

Annexes

Contents

A1.	Annex: Accountability in the FGIs.....	6
A1.1.	Holding the UK accountable	7
A1.2.	Holding the EU accountable	8
A1.2.a)	There is no accountability in the EU (and that might be by design).....	8
A1.2.b)	There's no communication with the EU, so we can't hold them accountable.....	9
A1.2.c)	We don't hold them accountable, because we don't have knowledge, time, or space in our lives to do so—and that's because of the EU.....	10
A1.2.d)	We can't vote meaningfully in the EU, so we can't change things from the inside	10
A2.	Annex: Brexit timeline	11
A3.	Annex: Codebook	12
A3.1.	Reading: from the general to the specific.....	12
A3.2.	Data processing: from the specific to the general.....	13
A3.3.	Text-based data	14
A3.3.a)	BLAME	14
A3.3.b)	CREDIT	16
A3.3.c)	VICTIM	16
A3.3.d)	Beneficiaries.....	17
A3.3.e)	Emotions.....	18
A3.3.f)	No blame (passive).....	24
A3.3.g)	Discourses - policy concerns.....	24
A3.3.h)	Discourses - political meta	28
A3.3.i)	Quotes.....	29
A3.3.j)	Topoi.....	29
A3.3.k)	Speaker	29
A3.3.l)	Maybe-blame	31
A3.3.m)	Tangents	31
A3.4.	Talk-based data	35

A3.4.a)	BLAME	35
A3.4.b)	CREDIT	35
A3.4.c)	VICTIM	36
A3.4.d)	Beneficiaries	36
A3.4.e)	Emotions	36
A3.4.f)	Discourses	38
A3.4.g)	Other items	38
A3.5.	Survey-experiment data	39
A3.5.a)	Blame	39
A3.5.b)	Victim	40
A3.5.c)	Doesn't affect me (victim uncreation)	40
A3.5.d)	Beneficiaries	40
A3.5.e)	Emotions	40
A3.5.f)	Contesting blame	49
A4.	Annex: Correlations between pre- and post-vignette emotions	50
A5.	Annex: Correlations between pre- and post-vignette emotions, by voting preference (VPL/VPR only)	53
A6.	Annex: Correlations between vote preference and pre/post-vignette emotions	56
A6.1.	Correlation between voting preference and pre-vignette emotions	56
A6.2.	Correlation between voting preference and post-vignette emotions	57
A7.	Annex: Correlations between in-group values and Just World Beliefs and post-vignette emotions, by voting preference	60
A8.	Annex: Correlations between psychometric, educational, and health data	61
A9.	Annex: Correlations between underlying characteristics and post-vignette effects	62
A9.1.	Post-vignette emotions: Sense of agency, agreeability, in-group values, and Just World Beliefs	62
A9.2.	Post-vignette emotions, (mental) health and educational attainment	67
A9.3.	Victim (un)creation and (re)blame	71
A10.	Annex: Crosstabs and post-vignette effects	72
A10.1.	Area of greatest interest	72
A10.2.	Brexit-specific identity	79
A10.3.	Class	81
A10.4.	Cultural attachment	86

A10.5. Gender	90
A10.6. General Election voting issue.....	92
A10.7. Generation.....	99
A10.8. Geoattachment.....	102
A10.9. Political party support.....	126
A10.10. Political values.....	133
A10.11. Race	135
A10.12. Religion	141
A10.13. Sexuality.....	145
A11. Annex: Emotional expressivity	147
A12. Annex: Ethics Review Forms	148
A12.1. Introductory text from all ethics review forms	148
A12.2. Survey-experiment v1	148
A12.2.a) Part I	148
A12.2.b) Part II: Research Ethics Checklist.....	150
A12.2.c) Part III: Research ethical considerations	151
A12.2.d) Part IV: Signature	155
A12.3. Survey-experiment v2.....	156
A12.3.a) Part I	156
A12.3.b) Part II: Research Ethics Checklist.....	158
A12.3.c) Part III: Research ethical considerations	159
A12.3.d) Part IV: Signature	162
A12.4. Focus groups.....	163
A12.4.a) Part I	163
A12.4.b) Part II: Research Ethics Checklist.....	165
A12.4.c) Part III: Research ethical considerations	166
A12.4.d) Part IV: Signature	172
A12.4.e) Research Consent Form	173
A12.5. Online focus groups and interviews	174
A12.5.a) Part I	174
A12.5.b) Part II: Research Ethics Checklist.....	176
A12.5.c) Part III: Research ethical considerations	177

A12.5.d) Part IV: Signature	183
A12.5.e) Research Consent.....	184
A13. Annex: Ethics Review Attachments.....	185
A13.1. Survey-experiment v1	186
A13.2. Survey-experiment v2.....	197
A13.3. Interest in follow-up research	209
A14. Annex: FGI questions	210
A15. Annex: Identity by victims, victim uncreation, and presence of (re)blame	213
A15.1. Brexit-specific identity	214
A15.2. Political party.....	215
A15.3. Religion	218
A15.4. Sexuality.....	220
A15.5. Generation.....	221
A15.6. Geo-attachment.....	222
A16. Annex: SE education levels.....	229
A17. Annex: SE emotions by vignette and voting preference	231
A18. Annex: SE emotions by vignette	234
A19. Annex: SE geo-attachment.....	236
A20. Annex: Suppose the EU was a person.....	240
A20.1. The EU as (unwanted) family	240
A20.2. The EU as a boring, disconnected bureaucrat	241
A20.3. The EU as a know-it-all control freak.....	242
A20.4. The EU as an inexorable fascist.....	243
A21. Annex: Vignettes.....	245
A21.1. Variation 1: Blame the EU.....	245
A21.2. Variation 2: Blame the UK Government.....	245
A21.3. Variation 3: Blame selves	246
A21.4. Variation 4: No blame	246
A22. Annex: What the campaigns talked about.....	247
A23. Annex: Who is blamed for what?.....	248
A24. Annex: Who is the EU?	252
A24.1. The EU is not Europe.....	252

A24.2.	The EU is Merkel, or the Establishment	252
A24.3.	The EU is the Commission.....	252
A24.4.	The EU is composed of several institutions.....	253
A25.	Confidential Annex: Focus group and interview participants	255
A26.	References.....	257

A1. Annex: Accountability in the FGIs

Given the frequency of 'accountability' as an issue in Leave campaign materials, and the relation of blame and accountability in previous research,¹ several of the introductory questions in the focus groups/interviews related to what accountability is:²

1. For you, what does it mean to 'hold someone accountable'?
2. What are some of the ways in which political actors such as parties or politicians can be held accountable?
3. What are ways people can hold the EU specifically accountable?

Two major conceptions of accountability were apparent in the responses: accountability as **explaining why certain actions were taken**, and accountability as **accepting punishment for actions**. Each relates to actions—whether explaining them (good or harmful actions), or being punished for them (harmful actions).

These conceptions, as well as differences in how UK politicians and the EU were to be 'held accountable', are presented here with indicative quotes. They are a useful resource when considering blame of the EU in the main text, as conceptions of accountability may limit what can be 'asked' via blame. The Leave campaign blamed the EU and therefore issued a 'call to action'³ to vote Leave, rather than pursuing other ways to hold the EU accountable, or indeed, verify its accountability for any item for which it was blamed.⁴

Stutters and the like are removed from the below, but quotes are otherwise presented as said by the interlocutors.⁵

Accountability as explaining one's actions:

Bronwyn: "being held accountable I think is to be able to have a two-way discourse."

Luke: "they have to explain their actions, I suppose"

Aileen: "They have to be able to answer—justify their actions."

Jamal: "they should be able to explain why decisions they made led to that kind of outcome. And I suppose if it's something bad then, the kind of the consequences that they need to be able to deal with, and obviously if it goes well, then they can bask in the glory so to speak."

Steve: "for me, accountability is not always achieving your goal, but it's to seem to at least strive towards it"

Accountability as being punished for one's (bad) actions:

¹ E.g. Lerner, Goldberg, and Tetlock, 'Sober Second Thought'; León, Jurado, and Garmendia Madariaga, 'Passing the Buck?'; Hobolt and Tilley, 'Blaming Europe?'

² See Annex: FGI questions, Methodology > Data sources > Focus groups and interviews.

³ See Blame and its effects > Defining blame.

⁴ See also Hobolt and Tilley, 'Blaming Europe?', and Blame and its effects > Blame's effects per political science > Hobolt and Tilley and 'Blaming Europe?'.

⁵ See also Methodology > Data analysis > Reading process and quote selection.

Mac: "holding them accountable would be really bringing them to justice, or either seeing that they've made a mistake and ensuring they never made that mistake again, or if need be, punishment to some extent."

Sam: "I guess you're not only accountable in a societal sense as in, you expect them to accept *blame* for their actions and the consequences thereof, but also that there's legal culpability as well."

Liz: "they have a responsibility to me in some area. And if they don't deliver on that responsibility, they need to pay the penalty for that, not me"

John: "I'm *thoroughly* accountable to my clients. I have other people working for me who deliver services to them, but it's *my* head that's on the block if things go wrong. ... [And you need to] know where someone stands. If someone's position is fluid, well how the hell can they be accountable to you?"

This last example points at the need for transparency—unless people know what a given person or body's position is, it is not possible for them to be 'held accountable'. This was echoed by Jacob, who said that "accountability is knowing who has authority".

A1.1. Holding the UK accountable

The participants were able to describe how to hold the UK government accountable in accordance with both of the above conceptions: by writing to their MP, seeking a complaints process, meeting with their MP/councillor, attending meetings, votes of no confidence, voting them out of office, supporting a same-party replacement, voting in all elections from local through national, rallying/protesting, speaking against them, writing to the newspaper, supporting alternate candidates (e.g. letterboxing), plebiscites (as verification of mandate to which they could be held accountable), recalling MPs who have broken the law, or putting MPs on trial for criminal behaviour. Todd raised the role of party manifestos, and the expectation that politicians not abiding by those would be punished—namely via election. Mac suggested public apologies, and perhaps even a scolding from 'authorities':

Mac: "You could make a show of it, you could like publicly have them apologise. You could just have them publicly acknowledge that they've been scolded by somebody in authority. [Laughs] The Queen's told them off, so that the Queen has talked to Boris Johnson and said he's been *very naughty* and not do it again. [Laughs] You know, as long as it's kind of made [laughs] as long as it's made *public*"

Mac suggested that this "public shaming" would be more effective than a fine, or reduction in pay or privileges. He gave the example of punishment where somebody has lied to the public. Aileen pointed to the role of the media in holding politicians to account. John said that politicians use blame to avoid accountability, and that politicians are only accountable to those people that voted for them rather than the population of their district as a whole:

"there's a caucus in this country, 30 percent of people who voted for a neo-Marxist⁶—and they're *wrong*. ... I don't want the government to be accountable to those people; I don't give a *damn* about them, and I don't think the government should

⁶ Meaning Jeremy Corbyn as then-leader of the Labour Party.

either. Because if there is a constituency in this country that believes that crap, then I don't think that any politician really ought to be pandering to them at all."

Megan pointed at the need to receive communications, in line with the conception of accountability as communicating/explaining one's actions. There was also an expectation that MPs would regularly be in their home offices, having council meetings or speaking with constituents, and possibly having lunchtime events where people could "come and ask them any questions" (Oliver).

Overall, irrespective of the conception of accountability they used, FGI participants appeared quite clear on there being at least a few actions they could take to hold politicians to account within the UK.

A1.2. Holding the EU accountable

When it came to holding the *EU* accountable, FGI participants thought it was probably not possible (Abigail: "If you don't like what your MP is doing, you can get together and you can recall them, and get rid of them. You can't do that in Europe."). This was because there was no accountability designed in the EU, because there was no communication mechanism (Abigail: "I don't think anybody knows how to contact them"), because it was unrealistic that people would have time and capacity to know about European issues and thereby take action, or because votes were not meaningful (Luke: "I don't think there's the same sort of voting structure when it comes to European MPs."). Only one participant said that there *was* a meaningful way, and that was by voting out:

Jamal: "the fact that Brexit is actually happening that that is kind of a consequence of—almost like an accountability issue in itself for the kind of relationship that we've had with the EU up till now."

This coheres with Hobolt and Tilley's research,⁷ where the only 'real' accountability mechanism people may perceive for the EU is to vote in or out of it.⁸

Even where accountability mechanisms similar to those for the UK government were raised, participants explained that they were not realistic, or did not (or would not) work.

Four themes appeared in how people conceptualised accountability vis-a-vis the EU, as follows:

A1.2.a) There is no accountability in the EU (and that might be by design)

Several participants argued that the EU was not accountable, was not interested in seeking opinions or input, and was that way by design. This seems to align with conceptions of the EU as fascistic.⁹

⁷ Hobolt and Tilley, *Blaming Europe?*

⁸ See *Blame and its effects* > *Blame's effects per political science* > Hobolt and Tilley and 'Blaming Europe?'.

⁹ See Annex: Who is the EU?.

Todd: "they're not only **undemocratic**, they're **anti-democratic**. I mean the European Parliament can't even **suggest** something to debate. It's all fed to them by the completely unelected mandarins."

Liz: "they had no accountability at all because there was no way the people in this country—the people in **any** of the Member States could put pressure on them... They kind of didn't consider the opinions of the people who had to live under the rules and regulations."

John: "I think it was virtually impossible to hold the EU accountable, because the majority of the decisions that were made were made by the leaders of the individual countries; they were making backroom deals in the EU before they even got anywhere near MEPs."

Bronwyn: "from everything I've read about the EU, and I **have** read a lot—and the whole thing was **designed** not to be democratic, or accountable."

Mac: "I don't know who my representative in the EU **is**, or if I **have** one. I mean it's not Nigel Farage. I **know** we have a UK team, but I mean who are they and what do they do? ... It seems like we don't have enough power to to do **anything** really with the EU kind of what's in their laws and bylaws. I don't think anyone could really hold the EU accountable apart from the EU, ... and obviously if there was any wrongdoing, there would have to be public apologies and stuff like that. I mean, you could always have the like NATO or the United States or something investigate the EU, but that's the kind of a political minefield. ... I think **because** they're a coalition of countries, it would be difficult to have any authority over any part of the EU."

A1.2.b) There's no communication with the EU, so we can't hold them accountable

Because there was no communication from the EU, and no way of communicating *to* the EU, accountability was necessarily impossible. For Douglas there was no "real hotline into Europe", while Megan said that they received little communication from the EU and did not know what they did for the UK, good or bad.

Megan: "To me the accountability comes from communications. There is very little communication from Europe. We don't see anything. ... I have no idea what funding comes from Europe where I live. I don't **ever** remember growing up seeing anything about where Europe has had a positive effect on my life growing up. There's no communication, where I can't go back to someone and say "that's not fair", or "how did that happen?". Most people don't know who their Member of European Parliament is, and we've probably never met them, never even know their name, even if they voted for them. I work in local government, in votes, in the electoral services, so I know most people vote for a party, not for a person. So the accountability is lost because it's so far away, and there's so many layers of democracy as well. ... So the accountability isn't there, it's too far away; there's no communication; there's no saying what happens locally."

A1.2.c) We don't hold them accountable, because we don't have knowledge, time, or space in our lives to do so—and that's because of the EU

Several participants suggested that it may be more that UK people *did* not hold the EU to account, rather than that they *could* not. However, this was due to their lack of knowledge, time, or mental space in which to consider complex EU affairs, meaning it was not their fault. The EU did not tell people how to hold it accountable, and people did not look into it, and so the EU was rendered *unaccountable*.

Alex: "I don't have the civil - like the mental space, let alone the infrastructural possibilities really for me to understand what's going on in the EU, and therefore I don't understand the issues. ... So accountability, even if I had the phone to my MEP would be irrelevant, because I couldn't talk about European issues"

Aileen: "I think obviously the media could attempt to hold them accountable. It just feels a lot remoter. And I would imagine most people in this country just maybe couldn't be **bothered** to hold them accountable."

A1.2.d) We can't vote meaningfully in the EU, so we can't change things from the inside

Lastly, with the EU designed as unaccountable, and not communicating and therefore not accountable, the only option left was voting; and this, too, was flawed. Either voting was meaningless because there was only one candidate:

Abigail: "I mean, Ursula von der Leyen, there was only one person put forward for that role, and they have to vote on it. You **cannot** have a democratic vote when there's only one person standing"

Or because MEPs had no power:

Abigail: "it's that Commission that takes all the decisions"

Or because the important institutions had personnel appointed, rather than being voted in:

Douglas: "If you can't vote for who's leading, I don't know how you **can** trust what's happening"

Mac: "I think maybe what your question's getting at is, 'do I know if the people from the EU are elected or not?'. I think that they're not **widely** elected by the—what's the word—the proletariat [laughs] by the people. I know that the people within the EU Council maybe elect their peers? But I don't know how that started off, or the actual process by which they're voted in."

Overall, irrespective of which conception of 'accountability' was used, the UK was seen as accountable in a way that the EU was not—and this was due to largely the EU's design, or poor communications with and from the EU. Only one option was available—voting out.

A2. Annex: Brexit timeline

Provided for quick reference when considering thesis methods and data collection.

7 May 2015	UK General Election. David Cameron, PM-elect, had campaigned on a promise to hold an EU membership referendum. A draft EU Referendum Bill that would underwrite this promise had its first reading in May 2013, and Cameron attempted membership renegotiations from 2014. The commitment to a referendum was listed in the Conservative Party Manifesto for the 2015 election. ¹⁰
17 Dec 2015	European Union Referendum Act receives royal assent ¹¹
19 Feb 2016	David Cameron finalises renegotiation deal on the UK's EU membership ¹²
20 Feb 2016	Cameron announces that referendum date will be 23 June ¹³
7 Jun 2016	Original deadline for online registration to vote in EU referendum ¹⁴
9 Jun 2016	Extended deadline to register to vote in EU referendum ¹⁵
16 Jun 2016	MP Jo Cox murdered ¹⁶
23 Jun 2016	Brexit referendum ¹⁷
13 Jul 2016	Theresa May becomes Prime Minister ¹⁸
29 Mar 2017	Article 50 to leave the EU triggered ¹⁹
24 July 2019	Boris Johnson becomes Prime Minister ²⁰
	<i>Data collection: survey-experiment</i>
12 Dec 2019	Boris Johnson's Conservative party wins the General Election ²¹
29 Mar 2019	Initial proposed 'exit date' (Brexit Day) ²²
31 Oct 2019	Second 'exit date' ²³
31 Jan 2020	Actual 'exit date' ²⁴
	<i>Data collection: focus groups and interviews</i>
31 Dec 2020	Expiry of implementation/transition period ²⁵

¹⁰ Directorate-General for Parliamentary Research Services, Eastock, and Poptcheva, 'The UK's "new Settlement" in the European Union'.

¹¹ UK Parliament, 'European Union Referendum Act 2015 Royal Assent'; UK Parliament, 'European Union Referendum Act 2015 Stages'.

¹² Banks and Oakeshott, 'The Bad Boys of Brexit'.

¹³ Kuenssberg, 'Cameron Calls EU Referendum for June'.

¹⁴ E.g. The Metro, 6 June 2016 featured ads from the Electoral Commission saying "Last chance to register. If you're not already registered to vote **make sure you do so by Tuesday 7 June.**" Emphasis in original.

¹⁵ E.g. Article in The Metro on 9 June 2016, "Deadline for EU register is extended to midnight". Yeatman, 'Deadline for EU Register Is Extended to Midnight'.

¹⁶ Cobain, Parveen, and Taylor, 'The Slow-Burning Hatred That Led Thomas Mair to Murder Jo Cox'; BBC News Service, 'EU Referendum Campaigns Suspended until Sunday after Jo Cox Attack'.

¹⁷ Directorate-General for Parliamentary Research Services, Eastock, and Poptcheva, 'The UK's "new Settlement" in the European Union'.

¹⁸ Wallenfeldt, 'Theresa May'.

¹⁹ Wallenfeldt.

²⁰ Centre for European Reform, 'Brexit Timeline'.

²¹ Eardley, 'Election Results 2019'.

²² Centre for European Reform, 'Brexit Timeline'.

²³ Centre for European Reform.

²⁴ Centre for European Reform.


²⁵ Centre for European Reform.

A3. Annex: Codebook

This codebook gives the codes used in the present research. As three separate files were used for analysing the data, it has three sections: text-based data, which refers to all pre-referendum materials including campaign content and Metro text and commentary; talk-based data, which refers to the focus groups and interviews (FGIs); and survey-experiment data, which refers to data from the survey-experiment (SE). The codes for the text-based data are shown first, as this was the first set of data analysed. Code naming and definitions were kept consistent across files. Only codes that were used or referenced in some way in the research are included in this codebook.

MaxQDA, a piece of software designed specifically for mixed methods research, was used to perform coding as shown in Figure 1. The 'lexical search' option was used to help verify coding, so that for example, Juncker's name was searched in the text-based data after coding had been done to ensure that no instances of him having spoken were missed.

Figure 1: An example coding window for the text-based data. For this example, only blame (pink), discourses (blue), and emotions (mauve) are selected for display.



Before turning to the codes, this annex briefly reviews how reading and data processing were done in the research per the thesis' methodology chapter. Fuller details can be viewed there.

A3.1. Reading: from the general to the specific

A deep familiarity with texts is necessary to conduct analysis of them, and so all texts were read multiple times. 'Reading' here refers to 'traditional' reading materials (campaign materials, The Metro), as well as to FGI transcripts and SE responses. It thus encompasses all data sources used for the present research. The reading process moved from the

general to the specific, while extracting data from texts moved from the specific to the general as follows.

Reading of any given text was done in three phases: skimming, scanning, and reading for deeper meaning—from the general to the specific. The initial 'skim' involves reading for general structure and keywords, notably those used in the heading(s) for the piece, granting initial understanding. 'Scanning' is the first full read-through, wherein all text in the piece is read and considered from the perspective of a 'normal reader'—no attempt is made to consider how the text connects to other texts, persuasiveness, contestation etc. This is the task of 'reading for deeper meaning', wherein the text itself is analysed for such items. Data processing takes place at both the scanning (e.g. blame) and deeper meaning (e.g. shared topics, recurrent imagery, connection to other texts) phases.

For the FGIs, the 'skimming' phase was omitted, as the text was created in process with the researcher. For these, multiple readings were (i) initial interview/focus group (verbal), (ii) transcription (each text listened to approximately twice), and (iii) two full read-throughs, employing scanning and reading for deeper meaning, of the typed transcript. For the survey-experiment, skimming and scanning were conducted after the first approx. 500 responses, and then all three phases of reading were performed on the full cleaned data set.

A3.2. Data processing: from the specific to the general

To gain a deep contextual understanding of the Leave campaign and what blame may or may not have appeared, what was and was not spoken about, what blame appeared in those discourses, and how this compared with the Remain campaign, the 223 texts from the 'News' section of Leave.EU and then 25 'Britain Stronger In Europe' documents were selected for deeper review. These texts were processed extensively, not looking just for 'blame' or vilification, for example, but coding *all* recurrent topics, images, topoi, motifs, and speakers using MaxQDA. This permitted for an initial understanding of interdiscursivity, in that the researcher could see how discourses on, for example, the economy, intersected with blame—I.e. identifying that the economy was blamed 'for'. Thence onwards, coding for the text-based data and SE responses focused on those items necessary for the present research, per the data analysis framework: blame, including topics of blame and subjects and objects; emotions; and contestation.

Codes were grouped as shown below, such that the parent group of 'EU' as blamee could include child codes 'EU institutions', 'EU regulations', specific EU personnel, and so on. This allowed for speaking in general terms (the EU was blamed for....) as well as more specifically (EU regulations are a particular problem...). Where applicable, the same group and code names were used across data sources, to facilitate comparison.

The code structure is shown below, with subcodes are indicated using >>. For instance, 'Blame >> Part of EU/EEC' indicates that 'Part of EU/EEC' is a subcode of 'Blame'.

A3.3. Text-based data

Codes emerged and used for the text-based data, including Leave.EU news and media, pamphlets and brochures; Britain Stronger in Europe materials; pro-Leave ads; Metro articles; and MetroTalk commentary.

A3.3.a) BLAME

Blame is a discursive practice in which a speaker makes a claim that a party has done (or is doing) a harmful thing. Identifying blame therefore means identifying, at a minimum, the 'harmful thing' and the 'party' (blamee). The former must always be present for an instance of blame—if it is a *helpful*, rather than *harmful*, thing, it would instead be an instance of credit. Whether the event is 'negative' or not may need to be established. Given the role of contextual information in completing blame and that the researcher is not herself British, only the most explicit instances of blame are used in analysis in the present research. Note that the harmful thing must belong to the present or past—a harmful thing taking place in the future is an instance of 'threat' rather than 'blame'.

Subcodes refer to the party that is blamed, e.g. the EU, academics, climate change and so on.

BLAME >> Part of EU / EEC

Part of the EU or European Economic Community is blamed, as opposed to the EU or a constituent part thereof. For instance, Member States are blamed. The EEC was a precursor to the EU; its inclusion in the label makes no substantive difference.

BLAME >> Part of EU / EEC >> Other European leaders

BLAME >> Political party

A political actor is blamed, whether an individual like David Cameron or a group such as the Remain campaign.

BLAME >> Political party >> Remain campaign(er)

The Remain campaign or a Remain campaigner is blamed.

BLAME >> Political party >> Leave campaign(er)

The Leave campaign or a Leave campaigner is blamed.

BLAME >> Political party >> UK Government or party

The UK government or a UK political party is blamed, including individuals and the civil service.

BLAME >> Political party >> Cameron

David Cameron is blamed.

BLAME >> EU

BLAME >> EU >> EU institution(s) Eurocrats Brussels ECJ euro

The EU as an institution is blamed, or 'Eurocrats' such as Commission staff, 'Brussels', the European Court of Justice or euro are blamed.

BLAME >> EU >> EU policies

Specific EU policies are blamed. Includes blame of EU 'regulations', 'red tape', and 'rules'.

BLAME >> EU >> Implied EU

Something bad is happening/has happened, and it is implied that this is because of the EU or the UK's membership thereof, OR the EU is involved in something that's happening/has happened, and it is implied that that thing is bad.

BLAME >> EU >> Specific EU figure

A specific EU figure such as Juncker is blamed.

BLAME >> Other**BLAME >> Other >> Academia****BLAME >> Other >> Elite**

Includes 'elite', the rich, banks, experts, the IMF, and corporations as blamees.

BLAME >> Other >> ISIS, terrorists**BLAME >> Other >> Media****BLAME >> Other >> Migrants, migrant crisis**

Migrants or migration crisis blamed; includes 'refugee crisis' and blame of Muslim people who are allegedly part of the migrant crisis. Includes two examples of 'implied' blame of migrants. Those two MetroTalk comments relate to an article blaming problems on migrants, and continue in a similar vein. Other comments about the article, published on that same day (1 April 2016), talk of the same thing.²⁶

BLAME >> Other >> Other country, leader, policy**BLAME >> Other >> People of the UK**

The people of the UK are blamed, including 'we'.

BLAME >> Non-agent / situation

The blamee is something without agency. This includes blamees that are not humans or groups thereof, such as situations.

BLAME >> Non-agent / situation >> Brexit itself

²⁶ The Metro, 'MetroTalk'.

Brexit itself is blamed, for instance fears around the referendum.

