Moderately bad 7. Extremely bad | Post          | Yes           |
| V162274           | Important to follow American’s customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) |                                | How important do you think the following is for being truly American. To follow America’s customs and traditions. | 1. Very important 2. Fairly important 3. Not very important 4. Not important at all | Post          | Yes           |
| V162208           | Newer lifestyles contributing to breakdown of society (5-point scale) |                                | Now I am going to read several statements about society in general. After each one, I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagree. 'The newer lifestyles are contributing to the breakdown of our society.' | 1. Agree strongly 2. Agree somewhat 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree somewhat 5. Disagree strongly | Post          | Yes           |
| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Response Scales                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| V162207           | Accept changes in morality  | World is changing and we should adjust views of moral behavior accordingly (5-point scale)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Now I am going to read several statements about society in general. After each one, I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagree. ‘The world is always changing and we should adjust our view of moral behavior to those changes.’                                                                 | 1. Agree strongly 2. Agree somewhat 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree somewhat 5. Disagree strongly                                                                                                                                                        | Post                     | Yes           |
| V162209           | Tolerance of people who choose their own moral standards (5-point scale)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Now I am going to read several statements about society in general. After each one, I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagree. ‘We should be more tolerant of people who choose to live according to their own moral standards, even if they are very different from our own.’ |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 1. Agree strongly 2. Agree somewhat 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree somewhat 5. Disagree strongly                                                                                                                                                         | Post                     | Yes           |
| V162168           | N/A                          | Country needs free thinkers who will have the courage to defy traditional ways (5-point scale)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Now I am going to read several statements. After each one, I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagree. The first statement is: ‘Our country needs free thinkers who will have the courage to defy traditional ways, even if this upsets many people.’                                                       | 1. Agree strongly 2. Agree somewhat 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree somewhat 5. Disagree strongly                                                                                                                                                        | Post                     | Yes           |
| V161110           | Economic vulnerability      | Worse off financially than 1 year ago (5-point scale)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that [you /you and your family living here] are [much better off financially, somewhat better off, about the same, somewhat worse off, or much worse off / much worse off financially, somewhat worse off, about the same, somewhat better off, or much better off] than you were a year ago? | 1. Much better off 2. Somewhat better off 3. About the same 4. Somewhat worse off 5. Much worse off                                                                                                                                                                     | Pre                      | No            |
| V161111           | Will be worse off financially next year (5-point scale)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Now looking ahead, do you think that a year from now [you /you and your family living here] will be [much better off financially, somewhat better off, about the same, somewhat worse off, or much worse off / much worse off financially, somewhat worse off, about the same, somewhat better off, or much better off] than now? |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 1. Much better off 2. Somewhat better off 3. About the same 4. Somewhat worse off 5. Much worse off                                                                                                                                                                     | Pre                      | No            |
| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s) | Response Scales | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| V162165            | Worried about current financial situation (5-point scale) | So far as you and your family are concerned, how worried are you about your current financial situation? | 1. Extremely worried 2. Very worried 3. Moderately worried 4. A little worried 5. Not at all worried | Post | Yes |
| V162167            | Family member of close friend lost job in past 12 months (indicator variable) | During the past 12 months, has anyone in your family or a close personal friend lost a job, or has no one in your family and no close personal friend lost a job in the past 12 months? | 1. Someone lost a job 2. No one lost a job | Post | N/A |
| V162192            | Minimum wage should be raised (4-point scale) | Should the minimum wage be [raised, kept the same, lowered but not eliminated, or eliminated altogether / eliminated altogether, lowered but not eliminated, kept the same, or raised]? | 1. Raised 2. Kept the same 3. Lowered 4. Eliminated | Post | Yes |
| V162140            | Economic progressivism (standardized composite of 8 variables) | Favor a tax on millionaires (3-point scale) | Do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose increasing income taxes on people making over one million dollars per year? | 1. Favor 2. Oppose 3. Neither favor nor oppose | Post | Yes (1. Oppose; 2. Neither favor nor oppose; 3. Favor) |
| V161189            | Government responsible for jobs and standard of living (7-point scale) | Some people feel the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Others think the government should just let each person get ahead on their own. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven’t you thought much about this? | 1. Govt should see to jobs and standard of living to 7. Govt should let each person get ahead on own | Pre | Yes |
| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s) | Response Scales | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| V162099            | Feeling thermometer for poor people (0-100 scale) | I’d like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days. I’ll read the name of a person and I’d like you to rate that person using something we call the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable and warm toward the person. Ratings between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you don’t feel favorable toward the person and that you don’t care too much for that person. You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don’t feel particularly warm or cold toward the person. If we come to a person whose name you don’t recognize, you don’t need to rate that person. Just tell me and we’ll move on to the next one. (How would you rate:) Poor people | 0. Don’t feel favorable/Don’t care 100. Favorable/Warm | Post | No |
| V162148            | Government should reduce income differences between rich and poor (3-point scale) | Next, do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose the government trying to reduce the difference in incomes between the richest and poorest households? | 1. Favor 2. Oppose 3. Neither favor nor oppose | Post | Yes (1. Oppose; 2. Neither favor nor oppose; 3. Favor) |
| V162243            | Society should make sure everyone has equal opportunity (5-point scale) | I am going to read several more statements. After each one, I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagree. The first statement is: ‘Our society should do whatever is necessary to make sure that everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed.’ | 1. Agree strongly 2. Agree somewhat 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree somewhat 5. Disagree strongly | Post | Yes |
| V162246            | Fewer problems if people were treated more equally (5-point scale) | I am going to read several more statements. After each one, I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagree. ‘If people were treated more equally in this country we would have many fewer problems.’ | 1. Agree strongly 2. Agree somewhat 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree somewhat 5. Disagree strongly | Post | Yes |
Table S9. Question wording and groups of items for composite variables, sorted in the order presented in the tables [Note: Table continues on multiple pages.]

| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s)                                                                 | Response Scales                          | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| V162276            | Government should take measures to reduce income differences (5-point scale) | Please say to what extend you agree or disagree with the following statement: ‘The government should take measures to reduce differences in income levels’ | 1. Agree strongly  
2. Agree somewhat  
3. Neither agree nor disagree  
4. Disagree somewhat  
5. Disagree strongly | Post | Yes |
| V162244            | Country better off if we worried less about equality (5-point scale) | I am going to read several more statements. After each one, I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagree. ‘This country would be better off if we worried less about how equal people are.’ | 1. Agree strongly  
2. Agree somewhat  
3. Neither agree nor disagree  
4. Disagree somewhat  
5. Disagree strongly | Post | Yes |
| V162245            | Not a big problem if people have different life chances (5-point scale) | I am going to read several more statements. After each one, I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagree. ‘It is not really that big a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others.’ | 1. Agree strongly  
2. Agree somewhat  
3. Neither agree nor disagree  
4. Disagree somewhat  
5. Disagree strongly | Post | Yes |
| V162100            | Economic libertarianism (standardized composite of 6 variables) | Feeling thermometer for big business (0-100 scale) | I’d like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days. I’ll read the name of a person and I’d like you to rate that person using something we call the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable and warm toward the person. Ratings between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you don’t feel favorable toward the person and that you don’t care too much for that person. You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don’t feel particularly warm or cold toward the person. If we come to a person whose name you don’t recognize, you don’t need to rate that person. Just tell me and we’ll move on to the next one. (How would you rate:) Big business | 0. Don’t feel favorable/Don’t care  
100. Favorable/Warm | Post | No |
| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s) | Response Scales | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|---------------|
| V162105           | Feeling thermometer for rich people (0-100 scale) | I’d like to get your feelings toward some of our political leaders and other people who are in the news these days. I’ll read the name of a person and I’d like you to rate that person using something we call the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable and warm toward the person. Ratings between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you don’t feel favorable toward the person and that you don’t care too much for that person. You would rate the person at the 50 degree mark if you don’t feel particularly warm or cold toward the person. If we come to a person whose name you don’t recognize, you don’t need to rate that person. Just tell me and we’ll move on to the next one. (How would you rate:) Rich people | 0.Don’t feel favorable/Don’t care | Post | No |
| V162180x          | Government should lower regulations on banks (7-point scale) | In your opinion, when it comes to regulating the activities of banks, should the government be doing more, less, or the same as it is now? | 1. A great deal more 2. A moderate amount more 3. A little more 4. The same 5. A little less 6. A moderate amount less 7. A great deal less | Post | No |
| V162186           | Lower regulation of business is good for society (5-point scale) | How much government regulation of business is good for society? | 1. A great deal 2. A lot 3. A moderate amount 4. A little 5. None at all | Post | No |
| V162152a / V162152b | Global trade is a threat (standardized composite of 6 variables) | Favor limits on imports to protect jobs (3-point scale) | V162152a: Some people have suggested placing new limits on foreign imports in order to protect American jobs. Others say that such limits would raise consumer prices and hurt American exports. Do you favor or oppose placing new limits on imports? V162152b: Some people have suggested placing new limits on foreign imports in order to protect American jobs. Others say that such limits would raise consumer prices and hurt | 1. Favor 2. Oppose 99. Haven’t thought much about this | Post | Yes to create: 1 Oppose 2 Haven’t though much; 3 Favor |
| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s)                                                                 | Response Scales                                                                 | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
|                   |                              |                         | American exports. Do you FAVOR or OPPOSE placing new limits on imports, or haven’t you thought much about this? | 1. Good  
2. Bad  
3. Neither good nor bad | Post | No  
(1. Good;  
2. Neither good nor bad;  
3. Bad) |
| V162175 | Increased trade has been bad for the US (3-point scale) | On some other topics. Have increasing amounts of trade with other countries been good for the United States, bad for the United States, or neither good nor bad? | 1. Good  
2. Bad  
3. Neither good nor bad | Post | No |
| V162176x | Oppose free trade agreements with other countries (7-point scale) | Do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose the U.S. making free trade agreements with other countries? | 1. Favor a great deal  
2. Favor moderately  
3. Favor a little  
4. Neither favor nor oppose  
5. Oppose a little  
6. Oppose moderately  
7. Oppose a great deal | Post | No |
| V162177 | Government should discourage outsourcing of jobs (3-point scale) | Recently, some big American companies have been hiring workers in foreign countries to replace workers in the U.S. Do you think the federal government should discourage companies from doing this, encourage companies to do this, or stay out of this matter? | 1. Discourage  
2. Encourage  
3. Should stay out of this matter | Post | Yes  
(1. Encourage;  
2. Should stay out of this matter;  
3. Discourage) |
| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s) | Response Scales | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| V161201           | N/A                           | Environmental protection harms jobs (7-point scale) | Some people think the federal government needs to regulate business to protect the environment. They think that efforts to protect the environment will also create jobs. Let us say this is point 1 on a 1-7 scale. Others think that the federal government should not regulate business to protect the environment. They think this regulation will not do much to help the environment and will cost us jobs. Let us say this is point 7 on a 1-7 scale. And of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven’t you thought much about this? | 1. Regulate business to protect the environment and create jobs to 7. No regulation because it will not work and will cost jobs | Pre | No |
| V161139           | US economy these days is good (5-point scale) | What do you think about the state of the economy these days in the United States? Would you say the state of the economy is [very good, good, neither good nor bad, bad, or very bad / very bad, bad, neither good nor bad, good, or very good]? | 1. Very good 2. Good 3. Neither good nor bad 4. Bad 5. Very bad | Pre | Yes |
| V161141x          | Economy is healthy (standardized composite of 3 variables) | US economy will get better in next 12 months (5-point scale) | What about the next 12 months? Do you expect the economy, in the country as a whole, to get better, stay about the same, or get worse? **IF R THINKS ECONOMY WILL BE BETTER IN NEXT 12 MONTHS / IF R THINKS ECONOMY WILL BE WORSE IN NEXT 12 MONTHS: [Much better or somewhat better / Much worse or somewhat worse]?** | 1. Get much better 2. Get somewhat better 3. About the same 4. Get somewhat worse 5. Get much worse | Pre | Yes |
| V161140x          | US economy has gotten better in last 12 months (5-point scale) | Now thinking about the economy in the country as a whole, would you say that over the past year the nation’s economy has gotten better, stayed about the same, or gotten worse? **IF R THINKS THE ECONOMY HAS GOTTEN BETTER IN THE PAST YEAR / IF R THINKS THE ECONOMY HAS GOTTEN WORSE IN THE PAST YEAR: [Much better or somewhat better? / Much worse or somewhat worse?]** | 1. Much better 2. Somewhat better 3. About the same 4. Somewhat worse 5. Much worse | Pre | Yes |
| V161138x          | Increasing opportunity and equality (standardized composite of 3 variables) | Inequality between rich and poor has declined in the past twenty years (5-point scale) | Do you think the difference in incomes between rich people and poor people in the United States today is larger, smaller, or about the same as it was 20 years ago? **IF INCOME GAP TODAY IS LARGER THAN IT WAS 20 YEARS AGO: (Would you say the difference in incomes is) much larger or somewhat larger?** | 1. Much larger 2. Somewhat larger 3. About the same 4. Somewhat smaller 5. Much smaller | Pre | No |
| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s) | Response Scales | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| V162134            |                             | A great deal of opportunity in America to get ahead (5-point scale) | IF INCOME GAP TODAY IS SMALLER THAN IT WAS 20 YEARS AGO: (Would you say the difference in incomes is) much smaller or somewhat smaller? | 1. A great deal 2. A lot 3. A moderate amount 4. A little 5. None | Post | Yes |
| V162136X           |                             | Easier to improve financial well-being than 20 years ago (7-point scale) | IF R SAYS ECONOMIC MOBILITY IN U.S. IS EASIER THAN 20 YEARS AGO / IF R SAYS ECONOMIC MOBILITY IN U.S. IS HARDER THAN 20 YEARS AGO: How much [easier/harder]? [A great deal, a moderate amount, or a little / A little, a moderate amount, or a great deal]? | 1. A great deal easier 2. A moderate amount easier 3. A little easier 4. The same 5. A little harder 6. A moderate amount harder 7. A great deal harder | Post | Yes |
| V162113            | Positive black racial affect (standardized composite of 4 variables) | Feeling thermometer for Black Lives Matter (0-100 scale) | Using the same thermometer scale which you used earlier in the interview, how would you rate: (How would you rate:) | 0. Don’t feel favorable/Don’t care 100. Favorable/Warm | Post | No |
| V162312            |                             | Feeling thermometer for blacks (0-100 scale) | Using the same thermometer scale which you used earlier in the interview, how would you rate: (How would you rate:) | 0. Don’t feel favorable/Don’t care 100. Favorable/Warm | Post | No |
| V162346            |                             | Blacks are hard-working, not lazy (7-point scale) | Where would you rate Blacks in general on this scale? | 1. Hard-working to 7. Lazy | Post | Yes |
| V162350            |                             | Blacks are peaceful, not violent (7-point scale) | Where would you rate Blacks in general on this scale? | 1. Peaceful to 7. Violent | Post | Yes |
| V162311            | Positive Hispanic racial affect (standardized composite of 3 variables) | Feeling thermometer for Hispanics (0-100 scale) | Using the same thermometer scale which you used earlier in the interview, how would you rate: (How would you rate:) | 0. Don’t feel favorable/Don’t care 100. Favorable/Warm | Post | No |
| V162347            |                             | Hispanics are hard-working, not lazy (7-point scale) | Where would you rate Hispanic-Americans in general on this scale? | 1. Hard-working to 7. Lazy | Post | Yes |
| V162351            |                             | Hispanics are peaceful, not violent (7-point scale) | Where would you rate Hispanic-Americans in general on this scale? | 1. Peaceful to 7. Violent | Post | Yes |
| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s) | Response Scales | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| V162314            | Positive white racial affect (standardized composite of 3 variables) | Feeling thermometer for whites (0-100 scale) | Using the same thermometer scale which you used earlier in the interview, how would you rate: (How would you rate:) Whites | 0. Don’t feel favorable /Don’ t care 100. Favorable /Warm | Post | No |
| V162345            | Whites are hard-working, not lazy (7-point scale) | Where would you rate Whites in general on this scale? | 1. Hard-working to 7. Lazy | Post | Yes |
| V162349            | Whites are peaceful, not violent (7-point scale) | Where would you rate Whites in general on this scale? | 1. Peaceful to 7. Violent | Post | Yes |
| V162212            | Generations of slavery and discrimination make it difficult for blacks (5-point scale) | Now I am going to read several statements about society in general. After each one, I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagree. 'Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class.' | 1. Agree strongly 2. Agree somewhat 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree somewhat 5. Disagree strongly | Post | Yes |
| V162357            | Blacks and Hispanics confront racial obstacles (standardized composite of 3 variables) | Discrimination against blacks (5-point scale) | How much discrimination is there in the United States today against each of the following groups? Blacks | 1. A great deal 2. A lot 3. A moderate amount 4. A little 5. None at all | Post | Yes |
| V162358            | Discrimination against Hispanics (5-point scale) | How much discrimination is there in the United States today against each of the following groups? Hispanics | 1. A great deal 2. A lot 3. A moderate amount 4. A little 5. None at all | Post | Yes |
| V162360            | Discrimination against whites (standardized composite of 2 variables) | Discrimination against whites (5-point scale) | How much discrimination is there in the United States today against each of the following groups? Whites | 1. A great deal 2. A lot 3. A moderate amount 4. A little 5. None at all | Post | Yes |
| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s) | Response Scales | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| V162317            | Whiteness can’t find jobs because employers hire minorities instead (5-point scale) | How likely is it that many whites are unable to find a job because employers are hiring minorities instead? | 1. Extremely likely<br>2. Very likely<br>3. Moderately likely<br>4. Slightly likely<br>5. Not at all likely | Post<br>Yes |                       |
| V161198            | Government should make an effort to improve position of blacks (7-point scale) | Some people feel that the government in Washington should make every effort to improve the social and economic position of blacks. Suppose these people are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Others feel that the government should not make any special effort to help blacks because they should help themselves. Suppose these people are at the other end, at point 7. And, of course, some other people have opinions somewhere in between, at points 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven’t you thought much about this? | 1. Govt should help blacks to<br>7. Blacks should help themselves | Pre<br>Yes |                       |
| V162213            | Government should help blacks (standardized composite of 3 variables) | Blacks have gotten less than they deserve (5-point scale) | Now I am going to read several statements about society in general. After each one, I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagree. ‘Over the past few years, blacks have gotten less than they deserve.’ | 1. Agree strongly<br>2. Agree somewhat<br>3. Neither agree nor disagree<br>4. Disagree somewhat<br>5. Disagree strongly | Post<br>Yes |                       |
| V162318/V162319    | Government treats whites better than blacks (3-point scale) | V162318: In general, does the federal government [treat whites better than blacks, treat them both same, or treat blacks better than whites / treat blacks better than whites, treat them both the same, or treat whites better than blacks]?<br>V162319: IF R SAYS FEDERAL GOVT TREATS WHITES BETTER THAN BLACKS / IF R SAYS FEDERAL GOVT TREATS BLACKS BETTER THAN WHITES: Does the federal government treat whites [much better, moderately better, or a little better / a little better, moderately better, or much better] / Does the federal government treat blacks [much better, moderately better, or much better]? / Does the federal government treat blacks [much better, moderately better, or much better]?<br>1. Treat whites better<br>2. Treat both the same<br>3. Treat blacks better //<br>1. Much<br>2. Moderately<br>3. A little | 1. Treat blacks much better to<br>7. Treat whites much better | Post<br>Yes |                       |
Table S9. Question wording and groups of items for composite variables, sorted in the order presented in the tables [Note: Table continues on multiple pages.]

| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s) | Response Scales | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| V162211           | Blacks should work harder and should not receive favors (standardized composite of 2 variables) | Blacks should work their way up without favors (5-point scale) | ‘Irish, Italians, Jewish and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same without any special favors.’ Do you [agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly / disagree strongly, disagree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, agree somewhat, or agree strongly] with this statement? | 1. Agree strongly 2. Agree somewhat 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree somewhat 5. Disagree strongly | Post | Yes |
| V162214           | Blacks should try harder to get ahead (5-point scale) | Blacks should try harder to get ahead (5-point scale) | ‘It’s really a matter of some people not trying hard enough, if blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites. Do you [agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly / disagree strongly, disagree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, agree somewhat, or agree strongly] with this statement? | 1. Agree strongly 2. Agree somewhat 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree somewhat 5. Disagree strongly | Post | Yes |
| V161204x          | Opposition to affirmative action in universities (7-point scale) | Oppose affirmative action in universities (7-point scale) | Do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose allowing universities to increase the number of black students studying at their schools by considering race along with other factors when choosing students? | 1. Favor a great deal 2. Favor a moderate amount 3. Favor a little 4. Neither favor nor oppose 5. Oppose a little 6. Oppose a moderate amount 7. Oppose a great deal | Pre | No |
| V162238x          | Oppose preferential hiring and promotion of blacks (4-point scale) | Oppose preferential hiring and promotion of blacks (4-point scale) | What about your opinion – are you for or against preferential hiring and promotion of blacks?  
IF R OPPOSES AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AT UNIVERSITIES: Do you oppose that [a great deal, a moderate amount, or a little / a little, a moderate amount, or a great deal]?  
IF R OPPOSES AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AT UNIVERSITIES: Do you oppose that [a great deal, a moderate amount, or a little / a little, a moderate amount, or a great deal]? | 1. Strongly for preferential 2. Not strongly for preferential hiring 3. Not strongly against preferential hiring 4. Strongly against preferential hiring (recoded to 1, 2, 3, 4) | Post | No |
| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s) | Response Scales | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------|
| V162266 | Majoritarian racial dominance (standardized composite of 2 variables) | Minorities should adapt to customs and traditions of the US (5-point scale) | Now thinking about minorities in the United States. Do you [agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly / disagree strongly, disagree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, agree somewhat or agree strongly] with the following statement? ‘Minorities should adapt to the customs and traditions of the United States’ | 1. Agree strongly 2. Agree somewhat 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree somewhat 5. Disagree strongly | Post | Yes |
| V162267 | The will of the majority should always prevail, even over the rights of minorities (5-point scale) | Do you [agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly / disagree strongly, disagree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, agree somewhat or agree strongly] with the following statement? ‘The will of the majority should always prevail, even over the rights of minorities.’ | 1. Agree strongly 2. Agree somewhat 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree somewhat 5. Disagree strongly | Post | Yes |
| V162316 | Important that whites work together to change laws unfair to whites (5-point scale, and in WONH analyses only) | How important is it that whites work together to change laws that are unfair to whites? | 1. Extremely important 2. Very important 3. Moderately important 4. A little important 5. Not at all important | Post | Yes |
| V161197 | Positive immigration affect (standardized composite of 6 variables) | Not important everyone in US learns English (4-point scale) | How important do you think it is that everyone in the United States learn to speak English? | 1. Very Important 2. Somewhat important 3. Not very important 4. Not at all important | Pre | No |
| V162269 | America’s culture is not harmed by immigrants (5-point scale) | (Do you [agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly / disagree strongly, disagree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, agree somewhat or agree strongly] with the following statement?) ‘America’s culture is generally harmed by immigrants.’ | 1. Agree strongly 2. Agree somewhat 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree somewhat 5. Disagree strongly | Post | No |
| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s)                                                                 | Response Scales                                                                 | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| V162270            | Immigrants do not increase crime (5-point scale) | (Do you [agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly /disagree strongly, disagree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, agree somewhat or agree strongly] with the following statement?) ‘Immigrants increase crime rates in the United States.’ | 1. Agree strongly 2. Agree somewhat 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree somewhat 5. Disagree strongly | Post                       | No            |
| V162271            | Not important to be born in the US to be truly American (4-point scale) | Some people say that the following things are important for being truly American. Others say they are not important. How important do you think the following is for being truly American... [very important, fairly important, not very important, or not important at all / not important at all, not very important, fairly important or very important]? ‘To have been born in the United States’ | 1. Very important 2. Fairly important 3. Not very important 4. Not important at all | Post                       | No            |
| V162272            | Not important to have American ancestry to be truly American (4-point scale) | (How important do you think the following is for being truly American... [very important, fairly important, not very important, or not important at all / not important at all, not very important, fairly important or very important]? ‘To have American ancestry’ | 1. Very important 2. Fairly important 3. Not very important 4. Not important at all | Post                       | No            |
| V162273            | Not important to speak English to be truly American (4-point scale) | (How important do you think the following is for being truly American... [very important, fairly important, not very important, or not important at all / not important at all, not very important, fairly important or very important]? ‘To be able to speak English’ | 1. Very important 2. Fairly important 3. Not very important 4. Not important at all | Post                       | No            |
Table S9. Question wording and groups of items for composite variables, sorted in the order presented in the tables [Note: Table continues on multiple pages.]

| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s) | Response Scales | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| V161192            | Negative views of unauthorized immigrants (standardized composite of 2 variables) | Make unauthorized immigrants felons and send them back (4-point scale) | Which comes closest to your view about what government policy should be toward unauthorized immigrants now living in the United States? | 1. Make all unauthorized immigrants felons and send them back to their home country. 2. Have a guest worker program that allows unauthorized immigrants to remain in the United States in order to work, but only for a limited amount of time. 3. Allow unauthorized immigrants to remain in the United States and eventually qualify for U.S. citizenship, but only if they meet certain requirements like paying back taxes and fines, learning English, and passing background checks. 4. Allow unauthorized immigrants to remain in the United States and eventually qualify for U.S. citizenship, without penalties | Pre | Yes |
| V162313            | Feeling thermometer for illegal immigrants (0-100 scale) | Using the same thermometer scale which you used earlier in the interview, how would you rate: Illegal immigrants | 0. Don’t feel favorable/Don’t care 100. Favorable/Warm | Post | Yes |
Table S9. Question wording and groups of items for composite variables, sorted in the order presented in the tables [Note: Table continues on multiple pages.]

