Online Supplemental Material I

Table 5. Coefficient parameters for switching vote to AfD from CDU/CSU or SPD

	Predictor			B (SE)	95% C.I. for Odds Ratios		
					OddsRatio	Lower	Upper
Demo	Intercept			-8.55 (1)*	0.001	0.001	0.002
	Sex (man)			0.96 (0.29)*	2.62	1.49	4.73
	Age			-0.02 (0.01)	0.98	0.96	1
	State (East Germany)			0.22 (0.33)	1.25	0.64	2.39
	Education (University degree)			0.56 (0.26)*	1.75	1.05	2.96
Political variables	Interest in politics (High vs mid or lower)			0.34 (0.27)	1.41	0.83	2.39
		Avg. voter-party Δ (std.)					
	Distance from previous party on Left-Right placement	CDU/CSU	0.57 (0.03)	-0.45 (0.58)	0.64	0.21	1.98
		SPD	0.5 (0.01)	1.61 (0.8)*	5.03	1.05	24.15
	Dist. from party on Prog.-Cons. Placement	CDU/CSU	0.59 (0.02)	1.81 (0.66)*	6.11	1.69	22.53
		SPD	0.39 (0.02)	0.34 (0.94)	1.4	0.22	8.65
Policy Attitudes	Dist. from party on anti-Green policies	CDU/CSU	0.04 (0.07)	0.74 (0.2)*	2.09	1.43	3.11
		SPD	-0.2 (0.04)	1.18 (0.35)*	3.24	1.68	6.69
	Dist. from party on pro-State intervention	CDU/CSU	0.25 (0.08)	0.21 (0.22)	1.24	0.8	1.92
		SPD	-0.05 (0.03)	0.63 (0.35)	1.89	0.97	3.82
	Dist. from party on Redistributionist pol.	CDU/CSU	-0.57 (0.04)	-0.59 (0.16)*	0.56	0.4	0.76
		SPD	-0.1 (0.04)	0.45 (0.29)	1.57	0.89	2.76
	Dist. from party on anti-Immigrant pol.	CDU/CSU	0.35 (0.09)	1.76 (0.25)*	5.79	3.59	9.57
		SPD	0.17 (0.04)	1.1 (0.43)*	3.01	1.31	7.12
	Dist. from party on pro-EU attitudes	CDU/CSU	0.06 (0.07)	-1.77 (0.2)*	0.17	0.11	0.25
		SPD	-0.49 (0.02)	-0.91 (0.34)*	0.4	0.21	0.77
	Dist. from party on Progressive values	CDU/CSU	0.59 (0.09)	-0.08 (0.2)	0.92	0.62	1.36
		SPD	-0.21 (0.03)	-0.8 (0.32)*	0.45	0.24	0.84
	Dist. from party on anti-State Control pol.	CDU/CSU	1.17 (0.08)	0.45 (0.17)*	1.56	1.12	2.18
		SPD	0.71 (0.06)	0.44 (0.26)	1.56	0.93	2.59

* p< .05

[1] Negative distances indicate the party having higher score on the relevant factor than the average previous voter. In this particular case, both CDU/CSU and SPD voters were more in favour of green policies than their respective parties (who had higher anti-green policies factor score).

Online Supplemental Material II. Weighting parameters

Weighting process outcomes

		Expected from voting population[1]	"Clean" dataset	Weighted dataset[2]
Sex	Man	48.8%	69.2%	48.9%
	Woman	51.1%	30.8%	51.1%
Age	18 to 30 years old	18.1%	37.8%	18.2%
	31 to 45 y.o.	22.1%	30.2%	22.1%
	46 to 60 y.o.	27.7%	25%	27.8%
	Over 61 y.o.	32%	6.7%	32%
State	East Germany State	19.6%	19.6%	19.7%
	West Germany State	80.3%	80.4%	80.3%
2013 federal election vote[3]	CDU/CSU	41.5%	24.6%	44.3%
	SPD	25.7%	24.3%	27.4%
	Die Linke	8.6%	12.9%	9.2%
	Die Grünen	8.4%	20.4%	9%
	FDP	4.8%	9.3%	5.1%
	AfD	4.7%	8.5%	5%

[1] Census data: Current updating of population figures (code 12411) (https://www-genesis.destatis.de/)

[2] The calculated weights ranged from 0.119 to 7 (truncated max. value); 90% of the weights under 2 and 95% under 3.2; Total weighted N= 4368.9; unweighted N= 4369

