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Figure A1 - Election results in Belgium, 1946-2017

Source: authors’ computations using official election results.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by selected groups of Belgian political parties in federal elections between 1946 and 2017.
Figure A2 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists among highest-educated and top-income voters, after controls

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the support for Socialists / Ecologists among highest-educated and top-income voters, after controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religion, church attendance, region and first language.
Figure A3 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists among specific regions

- Difference between (% Brussels) and (% other regions) voting left
- Difference between (% Flanders) and (% other regions) voting left
- Difference between (% Wallonia) and (% other regions) voting left

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the bias of specific Belgian regions towards Socialists / Ecologists, after controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religion and church attendance.
### Table A1 - The structure of political cleavages in Belgium, 2011-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of votes received (%)</th>
<th>PS / SP / PTB</th>
<th>Ecolo / Groen</th>
<th>VLD / MR</th>
<th>CD&amp;V / CdH</th>
<th>N-VA</th>
<th>Vlaams Belang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall vote share</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 40%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanders</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallonia</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

**Notes:** the table shows the average share of votes received by the main political parties by selected individual characteristics over the 2011-2014 period. Vote shares by group are those reported in surveys and may not match exactly official election results.
Source: authors' computations using official election results.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by selected Belgian political parties and groups of parties in federal elections between 1946 and 2017.
Figure AA2 - Election results in Belgium by group, 1946-2017

- **Socialists, communists, and ecologists**
- **Liberals, Christian democrats, and Flemish Nationalists**
- **Other parties and independents**

**Source:** authors' computations using official election results.

**Note:** the figure shows the share of votes received by selected groups of Belgian political parties in federal elections between 1946 and 2017.
Figure AA3 - The composition of the electorate by education level

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by education level.
Figure AA4 - The composition of the electorate by age group

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by age group.
Figure AA5 - The composition of the electorate by religion

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by religious affiliation.
Figure AA6 - The composition of the electorate by church attendance

*Source:* authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

*Note:* the figure shows the composition of the electorate by frequency of church attendance.
Figure AA7 - The composition of the electorate by language

Source: authors’ computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by language spoken at home.
Figure AA8 - The composition of the electorate by region

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by region.
Figure AA9 - Composition of income quintiles by education level, 1970s

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by education level in the 1970s.
Figure AA10 - Composition of income quintiles by education level, 2010s

Source: authors’ computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by education level in the 2010s.
Figure AA11 - Composition of income quintiles by region, 1970s

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by region in the 1970s.
Figure AA12 - Composition of income quintiles by region, 2010s

- Q1
- Q2
- Q3
- Q4
- Q5

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by region in the 2010s.
Figure AA13 - Composition of income quintiles by first language, 1970s

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by language spoken at home in the 1970s.
Figure AA14 - Composition of income quintiles by first language, 2010s

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by language spoken at home in the 2010s.
Figure AB1 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists by education level

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left-wing parties by education level.
Figure AB2 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists by education group

Source: authors’ computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left-wing parties by education group.
Figure AB3 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists by income decile

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left-wing parties by income decile.
Figure AB3b - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists by income decile

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left-wing parties by income decile.
Figure AB4 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists by income group

Source: authors’ computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left-wing parties by income group.
Figure AB5 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists by religious affiliation

Source: authors' computations using Belgium political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left-wing parties by religious affiliation.
Figure AB6 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists by church attendance

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left-wing parties by frequency of church attendance.
Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left-wing parties by rural-urban location.
Figure AB8 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists by gender

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left-wing parties by gender.
Figure AB9 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists by union membership

Source: authors’ computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left-wing parties by union membership status.
Figure AB10 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists by marital status

Source: authors’ computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left-wing parties by marital status.
Figure AB11 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists by perceived social class

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left-wing parties by self-perceived social class. Working class includes "lower class". Middle class includes "no class" and "upper class".
Figure AB12 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists by age group

Source: authors’ computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left-wing parties by age group.
Figure AB13 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists by region

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left-wing parties by region.
Figure AB14 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists by language

Source: authors’ computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left-wing parties by language.
Figure AC1 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists among highest-educated and top-income voters

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the support for Socialists / Ecologists among highest-educated and top-income voters.
Figure AC2 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists among highest-educated and top-income voters, after controls

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the support for Socialists / Ecologists among highest-educated and top-income voters, after controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religion, church attendance, region and first language.
Figure AC3 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists among university graduates

Difference between (% of university graduates) and (% of other voters) voting left

- After controlling for income
- After controlling for income, age, gender, employment, marital status, religion, church attendance, region, first language

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of university graduates and the share of other voters voting for Socialists / Ecologists, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure AC4 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists among highest-educated voters

- Difference between (% of top 10%) and (% of bottom 90%) educated voting left
- After controlling for income
- After controlling for income, age, gender, employment, marital status, religion, church attendance, region, first language

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% educated voters and the share of other voters voting for Socialists / Ecologists, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure AC5 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists among primary-educated voters

Difference between (% of primary educated) and (% of other voters) voting left

- After controlling for income
- After controlling for income, age, gender, employment, marital status, religion, church attendance, region, first language

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of primary-educated voters and the share of other voters voting for Socialists / Ecologists, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure AC6 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists among top-income voters

[Graph showing the difference between the share of top 10% earners and the share of other voters before and after controlling for other variables.]

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% earners and the share of other voters voting for Socialists / Ecologists, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure AC7 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists among voters with no religion

- Difference between (% of no religion) and (% of other voters) voting left
- After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, region, first language

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of voters declaring no religion and the share of other voters voting for Socialists / Ecologists, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure AC8 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists among Catholics

- Difference between (% of Catholics) and (% of other voters) voting left
- After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, region, first language

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of Catholic voters and the share of other voters voting for Socialists / Ecologists, before and after controlling for other variables.
Difference between (% of non-religious) and (% of other voters) voting left

After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, region, first language

**Source**: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

**Note**: the figure shows the difference between the share of voters never going to church and the share of other voters voting for Socialists / Ecologists, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure AC10 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists among women

- Difference between (% of women) and (% of men) voting left
- After controlling for income, education, age, employment, marital status, religion, church attendance, region, first language

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of women and the share of men voting for Socialists / Ecologists, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure AC11 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists among union members

Difference between (% of union members) and (% of other voters) voting left

After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religion, church attendance, region, first language

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of union members and the share of other voters voting for Socialists / Ecologists, before and after controlling for other variables.
**Figure AC12 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists among young voters**

- **Difference between (% of aged 20-39) and (% of other voters) voting left**
- **After controlling for income, education, gender, employment, marital status, religion, church attendance, region, first language**

**Source:** authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

**Note:** the figure shows the difference between the share of voters aged 20-39 and the share of voters older than 40 voting for Socialists / Ecologists, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure AC13 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists among French speakers

Difference between (% of French speakers) and (% of other voters) voting left

After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religion, church attendance

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of French-speakers and the share of other voters voting for Socialists / Ecologists, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure AC14 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists among specific regions

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the bias of specific Belgian regions towards Socialists / Ecologists.
Figure AC15 - Vote for Socialists / Ecologists among specific regions (after controls)

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the bias of specific Belgian regions towards Socialists / Ecologists, after controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religion and church attendance.
Figure AC16 - The education cleavage in Belgium

- Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting Vlaams Block
- Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting Socialist
- Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting Green
- Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting VU / N-VA
- Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting Christian Dem.
- Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting Liberal

Source: authors' computations using Belgium political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the bias of highest-educated voters towards Vlaams Block, Socialists, Greens, VU / N-VA, Christian Democrats, and Liberals.
Figure AC17 - The income cleavage in Belgium