| ANES variable name | Our composite variable label | Our item variable label | ANES question(s) | Response Scales | Pre/post election survey | Scale reversed |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| V162158            | Immigrants take jobs and hurt economy (standardized composite of 2 variables) | Recent immigrants have taken jobs away from people already here (4-point scale) | Now I’d like to ask you about immigration in recent years. How likely is it that recent immigration levels will take jobs away from people already here -- [extremely likely, very likely, somewhat likely, or not at all likely / not at all likely, somewhat likely, very likely, or extremely likely]? | 1. Extremely likely 2. Very likely 3. Somewhat likely 4. Not at all likely | Post | Yes |
| V162268            | Immigrants are not good for America’s economy (5-point scale) | And now thinking specifically about immigrants. (Do you [agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly /disagree strongly, disagree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, agree somewhat or agree strongly] with the following statement?) ‘Immigrants are generally good for America’s economy.’ | 1. Agree strongly 2. Agree somewhat 3. Neither agree nor disagree 4. Disagree somewhat 5. Disagree strongly | Post | No |
| V162157            | Number of immigrants should be increased (5-point scale) | Do you think the number of immigrants from foreign countries who are permitted to come to the United States to live should be [increased a lot, increased a little, left the same as it is now, decreased a little, or decreased a lot / decreased a lot, decreased a little, left the same as it is now, increased a little, or increased a lot]? | 1. Increased a lot 2. Increased a little 3. Left the same as it is now 4. Decreased a little 5. Decreased a lot | Post | Yes |
Table S10. Differences between Obama-to-Trump Voters and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only (source for Tables 2-5 in the main article with additional indicator-specific results in this table) [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-to-Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                              | Raw       | Adjusted   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------|
|                                                                                | vs O-C    | vs R-T     | vs O-C    | vs R-T     |
|                                                                                | Ns        | Ns         | Ns        | Ns         |
| Party identification (7-point scale from 1 for strong Democrat to 7 for strong Republican) | 2.195     | -2.046     | 2.296     | -1.965     |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.263     | 0.261      | 0.212     | 0.218      |
| Conservative ideology and affect (standardized composite of 4 variables)      | 0.975     | -0.787     | 0.786     | -0.747     |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.061     | 0.069      | 0.070     | 0.068      |
| Conservative-liberal self-rating on pre-election survey (7-point scale)       | 1.487     | -1.416     | 1.196     | -1.425     |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.134     | 0.134      | 0.173     | 0.128      |
| Conservative-liberal self-rating on post-election survey (7-point scale)      | 1.581     | -1.200     | 1.396     | -1.118     |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.124     | 0.117      | 0.129     | 0.112      |
| Feeling thermometer for liberals (0-100 scale, reversed)                      | 29.236    | -15.894    | 25.671    | -15.525    |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 2.986     | 3.397      | 2.901     | 3.162      |
| Feeling thermometer for conservatives (0-100 scale)                          | 19.380    | -17.780    | 15.874    | -16.881    |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 2.690     | 2.593      | 2.952     | 2.376      |
| Union involvement and affect (standardized composite of 2 variables)          | -0.047    | 0.800      | -0.213    | 0.640      |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.206     | 0.204      | 0.144     | 0.137      |
| You or anyone in household belong to a labor union (indicator variable)       | 0.002     | 0.135      | -0.057    | 0.105      |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.068     | 0.062      | 0.063     | 0.053      |
| Feeling thermometer for labor unions (0-100 scale)                           | -2.007    | 22.260     | -4.469    | 18.025     |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 4.785     | 4.880      | 3.060     | 3.053      |
| Political interest (standardized composite of 9 variables)                    | -0.574    | -0.356     | -0.512    | -0.240     |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.103     | 0.117      | 0.115     | 0.115      |
| Often pay attention to government and politics (5-point scale)                | -0.406    | -0.268     | -0.362    | -0.128     |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.113     | 0.110      | 0.110     | 0.104      |
| Interested in following political campaigns (3-point scale)                   | -0.164    | -0.060     | -0.194    | -0.010     |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.100     | 0.083      | 0.083     | 0.095      |
| Pay attention to news about national politics (5-point scale)                 | -0.383    | -0.229     | -0.385    | -0.198     |
Table S10. Differences between Obama-to-Trump Voters and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only (source for Tables 2-5 in the main article with additional indicator-specific results in this table) [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-to-Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw vs O-C Ns | Raw vs R-T Ns | Adjusted vs O-C Ns | Adjusted vs R-T Ns |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| (S.E) Care who wins presidential election (5-point scale)                        | 0.130        | 0.135        | 0.142              | 0.142              |
| (S.E) Care who wins presidential election (5-point scale)                        | -0.513       | -0.471       | -0.436             | -0.443             |
| (S.E) Joined a protest in past 12 months (indicator variable)                   | 0.017        | 0.012        | 0.018              | 0.011              |
| (S.E) Signed a petition in past 12 months (indicator variable)                  | -0.187       | -0.001       | -0.060             | 0.042              |
| (S.E) Bought or boycotted a product or service in past 12 months (5-point scale) | -0.543       | -0.220       | -0.357             | -0.197             |
| (S.E) Interest in politics (4-point scale)                                      | 0.102        | 0.098        | 0.101              | 0.091              |
| (S.E) Closely follow politics in media (4-point scale)                           | -0.432       | -0.295       | -0.396             | -0.205             |
| (S.E) Rich control politics (standardized composite of 2 variables)             | 0.035        | 0.408        | -0.187             | 0.432              |
| (S.E) Rich people buy elections (5-point scale)                                  | 0.105        | 0.470        | -0.163             | 0.558              |
| (S.E) Most politicians care about interests of rich and powerful (5-point scale)| -0.035       | 0.295        | -0.190             | 0.256              |
| (S.E) Days per week talk about politics with family or friends (scale from 0 to 7 days) | -2.066       | -1.219       | -1.611             | -1.103             |
| (S.E) Decided how to vote within one month of the election (indicator variable) | 0.331        | 0.251        | 0.263              | 0.286              |
| (S.E) Value tradition and the past (standardized composite of 4 variables)      | 1.160        | -0.158       | 0.864              | -0.216             |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.115        | 0.103        | 0.095              | 0.083              |
Table S10. Differences between Obama-to-Trump Voters and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only (source for Tables 2-5 in the main article with additional indicator-specific results in this table) [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-to-Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable | Raw vs O-C Ns | Raw vs R-T Ns | Adjusted vs O-C Ns | Adjusted vs R-T Ns |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| US position in the world weaker in past year (3-point scale) | 0.524 550 | -0.206 655 | 0.569 550 | -0.189 655 |
| (S.E) | 0.064 80 | 0.062 80 | 0.062 80 | 0.062 80 |
| Feels good to see the American flag (7-point scale) | 0.914 550 | -0.070 657 | 0.659 550 | -0.107 657 |
| (S.E) | 0.114 80 | 0.093 80 | 0.110 80 | 0.083 80 |
| Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 0.721 550 | -0.027 653 | 0.523 550 | -0.097 653 |
| (S.E) | 0.134 80 | 0.123 80 | 0.104 80 | 0.098 80 |
| Newer lifestyles contributing to breakdown of society (5-point scale) | 1.386 549 | -0.188 657 | 0.839 549 | -0.279 657 |
| (S.E) | 0.167 80 | 0.158 80 | 0.173 80 | 0.153 80 |
| Accept changes in morality (standardized composite of 2 variables) | -0.555 550 | 0.508 657 | -0.481 550 | 0.462 657 |
| (S.E) | 0.129 80 | 0.124 80 | 0.125 80 | 0.130 80 |
| World is changing and we should adjust views of moral behavior accordingly (5-point scale) | -0.440 550 | 0.790 657 | -0.455 550 | 0.763 657 |
| (S.E) | 0.219 80 | 0.205 80 | 0.199 80 | 0.181 80 |
| Tolerance of people who choose their own moral standards (5-point scale) | -0.780 547 | 0.382 656 | -0.612 547 | 0.310 656 |
| (S.E) | 0.161 80 | 0.153 80 | 0.171 80 | 0.170 80 |
| Country needs free thinkers who will have the courage to defy traditional ways (5-point scale) | 0.063 550 | 0.276 654 | 0.247 550 | 0.348 654 |
| (S.E) | 0.115 80 | 0.116 80 | 0.113 80 | 0.111 80 |
| Economic vulnerability (standardized composite of 4 variables) | 0.665 550 | 0.021 657 | 0.530 550 | -0.018 657 |
| (S.E) | 0.163 80 | 0.164 80 | 0.172 80 | 0.152 80 |
| Worse off financially than 1 year ago (5-point scale) | 0.632 550 | 0.019 656 | 0.504 550 | -0.018 656 |
| (S.E) | 0.155 80 | 0.156 80 | 0.164 80 | 0.145 80 |
| Will be worse off financially next year (5-point scale) | 0.195 548 | -0.093 646 | 0.097 548 | -0.130 646 |
| (S.E) | 0.138 79 | 0.133 79 | 0.144 79 | 0.096 79 |
| Worried about current financial situation (5-point scale) | 0.387 549 | 0.261 657 | 0.462 549 | 0.305 657 |
| (S.E) | 0.290 80 | 0.280 80 | 0.189 80 | 0.211 80 |
| Family member of close friend lost job in past 12 months (indicator variable) | 0.078 550 | 0.006 657 | 0.181 550 | 0.027 657 |
Table S1. Differences between Obama-to-Trump Voters and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only (source for Tables 2-5 in the main article with additional indicator-specific results in this table) [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw vs O-C Ns | Raw vs R-T Ns | Adjusted vs O-C Ns | Adjusted vs R-T Ns |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.089 80      | 0.093 80      | 0.068 80          | 0.073 80          |
| Economic progressivism (standardized composite of 8 variables)                   | -0.548 550    | 0.850 657     | -0.465 550        | 0.788 657         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.132 80      | 0.129 80      | 0.120 80          | 0.109 80          |
| Minimum wage should be raised (4-point scale)                                   | -0.150 548    | 0.486 648     | -0.124 548        | 0.431 648         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.071 79      | 0.088 79      | 0.074 79          | 0.073 79          |
| Favor a tax on millionaires (3-point scale)                                     | -0.076 550    | 0.727 656     | -0.096 550        | 0.701 656         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.071 80      | 0.076 80      | 0.053 80          | 0.084 80          |
| Government responsible for jobs and standard of living (7-point scale)          | -1.050 511    | 0.915 615     | -0.797 511        | 1.047 615         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.312 66      | 0.311 66      | 0.253 66          | 0.219 66          |
| Feeling thermometer for poor people (0-100 scale)                               | -1.456 542    | 2.612 643     | -2.295 542        | 1.702 643         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 2.793 78      | 2.848 78      | 2.359 78          | 2.380 78          |
| Government should reduce income differences between rich and poor (3-point scale) | -0.375 547    | 0.601 651     | -0.281 547        | 0.543 651         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.143 78      | 0.132 78      | 0.144 78          | 0.122 78          |
| Society should make sure everyone has equal opportunity (5-point scale)         | -0.237 550    | 0.496 656     | -0.224 550        | 0.410 656         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.134 80      | 0.146 80      | 0.111 80          | 0.135 80          |
| Fewer problems if people were treated more equally (5-point scale)               | -0.507 549    | 0.507 653     | -0.486 549        | 0.458 653         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.166 79      | 0.171 79      | 0.134 79          | 0.148 79          |
| Government should take measures to reduce income differences (5-point scale)    | -0.718 549    | 0.774 654     | -0.574 549        | 0.755 654         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.199 79      | 0.166 79      | 0.197 79          | 0.174 79          |
| Economic libertarianism (standardized composite of 6 variables)                  | 0.702 550     | -0.648 657    | 0.508 550         | -0.643 657        |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.113 80      | 0.106 80      | 0.127 80          | 0.099 80          |
| Country better off if we worried less about equality (5-point scale)            | 1.217 550     | -0.410 655    | 0.947 550         | -0.403 655        |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.175 80      | 0.142 80      | 0.186 80          | 0.144 80          |
| Not a big problem if people have different life chances (5-point scale)         | 0.635 550     | -0.270 655    | 0.280 550         | -0.260 655        |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.148 80      | 0.140 80      | 0.169 80          | 0.131 80          |
| Feeling thermometer for big business (0-100 scale)                               | 8.218 547     | -10.413 652   | 7.904 547         | -8.828 652        |
Table S10. Differences between Obama-to-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only (source for Tables 2-5 in the main article with additional indicator-specific results in this table) [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-To Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                      | Raw       | Adjusted  |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
|                                                       | vs O-C Ns  | vs R-T Ns | vs O-C Ns  | vs R-T Ns |
| (S.E)                                                  | 3.239     | 80        | 3.120     | 80        |
| Feeling thermometer for rich people (0-100 scale)     | 6.504     | 543       | -5.334    | 650       |
| (S.E)                                                  | 2.578     | 80        | 2.835     | 80        |
| Government should lower regulations on banks (7-point scale) | 0.379     | 544       | -1.159    | 641       |
| (S.E)                                                  | 0.265     | 79        | 0.267     | 79        |
| Lower regulation of business is good for society (5-point scale) | 0.100     | 549       | -0.570    | 656       |
| (S.E)                                                  | 0.140     | 80        | 0.135     | 80        |
| Global trade is a threat (standardized composite of 4 variables) | 0.841     | 550       | 0.265     | 657       |
| (S.E)                                                  | 0.123     | 80        | 0.129     | 80        |
| Favor limits on imports to protect jobs (3-point scale) | 0.622     | 544       | 0.110     | 644       |
| (S.E)                                                  | 0.096     | 80        | 0.085     | 80        |
| Increased trade has been bad for the US (3-point scale) | 0.564     | 542       | 0.225     | 650       |
| (S.E)                                                  | 0.116     | 77        | 0.117     | 77        |
| Oppose free trade agreements with other countries (7-point scale) | 1.083     | 546       | 0.353     | 649       |
| (S.E)                                                  | 0.256     | 80        | 0.272     | 80        |
| Government should discourage outsourcing of jobs (3-point scale) | 0.046     | 550       | 0.052     | 656       |
| (S.E)                                                  | 0.063     | 80        | 0.067     | 80        |
| Environmental protection harms jobs (7-point scale)    | 1.233     | 504       | -1.156    | 571       |
| (S.E)                                                  | 0.285     | 67        | 0.290     | 67        |
| Economy is healthy (standardized composite of 3 variables) | -0.931    | 549       | 0.312     | 657       |
| (S.E)                                                  | 0.106     | 80        | 0.104     | 80        |
| US economy these days is good (5-point scale)          | -1.017    | 547       | 0.106     | 657       |
| (S.E)                                                  | 0.129     | 80        | 0.124     | 80        |
| US economy will get better in next 12 months (5-point scale) | -0.210    | 539       | 0.022     | 639       |
| (S.E)                                                  | 0.098     | 78        | 0.101     | 78        |
| US economy has gotten better in last 12 months (5-point scale) | -0.730    | 548       | 0.498     | 653       |
Table S1. Differences between Obama-to-Trump Voters and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only (source for Tables 2-5 in the main article with additional indicator-specific results in this table) [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                       | Raw     | Adjusted  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-----------|
|                                                                      | vs O-C Ns | vs R-T Ns | vs O-C Ns | vs R-T Ns |
| (S.E)                                                                | 0.103 80 | 0.108 80  | 0.149 80  | 0.110 80  |
| Increasing opportunity and equality (standardized composite of 3 variables) | -0.181 550 | -0.374 657 | -0.314 550 | -0.365 657 |
| (S.E)                                                                | 0.143 80 | 0.139 80  | 0.158 80  | 0.119 80  |
| Inequality between rich and poor has declined in the past twenty years (5-point scale) | 0.146 549 | -0.385 653 | 0.118 549 | -0.475 653 |
| (S.E)                                                                | 0.122 80 | 0.122 80  | 0.110 80  | 0.125 80  |
| A great deal of opportunity in America to get ahead (5-point scale)   | -0.156 550 | -0.333 657 | -0.240 550 | -0.332 657 |
| (S.E)                                                                | 0.146 80 | 0.153 80  | 0.152 80  | 0.122 80  |
| Easier to improve financial well-being than 20 years ago (7-point scale) | -0.370 548 | -0.229 656 | -0.590 548 | -0.135 656 |
| (S.E)                                                                | 0.205 80 | 0.182 80  | 0.242 80  | 0.177 80  |
| Positive black racial affect (composite of 4 variables)              | -0.760 548 | 0.018 657  | -0.665 548 | -0.032 657 |
| (S.E)                                                                | 0.149 80 | 0.150 80  | 0.120 80  | 0.110 80  |
| Feeling thermometer for Black Lives Matter (0-100 scale)             | -28.781 543 | 12.621 651 | -25.999 543 | 10.269 651 |
| (S.E)                                                                | 4.036 79  | 4.082 79  | 3.484 79  | 4.148 79  |
| Feeling thermometer for blacks (0-100 scale)                         | -13.295 544 | -4.485 649 | -11.416 544 | -4.593 649 |
| (S.E)                                                                | 2.835 78  | 2.918 78  | 2.254 78  | 2.609 78  |
| Blacks are hard-working, not lazy (7-point scale)                    | -0.630 540 | -0.015 646 | -0.567 540 | -0.082 646 |
| (S.E)                                                                | 0.215 78  | 0.221 78  | 0.180 78  | 0.163 78  |
| Blacks are peaceful, not violent (7-point scale)                     | -0.625 538 | 0.036 647  | -0.538 538 | 0.008 647 |
| (S.E)                                                                | 0.190 78  | 0.191 78  | 0.177 78  | 0.158 78  |
| Positive Hispanic racial affect (standardized composite of 3 variables) | -0.414 545 | -0.150 651 | -0.320 545 | -0.053 651 |
| (S.E)                                                                | 0.171 78  | 0.154 78  | 0.131 78  | 0.112 78  |
| Feeling thermometer for Hispanics (0-100 scale)                      | -15.438 544 | -7.198 649 | -12.905 544 | -6.307 649 |
| (S.E)                                                                | 2.987 78  | 3.041 78  | 2.620 78  | 2.913 78  |
| Hispanics are hard-working, not lazy (7-point scale)                 | -0.202 540 | -0.037 646 | -0.113 540 | 0.074 646 |
| (S.E)                                                                | 0.218 78  | 0.195 78  | 0.167 78  | 0.131 78  |
| Hispanics are peaceful, not violent (7-point scale)                  | -0.179 538 | -0.030 648 | -0.135 538 | 0.080 648 |
Table S10. Differences between Obama-to-Trump Voters and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only (source for Tables 2-5 in the main article with additional indicator-specific results in this table) [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-to-Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw | Adjusted |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----------|
|                                                                                 | vs O-C | Ns | vs R-T | Ns | vs O-C | Ns | vs R-T | Ns |
| Positive white racial affect (standardized composite of 3 variables)             | 0.173 78 | 0.156 78 | 0.160 78 | 0.133 78 |
|                                                                                   | 0.478 545 | 0.152 651 | 0.426 545 | 0.199 651 |
| Feeling thermometer for whites (0-100 scale)                                    | 3.011 544 | 1.204 649 | 1.398 544 | 0.780 649 |
|                                                                                   | 3.028 78 | 3.007 78 | 2.655 78 | 2.779 78 |
| Whites are hard-working, not lazy (7-point scale)                               | 0.396 540 | 0.174 647 | 0.458 540 | 0.233 647 |
|                                                                                   | 0.189 78 | 0.181 78 | 0.216 78 | 0.164 78 |
| Whites are peaceful, not violent (7-point scale)                                | 0.720 537 | 0.171 648 | 0.582 537 | 0.253 648 |
|                                                                                   | 0.194 78 | 0.196 78 | 0.146 78 | 0.177 78 |
| Blacks and Hispanics confront racial obstacles (standardized composite of 3 variables) | -0.766 550 | 0.237 656 | -0.633 550 | 0.243 656 |
|                                                                                   | 0.124 80 | 0.099 80 | 0.114 80 | 0.104 80 |
| Generations of slavery and discrimination make it difficult for blacks (5-point scale) | -1.302 550 | 0.184 656 | -1.137 550 | 0.145 656 |
|                                                                                   | 0.182 80 | 0.172 80 | 0.154 80 | 0.158 80 |
| Discrimination against blacks (5-point scale)                                   | -0.719 538 | 0.208 638 | -0.583 538 | 0.202 638 |
|                                                                                   | 0.163 77 | 0.139 77 | 0.142 77 | 0.130 77 |
| Discrimination against Hispanics (5-point scale)                                | -0.426 538 | 0.270 634 | -0.331 538 | 0.279 634 |
|                                                                                   | 0.150 77 | 0.145 77 | 0.132 77 | 0.143 77 |
| Discrimination against whites (standardized composite of 2 variables)           | 0.924 547 | 0.101 652 | 0.775 547 | 0.133 652 |
|                                                                                   | 0.144 78 | 0.146 78 | 0.138 78 | 0.128 78 |
| Discrimination against whites (5-point scale)                                   | 0.523 534 | -0.004 634 | 0.471 534 | 0.050 634 |
|                                                                                   | 0.144 76 | 0.151 76 | 0.140 76 | 0.132 76 |
| Whites can't find jobs because employers hire minorities instead (5-point scale) | 1.100 545 | 0.199 648 | 0.877 545 | 0.170 648 |
|                                                                                   | 0.175 77 | 0.170 77 | 0.177 77 | 0.151 77 |
| Government should help blacks (composite of 3 variables)                        | -1.175 550 | 0.055 657 | -0.957 550 | 0.027 657 |
|                                                                                   | 0.111 80 | 0.098 80 | 0.098 80 | 0.098 80 |
| Government should make an effort to improve position of blacks (7-point scale)   | -2.061 497 | 0.099 605 | -1.784 497 | 0.059 605 |
| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw vs O-C Ns | Adjusted vs R-T Ns | Raw vs O-C Ns | Adjusted vs R-T Ns |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.217 71      | 0.215 71           | 0.204 71      | 0.202 71          |
| Blacks have gotten less than they deserve (5-point scale)                        | -1.499 549    | -0.087 656         | -1.161 549    | -0.061 656        |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.169 80      | 0.157 80           | 0.154 80      | 0.151 80          |
| Government treats whites better than blacks (3-point scale)                       | -1.405 544    | 0.315 645          | -1.270 544    | 0.156 645         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.206 78      | 0.187 78           | 0.198 78      | 0.182 78          |
| Blacks should work harder and should not receive favors (standardized composite of 2 variables) | 1.270 550    | 0.066 657          | 0.951 550     | 0.007 657         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.109 80      | 0.082 80           | 0.089 80      | 0.079 80          |
| Blacks should work their way up without favors (5-point scale)                    | 1.651 550     | -0.024 657         | 1.227 550     | -0.096 657        |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.144 80      | 0.107 80           | 0.131 80      | 0.111 80          |
| Blacks should try harder to get ahead (5-point scale)                             | 1.685 550     | 0.190 655          | 1.269 550     | 0.111 655         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.177 80      | 0.148 80           | 0.132 80      | 0.130 80          |
| Opposition to affirmative action (standardized composite of 2 variables)          | 0.616 550     | -0.272 654         | 0.352 550     | -0.262 654        |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.132 80      | 0.119 80           | 0.122 80      | 0.085 80          |
| Oppose affirmative action in universities (7-point scale)                          | 1.200 548     | -0.489 648         | 0.828 548     | -0.454 648        |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.289 79      | 0.257 79           | 0.262 79      | 0.166 79          |
| Oppose preferential hiring and promotion of blacks (4-point scale)                | 0.468 541     | -0.249 651         | 0.176 541     | -0.257 651        |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.117 80      | 0.110 80           | 0.114 80      | 0.097 80          |
| Majoritarian racial dominance (standardized composite of 2 variables)            | 0.962 550     | 0.032 654          | 0.648 550     | -0.006 654        |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.131 80      | 0.122 80           | 0.111 80      | 0.113 80          |
| Minorities should adapt to customs and traditions of the US (5-point scale)       | 1.048 550     | -0.046 653         | 0.615 550     | -0.118 653        |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.134 80      | 0.119 80           | 0.131 80      | 0.112 80          |
| The will of the majority should always prevail, even over the rights of minorities (5-point scale) | 0.969 549     | 0.112 650          | 0.744 549     | 0.109 650         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.192 79      | 0.191 79           | 0.159 79      | 0.174 79          |
| Important that whites work together to change laws unfair to whites               | 0.658 544     | -0.053 646         | 0.702 544     | -0.198 646        |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.203 77      | 0.194 77           | 0.171 77      | 0.160 77          |
Table S10. Differences between Obama-to-Donald Trump Voters and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only (source for Tables 2-5 in the main article with additional indicator-specific results in this table) [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-to-Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw vs O-C     | Raw vs R-T     | Adjusted vs O-C | Adjusted vs R-T |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Positive immigration affect (standardized composite of 6 variables)              | -1.298 550     | -0.183 657     | -0.967 550      | -0.124 657      |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.134 80       | 0.125 80       | 0.103 80        | 0.091 80        |
| Not important everyone in US learns English (4-point scale)                      | -0.520 550     | 0.047 657      | -0.276 550      | 0.098 657       |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.090 80       | 0.067 80       | 0.074 80        | 0.050 80        |
| America's culture is not harmed by immigrants (5-point scale)                   | -1.353 549     | -0.120 652     | -1.070 549      | -0.151 652      |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.172 79       | 0.175 79       | 0.146 79        | 0.149 79        |
| Immigrants do not increase crime (5-point scale)                                 | -1.429 549     | -0.034 652     | -1.075 549      | -0.062 652      |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.162 79       | 0.168 79       | 0.134 79        | 0.155 79        |
| Not important to be born in the US to be truly American (4-point scale)         | -0.909 549     | -0.259 653     | -0.664 549      | -0.162 653      |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.175 79       | 0.174 79       | 0.144 79        | 0.134 79        |
| Not important to have American ancestry to be truly American (4-point scale)     | -0.990 549     | -0.374 653     | -0.767 549      | -0.280 653      |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.161 79       | 0.149 79       | 0.116 79        | 0.111 79        |
| Not important to speak English to be truly American (4-point scale)             | -0.693 550     | -0.024 656     | -0.530 550      | 0.038 656       |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.080 80       | 0.056 80       | 0.072 80        | 0.044 80        |
| Negative views of unauthorized immigrants (standardized composite of 2 variables)| 1.099 550      | -0.020 657     | 0.944 550       | 0.002 657       |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.152 80       | 0.140 80       | 0.115 80        | 0.115 80        |
| Make unauthorized immigrants felons and send them back (4-point scale)          | 0.970 548      | 0.130 655      | 0.912 548       | 0.157 655       |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.139 79       | 0.137 79       | 0.098 79        | 0.104 79        |
| Feeling thermometer for illegal immigrants (0-100 scale)                        | 20.466 546     | -5.650 650     | 15.138 546      | -5.551 650      |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 3.927 78       | 3.661 78       | 3.414 78        | 3.420 78        |
| Immigrants take jobs and hurt economy (standardized composite of 2 variables)   | 1.149 550      | 0.132 656      | 0.926 550       | 0.162 656       |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.148 80       | 0.155 80       | 0.137 80        | 0.136 80        |
| Recent immigrants have taken jobs away from people already here (4-point scale) | 1.042 549      | 0.099 655      | 0.834 549       | 0.155 655       |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.119 80       | 0.115 80       | 0.132 80        | 0.111 80        |
| Immigrants are not good for America's economy (5-point scale)                   | 1.014 547      | 0.145 653      | 0.824 547       | 0.145 653       |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.231 79       | 0.244 79       | 0.181 79        | 0.210 79        |
Table S10. Differences between Obama-to-Trump Voters and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only (source for Tables 2-5 in the main article with additional indicator-specific results in this table) [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-to-Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                | Raw       |     | Adjusted  |     |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|
|                                                | vs O-C vs R-T vs O-C vs R-T Ns Ns Ns Ns |
| Number of immigrants should be increased (5-point scale) | -1.161 0.085 -0.940 0.128 | 549 656 549 656 |
| (S.E)                                          | 0.173 0.155 0.144 0.134 | 80 80 80 80 |
Table S11. Differences between Obama-to-Trump Voters and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters (source for Tables S5-S8 above with additional indicator-specific results in this table) [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-to-Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw vs O-C | Ns vs R-T | Ns | Adjusted vs O-C | Ns vs R-T | Ns |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------|----|----------------|-----------|----|
| Party identification (7-point scale from 1 for strong Democrat to 7 for strong Republican) | 2.495      | 809       | -1.771 | 720            | 2.631     | 809 | -1.605       | 720 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.232      | 99        | 0.243  | 99             | 0.182     | 99  | 0.221         | 99  |
| Conservative ideology and affect (standardized composite of 4 variables)         | 0.942      | 810       | -0.681 | 720            | 0.822     | 810 | -0.625        | 720 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.086      | 99        | 0.093  | 99             | 0.075     | 99  | 0.085         | 99  |
| Conservative-liberal self-rating on pre-election survey (7-point scale)          | 1.462      | 665       | -1.283 | 635            | 1.242     | 665 | -1.300        | 635 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.152      | 75        | 0.162  | 75             | 0.149     | 75  | 0.143         | 75  |
| Conservative-liberal self-rating on post-election survey (7-point scale)         | 1.696      | 704       | -0.952 | 659            | 1.481     | 704 | -0.870        | 659 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.180      | 83        | 0.185  | 83             | 0.137     | 83  | 0.163         | 83  |
| Feeling thermometer for liberals (0-100 scale, reversed)                         | 28.162     | 799       | -13.565 | 717          | 26.041    | 799 | -10.673       | 717 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 3.213      | 98        | 3.490  | 98             | 2.964     | 98  | 3.612         | 98  |
| Feeling thermometer for conservatives (0-100 scale)                              | 20.189     | 803       | -14.637 | 716          | 17.924    | 803 | -14.259       | 716 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 2.591      | 99        | 2.794  | 99             | 2.533     | 99  | 2.228         | 99  |
| Union involvement and affect (standardized composite of 2 variables)             | 0.002      | 810       | 0.843  | 720            | -0.113    | 810 | 0.770         | 720 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.157      | 99        | 0.170  | 99             | 0.111     | 99  | 0.138         | 99  |
| You or anyone in household belong to a labor union (indicator variable)         | 0.011      | 809       | 0.137  | 719            | -0.032    | 809 | 0.134         | 719 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.055      | 99        | 0.057  | 99             | 0.048     | 99  | 0.051         | 99  |
| Feeling thermometer for labor unions (0-100 scale)                               | -0.764     | 805       | 23.825 | 715           | -2.396    | 805 | 21.213        | 715 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 3.874      | 99        | 4.148  | 99             | 2.680     | 99  | 2.927         | 99  |
| Political interest (standardized composite of 9 variables)                       | -0.412     | 810       | -0.361 | 720            | -0.399    | 810 | -0.315        | 720 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.085      | 99        | 0.103  | 99             | 0.097     | 99  | 0.097         | 99  |
| Often pay attention to government and politics (5-point scale)                   | -0.193     | 810       | -0.255 | 720            | -0.238    | 810 | -0.183        | 720 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.096      | 99        | 0.102  | 99             | 0.101     | 99  | 0.096         | 99  |
| Interested in following political campaigns (3-point scale)                      | -0.113     | 810       | -0.107 | 720            | -0.156    | 810 | -0.099        | 720 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.083      | 99        | 0.096  | 99             | 0.076     | 99  | 0.085         | 99  |
| Pay attention to news about national politics (5-point scale)                    | -0.272     | 809       | -0.233 | 720            | -0.309    | 809 | -0.220        | 720 |
Table S11. Differences between Obama-to-Trump Voters and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters (source for Tables S5-S8 above with additional indicator-specific results in this table) [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-to-Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw          | Adjusted       |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|
|                                                                                  | vs O-C Ns    | vs R-T Ns      |
|                                                                                  | vs O-C Ns    | vs R-T Ns      |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.104 99     | 0.115 99       |
| Care who wins presidential election (5-point scale)                              | -0.491 810   | -0.483 718     |
|                                                                                  | -0.417 810   | -0.490 718     |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.151 99     | 0.162 99       |
| Joined a protest in past 12 months (indicator variable)                          | -0.039 810   | 0.008 719      |
|                                                                                  | -0.027 810   | 0.010 719      |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.014 99     | 0.009 99       |
| Signed a petition in past 12 months (indicator variable)                         | -0.137 810   | -0.005 719     |
|                                                                                  | -0.035 810   | 0.024 719      |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.055 99     | 0.052 99       |
| Bought or boycotted a product or service in past 12 months (5-point scale)       | -0.467 810   | -0.124 716     |
|                                                                                  | -0.251 810   | -0.054 716     |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.124 99     | 0.158 99       |
| Interest in politics (4-point scale)                                             | -0.276 810   | -0.284 720     |
|                                                                                  | -0.223 810   | -0.243 720     |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.080 99     | 0.085 99       |
| Closely follow politics in media (4-point scale)                                  | -0.319 809   | -0.266 720     |
|                                                                                  | -0.307 809   | -0.238 720     |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.079 99     | 0.087 99       |
| Rich control politics (standardized composite of 2 variables)                    | -0.170 809   | 0.252 719      |
|                                                                                  | -0.327 809   | 0.215 719      |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.103 99     | 0.122 99       |
| Rich people buy elections (5-point scale)                                        | -0.166 801   | 0.246 714      |
|                                                                                  | -0.347 801   | 0.220 714      |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.146 98     | 0.135 98       |
| Most politicians care about interests of rich and powerful (5-point scale)       | -0.154 809   | 0.221 718      |
|                                                                                  | -0.268 809   | 0.178 718      |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.109 99     | 0.139 99       |
| Days per week talk about politics with family or friends (scale from 0 to 7 days) | -1.232 810   | -0.924 720     |
|                                                                                  | -1.022 810   | -0.882 720     |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.378 99     | 0.391 99       |
| Decided how to vote within one month of the election (indicator variable)        | 0.316 759    | 0.240 681      |
|                                                                                  | 0.271 759    | 0.229 681      |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.068 96     | 0.066 96       |
| Value tradition and the past (standardized composite of 4 variables)             | 1.020 810    | -0.217 720     |
|                                                                                  | 0.815 810    | -0.240 720     |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.091 99     | 0.095 99       |
| US position in the world weaker in past year (3-point scale)                     | 0.559 809    | -0.218 718     |
|                                                                                  | 0.590 809    | -0.227 718     |
Table S11. Differences between Obama-to-Trump Voters and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters (source for Tables S5-S8 above with additional indicator-specific results in this table) [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-to-Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw vs O-C | Ns | vs R-T | Ns | Adjusted vs O-C | Ns | vs R-T | Ns |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----|--------|----|----------------|----|--------|----|
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.054      | 99 | 0.055  | 99 | 0.057          | 99 | 0.053  | 99 |
| Feels good to see the American flag (7-point scale)                              | 0.966      | 810| -0.086 | 720| 0.733          | 810| -0.133 | 720|
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.095      | 99 | 0.086  | 99 | 0.094          | 99 | 0.075  | 99 |
| Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point | 0.480      | 808| -0.150 | 716| 0.379          | 808| -0.185 | 716|
| scale)                                                                           |            |    |        |    |                |    |        |    |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.138      | 99 | 0.147  | 99 | 0.107          | 99 | 0.109  | 99 |
| Newer lifestyles contributing to breakdown of society (5-point scale)              | 1.167      | 806| -0.165 | 720| 0.785          | 806| -0.136 | 720|
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.137      | 99 | 0.147  | 99 | 0.144          | 99 | 0.171  | 99 |
| Accept changes in morality (standardized composite of 2 variables)               | -0.636     | 809| 0.410  | 720| -0.545         | 809| 0.358  | 720|
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.120      | 99 | 0.126  | 99 | 0.113          | 99 | 0.125  | 99 |
| World is changing and we should adjust views of moral behavior accordingly (5-point | -0.642     | 809| 0.664  | 720| -0.580         | 809| 0.702  | 720|
| scale)                                                                           |            |    |        |    |                |    |        |    |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.196      | 99 | 0.201  | 99 | 0.177          | 99 | 0.175  | 99 |
| Tolerance of people who choose their own moral standards (5-point scale)          | -0.775     | 806| 0.286  | 718| -0.640         | 806| 0.146  | 718|
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.141      | 99 | 0.149  | 99 | 0.141          | 99 | 0.161  | 99 |
| Country needs free thinkers who will have the courage to defy traditional ways (5- | 0.087      | 810| 0.176  | 717| 0.193          | 810| 0.342  | 717|
| point scale)                                                                     |            |    |        |    |                |    |        |    |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.121      | 99 | 0.142  | 99 | 0.112          | 99 | 0.144  | 99 |
| Economic vulnerability (standardized composite of 4 variables)                    | 0.717      | 810| 0.038  | 720| 0.605          | 810| 0.066  | 720|
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.132      | 99 | 0.147  | 99 | 0.140          | 99 | 0.138  | 99 |
| Worse off financially than 1 year ago (5-point scale)                             | 0.682      | 809| 0.035  | 719| 0.575          | 809| 0.062  | 719|
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.126      | 99 | 0.140  | 99 | 0.133          | 99 | 0.131  | 99 |
| Will be worse off financially next year (5-point scale)                           | 0.282      | 805| -0.100 | 708| 0.161          | 805| -0.106 | 708|
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.107      | 97 | 0.113  | 97 | 0.112          | 97 | 0.086  | 97 |
| Worried about current financial situation (5-point scale)                         | 0.342      | 809| 0.404  | 720| 0.468          | 809| 0.431  | 720|
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.239      | 99 | 0.255  | 99 | 0.162          | 99 | 0.188  | 99 |
| Family member of close friend lost job in past 12 months (indicator variable)    | 0.056      | 808| 0.008  | 720| 0.147          | 808| 0.044  | 720|
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.075      | 99 | 0.084  | 99 | 0.063          | 99 | 0.066  | 99 |
## Table S11. Differences between Obama-to-Trump Voters and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters

**Notes:** Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-to-Trump voters.

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw          | Adjusted     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
|                                                                                  | vs O-C Ns    | vs R-T Ns    | vs O-C Ns    | vs R-T Ns    |
| Economic progressivism (standardized composite of 8 variables)                    | -0.511 810   | 0.884 720    | -0.425 810   | 0.688 720    |
|                                                                                  | 0.114 99     | 0.130 99     | 0.100 99     | 0.115 99     |
| Minimum wage should be raised (4-point scale)                                    | -0.267 807   | 0.365 710    | -0.254 807   | 0.289 710    |
|                                                                                  | 0.119 98     | 0.139 98     | 0.101 98     | 0.120 98     |
| Favor a tax on millionaires (3-point scale)                                      | -0.096 807   | 0.612 718    | -0.148 807   | 0.500 718    |
|                                                                                  | 0.067 98     | 0.094 98     | 0.052 98     | 0.091 98     |
| Government responsible for jobs and standard of living (7-point scale)           | -0.714 738   | 1.312 676    | -0.509 738   | 1.186 676    |
|                                                                                  | 0.338 84     | 0.368 84     | 0.263 84     | 0.221 84     |
| Feeling thermometer for poor people (0-100 scale)                                | -2.015 799   | 4.260 706    | -1.889 799   | 1.063 706    |
|                                                                                  | 2.231 97     | 2.511 97     | 1.861 97     | 2.066 97     |
| Government should reduce income differences between rich and poor (3-point scale)| -0.268 803   | 0.668 713    | -0.191 803   | 0.539 713    |
|                                                                                  | 0.123 96     | 0.121 96     | 0.115 96     | 0.108 96     |
| Society should make sure everyone has equal opportunity (5-point scale)         | -0.265 809   | 0.454 719    | -0.246 809   | 0.366 719    |
|                                                                                  | 0.110 99     | 0.147 99     | 0.107 99     | 0.136 99     |
| Fewer problems if people were treated more equally (5-point scale)               | -0.551 809   | 0.497 715    | -0.497 809   | 0.349 715    |
|                                                                                  | 0.139 98     | 0.148 98     | 0.114 98     | 0.143 98     |
| Government should take measures to reduce income differences (5-point scale)    | -0.672 806   | 0.882 717    | -0.499 806   | 0.645 717    |
|                                                                                  | 0.185 98     | 0.183 98     | 0.174 98     | 0.165 98     |
| Economic libertarianism (standardized composite of 6 variables)                  | 0.640 810    | -0.606 720   | 0.528 810    | -0.579 720   |
|                                                                                  | 0.100 99     | 0.102 99     | 0.097 99     | 0.100 99     |
| Country better off if we worried less about equality (5-point scale)            | 0.979 808    | -0.452 718   | 0.836 808    | -0.425 718   |
|                                                                                  | 0.149 99     | 0.140 99     | 0.148 99     | 0.125 99     |
| Not a big problem if people have different life chances (5-point scale)         | 0.558 808    | -0.297 716   | 0.270 808    | -0.259 716   |
|                                                                                  | 0.131 99     | 0.122 99     | 0.138 99     | 0.121 99     |
| Feeling thermometer for big business (0-100 scale)                               | 8.411 804    | -6.639 715   | 9.041 804    | -5.856 715   |
|                                                                                  | 2.771 99     | 2.910 99     | 2.327 99     | 2.854 99     |
Table S11. Differences between Obama-to-Trump Voters and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters (source for Tables S5-S8 above with additional indicator-specific results in this table) [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-to-Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw vs O-C Ns | Raw vs R-T Ns | Adjusted vs O-C Ns | Adjusted vs R-T Ns |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Feeling thermometer for rich people (0-100 scale)                                 | 8.863 797     | -3.187 711    | 8.414 797          | -2.004 711        |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 2.157 99      | 2.580 99      | 1.927 99           | 2.291 99          |
| Government should lower regulations on banks (7-point scale)                      | 0.258 802     | -1.243 702    | 0.167 802          | -1.361 702        |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.224 97      | 0.227 97      | 0.207 97           | 0.215 97          |
| Lower regulation of business is good for society (5-point scale)                  | 0.120 807     | -0.600 719    | 0.099 807          | -0.557 719        |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.121 99      | 0.136 99      | 0.109 99           | 0.111 99          |
| Global trade is a threat (standardized composite of 4 variables)                 | 0.740 810     | 0.184 720     | 0.546 810          | 0.162 720         |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.098 99      | 0.110 99      | 0.094 99           | 0.095 99          |
| Favor limits on imports to protect jobs (3-point scale)                           | 0.571 797     | 0.064 705     | 0.420 797          | 0.024 705         |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.093 99      | 0.086 99      | 0.101 99           | 0.077 99          |
| Increased trade has been bad for the US (3-point scale)                           | 0.501 797     | 0.189 711     | 0.332 797          | 0.180 711         |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.101 95      | 0.111 95      | 0.103 95           | 0.100 95          |
| Oppose free trade agreements with other countries (7-point scale)                | 0.875 803     | 0.211 710     | 0.743 803          | 0.151 710         |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.191 98      | 0.220 98      | 0.190 98           | 0.202 98          |
| Government should discourage outsourcing of jobs (3-point scale)                 | 0.072 808     | 0.018 717     | 0.014 808          | 0.028 717         |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.054 99      | 0.063 99      | 0.054 99           | 0.065 99          |
| Environmental protection harms jobs (7-point scale)                               | 0.858 725     | -1.427 630    | 0.650 725          | -1.402 630        |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.271 84      | 0.281 84      | 0.248 84           | 0.221 84          |
| Economy is healthy (standardized composite of 3 variables)                       | -0.937 809    | 0.293 720     | -0.804 809         | 0.333 720         |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.104 99      | 0.114 99      | 0.124 99           | 0.093 99          |
| US economy these days is good (5-point scale)                                     | -0.924 806    | 0.148 720     | -0.790 806         | 0.194 720         |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.125 99      | 0.133 99      | 0.117 99           | 0.107 99          |
| US economy will get better in next 12 months (5-point scale)                     | -0.244 790    | 0.037 700     | -0.186 790         | 0.012 700         |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.097 96      | 0.105 96      | 0.119 96           | 0.089 96          |
| US economy has gotten better in last 12 months (5-point scale)                   | -0.820 806    | 0.414 716     | -0.713 806         | 0.455 716         |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.105 99      | 0.113 99      | 0.131 99           | 0.102 99          |
Table S11. Differences between Obama-to-Trump Voters and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters (source for Tables S5-S8 above with additional indicator-specific results in this table) [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-to-Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw vs O-C Ns | Raw vs R-T Ns | Adjusted vs O-C Ns | Adjusted vs R-T Ns |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Increasing opportunity and equality (standardized composite of 3 variables)      | -0.366        | -0.418        | -0.414             | -0.438            |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.140         | 0.143         | 0.134              | 0.120             |
| Inequality between rich and poor has declined in the past twenty years (5-point scale) | 0.030         | -0.370        | 0.037              | -0.334            |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.098         | 0.108         | 0.089              | 0.102             |
| A great deal of opportunity in America to get ahead (5-point scale)              | -0.250        | -0.391        | -0.293             | -0.490            |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.154         | 0.163         | 0.143              | 0.141             |
| Easier to improve financial well-being than 20 years ago (7-point scale)         | -0.660        | -0.267        | -0.731             | -0.182            |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.177         | 0.162         | 0.180              | 0.169             |
| Positive black racial affect (composite of 4 variables)                          | -0.845        | 0.000         | -0.746             | -0.033            |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.129         | 0.131         | 0.114              | 0.104             |
| Feeling thermometer for Black Lives Matter (0-100 scale)                         | -30.051       | 15.429        | -25.636            | 11.243            |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 3.760         | 4.252         | 3.115              | 4.151             |
| Feeling thermometer for blacks (0-100 scale)                                     | -12.564       | -2.319        | -10.668            | -2.771            |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 2.502         | 2.677         | 2.028              | 2.106             |
| Blacks are hard-working, not lazy (7-point scale)                                | -0.823        | -0.120        | -0.754             | -0.116            |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.193         | 0.200         | 0.167              | 0.162             |
| Blacks are peaceful, not violent (7-point scale)                                 | -0.742        | -0.110        | -0.695             | -0.096            |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.205         | 0.213         | 0.187              | 0.179             |
| Positive Hispanic racial affect (standardized composite of 3 variables)          | -0.344        | -0.067        | -0.253             | -0.076            |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.161         | 0.152         | 0.145              | 0.115             |
| Feeling thermometer for Hispanics (0-100 scale)                                  | -12.138       | -4.365        | -10.417            | -4.384            |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 2.916         | 3.124         | 2.576              | 2.621             |
| Hispanics are hard-working, not lazy (7-point scale)                             | -0.215        | 0.076         | -0.097             | 0.014             |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.193         | 0.187         | 0.156              | 0.142             |
| Hispanics are peaceful, not violent (7-point scale)                              | -0.137        | -0.050        | -0.091             | -0.012            |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.173         | 0.165         | 0.184              | 0.143             |
Table S11. Differences between Obama-to-Trump Voters and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters (source for Tables S5-S8 above with additional indicator-specific results in this table) [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-to-Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw | Adjusted |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----------|
|                                                                                | vs O-C | Ns   | vs R-T | Ns   | vs O-C | Ns   | vs R-T | Ns   |
| Positive white racial affect (standardized composite of 3 variables)          | 0.607 | 800   | 0.187 | 713   | 0.499 | 800   | 0.140 | 713   |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.150 | 96    | 0.164 | 96    | 0.133 | 96    | 0.134 | 96    |
| Feeling thermometer for whites (0-100 scale)                                  | 3.874 | 799   | 1.007 | 711   | 1.038 | 799   | 1.043 | 711   |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 2.703 | 96    | 2.787 | 96    | 2.501 | 96    | 2.349 | 96    |
| Whites are hard-working, not lazy (7-point scale)                             | 0.519 | 793   | 0.272 | 707   | 0.546 | 793   | 0.201 | 707   |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.170 | 96    | 0.171 | 96    | 0.190 | 96    | 0.153 | 96    |
| Whites are peaceful, not violent (7-point scale)                              | 0.900 | 789   | 0.166 | 708   | 0.696 | 789   | 0.114 | 708   |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.174 | 96    | 0.192 | 96    | 0.139 | 96    | 0.158 | 96    |
| Blacks and Hispanics confront racial obstacles (standardized composite of 3 variables) | -0.737 | 809   | 0.351 | 719   | -0.566 | 809   | 0.357 | 719   |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.122 | 99    | 0.119 | 99    | 0.109 | 99    | 0.107 | 99    |
| Generations of slavery and discrimination make it difficult for blacks (5-point scale) | -1.423 | 807   | 0.182 | 719   | -1.217 | 807   | 0.189 | 719   |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.149 | 99    | 0.151 | 99    | 0.137 | 99    | 0.135 | 99    |
| Discrimination against blacks (5-point scale)                                 | -0.692 | 790   | 0.320 | 698   | -0.518 | 790   | 0.325 | 698   |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.163 | 95    | 0.162 | 95    | 0.140 | 95    | 0.137 | 95    |
| Discrimination against Hispanics (5-point scale)                              | -0.358 | 787   | 0.393 | 693   | -0.239 | 787   | 0.386 | 693   |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.127 | 95    | 0.147 | 95    | 0.110 | 95    | 0.133 | 95    |
| Discrimination against whites (5-point scale)                                 | 0.455 | 779   | -0.055 | 694   | 0.382 | 779   | 0.031 | 694   |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.119 | 94    | 0.132 | 94    | 0.116 | 94    | 0.135 | 94    |
| Government should help blacks (composite of 3 variables)                      | -1.177 | 809   | 0.149 | 720   | -0.966 | 809   | 0.050 | 720   |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.104 | 99    | 0.095 | 99    | 0.082 | 99    | 0.087 | 99    |
| Government should make an effort to improve position of blacks (7-point scale) | -1.807 | 725   | 0.494 | 661   | -1.486 | 725   | 0.300 | 661   |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.274 | 86    | 0.276 | 86    | 0.181 | 86    | 0.205 | 86    |
| Blacks have gotten less than they deserve (5-point scale)                     | -1.542 | 806   | -0.078 | 719   | -1.230 | 806   | -0.099 | 719   |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.144 | 99    | 0.142 | 99    | 0.134 | 99    | 0.130 | 99    |
| Government treats whites better than blacks (3-point scale)                   | -1.547 | 799   | 0.406 | 706   | -1.357 | 799   | 0.120 | 706   |
| (S.E)                                                                         | 0.199 | 96    | 0.186 | 96    | 0.182 | 96    | 0.166 | 96    |
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Table S11. Differences between Obama-to-Trump Voters and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters (source for Tables S5-S8 above with additional indicator-specific results in this table) [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-to-Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw | Adjusted |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----------|
|                                                                                | vs O-C  | vs R-T  |       | vs O-C  | vs R-T  |
| Blacks should work harder and should not receive favors (standardized composite of 2 variables) | 1.152 | 0.065 | 720 | 0.913 | 0.006 | 720 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.090 | 0.079 | 99 | 0.068 | 0.077 | 99 |
| Blacks should work their way up without favors (5-point scale)                   | 1.503 | -0.047 | 719 | 1.162 | 0.099 | 99 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.119 | 0.104 | 99 | 0.099 | 0.104 | 99 |
| Blacks should try harder to get ahead (5-point scale)                            | 1.525 | 0.210 | 717 | 1.235 | 0.108 | 99 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.146 | 0.133 | 99 | 0.108 | 0.126 | 99 |
| Opposition to affirmative action (standardized composite of 2 variables)         | 0.727 | -0.319 | 717 | 0.450 | 0.288 | 717 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.104 | 0.104 | 99 | 0.099 | 0.078 | 99 |
| Oppose affirmative action in universities (7-point scale)                         | 1.279 | -0.586 | 711 | 0.889 | 0.531 | 711 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.239 | 0.227 | 98 | 0.213 | 0.146 | 98 |
| Oppose preferential hiring and promotion of blacks (4-point scale)                | 0.641 | -0.281 | 714 | 0.336 | -0.266 | 714 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.096 | 0.095 | 99 | 0.103 | 0.094 | 99 |
| Majoritarian racial dominance (standardized composite of 2 variables)            | 0.770 | -0.092 | 717 | 0.495 | -0.073 | 717 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.113 | 0.118 | 99 | 0.093 | 0.111 | 99 |
| Minorities should adapt to customs and traditions of the US (5-point scale)       | 0.848 | -0.166 | 715 | 0.505 | -0.173 | 715 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.131 | 0.134 | 99 | 0.116 | 0.132 | 99 |
| The will of the majority should always prevail, even over the rights of minorities (5-point scale) | 0.765 | -0.032 | 713 | 0.530 | 0.020 | 713 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.153 | 0.175 | 98 | 0.129 | 0.162 | 98 |
| Positive immigration affect (standardized composite of 6 variables)              | -0.928 | -0.030 | 720 | -0.723 | 0.029 | 720 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.109 | 0.125 | 99 | 0.082 | 0.086 | 99 |
| Not important everyone in US learns English (4-point scale)                      | -0.324 | 0.164 | 720 | -0.185 | 0.179 | 720 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.068 | 0.078 | 99 | 0.061 | 0.052 | 99 |
| America's culture is not harmed by immigrants (5-point scale)                   | -1.038 | -0.025 | 715 | -0.860 | -0.059 | 715 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.147 | 0.168 | 98 | 0.128 | 0.164 | 98 |
| Immigrants do not increase crime (5-point scale)                                 | -1.122 | 0.110 | 713 | -0.883 | 0.136 | 713 |
Table S11. Differences between Obama-to-Trump Voters and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters (source for Tables S5-S8 above with additional indicator-specific results in this table) [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for Obama-to-Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw         | Adjusted     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|
|                                                                                | vs O-C Ns   | vs R-T Ns    | vs O-C Ns   | vs R-T Ns    |
| Not important to be born in the US to be truly American (4-point scale)        | 0.138 97    | 0.158 715    | 0.125 97    | 0.149 715    |
| (S.E)                                                                           | -0.597 807  | -0.120 715   | -0.446 807  | 0.014 715    |
| Not important to have American ancestry to be truly American (4-point scale)  | 0.152 98    | 0.159 98     | 0.116 98    | 0.123 98     |
| (S.E)                                                                           | -0.628 806  | -0.215 715   | -0.495 806  | -0.116 715   |
| Not important to speak English to be truly American (4-point scale)            | 0.139 98    | 0.152 98     | 0.107 98    | 0.105 98     |
| (S.E)                                                                           | -0.538 808  | 0.012 719    | -0.439 808  | 0.015 719    |
| Negative views of unauthorized immigrants (standardized composite of 2 variables)| 0.920 810   | -0.164 720   | 0.826 810   | -0.133 720   |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.134 99    | 0.130 99     | 0.102 99    | 0.111 99     |
| Make unauthorized immigrants felons and send them back (4-point scale)         | 0.749 803   | -0.012 718   | 0.731 803   | 0.008 718    |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.121 98    | 0.119 98     | 0.089 98    | 0.099 98     |
| Feeling thermometer for illegal immigrants (0-100 scale)                       | 19.078 800  | -8.061 711   | 15.202 800  | -7.016 711   |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 3.473 96    | 3.804 96     | 2.977 96    | 3.157 96     |
| Immigrants take jobs and hurt economy (standardized composite of 2 variables)  | 0.918 810   | 0.048 719    | 0.742 810   | 0.096 719    |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.118 99    | 0.133 99     | 0.115 99    | 0.132 99     |
| Recent immigrants have taken jobs away from people already here (4-point scale)| 0.782 808   | -0.014 718   | 0.629 808   | 0.052 718    |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.119 99    | 0.121 99     | 0.116 99    | 0.120 99     |
| Immigrants are not good for America's economy (5-point scale)                  | 0.869 804   | 0.112 716    | 0.705 804   | 0.133 716    |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.178 98    | 0.203 98     | 0.152 98    | 0.178 98     |
| Number of immigrants should be increased (5-point scale)                       | -1.047 806  | 0.103 719    | -0.930 806  | 0.064 719    |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.138 99    | 0.133 99     | 0.119 99    | 0.119 99     |