BLAME >> Non-agent / situation >> Climate change / weather / flooding

Climate change, weather, or flooding are blamed.

BLAME >> Non-agent / situation >> Other non-agent

A different 'non-agent' is blamed, e.g. "the Greek debt crisis", "egos", "democracy".

A3.3.b) CREDIT

Where a speaker says a party is doing, or has done, a helpful thing. Subcodes refer to the party that is credited with the helpful thing (the creditee). Credit can be given or claimed for oneself.

CREDIT (giving, claiming) >> EU

CREDIT (giving, claiming) >> Implied EU

It is implied that the EU has done the helpful thing. E.g. "A strong economy means households are better off in Europe."²⁷ There is the suggestion that Europe is the EU, but no explicit credit given.

CREDIT (giving, claiming) >> Other

CREDIT (giving, claiming) >> UK

A3.3.c) VICTIM

Victims were simple to identify in blame, through noting whom the 'harmful thing' was being done to. In the example "As a consequence of EEC accession, the last 40 years has seen a **decimation of the British fishing industry**",²⁸ the British fishing industry suffers and thus would be coded as victim. Subcodes indicate exactly who was the victim of a given situation, for instance the EU or migrants as victims.

VICTIM >> EU

VICTIM >> EU >> EU public / Europeans

The EU public or Europeans, including subgroups such as 'German girls'.

VICTIM >> EU >> Part of EU / EEC

Parts of the EU, including individual Member States such as Greece.

VICTIM >> EU >> Other

²⁷ Britain Stronger In Europe, 'Top 10 Facts'.

²⁸ Leave.EU, 'Fishy Business'.

Other EU-related victims, including leaders within the EU or its Member States: e.g. where then-Greek Prime Minister Tsipras is a victim in his own right apart from any victimisation of Greece.

VICTIM >> Migrants

VICTIM >> Political party

VICTIM >> Political party >> Jo Cox

VICTIM >> Political party >> UK government or party

Where the UK government or a UK political party is victimised, including Prime Ministers prior to, but not including, David Cameron.

VICTIM >> Political party >> Leave campaign(er)

Where the Leave campaign, or a member of a Leave campaign party, is victimised; includes Leave.EU, Vote Leave, smaller groups such as Grassroots Out, plus UKIP.

VICTIM >> Political party >> Cameron

David Cameron specifically is spoken of as the victim of a harmful thing.

VICTIM >> UK / Britain

VICTIM >> UK / Britain >> Geographical part of UK

VICTIM >> UK / Britain >> UK business / industry

VICTIM >> UK / Britain >> UK people

Includes the people of the UK, incorporating UK voters, workers, taxpayers, and farmers.

VICTIM >> UK / Britain >> Our / us / we

Where victims involve a personal pronoun; e.g. 'we' or 'us' or 'I' are victimised.

VICTIM >> Other

Other victims that are occasional and are not included in the previous categories. E.g. "skilled engineers from India or paramedics from Australia",²⁹ "journalists worldwide",³⁰ international businesses and organisations.

A3.3.d) Beneficiaries

Instances of those who *benefit* as a result of the harmful thing outlaid in blame. The subcodes indicate who the beneficiary is, for instance 'big money', or the UK.

Beneficiaries >> Big money

²⁹ Britain Stronger In Europe and Vote Leave, 'In or Out? The Two Sides Give Their Reasons for Us to Remain - or Brexit'.

³⁰ Leave.EU, 'Sources to Advertisement'.

Big money, corporations, banks, and wealthy elite.

Beneficiaries >> Non-EU / EEC

Beneficiaries that are outside the EU, for example China or Russia.

Beneficiaries >> EU / Europe

Beneficiaries >> EU / Europe >> EU public / Europeans

Beneficiaries >> EU / Europe >> Part of EU

Including individual Member States.

Beneficiaries >> UK / Britain

The UK or Britain as beneficiaries; including our/us/we, the UK economy, and people of the UK.

Beneficiaries >> UK / Britain >> British businesses

UK/British business as the beneficiary.

Beneficiaries >> Other

All other beneficiaries.

A3.3.e) Emotions

People experience different emotions, for different reasons, in different contexts, and they express those emotions differently. To avoid the researcher's own emotion concepts affecting data processing and therefore interpretation, only explicitly labelled emotions in the data are used in the present research—for example, "it scares me", "it's scary". Each emotion thus identified was coded with its name. Different forms of the same word were collected, such that 'frustrated' and 'frustrating' are both considered as referring to the same emotion, as are 'afraid', 'fearful' and 'fear' (but not 'scared').

Emotions for the text-based data were not ultimately used in analysis.

Emotions >> admire

Admire, like, am fond of, or a (something)-phile.

Emotions >> alarmed

Emotions >> angry

Emotions >> annoyed / agitated

Emotions >> anxious

Emotions >> apathy

Emotions >> appalled

Emotions >> astonished

Emotions >> astounded

Emotions >> betrayed

Includes betrayal, betrayed, betray, and betrayer.

Emotions >> brave / courageous / bold

Emotions >> calm

Emotions >> caring / uncaring

Emotions >> certain / uncertain

Notions of 'feeling' certain or uncertain.

Emotions >> certain / uncertain >> state (thinking, knowns, definite)

References to *being* certain/uncertain (certainty as something one 'knows' rather than something which is 'felt').

Emotions >> comfortable / uncomfortable

Emotions >> compassionate

Emotions >> concerned

Emotions >> confident

Emotions >> confused

Includes confused, baffled, puzzled, and bewildered.

Emotions >> contempt

Emotions >> convinced

Emotions >> delighted

Emotions >> depressed

Emotions >> desperate

Emotions >> disappointed

Emotions >> disgrace

Emotions >> disturbed

Emotions >> doom / gloom

Emotions >> doubtful

Emotions >> embarrassed

Includes embarrassed, embarrassing, embarrassment.

Emotions >> encouraged

Includes encourage, encouraged, encouragement, and encouraging. Sometimes this refers to an emotion, and others it is used as a synonym for 'ask'. The subcode 'asking' is used where the word 'encourage' could be replaced with 'ask' with no change in the meaning of the sentence.

Emotions >> encouraged >> asking

Emotions >> enjoy

Emotions >> enraged

Includes rage, raging, enraged.

Emotions >> enthusiastic

Emotions >> excited

Emotions >> fearful

Includes fear, fearful, afraid, and frightened.

Emotions >> fed up

Emotions >> frustrated

Emotions >> happy

Emotions >> hatred

Emotions >> heat / cold

Feeling 'warm' or 'cool' towards something.

Emotions >> hoping

Emotions >> horrified

Emotions >> hostile / hostility

Emotions >> humiliated

Emotions >> hysterical / shrill

Emotions >> infuriated

Includes fury, furious, infuriating, infuriated.

Emotions >> insecure

Emotions >> inspired

Emotions >> laughable**Emotions >> let-down**

References to feeling 'let down'.

Emotions >> love / devotion**Emotions >> optimistic / pessimistic****Emotions >> outraged**

The comparatively high frequency is due to common usage of 'outrage' and 'outrageous' on pro-Brexit ads.

Emotions >> panicked**Emotions >> passionate****Emotions >> pleasure****Emotions >> positive / negative****Emotions >> proud****Emotions >> regret****Emotions >> resentment****Emotions >> respect****Emotions >> Sad****Emotions >> safe / unsafe / secure****Emotions >> satisfied****Emotions >> scared / scare-mongering**

Includes scared and scaremongering and fearmongering.

Emotions >> sceptical

Includes feeling sceptical (including 'Euro' sceptical)

Emotions >> serious / sober**Emotions >> shame**

Includes shame, shameful, ashamed, and shamed.

Emotions >> shocked**Emotions >> suffering****Emotions >> surprised**

Emotions >> suspicious

Emotions >> sympathy

Emotions >> terrified

Emotions >> threatened

Emotions >> tragedy

Emotions >> trust

Trust is included, as in when one 'feels trusting'. However, it is not certain whether 'trust' is an emotion, or a comment on a relationship status for example.

Emotions >> worried

Includes worry, worried, worrying, as well as 'rattled', preoccupied, and wary.

Emotions >> * Meta discussion of emotions

Discussions of emotions, attitudes, and passions, including critiquing others' emotionality, and speaking of the 'heart'. E.g. 'Change of heart', we are 'heartened', opposition as 'half-hearted'.

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions

Emotions that do not appear more than twice.

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> ignored / listened to

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> accepted

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> aggrieved

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> antagonised

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> bitter

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> cautious

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> constructive

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> discontent

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> cross

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> cynical / jaded

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> demotivated

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> despair

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> disconnected / disengaged

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> disgruntled

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> disillusioned / disenchanted

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> dismayed

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> enticed

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> forgiveness

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> fretful

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> friendly / affable

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> fun

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> genial

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> grateful / ungrateful

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> heart-broken

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> hungry

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> indifferent

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> intimidated

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> irritated

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> looking forward / yearning

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> lucky

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> miserable

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> nervous

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> neutral

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> nostalgic

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> patronised

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> pity

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> powerless

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> reassured

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> regard

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> scorn

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> shaken

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> shy

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> smothered

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> sorry

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> spooky

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> stern

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> tense

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> thrilled

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> troubled / untroubled

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> understood / misunderstood

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> wishful

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> keen

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> disgusted

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> lonely / isolated

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> stress

Emotions >> * Infrequent emotions >> pain

A3.3.f) No blame (passive)

Where a harmful thing has been or is being done, but who is doing it is not included. E.g. "Many parents are set to be disappointed today when their children are rejected for their school of choice".³¹

A3.3.g) Discourses - policy concerns

'Things that can be done' or affected within existing infrastructure, such as policy topics that can be legislated. This includes migration, security, the economy, and closely related topics (e.g. 'racism', 'terrorism', 'border security', and the policy topic of 'migration' were heavily interlinked).

Two non-'policy' topics were included here: 'identity/traditions/values/culture' and 'status/voice/influence/global representation'. The former was discussed in the text as being affected by UK government or EU policy, though the link between specific policy and identity or values was not necessarily present.

This category included references to British 'traditions', such as cricket, fox-hunting, and Christmas stockings.

³¹ Tahir, 'Children Miss out on School Places "Because of Europe"'.

The latter, status/voice, referred to governmental choices that could be made—namely participation in political bodies as forums for representation—and as such was likewise included.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Business, industry, fisheries

References to businesses (as in the EU is to be blamed for damaging businesses), industry (including specific industries such as steel-working or manufacturing), and fishing/fisheries.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Climate change / environment

References to climate change and environment. Includes flooding and energy (when related to climate change).

Discourses - policy concerns >> Crime

References to crime, criminal, specific crimes such as rape, and crime-related terms such as arrest.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Economy

References to the 'economy', including a range of items: financial crises, currencies, London as a financial centre, stock markets, taxes, VAT, trade and investment, and the EU Single Market. The parent code 'economy' contains all those items that are not fine-grained into subcodes; 'economy' was typically used as a collapsed code, with all subcodes collapsed into the parent code of 'economy'.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Economy >> Austerity, loans, financial crisis

References to austerity and any related loans (e.g. of and to Greece), and the Global Financial Crisis.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Economy >> Currency (inc joining the Euro)

References to currency, including joining the Euro and discussions of the strength of the pound/euro.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Economy >> London

References to London as an economic or financial centre.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Economy >> Other

IMF, Treasury, Bank of England, Exchange Rate Mechanism, S&P, 'the banks', stock market (FTSE). This general category, with only 9 items, may have been better included in the parent code of 'economy' (or vice-versa). Given the small number, and that the collapsed 'economy' code was used in analysis, this is not expected to have affected results.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Economy >> Taxes, VAT

References to taxes and VAT.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Economy >> Trade / investment / SM

References to trade, investment (including foreign investment/FDI), and the EU Single Market.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Education / universities

References to education, school (and school places), universities, research, and qualifications. Includes references to specific fields of study, e.g. 'science', as when BSIE use a quote from Stephen Hawking that "Leaving the EU would be a disaster for science" (What the experts say).³²

Discourses - policy concerns >> Identity / traditions

References to identity, traditions, values, and culture. Includes specific examples, for instance references to UK traditions such as fox-hunting, playing cricket, or Christmas rituals.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Jobs (inc trade unions)

References to jobs, employment, and trade unions.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Migration

References to migrants, refugees, Schengen, free movement, and borders. Where the issue discussed relates to border security without mention of migrants, it is coded with the subcode 'physical safety and border control'. Very few instances of 'physical safety' do not refer to the borders or imply migration.

Subcodes were often 'collapsed' into the parent code of 'migration' during analysis.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Migration >> Racism

References to racism, racists, extremists (but not 'terrorist' extremists), and xenophobia.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Migration >> Physical safety and border control

Physical safety and border control. E.g. "Only through Britain regaining control of its laws, its borders and its taxes can we begin to avoid those EU crises and solve their problems we inherit."³³

Discourses - policy concerns >> Migration >> Turkey

References to Turkey specifically, including migration from and via Turkey.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Migration >> Terrorism

Explicit references to terrorism. While it is often connected to migration in the text, not all references to terrorism pertain to migration per se. For instance, there is content around

³² Britain Stronger In Europe, 'Why We Need to Remain in the EU'.

³³ Bilney, 'Leave.EU Responds to the PM's Speech in Davos'.

the Paris and Brussels terrorist attacks. These are sometimes, but not always, linked to migration, depending on the speaker.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Public services inc NHS

References to public services and the National Health Services.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Quality of life

References to quality of life issues: housing, prices, salaries, and holidays. Subcodes were often 'collapsed' into the parent code 'quality of life' in analysis.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Quality of life >> Other

References to other quality of life issues: e.g. streaming services, 'material well-being', supermarket shopping, insolvencies and repossessions, and households.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Quality of life >> Holidays

E.g. "Leaving 'would mean more work and less holiday pay'".³⁴

Discourses - policy concerns >> Quality of life >> Housing

References to houses and the housing market, including affordability of housing.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Quality of life >> Prices / wallet

References to prices and wallets, including references to household budgets. E.g. "The cost of leaving the EU: £4,300 for every household"³⁵, "Anyone who has visited Norway or Switzerland knows how high the cost of living is in these non-EU countries. So why doesn't the exit camp address this? Graeme, Glasgow"³⁶.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Quality of life >> Salaries / wages

References to salaries and wages.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Rights and standards

Does not include all mentions of regulations or over-regulation, as these are ambiguous—instead just includes mentions of rights or standards applying to the UK. E.g. Human rights, 'bring them up to our standards'.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Security

References to security, stability and risk; the top-level code includes ambiguous, general, and references to security that are infrequent enough to be grouped into sub-codes. Subcodes were often 'collapsed' into the parent code of 'security' during analysis.

³⁴ The Metro, 'Leaving "Would Mean More Work and Less Holiday Pay"'.
³⁵ Britain Stronger In Europe, 'Get the Facts'.
³⁶ The Metro, 'MetroTalk'. 5 May 2016.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Security >> Financial security

References to financial security and stability.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Security >> Social security

References to social security and welfare, as well as pensions.

Discourses - policy concerns >> Status / voice / influence / global representation

References to status, voice, influence, and global representation, notably of the UK.

Discourses - policy concerns >> UK pays money to the EU

References to the UK paying money to the EU.

A3.3.h) Discourses - political meta

Meta-level discussions on the nature of politics and political values such as accountability, sovereignty, democracy, liberty, or populism.

Discourses - political meta >> Accountability

References to 'accountable', 'accountability', holding someone 'to account'.

Discourses - political meta >> Control / sovereignty / independence

References to 'control', 'sovereignty' and 'independence'. 'Border control' is found under 'physical safety and border (control)' rather than here.

Discourses - political meta >> Democracy / elections

References to democracy and elections, including 'democratic process' and notions of being 'unelected'. E.g. "over 60% of our laws are made from unelected foreign officials"³⁷.

Discourses - political meta >> Freedom / liberty

References to 'freedom', 'liberty'. Includes 'freedom to', as in 'freedom to trade with the world', but not free trade, which is captured under 'economy>trade'.

Discourses - political meta >> Populism (inc establishment conspiracies)

References to populism and 'the establishment'. Includes references to divides between the population and any 'elite', and establishment conspiracies. E.g. "Self-interest really isn't everything: we're backing Britain. Black hole? More like blackmail... The Proud Poor London",³⁸ "EU elites are quite frankly stunned by the rise of nationalist and populist political parties, but what did they expect?",³⁹ "Vote Leave with its Cabinet Ministers is much more of an SW1 establishment vehicle."⁴⁰

³⁷ Ad 1495. Facebook, 'Brexit Central BeLeave Ads'.

³⁸ The Metro, 'MetroTalk'. 16 June 2016.

³⁹ Leave.EU, 'EU Summit Deal Plays with Fire'.

⁴⁰ Farage, 'The Designation Is This Week... Now Let's Unite And Fight!'

A3.3.i) Quotes

Quotes >> Explicit blame/fault

Explicit reference to blame or fault in the text.

Quotes >> Heroes, saviours, demons

Characterisation in the text: heroes, saviours, and demons. E.g. "It's surprising we were able to get anything done before the saviour that is the European Union took Little Britain under its wing."⁴¹

A3.3.j) Topoi

General and specific topoi identified in the text. Not double-checked, as not used in analysis.

Topoi >> Advantage vs disadvantage

Topoi >> Truth vs untruth

Includes calls to notions of truth, including facts, trust/untruth, honesty, promises.

Topoi >> Good vs bad

Includes good/bad, moral/immoral.

Topoi >> Just vs unjust

Includes just and unjust, fair and unfair.

Topoi >> Sanity vs insanity

Topoi >> Testimony - Authorities

Calls to authority. Includes notions of 'the elite' being 'with us'.

Topoi >> Testimony - Other

Other testimony, e.g. law.

A3.3.k) Speaker

Who 'said' or was 'spoken for'. Generally not used in analysis.

Speaker >> Cameron

Quotes from David Cameron.

Speaker >> Juncker

Reported speech from Jean-Claude Juncker (there was no direct speech from him).

Speaker >> We speak for the Grassroots

⁴¹ Leave.EU, 'Can We Secure a Brighter Future Outside of Political Union?'

Claims to speak for, or actually speaking for, the grassroots or UK public. E.g. "The public don't want an emergency brake on migrant benefits, they want control of the steering wheel so that we, the British people, can choose the destination, speed and cost of our journey."⁴² "Leave.EU has some 500,000 supporters and is now owned by its members"⁴³. "This is a typical example of another senior politician who is totally out of touch with the concerns of the people."⁴⁴

Speaker >> Leave campaigners

Quotes from Leave campaigners. Incomplete in that not all content was coded; e.g. pieces entirely authored by Arron Banks were not coded as 'Arron Banks'. This is because these codes were deemed unnecessary for analysis.

Speaker >> Leave campaigners >> Arron Banks

Speaker >> Leave campaigners >> Boris Johnson

Speaker >> Leave campaigners >> Brian Monteith

Speaker >> Leave campaigners >> Jim Mellon

Speaker >> Leave campaigners >> Liz Bilney

Speaker >> Leave campaigners >> Michael Gove

Speaker >> Leave campaigners >> Nigel Farage

Speaker >> Leave campaigners >> Richard Tice

Speaker >> MetroTalk-Public

Coding of whether MetroTalk comments appeared to be written by people who were pro-Leave, or were pro-Remain or ambiguous in preference. This was performed by the researcher as opposed to self-identified. Example quotes:⁴⁵

"A knight of the realm, Bob Geldof putting two fingers up on the Thames during a protest by fishermen campaigning to leave the EU (Metro, Thu) is disgraceful. Of course, Geldof can afford private health care and does not have to queue along with thousands of EU migrants for NHS treatment. Mair, Liverpool" coded as MT Leave. (17 June 2016)

"All who advise the UK to vote to remain in the EU are more concerned with their own wealth and well-being at the expense of the country's. Dunc, London" coded as MT Leave (21 April 2016)

⁴² Bilney, 'Leave.EU Responds to Reports of an "emergency Brake" on Welfare Payments to EU Migrants'.

⁴³ Leave.EU, 'Merger between Vote Leave and Leave.EU'.

⁴⁴ Tice, 'Leave.Eu Responds to William Hague's Recent Comments on Our EU Membership'.

⁴⁵ The Metro, 'MetroTalk'.

"Anyone who has visited Norway or Switzerland knows how high the cost of living is in these non-EU countries. So why doesn't the exit camp address this? Graeme, Glasgow" coded as non-Leave/unsure. (5 May 2016)

"General Medical Council chief executive Niall Dickson says it is not true that EU laws prevent the UK from checking language skills or qualifications of EU doctors (Metro, Thu). I am a senior registrar doctor in the NHS. Doctors from non -EU countries have to pass language and professional exams before working here and meet strict visa requirements. But doctors from Eastern European countries can come to work in the NHS and are not required to sit language or professional exams. Dr Manish Rastogi, London" coded as non-Leave/unsure (9 May 2016).

These codes were used only when considering performance of blame in the second empirical chapter.

Speaker >> MetroTalk-Public >> MT Leave

Speaker >> MetroTalk-Public >> MT Non-Leave / unsure

Speaker >> Remain campaigners

Quotes from Remain campaigners. Incomplete in that not all content was coded. These codes were not used in analysis.

A3.3.l) Maybe-blame

Unclear as to whether the coded item includes blame or not as it is too ambiguous. Not included in analysis.

A3.3.m) Tangents

Additional discourses including motifs and metaphors identified in the 'reading for deeper meaning' phases. Codes were grouped by theme, and unless otherwise specified, were checked a maximum of two times given they are not used in analysis.

Tangents >> Violent means

Discussions of war and violence.

Tangents >> Violent means >> Current violence

Current violence and occupations.

Tangents >> Violent means >> Armies and defence bodies

Includes NATO, discussions of armies, and a potential European Army.

Tangents >> Violent means >> Politics as battle

Metaphors of politics as being, or leading to, a battle. Includes references to 'defence', 'weapons', 'arms', the 'lines' of battle, and instruments of violence.

Tangents >> Violent means >> War stories

References to historical wars, including World Wars 1 and 2, and the Napoleonic Wars. Frequent in Nigel Farage's pieces.

Tangents >> What is the UK

Descriptions of what the UK is. All codes and subcodes checked.

Tangents >> What is the UK >> (Not) European

The UK or Britain as European or not European.

Tangents >> What is the UK >> Exceptional

The UK as exceptional; includes 'believe in Britain'.

Tangents >> What is the EU

Descriptions of what the EU is.

Tangents >> What is the EU >> (Not) reforming

The EU is reforming or not reforming. Select auto-coding based on a lexical search for the term 'reform'. Not used in analysis.

Tangents >> What is the EU >> Acting villainously (non-blame)

The EU as a villain, with no blame apparent. For instance, the EU is associated with insults or negative metaphors. E.g. "An analysis of a number of the provisions from the controversial directive shows this is not just another example of an institution out of touch with the people and ignorant to research, but a much more sinister illustration of a puppet serving as a mouthpiece for self-serving big business."⁴⁶

Tangents >> What is the EU >> Drawing closer

The EU is drawing closer together, including references to an 'ever-closer union'.

Tangents >> What is the EU >> Falling apart

The EU is falling apart, destroying itself, dying, failing, powerless (to save itself) and similar.

Tangents >> Threat / danger

References to threat or danger. Includes items automatically coded through lexical searches for 'threat' and 'danger'; the majority of items were hand-coded by the researcher, and all search-based coding was verified. Not used in research.

Tangents >> Youth of today

⁴⁶ Leave.EU, 'The Lifesaving Innovation Helping Smokers Quit Is Being Hampered by Overzealous EU Regulation'. Note that blame is contained in the title of the piece, but not in the excerpt used here.

References to young, Millennials, children, and youth. Some items were auto-coded following a lexical search (millennial, youth, young); these were verified by the researcher. 'Millennials' were included due to the tendency in the text to conflate this term with people in their early 20s (e.g. undergraduate students).

Tangents >> Family

Family, including speaking on behalf of, family as victims, and family of nations.

Tangents >> Unity

Explicit references to unity, collaboration, and friendship.

Tangents >> Promise for future

References to positive expectations for the future.

Tangents >> Religion

References to religion, including metaphors and religious language/iconography. E.g. "Now may God bless you all."⁴⁷

Tangents >> Strength

Strength and strong. Includes 'stronger in Europe'.

Tangents >> Gender

References to gender, including imagery and representations. Not double-checked, as not used in analysis.

Tangents >> Gender >> Tampon tax

Tangents >> Gender >> Speaking for women

Tangents >> Gender >> Gender-based violence

Largely related to the Cologne attacks and racist depictions of particular immigrants as sexually violent.

Tangents >> Gender >> Women's rights and protections

Tangents >> Gender >> Portrayal of women

Images (pictures) of women in the materials.

Tangents >> Gender >> Gender metaphor

E.g. "In the end, there will be lots of people who agree with the No campaign in private, but won't have the balls to do anything public."⁴⁸

⁴⁷ Leave.EU, 'We're at War Again, for Some Reason!'

⁴⁸ Farage, 'Time for Tory Eurosceptics to Put up or Shut Up, Do the "Bastards" Have the Balls?'

Tangents >> Gender >> Feminism/sexism

Tangents >> Patriotism

References to patriotism and being patriotic.

A3.4. Talk-based data

Includes codes used in analysing the focus groups and interviews and which are discussed in the thesis or its annexes.

A3.4.a) BLAME

Used to highlight instances of blame (where a party has done or is doing a harmful thing). Where blame is identified, the blamee is coded. While they emerged on an ad hoc basis based on what blamees appeared in FGI responses, code names consistent with those from the other data sets were used. See also the 'blame' section for text-based data, above.

BLAME >> Maybe-blame

Where it is not certain whether or not an item was an instance of blame. Items coded 'maybe blame' were not included in analysis.

BLAME >> EU

BLAME >> EU >> EU institution(s) Eurocrats Brussels

BLAME >> EU >> EU policies

BLAME >> EU >> Implied EU

BLAME >> EU >> Other European Leaders

BLAME >> EU >> Specific EU Figure

BLAME >> Eurosceptics

BLAME >> Migrants

BLAME >> Other

BLAME >> Pro-EU parties

BLAME >> Situation

BLAME >> UK

BLAME >> UK >> UK Government (inc opposition and civil servants)

BLAME >> UK >> UK PM/Cameron

A3.4.b) CREDIT

Credit (where a speaker claims that a party has done or is doing a helpful thing), including 'implied credit'

CREDIT >> EU

CREDIT >> UK

A3.4.c) VICTIM

Victim identified. Identical to code listing for text-based data, with the addition of 'Eurosceptics' and 'Farmers' listed under 'UK people'. See notes in that section.

A3.4.d) Beneficiaries

Where an instance of blame is apparent, is there a beneficiary that benefits from the harmful situation? Beneficiaries were not ultimately used in analysis beyond the 'performance' chapter.

Beneficiaries >> Europe

Europe is listed as beneficiary. Includes countries within Europe, e.g. Germany, plus the EU, European public, and European Central Bank.

A3.4.e) Emotions

Emotions that FGI participants identified within themselves, either by explicitly saying what they felt (I feel sad), identifying what other people felt (they were angry), or emotions in appearing responses to questions about how FGI participants felt.

Descriptions of emotions are not included, as the below is what FGI participants said, in their own words. See also emotions in the 'text-based' and survey-experiment code sections.