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the bias of highest-educated voters towards Vlaams Block, Socialists, Greens, VU / N-VA, Christian Democrats, and Liberals.
Figure AD1 - Vote for PS / SP / PTB by education level

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the PS / SP / PTB by education level.
Figure AD2 - Vote for PS / SP / PTB by education group

Source: authors' computations using Belgium political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the PS / SP / PTB by education group.
Figure AD3 - Vote for PS / SP / PTB by income group

Source: authors' computations using Belgium political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the PS / SP / PTB by income group.
Figure AD4 - Vote for PS / SP / PTB by religious affiliation

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the PS / SP / PTB by religious affiliation.
Figure AD5 - Vote for PS / SP / PTB by gender

Source: authors’ computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the PS / SP / PTB by gender.
Figure AD6 - Vote for PS / SP / PTB by union membership

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the PS / SP / PTB by union membership status.
Figure AD7 - Vote for PS / SP / PTB by perceived social class

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the PS / SP / PTB by self-perceived social class. Working class includes "lower class". Middle class includes "no class" and "upper class".
Figure AD8 - Vote for PS / SP / PTB by region

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the PS / SP / PTB by region.
Figure AD9 - Vote for Ecolo / Agalev / Groen by education level

Source: authors’ computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Ecolo / Agalev / Groen by education level.
Figure AD10 - Vote for Ecolo / Agalev / Groen by education group

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Ecolo / Agalev / Groen by education group.
Figure AD11 - Vote for Ecolo / Agalev / Groen by income group

Source: authors’ computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Ecolo / Agalev / Groen by income group.
Figure AD12 - Vote for Ecolo / Agalev / Groen by religious affiliation

Source: authors’ computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Ecolo / Agalev / Groen by religious affiliation.
Figure AD13 - Vote for Ecolo / Agalev / Groen by gender

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Ecolo / Agalev / Groen by gender.
Figure AD14 - Vote for Ecolo / Agalev / Groen by union membership

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Ecolo / Agalev / Groen by union membership status.
Figure AD15 - Vote for Ecolo / Agalev / Groen by perceived social class

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Ecolo / Agalev / Groen by self-perceived social class. Working class includes "lower class". Middle class includes "no class" and "upper class".
Figure AD16 - Vote for Ecolo / Agalev / Groen by region

Source: authors’ computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Ecolo / Agalev / Groen by region.
Figure AD17 - Vote for PSC / CVP / CD&V / CdH by education level

**Source**: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

**Note**: the figure shows the share of votes received by the PSC / CVP / CD&V / CdH by education level.
Figure AD18 - Vote for PSC / CVP / CD&V / CdH by education group

Source: authors’ computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the PSC / CVP / CD&V / CdH by education group.
Figure AD19 - Vote for PSC / CVP / CD&V / CdH by income group

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the PSC / CVP / CD&V / CdH by income group.
Figure AD20 - Vote for the PSC / CVP / CD&V / CdH by religious affiliation

Source: authors’ computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the PSC / CVP / CD&V / CdH by religious affiliation.
Figure AD21 - Vote for PSC / CVP / CD&V / CdH by gender

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the PSC / CVP / CD&V / CdH by gender.
Figure AD22 - Vote for the PSC / CVP / CD&V / CdH by union membership

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the PSC / CVP / CD&V / CdH by union membership.
Figure AD23 - Vote for PSC / CVP / CD&V / CdH by perceived social class

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the PSC / CVP / CD&V / CdH by self-perceived social class. Working class includes "lower class". Middle class includes "no class" and "upper class".
Figure AD24 - Vote for PSC / CVP / CD&V / CdH by region

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the PSC / CVP / CD&V / CdH by region.
Figure AD25 - Vote for PVV / VLD / Other liberals by education level

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PVV / VLD / Other liberals by education level.
Figure AD26 - Vote for PVV / VLD / Other liberals by education group

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PVV / VLD / Other liberals by education group.
### Figure AD27 - Vote for PVV / VLD / Other liberals by income group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bottom 50%</th>
<th>Middle 40%</th>
<th>Top 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971-78</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-87</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-99</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-07</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-14</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

**Note:** the figure shows the share of votes received by PVV / VLD / Other liberals by income group.
Figure AD28 - Vote for the PVV / VLD / Other liberals by religious affiliation

Source: authors’ computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PVV / VLD / Other liberals by religious affiliation.
Figure AD29 - Vote for PVV / VLD / Other liberals by gender

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PVV / VLD / Other liberals by gender.
Figure AD30 - Vote for the PVV / VLD / Other liberals by union membership

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PVV / VLD / Other liberals by union membership status.
Figure AD31 - Vote for PVV / VLD / Other liberals by perceived social class

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PVV / VLD / Other liberals by self-perceived social class. Working class includes "lower class". Middle class includes "no class" and "upper class".
Figure AD32 - Vote for PVV / VLD / Other liberals by region

Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by PVV / VLD / Other liberals by region.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Eurobarometers Mannheim Trend File, various years</td>
<td>Gesis</td>
<td>2755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Eurobarometers Mannheim Trend File, various years</td>
<td>Gesis</td>
<td>5327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Eurobarometers Mannheim Trend File, various years</td>
<td>Gesis</td>
<td>5556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Eurobarometers Mannheim Trend File, various years</td>
<td>Gesis</td>
<td>5017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Eurobarometers Mannheim Trend File, various years</td>
<td>Gesis</td>
<td>5951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Eurobarometers Mannheim Trend File, various years</td>
<td>Gesis</td>
<td>6113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Eurobarometers Mannheim Trend File, various years</td>
<td>Gesis</td>
<td>10096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Belgium General Election Study, 1991</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>4511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Belgium General Election Study, 1995</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>3668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Belgium General Election Study, 1999</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>4239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>European Social Survey, 2004-2006</td>
<td>ESS</td>
<td>3576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>European Social Survey, 2008-2010</td>
<td>ESS</td>
<td>3464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>European Social Survey, 2012-2014</td>
<td>EVS</td>
<td>3638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>European Social Survey, 2016-2018</td>
<td>ESS</td>
<td>3533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** authors' elaboration. Gesis: Gesis – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences (https://www.gesis.org/home); DANS EASY: https://easy.dans.knaw.nl.

**Note:** the table shows the surveys used, the source from which these surveys can be obtained, and the sample size of each survey.
### Table AA2 - Complete descriptive statistics by decade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age: 20-40</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 40-60</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 60+</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Primary</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Secondary</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Tertiary</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status: Employed</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status: Unemployed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status: Inactive</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status: Married or with partner</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: No religion</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Catholic</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Protestant</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Muslim</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance: Never</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance: Less than monthly</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance: Monthly or more</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Man</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective class: Middle class</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: Dutch</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: French</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Brussels</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Flanders</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Wallonia</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** authors’ computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.