[3] Results from the 2013 federal election from: https://www.bundeswahlleiter.de/en/bundestagswahlen/2013/ergebnisse/bund-99.html#zweitstimmen-prozente11

Online Supplemental Material IIIa. Stimuli & Operationalisation

Variable name	Response Options
Sex	Woman Man
Age	Continuous
State	West Germany: Baden-Württemberg, Bayern, Bremen, Hamburg, Hessen, Niedersachsen, Nordrhein-Westfalen, Rheinland-Pfalz, Saarland, Schleswig-Holstein East Germany: Berlin, Brandenburg, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Sachsen, Sachen-Anhalt, Thüringen
Education	No university degree Schule beendet ohne Abschluss, Volks- Hauptschulabschluss, Mittlere Reife Realschulabschluss, Berufsabschluss/ Lehre, Meister Technicker oder Ähnliches, Abitur Fachhochschulreife Fachschulreife University degree (Fach-)Hochschulabschluss, Promotion Habilitation
Interest in politics	Low & Mid political interest[1] Not interested at all, A little interested, Somewhat interested High political interest[1] Fairly interested, Very interested
Self-placement Left-Right[2]	Treated as continuous (0:= Left; 10:= Right)
Self-placement Prog.-Cons.[3]	Treated as continuous (0:= Progressive; 10:=Conservative)
[1] Original wording for the measurement: [Überhaupt nicht; Wenig; Mittel] and [Stark; Sehr stark]	
[2] Wording for Left-Right self-placement question In der Politik wird oft debattiert, ob der Staat mehr oder weniger in die Wirtschaft eingreifen soll. Wie ist Ihre Meinung dazu und wie schätzen Sie die der Parteien ein? Sie können mit den untenstehenden Dials (Wählscheiben) einen Wert zwischen 0 und 10 eingeben. 0 bedeutet, dass die Regierung eine aktive Rolle in der Wirtschaft spielen soll. 10 bedeutet, dass die Regierung gar nicht in den Markt eingreifen soll.	
[3] Wording for Progressive-Conservative self-placement question In der Politik spricht man im Zusammenhang von gesellschaftlichen Themen häufig von „progressiv“ und „konservativ“. Konservativ steht z.B. für die Betonung traditioneller Werte. Progressiv steht z.B. für Offenheit gegenüber alternativen Lebensstilen. Wo stehen Sie und wie schätzen Sie die Parteien ein? Sie können mit den untenstehenden Dials (Wählscheiben) einen Wert zwischen 0 (progressiv) und 10 (konservariv) eingeben.	

Online Supplemental Material IIIb. Stimuli & Operationalisation

25 Policy items dimensionality

Dim.	Question	Loading
anti-Green	In the future, there should be a ban on diesel and petrol cars.	.84
	In the future, Germany should be completely supplied by renewable energy sources.	.84
	Proportion of overall variance explained by factor score	**70%**
pro- State Interventionism	Companies should be allowed to set the amount of manager salaries without restriction from the State.	.7
	Job protection for companies should be relaxed, so that new jobs can be created more easily.	.6
	The State should take measures to enforce gender equality with regards to salaries.	-.54
	Proportion of overall variance explained by factor score	**38%**
anti-Redistributionist policies	The property tax should be reintroduced.	.83
	Investments in social policy and infrastructure should take precedence over debt reduction.	.46
	Top earners ought to be taxed with higher rates.	.89
	Proportion of overall variance explained by factor score	**57%**
anti- Immigration policies	Germany should continue to receive an indefinite amount of refugees from war zones.	.91
	Asylum seekers and applicants who have been rejected should be deported, including to Afghanistan.	-.82
	There should be integration courses for all asylum seekers, even if there is a low chance of obtaining a leave to remain.	.71
	Proportion of overall variance explained by factor score	**67%**
pro- EU attitudes	German membership in the European Union is a good thing.	-.86
	EU-Turkey accession negotiations should be ended.	.54
	Economically weaker countries, e.g. Greece, should not be in the eurozone.	.74
	Proportion of overall variance explained by factor score	**53%**
Progressive social values	Same-sex couples should not have full rights to adoption.	.69
	Christian values should be the guiding principle of German politics.	.69
	Proportion of overall variance explained by factor score	**47%**
anti- State-control policies	A monitoring programme for the Internet is necessary to combat terrorism.	.81
	Video surveillance of public spaces should be expanded.	.81
	Proportion of overall variance explained by factor score	**65%**