Emotions >> angry

Emotions >> annoyed

First added in the FGI (talk-based) data file.

Emotions >> ashamed

Emotions >> betrayed

Emotions >> concerned

Emotions >> disappointed

Emotions >> disconnected

Emotions >> disgusted

First added in the FGI (talk-based) data file.

Emotions >> disillusioned

First added in the FGI (talk-based) data file.

Emotions >> encouraged

Emotions >> enraged

Emotions >> fearful / afraid

Emotions >> frustrated / sick and tired

First added in the FGI (talk-based) data file.

Emotions >> happy**Emotions >> hatred / loathe / detest**

First added in the FGI (talk-based) data file.

Emotions >> hoping**Emotions >> horrified**

First added in the FGI (talk-based) data file.

Emotions >> insecure

First added in the FGI (talk-based) data file.

Emotions >> love**Emotions >> optimistic****Emotions >> pressured**

First added in the FGI (talk-based) data file.

Emotions >> resentment**Emotions >> sad****Emotions >> scared / scare-mongering****Emotions >> shock****Emotions >> surprised**

First added in the FGI (talk-based) data file.

Emotions >> suspicion

First added in the FGI (talk-based) data file.

Emotions >> sympathy**Emotions >> terrified****Emotions >> uncomfortable****Emotions >> unheard**

First added in the FGI (talk-based) data file.

Emotions >> upset

First added in the FGI (talk-based) data file.

Emotions >> worried

A3.4.f) Discourses

Items that are discussed / depicted / framed. Codes in this section are identical to those used for the 'text-based' data. See notes there instead.

A3.4.g) Other items

Expertise

References to experts or expertise.

Metropolitan Elite

FGI participants references to the 'Metropolitan Elite', virtue signalling, or 'liberals' (as enemies).

Accountability - what is it?

Where FGI participants describe what accountability is. See Annex - Accountability.

Accountability - how to do it?

Where FGI participants describe how accountability is 'done'. See Annex - Accountability.

Accountability of EU

Where FGI participants describe how the EU specifically may be held accountable. See Annex - Accountability.

EU has bad comms

The EU has bad communication with the UK, or citizens of Member States including the UK.

Who are the EU

Who did FGI participants understand 'are' the EU? For instance, where they say that the EU is the Commission. See Annex - Who is the EU.

Characterisation of EU

How the EU is characterised; responses largely pertain to the FGI question "suppose the EU were a person, what would that person be like?". See Annex: Suppose the EU was a person for data.

Characterisation Nigel Farage

Where Nigel Farage is mentioned and described by FGI participants.

Mud-slinging

Infighting between Leave and Remain voters, including insults directed at Leave voters.

A3.5. Survey-experiment data

Below were the codes used for survey-experiment data that were used in analysis.

A3.5.a) Blame

Blame is a discursive practice in which a speaker makes a claim that a party has done (or is doing) a harmful thing. Identifying blame therefore means identifying, at a minimum, the 'harmful thing' and the 'party' (blamee). The former must always be present for an instance of blame—if it is a *helpful*, rather than *harmful*, thing, it would instead be an instance of credit. Whether the event is 'negative' or not may need to be established. Given the role of contextual information in completing blame and that the researcher is not herself British, only the most explicit instances of blame are used in analysis in the present research. Note that the harmful thing must belong to the present or past—a harmful thing taking place in the future is an instance of 'threat' rather than 'blame'.

Subcodes refer to the party that is blamed, e.g. the EU, academics, climate change and so on.

In this data set, survey-experiment data, blame identified is necessarily *endogenous* blame, performed by the participants themselves after encountering the harmful situation and exogenous blame contained within the vignette.

Blame >> Climate change / weather / flooding

Climate change, weather, or flooding are blamed.

Blame >> EU

The EU or part thereof is blamed. This code is not divided into subcodes to allow for better comparison with the 'blame-EU' vignette wherein the EU as a whole is blamed.

Blame >> Other

Blame >> Ourselves

Blame >> Politicians (non-specific)

Where politicians are blamed or required to take action, but it's not clear 'which' politicians are under discussion (local councillors, MPs, MEPs etc).

Blame >> Text author

The text author or text itself is blamed.

Blame >> UK (Government)

The UK government or part thereof is blamed. The blame-UK vignette blamed Westminster and domestic legislation.

Blame >> UK (Government) >> UK legislation

Blame >> UK (Government) >> Local councils**A3.5.b) Victim**

Victims were simple to identify in blame, through noting whom the 'harmful thing' was being done to. In the example "As a consequence of EEC accession, the last 40 years has seen a decimation of the British fishing industry",⁴⁹ the British fishing industry suffers and thus would be coded as victim. Subcodes indicate exactly who was the victim of a given situation, for instance the EU or migrants as victims.

A3.5.c) Doesn't affect me (victim uncreation)

Victim uncreation is where either the 'harm' or the 'victim' is unmade. The harmful consequences embedded in blame and related possibility of victimisation must be noted, in conjunction with a statement of uncaring ("My area does not suffer from flooding, so indifferent.": the victim does not deserve socially prescribed compassion), or victim blaming ("people choosing to buy homes near flood plains are deciding upon that risk for themselves.": they are not victims, because they chose it), or erasure through comparison ("Doesn't feel too close to home and it's worse in other countries": they are not victim *enough* to be worthy of the status).

A3.5.d) Beneficiaries

Instances of those who *benefit* as a result of the harmful thing outlaid in blame. The subcodes indicate who the beneficiary is, for instance 'big money', or the UK. Beneficiaries were not ultimately used in analysis beyond the 'performance' chapter.

A3.5.e) Emotions

People experience different emotions, for different reasons, in different contexts, and they express those emotions differently. To avoid the researcher's own emotion concepts affecting data processing and therefore interpretation, only explicitly labelled emotions in the data are used in the present research—for example, "it scares me", "it's scary". Each emotion thus identified was coded with its name. Different forms of the same word were collected, such that 'frustrated' and 'frustrating' are both considered as referring to the same emotion, as are 'afraid', 'fearful' and 'fear' (but not 'scared').

Emotions >> annoyed

Includes annoyed (104), fed up (5), agitated (1).

Emotions >> annoyed >> angry

Includes angry (56), pissed off (3), furious/infuriated (3), outraged (1)

Emotions >> annoyed >> exasperated**Emotions >> annoyed >> frustrated**

⁴⁹ Leave.EU, 'Fishy Business'.

Emotions >> annoyed >> irritated**Emotions >> annoyed >> miffed****Emotions >> annoyed >> narked****Emotions >> apathetic**

Includes apathetic (13), ambivalent (18), don't care (6), disinterested (5), don't/won't/wouldn't feel anything (7), neutral (44), indifferent (86), meh (13), nothing in particular (2), not bothered (7), not interested/uninterested (6), unconcerned (4), undecided+ambivalent (1), unmoved (2).

Emotions >> bad

Includes bad (11), negative (2).

Emotions >> better**Emotions >> bored****Emotions >> breath**

Includes breath (164), breathless (18), light-headed (9), dizzy (3), no air (2), turning blue (1), oxygenated (2).

Emotions >> calm

Includes calm (13), at ease (3), at peace (3), relaxed (5), peace of mind (1), chilled (2).

Emotions >> (compassion)

This code is empty, though the subcodes (empathetic, have-trying, sad, sorry, sympathetic) are the emotions that form the ~compassion grouping.

Emotions >> (compassion) >> empathetic**Emotions >> (compassion) >> have-trying**

Includes contributed/contributing, have helped, taken action, done something, achievement, accomplishment, helpful, made a difference, did my part/bit, doing my best, useful, and have tried/am trying.

Emotions >> (compassion) >> sad

Includes sad (107), sorrowful (1), depressed (3)

Emotions >> (compassion) >> sorry**Emotions >> (compassion) >> sympathetic****Emotions >> confident**

Includes confident (8), assured (2).

Emotions >> confused

Includes confused (37), baffled (2), muddled (1).

Emotions >> curious

Curious (3), puzzled (3), intrigued (2).

Emotions >> disappointed**Emotions >> good**

Good (63), great (10).

Emotions >> good >> fine**Emotions >> good >> nice****Emotions >> good >> okay****Emotions >> good >> positive****Emotions >> happy**

Happy, happier, happiest.

Emotions >> happy >> content**Emotions >> happy >> glad****Emotions >> happy >> pleased****Emotions >> hopeful**

Includes hope (2), hopeful (28), hoping (1), optimistic (6)

Emotions >> hopeless

Includes hopeless (17), 'not hopeful' and 'not too hopeful' (3).

Emotions >> informed**Emotions >> interested****Emotions >> nothing**

Includes nothing (76), N/A (30), not strongly (4), no feeling (5), - (3).

Emotions >> powerless**Emotions >> proud****Emotions >> relieved****Emotions >> relieved >> reassured**

Emotions >> rushed**Emotions >> safe****Emotions >> same**

Includes no different (33), same (91), unchanged (3), unmoved (3), unaffected (6), normal (42).

Emotions >> satisfied**Emotions >> scared****Emotions >> scared >> afraid****Emotions >> sceptical****Emotions >> stressed**

Includes stressed, strained (1), tense (2)

Emotions >> surprised**Emotions >> surprised >> shocked****Emotions >> tired****Emotions >> unknown****Emotions >> unsurprised****Emotions >> upset****Emotions >> worried**

Includes worried and alarmed (3).

Emotions >> worried >> anxious**Emotions >> worried >> cautious****Emotions >> worried >> concerned****Emotions >> worried >> nervous****Emotions >> worried >> panicked****Emotions >> worried >> uneasy****Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions**

All emotions that appeared less than 7 times. Text is exactly as typed by survey-experiment participants.

Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> little**Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> ^**

Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> a shame
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> accomplished, achievement
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> active
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> affronted
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> aggravated
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> aggressive
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> agreeable
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> amazed
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> amazing
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> amused
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> aroused
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> at the mercy
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> aware
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> being heard
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> bemused
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> betrayed
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> bollox
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> bothered
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> brain drained
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> brilliant
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> burnt out
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> can't make a difference
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> cares
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> cautiously optimistic
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> celebrating
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> certain
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> cleaner
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> closer
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> comfortable
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> comforted
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> complacent
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> concentrate
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> conflicted
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> couldn't concentrate
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> cross
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> cynical
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> dead
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> defeated
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> defiant
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> deflated
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> dejected
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> delighted
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> despair
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> determined
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> didn't concentrate
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> different
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> disbelief
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> disenfranchised

Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> disengagement
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> disgruntled
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> disgusted
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> disheartening
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> disillusioned
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> dismayed
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> dissatisfied
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> distracted
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> distressed
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> disturbed
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> dope
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> doubt
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> down
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> drained
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> dry
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> dumber
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> educated
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> eh
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> empowered
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> encouraged
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> energetic
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> enlightened
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> erudite
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> excellent
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> exciting
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> exhausted
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> expect little
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> expectant
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> familiarity
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> fan bloody tastic
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> fast
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> fatalistic
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> flood scares
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> fortunate
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> free
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> fresh
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> fucked
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> fukin over the moon
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> funny
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> futile
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> gloomy
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> gross
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> guilty
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> happy
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> hard
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> hasn't shifted my emotions
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> hate
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> healthier

Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> heard
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> heartbreaking
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> helpless
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> hopes are not high
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> horny
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> hungover
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> I need a brew
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> idem
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> ignored
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> impartial
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> impressed
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> imprisoned
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> in control
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> inadequate
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> incredulous
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> ineffective
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> ineffectual
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> insecure
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> insignificant
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> insulted
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> involved
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> irrelevant
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> I've had a say
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> judicious
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> justified
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> keen
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> laugh out loud .
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> less angry
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> less annoyed
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> less anxious
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> less arsed
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> less concerned
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> less confused
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> less disappointed
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> less frightened
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> less of a worry
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> less risk
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> less stressed
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> less stressed and pressured
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> less swamped
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> less worried
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> lied to
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> listened to
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> lonely
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> looked after
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> looking forward
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> lost
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> magical

Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> make an impact
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> meaningless
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> melancholy
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> mislead
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> misled
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> mistrust
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> mixed feelings
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> more comfortable
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> more could be done
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> more prepared
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> more to do
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> more work needs to be done
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> moving forward
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> neither angry
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> never content
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> niggled
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> no better
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> no good
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> no triumph
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> nobody listens
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> nonchalant
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> non-expectant
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> nonplussed
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> nor happy
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not annoyed
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not as connected
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not as happy
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not bad
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not concerned
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not confident
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not dying
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not feel differently
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not fun
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not good
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not happy
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not in control
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not much better
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not positive
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not reassured 🤔
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not scaremongering
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not that great
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> not to happy
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> nothing abnormal
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> numb
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> oblivious
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> older
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> one sided
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> overdosed

Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> overwhelmed
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> pass
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> peace
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> people care
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> pessimistic
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> pity
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> pointless
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> poorer
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> prepared
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> pressured
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> pride
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> pro-democratic
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> productive
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> progress
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> propagandised
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> refreshed
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> reinforced
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> required
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> resent
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> resigned
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> respect
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> responsible
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> right thing to do
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> rolling my eyes
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> same old story
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> scunnered
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> secure
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> securer
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> self praised
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> shame
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> shits going bad
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> shocking
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> shouldn't happen
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> small cog
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> smashing
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> smug
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> something is being done
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> sore
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> sovereign
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> special
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> step one
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> strange
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> strongly
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> struggle
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> stupid
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> superb
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> suspicious
Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> terrible

Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> things have improved
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> time for a beer
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> treeful
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> uncertain
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> uncomfortable
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> unconscious
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> unconvinced
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> unengaged
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> unfair
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> unfazed
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> unfortunate
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> unhappy
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> uninformed
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> uninspired
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> uninvested
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> unnerved
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> unsatisfied
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> unsettling
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> unsympathetic
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> used to this happening
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> useless
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> vindicated
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> virtuous
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> warm
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> wary
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> wasted my time
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> weary
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> well
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> will help
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> wishing
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> wondering
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> woozy
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> worse
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> wouldn't trust
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> wouldn't notice
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> wtf
 Emotions >> z Infrequent emotions >> 🤪

A3.5.f) Contesting blame

Instances of contestation, which is understood per its dictionary definition, "the action or process of disputing or arguing". There are multiple ways in which it can be done, including directly and indirectly. Direct contestation is identified where (a) people refer to the blame and (b) they indicate disagreement with it. Indirect contestation can take place where, instead of using blame, an actor uses an opposing practice, such as credit or threat. The other form of contestation identified in the present research, contestation by changing subjects and objects, is captured elsewhere, as with victim uncreation.

A4. Annex: Correlations between pre- and post-vignette emotions

This table was prepared using SPSS. Correlations use Spearman's rho, in anticipation of non-linear relationships. Pre-vignette emotions are shown in columns along the top; post-vignette emotions are shown in rows. Researcher emotion groupings are shown first. Only emotions that were recorded at least seven times in survey-experiment responses are included.

		Happy	Sad	Angry	Anxious	Content	Scared
~ ANNOYED	CC	-0.02	-0.002	.099**	0.052	0.014	0.051
	Sig.	0.519	0.95	0.002	0.095	0.665	0.102
APATHETIC	CC	-0.053	.090**	0.034	0.011	-0.021	0.018
	Sig.	0.092	0.004	0.278	0.729	0.501	0.563
~ COMPASSION	CC	.067*	-.085**	-.085**	-.085**	0.033	-.101**
	Sig.	0.033	0.006	0.007	0.006	0.298	0.001
~ GOOD	CC	0.039	-.064*	-0.006	-.079*	0.014	-0.033
	Sig.	0.213	0.041	0.843	0.012	0.658	0.291
~ HAPPY	CC	.081**	-0.03	-0.061	-0.05	0.043	-.065*
	Sig.	0.009	0.34	0.053	0.107	0.174	0.039
~ RELIEVED	CC	-0.019	-0.002	-0.05	0.002	-.081**	-0.001
	Sig.	0.554	0.946	0.113	0.943	0.01	0.962
~ SCARED	CC	-0.004	0.024	0.03	0.009	0.02	-0.005
	Sig.	0.904	0.444	0.343	0.782	0.53	0.886
~ SURPRISED	CC	0.01	-0.034	-.072*	0.026	0.044	-0.033
	Sig.	0.75	0.281	0.022	0.405	0.157	0.288
~ WORRIED	CC	0.003	-0.014	-.084**	.062*	-0.019	-0.017
	Sig.	0.919	0.645	0.007	0.047	0.55	0.591
annoyed	CC	0.016	0.01	0.061	0.013	0.038	0.019
	Sig.	0.6	0.75	0.05	0.68	0.225	0.539
annoyed\angry	CC	-0.022	-0.005	.077*	0.043	-0.012	0.049
	Sig.	0.48	0.861	0.014	0.165	0.697	0.118
annoyed\exasperated	CC	-0.037	0.035	0.037	0.029	-0.027	0.012
	Sig.	0.241	0.268	0.24	0.352	0.396	0.694
annoyed\frustrated	CC	-0.055	0.026	0.053	0.052	-0.021	0.046
	Sig.	0.076	0.412	0.091	0.099	0.495	0.144
annoyed\irritated	CC	0.038	-.064*	-0.052	-0.033	0.021	-0.039
	Sig.	0.225	0.04	0.096	0.299	0.508	0.219
annoyed\miffed	CC	-0.002	-0.036	-0.052	-0.002	0.059	-0.038
	Sig.	0.937	0.256	0.095	0.954	0.059	0.225
bad	CC	.105**	-0.06	-.087**	-0.056	.063*	-.066*
	Sig.	0.001	0.056	0.005	0.076	0.044	0.035
better	CC	-0.057	0.024	0.007	0.019	-.061*	0.003
	Sig.	0.067	0.437	0.817	0.554	0.049	0.931
bored	CC	0.014	0.014	0.022	-0.023	0.034	0.022
	Sig.	0.654	0.662	0.485	0.468	0.282	0.494
breath	CC	0.004	0.003	0.002	0.006	0.005	-0.006
	Sig.	0.9	0.923	0.937	0.845	0.87	0.861
calm	CC	-0.002	-0.058	-0.04	-0.014	-0.004	-0.008
	Sig.	0.954	0.066	0.201	0.664	0.899	0.802
(compassion)							
(compassion)\empathetic	CC	0.014	0.017	0.004	0.011	-0.012	-0.005
	Sig.	0.659	0.591	0.907	0.732	0.691	0.88
(compassion)\have-trying	CC	0.047	-0.017	-0.043	-0.04	0.047	-0.001
	Sig.	0.134	0.592	0.166	0.199	0.137	0.969

		Happy	Sad	Angry	Anxious	Content	Scared
(compassion)\sad	CC	0.049	-.111**	-.086**	-.083**	0.022	-.126**
	Sig.	0.12	0	0.006	0.008	0.481	0
(compassion)\sorry	CC	0.006	-0.001	-0.016	-0.048	-0.032	-0.014
	Sig.	0.844	0.974	0.612	0.122	0.314	0.665
(compassion)\sympathetic	CC	0.03	-0.009	-0.002	-0.008	0.05	-0.027
	Sig.	0.34	0.779	0.961	0.796	0.11	0.385
confident	CC	0.014	-0.002	-0.023	.069*	0.038	-0.009
	Sig.	0.664	0.952	0.471	0.028	0.219	0.783
confused	CC	0.03	0.006	-0.025	0.024	0.036	.078*
	Sig.	0.334	0.846	0.433	0.449	0.256	0.013
curious	CC	-0.023	-0.005	0.01	.062*	-0.037	0.018
	Sig.	0.454	0.883	0.755	0.046	0.235	0.577
disappointed	CC	0.025	0.034	0.038	0.033	0.027	0.015
	Sig.	0.429	0.277	0.222	0.291	0.392	0.627
good	CC	.099**	-.120**	-.079*	-.074*	.085**	-.079*
	Sig.	0.002	0	0.012	0.018	0.006	0.012
good\fine	CC	-0.036	0.003	0.023	-0.039	-0.039	-0.009
	Sig.	0.254	0.913	0.467	0.214	0.214	0.768
good\nice	CC	.081**	0.016	-0.013	0.014	0	.063*
	Sig.	0.01	0.608	0.677	0.652	1	0.045
good\okay	CC	-0.003	0.022	0.029	-0.033	-0.022	0.017
	Sig.	0.922	0.488	0.35	0.286	0.473	0.585
good\positive	CC	-0.036	-0.043	0.032	-0.012	-0.02	0.019
	Sig.	0.245	0.17	0.3	0.702	0.528	0.536
happy	CC	0.046	-0.045	-0.015	-0.061	-0.007	-0.035
	Sig.	0.138	0.15	0.63	0.052	0.82	0.264
happy\content	CC	0.034	-0.011	-.082**	-0.005	0.052	-.073*
	Sig.	0.278	0.722	0.009	0.884	0.094	0.02
happy\glad	CC	0.036	-0.003	-0.035	-0.023	0.017	-0.023
	Sig.	0.248	0.925	0.259	0.467	0.584	0.461
happy\pleased	CC	0.034	0.025	0.024	0.016	0.037	0.022
	Sig.	0.284	0.428	0.451	0.62	0.243	0.485
hopeful	CC	-0.021	0.061	0.057	.108**	-0.027	.064*
	Sig.	0.494	0.052	0.069	0.001	0.393	0.042
hopeless	CC	-0.006	0.018	0.051	0.029	-0.021	0.041
	Sig.	0.847	0.563	0.104	0.352	0.511	0.188
informed	CC	0.052	-0.005	-0.028	-0.021	0.021	0.003
	Sig.	0.098	0.861	0.377	0.509	0.505	0.916
interested	CC	0.031	-0.012	-0.004	-0.037	0.001	-0.027
	Sig.	0.318	0.704	0.901	0.236	0.986	0.384
nothing	CC	-0.041	.079*	0.02	-0.002	-0.024	0.032
	Sig.	0.194	0.012	0.522	0.942	0.446	0.309
powerless	CC	-0.03	0.035	0.037	0.044	-0.027	0.038
	Sig.	0.331	0.268	0.24	0.159	0.396	0.23
proud	CC	0.044	-0.003	-0.018	-0.032	0.021	-0.024
	Sig.	0.158	0.928	0.566	0.31	0.496	0.454
relieved	CC	-0.007	-0.02	-.062*	-0.014	-.063*	-0.03
	Sig.	0.813	0.517	0.048	0.655	0.043	0.347
relieved\reassured	CC	-0.034	0.051	0.026	0.046	-.062*	.079*
	Sig.	0.273	0.105	0.399	0.142	0.048	0.012
rushed	CC	-0.025	-0.008	0.006	-0.012	0.03	0.004
	Sig.	0.426	0.791	0.841	0.702	0.342	0.907
safe	CC	-0.007	0.011	-0.001	0.012	.079*	-0.044
	Sig.	0.813	0.714	0.964	0.694	0.012	0.162
same	CC	-0.047	0.02	0.042	-0.025	0.003	0.022
	Sig.	0.132	0.514	0.185	0.423	0.928	0.49
satisfied	CC	0.024	-0.022	0.015	0.001	-0.027	0.009
	Sig.	0.449	0.485	0.641	0.972	0.396	0.763

		Happy	Sad	Angry	Anxious	Content	Scared
scared	CC	0.017	0.005	0.011	-0.008	0.022	-0.008
	Sig.	0.581	0.864	0.72	0.799	0.492	0.795
scared\afraid	CC	-0.048	0.047	0.048	0.039	0	0.007
	Sig.	0.127	0.136	0.129	0.213	1	0.82
sceptical	CC	-0.04	0.047	-0.034	0.032	0.012	-0.009
	Sig.	0.197	0.135	0.284	0.308	0.697	0.768
stressed	CC	0	.095**	0.004	0.058	-.068*	0.003
	Sig.	0.995	0.002	0.887	0.063	0.03	0.914
surprised	CC	0.04	-0.041	-0.054	-0.004	0.037	-0.02
	Sig.	0.199	0.193	0.084	0.897	0.242	0.515
surprised\shocked	CC	-0.043	0.001	-0.047	0.053	0.025	-0.029
	Sig.	0.168	0.981	0.131	0.088	0.432	0.348
tired	CC	0.007	0.001	-0.004	-0.023	0.013	0.004
	Sig.	0.819	0.981	0.899	0.454	0.684	0.894
unknown	CC	-0.044	0.042	0.015	0.039	-0.035	0.047
	Sig.	0.156	0.176	0.63	0.212	0.259	0.131
unsurprised	CC	0.007	0.023	0.004	0.01	-0.016	0.021
	Sig.	0.828	0.465	0.895	0.758	0.618	0.51
upset	CC	.071*	-0.025	-0.051	-0.034	0.031	-0.014
	Sig.	0.024	0.418	0.105	0.273	0.315	0.654
worried	CC	0.01	0.012	-0.05	0.048	-0.016	0.022
	Sig.	0.74	0.7	0.113	0.125	0.62	0.479
worried\anxious	CC	-0.029	-0.01	-0.021	.064*	-0.045	0.021
	Sig.	0.354	0.751	0.51	0.042	0.147	0.51
worried\cautious	CC	-0.002	0.007	0.008	-0.002	0	0.007
	Sig.	0.937	0.832	0.797	0.954	1	0.82
worried\concerned	CC	0.008	-0.024	-.078*	0.014	0.023	-0.06
	Sig.	0.791	0.445	0.013	0.662	0.458	0.056
worried\nervous	CC	-0.002	0.007	0.008	-0.002	0	0.007
	Sig.	0.937	0.832	0.797	0.954	1	0.82
worried\panicked	CC	0.046	-0.036	-0.035	-0.04	0.047	0.007
	Sig.	0.145	0.256	0.263	0.196	0.133	0.82

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level; **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level. Uses Spearman's rho; significance is two-tailed. Happy N=1022, Sad N=1020, Angry N=1021, Anxious N=1021, Content N=1021, Scared N=1015. CC=Correlation coefficient.

A5. Annex: Correlations between pre- and post-vignette emotions, by voting preference (VPL/VPR only)

Pre-vignette emotions are shown in the top row, and post-vignette emotions in the left-hand column. Post-vignette emotions are limited to those showing any significant correlations with any pre-vignette emotion.