**Note:** the table shows descriptive statistics by decade for selected available variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table AA3 - The structure of political cleavages in Belgium, 2011-2014</th>
<th>Share of votes received (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS / SP / PTB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall vote share</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 40%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than monthly</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly or more</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanders</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallonia</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: authors' computations using Belgian political attitudes surveys.
Notes: the table shows the average share of votes received by the main political parties by selected individual characteristics over the 2011-2014 period. Vote shares by group are those reported in surveys and may not match exactly official election results.
Figure B1 - Election results in the Netherlands, 1946-2017

- Christian parties (KVP / CHU / CDA / Other)
- Socialists / Communists (PvdA / SP / Other)
- Conservative-liberal parties (VVD / PvdV)
- Democrats 66
- Greens (GroenLink, PPR)
- Extreme right (LPF, PVV)

Source: author's computations using official election results.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by selected groups of Dutch political parties in general elections between 1946 and 2017.
Figure B2 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left among highest-educated and top-income voters

Difference between (% of top 10%) and (% of bottom 90%) educated voting left / liberal / green, after controls

Difference between (% of top 10%) and (% of bottom 90%) earners voting left / liberal / green, after controls

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the support for left / liberal / green parties among highest-educated and top-income voters after controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, church attendance, region, rural-urban location, union membership, and self-perceived social class.
Figure B3 - The decline of class cleavages in the Netherlands

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the relative support of self-perceived working-class and upper-class voters towards left / liberal / green parties, after controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, church attendance, region, rural-urban location, and union membership.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall vote share</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>PvdA</th>
<th>GL</th>
<th>D66</th>
<th>CDA</th>
<th>VVD</th>
<th>PVV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of votes received (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper working</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rural</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very urban</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B1 - The structure of political cleavages in the Netherlands, 2010-2017
Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

Notes: the table shows the average share of votes received by the main political parties by selected individual characteristics over the 2010-2017 period. Vote shares by group are those reported in surveys and may not match exactly official election results.
Figure BA1 - Election results in the Netherlands, 1946-2017

Source: author's computations using official election results.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by selected groups of Dutch political parties in federal elections between 1946 and 2017.
Figure BA2 - Election results in the Netherlands by group

- Socialists, communists, greens, and social liberals (PvdA / SP / GL / D66 / Other left)
- Conservatives, christians, and anti-immigration (KVP / CDA / VVD / PVV / Other right)
- Other parties and independents

Source: author’s computations using official election results.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by selected groups of Dutch political parties in federal elections between 1946 and 2017.
Figure BA3 - The composition of the electorate by education

- **Primary**
- **Secondary**
- **Tertiary**
- **Postgraduate**

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by education level.
Figure BA4 - The composition of the electorate by age

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by age group.
Figure BA5 - The composition of the electorate by religion

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by religious affiliation.
Figure BA6 - The composition of the electorate by church attendance

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by frequency of church attendance.
Figure BA7 - The composition of the electorate by industry

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by industry of employment.
Figure BA8 - The composition of the electorate by perceived class

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by self-perceived social class.
Figure BA9 - The composition of the electorate by region

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by region.
Figure BA10 - The structure of the electorate by rural-urban location

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by rural-urban location.
Figure BA11 - Composition of income quintiles by education level, 1970s

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by education level in the 1970s.
Figure BA12 - Composition of income quintiles by education level, 2010s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by education level in the 2010s.
Figure BA13 - Composition of income quintiles by region, 1970s

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by region in the 1970s.
Figure BA14 - Composition of income quintiles by region, 2010s

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by region in the 2010s.
Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by location in the 1970s.
Figure BA16 - Composition of income quintiles by location, 2010s

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by location in the 2010s.
Figure BA17 - Composition of income quintiles by perceived class, 1970s

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by subjective social class in the 1970s.
Figure BA18 - Composition of income quintiles by perceived class, 2010s

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by subjective social class in the 2010s.
Figure BA19 - Composition of income quintiles by industry, 1970s

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by industry of employment in the 1970s.
Figure BA20 - Composition of income quintiles by industry, 2010s

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by industry of employment in the 2010s.
Figure BB1 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left by education level

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left / liberal / green parties by education level.
Figure BB2 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left by education group

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left / liberal / green parties by education group.
Figure BB3 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left by income decile

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left / liberal / green parties by income decile.
Figure BB3b - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left by income decile

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left / liberal / green parties by income decile.
Figure BB4 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left by income group

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left / liberal / green parties by income group.
Figure BB5 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left by religious affiliation

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left / liberal / green parties by religious affiliation.
Figure BB6 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left by church attendance

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left / liberal / green parties by frequency of church attendance.
Figure BB7 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left by location

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left / liberal / green parties by rural-urban location.
Figure BB8 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left by gender

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left / liberal / green parties by gender.
Figure BB9 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left by marital status

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left / liberal / green parties by marital status.
Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left / liberal / green parties by age group.
Figure BB11 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left by perceived social class

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left / liberal / green parties by self-percieved social class.
Figure BB12 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left by union membership

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left / liberal / green parties by union membership status.
Figure BB13 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left by region

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left / liberal / green parties by region.
Figure BB14 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left by home ownership

**Source:** authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

**Note:** the figure shows the share of votes received by left / liberal / green parties by homeownership status.
Figure BB15 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left by industry

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left / liberal / green parties by industrial affiliation.
Figure BB16 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left by location

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by left / liberal / green parties by rural-urban location.
Figure BC1 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left among highest-educated and top-income voters

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the support for left / liberal / green parties among highest-educated and top-income voters.
Figure BC2 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left among highest-educated and top-income voters (after controls)

- Difference between (% of top 10%) and (% of bottom 90%) educated voting left / liberal / green, after controls
- Difference between (% of top 10%) and (% of bottom 90%) earners voting left / liberal / green, after controls

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the support for left / liberal / green parties among highest-educated and top-income voters after controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, church attendance, region, rural-urban location, union membership, and self-perceived social class.
Figure BC3 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left among university graduates

- **Difference between (%) of university graduates) and (%) of other voters) voting left / liberal / green**
- **After controlling for income**
- **After controlling for income, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, church attendance, region, rural-urban location, union membership, self-perceived social class**

**Source:** authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

**Note:** the figure shows the difference between the share of university graduates and the share of other voters voting for left / liberal / green parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure BC4 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left among highest-educated voters

- Difference between (% of top 10%) and (% of bottom 90%) educated voting left / liberal / green
- After controlling for income
- After controlling for income, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, church attendance, region, rural-urban location, union membership, self-perceived social class

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% educated voters and the share of other voters voting for left / liberal / green parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure BC5 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left among primary educated voters

- Difference between (% of primary educated) and (% of other voters) voting left / liberal / green
- After controlling for income
- After controlling for income, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, church attendance, region, rural-urban location, union membership, self-perceived social class

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of primary educated voters and the share of other voters voting for left / liberal / green parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure BC6 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left among top-income earners

Difference between (% of top 10%) and (% of bottom 90%) earners voting left / liberal / green

After controlling for education

After controlling for education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, church attendance, region, rural-urban location, union membership, self-perceived social class

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% earners and the share of other voters voting for left / liberal / green parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure BC7 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left among voters with no religion

Difference between (% of no religion) and (% of other voters) voting left / liberal / green

After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, region, rural-urban location, union membership, self-perceived social class

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of voters declaring no religion and the share of other voters voting for left / liberal / green parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure BC8 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left among Catholics

- Difference between (% of Catholics) and (% of other voters) voting left / liberal / green
- After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, region, rural-urban location, union membership, self-perceived social class

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of Catholic voters and the share of other voters voting for left / liberal / green parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure BC9 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left among non-religious voters

Difference between (% of non-religious) and (% of other voters) voting left / liberal / green

After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, region, rural-urban location, union membership, self-perceived social class

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of voters never going to church and the share of other voters voting for left / liberal / green parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure BC10 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left among women

- Difference between (% of women) and (% of men) voting left / liberal / green
- After controlling for income, education, age, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, church attendance, region, rural-urban location, union membership, self-perceived social class

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of women and the share of men voting for left / liberal / green parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure BC11 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left among union members

Difference between (% of union members) and (% of other voters) voting left / liberal / green

After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, church attendance, region, rural-urban location, self-perceived social class

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of union members and the share of other voters voting for left / liberal / green parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure BC12 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left among self-perceived working-class and upper-class voters, after controls

- Blue line: Difference between (% of working class) and (% of other voters) voting left / liberal / green
- Red line: Difference between (% of upper class) and (% of other voters) voting left / liberal / green

