

## Appendix

Table A1. Descriptive statistics, individual-level variables.

	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.
Voting propensity	12104	0.47	.35	0	1
Taxes on high income, squared voter–party distance	12104	0.00	0.30	–.25	0.75
EU membership, squared voter–party distance	12104	0.00	0.33	–.28	.72
<i>Party competence</i>					
Most competent party	12104	0.14	0.34	0	1
Other party most competent	12104	0.50	0.50	0	1
<i>Party identification</i>					
Party identifier × own party	12104	0.10	0.30	0	1
Party identifier × other party	12104	0.39	0.49	0	1

Table A2. Descriptive statistics, context-level variables.

	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.
Polarization, left–right	22	0.042	0.013	0.023	0.071
Polarization, taxes on high incomes	22	0.054	0.017	0.020	0.085
Polarization, EU membership	22	0.086	0.018	0.044	0.118
Effective number of electoral parties	22	4.547	1.053	2.270	6.713
Log(effective threshold)	22	2.298	0.758	0.762	3.624

Table A3. Coding of the dummy variables for party identification and party competence.

Observation	<i>PID Own<sub>ij</sub></i>	<i>PID Other<sub>ij</sub></i>	<i>Best party<sub>ij</sub></i>	<i>Other best<sub>ij</sub></i>
Respondent 1 × Party A	1	0	1	0
Respondent 1 × Party B	0	1	0	1
Respondent 1 × Party C	0	1	0	1
Respondent 2 × Party A	0	1	0	1
Respondent 2 × Party B	1	0	1	0
Respondent 2 × Party C	0	1	0	1
Respondent 3 × Party A	0	0	0	0
Respondent 3 × Party B	0	0	0	0
Respondent 3 × Party C	0	0	0	0

*This table illustrates the coding of the two dummies measuring party identification and party competence. Respondent 1 identifies with party A and thinks this party is most competent. Respondent 2 identifies with party B and perceives it as the best party to solve his or her most important problem. Respondent 3 has no party identification and thinks that no party is able to solve the most pressing political problem.*

Table A4. Correlations between context-level variables.

	Polariz., left–right	Polariz., taxes	Polariz., EU	ENEP	Log(eff. threshold)
Polarization, left–right	–				
Polarization, taxes on high incomes	0.72***	–			
Polarization, EU membership	0.86***	0.65**	–		
Effective number of electoral parties	–0.20	0.39 <sup>†</sup>	–0.18	–	
Log(effective threshold)	0.02	–0.17	–0.00	–0.65**	–

<sup>†</sup>  $p < 0.10$ ; \*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ .

$N = 22$

Table A5. Impact of context-level variables on proximity voting, single-issue voting, and party identification voting: coefficients from bivariate regressions.

	Polarization	ENEP	Log(ET)
<i>Proximity voting</i>			
Taxes on high incomes	–1.047 (0.850)	–0.035** (0.011)	0.034 <sup>†</sup> (0.018)
EU membership	–1.286 <sup>†</sup> (0.743)	0.009 (0.014)	0.013 (0.018)
<i>Single-issue voting</i>			
Most competent party	2.732* (1.173)	–0.015 (0.016)	–0.001 (0.021)
Other party most competent	0.480 (0.486)	–0.004 (0.006)	0.009 (0.007)
<i>Party identification voting</i>			
PID, own party	–2.343*** (0.584)	0.008 (0.010)	0.010 (0.013)
PID, other party	–0.141 (0.609)	0.013 <sup>†</sup> (0.007)	–0.010 (0.009)

<sup>†</sup>  $p < 0.10$ ; \*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ .

Coefficients (standard errors in parentheses) of the second-stage models estimated with weighted least squares regressions. Each line corresponds to one dependent variable. Each dependent variable is regressed on a single context-level variable (polarization, fragmentation, or proportionality). For all models,  $N = 22$ . The measure of polarization used varies across dependent variables: economic polarization for issue voting on taxation, EU polarization for issue voting on EU membership, and general left–right polarization for the remaining dependent variables. The estimated values of the constant are not reported.

Table A6. Impact of electoral competitiveness on proximity voting, based on the reduced version of the individual-level model.

Dependent variable	Model 1				Model 2			
	Polarization	ENEP	Constant	$R^2$	Polarization	Log(ET)	Constant	$R^2$
<i>Proximity voting</i>								
Taxes on high incomes	0.475 (1.000)	-0.047* (0.018)	-0.060 (0.080)	0.29	0.027 (1.052)	0.049 <sup>†</sup> (0.025)	-0.363** (0.090)	0.18
EU membership	-2.011* (0.764)	0.012 (0.013)	-0.238* (0.101)	0.33	-2.143* (0.780)	0.002 (0.018)	-0.173 <sup>†</sup> (0.084)	0.29

<sup>†</sup>  $p < 0.10$ ; \*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ .

Coefficients (standard errors in parentheses) of the second-stage models estimated with weighted least squares regressions. Each line corresponds to one dependent variable. Each dependent variable is regressed on polarization and fragmentation (Model 1) and on polarization and proportionality (Model 2). For all models,  $N = 22$ . The measure of polarization used varies across dependent variables: economic polarization for issue voting on taxation and EU polarization for issue voting on EU membership.