		Happy			Sad			Angry			Anxious			Content			Scared		
		All	VPL	VPR	All	VPL	VPR	All	VPL	VPR	All	VPL	VPR	All	VPL	VPR	All	VPL	VPR
	N	1022	317	617	1020	317	614	1021	318	615	1021	317	616	1021	319	314	1015	313	614
~ ANNOYED	CC	-0.02	-0.009	-0.025	-0.002	-.137*	0.034	.099**	0.092	.102*	0.052	-0.027	.081*	0.014	0.013	0.031	0.051	0.014	0.065
	Sig	0.519	0.876	0.528	0.95	0.014	0.394	0.002	0.101	0.011	0.095	0.634	0.045	0.665	0.813	0.442	0.102	0.799	0.107
APATHETIC	CC	-0.053	0.010	-0.069	.090**	0.083	0.077	0.034	0.074	0.007	0.011	0.070	-0.012	-0.021	-0.029	-0.023	0.018	0.058	0.002
	Sig	0.092	0.861	0.088	0.004	0.140	0.057	0.278	0.187	0.855	0.729	0.215	0.763	0.501	0.602	0.576	0.563	0.305	0.960
~ COMPASSION	CC	.067*	0.057	0.064	-.085**	-0.069	-.102*	-.085**	-0.042	-.110**	-.085**	-0.035	-.128**	0.033	-0.025	0.048	-.101**	-0.084	-.122**
	Sig	0.033	0.310	0.114	0.006	0.218	0.011	0.007	0.454	0.006	0.006	0.533	0.001	0.298	0.651	0.232	0.001	0.137	0.002
~ GOOD	CC	0.039	0.014	0.047	-.064*	-0.055	-0.061	-0.006	-0.026	0.005	-.079*	-0.076	-.094*	0.014	0.012	0.019	-0.033	-0.047	-0.026
	Sig	0.213	0.801	0.243	0.041	0.332	0.133	0.843	0.639	0.903	0.012	0.180	0.020	0.658	0.831	0.644	0.291	0.408	0.521
~ HAPPY	CC	.081**	0.023	.094*	-0.03	0.028	-0.064	-0.061	-0.080	-0.058	-0.05	0.025	-.087*	0.043	0.019	0.051	-.065*	-0.061	-.094*
	Sig	0.009	0.678	0.020	0.34	0.623	0.115	0.053	0.154	0.150	0.107	0.652	0.031	0.174	0.733	0.204	0.039	0.279	0.020
~ RELIEVED	CC	-0.019	-0.078	-0.005	-0.002	0.009	0.012	-0.05	-0.039	-0.049	0.002	-0.016	0.028	-.081**	-0.023	-.112**	-0.001	0.002	0.012
	Sig	0.554	0.167	0.898	0.946	0.871	0.764	0.113	0.485	0.224	0.943	0.781	0.488	0.01	0.685	0.006	0.962	0.966	0.762
~ SCARED	CC	-0.004	0.090	-0.033	0.024	0.090	0.004	0.03	0.096	0.013	0.009	0.083	-0.016	0.02	0.000	0.029	-0.005	0.022	-0.015
	Sig	0.904	0.110	0.419	0.444	0.110	0.922	0.343	0.089	0.740	0.782	0.140	0.692	0.53	1.000	0.477	0.886	0.698	0.708
~ SURPRISED	CC	0.01	-0.002	0.018	-0.034	-0.037	-0.034	-.072*	-.137*	-0.035	0.026	0.029	0.027	0.044	0.031	0.060	-0.033	-.133*	0.022
	Sig	0.75	0.978	0.649	0.281	0.513	0.405	0.022	0.014	0.380	0.405	0.603	0.501	0.157	0.587	0.139	0.288	0.018	0.593
~ WORRIED	CC	0.003	0.042	-0.017	-0.014	0.054	-0.049	-.084**	-0.059	-.096*	.062*	0.075	0.046	-0.019	0.067	-0.051	-0.017	-0.004	-0.023

		Happy			Sad			Angry			Anxious			Content			Scared		
	Sig	0.919	0.456	0.678	0.645	0.340	0.224	0.007	0.296	0.018	0.047	0.186	0.252	0.55	0.232	0.203	0.591	0.938	0.573
annoyed \angry	CC	-0.022	-0.026	-0.032	-0.005	-.114*	0.043	.077*	0.084	0.065	0.043	-0.036	.082*	-0.012	0.015	-0.021	0.049	-0.028	.095*
	Sig	0.48	0.647	0.430	0.861	0.042	0.282	0.014	0.134	0.109	0.165	0.520	0.043	0.697	0.794	0.598	0.118	0.624	0.019
annoyed\irritated	CC	0.038	0.063	0.033	-.064*	-.162**	-0.034	-0.052	-0.064	-0.049	-0.033	-0.051	-0.032	0.021	0.064	0.008	-0.039	-0.054	-0.042
	Sig	0.225	0.264	0.413	0.04	0.004	0.395	0.096	0.257	0.229	0.299	0.364	0.429	0.508	0.253	0.837	0.219	0.343	0.297
bad	CC	.105**	.110*	.081*	-0.06	-0.093	-0.029	-.087**	-0.092	-0.069	-0.056	-0.097	-0.041	.063*	0.108	0.069	-.066*	-0.097	-.088*
	Sig	0.001	0.050	0.044	0.056	0.098	0.475	0.005	0.100	0.087	0.076	0.083	0.309	0.044	0.053	0.086	0.035	0.087	0.029
better	CC	-0.057	-0.062	-0.027	0.024	-0.023	0.027	0.007	0.056	-0.034	0.019	-0.016	0.022	-.061*	-0.059	-0.071	0.003	0.022	-0.031
	Sig	0.067	0.272	0.498	0.437	0.688	0.500	0.817	0.320	0.400	0.554	0.774	0.584	0.049	0.296	0.078	0.931	0.697	0.446
(compassion) \sad	CC	0.049	0.008	0.051	-.111**	-0.097	-.135**	-.086**	-0.036	-.106**	-.083**	-0.060	-.121**	0.022	-0.048	0.040	-.126**	-0.090	-.164**
	Sig	0.12	0.893	0.207	0	0.084	0.001	0.006	0.523	0.008	0.008	0.290	0.003	0.481	0.391	0.324	0	0.112	0.000
confident	CC	0.014	-0.002	0.022	-0.002	0.076	-0.041	-0.023	-0.061	-0.003	.069*	.132*	0.040	0.038	0.062	0.032	-0.009	-0.053	0.011
	Sig	0.664	0.978	0.579	0.952	0.177	0.311	0.471	0.282	0.934	0.028	0.019	0.323	0.219	0.267	0.433	0.783	0.350	0.781
confused	CC	0.03	-0.002	0.044	0.006	0.039	-0.012	-0.025	-0.029	-0.027	0.024	0.008	0.035	0.036	0.000	0.043	.078*	0.085	.085*
	Sig	0.334	0.965	0.271	0.846	0.491	0.762	0.433	0.607	0.507	0.449	0.889	0.380	0.256	1.000	0.288	0.013	0.133	0.036
curious	CC	-0.023	0.044	-.086*	-0.005	-0.021	0.018	0.01	-0.072	.091*	.062*	0.087	0.064	-0.037	0.001	-.082*	0.018	0.044	0.007
	Sig	0.454	0.440	0.033	0.883	0.712	0.650	0.755	0.200	0.024	0.046	0.122	0.110	0.235	0.982	0.042	0.577	0.436	0.858
good	CC	.099**	0.057	.093*	-.120**	-0.100	-.139**	-.079*	-0.089	-0.075	-.074*	-0.110	-0.070	.085**	0.108	0.057	-.079*	-.148**	-0.062
	Sig	0.002	0.313	0.021	0	0.074	0.001	0.012	0.115	0.064	0.018	0.050	0.083	0.006	0.053	0.156	0.012	0.009	0.125
good\nice	CC	.081**	.110*	.093*	0.016	0.017	0.018	-0.013	-0.065	0.014	0.014	-0.097	0.064	0	0.000	0.001	.063*	0.101	0.047
	Sig	0.01	0.050	0.020	0.608	0.760	0.650	0.677	0.248	0.721	0.652	0.083	0.110	1	1.000	0.982	0.045	0.075	0.245
happy \content	CC	0.034	0.041	0.037	-0.011	0.039	-0.039	-.082**	-.127*	-0.068	-0.005	0.056	-0.034	0.052	0.088	0.043	-.073*	-0.099	-0.066
	Sig	0.278	0.462	0.356	0.722	0.494	0.335	0.009	0.024	0.092	0.884	0.320	0.395	0.094	0.116	0.291	0.02	0.080	0.102
hopeful	CC	-0.021	-0.056	0.020	0.061	0.078	0.042	0.057	0.059	0.060	.108**	0.097	.090*	-0.027	-0.053	-0.037	.064*	0.089	0.050
	Sig	0.494	0.316	0.623	0.052	0.164	0.301	0.069	0.297	0.135	0.001	0.085	0.025	0.393	0.344	0.365	0.042	0.118	0.216

		Happy			Sad			Angry			Anxious			Content			Scared		
nothing	CC	-0.041	-0.078	0.001	.079*	0.094	0.078	0.02	-0.008	0.041	-0.002	0.078	-0.027	-0.024	-0.029	-0.005	0.032	0.101	-0.013
	Sig	0.194	0.167	0.976	0.012	0.096	0.053	0.522	0.887	0.305	0.942	0.164	0.502	0.446	0.607	0.898	0.309	0.074	0.754
relieved	CC	-0.007	-0.081	0.014	-0.02	0.004	-0.013	-.062*	-0.043	-0.067	-0.014	-0.017	0.005	-.063*	-0.024	-.085*	-0.03	-0.004	-0.027
	Sig	0.813	0.153	0.738	0.517	0.937	0.753	0.048	0.446	0.097	0.655	0.759	0.893	0.043	0.674	0.035	0.347	0.944	0.507
relieved \reassured	CC	-0.034	-0.001	-0.049	0.051	0.017	0.066	0.026	0.007	0.037	0.046	0.004	0.062	-.062*	0.000	-.087*	.079*	0.022	.102*
	Sig	0.273	0.985	0.228	0.105	0.760	0.105	0.399	0.900	0.359	0.142	0.950	0.122	0.048	1.000	0.032	0.012	0.698	0.012
safe	CC	-0.007	-0.047	0.012	0.011	-0.003	0.037	-0.001	0.043	-0.010	0.012	0.058	-0.009	.079*	.114*	0.054	-0.044	-.135*	0.012
	Sig	0.813	0.406	0.774	0.714	0.956	0.358	0.964	0.447	0.808	0.694	0.303	0.816	0.012	0.042	0.185	0.162	0.017	0.766
stressed	CC	0	-0.056	0.006	.095**	0.078	.112**	0.004	0.022	-0.008	0.058	0.057	0.063	-.068*	-0.053	-.082*	0.003	0.088	-0.021
	Sig	0.995	0.318	0.877	0.002	0.165	0.005	0.887	0.690	0.849	0.063	0.313	0.120	0.03	0.346	0.043	0.914	0.118	0.601
upset	CC	.071*	.110*	0.046	-0.025	-0.093	-0.023	-0.051	-0.092	-0.035	-0.034	-0.097	-0.010	0.031	0.000	0.027	-0.014	0.022	-0.018
	Sig	0.024	0.050	0.259	0.418	0.098	0.573	0.105	0.100	0.390	0.273	0.083	0.810	0.315	1.000	0.510	0.654	0.698	0.660
worried \anxious	CC	-0.029	-0.001	-0.055	-0.01	0.104	-0.039	-0.021	-0.092	-0.008	.064*	0.103	0.057	-0.045	0.000	-0.058	0.021		0.026
	Sig	0.354	0.985	0.176	0.751	0.064	0.338	0.51	0.100	0.841	0.042	0.067	0.154	0.147	1.000	0.151	0.51		0.523
worried \concerned	CC	0.008	-0.003	0.004	-0.024	0.036	-0.047	-.078*	-0.033	-.096*	0.014	0.007	0.017	0.023	0.060	0.004	-0.06	0.008	-.088*
	Sig	0.791	0.962	0.925	0.445	0.520	0.242	0.013	0.553	0.018	0.662	0.899	0.672	0.458	0.282	0.922	0.056	0.884	0.030
Prepared using Spearman's rho in anticipation of non-linear relationships. Table shows correlation coefficient followed by significance (2-tailed). Significant at p<0.05 is marked with *, and p<0.01 with **.																			

A6. Annex: Correlations between vote preference and pre/post-vignette emotions

A6.1. Correlation between voting preference and pre-vignette emotions

		VP Leave	VP Remain	VP Other
Happy	Correlation Coefficient	-0.033	0.024	0.008
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.291	0.448	0.790
	N	317	617	86
Sad	Correlation Coefficient	-0.049	0.049	0.001
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.114	0.119	0.964
	N	317	614	87
Angry	Correlation Coefficient	.068*	-0.054	-0.013
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.030	0.083	0.682
	N	318	615	86
Anxious	Correlation Coefficient	-.068*	.084**	-0.029
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.031	0.007	0.352
	N	317	616	86
Content	Correlation Coefficient	-0.002	-0.023	0.043
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.955	0.468	0.170
	N	319	614	86
Scared	Correlation Coefficient	-.081*	.095**	-0.034
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.010	0.003	0.284
	N	313	614	86
Prepared using Spearman's rho for consistency with correlations between pre/post-vignette emotions. Table shows correlation coefficient followed by significance (2-tailed). Significant at p<0.05 is marked with *, and p<0.01 with **.				

A6.2. Correlation between voting preference and post-vignette emotions

		VP Leave	VP Remain	VP Other
~ ANNOYED	CC	-.093**	.121**	-.059*
	Sig.	0.001	0.000	0.028
APATHETIC	CC	0.018	-0.029	0.027
	Sig.	0.498	0.278	0.314
~ COMPASSION	CC	-0.017	0.005	0.026
	Sig.	0.526	0.857	0.332
~ GOOD	CC	.088**	-.086**	0.012
	Sig.	0.001	0.002	0.646
~ HAPPY	CC	-0.004	0.003	0.000
	Sig.	0.872	0.918	0.997
~ RELIEVED	CC	-0.040	0.037	0.006
	Sig.	0.135	0.175	0.837
~ SCARED	CC	-0.024	0.035	-0.022
	Sig.	0.380	0.191	0.422
~ SURPRISED	CC	0.032	-0.025	-0.007
	Sig.	0.243	0.365	0.807
~ WORRIED	CC	-.094**	.101**	-0.025
	Sig.	0.001	0.000	0.351
annoyed	CC	-.088**	.102**	-0.040
	Sig.	0.001	0.000	0.140
annoyed\angry	CC	-0.002	0.020	-0.041
	Sig.	0.947	0.468	0.132
annoyed\exasperated	CC	0.025	-0.013	-0.016
	Sig.	0.365	0.628	0.544
annoyed\frustrated	CC	-.055*	0.038	0.010
	Sig.	0.042	0.155	0.715
annoyed\irritated	CC	-0.038	.058*	-0.037
	Sig.	0.155	0.031	0.173
annoyed\miffed	CC	0.042	-0.034	-0.008
	Sig.	0.121	0.204	0.762
annoyed\narked	CC	-0.017	0.021	-0.008
	Sig.	0.519	0.432	0.762
bad	CC	-0.030	0.015	0.025
	Sig.	0.266	0.578	0.363
better	CC	-.068*	.073**	-0.018
	Sig.	0.011	0.007	0.510
bored	CC	.071**	-0.047	-0.032
	Sig.	0.009	0.081	0.238
breath	CC	-.090**	.074**	0.022
	Sig.	0.001	0.006	0.409
calm	CC	-0.010	-0.002	0.022
	Sig.	0.723	0.927	0.414
(compassion)	CC			
(compassion)\empathetic	CC	-0.004	0.003	0.002
	Sig.	0.877	0.898	0.935
(compassion)\have-trying	CC	0.001	-0.003	0.008
	Sig.	0.979	0.914	0.775
(compassion)\sad	CC	-0.021	0.011	0.019
	Sig.	0.447	0.688	0.474
(compassion)\sorry	CC	-0.043	0.020	0.037
	Sig.	0.109	0.452	0.167
(compassion)\sympathetic	CC	.060*	-0.039	-0.028
	Sig.	0.027	0.150	0.292
confident	CC	0.001	0.015	-0.026

		VP Leave	VP Remain	VP Other
	Sig.	0.966	0.591	0.337
confused	CC	-0.053	.063*	-0.020
	Sig.	0.051	0.021	0.454
curious	CC	.056*	-0.038	-0.023
	Sig.	0.039	0.157	0.390
disappointed	CC	-0.050	0.050	-0.005
	Sig.	0.066	0.064	0.864
good	CC	-0.001	-0.022	0.044
	Sig.	0.980	0.408	0.105
good\fine	CC	.089**	-.076**	-0.009
	Sig.	0.001	0.005	0.750
good\nice	CC	-0.005	-0.013	0.032
	Sig.	0.847	0.628	0.231
good\okay	CC	.075**	-0.047	-0.038
	Sig.	0.006	0.082	0.162
good\positive	CC	-0.014	0.015	-0.003
	Sig.	0.616	0.578	0.926
happy	CC	-0.033	0.016	0.020
	Sig.	0.226	0.557	0.462
happy\content	CC	0.028	-0.002	-0.040
	Sig.	0.302	0.955	0.136
happy\glad	CC	-0.043	0.026	0.028
	Sig.	0.108	0.343	0.301
happy\pleased	CC	0.049	-0.040	-0.008
	Sig.	0.069	0.136	0.755
hopeful	CC	-0.038	0.029	0.014
	Sig.	0.157	0.281	0.593
hopeless	CC	-0.033	0.027	0.008
	Sig.	0.227	0.321	0.770
informed	CC	-0.016	0.029	-0.022
	Sig.	0.551	0.288	0.423
interested	CC	0.049	-0.026	-0.033
	Sig.	0.068	0.329	0.223
nothing	CC	0.042	-.063*	0.036
	Sig.	0.116	0.020	0.188
powerless	CC	0.021	-0.028	0.015
	Sig.	0.433	0.302	0.574
proud	CC	0.001	0.015	-0.026
	Sig.	0.966	0.591	0.337
relieved	CC	-0.036	0.029	0.012
	Sig.	0.180	0.285	0.649
relieved\reassured	CC	-0.019	0.029	-0.020
	Sig.	0.493	0.276	0.457
rushed	CC	-.061*	0.026	.056*
	Sig.	0.025	0.343	0.038
safe	CC	-0.034	0.009	0.042
	Sig.	0.203	0.732	0.117
same	CC	.086**	-.086**	-0.009
	Sig.	0.001	0.001	0.731
satisfied	CC	-0.010	0.015	-0.007
	Sig.	0.715	0.585	0.799
scared	CC	-0.019	0.029	-0.020
	Sig.	0.493	0.276	0.457
scared\afraid	CC	-0.017	0.021	-0.008
	Sig.	0.519	0.432	0.762
sceptical	CC	-0.009	0.026	-0.028
	Sig.	0.737	0.343	0.292

		VP Leave	VP Remain	VP Other
stressed	CC	-0.002	0.000	0.005
	Sig.	0.933	0.992	0.847
surprised	CC	0.006	-0.010	0.009
	Sig.	0.829	0.724	0.739
surprised\shocked	CC	0.047	-0.029	-0.025
	Sig.	0.084	0.284	0.362
tired	CC	0.001	0.015	-0.026
	Sig.	0.966	0.591	0.337
unknown	CC	-0.021	0.003	0.033
	Sig.	0.432	0.911	0.222
unsurprised	CC	0.010	-0.001	-0.012
	Sig.	0.713	0.956	0.661
upset	CC	-0.043	0.009	.056*
	Sig.	0.108	0.726	0.037
worried	CC	-.069*	.064*	0.004
	Sig.	0.011	0.018	0.877
worried\anxious	CC	-.076**	.074**	-0.002
	Sig.	0.005	0.006	0.941
worried\cautious	CC	-0.017	-0.034	.089**
	Sig.	0.519	0.204	0.001
worried\concerned	CC	-0.025	0.049	-.053*
	Sig.	0.354	0.072	0.048
worried\nervous	CC	0.042	-0.034	-0.008
	Sig.	0.121	0.204	0.762
worried\panicked	CC	-0.017	0.021	-0.008
	Sig.	0.519	0.432	0.762
worried\uneasy	CC	-0.025	0.030	-0.012
	Sig.	0.362	0.266	0.668
Prepared using Spearman's rho for consistency with correlations between pre/post-vignette emotions. Table shows correlation coefficient followed by significance (2-tailed). Significant at p<0.05 is marked with *, and p<0.01 with **. Total N=1368. VP Leave N=402 VP Remain N=845 VP Other N=115. (Six respondents did not give their voting preference.)				

A7. Annex: Correlations between in-group values and Just World Beliefs and post-vignette emotions, by voting preference

Note that results are limited to post-vignette emotions where there was a significant correlation between IGVs/JWBs and any emotion.

		In-group values		JWBs	
		VPL	VPR	VPL	VPR
N		321	622	323	624
~ ANNOYED	Pearson Correlation	0.007	-.142**	-0.101	-.119**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.903	0.000	0.069	0.003
APATHETIC	Pearson Correlation	-0.052	-.111**	0.097	-0.060
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.353	0.006	0.081	0.137
~ COMPASSION	Pearson Correlation	-0.003	.127**	-0.034	.123**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.964	0.002	0.542	0.002
~ GOOD	Pearson Correlation	0.051	.080*	0.018	.127**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.364	0.047	0.749	0.001
~ HAPPY	Pearson Correlation	0.062	.121**	0.023	.099*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.268	0.003	0.677	0.013
~ RELIEVED	Pearson Correlation	-0.063	0.009	0.056	-0.056
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.257	0.821	0.319	0.161
~ SCARED	Pearson Correlation	0.080	0.027	0.021	-0.009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.151	0.499	0.709	0.818
~ SURPRISED	Pearson Correlation	0.070	0.013	-0.045	-0.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.208	0.744	0.421	0.614
~ WORRIED	Pearson Correlation	-0.003	-0.035	-0.096	0.038
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.953	0.378	0.087	0.347
annoyed	Pearson Correlation	0.045	-.092*	-0.015	-0.074
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.423	0.022	0.794	0.065
annoyed\frustrated	Pearson Correlation	-0.066	-0.054	-0.009	-0.012
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.237	0.177	0.878	0.765
annoyed\irritated	Pearson Correlation	-0.019	-0.069	-0.049	-0.067
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.730	0.085	0.376	0.096
better	Pearson Correlation	-0.075	-0.054	-0.082	-0.018
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.180	0.182	0.141	0.647
(compassion)\sad	Pearson Correlation	0.093	.134**	-0.035	.151**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.095	0.001	0.536	0.000
(compassion)\sorry	Pearson Correlation	0.046	0.029	-0.028	0.019
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.411	0.470	0.610	0.637
good	Pearson Correlation	0.060	.138**	0.029	.148**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.286	0.001	0.598	0.000
good\nice	Pearson Correlation	0.046	.106**	0.070	.123**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.411	0.008	0.209	0.002
happy	Pearson Correlation	.113*	.150**	0.018	.126**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.042	0.000	0.750	0.002
hopeful	Pearson Correlation	0.040	-0.052	0.029	-0.049
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.472	0.192	0.598	0.222

* indicates $p < 0.05$, and ** $p < 0.01$.

A8. Annex: Correlations between psychometric, educational, and health data

		Sense of Agency	Agreeability	In-group values	JWB	Health	Poor mental health
Agreeability	Correlation	-0.025					
	Sig.	0.430					
	N	998					
In-group values	Correlation	-.083**	-0.007				
	Sig.	0.008	0.829				
	N	1019	1006				
Just World Beliefs	Correlation	-.297**	-.177**	.465**			
	Sig.	0.000	0.000	0.000			
	N	1023	1010	1032			
Health	Correlation	-.203**	0.042	.125**	.166**		
	Sig.	0.000	0.188	0.000	0.000		
	N	1023	1010	1032	1036		
Poor mental health	Correlation	.320**	-.067*	-.102**	-.169**	-.316**	
	Sig.	0.000	0.035	0.001	0.000	0.000	
	N	1018	1003	1025	1029	1030	
Education	Correlation	-0.043	.087**	-.186**	-0.032	.114**	-.084**
	Sig.	0.167	0.006	0.000	0.309	0.000	0.007
	N	1017	1004	1026	1030	1031	1024
Uses Pearson's <i>r</i> . Significance is 2-tailed. Significant at $p < 0.05$ is marked with *, and $p < 0.01$ with **.							

A9. Annex: Correlations between underlying characteristics and post-vignette effects

A9.1. Post-vignette emotions: Sense of agency, agreeability, in-group values, and Just World Beliefs

		SENSE OF AGENCY				AGREEABILITY				IN-GROUP VALUES				JUST WORLD BELIEFS			
		EU	UK	Selves	None	EU	UK	Selves	None	EU	UK	Selves	None	EU	UK	Selves	None
N		254	270	225	275	254	271	216	270	258	273	225	277	259	275	227	276
~ ANNOYED	CC	0.019	0.093	0.001	0.096	-0.033	0.015	0.064	-0.004	-0.118	-.187**	-0.129	-0.002	-.138*	-.156**	-.155*	0.022
	Sig.	0.763	0.126	0.987	0.111	0.597	0.807	0.349	0.951	0.058	0.002	0.054	0.969	0.026	0.009	0.019	0.721
APATHETIC	CC	-.144*	0.085	-0.026	-0.073	-0.024	-.205**	-0.042	-.124*	0.001	-0.019	-.143*	-.162**	.185**	-0.032	0.008	-.126*
	Sig.	0.022	0.165	0.695	0.225	0.705	0.001	0.536	0.042	0.989	0.758	0.032	0.007	0.003	0.601	0.903	0.036
~ COMPASSION	CC	-0.051	-0.032	-0.060	-.123*	0.087	.140*	0.112	0.107	0.013	0.039	0.019	0.101	0.058	0.075	-0.002	0.084
	Sig.	0.417	0.597	0.368	0.041	0.166	0.021	0.102	0.079	0.831	0.516	0.779	0.094	0.352	0.214	0.976	0.165
~ GOOD	CC	-0.052	0.001	0.075	-0.024	0.058	0.030	-0.095	0.065	0.051	0.079	0.122	0.110	.177**	0.065	0.070	0.050
	Sig.	0.413	0.993	0.262	0.695	0.361	0.627	0.164	0.288	0.416	0.195	0.068	0.067	0.004	0.285	0.294	0.403
~ HAPPY	CC	0.027	-.141*	-0.029	-0.050	0.103	.131*	0.075	0.091	.126*	0.118	0.094	-0.024	.148*	0.031	0.101	0.007
	Sig.	0.667	0.021	0.663	0.412	0.101	0.031	0.270	0.138	0.042	0.052	0.159	0.697	0.017	0.610	0.131	0.907
~ RELIEVED	CC	0.012	-0.007	0.021	0.049	0.009	0.060	0.076	0.110	-0.005	-0.032	-0.028	0.050	-0.035	-0.024	-0.039	-0.008
	Sig.	0.847	0.907	0.754	0.422	0.888	0.325	0.264	0.072	0.935	0.594	0.679	0.408	0.580	0.692	0.559	0.892
~ SCARED	CC	. ^c	0.020	0.004	0.067	. ^c	0.023	-0.060	0.037	. ^c	0.098	0.045	-0.107	. ^c	-0.028	0.031	-0.060
	Sig.		0.740	0.949	0.269		0.704	0.381	0.546		0.108	0.498	0.076		0.640	0.646	0.324
~ SURPRISED	CC	-0.007	.131*	0.019	0.095	0.009	-0.085	0.059	0.088	-0.029	0.081	0.066	0.052	-0.048	-0.010	-0.017	-0.015
	Sig.	0.912	0.031	0.780	0.117	0.889	0.163	0.386	0.148	0.648	0.182	0.324	0.390	0.443	0.872	0.796	0.806
~ WORRIED	CC	0.019	-0.016	0.000	-0.058	0.030	.174**	.219**	0.109	-0.091	0.017	-0.086	-0.109	-0.006	-0.011	-0.010	-0.062
	Sig.	0.761	0.797	0.995	0.339	0.635	0.004	0.001	0.075	0.143	0.781	0.197	0.070	0.927	0.860	0.881	0.307
annoyed	CC	-0.043	0.110	-.152*	.156**	0.000	0.023	0.040	-0.063	-0.044	-.148*	-0.094	0.000	-0.036	-.173**	-0.095	0.035
	Sig.	0.492	0.072	0.023	0.010	0.998	0.709	0.556	0.302	0.477	0.014	0.161	0.997	0.563	0.004	0.153	0.566
annoyed \angry	CC	.140*	0.023	0.098	-0.054	0.063	-0.049	0.045	0.015	-0.062	-0.013	-0.051	0.101	-.175**	0.035	-0.068	0.021
	Sig.	0.026	0.702	0.143	0.369	0.315	0.423	0.511	0.811	0.319	0.829	0.448	0.092	0.005	0.559	0.305	0.733
annoyed \exasperated	CC	-0.027	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	-0.072	0.095	. ^c	. ^c	0.024	0.002	. ^c	. ^c	-0.026	-0.104	. ^c	. ^c
	Sig.	0.667	0.000		0.000	0.255	0.119		0.000	0.702	0.970		0.000	0.673	0.084		0.000
annoyed \frustrated	CC	-0.091	-0.053	0.055	0.062	-0.108	0.037	0.041	0.042	-0.072	-.130*	-0.047	-0.097	0.025	-0.007	-0.075	-0.016
	Sig.	0.148	0.382	0.414	0.305	0.086	0.546	0.547	0.491	0.249	0.032	0.483	0.107	0.688	0.907	0.260	0.793
annoyed	CC	0.034	0.061	0.004	. ^c	-0.033	0.006	-0.035	. ^c	-0.045	-0.085	-0.062	. ^c	-0.036	-0.116	-0.063	. ^c
	Sig.																

