APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Descriptive Statistics for the Covariates in Tables 3-4

The covariates in Tables 3-4 are defined as followed. First of all, from the BES we construct the following individual respondent characteristics.

● ***income****:* income per capita in the respondent's household, in thousands of pounds.

● ***if-kids****:* an indicator variable for whether the household has any children under the age of 18.

● ***if-beneficiary****:* an indicator variable for whether the respondent's (or, if the respondent has a partner, the couple's) main source of income is a state payment other than a student loan or pension.

● ***if-graduate****:* an indicator variable for whether the respondent has a university degree or equivalent qualification.

● ***if-low-quals****:* an indicator variable for whether the respondent's highest academic qualification is lower than a General Certificate of Secondary Education grade C or equivalent. GCSE examinations are normally taken at age 16, two years before the Advanced Level qualification that equates to graduation from a North American high school.

● ***if-widowed***, ***if-separated***, ***if-divorced***, ***if-single****:* if all of these marital status indicator variables are equal to zero than the respondent is married.

● ***if-female****:* an indicator variable for whether the respondent is female.

● ***if-religious****:* an indicator variable for whether the respondent identifies as a member of an organized religious group.

● ***age****:* the respondent's age in years.

● ***trust-1****:* the respondent's answer to the question, 'On balance, would you say that most people can't be trusted or that most people can be trusted?' Respondents are asked to choose a point on

a 0-10 scale, with 10 indicating the highest level of trust.

● ***trust-2****:* the respondent's answer to the question, 'Do you think that most people you come into contact with would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance or would they try to be fair?' Respondents are asked to choose a point on a 0-10 scale, with 10 indicating the highest level of trust. This variable is available only in the 2010 wave of the BES.

● ***happiness****:* the respondent's answer to the question, 'Generally speaking, how happy are you?' Respondents are asked to choose a point on a 0-10 scale, with 10 indicating the highest level of happiness. This variable is available only in the 2010 wave of the BES.

● ***satisfaction****:* the respondent's answer to the question, 'On the whole, are you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, a little dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with the way that democracy works in this country?' Respondents are asked to choose between 'very satisfied' (coded four), 'fairly satisfied' (coded three), 'a little dissatisfied' (coded two) and 'very dissatisfied' (coded one).

We also use two constituency-level variables constructed from data in the 2001 census (used with the 2005 wave of the BES) and the 2011 census (used with the 2010 wave of the BES).

● ***density****:* the number of residents per hectare in a constituency.

● ***minority****:* the fraction of residents in a constituency identifying with a racial group other than 'white'. Other minority variables, such as the proportion of residents identifying with a minority religion, or the number of residents born overseas, are highly correlated with *minority*.

Finally, we use one constituency-level variable taken from votes in the 1975 referendum: 'Do you think that the United Kingdom should remain part of the European Community (the Common Market)?' See Cook and Francis for more details on the referendum.[1]

[1] Cook and Francis 1979.

● ***membership****:* the percentage of voters choosing 'yes' in the county in which the constituency is located. (Voting in the referendum was reported at the county level.)

Table A1 includes means and standard deviations of the non-binary variables appearing in the models using the BES survey data in Tables 3-4. The left-hand side of Table A1 relates to the 2010 wave of the BES and the right-hand side to the 2005 wave. For each binary variable, the table notes the proportion of observations equal to one.

Appendix 2: Results Using Alternative Measures of Attitudes

2.1 Alternative survey measures

The BES includes a number of questions relating to attitudes towards immigrants and far-right parties, other than those used for the results appearing in Tables 3-4. Tables A2-A3 report results which correspond to those in Tables 3-4, but which are based on the following alternative measure of attitudes.

● ***immigrant-issue-10****:* this variable is constructed in the same way as *immigrant-issue-05* in Table 4, but using data from the 2010 wave of the BES instead of data from the 2005 wave.

● ***immigrant-rank-10****:* this variable is based on a question in the 2010 wave of the BES which asked respondents to rank a number of different political issues according to their importance. The alternatives were: 'the economy generally', 'the environment', 'health care', 'unemployment', 'immigration', 'the war in Afghanistan', 'terrorism', and 'paying off government debt'. Respondents were asked to choose the first, second, and third most important issue. The ordinal variable *immigrant-rank-10* is equal to four if immigration was ranked first, three if it was ranked second, two if it was ranked third, and four if it was unranked.

