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1. Executive summary

This paper argues that Labour can win the next general election whenever it comes. However, to secure a decisive parliamentary majority that will sustain a Labour government in office for at least two terms, the Labour party will have to significantly expand its electoral support. Our analysis, based on an exclusive public opinion survey by Populus, indicates there are two political and electoral strategies available to Labour. The first strategy is termed the ‘Bernie Sanders’ approach of continuing to expand Labour’s vote among the professional middle-class; economically precarious younger voters; and the poorest groups on the very lowest incomes. These voters comprised the core of the 2017 Corbyn coalition.

The alternative approach we have labelled the ‘Clem Attlee’ strategy: this approach entails building support for Labour in all social grades and classes, and across the nation. The Attlee strategy means the party has to gain support among the lower and middle income voters who tend to populate ‘Communitarian Britain’, and who are less convinced about Labour’s programme and policy agenda. This voter group is defined by their struggle to ‘make ends meet’: they live on low to middle incomes and make just enough to get by through careful management of their household budget. The 64 parliamentary seats that Labour has to win next time to secure an outright majority are disproportionately populated by these voters, in the C2 social grades, who tend to earn approximately £21,000-34,000 a year. The aim should be not just to sneak past the winning post with ‘one more heave’, but to achieve a significant mandate through which Labour can transform the country for the benefit of the many not the few.

The voters Labour needs to win

Almost two-thirds of the 64 marginal seats Labour has to win at the next election have more C2 social grade voters than AB voters. This contrasts with Britain as a whole: just 55% of seats across the country fit this profile. Our poll suggests that those on middle incomes are currently most sceptical about and have a less favourable view of the Labour party.


Labour’s ‘core vote’ is increasingly concentrated among the highest and very lowest earners in Britain. Being a middle income earner (£21,000-£34,000) decreases the probability of voting Labour by 9 points compared to someone earning less than £14,000 per annum.

The 2017 election result

The voter groups at the 2017 general election who had a decisive impact on the result were not so much the very young or the very old, but 25-44 year olds, particularly university graduates, who switched in large numbers to Labour. The party’s success was in winning over these working-age voters.

Educational achievement as well as age matters in voting. For example, the Conservative party led among voters aged over 35 where voters had not attended university. In general, the more highly educated voters are, the more likely it is they will support the Labour party. We estimate that having a university degree increases the probability of voting Labour by 9 percentage points.1
Alongside this, Labour voters are much more likely to say that they are struggling to get by on their current income; this applies across income and social grade categories. It is those that are making ends meet on middle incomes that Labour is most at risk of losing.

'Hard remainers' broke heavily towards Labour on June 8th, driving the party’s gains in the South of England.

There was no discernible ‘London effect’ on voting patterns. Labour’s electoral dominance in London is the consequence of demographic and social variables rather than the fact that voters live in London.

Most people in Britain do not believe that living standards are getting better, either for them personally or the country as a whole. Britain is in the grip of a wave of economic pessimism before the Brexit process has even begun.

**Labour’s image in the minds of voters**

Voters believe that Labour is principally the party of ‘equality’. More voters want Labour to be the party of ‘fairness’, particularly the lower and middle income voters who were less likely to support Labour in 2017.

Many voters do not believe that Labour is close to its ‘traditional working class supporters’ any longer. That said self-identifying as working class makes voters 9 points more likely to support the party.

Labour’s weaknesses on policy issues remain: the perception of economic incompetence and the view that Labour is unable to negotiate a ‘good deal’ on Brexit are its biggest vulnerabilities. Voters believe that the Labour party is strongest on addressing the cost of living crisis, dealing with everyday concerns in their communities, and improving public services; but voters still do not view Labour as a ‘strong’ or decisive party.

Voters perceive Labour to be closest to the trade unions and the public sector; the party is no longer viewed as close to the political elite or the financial sector. This perception may well have enabled Labour to make gains among former UKIP voters.
2. Introduction

The 2017 general election has delivered a political earthquake in UK national life. An election in which the Conservatives were expected to obtain a greatly enhanced parliamentary majority with a mandate to secure a ‘tough’ Brexit deal has evaporated. May’s Government without a parliamentary majority is barely sustainable; the tentative ‘confidence and supply’ arrangement with the Northern Irish Democratic Unionist Party (DUP) might collapse at any moment. There is little agreement even among senior Conservatives about the shape and form that the Brexit process should now take. Neither Theresa May nor the Conservative Government’s survival can be taken for granted.

As a consequence, for the first time in a generation Labour stands on the brink of power. Jeremy Corbyn significantly outperformed expectations with the biggest rise in electoral support for Labour since 1997. It was not merely that the election delivered a number of gains across the country; in the leafy towns of Southern England as well as the Celtic heartlands of Wales and Scotland. Labour’s campaign was well executed: Corbyn managed to exude calm authority, in contrast to a cold and robotic prime minister, while inspiring many, especially the young. The Labour party’s manifesto was clear and costed in stark contrast to the Conservatives. The party was finally able to reshape the national conversation after seven years of austerity: inequality and narrow isolationism have apparently given way to a new concern among voters with fairness and social justice. There is a growing belief on the British left that the Labour party is about to experience another ‘1945 moment’ where the mood of the nation shifts decisively towards socialism.

Labour has now re-emerged as a viable contender for power in British politics. But to win another election outright, in three months or a year from now, the party has a steep hill to climb. The Labour party did not win a majority of votes or seats in 2017. Labour was confronting the most ineffectual Tory campaign in modern political history. The Conservative manifesto involved an attack on their core voters, particularly the relatively well-off elderly. The campaign had no clear economic narrative and the chancellor, Philip Hammond, was virtually absent from the airwaves. The Tories had presided over seven years of anaemic growth that failed to make its way into people’s pay packets, and were set to embark on the economic catastrophe of Brexit. The Conservatives ‘retoxified’ their brand by supporting the return of foxhunting. May is demonstrably among the worst leaders in the history of the Tory party.

Yet the Conservatives still won the most seats, and secured their highest share of the vote since the 1983 general election. Labour made no significant net gains among former Tory voters: the Labour party’s victories were achieved predominantly by squeezing the Greens and the Liberal Democrats. Despite the abysmal Tory campaign, the Conservative vote actually held up ending roughly where it had been in the polls when the prime minister called the election at 43 per cent. Labour gained fewer parliamentary seats in 2017 than it did under Neil Kinnock in 1992.

The Labour party has now lost three general elections in a row after the worst crisis in western capitalism for eighty years. This is no time for the party to rest on its laurels; Labour has to earn the right to be the next government of Britain. According to Professor John Curtice, the Conservatives need a 0.3 per cent swing to win a parliamentary majority at the next election. Labour requires a swing of 4.9 per cent. The aim should be not to sneak past the winning post with ‘one more heave’, but to achieve the 10 per cent swing required to create a sustainable governing majority which keeps Labour in power for a generation.