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the bias of self-perceived working class and upper class voters towards left / liberal / green parties, after controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, church attendance, region, rural-urban location, and union membership.
Figure BC13 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left among young voters

- Difference between (% of aged 20-39) and (% of other voters) voting left / liberal / green
- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for income, education, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, church attendance, region, rural-urban location, union membership, self-perceived social class

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of voters aged 20-39 and the share of voters older than 40 voting for left / liberal / green parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure BC14 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left among urban areas

- Difference between (% of voters in highly-urban areas) and (% of other voters) voting left / liberal / green
- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, church attendance, region, union membership, self-perceived social class

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of voters in highly-urban areas and the share of other voters voting for left / liberal / green parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure BC15 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left among specific regions

- Difference between (% East) and (% other regions) voting left, after controls
- Difference between (% North) and (% other regions) voting left, after controls
- Difference between (% South) and (% other regions) voting left, after controls

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the bias of Dutch regions towards left / liberal / green parties, after controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, church attendance, rural-urban location, union membership, and self-perceived social class.
**Figure BC16 - Vote for PvdA / D66 / Greens / Other left among specific industrial sectors**

- **Source:** authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
- **Note:** the figure shows the bias of voters with specific industrial affiliations towards left / liberal / green parties.
Figure BC17 - The education cleavage in the Netherlands

- Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting LPF / PVV
- Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting PvdA / SP
- Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting Green
- Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting VVD
- Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting Christian
- Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting D66

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the bias of highest-educated voters towards LPF / PVV, PvdA / SP, Green, VVD, Christian Democrats, D66.
Figure BC18 - The income cleavage in the Netherlands

Difference between (% top 10% income) and (% bottom 90% income) voting LPF / PVV
Difference between (% top 10% income) and (% bottom 90% income) voting PvdA / SP
Difference between (% top 10% income) and (% bottom 90% income) voting Green
Difference between (% top 10% income) and (% bottom 90% income) voting VVD
Difference between (% top 10% income) and (% bottom 90% income) voting Christian Democrats
Difference between (% top 10% income) and (% bottom 90% income) voting D66

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the bias of top-income voters towards LPF / PVV, PvdA / SP, Green, VVD, Christian Democrats, D66.
Figure BC19 - Class cleavages in the Netherlands

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the bias of self-perceived upper class voters towards LPF / PVV, PvdA / SP, Green, VVD, Christian Democrats, D66.
Figure BD1 - Vote for left-wing parties by education level

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Labour Party (PvdA) and the Socialist Party (SP) by education level.
Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Labour Party (PvdA) and the Socialist Party (SP) by education group.
Figure BD3 - Vote for left-wing parties by income group

- **Source**: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
- **Note**: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Labour Party (PvdA) and the Socialist Party (SP) by income group.
Figure BD4 - Vote for left-wing parties by religious affiliation

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Labour Party (PvdA) and the Socialist Party (SP) by religious affiliation.
Figure BD5 - Vote for left-wing parties by gender

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Labour Party (PvdA) and the Socialist Party (SP) by gender.
Figure BD6 - Vote for left-wing parties by union membership

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Labour Party (PvdA) and the Socialist Party (SP) by union membership status.
Figure BD7 - Vote left-wing parties by self-perceived social class

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Labour Party (PvdA) and the Socialist Party (SP) by self-perceived social class.
Figure BD8 - Vote for left-wing parties by location

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Labour Party (PvdA) and the Socialist Party (SP) by rural-urban location.
Figure BD9 - Vote for GroenLinks by education level

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the GroenLinks (ecologists) by education level.
Figure BD10 - Vote for GroenLinks by education group

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the GroenLinks (ecologists) by education group.
Figure BD11 - Vote for GroenLinks by income group

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the GroenLinks (ecologists) by income group.
Figure BD12 - Vote for GroenLinks by religious affiliation

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the GroenLinks (ecologists) by religious affiliation.
Figure BD13 - Vote for GroenLinks by gender

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the GroenLinks (ecologists) by gender.
Figure BD14 - Vote for GroenLinks by union membership

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the GroenLinks (ecologists) by union membership status.
Figure BD15 - Vote for GroenLinks by perceived class

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the GroenLinks (ecologists) by self-perceived social class.
Figure BD16 - Vote for GroenLinks by location

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the GroenLinks (ecologists) by rural-urban location.
Figure BD17 - Vote for Christian-democratic parties by education level

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA), Christian Historical Union (CHU), Christian Union (CU), Catholic People's Party (KVP), Anti-Revolutionary Party (ARP), Reformed Political League (GPV), and Reformatory Political Federation (RPF) by education level.
Figure BD18 - Vote for Christian-democratic parties by education group

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA), Christian Historical Union (CHU), Christian Union (CU), Catholic People's Party (KVP), Anti-Revolutionary Party (ARP), Reformed Political League (GPV), and Reformatory Political Federation (RPF) by education group.
Figure BD19 - Vote for Christian-democratic parties by income group

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA), Christian Historical Union (CHU), Christian Union (CU), Catholic People's Party (KVP), Anti-Revolutionary Party (ARP), Reformed Political League (GPV), and Reformatory Political Federation (RPF) by income group.
Figure BD20 - Vote for Christian-democratic parties by religious affiliation

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA), Christian Historical Union (CHU), Christian Union (CU), Catholic People's Party (KVP), Anti-Revolutionary Party (ARP), Reformed Political League (GPV), and Reformatory Political Federation (RPF) by religious affiliation.
Figure BD21 - Vote for Christian-democratic parties by gender

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA), Christian Historical Union (CHU), Christian Union (CU), Catholic People’s Party (KVP), Anti-Revolutionary Party (ARP), Reformed Political League (GPV), and Reformatory Political Federation (RPF) by gender.
Figure BD22 - Vote for Christian-democratic parties by union membership

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA), Christian Historical Union (CHU), Christian Union (CU), Catholic People's Party (KVP), Anti-Revolutionary Party (ARP), Reformed Political League (GPV), and Reformatory Political Federation (RPF) by union membership status.
Figure BD23 - Vote for Christian-democratic parties by self-perceived social class

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA), Christian Historical Union (CHU), Christian Union (CU), Catholic People's Party (KVP), Anti-Revolutionary Party (ARP), Reformed Political League (GPV), and Reformatory Political Federation (RPF) by self-perceived social class.
Figure BD24 - Vote for Christian-democratic parties by location

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA), Christian Historical Union (CHU), Christian Union (CU), Catholic People's Party (KVP), Anti-Revolutionary Party (ARP), Reformed Political League (GPV), and Reformatory Political Federation (RPF) by rural-urban location.
Figure BD25 - Vote for the liberals by education level

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) by education level.
Figure BD26 - Vote for the liberals by education group

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) by education group.
Figure BD27 - Vote for the liberals by income group

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) by income group.
Figure BD28 - Vote for the liberals by religious affiliation

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) by religious affiliation.
Figure BD29 - Vote for the liberals by gender

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) by gender.
Figure BD30 - Vote for the liberals by union membership

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) by union membership status.
Figure BD31 - Vote for the liberals by self-perceived social class

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) by self-perceived social class.
Figure BD32 - Vote for the liberals by location

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the People’s Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) by rural-urban location.
Figure BD33 - Vote for far-right parties by education level

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Party for Freedom (PVV), and Pim Fortuyn List (LPF) by education level.
Figure BD34 - Vote for far-right parties by education group

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Party for Freedom (PVV), and Pim Fortuyn List (LPF) by education group.
**Figure BD35 - Vote for far-right parties by income group**

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Party for Freedom (PVV), and Pim Fortuyn List (LPF) by income group.
Figure BD36 - Vote for far-right parties by religious affiliation