● ***BNP-support-10****:* this variable is based on a question in the 2010 wave of the BES which asked respondents, 'Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as Labour, Conservative, Liberal Democrat or what?' The binary variable *BNP-support-10* is equal to one if the respondent indicated that they saw themselves as a BNP supporter, and zero otherwise.

● ***BNP-feeling-10****:* this variable is constructed in the same way as *UKIP-feeling-05* in Table 4, but using data from the 2010 wave of the BES instead of data from the 2005 wave, and using responses to the question about the BNP rather than the one about the UKIP.

● ***UKIP-support-10****:* this binary variable is constructed in the same way as *BNP-support-10*, but indicates the respondent's identification with the UKIP.

● ***UKIP-feeling-10****:* this variable is constructed in the same way as *UKIP-feeling-05* in Table 4, but using data from the 2010 wave of the BES instead of data from the 2005 wave.

A Probit model is used for the binary variables *immigrant-issue-10*, *BNP-support-10* and *UKIP-support-10*, an Ordered Probit model for the ordinal variable *immigrant-rank-10*, and a Tobit model for the censored variables *BNP-feeling-10* and *UKIP-feeling-10*. Random Effects estimates are reported, except when the estimated variance of the random effect is zero, in which case pooled estimates are reported, with standard errors clustered at the constituency level.

The results in Tables A2-A3 are broadly consistent with those in Tables 3-4. In most cases, antipathy towards immigrants and support for far-right parties are significantly negatively correlated with income, education and trust, and significantly positively correlated with a self-identified religious affiliation. Moreover, in all but one of the models there is a negative and significant coefficient on *archa-town*. The one exception is the *BNP-support-10* model, in which the *archa-town* coefficient is negative but insignificantly different from zero. One possible explanation for this exception is that unlike the other variables capturing the level of support for

the BNP, *BNP-support-10* is a binary variable that does not admit different degrees of affinity with the party. Given the negative publicity about the BNP in the mainstream media, many respondents may have been reluctant to express their unequivocal support for the party (hence *BNP-support-10* = 0) and yet happy to rank the party fifth or sixth in the hypothetical AV ballot (hence *BNP-rank-10* > 0), or happy to give it a score of one or two (hence *BNP-feeling-10* > 0). Therefore, there is variation in *BNP-rank-10* and *BNP-feeling-10* which is correlated with *archa-town* but which is not captured by *BNP-support-10*.

2.2 Constituency-level election results

We can check the robustness of our results on support for far-right parties by comparing them with results using constituency-level data on actual election outcomes. We focus on the 2010 general election for the Westminster Parliament: European Parliament elections produce results only at the regional level (not at the constituency level), and general elections before 2010 were contested by the BNP and UKIP in a relatively small number of constituencies. For each constituency we have data on the share of votes cast for each party, including the BNP and UKIP. Table A4 shows sample statistics for the shares of the vote for these parties in the *archa* constituencies and the non-*archa* constituencies. In *archa* constituencies the average share was about 3% for both parties, and in non-*archa* constituencies the average share was about 4%. These differences are significant at the 1% level. In order to see whether the differences are robust to conditioning on other constituency characteristics, we need to fit models of the voting shares. The models include the following constituency-level characteristics from the 2011 census (in addition to *archa-town*, *density*, *membership* and *minority*). These characteristics are intended to correspond to the personal characteristics discussed in the main text.

● ***unemployment-rate****:* the proportion of economically active residents who are unemployed. This corresponds to the survey variable *if-beneficiary*.

● ***graduate-share****:* the proportion of adult residents who have a university degree of equivalent. This corresponds to the survey variable *if-graduate*.

● ***low-quals-share****:* the proportion of adult residents whose highest academic qualification is lower than a GCSE grade C. This corresponds to the survey variable *if-low-quals*.

● ***widowed-share***, ***separated-share***, ***divorced-share***, ***single-share****:* these are the proportion of adult residents in each marital category, corresponding to the survey variables *if-widowed*, *if-separated*, *if-divorced* and *if-single*.

● ***female-share****:* the proportion of residents who are female. This corresponds to the survey variable *if-female*.