		SENSE OF AGENCY				AGREEABILITY				IN-GROUP VALUES				JUST WORLD BELIEFS			
\irritated	Sig.	0.586	0.319	0.949	0.000	0.597	0.924	0.606	0.000	0.470	0.162	0.352	0.000	0.564	0.055	0.343	0.000
annoyed	CC	0.107	.c	.c	.c	0.018	.c	.c	.c	-0.094	.c	.c	.c	-0.111	.c	.c	.c
\miffed	Sig.	0.089				0.781				0.132				0.076			
annoyed	CC	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c
\narked	Sig.			0.000				0.000				0.000				0.000	
bad	CC	.c	-0.109	0.019	-.121*	.c	-.125*	.c	-0.012	.c	0.021	-0.042	0.049	.c	.166**	-0.090	0.024
	Sig.		0.073	0.781	0.045		0.040	0.000	0.842		0.726	0.531	0.417		0.006	0.175	0.686
better	CC	0.006	0.049	-0.025	-0.013	.165**	0.047	0.106	-0.014	0.011	-0.036	-.196**	-0.093	-0.024	-0.056	-.141*	0.043
	Sig.	0.922	0.426	0.706	0.834	0.009	0.439	0.122	0.822	0.859	0.553	0.003	0.121	0.701	0.352	0.034	0.478
bored	CC	-0.085	0.005	-0.010	.c	-0.016	-.245**	0.050	.c	0.043	-0.035	0.045	.c	-0.051	-0.042	0.031	.c
	Sig.	0.179	0.931	0.884		0.798	0.000	0.461		0.489	0.568	0.498		0.417	0.490	0.646	
breath	CC	-0.050	-0.071	0.067	-0.011	-0.008	0.067	0.006	0.058	-0.079	-0.019	-0.080	-0.061	-0.016	0.015	-0.107	-0.032
	Sig.	0.424	0.247	0.318	0.852	0.899	0.275	0.933	0.343	0.206	0.751	0.233	0.308	0.800	0.807	0.107	0.600
calm	CC	-0.007	0.087	-0.085	0.054	0.019	0.059	0.043	-0.023	0.021	0.009	0.042	0.023	0.035	-0.022	0.072	0.016
	Sig.	0.912	0.155	0.202	0.369	0.763	0.331	0.531	0.711	0.732	0.882	0.528	0.706	0.575	0.713	0.280	0.792
(compassion)	CC	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c
	Sig.																
(compassion)	CC	.c	0.057	-0.042	0.028	.c	0.026	0.000	0.042	.c	-0.031	0.006	-0.012	.c	0.040	0.006	0.032
\empathetic	Sig.		0.354	0.528	0.649		0.668	0.995	0.491		0.610	0.926	0.836		0.507	0.931	0.601
(compassion)	CC	-0.069	-0.021	-0.042	-.124*	0.045	0.069	0.089	0.035	-0.053	-0.088	0.013	0.073	-0.033	-0.025	-0.027	0.032
\have-trying	Sig.	0.277	0.729	0.528	0.040	0.474	0.260	0.190	0.571	0.398	0.146	0.850	0.225	0.597	0.681	0.686	0.598
(compassion)	CC	-0.047	-0.038	-0.028	-0.071	0.092	0.101	0.074	0.028	0.114	.163**	0.012	0.053	.152*	.160**	0.016	0.041
\sad	Sig.	0.459	0.537	0.673	0.243	0.144	0.096	0.279	0.644	0.067	0.007	0.859	0.381	0.014	0.008	0.813	0.502
(compassion)	CC	-0.031	-0.014	.c	0.022	-0.017	0.087	.c	0.114	-0.075	0.030	.c	0.005	0.047	-0.028	.c	-0.019
\sorry	Sig.	0.627	0.823	0.000	0.713	0.793	0.153	0.000	0.061	0.227	0.626	0.000	0.940	0.451	0.642	0.000	0.757
(compassion)	CC	0.119	.c	.c	-0.088	0.017	.c	.c	0.091	0.011	.c	.c	0.104	-0.045	.c	.c	.136*
\sympathetic	Sig.	0.058		0.000	0.146	0.790		0.000	0.135	0.862		0.000	0.083	0.471		0.000	0.024
confident	CC	0.054	-0.028	-0.078	0.030	0.089	.124*	0.072	-0.020	-0.002	-0.098	0.032	0.028	-0.045	-0.008	-0.009	-0.032
	Sig.	0.391	0.648	0.242	0.618	0.156	0.041	0.295	0.749	0.972	0.108	0.630	0.643	0.471	0.895	0.888	0.594
confused	CC	0.074	-0.073	-0.006	0.021	-0.005	.149*	0.004	-0.105	-0.033	-.119*	-0.013	-0.073	-0.014	-0.023	-0.067	-0.060
	Sig.	0.240	0.235	0.932	0.725	0.934	0.014	0.957	0.085	0.593	0.050	0.846	0.226	0.824	0.706	0.318	0.324
curious	CC	0.066	.c	-0.077	-0.092	0.070	.c	0.042	0.017	0.040	.c	0.059	0.028	-0.040	.c	0.063	-0.010
	Sig.	0.292	0.000	0.252	0.126	0.266	0.000	0.539	0.785	0.522	0.000	0.379	0.641	0.522	0.000	0.343	0.862
disappointed	CC	0.066	-0.067	0.032	.c	-0.002	0.047	0.111	.c	-0.024	-0.045	-0.030	.c	0.036	-0.058	-0.079	.c
	Sig.	0.292	0.275	0.628		0.969	0.437	0.105		0.699	0.460	0.654		0.562	0.337	0.236	
good	CC	-0.047	-0.039	0.094	0.061	-0.053	-0.056	-0.005	0.046	.156*	0.118	0.077	0.091	.149*	.135*	0.039	0.087
	Sig.	0.453	0.520	0.159	0.314	0.403	0.362	0.942	0.451	0.012	0.051	0.253	0.130	0.016	0.025	0.558	0.151
good	CC	-.181**	0.105	0.014	-0.006	.134*	0.089	-.182**	0.059	-0.028	0.003	0.057	0.043	.123*	-0.046	0.068	-0.062

		SENSE OF AGENCY				AGREEABILITY				IN-GROUP VALUES				JUST WORLD BELIEFS			
\fine	Sig.	0.004	0.086	0.833	0.915	0.032	0.142	0.007	0.338	0.651	0.956	0.397	0.473	0.047	0.444	0.305	0.308
good	CC	. ^c	-0.091	0.112	-0.001	. ^c	-0.023	-0.051	0.006	. ^c	0.069	.138*	0.045	. ^c	0.064	.197**	0.039
\nice	Sig.		0.134	0.093	0.981		0.707	0.452	0.915		0.257	0.039	0.455		0.288	0.003	0.523
good	CC	.159*	-0.023	0.014	-0.089	-0.060	0.100	0.004	-0.016	0.042	0.002	0.023	0.032	-0.006	-0.057	-0.078	0.063
\okay	Sig.	0.011	0.707	0.835	0.143	0.343	0.099	0.959	0.798	0.504	0.975	0.735	0.598	0.920	0.350	0.243	0.299
good	CC	0.053	-0.049	-0.024	-0.108	0.044	-.190**	.145*	0.023	-0.056	-0.098	0.031	0.029	0.097	0.112	-0.021	0.024
\positive	Sig.	0.399	0.422	0.725	0.074	0.489	0.002	0.033	0.706	0.368	0.108	0.645	0.626	0.119	0.062	0.751	0.686
happy	CC	0.084	-0.115	0.023	-0.012	0.019	0.099	0.079	0.040	.200**	0.103	0.114	0.035	.213**	0.048	0.121	0.006
	Sig.	0.183	0.059	0.733	0.845	0.766	0.105	0.250	0.518	0.001	0.088	0.087	0.565	0.001	0.430	0.069	0.925
happy	CC	-0.008	-0.073	0.048	0.043	0.123	0.099	0.054	-0.004	0.020	0.051	0.058	-0.062	-0.017	0.005	0.076	0.035
\content	Sig.	0.901	0.231	0.471	0.474	0.051	0.103	0.427	0.953	0.747	0.403	0.387	0.301	0.789	0.937	0.252	0.566
happy	CC	-0.051	. ^c	-0.066	-0.082	0.039	. ^c	-0.112	0.076	-0.077	. ^c	-0.052	-0.019	-0.019	. ^c	-0.048	-0.061
\glad	Sig.	0.415		0.324	0.178	0.538		0.101	0.214	0.220		0.442	0.748	0.759		0.475	0.313
happy	CC	-0.054	-0.025	-.146*	-0.078	0.052	-0.032	0.076	0.083	-0.002	0.027	-0.008	-0.041	0.047	-0.028	-0.032	0.015
\pleased	Sig.	0.396	0.687	0.029	0.195	0.413	0.594	0.267	0.174	0.980	0.660	0.899	0.492	0.451	0.640	0.626	0.810
hopeful	CC	0.050	0.118	-0.024	-0.097	0.017	0.032	0.068	0.070	-0.117	-0.070	-0.070	-0.028	-0.075	-0.061	-0.090	0.035
	Sig.	0.431	0.053	0.721	0.108	0.793	0.596	0.317	0.249	0.060	0.250	0.298	0.648	0.229	0.311	0.176	0.566
hopeless	CC	0.084	0.051	. ^c	0.030	-0.107	0.068	. ^c	0.002	-0.057	-0.025	. ^c	-0.020	-0.005	-.137*	. ^c	-0.015
	Sig.	0.182	0.401		0.618	0.088	0.266		0.974	0.362	0.682		0.743	0.930	0.023		0.806
informed	CC	-0.076	-0.042	-0.025	-0.022	0.057	-0.106	-.145*	0.056	0.076	-0.045	-0.086	0.111	0.011	-0.012	-0.052	0.095
	Sig.	0.228	0.487	0.708	0.714	0.365	0.080	0.033	0.361	0.222	0.460	0.199	0.064	0.862	0.841	0.440	0.114
interested	CC	-0.066	-0.077	-0.054	0.090	-0.035	-0.076	-0.049	-0.034	-0.056	0.063	.142*	-0.073	0.021	0.020	0.028	-0.060
	Sig.	0.291	0.205	0.420	0.138	0.575	0.214	0.472	0.577	0.368	0.299	0.033	0.226	0.737	0.737	0.677	0.324
nothing	CC	-0.071	-0.043	0.003	0.037	-.198**	-.160**	-0.124	-0.036	0.013	0.038	0.013	0.022	0.019	0.084	0.089	0.044
	Sig.	0.259	0.483	0.966	0.541	0.002	0.008	0.069	0.551	0.831	0.527	0.850	0.717	0.758	0.165	0.182	0.466
powerless	CC	. ^c	0.080	. ^c	0.067	. ^c	0.086	. ^c	0.006	. ^c	-0.020	. ^c	0.011	. ^c	-0.063	. ^c	-0.035
	Sig.	0.000	0.189		0.269	0.000	0.159		0.915	0.000	0.737		0.851	0.000	0.302		0.562
proud	CC	0.038	-0.099	0.026	-0.029	0.006	0.065	0.042	-0.036	-0.112	-0.009	0.085	0.078	-0.032	0.006	0.044	0.067
	Sig.	0.545	0.103	0.693	0.634	0.922	0.287	0.539	0.559	0.071	0.888	0.203	0.194	0.611	0.924	0.509	0.267
relieved	CC	0.008	-0.012	0.016	0.003	0.023	0.044	0.080	0.063	0.001	-0.053	-0.021	0.074	-0.026	-0.029	-0.065	0.053
	Sig.	0.903	0.849	0.814	0.963	0.719	0.475	0.240	0.300	0.981	0.382	0.752	0.217	0.682	0.627	0.327	0.380
relieved	CC	0.015	0.014	0.019	0.111	-0.039	0.065	0.000	.124*	-0.020	0.069	-0.023	-0.044	-0.032	0.016	0.072	-.137*
\reassured	Sig.	0.809	0.815	0.781	0.067	0.533	0.283	0.996	0.041	0.749	0.257	0.727	0.469	0.611	0.790	0.283	0.023
rushed	CC	. ^c	-0.036	-0.010	-0.099	. ^c	0.023	0.048	0.031	. ^c	-0.073	0.013	-0.020	. ^c	-0.070	-0.001	0.020
	Sig.	0.000	0.552	0.884	0.103	0.000	0.710	0.482	0.615	0.000	0.228	0.845	0.743	0.000	0.249	0.992	0.742
safe	CC	-0.108	-0.049	0.026	0.066	-0.029	-0.011	0.076	-0.028	0.090	0.004	-0.007	-0.020	0.068	-0.070	-0.052	0.028
	Sig.	0.087	0.427	0.693	0.277	0.648	0.852	0.266	0.650	0.151	0.949	0.918	0.745	0.274	0.249	0.440	0.640
same	CC	0.000	-0.035	-0.079	0.072	-0.044	-.157**	0.003	-.169**	0.045	-0.046	0.056	0.005	-0.004	0.015	0.034	-0.085

		SENSE OF AGENCY				AGREEABILITY				IN-GROUP VALUES				JUST WORLD BELIEFS			
	Sig.	0.998	0.571	0.236	0.234	0.481	0.010	0.964	0.006	0.467	0.452	0.403	0.928	0.951	0.801	0.613	0.161
satisfied	CC	0.023	-0.002	-0.024	-0.005	0.047	0.059	-0.050	-0.061	-0.030	0.025	0.088	-0.012	0.037	-0.067	0.044	0.053
	Sig.	0.713	0.973	0.721	0.941	0.456	0.336	0.462	0.321	0.634	0.679	0.190	0.837	0.557	0.266	0.514	0.380
scared	CC	. ^c	0.020	-0.042	0.067	. ^c	0.023	0.000	0.037	. ^c	0.098	0.072	-0.107	. ^c	-0.028	0.101	-0.060
	Sig.		0.740	0.528	0.269		0.704	0.996	0.546		0.108	0.282	0.076		0.640	0.128	0.324
scared \afraid	CC	. ^c	. ^c	0.067	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	-0.084	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	-0.023	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	-0.090	. ^c
	Sig.			0.316				0.218				0.727				0.175	
sceptical	CC	-0.069	0.035	-0.006	0.067	0.050	0.030	0.012	-0.085	0.013	0.003	-0.079	-0.056	-0.036	-0.011	-0.036	-0.035
	Sig.	0.274	0.564	0.933	0.269	0.430	0.622	0.865	0.165	0.834	0.958	0.237	0.352	0.564	0.852	0.586	0.562
stressed	CC	-0.076	0.048	-0.023	0.082	-0.005	0.058	0.029	-0.035	-0.020	-0.018	-0.057	-0.050	-0.111	0.000	-0.032	-0.047
	Sig.	0.225	0.433	0.726	0.178	0.934	0.344	0.667	0.566	0.749	0.772	0.399	0.403	0.076	0.998	0.626	0.433
surprised	CC	0.000	0.082	0.056	0.095	-0.075	-0.031	0.039	0.088	-0.078	0.005	0.080	0.052	-0.055	-0.004	-0.001	-0.015
	Sig.	0.999	0.179	0.401	0.117	0.234	0.608	0.571	0.148	0.214	0.941	0.232	0.390	0.376	0.948	0.988	0.806
surprised \shocked	CC	-0.011	0.110	-0.060	. ^c	0.105	-0.102	0.050	. ^c	0.050	.133*	-0.007	. ^c	-0.008	-0.011	-0.032	. ^c
	Sig.	0.863	0.071	0.374		0.094	0.094	0.461		0.423	0.028	0.918		0.901	0.852	0.627	
tired	CC	-0.011	0.039	. ^c	0.046	0.017	0.074	. ^c	-0.034	-0.002	0.005	. ^c	-0.091	-0.008	-0.016	. ^c	-0.032
	Sig.	0.863	0.519		0.444	0.790	0.225		0.577	0.972	0.941		0.129	0.901	0.791		0.594
unknown	CC	0.061	0.021	-0.031	0.037	-0.022	-0.021	0.057	0.071	-0.019	0.040	0.006	0.029	-0.023	0.036	0.009	-0.015
	Sig.	0.331	0.736	0.642	0.544	0.724	0.727	0.408	0.243	0.758	0.512	0.930	0.634	0.707	0.548	0.893	0.800
unsurprised	CC	-0.053	0.005	0.001	0.020	-0.108	-0.005	0.017	0.033	-0.013	-0.044	-0.038	0.014	0.021	-0.063	0.035	-0.033
	Sig.	0.398	0.931	0.989	0.741	0.086	0.939	0.799	0.584	0.830	0.469	0.572	0.813	0.737	0.302	0.595	0.580
upset	CC	0.005	-0.012	0.018	.135*	0.017	0.057	0.111	-0.004	0.063	0.062	-0.062	-0.056	0.085	0.070	-0.048	-0.109
	Sig.	0.932	0.846	0.784	0.025	0.790	0.351	0.105	0.952	0.312	0.309	0.352	0.352	0.171	0.248	0.475	0.071
worried	CC	-0.022	0.039	0.019	-0.050	0.028	.138*	0.102	0.064	-0.086	0.042	-0.094	-0.075	-0.008	-0.051	0.012	-0.038
	Sig.	0.722	0.520	0.780	0.405	0.656	0.023	0.134	0.291	0.170	0.492	0.160	0.213	0.894	0.397	0.860	0.535
worried \anxious	CC	0.019	-0.067	0.061	0.061	-0.056	0.096	-0.043	0.055	-0.099	0.000	0.019	-0.088	0.055	0.034	-0.013	-0.030
	Sig.	0.761	0.275	0.364	0.312	0.373	0.114	0.530	0.368	0.112	0.996	0.772	0.143	0.378	0.575	0.842	0.619
worried \cautious	CC	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	.135*	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	-0.004	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	-0.056	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	-0.109
	Sig.				0.025				0.952				0.352				0.071
worried \concerned	CC	0.025	-0.011	-0.041	-0.112	0.045	0.072	.222**	0.070	-0.010	0.007	-0.045	-0.026	-0.039	0.020	-0.017	-0.015
	Sig.	0.697	0.861	0.536	0.064	0.478	0.237	0.001	0.251	0.873	0.904	0.504	0.671	0.531	0.743	0.795	0.810
worried \nervous	CC	0.061	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	0.029	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	-0.002	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	0.021	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c
	Sig.	0.332				0.647				0.980				0.739			
worried \panicked	CC	. ^c	-0.007	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	0.046	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	-0.064	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	-0.056	. ^c	. ^c
	Sig.		0.911				0.453				0.290				0.354		
worried \uneasy	CC	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c
	Sig.		0.000	0.000			0.000	0.000			0.000	0.000			0.000	0.000	
N		254	270	225	275	254	271	216	270	258	273	225	277	259	275	227	276

	SENSE OF AGENCY	AGREEABILITY	IN-GROUP VALUES	JUST WORLD BELIEFS
<i>These correlations were conducted using Pearson's r. Only emotions that appeared at least seven times in survey-experiment responses are included. ** = Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * = Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). C = Cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant. 'CC' stands for 'correlation coefficient'; the applicable vignette is shown at the top of each column.</i>				

A9.2. Post-vignette emotions, (mental) health and educational attainment

		HEALTH				POOR MENTAL HEALTH				EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT			
		EU	UK	Selves	None	EU	UK	Selves	None	EU	UK	Selves	None
	N	260	275	227	276	258	273	225	275	259	274	225	274
~ ANNOYED	CC	-0.025	-0.065	0.050	-0.027	0.009	0.070	0.048	-0.076	0.100	-0.052	0.045	-0.001
	Sig.	0.690	0.280	0.455	0.653	0.889	0.251	0.472	0.211	0.108	0.391	0.502	0.981
APATHETIC	CC	-.159*	-0.032	-0.081	0.002	-0.072	0.045	0.023	0.027	0.081	-0.001	0.092	0.038
	Sig.	0.010	0.599	0.224	0.975	0.248	0.457	0.736	0.657	0.195	0.989	0.171	0.531
~ COMPASSION	CC	-0.017	0.091	0.042	0.027	-0.093	0.077	-0.023	-.219**	0.046	0.048	0.027	0.023
	Sig.	0.788	0.131	0.531	0.650	0.135	0.206	0.728	0.000	0.462	0.429	0.690	0.710
~ GOOD	CC	0.049	0.023	0.073	0.108	-0.031	-0.062	0.035	0.027	-0.048	-0.047	-0.121	-0.087
	Sig.	0.432	0.700	0.273	0.072	0.619	0.306	0.602	0.657	0.440	0.435	0.069	0.151
~ HAPPY	CC	.140*	0.095	0.022	0.010	-0.022	-0.050	-.169*	-0.041	-0.062	0.019	0.074	-0.009
	Sig.	0.024	0.117	0.741	0.866	0.727	0.411	0.011	0.501	0.322	0.753	0.266	0.879
~ RELIEVED	CC	0.100	-0.056	0.096	0.066	0.020	-0.047	-0.065	0.068	-0.012	0.032	0.072	0.046
	Sig.	0.109	0.352	0.151	0.278	0.745	0.437	0.329	0.263	0.852	0.595	0.283	0.448
~ SCARED	CC	. ^c	0.019	0.021	-0.065	. ^c	.129*	0.066	-0.009	. ^c	0.041	-0.090	0.036
	Sig.		0.752	0.758	0.281		0.033	0.322	0.888		0.502	0.178	0.553
~ SURPRISED	CC	0.034	0.033	-0.062	0.018	0.090	0.046	-0.011	-0.058	-0.114	-0.020	0.039	-0.014
	Sig.	0.587	0.582	0.350	0.772	0.150	0.451	0.869	0.338	0.068	0.740	0.556	0.816
~ WORRIED	CC	-.134*	-0.014	-0.122	0.059	0.029	0.054	0.100	-0.066	0.082	-0.020	0.048	0.111
	Sig.	0.031	0.816	0.067	0.327	0.648	0.376	0.134	0.274	0.188	0.745	0.470	0.068
annoyed	CC	0.003	-.145*	.142*	-0.033	-0.029	0.092	-0.071	-0.001	0.096	-0.058	-0.016	-0.037
	Sig.	0.961	0.016	0.032	0.581	0.642	0.129	0.287	0.991	0.124	0.339	0.814	0.540
annoyed\angry	CC	-0.076	0.076	-0.003	-0.092	-0.038	-0.003	0.041	-0.092	0.035	-0.012	-0.052	-.143*
	Sig.	0.223	0.210	0.959	0.127	0.542	0.967	0.545	0.126	0.576	0.845	0.441	0.018
annoyed\exasperated	CC	.134*	0.013	. ^c	. ^c	-0.046	0.095	. ^c	. ^c	0.066	0.060	. ^c	. ^c
	Sig.	0.030	0.824		0.000	0.458	0.119		0.000	0.290	0.320		0.000
annoyed\frustrated	CC	0.041	-0.005	-0.044	0.062	0.072	0.020	0.081	-0.047	-0.010	-0.035	0.095	.152*
	Sig.	0.507	0.932	0.510	0.301	0.249	0.747	0.224	0.435	0.874	0.564	0.153	0.012
annoyed\irritated	CC	-0.074	-0.041	-0.031	. ^c	0.046	-0.038	0.080	. ^c	-0.008	-0.006	0.128	. ^c
	Sig.	0.235	0.501	0.640	0.000	0.464	0.533	0.231	0.000	0.896	0.915	0.055	0.000
annoyed\miffed	CC	-0.065	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	0.114	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	0.030	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c
	Sig.	0.298				0.068				0.633			
annoyed\narked	CC	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c
	Sig.			0.000				0.000				0.000	
bad	CC	. ^c	0.027	0.012	0.066	. ^c	-0.080	-0.026	0.002	. ^c	0.074	0.074	-0.079
	Sig.		0.654	0.860	0.272		0.189	0.700	0.979		0.224	0.272	0.190
better	CC	-0.018	-0.051	.138*	-0.089	-0.009	0.051	-0.025	-0.050	0.008	-0.036	-0.079	-0.054

