**Appendix**

1. **Descriptive Statistics**

Public services included in the analysis: kindergarten, elementary school, doctor, dentist, nurse, police, short-stay health facility, medium-stay health facility, long-term health facility, emergency room, health center, pharmacy, ambulance, postal office

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | Min | Max |
| RN Vote Share | 34718 | 42.19 | 11.98 | 0 | 100 |
| % Sedentary Pop. | 34731 | 60.31 | 8.66 | 0 | 100 |
| Relative Housing Cost | 34731 | 1.62 | 1.72 | -22.2 | 12.9 |
| P. Services per Capita | 34731 | 2.29 | 3.58 | 0 | 125 |
| % Public Transport | 34697 | 3.05 | 5.82 | 0 | 66.8 |
| Median Distance | 35176 | 12.51 | 8.04 | 0 | 98.3 |
| % Foreign | 34731 | 2.97 | 3.80 | 0 | 57.9 |
| % Unemployment | 34730 | 10.73 | 4.82 | 0 | 57.1 |
| % Manual Workers | 34730 | 14.67 | 7.27 | 0 | 75 |
| % Non-Manual Workers | 34730 | 15.30 | 6.09 | 0 | 71.4 |
| % Low Education | 34731 | 28.48 | 7.94 | 0 | 71.4 |
| % Elderly | 34731 | 21.83 | 7.50 | 0 | 100 |
| Population/1000 | 34731 | 1.861 | 15.05 | .004 | 2187.5 |
| Dept. % Foreign | 96 | 4.90 | 2.28 | 1.6 | 24.2 |
| Dept. % Unemployment | 96 | 13.49 | 2.15 | 8.8 | 19.5 |
| Dept. % Poverty | 96 | 14.31 | 2.69 | 9.1 | 27.9 |
| Dept. % Share Industry | 96 | 14.37 | 3.59 | 3.8 | 21 |
| Dept. % Low Educated | 96 | 29.78 | 3.62 | 17.1 | 37 |
| Dept. RN Vote Share 2012 | 96 | 19.73 | 4.038 | 6.2 | 27.03 |

1. **Robustness of Results to Different Model Specifications**
2. **Table B1. Key Indicators Estimated Separately**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | RN Vote Share | RN Vote Share | RN Vote Share | RN Vote Share |
| Sedentary Pop. | 0.11\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.01) |  |  |  |  |
| Relative Housing Costs |  | 1.60\*\*\* |  |  |  |
|  |  | (0.04) |  |  |  |
| Public Services |  |  | -0.24\*\*\* |  |  |
|  |  |  | (0.01) |  |  |
| Public Transport |  |  |  | -0.26\*\*\* |  |
|  |  |  |  | (0.01) |  |
| Median Distance |  |  |  |  | 0.11\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.00) |
| Commune-level controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Dept.-level controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Constant | 5.98\* | 2.52 | 11.32\*\*\* | 9.41\*\*\* | 8.50\*\*\* |
|  | (2.68) | (2.99) | (2.68) | (2.83) | (2.66) |
| Dept. σ2 | 6.28\*\*\* | 8.05\*\*\* | 6.34\*\*\* | 7.17\*\*\* | 6.27\*\*\* |
|  | (1.07) | (1.34) | (1.10) | (1.20) | (1.08) |
| Observations | 34716 | 34716 | 34716 | 34684 | 34716 |
| AIC | 246136.59 | 245117.87 | 246083.16 | 245446.77 | 246121.29 |

Table reports unstandardized coefficients. Standard errors in parentheses

\* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001

**Table B2. First-round Results**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | RN Vote Share | RN Vote Share | RN Vote Share |
|  |  |  |  |
| % Sedentary Pop. | 0.03\*\*\* | 0.03\*\*\* | 0.03\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Relative Housing Costs | 0.76\*\*\* | 0.75\*\*\* | 0.75\*\*\* |
|  | (0.04) | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Public Services | -0.05\*\*\* | -0.05\*\*\* | -0.05\*\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| % Public Transport | -0.11\*\*\* | -0.11\*\*\* | -0.11\*\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Median Distance | 0.08\*\*\* | 0.08\*\*\* | 0.08\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Commune-level controls | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Dept.-level controls |  | Yes | Yes |
| Constant | 16.17\*\*\* | -3.13 | -2.26 |
|  | (0.61) | (1.99) | (1.88) |
| Dept. σ2 | 22.60\*\*\* | 3.42\*\*\* | 3.45\*\*\* |
|  | (3.45) | (0.54) | (0. 54) |
| Observations | 34709 | 34709 | 34709 |
| *AIC* | 225847.65 | 225703.42 | 225704.86 |

Table reports unstandardized coefficients. Standard errors in parentheses

\* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001

Table B2. illustrates that the results are robust to using first-round results as the dependent variable.

**Table B3. Analysis with Sample Restricted to Communes with Fewer than 5000 inhabitants**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | RN Vote Share | RN Vote Share | RN Vote Share |
| % Sedentary Pop. | 0.01\* | 0.01\* | 0.01\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Relative Housing Costs | 1.22\*\*\* | 1.19\*\*\* | 1.19\*\*\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) |
| Public Services | -0.09\*\*\* | -0.09\*\*\* | -0.09\*\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| % Public Transport | -0.07\*\*\* | -0.07\*\*\* | -0.07\*\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Median Distance | 0.08\*\*\* | 0.08\*\*\* | 0.08\*\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Commune-level controls | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Dept.-level controls | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Constant | 28.95\*\*\* | -2.92 | -1.82 |
|  | (0.83) | (3.08) | (2.82) |
| Dept. σ2 | 40.97\*\*\* | 6.14\*\*\* | 5.90\*\*\* |
|  | (6.05) | (0.95) | (0. 92) |
| Observations | 32600 | 32600 | 32600 |
| *AIC* | 229808.09 | 229645.50 | 229642.66 |

Table reports unstandardized coefficients. Standard errors in parentheses.