● ***religious-share****:* the proportion of residents who identify with an organized religion. This corresponds to the survey variable *if-religious*.

● ***under-30-share***, ***30-64-share***, ***over-64-share****:* the proportion of residents aged between 18 and 30, between 30 and 64, and over 64. The reference category is the proportion of residents under 18. These variables correspond to *age* and *if-kids*.

The census does not include any data corresponding to the survey variables *trust-1*, *trust-2*, *happiness* or *satisfaction*, nor does it include any data on household income.[2] However, it is possible to construct variables that proxy for income at the constituency level using the ACORN classification system.[3] Each postcode area in England is assigned to one of five wealth classifications; these classifications are based on the characteristics of housing in the area. It is

[2] Adding constituency-average values of these variables from the BES to the model of election outcomes does not produce any statistically significant coefficients.

[3] CACI 2014.

then possible to construct constituency-level aggregate measures of the proportion of individuals living in each of the five types of area. We take the highest wealth level as the reference category, and use the following four ACORN variables:

● ***acorn-2-share, acorn-3-share, acorn-4-share, acorn-5-share****:* here, *acorn-n-share* indicates the proportion of people in the constituency residing in an ACORN level-*n* area, where level 5 indicates the most impoverished type of neighbourhood.[4]

One additional constituency-level variable is used in the model:

● ***majority-2005****:* the size of the majority of the winning candidate in the 2005 general election, in thousands of votes. Supporters of a far-right party might be less inclined to vote for that party if there is a closer contest between the main contenders on the centre-right and centre-left (the Conservative Party, the Liberal Democrat Party and the Labour Party). In a close contest, a vote for the BNP or UKIP might be perceived to increase the probability of the voter's next-preferred part losing the election. (In reality the effect of a single vote on the probability is miniscule, but voters might nevertheless make electoral choices as if their decision were instrumental, as is the case in 'tactical voting'.) Therefore, there might be more votes for the BNP and UKIP in constituencies with a large majority in 2005, where the outcome of the 2010 election is almost certain.

The dependent variables are constructed using constituency-level data on the votes for the BNP, the UKIP, the Conservative Party (which won the general election), and the Labour Party (which came second). Following Fielding, we apply a logarithmic transformation and measure the voting shares as **log(*BNP vote ÷ Conservative vote*)**, **log(*BNP vote ÷ Labour vote*)**,

[4] These variables are taken from Pippa Norris's *British General Election Constituency Results 5.0* (www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/pnorris/Data/Data.htm).

log(*UKIP vote ÷ Conservative vote*), and **log(*UKIP vote ÷ Labour vote*)**.[5] These four variables capture the level of support for the two far-right parties relative to support for the two main parties.[6]

Table A5 shows the estimated coefficients in each of the four equations. For the UKIP voting shares these are Ordinary Least Squares estimates. OLS is not used for the BNP equations, because the BNP fielded candidates in only 271 out of the 460 provincial English constituencies, so OLS estimates could suffer from sample selection bias. Instead, the BNP equations are fitted using the sample selection model of Heckman,[7] which includes a Probit equation for the probability that the BNP will contest a constituency. This selection equation, which also appears in Table A5, needs to include an instrument that is excluded from the voting share equation: that is, a variable which affects the probability of the BNP contesting a constituency but not its expected performance there. We use the following instrument.

● ***electorate-size****:* the total number of registered voters in the constituency, in thousands. Note that overall BNP support was too low for any of its candidates to have any chance of winning their constituency election: its largest share of the vote in any constituency was 15%. Therefore, it would be a rational strategy for the party to focus its efforts on constituencies with the largest number of voters, in order to maximise its share of the national vote and raise its media profile. Although the British Electoral Commission continually adjusts constituency boundaries in order to minimize differences in their size, the unpredictability of migration between constituencies leads to some variation in size: the largest constituency has about twice as many registered voters

[5] Fielding 2000.

[6] The results are very similar if the dependent variable is just the percentage share of the BNP (or UKIP) vote, but simple theoretical models of voter choice do not generate an equation that is linear in the percentage share and the determinants of voter preferences.

[7] Heckman 1979.

as the smallest. There is no reason to suppose that political preferences are correlated with variations in size (which are driven mainly by demographic forecast errors), so size should be a valid instrument.