## Question wording

The wording of the questions used in this study is indicated below in the original German version and in an English translation. Interviews were also conducted in French and Italian. The corresponding questions are available from the author upon request.

### *Voting propensities*

Ich lese Ihnen jetzt die Namen von einigen Parteien vor. Bitte sagen Sie mir jeweils, wie gross die Wahrscheinlichkeit ist, dass Sie jemals diese Partei wählen werden. 0 oder eine Zahl in der Nähe von 0 bedeutet, dass die Wahrscheinlichkeit sehr klein ist, dass Sie diese Partei wählen werden. 10 oder eine Zahl in der Nähe von 10 bedeutet, dass die Wahrscheinlichkeit sehr gross ist. Welche Wahrscheinlichkeit besteht, dass Sie die Partei jemals wählen werden?

- Christlich-demokratische Volkspartei (CVP)?
- Etc.

I will now give you the names of some parties. Please tell me for each of them how large the probability is that you will ever vote for this party. 0 or a number close to 0 means a very small probability that you will vote for this party. 10 or a number close to 10 means that the probability is very large. What is the probability that you will ever vote for this party?

- Christian-Democratic Party (CVP)?
- Etc.

### *Opinion on taxation of high income*

Sind Sie für eine Erhöhung von den Steuern auf grossen Einkommen oder sind Sie für eine Verminderung von den Steuern auf grossen Einkommen?

1. Für Erhöhung
2. Weder noch
3. Für Verminderung

Are you in favour of higher taxes on high income or are you in favour of lower taxes on high income?

1. In favour of higher taxes
2. Neither nor
3. In favour of lower taxes

If respondents answer either “in favour of higher taxes” or “in favour of lower taxes”, follow-up question:

Sind Sie eher dafür oder stark dafür?

1. Eher dafür
2. Stark dafür

Are you rather in favour of this or strongly in favour of this?

1. Rather in favour
2. Strongly in favour

### *Opinion on Swiss EU membership*

Sind Sie für den Beitritt von der Schweiz zur Europäischen Union oder für den Alleingang von der Schweiz?

1. Für den Beitritt
2. Weder noch
3. Für den Alleingang

Are you in favour of a Swiss EU membership or are you in favour of Switzerland’s “Alleingang” [“unilateral approach”]?

1. In favour of EU membership
2. Neither nor
3. In favour of the “Alleingang”

If respondents answer either “in favour of EU membership” or “in favour of the Alleingang”, follow-up question:

Sind Sie eher dafür oder stark dafür?

1. Eher dafür
2. Stark dafür

Are you rather in favour of this or strongly in favour of this?

1. Rather in favour
2. Strongly in favour

***Parties’ issue positions: Swiss EU membership***

Was meinen Sie, ist die ... für den Beitritt von der Schweiz zur Europäischen Union oder ist die ... für den Alleingang von der Schweiz?

1. Für den Beitritt
2. Weder noch
3. Für den Alleingang

What do you think, is the ... in favour of a Swiss EU membership or is the ... in favour of Switzerland’s “Alleingang” [“unilateral approach”]?

1. In favour of EU membership
2. Neither nor
3. In favour of the “Alleingang”

If respondents answer either “in favour of EU membership” or “in favour of the Alleingang”, follow-up question:

Ist sie eher dafür oder stark dafür?

1. Eher dafür
2. Stark dafür

Is it rather in favour of this or strongly in favour of this?

1. Rather in favour
2. Strongly in favour

***Parties’ issue positions: Taxes on high income***

Was meinen Sie, ist die ... für eine Erhöhung von den Steuern auf grosse Einkommen, oder ist die ... für eine Verminderung von den Steuern auf grosse Einkommen?

1. Für eine Erhöhung
2. Weder noch
3. Für eine Verminderung

What do you think, is the ... in favour of higher taxes on high income or is the ... in favour of lower taxes on high income?

1. In favour of higher taxes
2. Neither nor
3. In favour of lower taxes

If respondents answer either “in favour of higher taxes” or “in favour of lower taxes”, follow-up question:

Ist sie eher dafür oder stark dafür?

1. Eher dafür
2. Stark dafür

Is it rather in favour of this or strongly in favour of this?

1. Rather in favour
2. Strongly in favour

***Most important problem and party competence***

In der Schweiz gibt es viele ungelöste Probleme. Welches ist Ihrer Meinung nach

There are many unsolved problems in Switzerland. Which problem is in your view

das gegenwärtig wichtigste Problem für  
unser Land?

the most important for our country at the  
moment?

If respondents indicated such a problem, follow-up question:

Welches ist Ihrer Meinung nach die  
kompetenteste Partei für die Lösung  
von dem Problem?

Which party is in your view the most  
competent to solve that problem?

***Party identification***

Wie schätzen Sie sich selbst ein? Stehen Sie  
gewöhnlich einer politischen Partei nahe?

Do you consider yourself to be close to a  
political party?

If respondents answer yes, follow-up question:

Um welche Partei handelt es sich?

Which party is it?