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Party for Freedom (PVV), and Pim Fortuyn List (LPF) by religious affiliation.
Figure BD37 - Vote for far-right parties by gender

Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Party for Freedom (PVV), and Pim Fortuyn List (LPF) by gender.
Figure BD38 - Vote for far-right parties by union membership

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Party for Freedom (PVV), and Pim Fortuyn List (LPF) by union membership status.
Figure BD39 - Vote for far-right parties by self-perceived social class

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Party for Freedom (PVV), and Pim Fortuyn List (LPF) by self-perceived social class.
Figure BD40 - Vote for far-right parties by location

Source: authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Party for Freedom (PVV), and Pim Fortuyn List (LPF) by rural-urban location.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Dutch parliamentary election studies</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>2495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Dutch parliamentary election studies</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>2495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Dutch parliamentary election studies</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>1526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Dutch parliamentary election studies</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>1856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Dutch parliamentary election studies</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>2305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Dutch parliamentary election studies</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>1541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Dutch parliamentary election studies</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>1630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Dutch parliamentary election studies</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>1754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Dutch parliamentary election studies</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Dutch parliamentary election studies</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>2101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Dutch parliamentary election studies</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>1524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Dutch parliamentary election studies</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>2521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Dutch parliamentary election studies</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>2621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Dutch parliamentary election studies</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>1677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Dutch parliamentary election studies</td>
<td>DANS EASY</td>
<td>3283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** authors' elaboration. DANS EASY: [https://easy.dans.knaw.nl](https://easy.dans.knaw.nl).

**Note:** The table shows the surveys used, the source from which these surveys can be obtained, and the sample size of each survey.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age: 20-40</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 40-60</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 60+</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Primary</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Secondary</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Tertiary</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Postgraduate</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status: Employed</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status: Inactive</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status: Married or with partner</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: No religion</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Catholic</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Protestant</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Muslim</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance: Never</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance: Less than monthly</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance: Monthly or more</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Man</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective class: Working</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective class: Upper working</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective class: Middle</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective class: Upper middle</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective class: Upper</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership: Yes</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: East</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: North</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: South</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: West</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural-urban: Very rural</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural-urban: Rural</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural-urban: Medium</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural-urban: Urban</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural-urban: Very urban</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union membership: Yes</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

**Note:** the table shows descriptive statistics by decade for selected available variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>PvdA</th>
<th>GL</th>
<th>D66</th>
<th>CDA</th>
<th>VVD</th>
<th>PVV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall vote share</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper working</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rural</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very urban</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than monthly</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly or more</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** authors’ computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

**Notes:** the table shows the average share of votes received by the main political parties by selected individual characteristics over the 2010-2017 period. Vote shares by group are those reported in surveys and may not match exactly official election results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PvdA</th>
<th>D66</th>
<th>CDA</th>
<th>VVD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall vote share</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper working</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rural</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very urban</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than monthly</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly or more</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: authors' computations using Dutch political attitudes surveys.

Notes: the table shows the average share of votes received by the main political parties by selected individual characteristics over the 1967-1977 period. Vote shares by group are those reported in surveys and may not match exactly official election results.
Figure C1 - Election results in Switzerland, 1947-2019

Source: author's computations using official election results.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by selected groups of Swiss political parties in federal elections between 1947 and 2019.
Figure C2 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other center-left among highest-educated and top-income voters, after controls

Difference between (% of top 10%) and (% of bottom 90%) educated voting centre-left / left, after controls

Difference between (% of top 10%) and (% of bottom 90%) earners voting centre-left / left, after controls

Source: authors’ computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the support for centre-left / left-wing parties among highest-educated and top-income voters after controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, region, home ownership, and union membership status.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Share of votes received (%)</th>
<th>Left wing</th>
<th>Christ. Democrats</th>
<th>Cons.-Liberals</th>
<th>Greens</th>
<th>Far right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SPS/PSS</td>
<td>CVP/PDC</td>
<td>FDP/PRD</td>
<td>GPS/PES</td>
<td>SVP/UDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PdA/PDT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GLP/PVL</td>
<td>FPS/PSDL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall vote share</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.

Notes: the table shows the average share of votes received by the main political parties by selected individual characteristics over the 2011-2019 period. Vote shares by group are those reported in surveys and may not match exactly official election results.
Figure C1 - Election results in Switzerland, 1947-2019

Source: author's computations using official election results.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by selected groups of Swiss political parties in federal elections between 1947 and 2019.
Figure CA2 - Election results in Switzerland by group, 1947-2019

Socialists, communists, greens, social liberals (SP / PDA / GPS / GLP / LDU / CSP / Other)
Conservatives, christians, anti-immigration (CVP / FDP / SVP / LPS / BDP / Other right)
Other parties and independents

Source: author’s computations using official election results.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by selected groups of Swiss political parties in federal elections between 1947 and 2019.
Figure CA3 - The composition of the electorate by education

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the distribution of education levels in the Swiss adult population and its evolution over time. 'Tertiary' education only refers here to university studies. Higher vocational education is grouped with 'Secondary'.

The figure shows the percentage distribution of the electorate by education level for different time periods: 1967-71, 1975-79, 1983-87, 1991-99, 2003-07, and 2011-19. The categories are Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary. The data is presented in stacked bar charts, with each bar divided into segments representing the proportion of each education level.
Figure CA4 - The composition of the electorate by age

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the distribution of age groups in the Swiss adult population and its evolution over time.
Figure CA5 - The composition of the electorate by religion

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the distribution of religious affiliation in the Swiss adult population and its evolution over time.
Figure CA6 - The composition of the electorate by church attendance

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the distribution of church attendance in the Swiss adult population and its distribution over time.
Figure CA7 - The composition of the electorate by linguistic region

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the distribution the Swiss adult population by linguistic region and its distribution over time.
Figure CA8 - The composition of the electorate by country of birth

Source: authors’ computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the distribution of the Swiss adult population by country of birth and its evolution over time.
Figure CA9 - Composition of income quintiles by education level, 1970s

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the distribution of education level by income quintile in the Swiss adult population in the 1970s.
Figure CA10 - Composition of income quintiles by education level, 2010s

Source: authors’ computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the distribution of education level by income quintile in the Swiss adult population in the 2010s.
Figure CA11 - Composition of income quintiles by region, 1970s

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the distribution of linguistic regions by income quintile in the Swiss adult population in the 1970s.
Figure CA12 - Composition of income quintiles by region, 2010s

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the distribution of linguistic regions by income quintile in the Swiss adult population in the 2010s.
Figure CB1 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left by education level

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by centre-left / left-wing parties by education level.
Figure CB2 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left by education group

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by centre-left / left-wing parties by education group.
Figure CB3 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left by income decile

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by centre-left / left-wing parties by income decile.
Figure CB3b - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left by income decile

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by centre-left / left-wing parties by income decile.
Figure CB4 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left by income group

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by centre-left / left-wing parties by income group.
Figure CB5 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left by religious affiliation

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by centre-left / left-wing parties by religious affiliation.
Figure CB6 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left by church attendance

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by centre-left / left-wing parties by frequency of church attendance.
Figure CB7 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left by location

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by centre-left / left-wing parties by rural-urban location.
Figure CB8 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left by gender

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by centre-left / left-wing parties by gender.
Figure CB9 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left by marital status

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by centre-left / left-wing parties by marital status.
Figure CB10 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left by age

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by centre-left / left-wing parties by age group.
Figure CB11 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left by homeownership

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by centre-left / left-wing parties by homeownership status.
Figure CB12 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left by union membership

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by centre-left / left-wing parties by union membership status.
Figure CB13 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left by region

Source: authors’ computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by centre-left / left-wing parties by linguistic region.
Figure CB14 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left by occupation (Kriesi classification)

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by centre-left / left-wing parties by occupation (Kriesi classification).
### Figure CB15 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left by occupation (Oesch classification)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed / Inactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled production workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business owners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine production workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled clerks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural semi-professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine service workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled service-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate managers and administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled service-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal professions and large employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine clerks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source**: authors’ computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.