The effects in Table A5 relate to the *relative* performance of parties, and the estimated effect of constituency characteristics does vary according to whether performance is measured relative to the Conservative Party or relative to the Labour Party. We see that in more economically deprived areas (as defined by the *acorn* variables), the BNP vote is significantly larger relative to the Conservative vote, and the UKIP vote is significantly smaller relative to the Labour vote. The BNP vote is also larger relative to the Conservative vote in areas of low educational attainment. These effects are consistent with the BNP's traditional blue-collar associations. Both the BNP and UKIP fare poorly relative to the Labour Party (but not relative to the Conservative Party) in areas with more voters in the 30-64 age range. In constituencies with a large majority in 2005, there are more votes for both the BNP and UKIP relative to both the Conservative Party and the Labour Party; this suggests that 'tactical' considerations do sway potential BNP and UKIP voters.

Conditional on these constituency characteristics, the BNP vote relative to both the Conservative vote and the Labour vote is significantly larger in non-*archa* constituencies than in *archa* constituencies. The coefficients in Table A5 imply that on average, the ratio of the BNP vote to the Conservative vote is 22% higher in non-*archa* constituencies, and the ratio of the BNP vote to the Labour vote is 20% higher. These results are consistent with those in Tables 2-3, again indicating that towns with a Jewish heritage have less sympathy for the far right. Conditional on constituency characteristics, the UKIP vote is also larger on average in non-*archa* constituencies, but this effect is not quite significant at the 5% level.

Appendix 3: Jews and Huguenots

While it would be informative to trace the evolution of regional variation in attitudes towards immigrants between the end of the 13th century and the end of the 20th century, data for the intervening centuries are quite limited. Nevertheless, one period of immigration for which some data do exist is the end of the 17th century, when there was a large influx of French Protestant (or Huguenot) refugees. Small numbers of Huguenots had been arriving in England since the wars of religion in the middle of the 16th century, but for most of the 17th century the Edict of Nantes gave legal protection to Huguenots in France. When King Louis XIV revoked the Edict in 1685, many Huguenots sought refuge in Protestant-majority countries, including England. Gwynn notes that estimates of the number of Huguenots entering England at the end of the 17th century vary between 20,000 and 120,000, in other words between 0.5% and 2.5% of the total population of five million.[8] In percentage terms, this is probably the largest single immigration event in English history.

Almost all Huguenot families were artisans; although there was some sympathy for them during a time of increasing anti-Catholic sentiment, they were in competition with indigenous skilled manual labour, and might not have been equally welcome in all parts of England. Gwynn lists all of the provincial English locations that were home to at least 100 Huguenots between 1681 and 1705. This list, which comprises a number of small towns and villages as well as cities, is reproduced in Table A6, along with the corresponding modern parliamentary constituencies. Huguenot settlements were heavily concentrated in the south and east of England, with only two located outside the modern East, South East and South West regions.

Is there a correlation between the pattern of medieval Jewish settlement and the pattern of Huguenot settlement in the 17th century? Table A7 provides some evidence on this question,

[8] Gwynn 1983.

tabulating 2010 parliamentary constituencies according to whether they were home to medieval Jews, or 17th century Huguenots, or both. Given the geographical concentration of Huguenot settlement, the sample is restricted to constituencies in the East, South East and South West regions. The table shows that 12 out of 22 *archa* constituencies (or 55%) were also home to Huguenots, but only 16 out of 176 non-*archa* constituencies (or 9%) were home to Huguenots. Using a Pearson test of association, this difference is significant at the 1% level; the difference remains significant even if large cities such as Bristol are excluded from the sample. In the absence of any regional 17th century socio-economic data on which to condition these figures, we cannot be sure of the reasons for the association between Jewish and Huguenot settlement. Nevertheless, towns with a Jewish heritage are much more likely also to have a Huguenot heritage, which is consistent with a pattern of tolerance towards immigrants that has persisted through the centuries.

LIST OF REFERENCES

CACI. 2014. *The ACORN User Guide*. London, UK: CACI.

Cook, Christopher, and Mary Francis. 1979. *The First European Elections: A Handbook and Guide*. London, UK: Macmillan Press.

Fielding, David. 2000. "Social and Economic Determinants of English Voter Choice in the 1997 General Election." *Public Choice* 102: 271-295.