The purpose of this initial report is to examine what Labour needs to do to win next time. The findings of the report are based on extensive opinion research conducted with the polling organisation,
We recognise the methodological limitations of polling as revealed in recent elections. Nonetheless, rigorous use of polling data can help us to develop a richer, more nuanced account of the electorate’s perceptions and views on key political issues. We do not believe that policy-making should be replaced by focus groups, slavishly following the opinions of particular voters. Yet only by listening carefully to the electorate will Labour be able to assemble a successful election-winning coalition and find a path back to power.

We begin by analysing the new political landscape of Britain. We turn our attention to dominant perceptions of the political parties, the Labour party in particular, to ascertain its relative strengths and weaknesses in the eyes of voters. Then, the report considers the key voter groups and marginal seats that Labour needs to win over if it is to triumph next time. Finally, the report draws brief conclusions about the agenda and strategy on which Labour should fight the next election if it is to return to government imminently.

---

2. Methodological note: Populus surveyed 2511 people online in Great Britain between 2-5 June 2017, including boosters of 2015 and 2017 Labour voters to ensure a robust sample size for detailed analysis. The overall results were weighted by 2017 general election result and down-weighted the 2015 Labour sample.
3. The new landscape of British politics

The landscape of UK politics is changing, and a long-term process of structural realignment is underway. This process is being propelled by several political dynamics.

The first dynamic is the structural aftershock of two major referendums: the 2014 referendum on Scottish independence, and the 2016 referendum on whether the UK should remain a member of the European Union (EU). This has introduced new dividing lines into British electoral politics: in Scotland, whether voters are ‘for’ or ‘against’ the union; in England and Wales, whether voters want to ‘leave’ or ‘remain’ in the EU. The Scottish National Party (SNP) lost twenty seats in Scotland in 2017 as ‘pro-union’ voters tactically switched support to Conservative, Labour or Liberal Democrat candidates where they were best placed to win. In England and Wales, predominantly middle-class and ardently ‘pro-remain’ voters who wanted a ‘softer’ Brexit were prepared to vote Labour tactically. This enabled the Labour party to sweep through London, and secure quite unexpected gains in Southern England.

The second dynamic of transformation in the political landscape is social and demographic change that is creating new alignments and coalitions in British politics. It has been said that ‘age’ has become the new dividing line in UK politics with older voters significantly more likely to support the Conservatives, while young electors flock to Labour. However, it ought to be remembered that Labour’s gains among 25-44 year olds were the critical factor at this election. The relationship between class and voting is also changing: it is not the case that class no longer matters in British politics. But Labour is securing more support among the highest social grades. Conversely, workers in the low to middle income range were more willing than ever to vote Conservative. Moreover, there is a growing cleavage between those who populate large urban areas, and those who live in towns and rural communities. There are some analysts who argue that voting for a political party is now a lifestyle choice, a new form of identity politics. It is clear that new social and political identities are emerging across the UK.

The third dynamic changing the landscape of British politics is the ongoing aftershocks of austerity, which are creating new patterns of inequality and precariousness. Pensioners and older voters who have largely been protected from the Conservatives’ austerity programme remained broadly loyal to the Tories, despite proposals in the manifesto to end the pension ‘triple lock’ and introduce a so-called ‘dementia tax’. Younger voters, even those who are relatively well educated from middle-class backgrounds, have revolted against austerity policies that are damaging their future economic prospects. Younger and middle-aged voters between the ages of 24 and 45 also shifted towards Labour, no doubt concerned that the next generation will, in all likelihood, be materially worse off than their parents.

As a consequence, the electoral map of Britain is being redrawn. Labour lost a handful of seats and found itself squeezed by the Tories in a number of constituencies in Northern England and the Midlands but made gains in the cities and the South: Brighton and Hove, overwhelmingly populated by younger, more middle-class, liberal voters were the symbols of Labour’s advance. Mansfield, a former mining town in Derbyshire which leaned heavily towards Leave in last year’s EU referendum, elected a Conservative MP for the first time in its history.

Inevitably, there is continuity as well as change in Britain’s electoral politics. Conservative support remains overwhelmingly concentrated in Southern England. Labour’s electoral advantage still lies in the former industrial and urban heartlands of Northern England, Wales and Scotland. There can be little doubt that a transition is underway, however. British politics is increasingly polarised between younger, more liberal, pro-European, and better educated voters who are more likely to

---

3. Social grades are commonly defined in the following way:
AB: ‘Higher & intermediate managerial, administrative, professional occupations’; C1: ‘Supervisory, clerical & junior managerial, administrative, professional occupations’; C2: ‘Skilled manual occupations’; DE: ‘Semi-skilled and unskilled manual occupations, unemployed and lowest grade occupations’. (Source: http://www.ukgeographics.co.uk/blog/social-grade-a-b-c1-c2-d-e). According to the NRS (http://www.nrs.co.uk/nrs-print/lifestyle-and-classification-data/social-grade), the proportion of social grades across the British population is as follows: AB 27 per cent; C1 27 per cent; C2 21 per cent; DE 21 per cent.
live in cities on the one hand. Alongside older, more socially conservative, pro-Leave voters who are most likely to reside in towns and villages on the other. There is some truth in the claim of a growing divide between ‘cosmopolitan’ and ‘communitarian’ Britain. Demographically and socially, the 2017 election has similarities to recent elections in the United States: for example, Obama won the presidency in 2008 and 2012 by uniting a ‘post-industrial coalition’ of upscale, high income college educated voters with poorer black communities. Obama’s support among white lower and middle income voters was much weaker. This trend was even more prevalent in Trump’s victory over Hilary Clinton. A similar process of structural realignment appears to be underway in UK elections.

It is too simplistic to depict this political realignment as a straightforward division between ‘cosmopolitan’ and ‘communitarian’ Britain. The electorate is not comprised of people who think the world is either ‘open’ or ‘closed’; neither has the traditional dividing line between left and right on economic policy disappeared. On key questions about policies and issues, the two ‘tribes’ of British politics are closer together than we might think. Britain is most certainly not in the grip of an existential culture war.

It would also be a great mistake to write off the Conservative party merely because Britain is becoming more liberal and diverse: the Tories for the last century have shown a remarkable capacity to adapt themselves pragmatically to change. Since universal suffrage and the growth of the working-class electorate in the 1920s and 1930s, the Conservatives have constantly altered their political message and appeal. The UK is becoming more diverse, more tolerant, and better educated; but to claim that the Tories are finished as a consequence is likely to prove mistaken.

What next for Labour?