**Note**: the figure shows the share of votes received by centre-left / left-wing parties by occupation (Oesch classification).
Figure CB16 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left by sector of occupation

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by centre-left / left-wing parties by sector of occupation.
Figure CC1 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left among highest-educated and top-income voters

Difference between (% of top 10%) and (% of bottom 90%) educated voting centre-left / left

Difference between (% of top 10%) and (% of bottom 90%) earners voting centre-left / left

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the support for centre-left / left-wing parties among highest-educated and top-income voters.
Figure CC2 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left among highest-educated and top-income voters, after controls

- Difference between (% of top 10%) and (% of bottom 90%) educated voting centre-left / left, after controls
- Difference between (% of top 10%) and (% of bottom 90%) earners voting centre-left / left, after controls

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the support for centre-left / left-wing parties among highest-educated and top-income voters after controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, region, home ownership, and union membership status.
Figure CC3 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left among university graduates

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of university graduates and the share of other voters voting for centre-left / left-wing parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure CC4 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left among highest-educated voters

Difference between (% of top 10%) and (% of bottom 90%) educated voting centre-left / left

After controlling for income

After controlling for income, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, region, home ownership, union membership

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% educated voters and the share of other voters voting for centre-left / left-wing parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure CC5 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left among primary-educated voters

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of primary educated voters and the share of other voters voting for centre-left / left-wing parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure CC6 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left among top-income voters

Difference between (% of top 10%) and (% of bottom 90%) earners voting centre-left / left

After controlling for education

After controlling for education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, region, home ownership, union membership

Source: authors’ computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% earners and the share of other voters voting for centre-left / left-wing parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure CC7 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left among voters with no religion

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of voters declaring no religion and the share of other voters voting for centre-left / left-wing parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of Protestant voters and the share of other voters voting for centre-left / left-wing parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure CC9 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left among Catholics

Difference between (% of Catholics) and (% of other voters) voting centre-left / left

- After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, region, home ownership, union membership

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of Catholic voters and the share of other voters voting for centre-left / left-wing parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure CC10 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left among non-religious voters

- Difference between (% of non-religious) and (% of other voters) voting centre-left / left
- After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, region, home ownership, union membership

Source: authors’ computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of voters never going to church and the share of other voters voting for centre-left / left-wing parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure CC11 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left among women

Difference between (% of women) and (% of men) voting centre-left / left

After controlling for income, education, age, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, region, home ownership, union membership

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of women and the share of men voting for centre-left / left-wing parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure CC12 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left among union members

Difference between (% of union members) and (% of other voters) voting centre-left / left

After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, region, home ownership

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of union members and the share of other voters voting for centre-left / left-wing parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure CC13 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left among young voters

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of voters aged 20-39 and the share of voters older than 40 voting for centre-left / left-wing parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure CC14 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left among rural areas

Difference between (% of rural voters) and (% of urban voters) voting centre-left / left

After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, region, home ownership, union membership

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of voters in rural areas and the share of voters in urban areas voting for centre-left / left-wing parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure CC15 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left among specific regions

Difference between (% German) and (% other regions) voting centre-left / left, after controls
Difference between (% French) and (% other regions) voting centre-left / left, after controls
Difference between (% Italian) and (% other regions) voting centre-left / left, after controls

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the bias of Swiss linguistic regions towards Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left, after controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, home ownership, and union membership.
Figure CC16 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left among homeowners

Difference between (% of homeowners) and (% of other voters) voting centre-left / left

After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, region, union membership

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of homeowners and the share of other voters voting for centre-left / left-wing parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure CC17 - Vote for Social Democrats / Greens / Other centre-left among foreign-born voters

Difference between (% of foreign-born) and (% of Swiss-born) voting centre-left / left

After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religious affiliation, region, home ownership, union membership

Source: authors' computations using New Zealand political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of foreign-born voters and the share of Swiss-born voters voting for centre-left / left-wing parties, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure CC18 - The education cleavage in Switzerland

- Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting SVP / SD / FPS
- Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting SP / PDT
- Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting Green
- Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting FDP
- Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting Christian

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the bias of highest-educated voters towards SVP / SD / FPS, SP / PDT, Greens, FDP.
### Figure CC19 - The income cleavage in Switzerland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td>the figure shows the bias of top-income voters towards SVP / SD / FPS, SP / PDT, Greens, FDP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Difference between (% top 10% income) and (% bottom 90% income) voting SVP / SD / FPS**
- **Difference between (% top 10% income) and (% bottom 90% income) voting SP / PDT**
- **Difference between (% top 10% income) and (% bottom 90% income) voting Green**
- **Difference between (% top 10% income) and (% bottom 90% income) voting FDP**
- **Difference between (% top 10% income) and (% bottom 90% income) voting Christian**
Figure CD1 - Vote for left-wing parties by education level

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Social Democratic Party (SPS / PSS) and Party of Labor (PdA / PdT) by education level.
Figure CD2 - Vote for left-wing parties by education group

Source: authors’ computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Social Democratic Party (SPS / PSS) and Party of Labor (PdA / PdT) by education group.
Figure CD3 - Vote for left-wing parties by income group

Source: authors’ computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Social Democratic Party (SPS / PSS) and Party of Labor (PdA / PdT) by income group.
Figure CD4 - Vote for left-wing parties by religious affiliation

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Social Democratic Party (SPS / PSS) and Party of Labor (PdA / PdT) by religious affiliation.
**Figure CD5 - Vote for left-wing parties by gender**

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Social Democratic Party (SPS / PSS) and Party of Labor (PdA / PdT) by gender.
Figure CD6 - Vote for left-wing parties by union membership

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Social Democratic Party (SPS / PSS) and Party of Labor (PdA / PdT) by union membership status.
Figure CD7 - Vote for left-wing parties by region

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Social Democratic Party (SPS / PSS) and Party of Labor (PdA / PdT) by linguistic region.
Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Green Party (GPS / PES) and Green Liberal Party (GLP / PVL) by education level.
Figure CD9 - Vote for green parties by education group

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Green Party (GPS / PES) and Green Liberal Party (GLP / PVL) by education group.
Figure CD10 - Vote for green parties by income group

- **Bottom 50%**
- **Middle 40%**
- **Top 10%**

**Source**: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.

**Note**: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Green Party (GPS / PES) and Green Liberal Party (GLP / PVL) by income group.
Figure CD11 - Vote for green parties by religious affiliation

Source: authors’ computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Green Party (GPS / PES) and Green Liberal Party (GLP / PVL) by religious affiliation.
Figure CD12 - Vote for green parties by gender

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Green Party (GPS / PES) and Green Liberal Party (GLP / PVL) by gender.
Vote for green parties by union membership

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Green Party (GPS / PES) and Green Liberal Party (GLP / PVL) by union membership status.
Figure CD14 - Vote for green parties by region

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Green Party (GPS / PES) and Green Liberal Party (GLP / PVL) by by linguistic region.
Figure CD15 - Vote for the Christian Democrats by education level

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Christian Democratic People's Party (CVP / PDC) by education level.
Figure CD16 - Vote for the Christian Democrats by education group

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Christian Democratic People's Party (CVP / PDC) by education group.
Figure CD17 - Vote for the Christian Democrats by income group