Gwynn, Robin. 1983. "The Number of Huguenot Immigrants in England in the Late Seventeenth Century." *Journal of Historical Geography 9*: 384-395.

Heckman, James. 1979. "Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error." *Econometrica* 47: 153-61.

TABLE A1

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

	BES 2010 (9,313 observations)				*BES 2005 (4,828 observations)*			
	mean	*s.d.*	*min.*	*max.*	*mean*	*s.d.*	*min.*	*max.*
income ÷ 100	15.62	11.03	0.42	105.00	12.45	8.89	0.42	75.00
age	49.97	14.19	17	105	46.64	14.39	18	87
age^2 ÷ 100	26.80	14.00	2.89	110.25	23.83	13.67	3.24	75.69
trust-1	5.58	2.24	0	10	5.63	2.27	0	10
trust-2	5.82	2.30	0	10				
happiness	6.48	2.21	0	10				
satisfaction	2.71	0.84	1	4	2.69	0.92	1	5
membership	69.5	3.69	62.9	76.3	69.3	3.69	62.9	76.3
density ÷ 100	14.02	14.85	0.26	80.02	13.44	13.29	0.26	66.50
minority	0.08	0.10	0.01	0.73	0.05	0.07	0.00	0.65
	proportion = 1				*proportion = 1*			
if-kids	0.26				0.32			
if-beneficiary	0.07				0.10			
if-graduate	0.30				0.24			
if-low-quals	0.34				0.38			
if-widowed	0.03				0.03			
if-separated	0.02				0.02			
if-divorced	0.08				0.08			
if-single	0.14				0.17			
if-female	0.49				0.50			
if-religious	0.46				0.45			

TABLE A2

DETERMINANTS OF RESPONSES TO OTHER QUESTIONS IN THE BRITISH ELECTION STUDY (PART 1)

	immigrant-rank-10			*immigrant-issue-10*			*BNP-support-10*		
	Ordered Probit			*Probit*			*Probit*		
	coeff.	*t ratio*	*m.e.*	*coeff.*	*t ratio*	*m.e.*	*coeff.*	*t ratio*	*m.e.*
archa-town	-0.150	-3.52	-0.055	-0.120	-1.99	-0.027	-0.032	-0.28	-0.001
income	-0.489	-3.94	-0.180	-0.778	-3.91	-0.173	-0.991	-2.45	-0.045
if-kids	-0.032	-0.96	-0.012	-0.046	-1.00	-0.010	0.066	0.81	0.003
if-beneficiary	0.028	0.55	0.010	0.062	0.96	0.014	0.061	0.53	0.003
if-graduate	-0.396	-12.42	-0.146	-0.261	-5.53	-0.058	-0.311	-3.23	-0.014
if-low-quals	0.131	4.48	0.048	0.186	4.79	0.041	0.147	2.14	0.007
if-widowed	0.002	0.03	0.001	-0.019	-0.22	-0.004	0.056	0.31	0.003
if-separated	0.145	1.71	0.053	0.157	1.35	0.035	0.145	0.71	0.007
if-divorced	-0.035	-0.82	-0.013	0.012	0.20	0.003	0.017	0.15	0.001
if-single	-0.065	-1.52	-0.024	-0.051	-0.88	-0.011	-0.094	-0.89	-0.004
if-female	0.023	0.99	0.009	0.030	0.93	0.007	-0.282	-4.30	-0.013
if-religious	0.126	4.89	0.046	0.103	3.10	0.023	-0.058	-0.89	-0.003
age	0.022	3.52	0.008	0.035	4.34	0.008	-0.003	-0.20	0.000
age^2 *÷ 100*	-0.012	-2.00	-0.005	-0.027	-3.44	-0.006	0.003	0.19	0.000
trust-1	-0.053	-7.07	-0.020	-0.050	-4.78	-0.011	-0.059	-2.92	-0.003
trust-2	-0.022	-2.92	-0.008	-0.014	-1.34	-0.003	-0.035	-1.85	-0.002
happiness	-0.008	-1.28	-0.003	0.003	0.40	0.001	-0.005	-0.37	0.000
satisfaction	-0.169	-10.94	-0.062	-0.123	-5.78	-0.027	0.193	4.65	0.009
membership	-0.010	-2.13	-0.004	-0.017	-2.93	-0.004	0.000	-0.05	0.000
density ÷ 100	-0.067	-0.59	-0.025	-0.116	-0.76	-0.026	0.086	0.28	0.004
minority	0.506	3.33	0.186	0.421	2.10	0.094	0.236	0.69	0.011
s.d. of random effect	0.032			0.009			0.004		
sample size	9,313			9,313			9,313		