If Labour is to make further advances at the next general election, it needs a strategy to grow its base of political support. Two electoral and political strategies appear potentially fruitful.

The first is to take forward the ‘Corbyn Coalition’ of June 2017. This might be labelled the ‘Bernie Sanders strategy’. The unique electoral alliance Labour galvanised on 8 June includes not only liberal Britain angered by the decision to leave the EU, but working-class voters on the very lowest incomes, some of whom defected from Ukip as they were appalled by austerity, as well as younger people leading economically precarious lives. As we have seen, it has been claimed that Britain is becoming more liberal, urban, ethnically diverse and well educated over time: in which case, the ‘Bernie Sanders strategy’ is likely to have a long-term electoral pay-off for Labour.

The alternative strategy is to extend Labour’s support into the middle and lower income social groups in marginal seats, some of whom defected to the Conservatives in 2017. This approach can be labelled the ‘Attlee’ strategy; the aim is to build support for Labour throughout all classes and parts of Britain, as the party did on the eve of its famous 1945 victory. The Attlee approach is self-evidently a challenge for Labour next time: many of these voters are in favour of leaving the EU, and are the most sympathetic to socially authoritarian and conservative values. Yet where Labour assembled a broad electoral alliance in the victories of 1945, 1964-66, and 1997, the party secured strong support among more socially conservative working-class voters. At the same time, it is unlikely that Labour will make further progress at the next general election merely by piling up votes among the relatively affluent, the highly educated, the young and the poor. In a first-past-the-post electoral system, a party’s success depends as much on the breadth as the depth of its electoral support and the party’s capacity to win seats in the House of Commons.

Moreover, for Labour, the question of which strategy to adopt, Sanders or Attlee, is not purely a matter of electoral calculation. Labour was created at the beginning of the 20th century to be the
party of working-people; as the historian Martin Pugh has demonstrated, the Labour party always had strong roots in working-class communities that were never overtly sympathetic to socialist values or programmes. The new proletarian class created their own social institutions, trade unions, churches, schools, co-operatives, friendly societies, sports and cultural facilities, and working men’s clubs that were more often fiercely independent of the state. They believed in mutuality and social responsibility where as far as possible, rights were matched by obligations. Where political parties have secured a viable parliamentary majority in British politics, they have tended to be perceived as both ‘strong’ and ‘compassionate’. Labour is still seen by too many of these voters as having its heart in the right place, but as lacking the strength and resolve to be a credible governing party.

We argue in this report that Labour should pursue an Attlee-inspired political nation-building strategy if it is to win outright at the next general election. The Labour party should remain the worker’s party fighting for those families in Britain struggling each year to make ends meet.
4. Views of the political parties

Perceptions of the Labour party

By the end of the election campaign, the public had a more favourable view of the Labour party (37 per cent favourable/40 per cent unfavourable) than the Conservatives (34 per cent favourable/40 per cent unfavourable). In truth, however, neither party had a decisive advantage. Those groups with the most favourable view of Labour were urban dwellers (44 per cent), current students, and those with higher degrees. The least favourably disposed to Labour were pensioners and older married couples.

The political principle that the public across all social groups believe is important to Labour is ‘equality’ (63 per cent), followed by ‘fairness’ (59 per cent) and ‘community’ (56 per cent). The values they think least important to Labour are ‘environmentalism’ (43 per cent) and ‘internationalism’ (42 per cent). In reality, relatively few members of the public would be more likely to vote Labour if the party put ‘internationalism’ at the heart of its agenda. It is striking that the value the public would most like Labour to emphasise is ‘fairness’ (45 per cent agree/8 per cent disagree) rather than ‘equality’ (37 per cent agree/12 per cent disagree) or ‘internationalism’ (19 per cent agree/18 per cent disagree).

This feeling is strongest among the social groups Labour has yet to convince. Those in the C2 social grade favour an emphasis on ‘fairness’ by 51 to 6 per cent (C2s comprise 21 per cent of the total British voter population). Among this group, Labour’s position is less than commanding. When we asked all respondents which party they most trusted ‘to make Britain a fair place to work hard, make a living, and do well for yourself’, 31 per cent chose the Conservatives (46 per cent distrust), 36 per cent Labour (43 per cent distrust), and 20 per cent the Liberal Democrats (41 per cent distrust). The Labour party is more likely to be perceived as the party of fairness, but its advantage over the Conservatives is hardly overwhelming.

‘Freedom’ also scores highly as a principle that Labour should emphasise in its political and policy agenda (40 per cent agree/8 per cent disagree). The emphasis on freedom is particularly important for younger respondents in the 25 to 34 age category (51 per cent agree/3 per cent disagree); and those in social grade AB (44 per cent agree/7 per cent disagree). Going too far in appealing to voters with more authoritarian social attitudes by sacrificing a clear stance on civil liberties could be politically damaging for Labour.

When asked which terms ‘best describe the Conservative party and the Labour party today’, Labour was most likely to be viewed as ‘incompetent’ (18 per cent), ‘weak’ (16 per cent), and more positively, ‘forward-looking’ (13 per cent). In contrast, the Conservatives are seen as ‘authoritarian’ (20 per cent), ‘competent’ (15 per cent), and ‘strong’ (12 per cent). Only 7 per cent of the public believed Labour could best be described as competent and only 4 per cent thought that the party was ‘patriotic’. The C2 respondents were most likely to perceive the Tories to be authoritarian and strong, and to see Labour as incompetent (23 per cent) and weak (13 per cent). Just 4 per cent of C2s believe Labour can best be described as a ‘moderate’ party.

56 per cent of respondents in our survey perceived that Labour now stands for the working-class. Just 2 per cent say the same for the Conservatives, an indicator of the strategic failure of Theresa May’s campaign to bring the Tories closer to working-class voters. It is striking too that the public believe the Conservatives stand for the ‘upper-middle class’ (24 per cent) and the ‘upper class’ (38 per cent); May’s party is seen as representing wealth, power and privilege in today’s Britain. Crucially,
neither party is perceived to stand for the middle class (10 per cent Conservative; 8 per cent Labour), or for ‘all classes in society’ (13 per cent for both).

**Figure 1: who do you think Labour and the Conservatives stand for?**

![Bar chart showing public perception of Labour and Conservative stand](chart1.png)

**Base: all respondents (2511)**

However, when we asked the public whether they believed that Labour has ‘moved closer or further away from its traditional working-class supporters’, only 27 per cent thought the party had moved closer and 39 per cent further away. This perception was particularly marked among the C2 social group: 22 per cent thought the party had moved closer, and 47 per cent further away.