67
Table S12. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw vs O-C | Raw Ns | Raw vs R-T | Raw Ns | Adjusted vs O-C | Adjusted Ns | Adjusted vs R-T | Adjusted Ns |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------|------------|--------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| Party identification (7-point scale from 1 for strong Democrat to 7 for strong Republican) | 3.654      | 663    | -0.593     | 774    | 3.643          | 659         | -0.516         | 771         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.153      | 193    | 0.147      | 193    | 0.148          | 193         | 0.165          | 193         |
| Conservative ideology and affect (standardized composite of 4 variables)         | 1.367      | 662    | -0.397     | 773    | 1.409          | 658         | -0.348         | 770         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.082      | 192    | 0.071      | 192    | 0.098          | 192         | 0.078          | 192         |
| Conservative-liberal self-rating on pre-election survey (7-point scale)          | 2.310      | 579    | -0.595     | 677    | 2.403          | 576         | -0.608         | 674         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.133      | 155    | 0.132      | 155    | 0.153          | 155         | 0.131          | 155         |
| Conservative-liberal self-rating on post-election survey (7-point scale)         | 2.193      | 611    | -0.590     | 708    | 2.312          | 607         | -0.505         | 705         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.150      | 169    | 0.132      | 169    | 0.166          | 169         | 0.131          | 169         |
| Feeling thermometer for liberals (0-100 scale, reversed)                         | 36.881     | 657    | -8.178     | 769    | 36.712         | 653         | -9.462         | 766         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 2.405      | 190    | 2.375      | 190    | 2.278          | 190         | 2.390          | 190         |
| Feeling thermometer for conservatives (0-100 scale)                              | 30.156     | 656    | -7.029     | 766    | 31.478         | 652         | -4.949         | 763         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 2.333      | 189    | 2.273      | 189    | 2.535          | 189         | 2.373          | 189         |
| Union involvement and affect (standardized composite of 2 variables)             | -0.522     | 663    | 0.327      | 774    | -0.404         | 659         | 0.134          | 771         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.116      | 193    | 0.102      | 193    | 0.116          | 193         | 0.104          | 193         |
| You or anyone in household belong to a labor union (indicator variable)          | -0.070     | 663    | 0.064      | 773    | -0.029         | 659         | 0.011          | 770         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.046      | 193    | 0.039      | 193    | 0.045          | 193         | 0.040          | 193         |
| Feeling thermometer for labor unions (0-100 scale)                               | -15.754    | 659    | 8.523      | 767    | -13.840        | 655         | 4.637          | 764         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 2.332      | 191    | 2.332      | 191    | 2.538          | 191         | 2.522          | 191         |
| Political interest (standardized composite of 9 variables)                       | -0.645     | 663    | -0.430     | 774    | -0.452         | 659         | -0.257         | 771         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.110      | 193    | 0.100      | 193    | 0.125          | 193         | 0.100          | 193         |
| Often pay attention to government and politics (5-point scale)                    | -0.590     | 663    | -0.452     | 774    | -0.421         | 659         | -0.268         | 771         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.100      | 193    | 0.103      | 193    | 0.110          | 193         | 0.113          | 193         |
| Interested in following political campaigns (3-point scale)                      | -0.322     | 663    | -0.218     | 774    | -0.255         | 659         | -0.114         | 771         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.083      | 193    | 0.075      | 193    | 0.091          | 193         | 0.074          | 193         |
| Pay attention to news about national politics (5-point scale)                    | -0.505     | 662    | -0.354     | 774    | -0.226         | 659         | -0.141         | 771         |
Table S12. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only  [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable | Raw vs O-C Ns | Raw vs R-T Ns | Adjusted vs O-C Ns | Adjusted vs R-T Ns |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| (S.E)            | 0.104 193     | 0.100 193     | 0.135 193         | 0.098 193         |
| Care who wins presidential election (5-point scale) | -0.383 663 | -0.342 772 | -0.216 659 | -0.281 769 |
| (S.E)            | 0.113 193     | 0.092 193     | 0.112 193         | 0.095 193         |
| Joined a protest in past 12 months (indicator variable) | -0.044 663 | 0.007 773 | -0.019 659 | 0.007 770 |
| (S.E)            | 0.013 193     | 0.006 193     | 0.007 193         | 0.006 193         |
| Signed a petition in past 12 months (indicator variable) | -0.202 663 | -0.019 773 | -0.187 659 | -0.019 770 |
| (S.E)            | 0.048 193     | 0.038 193     | 0.058 193         | 0.043 193         |
| Bought or boycotted a product or service in past 12 months (5-point scale) | -0.327 661 | -0.005 769 | -0.329 657 | -0.029 766 |
| (S.E)            | 0.117 191     | 0.108 191     | 0.150 191         | 0.114 191         |
| Interest in politics (4-point scale) | -0.367 662 | -0.276 773 | -0.316 658 | -0.212 770 |
| (S.E)            | 0.092 192     | 0.078 192     | 0.090 192         | 0.076 192         |
| Closely follow politics in media (4-point scale) | -0.319 661 | -0.181 773 | -0.247 657 | -0.123 770 |
| (S.E)            | 0.073 192     | 0.071 192     | 0.088 192         | 0.075 192         |
| Rich control politics (standardized composite of 2 variables) | -0.230 662 | 0.144 772 | -0.553 658 | -0.001 769 |
| (S.E)            | 0.099 192     | 0.084 192     | 0.100 192         | 0.089 192         |
| Rich people buy elections (5-point scale) | -0.305 659 | 0.060 766 | -0.694 655 | -0.098 763 |
| (S.E)            | 0.115 190     | 0.098 190     | 0.137 190         | 0.125 190         |
| Most politicians care about interests of rich and powerful (5-point scale) | -0.133 662 | 0.199 771 | -0.348 658 | 0.085 768 |
| (S.E)            | 0.117 192     | 0.103 192     | 0.104 192         | 0.096 192         |
| Days per week talk about politics with family or friends (scale from 0 to 7 days) | -1.258 662 | -0.425 773 | -0.896 658 | -0.270 770 |
| (S.E)            | 0.259 192     | 0.265 192     | 0.308 192         | 0.289 192         |
| Decided how to vote within one month of the election (indicator variable) | 0.121 621 | 0.041 729 | 0.055 617 | -0.002 727 |
| (S.E)            | 0.049 181     | 0.047 181     | 0.060 181         | 0.047 181         |
| Value tradition and the past (standardized composite of 4 variables) | 1.085 662 | -0.233 773 | 1.127 658 | -0.219 770 |
| (S.E)            | 0.080 192     | 0.062 192     | 0.088 192         | 0.066 192         |
| US position in the world weaker in past year (3-point scale) | 0.627 662 | -0.104 771 | 0.612 658 | -0.086 768 |
Table S12. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw vs O-C | Raw Ns | Raw vs R-T | Raw Ns | Adjusted vs O-C | Adjusted Ns | Adjusted vs R-T | Adjusted Ns |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------|------------|--------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.052      | 192    | 0.040      | 192    | 0.074          | 192         | 0.046          | 192         |
| Feels good to see the American flag (7-point scale)                              | 0.801      | 662    | -0.184     | 773    | 0.921          | 658         | -0.194         | 770         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.096      | 192    | 0.085      | 192    | 0.131          | 192         | 0.079          | 192         |
| Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 0.645      | 662    | -0.101     | 769    | 0.657          | 658         | -0.103         | 766         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.090      | 192    | 0.075      | 192    | 0.096          | 192         | 0.084          | 192         |
| Newer lifestyles contributing to breakdown of society (5-point scale)             | 1.219      | 661    | -0.357     | 773    | 1.242          | 657         | -0.314         | 770         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.136      | 192    | 0.109      | 192    | 0.161          | 192         | 0.101          | 192         |
| Accept changes in morality (standardized composite of 2 variables)              | -0.752     | 662    | 0.312      | 773    | -0.773         | 658         | 0.238          | 770         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.093      | 192    | 0.089      | 192    | 0.121          | 192         | 0.083          | 192         |
| World is changing and we should adjust views of moral behavior accordingly (5-point scale) | -0.681     | 662    | 0.550      | 773    | -0.659         | 658         | 0.394          | 770         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.154      | 192    | 0.135      | 192    | 0.206          | 192         | 0.120          | 192         |
| Tolerance of people who choose their own moral standards (5-point scale)         | -0.983     | 659    | 0.178      | 772    | -1.046         | 655         | 0.159          | 769         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.110      | 192    | 0.115      | 192    | 0.143          | 192         | 0.119          | 192         |
| Country needs free thinkers who will have the courage to defy traditional ways (5-point scale) | 0.026      | 662    | 0.235      | 770    | 0.012          | 658         | 0.207          | 767         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.100      | 192    | 0.096      | 192    | 0.130          | 192         | 0.113          | 192         |
| Economic vulnerability (standardized composite of 4 variables)                   | 0.384      | 663    | -0.257     | 774    | 0.351          | 659         | -0.287         | 771         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.106      | 193    | 0.105      | 193    | 0.124          | 193         | 0.113          | 193         |
| Worse off financially than 1 year ago (5-point scale)                            | 0.365      | 663    | -0.246     | 773    | 0.334          | 659         | -0.274         | 770         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.101      | 193    | 0.100      | 193    | 0.118          | 193         | 0.107          | 193         |
| Will be worse off financially next year (5-point scale)                          | 0.120      | 662    | -0.169     | 764    | 0.265          | 658         | -0.027         | 761         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.079      | 193    | 0.079      | 193    | 0.090          | 193         | 0.089          | 193         |
| Worried about current financial situation (5-point scale)                        | 0.375      | 661    | 0.252      | 773    | 0.215          | 657         | 0.144          | 770         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.124      | 192    | 0.116      | 192    | 0.148          | 192         | 0.115          | 192         |
| Family member of close friend lost job in past 12 months (indicator variable)    | 0.166      | 662    | 0.096      | 773    | 0.242          | 658         | 0.026          | 770         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.045      | 192    | 0.047      | 192    | 0.049          | 192         | 0.049          | 192         |
Table S12. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney- Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                           | Raw vs O-C | Ns  | Raw vs R-T  | Ns  | Adjusted vs O-C | Ns  | Adjusted vs R-T | Ns  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----|-------------|-----|-----------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
| Economic progressivism (standardized composite of 8 variables) | -1.000     | 662 | 0.399       | 773 | -1.081          | 658 | 0.308           | 770 |
| (S.E)                                                      | 0.082     | 192 | 0.089       | 192 | 0.088           | 192 | 0.097           | 192 |
| Minimum wage should be raised (4-point scale)             | -0.398     | 661 | 0.240       | 765 | -0.257          | 657 | 0.221           | 762 |
| (S.E)                                                      | 0.066     | 192 | 0.067       | 192 | 0.087           | 192 | 0.070           | 192 |
| Favor a tax on millionaires (3-point scale)               | -0.460     | 662 | 0.345       | 772 | -0.355          | 658 | 0.373           | 769 |
| (S.E)                                                      | 0.083     | 192 | 0.092       | 192 | 0.088           | 192 | 0.095           | 192 |
| Government responsible for jobs and standard of living (7-point scale) | -1.342     | 618 | 0.628       | 726 | -1.486          | 614 | 0.425           | 723 |
| (S.E)                                                      | 0.186     | 173 | 0.188       | 173 | 0.207           | 173 | 0.202           | 173 |
| Feeling thermometer for poor people (0-100 scale)         | -7.365     | 655 | -3.178      | 760 | -8.339          | 651 | -1.805          | 757 |
| (S.E)                                                      | 2.249     | 191 | 2.366       | 191 | 2.564           | 191 | 2.304           | 191 |
| Government should reduce income differences between rich and poor (3-point scale) | -0.566     | 661 | 0.410       | 769 | -0.633          | 657 | 0.294           | 766 |
| (S.E)                                                      | 0.083     | 192 | 0.079       | 192 | 0.095           | 192 | 0.095           | 192 |
| Society should make sure everyone has equal opportunity (5-point scale) | -0.799     | 662 | -0.069      | 772 | -0.845          | 658 | -0.003          | 769 |
| (S.E)                                                      | 0.090     | 192 | 0.119       | 192 | 0.089           | 192 | 0.130           | 192 |
| Fewer problems if people were treated more equally (5-point scale) | -0.903     | 662 | 0.111       | 770 | -1.070          | 658 | 0.173           | 767 |
| (S.E)                                                      | 0.098     | 192 | 0.108       | 192 | 0.105           | 192 | 0.119           | 192 |
| Government should take measures to reduce income differences (5-point scale) | -1.094     | 660 | 0.400       | 769 | -1.329          | 656 | 0.141           | 766 |
| (S.E)                                                      | 0.141     | 190 | 0.148       | 190 | 0.141           | 190 | 0.150           | 190 |
| Economic libertarianism (standardized composite of 6 variables) | 0.969      | 662 | -0.378      | 773 | 1.040           | 658 | -0.317          | 770 |
| (S.E)                                                      | 0.093     | 192 | 0.076       | 192 | 0.105           | 192 | 0.075           | 192 |
| Country better off if we worried less about equality (5-point scale) | 1.259      | 662 | -0.361      | 771 | 1.223           | 658 | -0.328          | 768 |
| (S.E)                                                      | 0.146     | 192 | 0.129       | 192 | 0.161           | 192 | 0.125           | 192 |
| Not a big problem if people have different life chances (5-point scale) | 0.618      | 662 | -0.287      | 771 | 0.713           | 658 | -0.213          | 768 |
| (S.E)                                                      | 0.143     | 192 | 0.124       | 192 | 0.150           | 192 | 0.117           | 192 |
| Feeling thermometer for big business (0-100 scale)         | 15.042     | 657 | -3.553      | 766 | 17.369          | 653 | -1.824          | 763 |
| (S.E)                                                      | 2.224     | 190 | 1.923       | 190 | 2.710           | 190 | 1.874           | 190 |
Table S12. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                | Raw vs O-C | Raw Ns | Raw vs R-T | Raw Ns | Adjusted vs O-C | Adjusted Ns | Adjusted vs R-T | Adjusted Ns |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------|------------|--------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Feeling thermometer for rich people (0-100 scale)               | 7.642      | 655    | -1.128     | 766    | 8.983           | 651         | -2.516          | 763         |
| (S.E)                                                           | 1.819      | 192    | 1.888      | 192    | 2.190           | 192         | 2.094           | 192         |
| Government should lower regulations on banks (7-point scale)    | 0.915      | 656    | -0.622     | 757    | 0.902           | 652         | -0.657          | 754         |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.173      | 191    | 0.160      | 191    | 0.182           | 191         | 0.160           | 191         |
| Lower regulation of business is good for society (5-point scale)| 0.462      | 660    | -0.211     | 771    | 0.520           | 656         | -0.207          | 768         |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.088      | 191    | 0.080      | 191    | 0.109           | 191         | 0.096           | 191         |
| Global trade is a threat (standardized composite of 4 variables)| 0.833      | 662    | 0.256      | 773    | 0.749           | 658         | 0.141           | 770         |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.097      | 192    | 0.102      | 192    | 0.108           | 192         | 0.094           | 192         |
| Favor limits on imports to protect jobs (3-point scale)         | 0.519      | 654    | 0.008      | 758    | 0.552           | 650         | 0.012           | 755         |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.081      | 190    | 0.083      | 190    | 0.106           | 190         | 0.092           | 190         |
| Increased trade has been bad for the US (3-point scale)         | 0.579      | 656    | 0.242      | 768    | 0.508           | 652         | 0.137           | 765         |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.090      | 191    | 0.088      | 191    | 0.100           | 191         | 0.084           | 191         |
| Oppose free trade agreements with other countries (7-point scale)| 1.096      | 656    | 0.356      | 763    | 0.903           | 652         | 0.175           | 760         |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.159      | 190    | 0.174      | 190    | 0.179           | 190         | 0.168           | 190         |
| Government should discourage outsourcing of jobs (3-point scale)| 0.019      | 660    | 0.025      | 770    | 0.010           | 656         | 0.022           | 767         |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.060      | 190    | 0.057      | 190    | 0.065           | 190         | 0.062           | 190         |
| Environmental protection harms jobs (7-point scale)             | 1.868      | 588    | -0.517     | 659    | 1.732           | 584         | -0.457          | 657         |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.237      | 151    | 0.231      | 151    | 0.234           | 151         | 0.224           | 151         |
| Economy is healthy (standardized composite of 3 variables)      | -1.167     | 662    | 0.078      | 774    | -1.077          | 658         | 0.093           | 771         |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.092      | 193    | 0.085      | 193    | 0.102           | 193         | 0.087           | 193         |
| US economy these days is good (5-point scale)                   | -1.076     | 660    | 0.048      | 774    | -0.900          | 656         | 0.090           | 771         |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.091      | 193    | 0.081      | 193    | 0.107           | 193         | 0.085           | 193         |
| US economy will get better in next 12 months (5-point scale)    | -0.246     | 652    | -0.012     | 756    | -0.207          | 648         | -0.067          | 753         |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.080      | 191    | 0.092      | 191    | 0.090           | 191         | 0.106           | 191         |
| US economy has gotten better in last 12 months (5-point scale)  | -1.119     | 661    | 0.112      | 770    | -1.131          | 657         | 0.120           | 767         |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.105      | 193    | 0.101      | 193    | 0.106           | 193         | 0.107           | 193         |
### Table S12. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only

[Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw                  | Adjusted               |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
|                                                                                  | vs O-C | Ns | vs R-T | Ns | vs O-C | Ns | vs R-T | Ns |
| Increasing opportunity and equality (standardized composite of 3 variables)     | -0.050 | 663 | -0.251 | 774 | 0.139 | 659 | -0.113 | 771 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.098  | 193 | 0.084  | 193 | 0.102  | 193 | 0.119  | 193 |
| Inequality between rich and poor has declined in the past twenty years (5-point scale) | 0.481  | 660 | -0.051 | 768 | 0.449  | 656 | 0.074  | 765 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.104  | 191 | 0.104  | 191 | 0.126  | 191 | 0.110  | 191 |
| A great deal of opportunity in America to get ahead (5-point scale)             | -0.246 | 662 | -0.428 | 773 | -0.035 | 658 | -0.273 | 770 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.105  | 192 | 0.093  | 192 | 0.106  | 192 | 0.116  | 192 |
| Easier to improve financial well-being than 20 years ago (7-point scale)        | -0.087 | 657 | 0.040  | 769 | 0.129  | 653 | 0.068  | 766 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.142  | 189 | 0.148  | 189 | 0.152  | 189 | 0.181  | 189 |
| Positive black racial affect (composite of 4 variables)                         | -0.916 | 660 | -0.145 | 773 | -0.817 | 656 | -0.059 | 770 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.096  | 192 | 0.086  | 192 | 0.102  | 192 | 0.095  | 192 |
| Feeling thermometer for Black Lives Matter (0-100 scale)                         | -37.113 | 655 | 4.243  | 767 | -35.658 | 651 | 7.130  | 764 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 2.531  | 191 | 2.516  | 191 | 2.941  | 191 | 2.884  | 191 |
| Feeling thermometer for blacks (0-100 scale)                                     | -11.368 | 657 | -2.600 | 766 | -10.860 | 653 | -1.622 | 763 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 2.109  | 191 | 2.017  | 191 | 2.058  | 191 | 2.244  | 191 |
| Blacks are hard-working, not lazy (7-point scale)                               | -0.848 | 653 | -0.242 | 763 | -0.691  | 649 | -0.219  | 760 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.136  | 191 | 0.136  | 191 | 0.143  | 191 | 0.140  | 191 |
| Blacks are peaceful, not violent (7-point scale)                                | -0.872 | 651 | -0.222 | 764 | -0.746  | 647 | -0.055  | 761 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.132  | 191 | 0.116  | 191 | 0.174  | 191 | 0.130  | 191 |
| Positive Hispanic racial affect (standardized composite of 3 variables)         | -0.447 | 659 | -0.188 | 769 | -0.424  | 655 | -0.135  | 766 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.111  | 192 | 0.097  | 192 | 0.120  | 192 | 0.095  | 192 |
| Feeling thermometer for Hispanics (0-100 scale)                                 | -12.049 | 657 | -3.846 | 766 | -12.537 | 653 | -2.069  | 763 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 2.179  | 191 | 2.020  | 191 | 2.068  | 191 | 2.174  | 191 |
| Hispanics are hard-working, not lazy (7-point scale)                            | -0.243 | 653 | -0.082 | 763 | -0.342  | 649 | -0.060  | 760 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.155  | 191 | 0.139  | 191 | 0.168  | 191 | 0.135  | 191 |
| Hispanics are peaceful, not violent (7-point scale)                             | -0.375 | 651 | -0.232 | 765 | -0.197  | 647 | -0.185  | 762 |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.115  | 191 | 0.117  | 191 | 0.172  | 191 | 0.116  | 191 |
Table S12. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable | Raw vs O-C | Ns | Raw vs R-T | Ns | Adjusted vs O-C | Ns | Adjusted vs R-T | Ns |
|------------------|------------|----|------------|----|----------------|----|----------------|----|
| Positive white racial affect (standardized composite of 3 variables) | 0.191 | 659 | -0.138 | 769 | 0.324 | 655 | -0.120 | 766 |
| (S.E) | 0.098 | 192 | 0.085 | 192 | 0.106 | 192 | 0.081 | 192 |
| Feeling thermometer for whites (0-100 scale) | 0.436 | 657 | -1.361 | 766 | 2.463 | 653 | -0.040 | 763 |
| (S.E) | 1.788 | 191 | 1.812 | 191 | 1.989 | 191 | 1.974 | 191 |
| Whites are hard-working, not lazy (7-point scale) | 0.171 | 653 | -0.056 | 764 | 0.343 | 649 | -0.102 | 761 |
| (S.E) | 0.126 | 191 | 0.119 | 191 | 0.133 | 191 | 0.117 | 191 |
| Whites are peaceful, not violent (7-point scale) | 0.301 | 650 | -0.250 | 765 | 0.409 | 646 | -0.204 | 762 |
| (S.E) | 0.131 | 191 | 0.113 | 191 | 0.165 | 191 | 0.118 | 191 |
| Blacks and Hispanics confront racial obstacles (standardized composite of 3 variables) | -0.921 | 662 | 0.085 | 772 | -0.932 | 658 | 0.149 | 769 |
| (S.E) | 0.094 | 192 | 0.077 | 192 | 0.095 | 192 | 0.086 | 192 |
| Generations of slavery and discrimination make it difficult for blacks (5-point scale) | -1.447 | 662 | 0.044 | 772 | -1.459 | 658 | 0.199 | 769 |
| (S.E) | 0.120 | 192 | 0.114 | 192 | 0.165 | 192 | 0.114 | 192 |
| Discrimination against blacks (5-point scale) | -0.820 | 648 | 0.110 | 752 | -0.792 | 644 | 0.165 | 749 |
| (S.E) | 0.099 | 187 | 0.084 | 187 | 0.102 | 187 | 0.097 | 187 |
| Discrimination against Hispanics (5-point scale) | -0.631 | 651 | 0.068 | 751 | -0.685 | 647 | 0.094 | 748 |
| (S.E) | 0.099 | 190 | 0.090 | 190 | 0.113 | 190 | 0.094 | 190 |
| Discrimination against whites (standardized composite of 2 variables) | 0.903 | 661 | 0.082 | 770 | 0.784 | 657 | -0.070 | 767 |
| (S.E) | 0.104 | 192 | 0.106 | 192 | 0.119 | 192 | 0.125 | 192 |
| Discrimination against whites (5-point scale) | 0.707 | 647 | 0.180 | 751 | 0.534 | 643 | 0.035 | 748 |
| (S.E) | 0.096 | 189 | 0.095 | 189 | 0.133 | 189 | 0.111 | 189 |
| Whites can't find jobs because employers hire minorities instead (5-point scale) | 0.843 | 659 | -0.054 | 766 | 0.842 | 655 | -0.166 | 763 |
| (S.E) | 0.119 | 191 | 0.123 | 191 | 0.130 | 191 | 0.143 | 191 |
| Government should help blacks (composite of 3 variables) | -1.147 | 662 | 0.085 | 773 | -1.081 | 658 | 0.157 | 770 |
| (S.E) | 0.081 | 192 | 0.072 | 192 | 0.099 | 192 | 0.072 | 192 |
| Government should make an effort to improve position of blacks (7-point scale) | -2.117 | 607 | 0.052 | 719 | -2.146 | 604 | 0.222 | 716 |
| (S.E) | 0.149 | 181 | 0.143 | 181 | 0.191 | 181 | 0.145 | 181 |
Table S12. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only  

[Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw vs O-C | Ns  | vs R-T | Ns  | vs O-C | Ns  | vs R-T | Ns  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|
| Blacks have gotten less than they deserve (5-point scale)                      | -1.348     | 661 | 0.067  | 772 | -1.175 | 657 | 0.120  | 769 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.118      | 192 | 0.103  | 192 | 0.138  | 192 | 0.103  | 192 |
| Government treats whites better than blacks (3-point scale)                    | -1.412     | 658 | 0.303  | 763 | -1.422 | 654 | 0.410  | 760 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.155      | 192 | 0.141  | 192 | 0.167  | 192 | 0.155  | 192 |
| Blacks should work harder and should not receive favors (standardized composite of 2 variables) | 1.165      | 662 | -0.042 | 773 | 1.035  | 658 | -0.081 | 770 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.090      | 192 | 0.069  | 192 | 0.110  | 192 | 0.072  | 192 |
| Blacks should work their way up without favors (5-point scale)                 | 1.551      | 662 | -0.125 | 773 | 1.354  | 658 | -0.100 | 770 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.118      | 192 | 0.089  | 192 | 0.150  | 192 | 0.091  | 192 |
| Blacks should try harder to get ahead (5-point scale)                          | 1.508      | 661 | 0.007  | 770 | 1.363  | 657 | -0.114  | 767 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.137      | 191 | 0.115  | 191 | 0.160  | 191 | 0.123  | 191 |
| Opposition to affirmative action (standardized composite of 2 variables)       | 0.712      | 662 | -0.178 | 770 | 0.603  | 658 | -0.142  | 767 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.085      | 192 | 0.075  | 192 | 0.118  | 192 | 0.077  | 192 |
| Oppose affirmative action in universities (7-point scale)                       | 1.261      | 661 | -0.432 | 765 | 0.965  | 657 | -0.447  | 762 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.190      | 192 | 0.179  | 192 | 0.227  | 192 | 0.163  | 192 |
| Oppose preferential hiring and promotion of blacks (4-point scale)             | 0.616      | 651 | -0.103 | 765 | 0.574  | 647 | -0.027  | 762 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.077      | 190 | 0.066  | 190 | 0.119  | 190 | 0.082  | 190 |
| Majoritarian racial dominance (standardized composite of 2 variables)          | 0.726      | 662 | -0.199 | 770 | 0.657  | 658 | -0.197  | 767 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.104      | 192 | 0.090  | 192 | 0.112  | 192 | 0.097  | 192 |
| Minorities should adapt to customs and traditions of the US (5-point scale)    | 0.773      | 662 | -0.318 | 769 | 0.705  | 658 | -0.222  | 766 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.120      | 192 | 0.110  | 192 | 0.144  | 192 | 0.107  | 192 |
| The will of the majority should always prevail, even over the rights of minorities (5-point scale) | 0.749      | 662 | -0.101 | 767 | 0.673  | 658 | -0.194  | 764 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.123      | 192 | 0.115  | 192 | 0.144  | 192 | 0.131  | 192 |
| Important that whites work together to change laws unfair to whites            | 0.586      | 657 | -0.117 | 763 | 0.745  | 653 | -0.112  | 760 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.140      | 190 | 0.115  | 190 | 0.154  | 190 | 0.124  | 190 |
| Positive immigration affect (standardized composite of 6 variables)            | -1.152     | 662 | -0.034 | 773 | -1.126 | 658 | 0.065  | 770 |
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Table S12. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable | Raw vs O-C Ns | Raw vs R-T Ns | Adjusted vs O-C Ns | Adjusted vs R-T Ns |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| (S.E) | 0.094 192 | 0.067 192 | 0.095 192 | 0.072 192 |
| Not important everyone in US learns English (4-point scale) | -0.460 662 | 0.104 773 | -0.449 658 | 0.084 770 |
| (S.E) | 0.085 192 | 0.056 192 | 0.089 192 | 0.054 192 |
| America's culture is not harmed by immigrants (5-point scale) | -1.300 662 | -0.069 769 | -1.278 658 | 0.078 766 |
| (S.E) | 0.099 192 | 0.095 192 | 0.110 192 | 0.099 192 |
| Immigrants do not increase crime (5-point scale) | -1.526 661 | -0.126 768 | -1.485 657 | -0.086 765 |
| (S.E) | 0.092 191 | 0.086 191 | 0.111 191 | 0.096 191 |
| Not important to be born in the US to be truly American (4-point scale) | -0.674 661 | -0.021 769 | -0.704 657 | 0.082 766 |
| (S.E) | 0.123 191 | 0.101 191 | 0.138 191 | 0.097 191 |
| Not important to have American ancestry to be truly American (4-point scale) | -0.725 662 | -0.106 770 | -0.690 658 | 0.059 767 |
| (S.E) | 0.093 192 | 0.094 192 | 0.138 192 | 0.099 192 |
| Not important to speak English to be truly American (4-point scale) | -0.612 662 | 0.058 772 | -0.577 658 | 0.061 769 |
| (S.E) | 0.078 192 | 0.050 192 | 0.085 192 | 0.052 192 |
| Negative views of unauthorized immigrants (standardized composite of 2 variables) | 1.109 662 | -0.013 773 | 1.103 658 | -0.099 770 |
| (S.E) | 0.096 192 | 0.096 192 | 0.097 192 | 0.100 192 |
| Make unauthorized immigrants felons and send them back (4-point scale) | 0.891 660 | 0.047 771 | 0.864 656 | -0.046 768 |
| (S.E) | 0.086 191 | 0.096 191 | 0.086 191 | 0.094 191 |
| Feeling thermometer for illegal immigrants (0-100 scale) | 24.231 658 | -1.896 766 | 24.983 654 | -3.016 763 |
| (S.E) | 2.884 190 | 2.412 190 | 2.821 190 | 2.703 190 |
| Immigrants take jobs and hurt economy (standardized composite of 2 variables) | 1.094 662 | 0.073 772 | 1.117 658 | -0.033 769 |
| (S.E) | 0.094 192 | 0.095 192 | 0.103 192 | 0.103 192 |
| Recent immigrants have taken jobs away from people already here (4-point scale) | 0.983 661 | 0.037 771 | 1.036 657 | -0.033 768 |
| (S.E) | 0.101 192 | 0.104 192 | 0.116 192 | 0.109 192 |
| Immigrants are not good for America's economy (5-point scale) | 0.966 660 | 0.094 770 | 0.950 656 | -0.029 767 |
| (S.E) | 0.106 192 | 0.105 192 | 0.111 192 | 0.116 192 |
| Number of immigrants should be increased (5-point scale) | -1.195 660 | 0.050 771 | -1.263 656 | 0.074 768 |
Table S12. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters, WONH only [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable | Raw vs O-C Ns | Raw vs R-T Ns | Adjusted vs O-C Ns | Adjusted vs R-T Ns |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| (S.E)            | 0.108        | 191          | 0.114             | 191               | 0.130             | 191               | 0.109             | 191               |
Table S13. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable | Raw vs O-C | Raw Ns | Adjusted vs R-T | Adjusted Ns |
|------------------|------------|--------|-----------------|-------------|
| Party identification (7-point scale from 1 for strong Democrat to 7 for strong Republican) | 3.649 | 927 | -0.612 | 840 | 3.595 | 922 | -0.499 | 837 |
| (S.E) | 0.143 | 214 | 0.137 | 214 | 0.128 | 214 | 0.144 | 214 |
| Conservative ideology and affect (standardized composite of 4 variables) | 1.225 | 927 | -0.400 | 839 | 1.384 | 922 | -0.353 | 836 |
| (S.E) | 0.073 | 214 | 0.065 | 214 | 0.080 | 214 | 0.070 | 214 |
| Conservative-liberal self-rating on pre-election survey (7-point scale) | 2.193 | 763 | -0.558 | 736 | 2.384 | 759 | -0.574 | 733 |
| (S.E) | 0.129 | 171 | 0.119 | 171 | 0.142 | 171 | 0.119 | 171 |
| Conservative-liberal self-rating on post-election survey (7-point scale) | 2.046 | 811 | -0.605 | 768 | 2.283 | 807 | -0.535 | 765 |
| (S.E) | 0.131 | 171 | 0.120 | 171 | 0.140 | 171 | 0.119 | 171 |
| Feeling thermometer for liberals (0-100 scale, reversed) | 33.632 | 915 | -7.996 | 835 | 35.847 | 910 | -8.408 | 832 |
| (S.E) | 0.126 | 214 | 0.096 | 214 | 0.103 | 214 | 0.099 | 214 |
| Feeling thermometer for conservatives (0-100 scale) | 26.991 | 917 | -7.793 | 832 | 30.498 | 912 | -6.308 | 829 |
| (S.E) | 0.131 | 171 | 0.120 | 171 | 0.140 | 171 | 0.119 | 171 |
| Union involvement and affect (standardized composite of 2 variables) | -0.491 | 928 | 0.346 | 840 | -0.417 | 923 | 0.209 | 837 |
| (S.E) | 0.099 | 214 | 0.096 | 214 | 0.103 | 214 | 0.099 | 214 |
| You or anyone in household belong to a labor union (indicator variable) | -0.058 | 927 | 0.067 | 839 | -0.043 | 922 | 0.027 | 836 |
| (S.E) | 0.038 | 214 | 0.037 | 214 | 0.038 | 214 | 0.038 | 214 |
| Feeling thermometer for labor unions (0-100 scale) | -15.378 | 921 | 9.075 | 833 | -13.419 | 916 | 6.483 | 830 |
| (S.E) | 2.156 | 212 | 2.131 | 212 | 2.310 | 212 | 2.279 | 212 |
| Political interest (standardized composite of 9 variables) | -0.490 | 928 | -0.443 | 840 | -0.434 | 923 | -0.258 | 837 |
| (S.E) | 0.101 | 214 | 0.098 | 214 | 0.107 | 214 | 0.098 | 214 |
| Often pay attention to government and politics (5-point scale) | -0.414 | 928 | -0.474 | 840 | -0.403 | 923 | -0.286 | 837 |
| (S.E) | 0.095 | 214 | 0.098 | 214 | 0.090 | 214 | 0.107 | 214 |
| Interested in following political campaigns (3-point scale) | -0.233 | 928 | -0.227 | 840 | -0.237 | 923 | -0.114 | 837 |
| (S.E) | 0.075 | 214 | 0.070 | 214 | 0.077 | 214 | 0.071 | 214 |
| Pay attention to news about national politics (5-point scale) | -0.390 | 927 | -0.354 | 840 | -0.223 | 923 | -0.114 | 837 |
Table S13. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable | Raw vs O-C Ns | Raw vs R-T Ns | Adjusted vs O-C Ns | Adjusted vs R-T Ns |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| (S.E) Care who wins presidential election (5-point scale) | 0.096 214 | 0.098 214 | 0.114 214 | 0.098 214 |
| (S.E) Joined a protest in past 12 months (indicator variable) | -0.036 928 | -0.347 383 | -0.016 923 | 0.012 836 |
| (S.E) Signed a petition in past 12 months (indicator variable) | 0.011 214 | -0.017 214 | 0.007 214 | 0.017 214 |
| (S.E) Bought or boycotted a product or service in past 12 months (5-point scale) | -0.375 926 | -0.375 921 | -0.375 921 | -0.059 831 |
| (S.E) Interest in politics (4-point scale) | -0.076 213 | -0.078 213 | 0.078 213 | 0.071 213 |
| (S.E) Closely follow politics in media (4-point scale) | -0.240 926 | -0.231 921 | 0.082 213 | 0.072 213 |
| (S.E) Rich control politics (standardized composite of 2 variables) | -0.266 926 | -0.510 921 | -0.510 921 | -0.014 835 |
| (S.E) Rich people buy elections (5-point scale) | -0.086 213 | -0.095 213 | 0.082 213 | 0.085 213 |
| (S.E) Most politicians care about interests of rich and powerful (5-point scale) | -0.154 926 | -0.299 921 | 0.096 213 | 0.115 211 |
| (S.E) Days per week talk about politics with family or friends (scale from 0 to 7 days) | 0.092 213 | 0.010 213 | 0.096 213 | 0.092 213 |
| (S.E) Decided how to vote within one month of the election (indicator variable) | 0.244 213 | 0.249 213 | 0.266 213 | 0.267 213 |
| (S.E) Value tradition and the past (standardized composite of 4 variables) | 0.065 213 | 0.072 213 | 0.072 213 | 0.062 213 |
| (S.E) US position in the world weaker in past year (3-point scale) | 0.673 926 | 0.625 921 | 0.625 921 | 0.082 834 |
Table S13. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw               | Adjusted              |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
|                                                                                  | vs O-C Ns         | vs R-T Ns             | vs O-C Ns         | vs R-T Ns             |
| (S.E) Feels good to see the American flag (7-point scale)                        | 0.046 213         | 0.036 213             | 0.061 213         | 0.040 213             |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 0.823 927         | -0.235 839            | 0.870 922         | -0.228 836            |
| (S.E) Newer lifestyles contributing to breakdown of society (5-point scale)       | 0.082 213         | 0.083 213             | 0.108 213         | 0.072 213             |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 0.513 925         | -0.119 835            | 0.632 920         | -0.083 832            |
| (S.E) Newer lifestyles contributing to breakdown of society (5-point scale)       | 0.082 213         | 0.075 213             | 0.086 213         | 0.079 213             |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 1.011 923         | -0.318 839            | 1.247 918         | -0.186 836            |
| (S.E) Newer lifestyles contributing to breakdown of society (5-point scale)       | 0.113 213         | 0.109 213             | 0.136 213         | 0.113 213             |
| (S.E) Accept changes in morality (standardized composite of 2 variables)         | 0.823 927         | 0.295 839             | -0.821 921        | 0.220 836             |
| (S.E) World is changing and we should adjust views of moral behavior accordingly (5-point scale) | 0.083 213         | 0.083 213             | 0.103 213         | 0.079 213             |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | -0.769 926        | 0.537 839             | -0.771 921        | 0.413 836             |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 0.131 213         | 0.129 213             | 0.167 213         | 0.113 213             |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | -0.909 923        | 0.154 837             | -1.049 918        | 0.112 834             |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 0.102 213         | 0.105 213             | 0.128 213         | 0.113 213             |
| (S.E) Economic vulnerability (standardized composite of 4 variables)             | 0.176 927         | 0.261 836             | 0.023 922         | 0.241 833             |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 0.094 213         | 0.089 213             | 0.106 213         | 0.097 213             |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 0.446 928         | -0.237 840            | 0.426 923         | -0.221 837            |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 0.099 214         | 0.104 214             | 0.112 214         | 0.107 214             |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 0.425 927         | -0.227 839            | 0.405 922         | -0.211 836            |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 0.094 214         | 0.099 214             | 0.107 214         | 0.101 214             |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 0.226 923         | -0.161 829            | 0.301 918         | -0.032 826            |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 0.073 213         | 0.073 213             | 0.076 213         | 0.078 213             |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 0.189 926         | 0.257 839             | 0.199 921         | 0.176 836             |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 0.115 213         | 0.114 213             | 0.119 213         | 0.115 213             |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 0.137 925         | 0.090 839             | 0.218 920         | 0.009 836             |
| (S.E) Important to follow American's customs and traditions to be truly American (4-point scale) | 0.042 213         | 0.046 213             | 0.043 213         | 0.045 213             |
Table S13. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable | Raw vs O-C Ns | Raw vs R-T Ns | Adjusted vs O-C Ns | Adjusted vs R-T Ns |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Economic progressivism (standardized composite of 8 variables) | -0.990 927 | 0.407 839 | -1.057 922 | 0.317 836 |
| (S.E) | 0.072 213 | 0.080 213 | 0.079 213 | 0.089 213 |
| Minimum wage should be raised (4-point scale) | -0.383 925 | 0.253 830 | -0.284 920 | 0.218 827 |
| (S.E) | 0.059 213 | 0.067 213 | 0.082 213 | 0.068 213 |
| Favor a tax on millionaires (3-point scale) | -0.392 925 | 0.318 838 | -0.375 920 | 0.330 835 |
| (S.E) | 0.074 213 | 0.080 213 | 0.075 213 | 0.084 213 |
| Government responsible for jobs and standard of living (7-point scale) | -1.356 849 | 0.672 790 | -1.427 844 | 0.533 787 |
| (S.E) | 0.162 193 | 0.168 193 | 0.178 193 | 0.187 193 |
| Feeling thermometer for poor people (0-100 scale) | -9.203 917 | -2.800 826 | -7.638 912 | -1.548 823 |
| (S.E) | 1.997 212 | 2.260 212 | 2.274 212 | 2.219 212 |
| Government should reduce income differences between rich and poor (3-point scale) | -0.545 923 | 0.389 835 | -0.637 918 | 0.291 832 |
| (S.E) | 0.072 213 | 0.073 213 | 0.082 213 | 0.085 213 |
| Society should make sure everyone has equal opportunity (5-point scale) | -0.773 926 | -0.055 838 | -0.808 921 | 0.029 835 |
| (S.E) | 0.090 213 | 0.116 213 | 0.085 213 | 0.122 213 |
| Fewer problems if people were treated more equally (5-point scale) | -0.940 927 | 0.112 835 | -1.018 922 | 0.136 832 |
| (S.E) | 0.103 213 | 0.117 213 | 0.094 213 | 0.122 213 |
| Government should take measures to reduce income differences (5-point scale) | -1.122 922 | 0.435 835 | -1.278 917 | 0.187 832 |
| (S.E) | 0.119 211 | 0.135 211 | 0.123 211 | 0.141 211 |
| Economic libertarianism (standardized composite of 6 variables) | 0.863 927 | -0.382 839 | 1.011 922 | -0.296 836 |
| (S.E) | 0.082 213 | 0.068 213 | 0.096 213 | 0.075 213 |
| Country better off if we worried less about equality (5-point scale) | 1.076 925 | -0.346 837 | 1.219 920 | -0.315 834 |
| (S.E) | 0.128 213 | 0.121 213 | 0.138 213 | 0.113 213 |
| Not a big problem if people have different life chances (5-point scale) | 0.567 925 | -0.290 835 | 0.662 920 | -0.197 832 |
| (S.E) | 0.123 213 | 0.117 213 | 0.136 213 | 0.117 213 |
| Feeling thermometer for big business (0-100 scale) | 11.988 919 | -3.146 832 | 16.894 914 | -0.719 829 |
| (S.E) | 2.170 211 | 1.913 211 | 2.502 211 | 2.034 211 |
Table S13. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw        | Adjusted   |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|
|                                                                                | vs O-C Ns | vs R-T Ns | vs O-C Ns | vs R-T Ns |
| Feeling thermometer for rich people (0-100 scale)                               | 8.178 914 | -3.768 830 | 9.076 909 | -2.165 827 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 1.611 213 | 1.175 213 | 1.897 213 | 1.899 213 |
| Government should lower regulations on banks (7-point scale)                    | 0.813 920 | -0.694 822 | 0.830 915 | -0.645 819 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.162 212 | 0.152 212 | 0.163 212 | 0.150 212 |
| Lower regulation of business is good for society (5-point scale)               | 0.483 923 | -0.238 837 | 0.519 918 | -0.232 834 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.072 212 | 0.072 212 | 0.088 212 | 0.080 212 |
| Global trade is a threat (standardized composite of 4 variables)               | 0.779 927 | 0.224 839 | 0.742 922 | 0.097 836 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.086 213 | 0.096 213 | 0.092 213 | 0.090 213 |
| Favor limits on imports to protect jobs (3-point scale)                        | 0.486 912 | -0.021 822 | 0.535 907 | -0.045 819 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.072 211 | 0.080 211 | 0.088 211 | 0.087 211 |
| Increased trade has been bad for the US (3-point scale)                        | 0.508 917 | 0.202 833 | 0.465 912 | 0.113 830 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.083 212 | 0.088 212 | 0.088 212 | 0.081 212 |
| Oppose free trade agreements with other countries (7-point scale)              | 1.037 919 | 0.360 828 | 0.965 914 | 0.139 825 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.136 211 | 0.162 211 | 0.156 211 | 0.148 211 |
| Government should discourage outsourcing of jobs (3-point scale)               | 0.080 923 | 0.025 834 | 0.042 918 | 0.012 831 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.053 211 | 0.054 211 | 0.058 211 | 0.056 211 |
| Environmental protection harms jobs (7-point scale)                            | 1.736 814 | -0.540 721 | 1.756 809 | -0.496 719 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.201 170 | 0.204 170 | 0.191 170 | 0.202 170 |
| Economy is healthy (standardized composite of 3 variables)                    | -1.158 927 | 0.075 840 | -1.112 922 | 0.064 837 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.083 214 | 0.083 214 | 0.089 214 | 0.084 214 |
| US economy these days is good (5-point scale)                                  | -1.022 924 | 0.051 840 | -0.917 919 | 0.071 837 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.079 214 | 0.076 214 | 0.090 214 | 0.079 214 |
| US economy will get better in next 12 months (5-point scale)                   | -0.300 907 | -0.017 820 | -0.272 902 | -0.032 817 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.075 211 | 0.088 211 | 0.079 211 | 0.099 211 |
| US economy has gotten better in last 12 months (5-point scale)                 | -1.133 924 | 0.105 836 | -1.159 919 | 0.069 833 |
| (S.E)                                                                           | 0.096 214 | 0.099 214 | 0.096 214 | 0.104 214 |
Table S13. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw vs O-C | Raw Ns | Raw vs R-T | Raw Ns | Adjusted vs O-C | Adjusted Ns | Adjusted vs R-T | Adjusted Ns |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------|------------|--------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| Increasing opportunity and equality (standardized composite of 3 variables)      | -0.158     | 928    | -0.219     | 840    | 0.104          | 923         | -0.110         | 837         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.084      | 214    | 0.082      | 214    | 0.088          | 214         | 0.109          | 214         |
| Inequality between rich and poor has declined in the past twenty years (5-point scale) | 0.361      | 924    | -0.042     | 834    | 0.438          | 919         | 0.105          | 831         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.088      | 212    | 0.100      | 212    | 0.097          | 212         | 0.102          | 212         |
| A great deal of opportunity in America to get ahead (5-point scale)              | -0.245     | 926    | -0.393     | 838    | -0.031         | 921         | -0.297         | 835         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.084      | 212    | 0.088      | 212    | 0.090          | 212         | 0.113          | 212         |
| Easier to improve financial well-being than 20 years ago (7-point scale)         | -0.315     | 921    | 0.066      | 834    | 0.019          | 916         | 0.086          | 831         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.137      | 209    | 0.142      | 209    | 0.136          | 209         | 0.167          | 209         |
| Positive black racial affect (composite of 4 variables)                          | -0.965     | 925    | -0.127     | 839    | -0.851         | 920         | -0.052         | 836         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.080      | 213    | 0.078      | 213    | 0.092          | 213         | 0.086          | 213         |
| Feeling thermometer for Black Lives Matter (0-100 scale)                         | -40.303    | 910    | 5.231      | 833    | -35.872        | 905         | 6.864          | 830         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 2.296      | 212    | 2.503      | 212    | 2.575          | 212         | 2.762          | 212         |
| Feeling thermometer for blacks (0-100 scale)                                     | -12.409    | 918    | -2.203     | 832    | -11.328        | 913         | -1.677         | 829         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 1.858      | 212    | 1.847      | 212    | 1.824          | 212         | 2.055          | 212         |
| Blacks are hard-working, not lazy (7-point scale)                               | -0.915     | 912    | -0.223     | 827    | -0.752         | 907         | -0.171         | 824         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.127      | 212    | 0.122      | 212    | 0.131          | 212         | 0.122          | 212         |
| Blacks are peaceful, not violent (7-point scale)                                | -0.844     | 910    | -0.220     | 828    | -0.774         | 905         | -0.047         | 825         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.104      | 212    | 0.112      | 212    | 0.150          | 212         | 0.119          | 212         |
| Positive Hispanic racial affect (standardized composite of 3 variables)         | -0.509     | 920    | -0.240     | 835    | -0.458         | 915         | -0.237         | 832         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.091      | 213    | 0.090      | 213    | 0.106          | 213         | 0.093          | 213         |
| Feeling thermometer for Hispanics (0-100 scale)                                 | -11.738    | 918    | -4.100     | 832    | -12.516        | 913         | -2.790         | 829         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 1.881      | 212    | 1.917      | 212    | 1.786          | 212         | 2.104          | 212         |
| Hispanics are hard-working, not lazy (7-point scale)                            | -0.425     | 911    | -0.138     | 827    | -0.390         | 906         | -0.181         | 824         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.137      | 212    | 0.137      | 212    | 0.154          | 212         | 0.137          | 212         |
| Hispanics are peaceful, not violent (7-point scale)                             | -0.375     | 909    | -0.298     | 829    | -0.242         | 904         | -0.286         | 826         |
| (S.E)                                                                            | 0.099      | 212    | 0.111      | 212    | 0.145          | 212         | 0.108          | 212         |
Table S13. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                | Raw vs O-C | Ns | Raw vs R-T | Ns | Adjusted vs O-C | Ns | Adjusted vs R-T | Ns |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----|------------|----|----------------|----|----------------|----|
| Positive white racial affect (standardized composite of 3 variables) | 0.284 213 920 | -0.151 213 835 | 0.364 213 915 | -0.165 213 832 |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.094 213 920 | 0.085 213 835 | 0.099 213 915 | 0.076 213 832 |
| Feeling thermometer for whites (0-100 scale)                    | 1.970 212 918 | -1.014 212 832 | 3.036 212 913 | 0.335 212 829 |
| (S.E)                                                           | 1.665 212 918 | 1.692 212 832 | 1.796 212 913 | 1.719 212 829 |
| Whites are hard-working, not lazy (7-point scale)               | 0.202 212 912 | -0.060 212 828 | 0.373 212 907 | -0.130 212 825 |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.120 212 912 | 0.114 212 828 | 0.125 212 907 | -0.112 212 825 |
| Whites are peaceful, not violent (7-point scale)                | 0.457 212 908 | -0.295 212 829 | 0.459 212 903 | -0.291 212 826 |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.125 212 908 | 0.117 212 829 | 0.141 212 903 | 0.104 212 826 |
| Blacks and Hispanics confront racial obstacles (standardized composite of 3 variables) | -0.960 212 926 | 0.134 212 838 | -0.927 212 921 | 0.177 212 835 |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.079 212 926 | 0.071 212 838 | 0.083 212 921 | 0.078 212 835 |
| Generations of slavery and discrimination make it difficult for blacks (5-point scale) | -1.520 212 924 | -0.084 212 838 | -1.484 212 919 | 0.235 212 835 |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.114 212 924 | 0.109 212 838 | 0.136 212 919 | 0.099 212 835 |
| Discrimination against blacks (5-point scale)                   | -0.849 207 905 | 0.170 207 815 | -0.779 207 900 | 0.205 207 812 |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.087 207 905 | 0.079 207 815 | 0.090 207 900 | 0.086 207 812 |
| Discrimination against Hispanics (5-point scale)                | -0.667 207 905 | 0.091 207 815 | -0.687 207 900 | 0.093 207 810 |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.080 207 905 | 0.085 207 815 | 0.095 207 900 | 0.092 207 810 |
| Discrimination against whites (5-point scale)                   | 0.658 897 916 | 0.149 897 814 | 0.546 897 892 | 0.048 897 811 |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.093 897 916 | 0.097 897 814 | 0.113 897 892 | 0.109 897 810 |
| Government should help blacks (composite of 3 variables)        | -1.208 213 926 | 0.119 213 839 | -1.084 213 921 | 0.171 213 836 |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.082 213 926 | 0.074 213 839 | 0.086 213 921 | 0.069 213 836 |
| Government should make an effort to improve position of blacks (7-point scale) | -2.200 201 843 | 0.095 201 781 | -2.093 201 839 | 0.222 201 778 |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.148 201 843 | 0.136 201 781 | 0.166 201 839 | 0.139 201 778 |
| Blacks have gotten less than they deserve (5-point scale)       | -1.369 201 923 | 0.099 201 838 | -1.199 201 918 | 0.155 201 835 |
| (S.E)                                                           | 0.110 201 923 | 0.103 201 838 | 0.119 201 918 | 0.097 201 835 |
| Government treats whites better than blacks (3-point scale)     | -1.582 213 919 | 0.372 213 828 | -1.416 213 914 | 0.426 213 825 |
Table S13. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable | Raw vs O-C Ns | Raw vs R-T Ns | Adjusted vs O-C Ns | Adjusted vs R-T Ns |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| (S.E)            |              |              |                    |                   |
| Blacks should work harder and should not receive favors (standardized composite of 2 variables) | 0.161 213 | 0.147 213 | 0.152 213 | 0.143 213 |
| (S.E)            | 1.021 925    | -0.067 839   | 0.999 920         | -0.103 836       |
| Blacks should work their way up without favors (5-point scale) | 0.082 213 | 0.067 213 | 0.092 213 | 0.064 213 |
| (S.E)            | 1.395 922    | -0.154 838   | 1.326 917         | -0.144 835       |
| Blacks should try harder to get ahead (5-point scale) | 0.103 213 | 0.087 213 | 0.125 213 | 0.083 213 |
| (S.E)            | 1.289 923    | -0.030 835   | 1.297 918         | -0.134 832       |
| Opposition to affirmative action (standardized composite of 2 variables) | 0.129 212 | 0.110 212 | 0.137 212 | 0.109 212 |
| (S.E)            | 0.850 925    | -0.202 836   | 0.677 920         | -0.191 833       |
| Oppose affirmative action in universities (7-point scale) | 0.079 213 | 0.070 213 | 0.101 213 | 0.070 213 |
| (S.E)            | 1.385 922    | -0.489 831   | 1.030 917         | -0.549 828       |
| Oppose preferential hiring and promotion of blacks (4-point scale) | 0.186 213 | 0.169 213 | 0.199 213 | 0.152 213 |
| (S.E)            | 0.813 901    | -0.115 831   | 0.680 896         | -0.061 828       |
| Majoritarian racial dominance (standardized composite of 2 variables) | 0.069 211 | 0.061 211 | 0.100 211 | 0.074 211 |
| (S.E)            | 0.663 925    | -0.196 836   | 0.674 920         | -0.161 833       |
| Minorities should adapt to customs and traditions of the US (5-point scale) | 0.085 213 | 0.082 213 | 0.095 213 | 0.088 213 |
| (S.E)            | 0.693 925    | -0.319 834   | 0.737 920         | -0.197 831       |
| The will of the majority should always prevail, even over the rights of minorities (5-point scale) | 0.102 213 | 0.099 213 | 0.125 213 | 0.095 213 |
| (S.E)            | 0.698 925    | -0.094 833   | 0.676 920         | -0.143 830       |
| Positive immigration affect (standardized composite of 6 variables) | 0.103 213 | 0.108 213 | 0.117 213 | 0.122 213 |
| (S.E)            | -0.909 927   | -0.010 839   | -1.043 922        | 0.076 836        |
| Not important everyone in US learns English (4-point scale) | 0.068 213 | 0.065 213 | 0.079 213 | 0.067 213 |
| (S.E)            | -0.383 927   | 0.100 839    | -0.451 922        | 0.081 836        |
| America's culture is not harmed by immigrants (5-point scale) | 0.064 213 | 0.051 213 | 0.077 213 | 0.049 213 |
| (S.E)            | -1.057 925   | -0.044 835   | -1.171 920        | 0.067 832        |
|                  | 0.096 213    | 0.098 213    | 0.100 213         | 0.110 213        |
Table S13. Differences between 2016 Trump voters who did not vote in 2012 for a reason other than age and Obama-Clinton (O-C) and Romney-Trump (R-T) voters [Notes: Table continues on multiple pages. Rows in red are the core results, analogous to those reported in the main article. Rows in black are additional indicator-specific results for the composite in red immediately above each set. Rows labeled S.E. are standard errors for each difference. For Ns, the top number is the raw N for the model for each outcome, and the bottom number is the raw N for the new 2016 Trump voters.]