TABLE A3

DETERMINANTS OF RESPONSES TO OTHER QUESTIONS IN THE BRITISH ELECTION STUDY (PART 2)

	BNP-feeling-10		*UKIP-support-10*			*UKIP-feeling-10*	
	Tobit		*Probit*			*Tobit*	
	coeff.	*t ratio*	*coeff.*	*t ratio*	*m.e.*	*coeff.*	*t ratio*
archa-town	-0.844	-3.71	-0.294	-2.23	-0.025	-0.437	-2.81
income	-2.546	-3.80	-1.420	-4.47	-0.118	-1.514	-3.76
if-kids	0.238	1.44	-0.200	-2.64	-0.017	0.010	0.09
if-beneficiary	-0.003	-0.01	-0.155	-1.63	-0.013	-0.229	-1.39
if-graduate	-2.013	-13.7	-0.289	-3.95	-0.024	-1.080	-10.9
if-low-quals	0.403	2.87	0.023	0.40	0.002	0.348	3.71
if-widowed	0.302	0.90	0.042	0.31	0.004	0.007	0.03
if-separated	0.232	0.52	0.339	2.15	0.028	0.052	0.18
if-divorced	-0.332	-1.49	-0.057	-0.64	-0.005	-0.108	-0.74
if-single	-0.649	-3.12	0.052	0.60	0.004	-0.303	-2.35
if-female	-0.556	-4.69	-0.278	-5.44	-0.023	-0.136	-1.68
if-religious	0.451	3.68	-0.067	-1.35	-0.006	0.581	7.24
age	0.006	0.18	0.030	2.43	0.003	0.005	0.26
$age^2 \div 100$	-0.013	-0.40	-0.021	-1.76	-0.002	0.003	0.17
trust-1	-0.218	-5.49	-0.023	-1.59	-0.002	-0.096	-3.84
trust-2	-0.179	-4.47	0.006	0.39	0.000	-0.039	-1.59
happiness	-0.067	-2.30	0.001	0.13	0.000	-0.028	-1.40
satisfaction	0.825	10.34	0.278	8.68	0.023	0.473	9.86
membership	0.008	0.32	0.014	1.52	0.001	-0.023	-1.47
density ÷ 100	-1.443	-2.56	-0.198	-0.73	-0.016	-1.302	-3.50
minority	2.412	3.31	-0.205	-0.47	-0.017	0.377	0.69
s.d. of random effect	0.000		0.049			0.166	
sample size	9,088		9,313			8,301	

TABLE A4

CONSTITUENCY-LEVEL VOTING SHARES OF THE BNP AND UKIP IN 2010

BNP	*# constituencies*	*mean share*	*std. dev. of share*
non-archa constituencies	249	4.07%	1.88%
archa constituencies	22	2.87%	1.34%
all constituencies	271	3.98%	1.87%
t-ratio for difference	2.93		

UKIP	*# constituencies*	*mean share*	*std. dev. of share*
non-archa constituencies	392	4.06%	1.69%
archa constituencies	37	3.07%	1.21%
all constituencies	429	3.98%	1.68%
t-ratio for difference	3.48		