**Figure 2: to what extent do you think the Labour party has moved closer or further away from its traditional working class supporters?**

![Bar chart showing public perception of Labour’s move](chart2.png)

**Base: all respondents (2511)**
Perceptions of Labour’s policies

The issues on which Labour is trusted most by the public are ‘understanding the concerns of people in your area about day to day life in Britain’ (40 per cent), tackling the cost of living crisis (38 per cent), and ensuring value for money in public services (37 per cent). The Conservatives lead on economic management (42 per cent) and ‘negotiating a good Brexit deal with the EU’ (47 per cent).

The Labour party is weakest on Brexit where 54 per cent of C2 voters (21 per cent of the total British voter population) think that the Tories will get the best deal, and being trusted on the economy among the C1s and DEs (where only 23 per cent in both groups trust Labour). The Tories are seen as the party most likely to be out of touch with people’s everyday concerns.

In relation to key institutions in society, Labour is seen, not surprisingly, as closest to the trade unions (81 per cent), the public sector (69 per cent), and the working-class (68 per cent). The party is most distant from the financial sector (68 per cent) and the political elite (65 per cent) (see Figure 3 below). Labour’s separation from the ruling economic and political establishment may have been useful in winning over former UKIP voters, although Professor John Curtice has indicated that Labour’s gains were limited among those who once voted for UKIP.

Figure 3: to what extent do you think the Labour party is close or distant from the following groups? (per cent close/very close)

![Figure 3: Perceptions of Labour's policies](image)

Base: all respondents (2511)

The long-term impact of globalisation on British voters

Our survey shows that the British public are not overwhelmingly hostile to globalisation, and that their attitude is generally more neutral. Last year’s referendum on EU membership appeared to indicate that antipathy to globalisation and its impact on jobs and national identity was a strong factor in driving the vote to leave the EU. In this poll, 39 per cent of voters believed that globalisation has been ‘good for the UK’, 28 per cent ‘good for their families’, and 22 per cent ‘good for the local community’. Only 24 per cent believed that globalisation had been ‘negative for the UK’, 18 per cent ‘negative for their families’, and 21 per cent ‘negative for the local community’.

![Figure 3: The long-term impact of globalisation on British voters](image)
A positive view of the impact of globalisation on ‘you and your family’ is not surprisingly strongest among those earning more than £55,000 per annum (54 per cent), 18-24 year olds (46 per cent), and AB social grade voters (37 per cent). C2 voters and those earning between £21,000 and £34,000 a year are the most likely to have a negative or sceptical opinion about the effects of globalisation. 60 per cent of those earning more than £55,000 thought that globalisation had a positive impact on the UK. In contrast, 34 per cent of C2 voters believed that globalisation had a negative effect on the UK’s prospects. C2 voters were the most likely to believe that globalisation was responsible for taking British jobs. When we asked 2015 and 2017 Labour voters what terms they most associated with globalisation, 58 per cent said ‘corporations and controlling elites’. Somewhat surprisingly, free movement and immigration did not register to the same extent (17 per cent).

Overall, the absence of underlying pessimism about globalisation might partly explain UKIP’s relatively weak performance in the 2017 general election, alongside the failure of Theresa May’s more nationalistic and isolationist brand of Conservatism to make greater headway among working-class voters in the north of England.

That said, the less well educated are much less positive about globalisation than the electorate as a whole, and voters want national governments to do more to protect British companies and workers. Overall, 58 per cent of respondents agreed that ‘the UK government should prevent British companies based in Britain from being taken over by foreign companies’ (11 per cent disagreed). The over-65s (67 per cent), the C2s (65 per cent), those living in the east Midlands (65 per cent), and those with only a secondary education (64 per cent) were the most likely to agree.

Moreover, there is less agreement among the British public that ‘ethnic and religious diversity has been good for Britain’: 35 per cent agree with the statement while 37 per cent disagree. 18-24 year olds (49 per cent), those in social grade AB (47 per cent), those working in the public sector (45 per cent), and those with higher degrees were most likely to believe that diversity has been positive. 55-64 year olds (48 per cent) and those in social grade DE (47 per cent) were most likely to disagree that ethnic and religious diversity has been beneficial for Britain.
5. Key voter groups

The greatest electoral challenge that Labour now faces is that the middle-ground of its electoral support has been hollowed-out. Those who tend to vote Labour are either the affluent professional middle-class, younger people who face a precarious future despite often having a good education, and the poorest segments of the working-class. Those in the middle, the C2s and those earning between £21,000 and £34,000 a year, have increasingly gravitated towards the Conservatives.

This group are the ‘make ends meet’ voters: they live on low to middle incomes and make just enough to get by through tight management of their household budget. Those in this group – and others – that Labour has so far failed to win over are less likely to report major problems living on their current income. These voters are aspirational: they get by, but they look upwards, not downwards and are frustrated at the present squeeze in their living standards. Appealing to these voters is a major strategic issue for Labour since many of the marginal seats it needs to win to get back into government are disproportionately populated by these so-called C2 middle income groups. So what are the motivations and concerns of these key voters?

Living standards and the new inequalities

The public in our survey overwhelmingly believe that Britain is a country where the rich are getting richer. 66 per cent of respondents think that the living standards of ‘the rich’ in the UK are getting better; but only 13 per cent agree living standards are improving for ‘you and your family’; 9 per cent for ‘people in Britain’; and 7 per cent for ‘the poor’. Conversely living standards are believed to be getting worse for the poor (65 per cent), ‘people in Britain’ (54 per cent), and ‘you and your family’ (39 per cent). Only five per cent of those who voted Labour in 2017 believed that the living standards of the British people were getting better, while 76 per cent thought they were getting worse (87 per cent to 3 per cent for ‘the poor’).

Moreover, 77 per cent of respondents in our survey agreed that ‘the gap between rich and poor in Britain is too large’; those in social grade DE (84 per cent), those with university degrees (84 per cent), and 45-54 year olds (83 per cent) were the most likely to agree that the gap is too big.

Voters who said they were ‘struggling to get by on their present income’ were considerably more likely to vote Labour than those who reported being comfortable. This, as shown in the results of the regression model, is a significant factor controlling for other demographic variables and across the income spectrum. Those who feel that they are struggling – whether it is those who have first-hand experience of the benefits freeze or professionals paying exorbitant rent in London – are overwhelmingly already voting Labour. It is those who are ‘making ends meet’, particularly those on middle incomes, that Labour is struggling with most.
Figure 4: support for Labour and Conservatives, by whether respondents feel they are comfortable or struggling to get by on their present income

Base: 2220 respondents who say they voted in 2017

Figure 5: effect on voting of ‘struggling to get by’, by income bracket (see Technical Appendix for full results of regression model)
Perhaps the most astonishing feature of the 2017 campaign was the absence of serious debate about the state of the economy. This was symbolized by the Chancellor, Philip Hammond’s, self-acknowledged, almost total disappearance from the campaign. Conservative strategists evidently realized that the economy was becoming more of a liability than they had appreciated. The failure to bring down the deficit since 2010 and the vulnerability of growth and real wages to a ‘hard’ Brexit forced the Tories to downplay economic issues. It is worth remembering that the 2017 election was fought in a climate of stagnant real wages and falling living standards. Inflation was rising and beginning to outstrip pay growth, eating into median earnings.

