**Online Appendix**

As a robustness check I have carried out additional analysis to see if the findings from the cross-sectional analysis of 2001 reported in Table 3 also holds in other election years. To investigate this possibility I link data from the 1992 British Representation Survey to the 1992 British Election Survey. As before I specify a multilevel logit model with individuals nested in constituencies to estimate how the class-party association varies according to the occupational background of the Labour candidate. The general model is specified as follows:

,

where *VOTE*is party support (1 = Labour; 0 = Conservative), is the constant, Class is the occupational background of the voter, LABCLASS is the occupational background of the Labour candidate; and Class\*LABCLASS is a cross-level interaction between voter’s class and Labour candidate’s class. Controls are also included for age, sex, education, and religion at the individual level, and economic deprivation at the constituency level. Due to data limitations it is not possible to replicate Models 2 and 3 from Table 3, so the analysis below is based on the occupational background of all Labour candidates for which data is available, and does not discriminate by incumbency status.

Broadly speaking the results from Table 5 broadly confirm the pattern of associations reported in Table 3. Given the sample size and missing data we should be somewhat cautious in our interpretation the results, but nonetheless the findings are reassuring in the sense that they are broadly consistent with the earlier analysis. The sign for the class coefficient of the Labour candidate is negative, suggesting that people are less likely to vote Labour when the candidate is working class, controlling for the level of economic deprivation in the constituency. The interaction term between voter’s social class and candidate’s social class is also in the expected direction. This indicates that working class voters tend to be relatively more likely than the middle class to vote Labour when the Labour candidate is also working class.

**Table 5:** Multilevel Logistic Regression Models Predicting Labour vs. Conservative vote, 1992

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Model 1:Lab vs. Con voteAll seats 1992 |
|  | B | S.E. |
| Voter’s Social Class |  |  |
|  Routine Non Manual | -1.58 | 1.54 |
|  Working Class | -1.91 | 1.61 |
| Labour Candidate’s Social Class |  |  |
|  Working Class | -1.25 | 1.31 |
| Labour Class by Voter’s Class  |  |  |
|  by RNM | 1.87 | 1.36 |
|  by WC | 2.45 | 1.39 |
| Economic Deprivation | -0.02 | 0.09 |
| Econ deprivation by Voter’s Class  |  |  |
|  by RNM | 0.03 | 0.10 |
|  by WC | 0.08 | 0.11 |
| Constant | 1.31 |  |
| Chi Square | 78 (16) |  |
| Log likelihood | -843 |  |
| N | 1394 |  |

*Notes:* Reference category is Middle class. Due to small sample size salariat and petty bourgeoisie categories have been merged. Models also control for age, sex, education and religion.