Note that the response options ("Completely Agree" to "Completely Disagree") have been coded as 1:5, thus larger factor scores indicate larger **disagreement** with the wording of the questions in each factor

Online Supplemental Material IVa. Vote Intention in the 2017 election model

	Predictor	B (SE)	95% C.I. for Odds Ratios		
			Odds Ratio	Lower	Upper
	SPD vs CDU/CSU				
Demo	Intercept	-1.51 (0.43)*	0.22	0.09	0.51
Demo	Sex (Man)	0.19 (0.18)	1.2	0.85	1.71
Demo	Age	0.04 (0.01)*	1.04	1.03	1.05
Demo	State (East Germany)	0.31 (0.27)	1.36	0.8	2.31
Demo	Education (University degree)	0.36 (0.18)	1.43	1	2.06
Political vars.	Interest in politics (High vs mid or lower)	0.27 (0.18)	1.32	0.92	1.89
Political vars.	Left (0) – Right (10) self-placement	-0.04 (0.04)	0.96	0.89	1.03
Political vars.	Progressive (0) – Conservative (10) placement	-0.05 (0.04)	0.95	0.89	1.02
Policy Attitudes	anti-Green policies	-0.27 (0.13)*	0.77	0.6	0.98
Policy Attitudes	pro-State Intervention policies	0.94 (0.14)*	2.56	1.93	3.4
Policy Attitudes	anti-Tax & spend policies	-1.08 (0.13)*	0.34	0.27	0.44
Policy Attitudes	anti-Immigration policies	-0.45 (0.14)*	0.64	0.49	0.83
Policy Attitudes	pro-EU policies	-0.28 (0.15)	0.75	0.56	1.01
Policy Attitudes	Progressive social values	0.69 (0.13)*	1.99	1.53	2.58
Policy Attitudes	anti-State Control policies	0.34 (0.12)*	1.41	1.12	1.77
	Die Linke vs CDU/CSU				
Demo	Intercept	-2.64 (0.5)*	0.07	0.03	0.19
Demo	Sex (Man)	0.45 (0.21)*	1.57	1.04	2.35
Demo	Age	0.05 (0.01)*	1.05	1.03	1.06
Demo	State (East Germany)	1.2 (0.29)*	3.33	1.89	5.87
Demo	Education (University degree)	0.35 (0.21)	1.42	0.93	2.15
Political vars.	Interest in politics (High vs mid or lower)	0.11 (0.21)	1.12	0.74	1.7
Political vars.	Left – Right self-placement	-0.11 (0.04)*	0.9	0.82	0.97
Political vars.	Progressive – Conservative self-placement	-0.04 (0.04)	0.96	0.89	1.04
Policy Attitudes	anti-Green policies	-0.65 (0.14)*	0.52	0.39	0.69
Policy Attitudes	pro-State Intervention policies	0.86 (0.17)*	2.35	1.68	3.3
Policy Attitudes	anti-Tax & spend policies	-2.16 (0.2)*	0.12	0.08	0.17
Policy Attitudes	anti-Immigration policies	-0.61 (0.16)*	0.54	0.4	0.74
Policy Attitudes	pro-EU policies	-0.79 (0.17)*	0.46	0.33	0.64
Policy Attitudes	Progressive social values	0.41 (0.15)*	1.51	1.12	2.04
Policy Attitudes	anti-State Control policies	1.02 (0.13)*	2.76	2.13	3.59