Figure 6: UK Nominal pay versus inflation

Moreover, according to the OECD the UK is already at the bottom of the EU growth table before the full effects of the Brexit process kick in. Public sector pay has begun to fall sharply in real terms. The value of benefits has also declined; for example, the Resolution Foundation highlight that child benefit is worth less now than it was 17 years ago, affecting over 10 million families. Household incomes are more unstable than at any time in the last 40 years; job insecurity is widespread with growing polarisation and ‘hollowing-out’ in the labour market resulting from technological change and the growth of temporary agency working. Dark clouds are gathering on the horizon for the British economy and voters’ living standards.

Education and voting behaviour

In our survey, those aged 18-34 who said they were voting in 2017 were much more likely to vote Labour, but significantly more likely to support the Labour party if they had attended university (36 to 25 percentage point lead over Conservatives). The education gap and the impact of going to university were even greater among 35-54 year olds (23 to -7 per cent), and those older than 55 (-4 to -31 per cent) as Figure 7 demonstrates below:
Class and voting

In our survey, 61 per cent of voters perceived themselves to be working-class, 37 per cent middle-class, and 2 per cent upper-middle-class. This exposes as a myth the claim that Britain is now an overwhelmingly middle-class society. Even 38 per cent of voters in social grade AB say they belong to the working-class. C2 voters are more likely to identify as working-class (79 per cent) than either the C1s or DEs. Labour’s support has grown in the AB social grades compared with thirty years ago. In 2015, Labour’s vote was evenly distributed across the social grades; but in 2017 DEs swung towards the Conservatives:

Base: 2220 respondents who say they voted in 2017
Those in the AB social grade are now most likely to have a favourable view of the Labour party (46 per cent favourable to 34 per cent unfavourable) and to have a less favourable view of the Conservatives (34 per cent favourable to 46 per cent unfavourable), while the C1s were the least positive about Labour (35 per cent to 38 per cent). Moreover, 46 per cent of those earning more than £55,000 a year say they voted for the Labour party. Labour now leads among the highest earners and the lowest earners. But it has a significant deficit among those on middle incomes earning between £21,000 and £34,000 per annum according to Figure 9 below:

Figure 8: voting by social grade, general election 2017

Figure 9: voting in 2017 by household income 2017

Base: 2220 respondents who say they voted in 2017
In our model as shown in Figure 10, those who identify as ‘middle-class’ but have a ‘DE’ occupation are much less likely to vote Labour (the right side of the red line); if you self-identify as ‘working-class’, you are more likely to vote Labour regardless of your social grade:

**Figure 10: socio-economic effects on voting**

If we use NS-SEC occupational categories rather than standard social grade, we can see the swing from Conservative to Labour in each constituency by the percentage of the working age population in ‘routine and semi-routine’ occupations; managerial and professional occupations; and ‘intermediate, lower supervisory and technical occupations’. This analysis indicates that Labour’s support is weakest among voters at the lower end of the employment scale in routine and semi-routine occupations:
Figures 11, 12 and 13: swings from Conservative to Labour among key occupational groups.
It is clear that the 2017 general election was not the February 1974 election where working-class voters in routine and semi-routine occupations living on council estates poured into polling stations to defeat Heath’s Conservative Government. The social make-up of the Tory party has been changing over time: at this election, the Conservatives won fewer voters among middle-class professionals than at any election since 1945. The Tory vote is increasingly older and more working-class.

Unifying the centre-left?

Labour’s success in 2017 was due in no small part to its ability to unify the centre-left vote, sweeping up support among former Liberal Democrat and Green voters. Historically, Labour lost elections in the 20th century in part because centre-left support was divided, whereas the right consolidated around the Conservative party. In 2017, the Liberal Democrat share of the vote remained at rock-bottom (declining slightly to 7.5 per cent). Over the last 30 years, the Liberal Democrats have averaged more than 20 per cent in general elections. The national Green vote has also declined. There is some evidence that a tacit ‘progressive alliance’ was operating in key battleground seats. According to our poll, 31 per cent of the public cast their ballot to ensure ‘strong opposition to the Conservatives’. However, only 15 per cent explicitly said they intended to vote tactically, even if it meant not voting for the party they identified with most closely (60 per cent were not intending to vote tactically). Ultimately, with Labour’s success in squeezing support for other left-of-centre parties, significant additional gains at the next election are most likely to come if Labour can take votes directly from the Conservatives.

Wanting to ‘leave’ the EU was a stronger motivator for voters than the desire to ‘remain’: 30 per cent were ‘strongly influenced’ in voting by the wish for the UK to leave the EU, and 17 per cent of voters by the desire to remain. Voting according to the wish to leave the EU was strongest among the over-65s (47 per cent), the C2s (40 per cent), and those living in the north-east of England. Importantly, however, Labour was able to win over pro-remain voters (see Figure 14 below) despite the party deciding not to vote against Article 50, or to support continuing membership of the single market. The pledge in Labour’s manifesto not to set an arbitrary migration target and to give EU citizens residing in Britain the right to remain in the UK appears to have been sufficient to establish Labour as the de facto pro-European party. 32 per cent of voters earning more than £55,000 per annum
and those with higher degrees were strongly motivated by the desire to remain in the EU. These were the ‘diehard remain’ voters that the Liberal Democrats hoped to win over, but went to Labour, producing unexpected gains in the South of England such as Canterbury and Kensington, won by the Labour party for the first time:

Figure 14: voting movements among remain voters and those whose election vote was strongly influenced by desire to remain in the EU

![Image of voting movements among remain voters and those whose election vote was strongly influenced by desire to remain in the EU](image)

Base: 2220 respondents who say they voted in 2017

**Ukip defectors to Labour**

Despite making progress among remain voters, Labour still made inroads among those on the lowest incomes who leaned more heavily towards leaving the EU. One of the most remarkable features of the 2017 campaign was that the Ukip vote did not only shift to the Conservatives. The Tories were the beneficiaries of Ukip’s collapse, but Labour gained too among former Ukip supporters. John Curtice estimates that the Conservatives won 60 per cent of former Ukip voters, while Labour secured around 20 per cent, enough to tip the balance in tight constituency races. The Ukip vote historically was not only motivated by identity politics issues such as migration and Europe, but antipathy to the governing political and economic establishment exacerbated by seven years of austerity. Labour appears to have been successful in peeling away some of these voters despite its opposition to a ‘hard’ Brexit.