		HEALTH				POOR MENTAL HEALTH				EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT			
	Sig.	0.771	0.398	0.038	0.139	0.889	0.403	0.710	0.411	0.895	0.558	0.239	0.373
bored	CC	0.030	-.160**	-.135*	.c	-0.045	0.024	-0.008	.c	0.060	-0.005	-0.011	.c
	Sig.	0.627	0.008	0.042		0.473	0.688	0.907		0.336	0.934	0.872	
breath	CC	-0.028	-0.027	-0.049	-0.078	-0.031	0.031	0.044	-0.008	-0.036	-0.014	-0.032	-0.017
	Sig.	0.652	0.653	0.465	0.197	0.621	0.612	0.515	0.894	0.561	0.821	0.634	0.782
calm	CC	-0.038	0.048	-0.002	0.064	0.008	-0.019	-0.053	0.065	0.052	-0.067	-0.095	-0.035
	Sig.	0.542	0.425	0.978	0.291	0.899	0.750	0.432	0.286	0.403	0.267	0.156	0.560
(compassion)	CC	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c	.c
	Sig.												
(compassion)\empathetic	CC	.c	0.013	0.017	-0.077	.c	-0.019	0.043	-0.013	.c	0.029	-0.090	0.040
	Sig.		0.824	0.802	0.203		0.748	0.524	0.833		0.636	0.180	0.513
(compassion)\have-trying	CC	-0.007	0.016	0.066	0.089	-0.099	0.104	-0.063	-.127*	0.081	0.060	-0.047	-0.029
	Sig.	0.906	0.792	0.322	0.138	0.111	0.085	0.349	0.035	0.193	0.325	0.487	0.638
(compassion)\sad	CC	0.019	0.096	-0.004	-0.025	0.009	-0.024	0.002	-.162**	-0.034	-0.028	0.105	0.060
	Sig.	0.763	0.114	0.956	0.673	0.887	0.691	0.980	0.007	0.590	0.642	0.117	0.319
(compassion)\sorry	CC	-0.065	0.067	.c	0.031	-0.040	0.065	.c	-0.069	0.063	0.058	.c	-0.021
	Sig.	0.298	0.269	0.000	0.613	0.525	0.282	0.000	0.256	0.310	0.341	0.000	0.732
(compassion)\sympathetic	CC	-0.035	.c	.c	0.031	-0.061	.c	.c	-0.073	-0.029	.c	.c	-0.025
	Sig.	0.572		0.000	0.613	0.327		0.000	0.225	0.644		0.000	0.685
confident	CC	-0.092	0.013	0.101	-0.092	.166**	0.007	-0.058	-0.032	-0.005	0.029	-0.029	-0.014
	Sig.	0.140	0.824	0.129	0.126	0.007	0.904	0.388	0.596	0.935	0.636	0.665	0.816
confused	CC	-0.023	-0.074	-0.071	0.090	-0.009	-0.058	0.016	-0.023	-0.005	0.014	0.001	0.036
	Sig.	0.709	0.218	0.287	0.136	0.881	0.337	0.806	0.709	0.934	0.813	0.991	0.553
curious	CC	0.026	.c	0.080	0.090	0.048	.c	-0.059	-0.037	0.110	.c	-0.065	0.067
	Sig.	0.675	0.000	0.230	0.136	0.440	0.000	0.376	0.544	0.077	0.000	0.329	0.272
disappointed	CC	0.026	-0.054	0.072	.c	0.012	-0.080	0.001	.c	-0.064	0.041	-0.051	.c
	Sig.	0.675	0.369	0.278		0.850	0.185	0.983		0.301	0.503	0.451	
good	CC	0.070	0.010	0.017	0.028	0.063	-0.081	0.082	0.079	-0.064	0.007	-0.109	0.013
	Sig.	0.260	0.868	0.800	0.644	0.314	0.181	0.218	0.189	0.304	0.903	0.104	0.834
good\fine	CC	0.086	-0.016	0.095	0.098	-0.041	-0.042	-0.046	0.078	0.014	-0.043	-0.100	-0.095
	Sig.	0.165	0.789	0.152	0.103	0.508	0.490	0.496	0.200	0.817	0.477	0.134	0.117
good\nice	CC	.c	0.013	0.017	0.012	.c	0.041	.139*	0.006	.c	0.029	0.056	0.097
	Sig.		0.824	0.802	0.838		0.501	0.037	0.926		0.636	0.405	0.109
good\okay	CC	-0.071	0.046	-0.007	0.044	-0.024	0.039	-0.024	-.126*	-0.118	-0.078	-0.050	-0.106
	Sig.	0.252	0.451	0.921	0.465	0.702	0.518	0.722	0.037	0.057	0.200	0.457	0.080
good\positive	CC	-0.020	0.013	-0.014	0.021	-0.057	-0.060	0.032	-0.076	0.091	0.029	0.043	0.027
	Sig.	0.747	0.824	0.838	0.722	0.362	0.325	0.634	0.208	0.146	0.636	0.526	0.656
happy	CC	0.066	0.096	-0.024	0.024	0.013	0.065	-.169*	-0.031	-0.089	-0.020	0.002	0.032

		HEALTH				POOR MENTAL HEALTH				EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT			
	Sig.	0.289	0.112	0.717	0.695	0.838	0.286	0.011	0.610	0.152	0.742	0.971	0.593
happy\content	CC	.154*	0.050	0.095	0.031	-0.017	-.125*	-0.061	0.061	0.057	0.097	0.091	-0.050
	Sig.	0.013	0.411	0.153	0.613	0.784	0.039	0.366	0.317	0.361	0.109	0.172	0.412
happy\glad	CC	0.020	.c	-0.031	0.021	-0.050	.c	0.029	-0.007	-0.080	.c	-0.051	-0.062
	Sig.	0.746		0.640	0.722	0.421		0.663	0.913	0.201		0.451	0.310
happy\pleased	CC	0.015	-0.037	-0.021	-0.065	-0.012	-0.051	-0.076	-0.094	0.030	-0.116	0.096	0.013
	Sig.	0.809	0.543	0.751	0.280	0.850	0.398	0.255	0.121	0.633	0.055	0.149	0.827
hopeful	CC	-0.112	-0.112	0.029	-0.033	.123*	.147*	0.108	-0.018	0.118	0.022	-0.015	0.089
	Sig.	0.071	0.064	0.661	0.581	0.048	0.015	0.107	0.765	0.057	0.717	0.818	0.142
hopeless	CC	-.145*	-0.005	.c	-0.092	.149*	0.068	.c	0.058	-0.071	-0.035	.c	-0.014
	Sig.	0.020	0.932		0.126	0.017	0.263		0.338	0.258	0.564		0.816
informed	CC	-0.035	-0.024	-0.110	0.062	0.003	0.002	0.065	-0.036	-0.005	0.004	0.032	0.051
	Sig.	0.572	0.689	0.099	0.301	0.961	0.978	0.329	0.557	0.935	0.943	0.638	0.400
interested	CC	0.119	-0.013	0.059	-0.065	-0.012	0.106	-0.081	-0.009	.129*	0.058	-0.096	0.005
	Sig.	0.056	0.836	0.378	0.281	0.842	0.081	0.223	0.888	0.037	0.341	0.150	0.930
nothing	CC	.168**	0.063	0.000	-.129*	-0.120	-0.033	0.028	0.115	-0.034	0.022	0.055	-0.118
	Sig.	0.007	0.299	0.996	0.032	0.055	0.591	0.679	0.058	0.583	0.718	0.408	0.050
powerless	CC	.c	-0.093	.c	0.012	.c	.139*	.c	-0.051	.c	0.018	.c	0.005
	Sig.	0.000	0.125		0.838	0.000	0.022		0.400	0.000	0.763		0.930
proud	CC	-0.065	-0.037	-0.047	0.021	0.079	0.053	-0.014	-0.035	0.030	-0.004	0.007	-0.097
	Sig.	0.298	0.543	0.485	0.722	0.206	0.381	0.835	0.560	0.633	0.946	0.913	0.109
relieved	CC	0.100	-0.040	0.097	0.038	0.037	-0.045	-0.046	0.009	-0.034	0.025	0.097	0.017
	Sig.	0.108	0.511	0.147	0.534	0.551	0.457	0.489	0.882	0.590	0.678	0.147	0.776
relieved\reassured	CC	0.015	-0.065	0.012	0.072	-0.047	-0.013	-0.066	.143*	0.063	0.029	-0.063	0.073
	Sig.	0.809	0.279	0.860	0.230	0.455	0.833	0.326	0.018	0.310	0.636	0.345	0.231
rushed	CC	.c	0.023	-0.031	0.018	.c	-0.011	-0.065	.128*	.c	-0.005	-0.011	0.051
	Sig.	0.000	0.699	0.640	0.772	0.000	0.862	0.332	0.034	0.000	0.934	0.872	0.401
safe	CC	-0.010	0.023	0.017	0.025	0.008	-0.034	-0.054	0.015	-0.024	-0.042	-0.041	0.057
	Sig.	0.874	0.699	0.802	0.681	0.901	0.577	0.424	0.806	0.699	0.492	0.539	0.348
same	CC	0.013	0.033	.145*	-0.088	-0.001	-0.073	-0.108	0.028	-0.054	-0.071	0.019	0.003
	Sig.	0.831	0.590	0.029	0.143	0.989	0.228	0.107	0.641	0.391	0.239	0.774	0.955
satisfied	CC	-0.062	0.066	-0.081	0.065	0.044	-0.019	-0.044	0.027	0.000	0.004	-0.001	0.116
	Sig.	0.318	0.273	0.222	0.284	0.478	0.757	0.510	0.654	0.996	0.943	0.984	0.056
scared	CC	.c	0.019	0.017	-0.065	.c	.129*	0.077	-0.009	.c	0.041	-.138*	0.036
	Sig.		0.752	0.802	0.281		0.033	0.252	0.888		0.502	0.038	0.553
scared\afraid	CC	.c	.c	0.012	.c	.c	.c	0.006	.c	.c	.c	0.039	.c
	Sig.			0.860				0.927				0.557	
sceptical	CC	0.070	-0.037	-0.077	0.012	-0.077	0.044	-0.010	-0.023	0.022	0.041	0.039	0.067

		HEALTH				POOR MENTAL HEALTH				EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT			
	Sig.	0.262	0.543	0.245	0.838	0.218	0.472	0.883	0.709	0.724	0.502	0.557	0.272
stressed	CC	-0.065	-0.077	-0.066	0.020	-0.040	-0.025	0.069	.183**	-0.037	0.081	0.010	-0.041
	Sig.	0.298	0.206	0.321	0.738	0.525	0.684	0.305	0.002	0.553	0.180	0.877	0.495
surprised	CC	0.072	0.067	-0.044	0.018	0.064	0.065	0.035	-0.058	-0.064	-0.038	0.098	-0.014
	Sig.	0.245	0.269	0.505	0.772	0.302	0.282	0.601	0.338	0.301	0.536	0.145	0.816
surprised\shocked	CC	-0.035	-0.037	-0.047	. ^c	0.062	-0.013	-0.082	. ^c	-0.100	0.018	-0.090	. ^c
	Sig.	0.572	0.543	0.485		0.318	0.826	0.221		0.109	0.763	0.180	
tired	CC	-0.035	0.027	. ^c	.127*	-0.002	0.049	. ^c	-0.077	-0.005	0.026	. ^c	0.116
	Sig.	0.572	0.654		0.034	0.976	0.424		0.202	0.935	0.669		0.055
unknown	CC	-0.061	-0.047	-0.089	0.038	0.036	0.106	-0.036	-0.014	-0.038	-.187**	0.026	0.037
	Sig.	0.323	0.436	0.179	0.534	0.566	0.080	0.592	0.818	0.541	0.002	0.701	0.542
unsurprised	CC	-0.020	0.019	-0.021	0.064	0.073	-0.037	-0.072	-0.003	-0.064	-0.003	-0.041	0.026
	Sig.	0.747	0.752	0.751	0.291	0.246	0.541	0.281	0.962	0.301	0.962	0.538	0.666
upset	CC	0.021	0.023	0.021	0.090	0.033	-0.022	0.094	-0.037	-0.053	-0.023	0.029	0.036
	Sig.	0.732	0.699	0.758	0.136	0.601	0.715	0.159	0.544	0.400	0.701	0.667	0.553
worried	CC	-0.096	-0.083	-0.094	0.046	0.088	.200**	0.066	0.000	0.038	-0.095	-0.010	.119*
	Sig.	0.122	0.168	0.157	0.447	0.158	0.001	0.321	0.996	0.538	0.118	0.885	0.050
worried\anxious	CC	-0.050	0.036	-0.110	-0.020	0.008	-0.029	0.077	-0.029	0.026	-0.044	0.104	.125*
	Sig.	0.422	0.551	0.099	0.739	0.901	0.632	0.252	0.627	0.673	0.469	0.119	0.039
worried\cautious	CC	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	0.090	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	-0.037	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	0.036
	Sig.				0.136				0.544				0.553
worried\concerned	CC	-0.096	0.001	-0.037	0.039	-0.047	-0.058	0.045	-0.074	0.062	0.085	0.028	-0.032
	Sig.	0.122	0.986	0.575	0.515	0.453	0.338	0.497	0.224	0.324	0.160	0.671	0.599
worried\nervous	CC	0.015	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	0.063	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c
	Sig.	0.809				0.000				0.310			
worried\panicked	CC	. ^c	0.092	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	-0.053	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	-0.003	. ^c	. ^c
	Sig.		0.126				0.383				0.962		
worried\uneasy	CC	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c	. ^c
	Sig.		0.000	0.000			0.000	0.000			0.000	0.000	
	N	260	275	227	276	258	273	225	275	259	274	225	274
These correlations were conducted using Pearson's r. Only emotions that appeared at least seven times in survey-experiment responses are included. ** = Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * = Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). C = Cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant. 'CC' stands for 'correlation coefficient'; the applicable vignette is shown at the top of each column.													

A9.3. Victim (un)creation and (re)blame

		Victim identified				Victim uncreation				(Re)blame present			
		EU	UK	Selves	None	EU	UK	Selves	None	EU	UK	Selves	None
Sense of Agency	CC	.124*	0.005	-0.023	0.022	0.036	-0.069	-0.127	-0.047	0.062	0.094	0.050	0.076
	Sig.	0.048	0.931	0.732	0.718	0.573	0.258	0.058	0.441	0.327	0.125	0.456	0.211
	N	254	270	225	275	254	270	225	275	254	270	225	275
Agreeability	CC	0.047	.140*	0.034	.125*	-0.109	-.170**	-0.097	-0.109	-0.094	0.034	0.094	0.112
	Sig.	0.456	0.021	0.618	0.040	0.084	0.005	0.154	0.075	0.136	0.575	0.167	0.065
	N	254	271	216	270	254	271	216	270	254	271	216	270
In-group values	CC	0.095	0.101	0.007	-.132*	-0.044	0.047	-0.034	0.050	-0.012	-0.042	-0.112	-.165**
	Sig.	0.129	0.097	0.919	0.028	0.479	0.442	0.608	0.408	0.845	0.490	0.094	0.006
	N	258	273	225	277	258	273	225	277	258	273	225	277
JWB	CC	0.085	-0.030	-0.083	-0.085	0.013	0.040	0.058	0.086	-0.068	-0.024	-.160*	-.221**
	Sig.	0.171	0.624	0.211	0.160	0.841	0.510	0.388	0.155	0.279	0.688	0.016	0.000
	N	259	275	227	276	259	275	227	276	259	275	227	276
Health	CC	-0.021	.143*	0.080	-0.093	-0.014	0.066	-0.003	-0.002	-0.098	-0.049	-0.041	-0.026
	Sig.	0.738	0.018	0.229	0.125	0.821	0.276	0.969	0.974	0.114	0.420	0.536	0.662
	N	260	275	227	276	260	275	227	276	260	275	227	276
Poor mental health	CC	-0.024	0.038	-0.042	0.002	0.004	0.060	-0.033	0.016	0.022	-0.017	0.020	0.014
	Sig.	0.700	0.535	0.528	0.980	0.954	0.326	0.628	0.795	0.724	0.781	0.766	0.819
	N	258	273	225	275	258	273	225	275	258	273	225	275
Educational attainment	CC	-0.034	0.021	-0.040	0.111	0.050	0.006	-0.100	-0.008	0.007	0.036	0.066	.129*
	Sig.	0.586	0.730	0.555	0.068	0.427	0.923	0.134	0.894	0.908	0.553	0.323	0.032
	N	259	274	225	274	259	274	225	274	259	274	225	274

These correlations were conducted using Pearson's *r*. ** = Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * = Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). C = Cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant. 'CC' stands for 'correlation coefficient'; the applicable vignette is shown at the top of each column.

A10. Annex: Crosstabs and post-vignette effects

A10.1. Area of greatest interest

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
blame EU	Count	8	0	8	0	3	5	8
	Expected Count	7.1	0.9	7.8	0.2	3.9	4.1	8.0
	% within Area of interest	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
Agriculture, environmental and related studies	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	0.5	-0.5	-0.7	0.7	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
Architecture and building	% within Area of interest	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-1.0	1.0	
	Count	26	3	27	2	16	13	29
	Expected Count	25.7	3.3	28.1	0.9	14.2	14.8	29.0
	% within Area of interest	89.7%	10.3%	93.1%	6.9%	55.2%	44.8%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	-1.3	1.3	0.7	-0.7	
Creative arts	Count	6	3	8	1	4	5	9
	Expected Count	8.0	1.0	8.7	0.3	4.4	4.6	9.0
	% within Area of interest	66.7%	33.3%	88.9%	11.1%	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%
Education	Adjusted Residual	-2.1	2.1	-1.4	1.4	-0.3	0.3	
	Count	26	5	30	1	16	15	31
	Expected Count	27.4	3.6	30.0	1.0	15.1	15.9	31.0
Engineering and related technologies	% within Area of interest	83.9%	16.1%	96.8%	3.2%	51.6%	48.4%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.9	0.9	-0.1	0.1	0.3	-0.3	
	Count	8	0	8	0	4	4	8
	Expected Count	7.1	0.9	7.8	0.2	3.9	4.1	8.0
	% within Area of interest	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	0.5	-0.5	0.1	-0.1	
Food, hospitality and personal services	Count	11	3	14	0	8	6	14
	Expected Count	12.4	1.6	13.6	0.4	6.8	7.2	14.0
	% within Area of interest	78.6%	21.4%	100.0%	0.0%	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
Health	Adjusted Residual	-1.2	1.2	0.7	-0.7	0.6	-0.6	
	Count	47	5	52	0	27	25	52
	Expected Count	46.0	6.0	50.4	1.6	25.4	26.6	52.0
Information technology	% within Area of interest	90.4%	9.6%	100.0%	0.0%	51.9%	48.1%	100.0%

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
		Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	1.4	-1.4	0.5	-0.5	
		Count	10	0	10	0	6	4	10
		Expected Count	8.8	1.2	9.7	0.3	4.9	5.1	10.0
		% within Area of interest	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Management and commerce	Adjusted Residual	1.2	-1.2	0.6	-0.6	0.7	-0.7	
		Count	10	1	11	0	4	7	11
		Expected Count	9.7	1.3	10.7	0.3	5.4	5.6	11.0
		% within Area of interest	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%	0.0%	36.4%	63.6%	100.0%
	Mixed programs (e.g. literacy and numeracy skills; personal, so	Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	0.6	-0.6	-0.8	0.8	
		Count	30	5	35	0	15	20	35
		Expected Count	31.0	4.0	33.9	1.1	17.1	17.9	35.0
		% within Area of interest	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	Natural and physical sciences	Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5	1.1	-1.1	-0.8	0.8	
		Count	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Area of interest	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Other (please specify)	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	-5.6	5.6	-1.0	1.0	
		Count	46	5	48	3	24	27	51
		Expected Count	45.1	5.9	49.4	1.6	24.9	26.1	51.0
		% within Area of interest	90.2%	9.8%	94.1%	5.9%	47.1%	52.9%	100.0%
	Society and culture (including politics)	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	-1.3	1.3	-0.3	0.3	
		Count	230	30	252	8	127	133	260
		Expected Count	230.0	30.0	252.0	8.0	127.0	133.0	260.0
		% within Area of interest	88.5%	11.5%	96.9%	3.1%	48.8%	51.2%	100.0%
blame ourselves		Count	7	0	6	1	3	4	7
		Expected Count	6.3	0.7	6.8	0.2	4.1	2.9	7.0
		% within Area of interest	100.0%	0.0%	85.7%	14.3%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	Agriculture, environmental and related studies	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	-1.7	1.7	-0.8	0.8	
		Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
		Expected Count	2.7	0.3	2.9	0.1	1.7	1.3	3.0
	Architecture and building	% within Area of interest	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	-0.9	0.9	
		Count	18	0	18	0	13	5	18
		Expected Count	16.1	1.9	17.4	0.6	10.4	7.6	18.0
		% within Area of interest	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	72.2%	27.8%	100.0%
	Creative arts	Adjusted Residual	1.5	-1.5	0.8	-0.8	1.3	-1.3	

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
				False	True	False	True	
	Count	17	1	18	0	14	4	18
	Expected Count	16.1	1.9	17.4	0.6	10.4	7.6	18.0
	% within Area of interest	94.4%	5.6%	100.0%	0.0%	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.8	-0.8	1.8	-1.8	
Education	Count	30	5	33	2	22	13	35
	Expected Count	31.3	3.7	33.9	1.1	20.3	14.7	35.0
	% within Area of interest	85.7%	14.3%	94.3%	5.7%	62.9%	37.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.8	0.8	-1.0	1.0	0.6	-0.6	
Engineering and related technologies	Count	6	0	6	0	3	3	6
	Expected Count	5.4	0.6	5.8	0.2	3.5	2.5	6.0
	% within Area of interest	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.4	-0.4	-0.4	0.4	
Food, hospitality and personal services	Count	11	2	13	0	8	5	13
	Expected Count	11.6	1.4	12.6	0.4	7.5	5.5	13.0
	% within Area of interest	84.6%	15.4%	100.0%	0.0%	61.5%	38.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.6	0.6	0.7	-0.7	0.3	-0.3	
Health	Count	35	11	44	2	26	20	46
	Expected Count	41.1	4.9	44.6	1.4	26.7	19.3	46.0
	% within Area of interest	76.1%	23.9%	95.7%	4.3%	56.5%	43.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-3.3	3.3	-0.5	0.5	-0.2	0.2	
Information technology	Count	9	0	9	0	5	4	9
	Expected Count	8.0	1.0	8.7	0.3	5.2	3.8	9.0
	% within Area of interest	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.1	-1.1	0.5	-0.5	-0.1	0.1	
Management and commerce	Count	6	1	7	0	5	2	7
	Expected Count	6.3	0.7	6.8	0.2	4.1	2.9	7.0
	% within Area of interest	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	0.0%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.3	0.3	0.5	-0.5	0.7	-0.7	
Mixed programs (e.g. literacy and numeracy skills; personal, so	Count	14	1	14	1	6	9	15
	Expected Count	13.4	1.6	14.5	0.5	8.7	6.3	15.0
	% within Area of interest	93.3%	6.7%	93.3%	6.7%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	-0.8	0.8	-1.5	1.5	
Natural and physical sciences	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.6	0.4	1.0
	% within Area of interest	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	0.2	-0.2	-1.2	1.2	
Other (please specify)								

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
				False	True	False	True	
	Count	45	3	47	1	25	23	48
	Expected Count	42.9	5.1	46.5	1.5	27.8	20.2	48.0
	% within Area of interest	93.8%	6.3%	97.9%	2.1%	52.1%	47.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.1	-1.1	0.5	-0.5	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	202	24	219	7	131	95	226
	Expected Count	202.0	24.0	219.0	7.0	131.0	95.0	226.0
	% within Area of interest	89.4%	10.6%	96.9%	3.1%	58.0%	42.0%	100.0%
blame UK	Count	7	3	10	0	7	3	10
	Expected Count	8.7	1.3	9.8	0.2	5.3	4.7	10.0
	% within Area of interest	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%	0.0%	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
Agriculture, environmental and related studies	Adjusted Residual	-1.6	1.6	0.5	-0.5	1.1	-1.1	
	Count	2	2	3	1	2	2	4
	Expected Count	3.5	0.5	3.9	0.1	2.1	1.9	4.0
Architecture and building	% within Area of interest	50.0%	50.0%	75.0%	25.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.2	2.2	-3.1	3.1	-0.1	0.1	
	Count	22	1	23	0	10	13	23
	Expected Count	20.0	3.0	22.5	0.5	12.3	10.7	23.0
	% within Area of interest	95.7%	4.3%	100.0%	0.0%	43.5%	56.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.3	-1.3	0.7	-0.7	-1.0	1.0	
Creative arts	Count	9	1	9	1	6	4	10
	Expected Count	8.7	1.3	9.8	0.2	5.3	4.7	10.0
	% within Area of interest	90.0%	10.0%	90.0%	10.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Education	Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	-1.7	1.7	0.4	-0.4	
	Count	28	3	31	0	16	15	31
	Expected Count	26.9	4.1	30.3	0.7	16.5	14.5	31.0
	% within Area of interest	90.3%	9.7%	100.0%	0.0%	51.6%	48.4%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.9	-0.9	-0.2	0.2	
Engineering and related technologies	Count	9	1	9	1	8	2	10
	Expected Count	8.7	1.3	9.8	0.2	5.3	4.7	10.0
	% within Area of interest	90.0%	10.0%	90.0%	10.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Food, hospitality and personal services	Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	-1.7	1.7	1.7	-1.7	
	Count	21	5	26	0	21	5	26
	Expected Count	22.6	3.4	25.4	0.6	13.9	12.1	26.0
	% within Area of interest	80.8%	19.2%	100.0%	0.0%	80.8%	19.2%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.0	1.0	0.8	-0.8	3.0	-3.0	
Health	Count	58	5	62	1	29	34	63
	Information technology							

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
				False	True	False	True	
	Expected Count	54.7	8.3	61.6	1.4	33.6	29.4	63.0
	% within Area of interest	92.1%	7.9%	98.4%	1.6%	46.0%	54.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.4	-1.4	0.4	-0.4	-1.3	1.3	
	Count	10	4	13	1	9	5	14
	Expected Count	12.2	1.8	13.7	0.3	7.5	6.5	14.0
	% within Area of interest	71.4%	28.6%	92.9%	7.1%	64.3%	35.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.8	1.8	-1.3	1.3	0.8	-0.8	
	Count	7	0	7	0	3	4	7
	Expected Count	6.1	0.9	6.8	0.2	3.7	3.3	7.0
	% within Area of interest	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	0.4	-0.4	-0.6	0.6	
	Count	23	4	27	0	16	11	27
	Expected Count	23.5	3.5	26.4	0.6	14.4	12.6	27.0
	% within Area of interest	85.2%	14.8%	100.0%	0.0%	59.3%	40.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.3	0.3	0.8	-0.8	0.7	-0.7	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Area of interest	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	0.9	-0.9	
	Count	41	7	47	1	18	30	48
	Expected Count	41.7	6.3	46.9	1.1	25.6	22.4	48.0
	% within Area of interest	85.4%	14.6%	97.9%	2.1%	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.3	0.3	0.1	-0.1	-2.4	2.4	
	Count	238	36	268	6	146	128	274
	Expected Count	238.0	36.0	268.0	6.0	146.0	128.0	274.0
	% within Area of interest	86.9%	13.1%	97.8%	2.2%	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
no blame	Count	4	1	5	0	1	4	5
	Expected Count	3.8	1.2	4.8	0.2	3.2	1.8	5.0
	% within Area of interest	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.0%	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	0.5	-0.5	-2.0	2.0	
	Count	5	0	5	0	4	1	5
	Expected Count	3.8	1.2	4.8	0.2	3.2	1.8	5.0
	% within Area of interest	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.3	-1.3	0.5	-0.5	0.8	-0.8	
	Count	18	13	30	1	20	11	31
	Expected Count	23.5	7.5	29.7	1.3	19.5	11.5	31.0

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
				False	True	False	True	
	% within Area of interest	58.1%	41.9%	96.8%	3.2%	64.5%	35.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.4	2.4	0.3	-0.3	0.2	-0.2	
	Count	9	1	10	0	6	4	10
Education	Expected Count	7.6	2.4	9.6	0.4	6.3	3.7	10.0
	% within Area of interest	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.1	-1.1	0.7	-0.7	-0.2	0.2	
	Count	28	7	34	1	22	13	35
	Expected Count	26.5	8.5	33.5	1.5	22.1	12.9	35.0
Engineering and related technologies	% within Area of interest	80.0%	20.0%	97.1%	2.9%	62.9%	37.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.5	-0.5	0.0	0.0	
	Count	5	1	5	1	6	0	6
	Expected Count	4.5	1.5	5.7	0.3	3.8	2.2	6.0
	% within Area of interest	83.3%	16.7%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	-1.5	1.5	1.9	-1.9	
Food, hospitality and personal services	Count	16	5	20	1	16	5	21
	Expected Count	15.9	5.1	20.1	0.9	13.2	7.8	21.0
	% within Area of interest	76.2%	23.8%	95.2%	4.8%	76.2%	23.8%	100.0%
Health	Adjusted Residual	0.1	-0.1	-0.1	0.1	1.3	-1.3	
	Count	46	11	55	2	31	26	57
	Expected Count	43.2	13.8	54.5	2.5	35.9	21.1	57.0
	% within Area of interest	80.7%	19.3%	96.5%	3.5%	54.4%	45.6%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	0.3	-0.3	-1.5	1.5	
	Count	12	5	16	1	15	2	17
Information technology	Expected Count	12.9	4.1	16.3	0.7	10.7	6.3	17.0
	% within Area of interest	70.6%	29.4%	94.1%	5.9%	88.2%	11.8%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5	-0.3	0.3	2.2	-2.2	
Management and commerce	Count	3	1	3	1	1	3	4
	Expected Count	3.0	1.0	3.8	0.2	2.5	1.5	4.0
	% within Area of interest	75.0%	25.0%	75.0%	25.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
Mixed programs (e.g. literacy and numeracy skills; personal, so	Adjusted Residual	0.0	0.0	-2.0	2.0	-1.6	1.6	
	Count	20	5	25	0	15	10	25
	Expected Count	18.9	6.1	23.9	1.1	15.8	9.2	25.0
	% within Area of interest	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	1.1	-1.1	-0.3	0.3	
	Count	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
Natural and physical sciences	Expected Count	1.5	0.5	1.9	0.1	1.3	0.7	2.0
	Other (please specify)							

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
Society and culture (including politics)	% within Area of interest	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.3	-0.3	1.1	-1.1	
	Count	41	17	54	4	35	23	58
	Expected Count	43.9	14.1	55.5	2.5	36.6	21.4	58.0
	% within Area of interest	70.7%	29.3%	93.1%	6.9%	60.3%	39.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.0	1.0	-1.1	1.1	-0.5	0.5	
	Count	209	67	264	12	174	102	276
	Expected Count	209.0	67.0	264.0	12.0	174.0	102.0	276.0
% within Area of interest		75.7%	24.3%	95.7%	4.3%	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
Adjusted residuals of ±1.96 are significant at p<0.05.								