Reference category throughout: CDU/CSU

* p< .05

Online Supplemental Material IVb. Vote Intention in the 2017 election model

	Predictor	B (SE)	95% C.I. for Odds Ratios		
			Odds Ratio	Lower	Upper
	die Grünen vs CDU/CSU				
Demo	Intercept	-2.46 (0.51)*	0.09	0.03	0.23
Demo	Sex (Man)	-0.58 (0.21)*	0.56	0.38	0.84
Demo	Age	0.05 (0.01)*	1.05	1.03	1.06
Demo	State (East Germany)	0.51 (0.3)	1.66	0.92	3.02
Demo	Education (University degree)	0.84 (0.21)*	2.31	1.54	3.45
Political vars.	Interest in politics (High vs mid or lower)	0.4 (0.21)	1.49	0.98	2.25
Political vars.	Left (0) – Right (10) self-placement	-0.06 (0.04)	0.95	0.87	1.03
Political vars.	Progressive (0) – Conservative (10) placement	-0.12 (0.04)*	0.89	0.82	0.96
Policy Attitudes	anti-Green policies	-1.5 (0.16)*	0.22	0.16	0.3
Policy Attitudes	pro-State Intervention policies	0.51 (0.16)*	1.67	1.21	2.29
Policy Attitudes	anti-Tax & spend policies	-0.65 (0.14)*	0.52	0.39	0.69
Policy Attitudes	anti-Immigration policies	-0.52 (0.16)*	0.59	0.44	0.8
Policy Attitudes	pro-EU policies	0.2 (0.19)	1.22	0.85	1.75
Policy Attitudes	Progressive social values	0.3 (0.16)	1.35	1	1.83
Policy Attitudes	anti-State Control policies	0.62 (0.13)*	1.86	1.44	2.41
	FDP vs CDU/CSU				
Demo	Intercept	0.29 (0.4)	1.34	0.61	2.92
Demo	Sex (Man)	0.1 (0.17)	1.1	0.79	1.54
Demo	Age	0 (0.01)	1	0.99	1.01
Demo	State (East Germany)	0.19 (0.26)	1.21	0.72	2.02
Demo	Education (University degree)	0.22 (0.17)	1.25	0.9	1.73
Political vars.	Interest in politics (High vs mid or lower)	-0.31 (0.17)	0.73	0.53	1.02
Political vars.	Left – Right self-placement	-0.07 (0.04)	0.94	0.87	1
Political vars.	Progressive – Conservative self-placement	-0.02 (0.04)	0.98	0.91	1.05
Policy Attitudes	anti-Green policies	0.11 (0.12)	1.12	0.89	1.41
Policy Attitudes	pro-State Intervention policies	-0.3 (0.12)*	0.74	0.58	0.94
Policy Attitudes	anti-Tax & spend policies	0.07 (0.1)	1.07	0.89	1.29
Policy Attitudes	anti-Immigration policies	0.29 (0.13)*	1.33	1.03	1.72
Policy Attitudes	pro-EU policies	-0.09 (0.14)	0.92	0.7	1.2
Policy Attitudes	Progressive social values	0.21 (0.11)	1.24	0.99	1.55
Policy Attitudes	anti-State Control policies	0.56 (0.11)*	1.75	1.42	2.16

Reference category throughout: CDU/CSU

* p< .05

Online Supplemental Material V. Distribution of "Interest in politics" variable

Interest in Politics variable

Values	Weighted dataset			weighted GLES[1]		weighted EES[2]	
	Unweighted N	Weighted N	Valid %	Valid % among all data	Valid % among voters[4]	Valid % among all data	Valid % among voters[4]
Not interested at all[3]	23	30.8	0.7%	5.8%	2.8%	8.1%	3.1%
A little interested	198	220.9	5.1%	16.9%	14.9%	26.1%	24.5%
Somewhat interested	1324	1459.1	33.7%	43%	43.7%	48.9%	51.9%
Fairly interested	1829	1704.4	39.3%	24.9%	27.9%	NA	NA
Very interested	973	917.3	21.2%	9.3%	10.7%	16.9%	20.5%

The variable "interest in politics" was not used in the calculation of the weights

[1] Data from the 2017 post-election cross-sectional German Longitudinal Election Study (see https://www.gesis.org/en/elections-home/gles/data/)

[2] Data from the 2017 early release European Election Study (Schmitt, Hobolt, van der Brug and Popa, 2019): http://europeanelectionstudies.net/european-election-studies/ees-2019-study/voter-study-2019)

[3] Response options in original: Überhaupt nicht; Wenig; Mittel; Stark; Sehr stark

[4] Calculated only taking into account individuals with a valid response in the relevant "vote in 2017" question.

For analyses the first three categories [not at all, a little, somewhat interested] were combined, as were the categories [fairly, vary interested] to form a binary variable

Education variable

Values	Weighted dataset		
	Unweighted N	Weighted N	Valid %
Volks-, Hauptschulabschluss	123	155.8	3.8%
Mittlere Reife, Realschulabschluss	357	473.8	11.5%
Berufsabschluss/ Lehre	633	701	16.9%
Meister, Techniker, oder Ahnliches	322	298.5	7.2%
Abitur, Fachhochschulreife, Fachschulreife	786	772.4	18.7%
(Fach-)Hochschulabschluss	1688	1477.9	35.7%
Promotion, Habilitation	218	184.7	4.5%

For analyses, the last two categories [(Fach-)Hochschulabschluss, Promotion Habilitation] were combined into a "with university degree" category (%), the remaining into a "non-university degree" category (%) yielding a binary variable. Expected from population: with university degree (17.7%), without (82.3%).