**The surge among the young?**

Labour improved its performance among young people at the 2017 election. There is evidence that Jeremy Corbyn was particularly effective at motivating younger groups to vote. However, it wasn’t the youngest voters who delivered the unexpected Labour gains. The swing among 25 to 44 year olds was the more decisive factor in the election. Despite the widely held media view that it was ‘the young wot won it’ for Labour, the group that swung heavily to the party in 2017 were 25-44 year olds. This was not an election overwhelmingly shaped by the very young or the very old. 25-44 year olds are less likely to be homeowners than in the past (due to the difficulties of accessing the housing market for those on modest incomes), and more likely to have dependent children. In June
2017, these groups leaned heavily towards the Labour party, as Figure 15 illustrates below:

**Figure 15: voting by age**

![Bar chart showing voting by age](chart)

**Base: 2220 respondents who say they voted in 2017**

Moreover, the evidence from our poll indicates that young people in Britain are idealistic, but not particularly motivated by traditional ideological beliefs. Corbyn’s decision to largely eschew the language of ‘socialism’ appears to have paid off in building a broad electoral alliance for Labour.

**Gender and voting**

In 2017, Labour was relatively successful in capturing women’s votes. The party’s policy agenda appears to have resonated with women. Overall, Labour and the Conservatives both secured 41 per cent of the female vote; but the Conservatives led among men by 43 to 39 per cent.
The new marginal seats

There are 64 parliamentary constituencies that Labour now has to win in order to secure a majority of one in the House of Commons. These seats exist in every region of the country, and there is no particular social or demographic pattern that unites them. However, we do know that 41 out of the 64 parliamentary constituencies Labour has to win next time have more voters in social grade C2 than social grade AB; 66 out of the 100 top targets have more C2 than AB voters:

Figure 16: party voting by gender in 2017

Base: 2220 respondents who say they voted in 2017

Figure 17: percentage of seats where C2 households outnumber those in AB social grades
On the whole, Labour’s target seats look less like the seats they currently hold, and more like Britain as a whole. The new marginals Labour will need to focus on are generally:

- Those with a higher proportion of white voters
- Have fewer students
- Have fewer voters born outside the UK

On average, these constituencies do not lean heavily towards leave or remain. Of course, there are more affluent seats such as Chipping Barnett that were clearly pro-remain; other constituencies like Stoke-on-Trent South voted decisively to leave the EU. In many of the latter seats, Labour’s task has become harder, with Tories making gains or increasing their majorities at the 2017 election. Labour will need a coherent electoral and political strategy to appeal to the diversity of voters that inhabit both ‘communitarian’ and ‘cosmopolitan’ Britain.
6. Summary and conclusions

There can be little doubt that the campaign Jeremy Corbyn fought marks a decisive shift in the politics of the Labour party to which all sections of the party will now be obliged to respond. We can glean a number of strategic lessons from the Corbyn political project in the wake of the election result.

The first lesson is that Corbyn’s politics evidently appeal to many younger voters, as well as the social groups that have increasingly abstained from voting in the UK since the late 1980s. Corbyn projected ‘hope’ because his programme was not constrained by conventional electoral calculation. Labour’s prospectus offered an alternative vision of society after nearly a decade of spending cuts, tax rises, and missed deficit reduction targets. Corbyn’s views on policy articulated a rare combination of clarity, principle and conviction. The Labour leader apparently offers an innovative politics of participation that is about doing things ‘with’ people rather than ‘to’ them. His first speech of the campaign spoke of sweeping away anachronistic institutions and inherited privilege. If carried forward this might be the platform for a resurgence of British social democracy.

The challenge ahead for Corbyn’s project is to construct the electoral alliance between the ‘haves’ and ‘have nots’ that is required to win greater numbers of marginal seats, to enter government, and to deliver policies like progressive redistribution and public investment. Another general election appears likely to be called relatively soon. A decisive Labour victory will mean winning in constituencies like Stoke-on-Trent South, Reading West, Thurrock, and Glasgow North West that Labour was unable to win on 8 June.

The second lesson of the Corbyn project is that Labour needs to get over the intellectual defensiveness that has plagued the party since the late 1980s. Corbyn says he now wants an open debate about policy; he ought to be taken at his word. In the past, some modernisers behaved as if the best approach to making Labour a party of government was to give the entire PLP and party membership an intellectual lobotomy. This way of working denuded the Labour party of the capacity to think and revitalise itself. The ascendency of Thatcherism convinced many that Britain had become an inherently conservative country, and that the left could only win by accepting the basic parameters of the Thatcher settlement. In this election under Corbyn, Labour made its most audacious attempt since 1945 to shift the centre ground of politics towards the left. Moreover, the assumption that negative coverage in the mainstream press would destroy Labour’s chances has been confounded. The influence of newspapers appears to be waning among British voters.

The Corbyn project’s third lesson is that when effectively presented, measures that are widely perceived to be ‘leftwing’ are still popular with mainstream voters. Among the most important issues raised in the Labour manifesto was the question of public ownership in a post-industrial economy geared towards the production and distribution of information and knowledge. For the last 30 years, the assumption in the Labour party has been that whether ownership is public or private no longer matters. It was thought that utilities and public services delivered through the private sector could still be regulated effectively in the public interest. Nationalisation in the 1990s was rejected by Labour because it was believed to be too costly to bring major public utilities like water, gas or rail back into public ownership. Yet it is clear that since 1997, public opinion has become more hostile towards private ownership of the utilities, especially rail. Previous assumptions ought to be revisited: many privatised industries in the UK are natural monopolies; the privatisations of the 1980s and 1990s have been detrimental both to consumer welfare and economic efficiency.

None of this ignores the fact that Labour is still some way from winning a parliamentary majority
at the next general election. The party has made significant progress since 2015; but to defeat the Conservatives, Labour has to be capable of winning seats throughout Britain. It is not enough merely to rouse already committed supporters: the party has to be capable of reaching out to ‘non-Labour Britain’ where there is little tribal affiliation with the Labour party as Attlee did in 1945.

This does not mean that Labour is guaranteed to win whenever the next election comes. The Corbyn agenda can be taken forward, but Labour still has critical vulnerabilities that need to be urgently addressed, particularly in appealing to ‘make ends meet’ voters: these groups live on low to middle incomes and make just enough to get by through tight management of their household budget.

First, Labour is still not perceived to be an economically competent party. The evidence from our research is that voters on very high and very low incomes were most willing to support the Labour party. Those on middle to lower incomes appear to be more concerned about the impact of Labour’s policies, even if they believe the party is better placed to tackle the ‘cost of living crisis’. John McDonnell’s tax plans deliberately excluded anyone earning less than £80,000 a year from paying higher income tax. Labour had the courage to make an explicit case for extra investment in public services. But Labour must also be wary of the charge that the party wants to place a cap on people’s aspirations, and that its public spending plans threaten economic stability. One possible solution that Labour should consider is the introduction of new ‘hypothecated’ taxes as a way of reassuring voters that the tax they pay is used efficiently to improve public services such as the NHS.