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Christian Democratic People's Party (CVP / PDC) by income group.
Figure CD18 - Vote for the Christian Democrats by religious affiliation

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Christian Democratic People's Party (CVP / PDC) by religious affiliation.
Figure CD19 - Vote for the Christian Democrats by gender

Source: authors’ computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Christian Democratic People's Party (CVP / PDC) by gender.
Figure CD20 - Vote for the Christian Democrats by union membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not union member</th>
<th>Union member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-71</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-79</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-87</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-99</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-07</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-19</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Christian Democratic People's Party (CVP / PDC) by union membership status.
Figure CD21 - Vote for the Christian Democrats by region

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Christian Democratic People's Party (CVP / PDC) by linguistic region.
Figure CD22 - Vote for the Liberals by education level

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Free Democratic Party (FDP / PRD) by education level.
Figure CD23 - Vote for the Liberals by education group

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Free Democratic Party (FDP / PRD) by education group.
Figure CD24 - Vote for the Liberals by income group

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Free Democratic Party (FDP / PRD) by income group.
Figure CD25 - Vote for the Liberals by religious affiliation

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Free Democratic Party (FDP / PRD) by religious affiliation
Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Free Democratic Party (FDP / PRD) by gender.
Figure CD27 - Vote for the Liberals by union membership

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Free Democratic Party (FDP / PRD) by union membership status.
Figure CD28 - Vote for the Liberals by region

Source: authors’ computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Free Democratic Party (FDP / PRD) by linguistic region.
Figure CD29 - Vote for far-right parties by education level

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Swiss People's Party (SVP / UDC), Swiss Democrats (SD / DS), and Freedom Party (FPS / PSL) by education level.
Figure CD30 - Vote for far-right parties by education group

Source: authors’ computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Swiss People’s Party (SVP / UDC), Swiss Democrats (SD / DS), and Freedom Party (FPS / PSL) by education group.
Source: authors’ computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.  
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Swiss People’s Party (SVP / UDC), Swiss Democrats (SD / DS), and Freedom Party (FPS / PSL) by income group.
Figure CD32 - Vote for far-right parties by religious affiliation

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Swiss People's Party (SVP / UDC), Swiss Democrats (SD / DS), and Freedom Party (FPS / PSL) by religious affiliation.
Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Swiss People's Party (SVP / UDC), Swiss Democrats (SD / DS), and Freedom Party (FPS / PSL) by gender.
Figure CD34 - Vote for far-right parties by union membership

Source: authors’ computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Swiss People's Party (SVP / UDC), Swiss Democrats (SD / DS), and Freedom Party (FPS / PSL) by union membership status.
Figure CD35 - Vote for far-right parties by region

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Swiss People's Party (SVP / UDC), Swiss Democrats (SD / DS), and Freedom Party (FPS / PSL) by linguistic region.
**Figure CD36 - Vote for far-right parties by location**

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Swiss People's Party (SVP / UDC), Swiss Democrats (SD / DS), and Freedom Party (FPS / PSL) by rural-urban location.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Swiss national election studies, 1971 (previous vote)</td>
<td>FORS</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Swiss national election studies</td>
<td>FORS</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Swiss national election studies</td>
<td>FORS</td>
<td>1253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Swiss national election studies</td>
<td>FORS</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Swiss national election studies, 1987 (previous vote)</td>
<td>FORS</td>
<td>1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Swiss national election studies</td>
<td>FORS</td>
<td>1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Swiss national election studies</td>
<td>FORS</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Swiss national election studies</td>
<td>FORS</td>
<td>7561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Swiss national election studies</td>
<td>FORS</td>
<td>3258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Swiss national election studies</td>
<td>FORS</td>
<td>5891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Swiss national election studies</td>
<td>FORS</td>
<td>4392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Swiss national election studies</td>
<td>FORS</td>
<td>4391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Swiss national election studies</td>
<td>FORS</td>
<td>5337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Swiss national election studies</td>
<td>FORS</td>
<td>6664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors' elaboration. FORS: https://forscenter.ch/projects/selects/
Note: the table shows the surveys used, the source from which these surveys can be obtained, and the sample size of each survey.
### Table CA2 - Complete descriptive statistics by decade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age: 20-40</strong></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age: 40-60</strong></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age: 60+</strong></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education: Primary</strong></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education: Secondary</strong></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education: Tertiary</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment status: Employed</strong></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment status: Unemployed</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment status: Inactive</strong></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status: Married or with partner</strong></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion: No religion</strong></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion: Catholic</strong></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion: Protestant</strong></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion: Other</strong></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church attendance: Never</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church attendance: Less than monthly</strong></td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church attendance: Monthly or more</strong></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural-urban: Rural areas</strong></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sector: Public</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender: Man</strong></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of birth: CH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of birth: Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home ownership: Yes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region: German</strong></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region: French</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region: Italian</strong></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Union membership: Yes</strong></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.

**Note:** the table shows descriptive statistics by decade for selected available variables.
### Table CA3 - The structure of political cleavages in Switzerland, 2011-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SPS / PDA</th>
<th>CVP</th>
<th>FDP</th>
<th>GPS / GLP</th>
<th>SVP / FPS / SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall vote share</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 40%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than monthly</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly or more</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation (Oesch classif.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate managers and administrators</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine service workers</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical experts</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural semi-professionals</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business owners</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled production workers</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled clerks</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural professionals</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal professions and large employers</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed / Inactive</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and administrators</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled service-workers</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine production workers</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine clerks</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors' computations using Swiss political attitudes surveys.
Notes: the table shows the average share of votes received by the main political parties by selected individual characteristics over the 2011-2019 period. Vote shares by group are those reported in surveys and may not match exactly official election results.
Figure D1 - Election results in Austria, 1945-2019

- Austrian People's Party (ÖVP)
- Social Democratic Party of Austria (SPÖ)
- Freedom Party of Austria (FPÖ/BZÖ)
- Greens (United Greens, Green Alternative)
- Liberal Forum / NEOS
- Communist Party (KPÖ)

Source: authors’ computations using official election results.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by selected groups of Austrian political parties in legislative elections between 1945 and 2019.
**Figure D2 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS among highest-educated and top-income voters, after controls**

- **Source**: authors’ computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
- **Note**: the figure shows the support for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS among highest-educated and top-income voters, after controlling for other variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table D1 - The structure of political cleavages in Austria, 2013-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of votes received (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPO / KPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall vote share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.

**Notes:** the table shows the average share of votes received by the main political parties by selected individual characteristics over the 2013-2017 period. Vote shares by group are those reported in surveys and may not match exactly official election results.
Figure DA1 - Election results in Austria, 1945-2019

- Austrian People's Party (ÖVP)
- Social Democratic Party of Austria (SPÖ)
- Freedom Party of Austria (FPÖ/BZÖ)
- Greens (United Greens, Green Alternative)
- Liberal Forum / NEOS
- Communist Party (KPÖ)

Source: authors’ computations using official election results.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by selected groups of Austrian political parties in legislative elections between 1945 and 2019.
Figure DA2 - Election results in Austria by group, 1945-2019

- Socialists, communists, greens, liberals (SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS / Other left)
- Conservatives, christians, anti-immigration (ÖVP / FPÖ / BZÖ / Other right)
- Other parties and independents

Source: authors' computations using official election results.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by selected groups of Austrian political parties in legislative elections between 1945 and 2019.
Figure DA3 - The composition of the electorate by education level

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by education level.
Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by age group.
Figure DA5 - The composition of the electorate by religion

No religion  Catholic  Protestant  Muslim

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of the electorate by religious affiliation.
Figure DA6 - Composition of income quintiles by education level, 1970s

Source: authors’ computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by education level in the 1970s.
Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the composition of income quintiles by education level in the 2010s.
Figure DB1 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by education level