| Outcome variable                                                                 | Raw vs O-C | Ns  | Raw vs R-T | Ns  | Adjusted vs O-C | Ns  | Adjusted vs R-T | Ns  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|-----------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
| Immigrants do not increase crime (5-point scale)                                 | -1.319     | 924 | -0.086     | 833 | -1.398          | 919 | -0.051          | 830 |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.083      | 212 | 0.085      | 212 | 0.094           | 212 | 0.088           | 212 |
| Not important to be born in the US to be truly American (4-point scale)          | -0.458     | 924 | 0.024      | 834 | -0.587          | 919 | 0.136           | 831 |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.095      | 212 | 0.097      | 212 | 0.112           | 212 | 0.090           | 212 |
| Not important to have American ancestry to be truly American (4-point scale)     | -0.510     | 924 | -0.093     | 835 | -0.614          | 919 | 0.043           | 832 |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.082      | 213 | 0.092      | 213 | 0.109           | 213 | 0.097           | 213 |
| Not important to speak English to be truly American (4-point scale)              | -0.496     | 925 | 0.054      | 838 | -0.582          | 920 | 0.052           | 835 |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.057      | 213 | 0.046      | 213 | 0.074           | 213 | 0.046           | 213 |
| Negative views of unauthorized immigrants (standardized composite of 2 variables) | 1.055      | 927 | -0.025     | 839 | 1.084           | 922 | -0.103          | 836 |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.079      | 213 | 0.088      | 213 | 0.081           | 213 | 0.089           | 213 |
| Make unauthorized immigrants felons and send them back (4-point scale)           | 0.787      | 920 | 0.028      | 837 | 0.826           | 915 | -0.064          | 834 |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.077      | 212 | 0.088      | 212 | 0.071           | 212 | 0.084           | 212 |
| Feeling thermometer for illegal immigrants (0-100 scale)                         | 25.135     | 918 | -1.883     | 831 | 25.363          | 913 | -2.584          | 828 |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 2.270      | 211 | 2.331      | 211 | 2.417           | 211 | 2.446           | 211 |
| Immigrants take jobs and hurt economy (standardized composite of 2 variables)    | 0.908      | 927 | 0.037      | 838 | 1.020           | 922 | -0.033          | 835 |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.086      | 213 | 0.088      | 213 | 0.083           | 213 | 0.100           | 213 |
| Recent immigrants have taken jobs away from people already here (4-point scale)  | 0.808      | 925 | 0.007      | 837 | 0.950           | 920 | -0.037          | 834 |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.093      | 213 | 0.094      | 213 | 0.097           | 213 | 0.105           | 213 |
| Immigrants are not good for America's economy (5-point scale)                    | 0.814      | 922 | 0.060      | 836 | 0.864           | 917 | -0.024          | 833 |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.092      | 213 | 0.099      | 213 | 0.091           | 213 | 0.108           | 213 |
| Number of immigrants should be increased (5-point scale)                         | -1.103     | 922 | 0.049      | 837 | -1.260          | 917 | 0.044           | 834 |
| (S.E)                                                                             | 0.095      | 212 | 0.109      | 212 | 0.104           | 212 | 0.101           | 212 |
Table S14. Average probability differences of voting for Trump from eighteen logistic regression models, WONH voters only with covariates for age, gender, region, education, and EGP class

| Economic interests:                              | Fourteen models (one model for each variable) | Three models (each set of variables specified separately) | One model (all variables specified together) |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| All WONH voters                                  | All WONH voters                               | All WONH voters                                          | All WONH voters                            |
| Further restricted to non-defectors               | Further restricted to non-defectors            | Further restricted to non-defectors                       | Further restricted to non-defectors         |
| Economic vulnerability                           | 0.149                                         | 0.021                                                   | 0.012                                       | 0.012                                       |
|                                                 | (0.014)                                       | (0.010)                                                 | (0.010)                                    | (0.010)                                    |
| Global trade is a threat                         | 0.134                                         | 0.045                                                   | 0.025                                       | 0.022                                       |
|                                                 | (0.014)                                       | (0.010)                                                 | (0.010)                                    | (0.009)                                    |
| Economy is healthy                               | -0.261                                        | -0.122                                                  | -0.088                                      | -0.083                                      |
|                                                 | (0.010)                                       | (0.012)                                                 | (0.012)                                    | (0.012)                                    |
| Economic progressivism                           | -0.252                                        | -0.126                                                  | -0.097                                      | -0.096                                      |
|                                                 | (0.007)                                       | (0.011)                                                 | (0.012)                                    | (0.011)                                    |
| Economic libertarianism                          | 0.241                                         | 0.072                                                   | 0.033                                       | 0.044                                       |
|                                                 | (0.009)                                       | (0.012)                                                 | (0.013)                                    | (0.014)                                    |
| Racial attitudes:                                |                                               |                                                         |                                             |                                             |
|Blacks should work harder and                     | 0.251                                         | 0.132                                                   | 0.038                                       | 0.029                                       |
|should not receive favors                         | (0.007)                                       | (0.015)                                                 | (0.016)                                    | (0.014)                                    |
|Blacks and Hispanics confront                     | -0.236                                        | -0.133                                                  | -0.048                                      | -0.047                                      |
|racial obstacles                                  | (0.011)                                       | (0.013)                                                 | (0.010)                                    | (0.010)                                    |
|Opposition to affirmative action                  | 0.207                                         | 0.033                                                   | -0.022                                      | -0.019                                      |
|Discrimination against whites                    | 0.143                                         | 0.054                                                   | 0.010                                       | 0.010                                       |
|Positive black racial affect                     | -0.181                                        | -0.050                                                  | -0.002                                      | -0.006                                      |
|Positive Hispanic racial affect                   | -0.069                                        | 0.011                                                   | 0.010                                       | 0.014                                       |
|Immigration attitudes:                            |                                               |                                                         |                                             |                                             |
|Negative views of unauthorized immigrants         | 0.249                                         | 0.153                                                   | 0.044                                       | 0.047                                       |
|Immigrants take jobs and hurt                     | 0.228                                         | 0.088                                                   | 0.019                                       | 0.010                                       |
|economy                                          | (0.010)                                       | (0.014)                                                 | (0.014)                                    | (0.012)                                    |
|Number of immigrants should be increased          | -0.187                                        | -0.072                                                  | -0.013                                      | -0.013                                      |
|                                                 | (0.009)                                       | (0.012)                                                 | (0.011)                                    | (0.012)                                    |

Source: ANES 2016 Time Series Study (December 18, 2018 release)

Notes: Standard errors of the average probability differences are in parentheses. The sample is restricted to those aged 23 or older in 2016, so that those who were ineligible to vote in 2012 because of age were excluded. The raw N varies slightly by model (from 1,415–1,488 for the first column to 1,337–1,375 for the second column). Additional cases are lost to listwise deletion for subsequent models, so that the Ns for the corresponding kitchen sink models in the last two columns are 1,376 and 1,300.
**Table S15 (for comparison with Table S14).** Average probability differences of voting for Trump from eighteen logistic regression models, WONH voters only with covariates for age, gender, region, education, EGP class, and party identification

| Economic interests: | Fourteen models (one model for each variable) | Three models (each set of variables specified separately) | One model (all variables specified together) |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
|                     | All WONH voters | Further restricted to non-defectors | All WONH voters | Further restricted to non-defectors | All WONH voters | Further restricted to non-defectors |
| Economic vulnerability | 0.041 (0.008) | 0.033 (0.006) | 0.020 (0.007) | 0.016 (0.006) | 0.013 (0.008) | 0.012 (0.006) |
| Global trade is a threat | 0.039 (0.007) | 0.027 (0.007) | 0.024 (0.007) | 0.013 (0.006) | 0.018 (0.007) | 0.009 (0.006) |
| Economy is healthy | -0.069 (0.008) | -0.060 (0.008) | -0.050 (0.008) | -0.045 (0.007) | -0.038 (0.008) | -0.034 (0.006) |
| Economic progressivism | -0.044 (0.010) | -0.041 (0.010) | -0.034 (0.010) | -0.029 (0.008) | -0.026 (0.010) | -0.022 (0.008) |
| Economic libertarianism | 0.045 (0.010) | 0.044 (0.010) | 0.031 (0.009) | 0.031 (0.008) | 0.012 (0.008) | 0.023 (0.007) |

| Racial attitudes: | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
|                    | All WONH voters | Further restricted to non-defectors | All WONH voters | Further restricted to non-defectors | All WONH voters | Further restricted to non-defectors |
| Blacks should work harder and should not receive favors | 0.071 (0.009) | 0.057 (0.009) | 0.061 (0.011) | 0.050 (0.011) | 0.033 (0.009) | 0.024 (0.007) |
| Blacks and Hispanics confront racial obstacles | -0.057 (0.009) | -0.050 (0.009) | -0.045 (0.009) | -0.042 (0.008) | -0.029 (0.008) | -0.027 (0.006) |
| Opposition to affirmative action | 0.033 (0.010) | 0.018 (0.009) | -0.003 (0.010) | -0.013 (0.009) | -0.010 (0.009) | -0.012 (0.007) |
| Discrimination against whites | 0.038 (0.008) | 0.021 (0.007) | 0.020 (0.007) | 0.018 (0.006) | 0.013 (0.008) | 0.014 (0.007) |
| Positive black racial affect | -0.030 (0.007) | -0.026 (0.006) | 0.006 (0.009) | 0.001 (0.008) | 0.014 (0.009) | 0.008 (0.007) |
| Positive Hispanic racial affect | -0.020 (0.009) | -0.018 (0.008) | -0.011 (0.009) | -0.010 (0.008) | -0.006 (0.008) | -0.004 (0.006) |

| Immigration attitudes: | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
|                       | All WONH voters | Further restricted to non-defectors | All WONH voters | Further restricted to non-defectors | All WONH voters | Further restricted to non-defectors |
| Negative views of unauthorized immigrants | 0.055 (0.009) | 0.040 (0.008) | 0.033 (0.010) | 0.026 (0.010) | 0.016 (0.008) | 0.010 (0.007) |
| Immigrants take jobs and hurt economy | 0.048 (0.009) | 0.034 (0.009) | 0.023 (0.010) | 0.015 (0.010) | 0.003 (0.009) | 0.000 (0.009) |
| Number of immigrants should be increased | -0.054 (0.008) | -0.035 (0.007) | -0.019 (0.008) | -0.014 (0.008) | -0.007 (0.006) | -0.001 (0.005) |

*Source:* ANES 2016 Time Series Study (December 18, 2018 release)

*Notes:* See Table S14.