\*p < 0.05, \*\*p < 0.01, \*\*\*p < 0.001

As shown above in Table B3., the results are robust to excluding large communes from the sample. This finding is noteworthy, as it suggests that the spatial variation in PRR support is not merely driven by an urban-rural divide, but that there exists important variation across the smaller rural and peri-urban areas as well when it comes to their “desirability,” residential constraints and access to services and opportunities. This finding conforms with the qualitative analysis.

**Table B4. Interactive Models**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | RN Vote Share | RN Vote Share | RN Vote Share |
| % Sedentary | 0.03\*\*\* | 0.01\* | -0.04\*\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Relative Housing Costs | 0.63\*\*\* | 1.27\*\*\* | 1.32\*\*\* |
|  | (0.18) | (0.04) | (0.04) |
| Sedentary Pop.\*Housing Costs | 0.01\*\*\* |  |  |
|  | (0.00) |  |  |
| Sedentary Pop.\* Foreign |  | 0.01\*\*\* |  |
|  |  | (0.00) |  |
| Sedentary Pop.\* Unemployment |  |  | 0.01\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |
| Public Services | -0.13\*\*\* | -0.13\*\*\* | -0.13\*\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Public Transport | -0.17\*\*\* | -0.16\*\*\* | -0.17\*\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Median Distance | 0.11\*\*\* | 0.10\*\*\* | 0.10\*\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| % Foreign | -0.26\*\*\* | -0.93\*\*\* | -0.25\*\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.07) | (0.01) |
| % Unemployment | 0.11\*\*\* | 0.12\*\*\* | -0.37\*\*\* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.05) |
| Commune-level controls | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Dept.-level controls | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Constant | 0.11 | 0.65 | 3.96\* |
|  | (2.79) | (2.73) | (2.80) |
| Dept. σ2 | 6.80\*\*\* | 6.49\*\*\* | 6.61\*\*\* |
|  | (1.08) | (1.02) | (1.04) |
| Observations | 34684 | 34684 | 34684 |
| *AIC* | 243882.41 | 243793.21 | 243814.56 |

Table reports unstandardized coefficients. Standard errors in parentheses.

\*p < 0.05, \*\*p < 0.01, \*\*\*p < 0.001

Analyses presented in table B4. show that there is a positive, albeit small interactive effect of relative house prices, foreign populations, and unemployment and local sedentariness on RN support.

1. **Qualitative Research**

**C1. Descriptive Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **High PRR Commune** | **Low PRR Commune** | **CM Min.** | **CM Max.** | **National Min.** | **National Max.** |
| Vote Le Pen 1st Round | 31 – 42% | 16 – 19% | 2 | 55 | 0 | 84 |
| Vote Le Pen 2nd Round | 51 – 58% | 26 – 36% | 19 | 65 | 0 | 100 |
| Share Foreign | 0.1 – 3% | 0.5 – 3% | 0 | 20.9 | 0 | 66.7 |
| Share Unemployment | 8.5 – 14% | 8 - 12.4% | 0 | 35.5 | 0 | 57.1 |
| Share Employment in Industry | 0 – 14% | 0 – 12% | 0 | 75.1 | 0 | 100 |
| Pop. | 400 - 2000 | 450 - 1002 | 52 | 75735 | 0 | 2187526 |
| Type | Rural; Peri-Urban | Rural; Peri-Urban |  |  |  |  |
| N = | 8 | 7 |  |  |  |  |

Note: N= total number of communes. At the national level, Le Pen won 21.4 percent of votes on the 1st round, and 34 percent on the 2nd round.

**C2. Qualitative Interview Protocol**

The interviews were conducted in semi-structured form; the guiding questionnaire for interviews is detailed below.

1. How would you describe yourself? (e.g. age, occupation, education, marital status etc.)

2. Generally speaking, how interested are you in politics?

3. What forms of political action have you/do you regularly engage in (e.g. vote, take part in protest, sign a petition etc.)

4. Has your engagement in politics changed in recent years (i.e. have you become more or less active in politics over the years)?

5. How long have you lived in your community? How would you describe your it? How has your community changed over time?

6. In your opinion, what do you think are the most pressing issues facing France today? How about your community? Are certain of these issues you mentioned more important than others?

7. How affected are you personally about these issues outlined in your daily life? How prevalent are they in your community? How about other people like you?

8. (How) have you reacted to these issues you have outlined? How would you like to react? How do you think these issues should have been addressed at the national/community level?

9. Does immigration have an effect on your community? How about life in France in general? How does it affect you and/or your community?

10. Does globalization have an effect on your community? How about life in France in general? How does it affect you and/or your community?

11. Does the EU have an effect on your community? How about life in France in general? How does it affect you and/or your community?

12. What do you think about political parties’ ability to address the key issues you highlighted?

13. Are there differences between how well political parties have addressed key issues and concerns?

14. What, if any, effect has the PRR party’s recent strong performance has had on the country? How about the community? Does the PRR party differ from other parties? If yes, in which ways?