Source: authors’ computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by education level.
Figure DB2 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by education group

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by education group.
Figure DB3 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by income decile

Source: authors’ computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by income decile.
Figure DB3b - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by income decile

Source: authors’ computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by income decile.
Figure DB4 - Vote SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by income group

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by income group.
Figure DB5 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by religious affiliation

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by religious affiliation.
Figure DB6 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by church attendance

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by frequency of church attendance.
Figure DB7 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by location

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by rural-urban location.
Figure DB8 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by gender

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by gender.
**Figure DB9 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by marital status**

![Bar chart showing the share of votes received by SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by marital status for different time periods: 1971, 1983-86, 1994-99, 2002-08, and 2013-17.](image)

**Source:** authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.

**Note:** the figure shows the share of votes received by SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by marital status.
Figure DB10 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by age

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS by age group.
Figure DC1 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS among highest-educated and top-income voters

Source: authors’ computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the support for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS among highest-educated and top-income voters.
Figure DC2 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS among highest-educated and top-income voters, after controls

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the support for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS among highest-educated and top-income voters, after controlling for other variables.
Figure DC3 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS among university graduates

- Difference between (% of university graduates) and (% of other voters) voting Left / Green / NEOS
- After controlling for income
- After controlling for income, age, gender, employment, marital status, religion, rural/urban location

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of university graduates and the share of other voters voting for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure DC4 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS among highest-educated voters

- Difference between (% of top 10%) and (% of bottom 90%) educated voting Left / Green / NEOS
- After controlling for income
- After controlling for income, age, gender, employment, marital status, religion, rural/urban location

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% educated voters and the share of other voters voting for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure DC5 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS among primary-educated voters

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of primary educated voters and the share of other voters voting for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure DC6 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS among top-income voters

Source: authors’ computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of top 10% earners and the share of other voters voting for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS, before and after controlling for other variables.
**Figure DC7 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS among voters with no religion**

- **Blue line**: Difference between (% of no religion) and (% of other voters) voting Left / Green / NEOS
- **Red line**: After controlling for income, education
- **Green line**: After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, rural/urban location

**Source**: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.

**Note**: the figure shows the difference between the share of voters declaring no religion and the share of other voters voting for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure DC8 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS among Catholics

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of Catholic voters and the share of other voters voting for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure DC9 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS among non-religious voters

- Difference between (% of non-religious) and (% of other voters) voting Left / Green / NEOS
- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, rural/urban location

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of voters never going to church and the share of other voters voting for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure DC10 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS among women

Difference between (% of women) and (% of men) voting Left / Green / NEOS

- After controlling for income, education
- After controlling for income, education, age, employment, marital status, religion, rural/urban location

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of women and the share of men voting SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure DC11 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS among young voters

- **Difference between (% of aged 20-39) and (% of other voters) voting Left / Green / NEOS**
- **After controlling for income, education**
- **After controlling for income, education, gender, employment, marital status, religion, rural/urban location**

**Source:** authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.

**Note:** the figure shows the difference between the share of voters aged 20-39 and the share of voters older than 40 voting for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure DC12 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS among rural areas

- Difference between (% of rural areas) and (% of urban areas) voting Left / Green / NEOS
- After controlling for income
- After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status, religion

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of rural areas and the share of urban areas voting for SPÖ / KPÖ / Greens / NEOS, before and after controlling for other variables.
Figure DC13 - The education cleavage in Austria

- **Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting FPÖ**
- **Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting SPÖ / KPÖ**
- **Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting Greens**
- **Difference between (% top 10% educated) and (% bottom 90% educated) voting ÖVP**

**Source:** authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.

**Note:** the figure shows the bias of highest-educated voters towards the FPÖ, SPÖ/KPÖ, Greens, and ÖVP.
Figure DC14 - The income cleavage in Austria

- Difference between (% top 10% income) and (% bottom 90% income) voting FPÖ
- Difference between (% top 10% income) and (% bottom 90% income) voting SPÖ / KPÖ
- Difference between (% top 10% income) and (% bottom 90% income) voting Greens
- Difference between (% top 10% income) and (% bottom 90% income) voting ÖVP

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the bias of top-income voters towards the FPÖ, SPÖ/KPÖ, Greens, and ÖVP.
Figure DD1 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ by education level

Source: authors’ computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the SPÖ / KPÖ by education level.
Figure DD2 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ by education group

Source: authors’ computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the SPÖ / KPÖ by education group.
Figure DD3 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ by income group

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the SPÖ / KPÖ by income group.
Figure DD4 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ by religious affiliation

Source: authors’ computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the SPÖ / KPÖ by religious affiliation.
Figure DD5 - Vote for SPÖ / KPÖ by gender

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the SPÖ / KPÖ by gender.
Figure DD6 - Vote for Greens by education level

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Greens by education level.
Figure DD7 - Vote for Greens by education group

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Greens by education group.
Figure DD8 - Vote for Greens by income group

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Greens by income group.
Figure DD9 - Vote for Greens by religious affiliation

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Greens by religious affiliation.
Figure DD10 - Vote for Greens by gender

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.  
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Greens by gender.
Figure DD11 - Vote for ÖVP by education level

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the ÖVP by education level.
Figure DD12 - Vote for ÖVP by education group

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the ÖVP by education group.
Figure DD13 - Vote for ÖVP by income group

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the ÖVP by income group.
Figure DD14 - Vote for ÖVP by religious affiliation

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the ÖVP by religious affiliation.
Figure DD15 - Vote for ÖVP by gender

Source: authors’ computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the ÖVP by gender.
Figure DD16 - Vote for FPÖ by education level

Source: authors’ computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the FPÖ by education level.
Figure DD17 - Vote for FPÖ by education group

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the FPÖ by education group.
Figure DD18 - Vote for FPÖ by income group

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the FPÖ by income group.
Figure DD19 - Vote for FPÖ by religious affiliation

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the FPÖ by religious affiliation.
Figure DD20 - Vote for FPÖ by gender

Source: authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the FPÖ by gender.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>International social mobility and politics file</td>
<td>ISMP</td>
<td>1585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>International social mobility and politics file</td>
<td>ISMP</td>
<td>987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>International social mobility and politics file</td>
<td>ISMP</td>
<td>2969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Eurobarometers Mannheim Trend File, various years</td>
<td>GESIS</td>
<td>5145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Eurobarometers Mannheim Trend File, various years</td>
<td>GESIS</td>
<td>7327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Eurobarometers Mannheim Trend File, various years</td>
<td>GESIS</td>
<td>7095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>European social survey and Eurobarometers</td>
<td>ESS</td>
<td>8591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>European social survey</td>
<td>ESS</td>
<td>2405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Comparative study of electoral systems</td>
<td>CSES</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Comparative study of electoral systems</td>
<td>CSES</td>
<td>1203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Note:** the table shows the surveys used, the source from which these surveys can be obtained, and the sample size of each survey.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age: 20-40</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 40-60</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 60+</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Primary</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Secondary</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Tertiary</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status: Employed</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status: Unemployed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status: Inactive</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status: Married or with partner</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: No religion</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Catholic</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Protestant</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Muslim</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance: Never</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance: Less than monthly</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance: Monthly or more</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural-urban: Rural areas</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Man</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.

**Note:** the table shows descriptive statistics by decade for selected available variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Share of votes received (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPO / KPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall vote share</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 40%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than monthly</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly or more</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** authors' computations using Austrian political attitudes surveys.

**Notes:** the table shows the average share of votes received by the main political parties by selected individual characteristics over the 2013-2017 period. Vote shares by group are those reported in surveys and may not match exactly official election results.