Further, Labour’s investment plans must be built on the premise that all politics is local. Investment in the abstract and large spending figures at the national level do not sit comfortably with Labour’s other ‘retail’ offers and risk sounding unaffordable when Labour’s platform is inevitably subjected to greater scrutiny in the next campaign. Instead, Labour should use the time it has now before the next election to map where in the country private investment is too low, and where public investment could help to revitalise local economies, for example through the proposed regional development banks. Concrete offers to the parts of the UK that have suffered decades of under-investment would appeal to people’s sense of place and belonging (not class identity or other sectional interests), and the ‘communitarian’ instincts of many of the voters Labour currently struggles most with.

Second, Labour is viewed as relatively weak on maintaining social order at a time of heightened terrorist threats. Corbyn was effective in pointing out the damaging long-term effect of cuts in policing and the intelligence agencies in the aftermath of the terrorist atrocities during the 2017 campaign. However, there is more to be done in winning voters’ trust, particularly on the issue of defence. Centre-left parties have to be alive to the politics of insecurity, not only economic and financial insecurity, but concerns about crime, public disorder, family instability, and geo-political risks. In truth, the fact that the Conservatives are viewed as an ‘authoritarian’ party is attractive to many of the voters Labour needs to win over in crucial marginal seats. The Labour party has to develop a new generation of policies on law and order to keep communities safe, emphasising effective neighbourhood policing in particular. Labour’s stance on ‘Brexit’ acknowledges that many lower to middle income voters are unhappy about the impact of freedom of movement across Europe. The salience of immigration as an issue is likely to remain.

Third, Labour has to consolidate its appeal among former Liberal Democrat and Green voters beyond the issue of remaining in Europe. The party needs a constitutional reform agenda that creates a consensus for political change as Charter 88 did in the 1980s and 1990s. We need a plan for a federal UK that addresses the imbalances in the current constitutional settlement, particularly the lack of voice for England and the English. At the election, voters were often compelled to vote tactically because of an outdated and anachronistic electoral system that gives the Conservatives the most seats on just 43 per cent of the vote. Jeremy Corbyn is ideally placed to develop his own ‘new politics’ agenda. Moreover, too few voters see Labour as the party of environmentalism, at
a time when President Trump is seeking to destroy the Paris Climate Change Agreement. The left needs to be green as well as egalitarian in its politics.

Fourth, Labour has to address long-term challenges and assemble a viable programme for government. For instance, ahead of the 2010 election, Andy Burnham developed practical social care proposals in which older people who needed residential care would have their estate taxed on death. The policy was derided by the Conservatives as a ‘death tax’, but it is a much more sensible proposal than the social care measures in the Tory manifesto. Equally, nationalisation is now a prominent plank of Labour’s programme: the party has to develop a form of ‘social’ ownership in a sector such as the railways that gives citizens and workers a greater role in the running of the industry. There is much work to be done in preparing for office.

Fifth, Labour will need its own plan for a ‘progressive’ Brexit that puts jobs first. The challenge for the Labour party is to develop a policy in which as far as possible the UK remains in the single market and the customs union, while securing changes to the current ‘freedom of movement’ provisions that enable national governments to better control the migration of people. Labour’s constructive relationships with centre-left parties throughout Europe mean it is ideally placed to undertake the negotiations that the Tories are mishandling so badly, especially if Labour can build a constructive relationship with President Macron in France.

Of course, it should be recognised that Jeremy Corbyn’s appeal is centred on the fact that he is not motivated by narrow electoral calculation. The cautious vote-seeking strategies of the New Labour years have been replaced by a man who, even if much of the electorate disagree with some of what he believes, gains much credit for actually saying what he does believe. There is some truth in the claim that Corbyn has ‘detoxified’ the Labour brand by eschewing the politics of voter targeting and issue positioning. He has the confidence to speak of a new social and economic order, and a different kind of society premised on values of co-operation, mutuality and interdependence. Yet winning votes, upholding Labour’s values and shaping the good society are not mutually exclusive goals. Corbyn’s Labour need not surrender its values in order to make further progress at the next election.

In this paper, we have argued that Labour can win the next general election whenever it comes. However, to secure a decisive parliamentary majority that can sustain a Labour government in office for at least two terms, the Labour party will have to grow its electoral support. Our analysis indicates there are two political and electoral strategies available to Labour. The first strategy is termed the ‘Bernie Sanders’ approach: continuing to grow Labour’s support among the professional middle-class; economically precarious younger voters; and poorer groups on the lowest incomes. This was the core of the Corbyn Coalition in 2017.

The second approach is the ‘Attlee’ strategy of building support among all social grades and classes, and across the length and breadth of the nation. That strategy means that the party has to gain support among those earning £21,000-34,000 a year: the C2 social grade voters who generally populate ‘Communitarian Britain’, and who are not yet convinced about the merits of Labour’s political and policy agenda. This group are the ‘make ends meet’ voters: they live on low to middle incomes and make just enough to get by through diligent management of their household budget. The 64 parliamentary seats that Labour has to win next time to secure an outright majority in the House of Commons are disproportionately populated by voters on lower to middle incomes. Appealing effectively to these sceptical voters will not be easy. But if the party develops the right strategy and policies, and if Labour remains the worker’s party fighting for those families who are just getting by, it can win the next election whenever it comes.
6. Technical appendix

Survey

Populus surveyed 2511 people online in Great Britain between 2-5 June 2017, including boosters of 2015 and 2017 Labour voters to ensure a robust sample size for detailed analysis. The overall results were weighted by 2017 general election result and down-weighted the 2015 Labour sample.

Regression analysis

A number of individual demographic factors have been shown to correlate with voting intention. In order to disentangle these factors from one another, our study uses logistic regression analysis to measure the effect of discrete changes in demographic factors of interest on the probability that an individual respondent voter will be a Labour voter at the 2017 general election. The weights provided by Populus were applied in the model.

First, initial diagnostics were run to test multicollinearity between the explanatory variables, extreme outlier data points, and to collapse variables where there were small sub-samples. Next, bivariate logistic regression models were computed to establish which demographic variables should initially be included in the model. Those with the lowest p-values (<0.01) were initially added to the model simultaneously creating an initial baseline model, then each additional variable was tested by adding it temporarily to that baseline. The variable with the lowest p-value was added to the baseline, and this was repeated until no additional variables were significant at the 95 per cent confidence level.

