Source: literacy rate from Ipeadata, except 1950 and 1960, which are from the Censo Demográfico 1960 (IBGE). The estimates for 1872-1890 are imputed from the literacy rates of the total population. Estimates for 1900-2018 are imputed from the literacy rates of the population aged 15 and over. Voter data is from the IBGE Censuses and Love (1970) for 1886-1930, and from the International IDEA Voter Turnout Database for 1945-2018 (see wpid.world).

Note: the literacy rate refers to the proportion of the voting age population who can read and write. Voters are the people who actually voted in all presidential and parliamentary elections as a share of the voting age population. Between 1886 and 1934 no data was found for parliamentary elections. Between 1960 and 1989 no direct elections for the president were held.
Figure 14.2 - Presidential election results in Brazil, 1989-2018

Source: authors' computations using official election results (see wpid.world).

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by Brazilian political parties in the second round of presidential elections between 1989 and 2018. In 2018, the PT (Fernando Haddad) received 45% of votes. PT: Partido dos Trabalhadores; PRN: Partido da Reconstrução Nacional; PSDB: Partido da Social Democracia Brasileira; PSL: Partido Social Liberal.
Figure 14.3 - The PT vote by income in Brazil, 1989-2018

Source: authors' computations using Brazilian electoral surveys (see wpid.world).

Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Workers' Party in the second round of presidential elections by household income group. In 2018, 54% of bottom 50% income earners voted PT, compared to 34% of top 10% income earners.
Figure 14.4 - The PT vote by education level in Brazil, 1989-2018

Source: authors' computations using Brazilian electoral surveys (see wpid.world).
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Workers' Party in the second round of presidential elections by education level. In 2018, 58% of primary-educated voters (or illiterates) voted PT, compared to 37% of university graduates.
Figure 14.5 - Political conflict and income in Brazil, 1989-2018

Source: authors’ computations using Brazilian electoral surveys (see wpid.world).
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of bottom 50% earners voting PT and the share of top 50% earners voting PT in the second round of presidential elections, before and after controls. Support for the PT has become increasingly concentrated among low-income earners since 1989. In 2018, low-income voters were more likely to vote PT by 19 percentage points.
Figure 14.6 - The educational cleavage in Brazil, 1989-2018

The educational cleavage in Brazil, 1989-2018
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Source: authors' computations using Brazilian electoral surveys (see wpid.world).
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of primary-educated voters (or illiterates) voting PT and the share of other voters voting PT in the second round of presidential elections, before and after controls. Support for the PT has become increasingly concentrated among lower-educated voters since 1989. In 2018, primary-educated voters were more likely to vote PT by 18 percentage points.
Figure 14.7 - The PT vote by region in Brazil, 1989-2018

Source: authors’ computations using Brazilian electoral surveys (see wpid.world).
Note: the figure shows the share of votes received by the Workers’ Party in the second round of presidential elections by region. In 2018, 65% of voters of the Northeast Region voted PT, compared to 33% of voters of the South Region.
Support for the PT has become increasingly concentrated in the Northeast Region, where the PT's vote share was 27 percentage points higher than in the rest of Brazil in 2018.

Source: authors’ computations using Brazilian electoral surveys (see wpid.world).

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of voters living in the Northeast Region voting PT and the share of voters living in other regions voting PT in the second round of presidential elections, before and after controls.
Figure 14.9 - The rural-urban cleavage in Brazil, 1989-2018
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- After controlling for income
- After controlling for income, education, age, gender
- After controlling for income, education, age, gender, region
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Source: authors’ computations using Brazilian electoral surveys (see wpid.world).
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of voters living in rural areas voting PT and the share of voters living in cities voting PT in the second round of presidential elections, before and after controls. The vote share obtained by the PT in rural areas was 21 percentage points lower than in urban areas in 1989, compared to 2 percentage points higher in 2018.
Figure 14.10 - The racial cleavage in Brazil, 2018

Source: authors’ computations using Brazilian electoral surveys (see wpid.world).
Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of self-declared non-White voters voting PT and the share of White voters voting PT in the second round of presidential elections, before and after controls. In 2018, non-White voters were 17 percentage points more likely to vote PT before controls and 10 percentage points more likely to do so after controls (all other things being equal).
Figure 14.11 - The religious cleavage in Brazil, 2002-2018

Difference between (% of Protestant voters voting PT) and (% of non-Protestant voters voting PT)

After controlling for income, education, age, gender, employment, marital status

Source: authors’ computations using electoral (CSES) surveys (see wpid.world).

Note: the figure shows the difference between the share of Protestants and the share of Catholics, non-believers, and other voters voting PT in the second round of presidential elections, before and after controls. In 2018, Protestant voters were less likely to vote PT by 17 percentage points.
Figure 14.12 - Reasons determining candidate choice in the 2018 presidential election by income group in Brazil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>Employment / Health</th>
<th>Corruption / Security</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors’ computations using a survey conducted by the Datafolha institute in October 2017 (see wpid.world).

Note: the figure decomposes answers to the question of the issue that would be most decisive in respondents’ vote choice in the 2018 election by income group. In 2017, 53% of bottom 50% income earners considered that employment and health would be the key issues determining their vote, compared to 30% of top 10% income earners.