TABLE A5

DETERMINANTS OF 2010 CONSTITUENCY-LEVEL ELECTION OUTCOMES

	log of BNP vote ÷ Conservative vote		*log of BNP vote ÷ Labour vote*		*BNP election participation*		*log of UKIP vote ÷ Conservative vote*		*log of UKIP vote ÷ Labour vote*	
	Heckman		*Heckman*		*Probit*		*OLS*		*OLS*	
	coeff.	*t ratio*	*coeff.*	*t ratio*	*coeff.*	*t ratio*	*coeff.*	*t ratio*	*coeff.*	*t ratio*
archa-town	-0.199	-2.10	-0.218	-2.03	-0.040	-0.14	-0.121	-1.83	-0.130	-1.39
acorn-2-share	0.210	0.35	0.993	1.44	0.504	0.28	-0.632	-1.35	-0.238	-0.44
acorn-3-share	1.237	3.12	-0.228	-0.52	0.761	0.61	0.063	0.20	-1.249	-3.15
acorn-4-share	1.665	4.28	-0.099	-0.23	1.355	1.06	0.021	0.07	-1.812	-4.58
acorn-5-share	1.880	3.91	-0.172	-0.32	-0.822	-0.52	0.169	0.40	-1.432	-2.72
unemployment-rate	-4.112	-1.05	-11.922	-2.80	-23.358	-1.94	7.308	2.72	1.466	0.39
graduate-share	1.931	1.35	-0.079	-0.05	-3.260	-0.84	0.515	0.56	-0.282	-0.26
low-quals-share	6.284	3.54	1.243	0.63	10.165	1.71	3.607	2.62	-1.757	-1.06
widowed-share	-2.803	-0.27	12.744	1.11	17.254	0.54	-14.540	-1.77	-7.426	-0.71
separated-share	12.543	1.16	20.849	1.75	-13.812	-0.38	0.259	0.03	11.966	0.91
divorced-share	-8.282	-1.89	-4.260	-0.87	6.977	0.49	2.180	0.64	8.638	1.93
single-share	-0.658	-0.28	0.379	0.14	9.199	1.31	-1.383	-0.85	-4.494	-2.10
female-share	-7.050	-1.27	-12.847	-2.09	23.932	1.40	-0.166	-0.04	-2.898	-0.55
religious-share	-0.219	-0.26	-0.587	-0.64	2.155	0.80	0.678	0.98	-0.196	-0.23
under-30-share	2.786	0.74	-10.335	-2.48	-12.194	-1.00	5.941	2.06	-3.063	-0.87
30-64-share	1.347	0.38	-13.002	-3.35	-13.411	-1.15	4.617	1.65	-10.072	-3.02
over-64-share	0.151	0.06	-2.972	-1.04	-14.010	-1.92	4.402	2.59	2.100	0.85
membership	-0.021	-2.12	0.003	0.26	0.039	1.27	-0.002	-0.31	0.016	1.76
density ÷ 100	-0.003	-1.15	-0.003	-0.87	-0.002	-0.19	0.004	1.73	0.004	1.17
minority	-0.326	-0.54	-0.432	-0.64	-2.107	-1.15	-0.655	-1.43	-0.837	-1.45
majority-2005	0.013	5.39	0.010	3.70	-0.002	-0.31	0.013	6.68	0.012	4.90
electorate-size					0.239	1.78				
sample size	271		271		460		429		428	

TABLE A6

TOWNS AND VILLAGES WITH HUGUENOT COMMUNITIES BETWEEN 1681 AND 1705

town	*modern parliamentary constituencies*
Barnstaple	Devon N
Bideford	Devon W & Torridge
Bristol	Bristol E, NW, S, W
Canterbury	Canterbury
Colchester	Colchester
Coventry*	Coventry NE, NW, S
Dartmouth	Totnes
Dover	Dover
Exeter	Exeter
Falmouth	Falmouth & Camborne (2005), Truro & Falmouth (2010)
Hollingbourne	Faversham & Mid Kent
Huntingdon	Huntingdon
Ipswich	Ipswich
Maldon	Maldon
Norwich	Norwich N, S
Plymouth / Stonehouse	Plymouth Sutton (2005), Plymouth Devonport (2005), Plymouth Sutton & Devonport (2010), Plymouth Moor View (2010)
Rye	Hastings & Rye
Sandtoft*	Gainsborough
Soham	Cambridgeshire SE
Southampton	Southampton Itchen, Southampton Test
Taunton	Taunton (2005), Taunton Deane (2010)
Thorney	Peterborough
Thorpe-le-Soken	Harwich (2005), Harwich & Essex N (2010)
Salisbury	Salisbury

* Indicates a location outside the East, South East and South West regions.

TABLE A7

HUGUENOT AND *ARCHA* CONSTITUENCIES IN THE EAST, SOUTH EAST AND SOUTH WEST REGIONS

	Non-Archa	*Archa*	*Total*
Non-Huguenot	160	10	170
Huguenot	16	12	28
Total	176	22	198