Interaction effects of theoretical interest were then tested, and significant effects added to the model. The linearity of the effect of each variable was also tested, with any continuous or ordinal variables exhibiting non-linear effects replaced with categorical variables. Effects are reported as significant at a 95 per cent confidence level. In some cases, confidence intervals are relatively large due to small sub-samples, but all have a p-value less than or equal to 0.05. Average marginal effects are reported below.

Figure 18: logistic regression model, probability of voting Labour

<p>| Variable                   | Coef.  | Std. Err. | z     | P&gt;|z|  | Lower CI (95%) | Upper CI (95%) |
|----------------------------|--------|-----------|-------|-----|----------------|----------------|
| Age (single year)          | -0.026 | 0.005     | -5.260| &lt;0.001| -0.036         | -0.016         |
| Has attended university    | -0.559 | 0.366     | -1.530| 0.126| -1.276         | 0.158          |
| age#university             | 0.020  | 0.007     | 2.810 | 0.005| 0.006          | 0.034          |
| Home ownership             | -0.210 | 0.133     | -1.580| 0.113| -0.470         | 0.050          |
| Male                       | -0.131 | 0.115     | -1.140| 0.254| -0.357         | 0.094          |
| Christian                  | -0.427 | 0.120     | -3.570| 0.000| -0.661         | -0.192         |
| Nonwhite                   | 0.595  | 0.282     | 2.110 | 0.035| 0.042          | 1.148          |
| City-dweller               | 0.490  | 0.121     | 4.040 | &lt;0.001| 0.252          | 0.727          |
| North East                 | 1.044  | 0.310     | 3.370 | 0.001| 0.437          | 1.651          |
| North West                 | 0.574  | 0.243     | 2.360 | 0.018| 0.098          | 1.050          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.477</th>
<th>0.257</th>
<th>1.850</th>
<th>0.064</th>
<th>-0.027</th>
<th>0.981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; Humber-side</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>1.110</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>-0.281</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>-0.568</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>-1.570</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>-1.279</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>0.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>-0.298</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>-1.060</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>-0.849</td>
<td>0.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>-0.502</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>-2.090</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>-0.972</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>-0.545</td>
<td>0.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income £14-21k</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>-0.464</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income £21-34k</td>
<td>-0.464</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>-2.680</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.803</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income £34-55k</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>-0.280</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>-0.449</td>
<td>0.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income more than £55k</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>-0.502</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle- or upper-middle-class</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>-0.307</td>
<td>0.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social grade C1</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>1.530</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>0.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social grade C2</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>-0.328</td>
<td>0.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social grade DE</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>-0.320</td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle- or upper-middle-class#C1</td>
<td>-0.580</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>-1.990</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>-1.149</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle- or upper-middle-class#C2</td>
<td>-1.001</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>-2.620</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-1.751</td>
<td>-0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle- or upper-middle-class#DE</td>
<td>-1.144</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>-3.280</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-1.826</td>
<td>-0.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither comfortable nor struggling to get by</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>2.510</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggling to get by</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>3.900</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really struggling to get by</td>
<td>1.218</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>4.450</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>1.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>1.640</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>1.527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample size** 2049.000  
**Pseudo R-squared** 0.140
Figure 19: marginal effects of logistic regression model

|                                                | dy/dx | Std. Err. | z      | P>|z|  | Lower CI (95%) | Upper CI (95%) |
|------------------------------------------------|-------|-----------|--------|------|----------------|----------------|
| Age (single year)                               | -0.004| 0.001     | -4.860 | <0.001 | -0.005         | -0.002         |
| Has attended university                        | 0.088 | 0.027     | 3.240  | 0.001 | 0.035          | 0.142          |
| Home ownership                                 | -0.042| 0.027     | -1.570 | 0.117 | -0.094         | 0.010          |
| Male                                           | -0.026| 0.023     | -1.140 | 0.255 | -0.070         | 0.019          |
| Christian                                      | -0.086| 0.024     | -3.530 | <0.001 | -0.133         | -0.038         |
| Nonwhite                                       | 0.122 | 0.059     | 2.070  | 0.039 | 0.006          | 0.237          |
| City dweller                                   | 0.099 | 0.025     | 4.010  | <0.001 | 0.050          | 0.147          |
| North East                                     | 0.217 | 0.062     | 3.500  | <0.001 | 0.095          | 0.339          |
| North West                                     | 0.119 | 0.049     | 2.420  | 0.016 | 0.023          | 0.216          |
| Yorkshire & Humber-side                        | 0.099 | 0.053     | 1.880  | 0.061 | -0.004         | 0.202          |
| West Midlands                                  | 0.061 | 0.055     | 1.110  | 0.267 | -0.047         | 0.168          |
| East Midlands                                  | 0.050 | 0.055     | 0.920  | 0.358 | -0.057         | 0.158          |
| Wales                                          | -0.107| 0.066     | -1.620 | 0.105 | -0.236         | 0.022          |
| East of England                                | -0.002| 0.050     | -0.040 | 0.964 | -0.100         | 0.096          |
| Scotland                                       | -0.058| 0.054     | -1.070 | 0.286 | -0.165         | 0.049          |
| South East                                     | -0.095| 0.046     | -2.070 | 0.039 | -0.185         | -0.005         |
| South West                                     | -0.004| 0.053     | -0.080 | 0.933 | -0.109         | 0.100          |
| Income £14-21k                                 | -0.022| 0.037     | -0.590 | 0.553 | -0.094         | 0.050          |
| Income £21-34k                                 | -0.091| 0.034     | -2.650 | 0.008 | -0.158         | -0.024         |
| Income £34-55k                                 | -0.011| 0.041     | -0.280 | 0.777 | -0.091         | 0.068          |
| Income more than £55k                          | -0.002| 0.051     | -0.040 | 0.968 | -0.102         | 0.098          |
| Middle- or upper-middle-class                  | -0.094| 0.025     | -3.820 | <0.001 | -0.143         | -0.046         |
| C1                                             | 0.018 | 0.031     | 0.570  | 0.572 | -0.044         | 0.079          |
| C2                                             | -0.048| 0.037     | -1.300 | 0.193 | -0.120         | 0.024          |
| DE                                             | -0.065| 0.035     | -1.870 | 0.062 | -0.133         | 0.003          |
| Neither comfortable nor struggling to get by   | 0.068 | 0.027     | 2.530  | 0.011 | 0.015          | 0.121          |
| Struggling to get by                           | 0.133 | 0.034     | 3.890  | <0.001 | 0.066          | 0.200          |
| Really struggling to get by                    | 0.249 | 0.056     | 4.460  | <0.001 | 0.140          | 0.359          |
Figure 20: interaction effect, class identity and social grade

Figure 21: interaction effect, age and education