A10.2. Brexit-specific identity

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False		(Re)blame present False		Total
blame EU	Count	39	8	44	3	19	28	47
	Expected Count	41.0	6.0	45.5	1.5	20.3	26.7	47.0
	% within Brexit-specific identity	83.0%	17.0%	93.6%	6.4%	40.4%	59.6%	100.0%
	Leaver	Adjusted Residual	-1.1	1.1	-1.6	1.6	-0.5	0.5
	Count	70	8	77	1	35	43	78
	Expected Count	68.0	10.0	75.5	2.5	33.7	44.3	78.0
	% within Brexit-specific identity	89.7%	10.3%	98.7%	1.3%	44.9%	55.1%	100.0%
	Remainer	Adjusted Residual	1.1	-1.1	1.6	-1.6	0.5	-0.5
	TOTAL	Count	109	16	121	4	54	71
	Expected Count	109.0	16.0	121.0	4.0	54.0	71.0	125.0
	% within Brexit-specific identity	87.2%	12.8%	96.8%	3.2%	43.2%	56.8%	100.0%
blame ourselves	Count	48	3	49	2	30	21	51
	Expected Count	45.1	5.9	49.8	1.2	27.5	23.5	51.0
	% within Brexit-specific identity	94.1%	5.9%	96.1%	3.9%	58.8%	41.2%	100.0%
	Leaver	Adjusted Residual	1.6	-1.6	-1.0	1.0	0.9	-0.9
	Count	67	12	78	1	40	39	79
	Expected Count	69.9	9.1	77.2	1.8	42.5	36.5	79.0
	% within Brexit-specific identity	84.8%	15.2%	98.7%	1.3%	50.6%	49.4%	100.0%
	Remainer	Adjusted Residual	-1.6	1.6	1.0	-1.0	-0.9	0.9
	TOTAL	Count	115	15	127	3	70	60
	Expected Count	115.0	15.0	127.0	3.0	70.0	60.0	130.0
	% within Brexit-specific identity	88.5%	11.5%	97.7%	2.3%	53.8%	46.2%	100.0%
blame UK	Count	46	4	50	0	26	24	50
	Expected Count	42.9	7.1	49.7	0.3	25.0	25.0	50.0
	% within Brexit-specific identity	92.0%	8.0%	100.0%	0.0%	52.0%	48.0%	100.0%
	Leaver	Adjusted Residual	1.5	-1.5	0.7	-0.7	0.3	-0.3
	Count	81	17	97	1	48	50	98
	Expected Count	84.1	13.9	97.3	0.7	49.0	49.0	98.0
	% within Brexit-specific identity	82.7%	17.3%	99.0%	1.0%	49.0%	51.0%	100.0%
	Remainer	Adjusted Residual	-1.5	1.5	-0.7	0.7	-0.3	0.3
	TOTAL	Count	127	21	147	1	74	74
	Expected Count	127.0	21.0	147.0	1.0	74.0	74.0	148.0
	% within Brexit-specific identity	85.8%	14.2%	99.3%	0.7%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
no blame	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Ambiguous	Expected Count	0.8	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.6	1.0

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
	% within Brexit-specific identity	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	-1.1	1.1	
	Count	46	6	47	5	34	18	52
	Expected Count	39.1	12.9	48.9	3.1	29.3	22.7	52.0
	% within Brexit-specific identity	88.5%	11.5%	90.4%	9.6%	65.4%	34.6%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	2.8	-2.8	-1.3	1.3	1.6	-1.6	
	Count	65	31	92	4	50	46	96
	Expected Count	72.2	23.8	90.2	5.8	54.1	41.9	96.0
	% within Brexit-specific identity	67.7%	32.3%	95.8%	4.2%	52.1%	47.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.8	2.8	1.3	-1.3	-1.4	1.4	
	Count	112	37	140	9	84	65	149
	Expected Count	112.0	37.0	140.0	9.0	84.0	65.0	149.0
	% within Brexit-specific identity	75.2%	24.8%	94.0%	6.0%	56.4%	43.6%	100.0%

Adjusted residuals of ± 1.96 are significant at $p < 0.05$.

A10.3. Class

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total	
blame EU	Count	4	0	4	0	1	3	4	
	Expected Count	3.6	0.4	3.9	0.1	1.6	2.4	4.0	
	Infrequent inc combinations	% within Class	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.4	-0.4	-0.6	0.6		
	Count	25	0	25	0	10	15	25	
	Expected Count	22.4	2.6	24.2	0.8	10.0	15.0	25.0	
	% within Class	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%	
	Adjusted Residual	1.9	-1.9	1.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0		
	Count	25	3	27	1	14	14	28	
	Expected Count	25.1	2.9	27.1	0.9	11.2	16.8	28.0	
	% within Class	89.3%	10.7%	96.4%	3.6%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
	Adjusted Residual	-0.1	0.1	-0.2	0.2	1.2	-1.2		
	Count	2	1	2	1	1	2	3	
	Expected Count	2.7	0.3	2.9	0.1	1.2	1.8	3.0	
	% within Class	66.7%	33.3%	66.7%	33.3%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
	Adjusted Residual	-1.3	1.3	-3.1	3.1	-0.2	0.2		
	Count	31	5	35	1	12	24	36	
	Expected Count	32.2	3.8	34.9	1.1	14.4	21.6	36.0	
	% within Class	86.1%	13.9%	97.2%	2.8%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
	Adjusted Residual	-0.8	0.8	0.1	-0.1	-0.9	0.9		
	Count	10	2	12	0	5	7	12	
	Expected Count	10.7	1.3	11.6	0.4	4.8	7.2	12.0	
	% within Class	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	41.7%	58.3%	100.0%	
	Adjusted Residual	-0.7	0.7	0.6	-0.6	0.1	-0.1		
	Count	49	6	53	2	22	33	55	
	Expected Count	49.3	5.7	53.3	1.7	21.9	33.1	55.0	
	% within Class	89.1%	10.9%	96.4%	3.6%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%	
	Adjusted Residual	-0.1	0.1	-0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0		
	Count	146	17	158	5	65	98	163	
	Expected Count	146.0	17.0	158.0	5.0	65.0	98.0	163.0	
	% within Class	89.6%	10.4%	96.9%	3.1%	39.9%	60.1%	100.0%	
blame ourselves	Count	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	
	Infrequent inc combinations	Expected Count	2.5	0.5	2.8	0.2	1.6	1.4	3.0
	% within Class	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	1.6	-1.6	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.8	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Class	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	0.9	-0.9	
	Count	16	3	18	1	8	11	19
	Expected Count	15.9	3.1	17.9	1.1	10.1	8.9	19.0
	% within Class	84.2%	15.8%	94.7%	5.3%	42.1%	57.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.1	-0.1	0.1	-0.1	-1.0	1.0	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.8	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Class	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	-1.1	1.1	
	Count	28	11	39	0	17	22	39
	Expected Count	32.6	6.4	36.7	2.3	20.6	18.4	39.0
	% within Class	71.8%	28.2%	100.0%	0.0%	43.6%	56.4%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.3	2.3	1.8	-1.8	-1.4	1.4	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.8	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Class	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	0.9	-0.9	
	Count	23	3	25	1	17	9	26
	Expected Count	21.8	4.2	24.5	1.5	13.8	12.2	26.0
	% within Class	88.5%	11.5%	96.2%	3.8%	65.4%	34.6%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.5	-0.5	1.4	-1.4	
	Count	14	2	15	1	10	6	16
	Expected Count	13.4	2.6	15.1	0.9	8.5	7.5	16.0
	% within Class	87.5%	12.5%	93.8%	6.3%	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	-0.1	0.1	0.8	-0.8	
	Count	41	6	41	6	24	23	47
	Expected Count	39.3	7.7	44.2	2.8	24.9	22.1	47.0
	% within Class	87.2%	12.8%	87.2%	12.8%	51.1%	48.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	-2.4	2.4	-0.3	0.3	
	Count	128	25	144	9	81	72	153
	Expected Count	128.0	25.0	144.0	9.0	81.0	72.0	153.0
	% within Class	83.7%	16.3%	94.1%	5.9%	52.9%	47.1%	100.0%

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
blame UK	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
Lower middle / skilled working	% within Class	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	-1.0	1.0	
Lower middle class	Count	27	3	30	0	14	16	30
	Expected Count	26.3	3.7	29.5	0.5	15.0	15.0	30.0
	% within Class	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%	0.0%	46.7%	53.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.8	-0.8	-0.4	0.4	
Middle / skilled working class	Count	1	1	2	0	1	1	2
	Expected Count	1.8	0.2	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
	% within Class	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.6	1.6	0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.0	
Middle / working class	Count	2	1	3	0	2	1	3
	Expected Count	2.6	0.4	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
	% within Class	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.1	1.1	0.2	-0.2	0.6	-0.6	
Middle class	Count	41	3	43	1	23	21	44
	Expected Count	38.6	5.4	43.2	0.8	22.0	22.0	44.0
	% within Class	93.2%	6.8%	97.7%	2.3%	52.3%	47.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.3	-1.3	-0.3	0.3	0.4	-0.4	
Skilled working class	Count	22	4	25	1	13	13	26
	Expected Count	22.8	3.2	25.5	0.5	13.0	13.0	26.0
	% within Class	84.6%	15.4%	96.2%	3.8%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5	-0.9	0.9	0.0	0.0	
Upper middle class	Count	9	1	10	0	4	6	10
	Expected Count	8.8	1.2	9.8	0.2	5.0	5.0	10.0
	% within Class	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	0.4	-0.4	-0.7	0.7	
Working class	Count	46	8	53	1	28	26	54
	Expected Count	47.3	6.7	53.0	1.0	27.0	27.0	54.0
	% within Class	85.2%	14.8%	98.1%	1.9%	51.9%	48.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.7	0.7	-0.1	0.1	0.3	-0.3	
no blame	Count	149	21	167	3	85	85	170
	Expected Count	149.0	21.0	167.0	3.0	85.0	85.0	170.0
	% within Class	87.6%	12.4%	98.2%	1.8%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
no blame		Count	1	0	1	0	1	1

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
Lower middle / skilled working	Expected Count		0.7	0.3	1.0	0.0	0.6	0.4	1.0
	% within Class		100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual		0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	0.8	-0.8	
Lower middle class	Count		16	5	20	1	13	8	21
	Expected Count		15.6	5.4	20.0	1.0	12.8	8.2	21.0
	% within Class		76.2%	23.8%	95.2%	4.8%	61.9%	38.1%	100.0%
Middle / skilled working class	Adjusted Residual		0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	-0.1	
	Count		1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count		0.7	0.3	1.0	0.0	0.6	0.4	1.0
Middle / working class	% within Class		100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual		0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	-1.3	1.3	
	Count		1	0	1	0	0	1	1
Middle class	Expected Count		0.7	0.3	1.0	0.0	0.6	0.4	1.0
	% within Class		100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual		0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	-1.3	1.3	
Middle class	Count		34	12	44	2	29	17	46
	Expected Count		34.1	11.9	43.8	2.2	28.0	18.0	46.0
	% within Class		73.9%	26.1%	95.7%	4.3%	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
Middle class	Adjusted Residual		0.0	0.0	0.2	-0.2	0.4	-0.4	
	Count		1	1	2	0	2	0	2
	Expected Count		1.5	0.5	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
Skilled working / working class	% within Class		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual		-0.8	0.8	0.3	-0.3	1.1	-1.1	
	Count		34	9	39	4	26	17	43
Skilled working class	Expected Count		31.9	11.1	40.9	2.1	26.2	16.8	43.0
	% within Class		79.1%	20.9%	90.7%	9.3%	60.5%	39.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual		0.9	-0.9	-1.6	1.6	-0.1	0.1	
Skilled working class	Count		4	3	6	1	6	1	7
	Expected Count		5.2	1.8	6.7	0.3	4.3	2.7	7.0
	% within Class		57.1%	42.9%	85.7%	14.3%	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
Upper middle class	Adjusted Residual		-1.0	1.0	-1.2	1.2	1.4	-1.4	
	Count		31	13	44	0	24	20	44
	Expected Count		32.6	11.4	41.9	2.1	26.8	17.2	44.0
Working class	% within Class		70.5%	29.5%	100.0%	0.0%	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual		-0.6	0.6	1.7	-1.7	-1.0	1.0	
	Count		123	43	158	8	101	65	166

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
Expected Count		123.0	43.0	158.0	8.0	101.0	65.0	166.0
% within Class		74.1%	25.9%	95.2%	4.8%	60.8%	39.2%	100.0%
Adjusted residuals of ± 1.96 are significant at $p < 0.05$.								

A10.4. Cultural attachment

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
blame EU	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.8	0.2	1.0	0.0	0.4	0.6	1.0
Expat	% within Cultural Attachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.2	-0.2	-0.8	0.8	
	Count	5	1	6	0	4	2	6
Immigrant	Expected Count	4.7	1.3	5.8	0.2	2.4	3.6	6.0
	% within Cultural Attachment	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	0.4	-0.4	1.4	-1.4	
Immigrant / Other	Count	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
	Expected Count	1.6	0.4	1.9	0.1	0.8	1.2	2.0
	% within Cultural Attachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
International	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.2	-0.2	1.8	-1.8	
	Count	8	2	9	1	3	7	10
	Expected Count	7.8	2.2	9.7	0.3	4.1	5.9	10.0
International / Multi-cultural	% within Cultural Attachment	80.0%	20.0%	90.0%	10.0%	30.0%	70.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.1	-0.1	-1.7	1.7	-0.8	0.8	
	Count	1	1	2	0	1	1	2
Multi-cultural	Expected Count	1.6	0.4	1.9	0.1	0.8	1.2	2.0
	% within Cultural Attachment	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.0	1.0	0.2	-0.2	0.3	-0.3	
Westerner	Count	2	3	5	0	2	3	5
	Expected Count	3.9	1.1	4.9	0.1	2.0	3.0	5.0
	% within Cultural Attachment	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Westerner / Other	Adjusted Residual	-2.2	2.2	0.4	-0.4	0.0	0.0	
	Count	7	1	8	0	3	5	8
	Expected Count	6.3	1.7	7.8	0.2	3.2	4.8	8.0
Westerner	% within Cultural Attachment	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%	0.0%	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.5	-0.5	-0.2	0.2	
	Count	3	0	3	0	0	3	3
Westerner / Other	Expected Count	2.4	0.6	2.9	0.1	1.2	1.8	3.0
	% within Cultural Attachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.3	-0.3	-1.5	1.5	
Westerner / Other	Count	29	8	36	1	15	22	37
	Expected Count	29.0	8.0	36.0	1.0	15.0	22.0	37.0

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
	% within Cultural Attachment	78.4%	21.6%	97.3%	2.7%	40.5%	59.5%	100.0%
blame ourselves	Count	4	1	5	0	4	1	5
	Expected Count	4.5	0.5	4.8	0.2	2.6	2.4	5.0
	% within Cultural Attachment	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	Expat	Adjusted Residual	-0.9	0.9	0.5	-0.5	1.4	-1.4
		Count	4	0	3	1	3	4
		Expected Count	3.6	0.4	3.8	0.2	2.0	4.0
	Immigrant	% within Cultural Attachment	100.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	25.0%	75.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	-2.0	2.0	-1.1	1.1
		Count	1	0	1	0	1	0
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5
	Immigrant / Other	% within Cultural Attachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	0.2	-0.2	1.0	-1.0
		Count	10	0	10	0	7	3
		Expected Count	9.1	0.9	9.5	0.5	5.1	4.9
	International	% within Cultural Attachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	70.0%	30.0%
		Adjusted Residual	1.2	-1.2	0.8	-0.8	1.4	-1.4
		Count	3	0	3	0	2	1
		Expected Count	2.7	0.3	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5
	International / Multi-cultural	% within Cultural Attachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%
		Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.4	-0.4	0.6	-0.6
		Count	7	2	9	0	3	6
		Expected Count	8.2	0.8	8.6	0.4	4.6	4.4
	Multi-cultural	% within Cultural Attachment	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.5	1.5	0.7	-0.7	-1.2	1.2
		Count	10	1	10	1	4	7
		Expected Count	10.0	1.0	10.5	0.5	5.6	5.4
	Westerner	% within Cultural Attachment	90.9%	9.1%	90.9%	9.1%	36.4%	63.6%
		Adjusted Residual	0.0	0.0	-0.8	0.8	-1.1	1.1
		Count	39	4	41	2	22	21
		Expected Count	39.0	4.0	41.0	2.0	22.0	21.0
		% within Cultural Attachment	90.7%	9.3%	95.3%	4.7%	51.2%	48.8%
blame UK	Count	3	0	3		3	0	3
	Expected Count	2.3	0.7	3.0		1.2	1.8	3.0
	% within Cultural Attachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%		100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Expat	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0			2.1	-2.1

Blame condition			Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
	Expat / Other	Count	1	1	2		1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.6	0.4	2.0		0.8	1.2	2.0
		% within Cultural Attachment	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.0	1.0			0.3	-0.3	
	Immigrant	Count	8	0	8		4	4	8
		Expected Count	6.2	1.8	8.0		3.3	4.7	8.0
		% within Cultural Attachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	1.7	-1.7			0.5	-0.5	
	International	Count	10	1	11		4	7	11
		Expected Count	8.6	2.4	11.0		4.6	6.4	11.0
		% within Cultural Attachment	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%		36.4%	63.6%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	1.2	-1.2			-0.4	0.4	
	International / Multi-cultural	Count	0	2	2		1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.6	0.4	2.0		0.8	1.2	2.0
		% within Cultural Attachment	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-2.7	2.7			0.3	-0.3	
	Multi-cultural	Count	5	2	7		2	5	7
		Expected Count	5.5	1.5	7.0		2.9	4.1	7.0
		% within Cultural Attachment	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%		28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5			-0.8	0.8	
	Westerner	Count	5	2	7		2	5	7
		Expected Count	5.5	1.5	7.0		2.9	4.1	7.0
		% within Cultural Attachment	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%		28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5			-0.8	0.8	
	Westerner / Other	Count	0	1	1		0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.8	0.2	1.0		0.4	0.6	1.0
		% within Cultural Attachment	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%		0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.9	1.9			-0.9	0.9	
		Count	32	9	41		17	24	41
		Expected Count	32.0	9.0	41.0		17.0	24.0	41.0
		% within Cultural Attachment	78.0%	22.0%	100.0%		41.5%	58.5%	100.0%
no blame		Count	2	2	3	1	2	2	4
		Expected Count	2.7	1.3	3.7	0.3	2.7	1.3	4.0
		% within Cultural Attachment	50.0%	50.0%	75.0%	25.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Expat	Adjusted Residual	-0.8	0.8	-1.3	1.3	-0.8	0.8	
	Expat / Other	Count	0	1	1	0	1	0	1

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.7	0.3	1.0
	% within Cultural Attachment	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.5	1.5	0.3	-0.3	0.7	-0.7	
	Count	3	1	4	0	3	1	4
	Expected Count	2.7	1.3	3.7	0.3	2.7	1.3	4.0
	% within Cultural Attachment	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	
	Count	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.7	0.3	1.0
	% within Cultural Attachment	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.5	1.5	0.3	-0.3	0.7	-0.7	
	Count	6	3	9	0	5	4	9
	Expected Count	6.2	2.8	8.3	0.7	6.2	2.8	9.0
	% within Cultural Attachment	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.1	0.1	1.0	-1.0	-1.0	1.0	
	Count	3	2	5	0	3	2	5
	Expected Count	3.4	1.6	4.6	0.4	3.4	1.6	5.0
	% within Cultural Attachment	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.4	0.4	0.7	-0.7	-0.4	0.4	
	Count	11	2	11	2	10	3	13
	Expected Count	8.9	4.1	12.0	1.0	8.9	4.1	13.0
	% within Cultural Attachment	84.6%	15.4%	84.6%	15.4%	76.9%	23.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.5	-1.5	-1.2	1.2	0.8	-0.8	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.7	0.3	1.0
	% within Cultural Attachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.3	-0.3	0.7	-0.7	
	Count	26	12	35	3	26	12	38
	Expected Count	26.0	12.0	35.0	3.0	26.0	12.0	38.0
	% within Cultural Attachment	68.4%	31.6%	92.1%	7.9%	68.4%	31.6%	100.0%
Adjusted residuals of ± 1.96 are significant at $p < 0.05$.								

A10.5. Gender

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
blame EU	Count	111	15	119	7	59	67	126
	Expected Count	111.1	14.9	120.3	5.7	58.4	67.6	126.0
	% within Gender	88.1%	11.9%	94.4%	5.6%	46.8%	53.2%	100.0%
	Man	Adjusted Residual	0.0	0.0	-1.0	1.0	0.2	-0.2
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Gender	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Other	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	1.1	-1.1
	Count	44	6	49	1	22	28	50
	Expected Count	44.1	5.9	47.7	2.3	23.2	26.8	50.0
	% within Gender	88.0%	12.0%	98.0%	2.0%	44.0%	56.0%	100.0%
	Woman	Adjusted Residual	0.0	0.0	1.0	-1.0	-0.4	0.4
	Count	156	21	169	8	82	95	177
	Expected Count	156.0	21.0	169.0	8.0	82.0	95.0	177.0
	% within Gender	88.1%	11.9%	95.5%	4.5%	46.3%	53.7%	100.0%
blame ourselves	Count	94	15	101	8	57	52	109
	Expected Count	93.7	15.3	103.3	5.7	57.4	51.6	109.0
	% within Gender	86.2%	13.8%	92.7%	7.3%	52.3%	47.7%	100.0%
	Man	Adjusted Residual	0.1	-0.1	-1.6	1.6	-0.1	0.1
	Count	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	1.9	0.1	1.1	0.9	2.0
	% within Gender	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Non-binary	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	1.3	-1.3
	Count	51	9	59	1	31	29	60
	Expected Count	51.6	8.4	56.8	3.2	31.6	28.4	60.0
	% within Gender	85.0%	15.0%	98.3%	1.7%	51.7%	48.3%	100.0%
	Woman	Adjusted Residual	-0.3	0.3	1.5	-1.5	-0.2	0.2
	Count	147	24	162	9	90	81	171
	Expected Count	147.0	24.0	162.0	9.0	90.0	81.0	171.0
	% within Gender	86.0%	14.0%	94.7%	5.3%	52.6%	47.4%	100.0%
blame UK	Count	109	19	125	3	61	67	128
	Expected Count	111.8	16.2	124.1	3.9	65.6	62.4	128.0
	% within Gender	85.2%	14.8%	97.7%	2.3%	47.7%	52.3%	100.0%
	Man	Adjusted Residual	-1.2	1.2	0.8	-0.8	-1.4	1.4

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
	Non-binary	Count	1	0	1	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Gender	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-1.0	1.0	
	Other	Count	1	0	1	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Gender	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	1.0	-1.0	
	Woman	Count	61	6	64	39	28	67
		Expected Count	58.5	8.5	65.0	34.4	32.6	67.0
		% within Gender	91.0%	9.0%	95.5%	58.2%	41.8%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	1.1	-1.1	-0.8	1.4	-1.4	
no blame	Man	Count	172	25	191	6	101	197
		Expected Count	172.0	25.0	191.0	6.0	101.0	197.0
		% within Gender	87.3%	12.7%	97.0%	3.0%	51.3%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual						
	Non-binary	Count	96	41	126	11	92	137
		Expected Count	97.9	39.1	127.9	9.1	89.4	137.0
		% within Gender	70.1%	29.9%	92.0%	8.0%	67.2%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.6	0.6	-1.1	1.1	0.8	-0.8
	Other	Count	4	3	6	1	6	7
		Expected Count	5.0	2.0	6.5	0.5	4.6	7.0
		% within Gender	57.1%	42.9%	85.7%	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.9	0.9	-0.8	0.8	1.2	-1.2
	Woman	Count	1	1	2	0	2	2
		Expected Count	1.4	0.6	1.9	0.1	1.3	2.0
		% within Gender	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.7	0.7	0.4	-0.4	1.0	-1.0
	Man	Count	49	15	62	2	37	64
		Expected Count	45.7	18.3	59.7	4.3	41.8	64.0
		% within Gender	76.6%	23.4%	96.9%	3.1%	57.8%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	1.1	-1.1	1.4	-1.4	-1.5	1.5
	Non-binary	Count	150	60	196	14	137	210
		Expected Count	150.0	60.0	196.0	14.0	137.0	210.0
		% within Gender	71.4%	28.6%	93.3%	6.7%	65.2%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual						

Adjusted residuals of ± 1.96 are significant at $p < 0.05$.

A10.6. General Election voting issue

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
blame EU	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.4	0.6	1.0
Crime	% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-0.8	0.8	
Economy	Count	5	1	6	0	3	3	6
	Expected Count	5.3	0.7	5.7	0.3	2.3	3.7	6.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.4	0.4	0.5	-0.5	0.7	-0.7	
Education	Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
	Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.9	0.1	0.8	1.2	2.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.3	-0.3	0.4	-0.4	
Environment / Climate Change	Count	10	0	10	0	2	8	10
	Expected Count	8.8	1.2	9.6	0.4	3.8	6.2	10.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.2	-1.2	0.7	-0.7	-1.2	1.2	
Family Life / Childcare	Count	2	1	3	0	3	0	3
	Expected Count	2.7	0.3	2.9	0.1	1.1	1.9	3.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.2	1.2	0.4	-0.4	2.3	-2.3	
Health	Count	5	0	5	0	2	3	5
	Expected Count	4.4	0.6	4.8	0.2	1.9	3.1	5.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.5	-0.5	0.1	-0.1	
Housing	Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	2.7	0.3	2.9	0.1	1.1	1.9	3.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.4	-0.4	-0.2	0.2	
I would rather not say	Count	2	0	2	0	0	2	2
	Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.9	0.1	0.8	1.2	2.0
Immigration and Asylum	% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.3	-0.3	-1.1	1.1	
	Count	4	0	4	0	3	1	4
	Expected Count	3.5	0.5	3.8	0.2	1.5	2.5	4.0

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
		% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.4	-0.4	1.6	-1.6	
		Count	6	0	6	0	1	5	6
		Expected Count	5.3	0.7	5.7	0.3	2.3	3.7	6.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.5	-0.5	-1.1	1.1	
		Count	19	3	19	3	8	14	22
		Expected Count	19.4	2.6	21.0	1.0	8.3	13.7	22.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	86.4%	13.6%	86.4%	13.6%	36.4%	63.6%	100.0%
	Relationship with the EU (Brexit)	Adjusted Residual	-0.4	0.4	-2.6	2.6	-0.2	0.2	
		Count	1	1	2	0	2	0	2
		Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.9	0.1	0.8	1.2	2.0
	Tax	% within Most important GE voting issue	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.7	1.7	0.3	-0.3	1.8	-1.8	
		Count	1	1	2	0	0	2	2
	Unsure	Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.9	0.1	0.8	1.2	2.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.7	1.7	0.3	-0.3	-1.1	1.1	
	Will not vote	Count	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.4	0.6	1.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-2.8	2.8	0.2	-0.2	-0.8	0.8	
		Count	61	8	66	3	26	43	69
		Expected Count	61.0	8.0	66.0	3.0	26.0	43.0	69.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	88.4%	11.6%	95.7%	4.3%	37.7%	62.3%	100.0%
blame ourselves	Economy	Count	5	0	4	1	3	2	5
		Expected Count	4.2	0.8	4.4	0.6	2.1	2.9	5.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	-0.7	0.7	0.8	-0.8	
		Count	3	2	3	2	2	3	5
		Expected Count	4.2	0.8	4.4	0.6	2.1	2.9	5.0
	Education	% within Most important GE voting issue	60.0%	40.0%	60.0%	40.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.5	1.5	-2.1	2.1	-0.1	0.1	
		Count	4	1	5	0	1	4	5
	Environment / Climate Change	Expected Count	4.2	0.8	4.4	0.6	2.1	2.9	5.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.0%	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
		Adjusted Residual	-0.2	0.2	0.8	-0.8	-1.0	1.0	
		Count	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.8	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.4	0.6	1.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Family Life / Childcare	Adjusted Residual	-2.3	2.3	0.4	-0.4	-0.9	0.9	
		Count	6	2	8	0	3	5	8
		Expected Count	6.7	1.3	7.1	0.9	3.4	4.6	8.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
	Health	Adjusted Residual	-0.7	0.7	1.1	-1.1	-0.3	0.3	
		Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.8	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.4	0.6	1.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Housing	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.4	-0.4	-0.9	0.9	
		Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.8	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.4	0.6	1.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	I would rather not say	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.4	-0.4	-0.9	0.9	
		Count	1	1	2	0	2	0	2
		Expected Count	1.7	0.3	1.8	0.2	0.8	1.2	2.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Immigration and Asylum	Adjusted Residual	-1.3	1.3	0.5	-0.5	1.7	-1.7	
		Count	8	2	10	0	3	7	10
		Expected Count	8.4	1.6	8.9	1.1	4.2	5.8	10.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.0%	30.0%	70.0%	100.0%
	Other (please specify)	Adjusted Residual	-0.4	0.4	1.2	-1.2	-0.8	0.8	
		Count	33	2	30	5	15	20	35
		Expected Count	29.4	5.6	31.1	3.9	14.7	20.3	35.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	94.3%	5.7%	85.7%	14.3%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	Relationship with the EU (Brexit)	Adjusted Residual	2.2	-2.2	-0.8	0.8	0.1	-0.1	
		Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.8	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.4	0.6	1.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Tax	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.4	-0.4	1.2	-1.2	
		Count	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.8	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.4	0.6	1.0
	Transport	% within Most important GE voting issue	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Blame condition			Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
		Adjusted Residual	-2.3	2.3	0.4	-0.4	-0.9	0.9	
		Count	3	1	4	0	2	2	4
		Expected Count	3.4	0.6	3.6	0.4	1.7	2.3	4.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Unsure	Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5	0.7	-0.7	0.3	-0.3	
		Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.8	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.4	0.6	1.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Welfare Benefits	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.4	-0.4	1.2	-1.2	
		Count	1	0	0	1	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.8	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.4	0.6	1.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Will not vote	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	-2.8	2.8	1.2	-1.2	
		Count	68	13	72	9	34	47	81
		Expected Count	68.0	13.0	72.0	9.0	34.0	47.0	81.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	84.0%	16.0%	88.9%	11.1%	42.0%	58.0%	100.0%
blame UK		Count	1	1	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	0.9	1.1	2.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Crime	Adjusted Residual	-1.4	1.4	0.2	-0.2	0.1	-0.1	
		Count	1	1	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	0.9	1.1	2.0
	Defence and Security	% within Most important GE voting issue	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.4	1.4	0.2	-0.2	0.1	-0.1	
		Count	8	1	9	0	3	6	9
	Economy	Expected Count	7.7	1.3	8.9	0.1	4.2	4.8	9.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	0.3	-0.3	-0.9	0.9	
	Education	Count	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Environment / Climate Change	Adjusted Residual	-2.4	2.4	0.1	-0.1	-0.9	0.9	
		Count	7	2	9	0	2	7	9
		Expected Count	7.7	1.3	8.9	0.1	4.2	4.8	9.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%	0.0%	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.6	0.6	0.3	-0.3	-1.6	1.6	

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
	Family Life / Childcare	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	1.1	-1.1	
	Health	Count	4	1	5	0	4	1	5
		Expected Count	4.3	0.7	4.9	0.1	2.4	2.6	5.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.3	0.3	0.2	-0.2	1.5	-1.5	
	Housing	Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
		Expected Count	2.6	0.4	3.0	0.0	1.4	1.6	3.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.2	-0.2	-0.5	0.5	
	Immigration and Asylum	Count	3	0	3	0	0	3	3
		Expected Count	2.6	0.4	3.0	0.0	1.4	1.6	3.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.2	-0.2	-1.7	1.7	
	Other (please specify)	Count	10	0	9	1	5	5	10
		Expected Count	8.5	1.5	9.9	0.1	4.7	5.3	10.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	90.0%	10.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	1.4	-1.4	-2.8	2.8	0.2	-0.2	
	Relationship with the EU (Brexit)	Count	30	6	36	0	20	16	36
		Expected Count	30.6	5.4	35.6	0.4	17.0	19.0	36.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.4	0.4	0.8	-0.8	1.3	-1.3	
	Tax	Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	0.9	1.1	2.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	0.1	-0.1	
	Unsure	Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
		Expected Count	2.6	0.4	3.0	0.0	1.4	1.6	3.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.2	-0.2	-0.5	0.5	
	Will not vote	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	1.1	-1.1	

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
	Count	74	13	86	1	41	46	87
	Expected Count	74.0	13.0	86.0	1.0	41.0	46.0	87.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	85.1%	14.9%	98.9%	1.1%	47.1%	52.9%	100.0%
no blame	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.6	0.4	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Crime	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	0.8	-0.8	
	Count	3	2	5	0	2	3	5
	Expected Count	3.2	1.8	4.5	0.5	3.0	2.0	5.0
Economy	% within Most important GE voting issue	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.2	0.2	0.8	-0.8	-1.0	1.0	
	Count	1	1	2	0	2	0	2
Education	Expected Count	1.3	0.7	1.8	0.2	1.2	0.8	2.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.4	0.4	0.5	-0.5	1.1	-1.1	
Environment / Climate Change	Count	5	2	5	2	5	2	7
	Expected Count	4.4	2.6	6.2	0.8	4.3	2.7	7.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	71.4%	28.6%	71.4%	28.6%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
Family Life / Childcare	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	-1.6	1.6	0.6	-0.6	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.6	0.4	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
Health	% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	0.8	-0.8	
	Count	1	4	5	0	3	2	5
Housing	Expected Count	3.2	1.8	4.5	0.5	3.0	2.0	5.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.1	2.1	0.8	-0.8	0.0	0.0	
Immigration and Asylum	Count	2	2	4	0	2	2	4
	Expected Count	2.5	1.5	3.6	0.4	2.4	1.6	4.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Other (please specify)	Adjusted Residual	-0.6	0.6	0.7	-0.7	-0.5	0.5	
	Count	4	1	5	0	4	1	5
	Expected Count	3.2	1.8	4.5	0.5	3.0	2.0	5.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.8	-0.8	0.9	-0.9	
	Count	4	2	6	0	3	3	6

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
	Expected Count	3.8	2.2	5.3	0.7	3.7	2.3	6.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	0.9	-0.9	-0.6	0.6	
	Count	1	0	0	1	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.6	0.4	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Pensions	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	-2.9	2.9	0.8	-0.8	
	Count	26	14	34	6	25	15	40
	Expected Count	25.4	14.6	35.6	4.4	24.4	15.6	40.0
Relationship with the EU (Brexit)	% within Most important GE voting issue	65.0%	35.0%	85.0%	15.0%	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	-1.1	1.1	0.3	-0.3	
	Count	1	1	2	0	0	2	2
	Expected Count	1.3	0.7	1.8	0.2	1.2	0.8	2.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.4	0.4	0.5	-0.5	-1.8	1.8	
Tax	Count	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.6	0.4	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Unsure	Adjusted Residual	-1.3	1.3	0.4	-0.4	0.8	-0.8	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.6	0.4	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	-1.3	1.3	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
Welfare Benefits	Expected Count	0.6	0.4	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	-1.3	1.3	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.6	0.4	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Will not vote	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	-1.3	1.3	
	Count	52	30	73	9	50	32	82
	Expected Count	52.0	30.0	73.0	9.0	50.0	32.0	82.0
	% within Most important GE voting issue	63.4%	36.6%	89.0%	11.0%	61.0%	39.0%	100.0%
Adjusted residuals of ±1.96 are significant at p<0.05.								

A10.7. Generation

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
blame EU	Count	11	0	11	0	5	6	11
	Expected Count	9.1	1.9	10.8	0.2	5.0	6.0	11.0
	% within GENERATION	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.7	-1.7	0.5	-0.5	0.0	0.0	
	Count	8	3	11	0	3	8	11
	Expected Count	9.1	1.9	10.8	0.2	5.0	6.0	11.0
	% within GENERATION	72.7%	27.3%	100.0%	0.0%	27.3%	72.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.0	1.0	0.5	-0.5	-1.4	1.4	
	Count	30	7	36	1	19	18	37
	Expected Count	30.7	6.3	36.4	0.6	16.9	20.1	37.0
	% within GENERATION	81.1%	18.9%	97.3%	2.7%	51.4%	48.6%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5	-0.8	0.8	1.1	-1.1	
	Count	49	10	58	1	27	32	59
	Expected Count	49.0	10.0	58.0	1.0	27.0	32.0	59.0
	% within GENERATION	83.1%	16.9%	98.3%	1.7%	45.8%	54.2%	100.0%
	TOTAL							
blame ourselves	Count	3	0	3	0	2	1	3
	Expected Count	2.3	0.7	2.9	0.1	1.8	1.2	3.0
	% within GENERATION	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	
	Count	6	0	6	0	3	3	6
	Expected Count	4.6	1.4	5.7	0.3	3.6	2.4	6.0
	% within GENERATION	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.5	-1.5	0.6	-0.6	-0.6	0.6	
	Count	3	2	4	1	4	1	5
	Expected Count	3.8	1.2	4.8	0.2	3.0	2.0	5.0
	% within GENERATION	60.0%	40.0%	80.0%	20.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.9	0.9	-1.7	1.7	1.0	-1.0	
	Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
	Expected Count	1.5	0.5	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
	% within GENERATION	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.3	-0.3	-0.3	0.3	
	Count	19	8	26	1	16	11	27
	Expected Count	20.7	6.3	25.7	1.3	16.3	10.7	27.0
	% within GENERATION	70.4%	29.6%	96.3%	3.7%	59.3%	40.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.3	1.3	0.4	-0.4	-0.2	0.2	

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
blame UK	TOTAL	Count	33	10	41	2	26	17	43
		Expected Count	33.0	10.0	41.0	2.0	26.0	17.0	43.0
		% within GENERATION	76.7%	23.3%	95.3%	4.7%	60.5%	39.5%	100.0%
		Count	3	0	3	0	3	0	3
		Expected Count	2.6	0.4	3.0	0.0	1.2	1.8	3.0
		% within GENERATION	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Baby Boomer	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.2	-0.2	2.1	-2.1	
		Count	13	0	13	0	4	9	13
		Expected Count	11.4	1.6	12.8	0.2	5.3	7.7	13.0
	Gen X	% within GENERATION	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	30.8%	69.2%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	1.5	-1.5	0.5	-0.5	-0.8	0.8	
		Count	10	4	14	0	5	9	14
		Expected Count	12.3	1.8	13.8	0.2	5.7	8.3	14.0
		% within GENERATION	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	0.0%	35.7%	64.3%	100.0%
	Gen Z	Adjusted Residual	-2.1	2.1	0.5	-0.5	-0.4	0.4	
		Count	30	4	33	1	14	20	34
		Expected Count	29.8	4.3	33.5	0.5	13.8	20.2	34.0
	Millennial	% within GENERATION	88.2%	11.8%	97.1%	2.9%	41.2%	58.8%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	-0.9	0.9	0.1	-0.1	
		Count	56	8	63	1	26	38	64
	TOTAL	Expected Count	56.0	8.0	63.0	1.0	26.0	38.0	64.0
		% within GENERATION	87.5%	12.5%	98.4%	1.6%	40.6%	59.4%	100.0%
		Count	3	0	3	0	2	1	3
no blame		Expected Count	2.1	0.9	2.7	0.3	1.6	1.4	3.0
		% within GENERATION	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	1.1	-1.1	0.6	-0.6	0.5	-0.5	
	Baby Boomer	Count	7	1	7	1	3	5	8
		Expected Count	5.6	2.4	7.3	0.7	4.2	3.8	8.0
		% within GENERATION	87.5%	12.5%	87.5%	12.5%	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
	Gen X	Adjusted Residual	1.1	-1.1	-0.4	0.4	-0.9	0.9	
		Count	4	5	7	2	6	3	9
		Expected Count	6.4	2.6	8.2	0.8	4.8	4.2	9.0
		% within GENERATION	44.4%	55.6%	77.8%	22.2%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.8	1.8	-1.5	1.5	0.9	-0.9	
		Count	3	1	4	0	2	2	4
	Greatest Generation	Expected Count	2.8	1.2	3.6	0.4	2.1	1.9	4.0
		% within GENERATION	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
		Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	0.6	-0.6	-0.1	0.1	
		Count	28	13	38	3	22	19	41
		Expected Count	28.9	12.1	37.4	3.6	21.7	19.3	41.0
		% within GENERATION	68.3%	31.7%	92.7%	7.3%	53.7%	46.3%	100.0%
	Millennial	Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5	0.5	-0.5	0.1	-0.1	
		Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
		Expected Count	2.1	0.9	2.7	0.3	1.6	1.4	3.0
		% within GENERATION	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Silent Generation	Adjusted Residual	1.1	-1.1	0.6	-0.6	-0.7	0.7	
		Count	48	20	62	6	36	32	68
		Expected Count	48.0	20.0	62.0	6.0	36.0	32.0	68.0
		% within GENERATION	70.6%	29.4%	91.2%	8.8%	52.9%	47.1%	100.0%
	TOTAL								

Adjusted residuals of ± 1.96 are significant at $p < 0.05$.

A10.8. Geoattachment

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
blame EU	Count	36	2	37	1	18	20	38
	Expected Count	33.7	4.3	36.6	1.4	17.1	20.9	38.0
British	% within Geoattachment	94.7%	5.3%	97.4%	2.6%	47.4%	52.6%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.3	-1.3	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	
	Count	10	1	9	2	5	6	11
British / English	Expected Count	9.8	1.3	10.6	0.4	5.0	6.0	11.0
	% within Geoattachment	90.9%	9.1%	81.8%	18.2%	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	-2.6	2.6	0.0	0.0	
British / English / Londoner	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
British / English / Northerner	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	3	0	3	0	3	0	3
	Expected Count	2.7	0.3	2.9	0.1	1.4	1.6	3.0
British / English / Rural	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	1.9	-1.9	
	Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
British / English / Southerner	Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.9	0.1	0.9	1.1	2.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.3	-0.3	0.1	-0.1	
British / English / Londoner	Count	2	0	1	1	0	2	2
	Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.9	0.1	0.9	1.1	2.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
British / English / Southerner	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	-3.4	3.4	-1.3	1.3	
	Count	2	2	4	0	3	1	4
	Expected Count	3.5	0.5	3.8	0.2	1.8	2.2	4.0
British / Londoner	% within Geoattachment	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.5	2.5	0.4	-0.4	1.2	-1.2	
British / Northerner	Count	9	1	9	1	4	6	10
	Expected Count	8.9	1.1	9.6	0.4	4.5	5.5	10.0
	% within Geoattachment	90.0%	10.0%	90.0%	10.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
British / Other	Adjusted Residual	0.1	-0.1	-1.0	1.0	-0.3	0.3	
	Count	4	2	6	0	1	5	6
	Expected Count	5.3	0.7	5.8	0.2	2.7	3.3	6.0
	% within Geoattachment	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.7	1.7	0.5	-0.5	-1.4	1.4	

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
		Count	2	1	3	0	2	1	3
		Expected Count	2.7	0.3	2.9	0.1	1.4	1.6	3.0
		% within Geoattachment	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.2	1.2	0.3	-0.3	0.8	-0.8	
British / Rural		Count	3	0	3	0	3	0	3
		Expected Count	2.7	0.3	2.9	0.1	1.4	1.6	3.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	1.9	-1.9	
British / Scottish		Count	5	1	6	0	2	4	6
		Expected Count	5.3	0.7	5.8	0.2	2.7	3.3	6.0
		% within Geoattachment	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.4	0.4	0.5	-0.5	-0.6	0.6	
British / Southerner		Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.9	0.1	0.9	1.1	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.3	-0.3	0.1	-0.1	
British / Welsh		Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-0.9	0.9	
Celtic		Count	3	3	6	0	2	4	6
		Expected Count	5.3	0.7	5.8	0.2	2.7	3.3	6.0
		% within Geoattachment	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-3.0	3.0	0.5	-0.5	-0.6	0.6	
City person		Count	30	8	38	0	17	21	38
		Expected Count	33.7	4.3	36.6	1.4	17.1	20.9	38.0
		% within Geoattachment	78.9%	21.1%	100.0%	0.0%	44.7%	55.3%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-2.0	2.0	1.3	-1.3	0.0	0.0	
English		Count	5	0	5	0	4	1	5
		Expected Count	4.4	0.6	4.8	0.2	2.3	2.7	5.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	1.6	-1.6	
English / City		Count	2	0	2	0	0	2	2
		Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.9	0.1	0.9	1.1	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.3	-0.3	-1.3	1.3	
English / Londoner		Count	2	1	3	0	1	2	3
		Adjusted Residual							
English / Northerner		Count							
		Adjusted Residual							

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
	Expected Count	2.7	0.3	2.9	0.1	1.4	1.6	3.0
	% within Geoattachment	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.2	1.2	0.3	-0.3	-0.4	0.4	
English / Rural person	Count	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
	Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.9	0.1	0.9	1.1	2.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
English / Southerner	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.3	-0.3	1.6	-1.6	
	Count	5	0	5	0	2	3	5
	Expected Count	4.4	0.6	4.8	0.2	2.3	2.7	5.0
European	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	-0.2	0.2	
	Count	11	0	11	0	9	2	11
European / British	Expected Count	9.8	1.3	10.6	0.4	5.0	6.0	11.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.2	-1.2	0.7	-0.7	2.5	-2.5	
European / British / English	Count	7	0	7	0	3	4	7
	Expected Count	6.2	0.8	6.7	0.3	3.2	3.8	7.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
European / British / Londoner	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	0.5	-0.5	-0.1	0.1	
	Count	1	1	2	0	2	0	2
	Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.9	0.1	0.9	1.1	2.0
European / British / Other	% within Geoattachment	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.7	1.7	0.3	-0.3	1.6	-1.6	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
European / City	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	1.1	-1.1	
European / English	Count	3	0	3	0	2	1	3
	Expected Count	2.7	0.3	2.9	0.1	1.4	1.6	3.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
European / English	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	0.8	-0.8	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
European / English	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	2	1	3	0	3	0	3
European / English	Expected Count	2.7	0.3	2.9	0.1	1.4	1.6	3.0

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
	% within Geoattachment	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.2	1.2	0.3	-0.3	1.9	-1.9	
	Count	5	0	4	1	1	4	5
	Expected Count	4.4	0.6	4.8	0.2	2.3	2.7	5.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	-1.9	1.9	-1.1	1.1	
	Count	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
European / Irish	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	-5.0	5.0	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
European / Irish / Celtic	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
European / Londoner	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	1.1	-1.1	
European / Northerner	Count	4	0	4	0	0	4	4
	Expected Count	3.5	0.5	3.8	0.2	1.8	2.2	4.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.4	-0.4	-1.8	1.8	
	Count	7	0	6	1	2	5	7
European / Other	Expected Count	6.2	0.8	6.7	0.3	3.2	3.8	7.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	85.7%	14.3%	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	-1.5	1.5	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
European / Scottish	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
European / Southerner	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-0.9	0.9	
European / Welsh	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
Infrequent	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-0.9	0.9	
		Count	8	1	8	1	4	5	9
		Expected Count	8.0	1.0	8.7	0.3	4.1	4.9	9.0
Irish		% within Geoattachment	88.9%	11.1%	88.9%	11.1%	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.0	0.0	-1.2	1.2	0.0	0.0	
		Count	1	1	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.9	0.1	0.9	1.1	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.7	1.7	0.3	-0.3	0.1	-0.1	
Irish / City		Count	1	2	3	0	3	0	3
		Expected Count	2.7	0.3	2.9	0.1	1.4	1.6	3.0
		% within Geoattachment	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Londoner		Adjusted Residual	-3.0	3.0	0.3	-0.3	1.9	-1.9	
		Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	1.1	-1.1	
		Count	6	1	7	0	3	4	7
		Expected Count	6.2	0.8	6.7	0.3	3.2	3.8	7.0
		% within Geoattachment	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.2	0.2	0.5	-0.5	-0.1	0.1	
Northerner		Count	5	0	4	1	3	2	5
		Expected Count	4.4	0.6	4.8	0.2	2.3	2.7	5.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Rural person		Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	-1.9	1.9	0.7	-0.7	
		Count	18	1	19	0	4	15	19
		Expected Count	16.8	2.2	18.3	0.7	8.6	10.4	19.0
		% within Geoattachment	94.7%	5.3%	100.0%	0.0%	21.1%	78.9%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.9	-0.9	-2.2	2.2	
		Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
Scottish		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-0.9	0.9	
Scottish / Celtic		Count	2	0	2	0	0	2	2
		Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.9	0.1	0.9	1.1	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Scottish / City		Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.3	-0.3	-1.3	1.3	

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
Blame condition	Scottish / Rural	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	1.1	-1.1	
	Southerner	Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.9	0.1	0.9	1.1	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.3	-0.3	0.1	-0.1	
	Southerner / Other	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-0.9	0.9	
	Welsh	Count	6	0	6	0	3	3	6
		Expected Count	5.3	0.7	5.8	0.2	2.7	3.3	6.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.5	-0.5	0.2	-0.2	
	Welsh / Other	Count	2	0	2	0	0	2	2
		Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.9	0.1	0.9	1.1	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.3	-0.3	-1.3	1.3	
	TOTAL	Count	234	30	254	10	119	145	264
		Expected Count	234.0	30.0	254.0	10.0	119.0	145.0	264.0
		% within Geoattachment	88.6%	11.4%	96.2%	3.8%	45.1%	54.9%	100.0%
blame ourselves	British	Count	28	6	29	5	21	13	34
		Expected Count	29.7	4.3	31.9	2.1	18.6	15.4	34.0
		% within Geoattachment	82.4%	17.6%	85.3%	14.7%	61.8%	38.2%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.9	0.9	-2.2	2.2	0.9	-0.9	
	British / City	Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.7	0.3	1.9	0.1	1.1	0.9	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.4	-0.4	-0.1	0.1	
	British / English	Count	6	0	6	0	2	4	6
		Expected Count	5.2	0.8	5.6	0.4	3.3	2.7	6.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.6	-0.6	-1.1	1.1	
	British / English / Londoner	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	0.9	-0.9	
	Count	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
British / English / Northerner	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	1.9	0.1	1.1	0.9	2.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.4	-0.4	1.3	-1.3	
British / English / Southerner	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
British / Irish	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	0.9	-0.9	
	Count	2	1	3	0	2	1	3
	Expected Count	2.6	0.4	2.8	0.2	1.6	1.4	3.0
British / Londoner	% within Geoattachment	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.1	1.1	0.4	-0.4	0.4	-0.4	
	Count	1	1	1	1	2	0	2
British / Northerner	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	1.9	0.1	1.1	0.9	2.0
	% within Geoattachment	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.6	1.6	-2.6	2.6	1.3	-1.3	
British / Other	Count	3	1	4	0	1	3	4
	Expected Count	3.5	0.5	3.8	0.2	2.2	1.8	4.0
	% within Geoattachment	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
British / Rural	Adjusted Residual	-0.7	0.7	0.5	-0.5	-1.2	1.2	
	Count	7	1	8	0	5	3	8
	Expected Count	7.0	1.0	7.5	0.5	4.4	3.6	8.0
British / Scottish	% within Geoattachment	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%	0.0%	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.0	0.0	0.7	-0.7	0.5	-0.5	
	Count	4	2	6	0	3	3	6
British / Welsh	Expected Count	5.2	0.8	5.6	0.4	3.3	2.7	6.0
	% within Geoattachment	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.5	1.5	0.6	-0.6	-0.2	0.2	
British / Welsh	Count	5	1	5	1	3	3	6
	Expected Count	5.2	0.8	5.6	0.4	3.3	2.7	6.0
	% within Geoattachment	83.3%	16.7%	83.3%	16.7%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
British / Welsh	Adjusted Residual	-0.3	0.3	-1.1	1.1	-0.2	0.2	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
British / Welsh	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	0.9	-0.9	
		Count	6	0	6	0	4	2	6
		Expected Count	5.2	0.8	5.6	0.4	3.3	2.7	6.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
City person		Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.6	-0.6	0.6	-0.6	
		Count	27	4	29	2	20	11	31
		Expected Count	27.1	3.9	29.1	1.9	17.0	14.0	31.0
		% within Geoattachment	87.1%	12.9%	93.5%	6.5%	64.5%	35.5%	100.0%
English		Adjusted Residual	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.1	1.2	-1.2	
		Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
English / City		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	0.9	-0.9	
		Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.7	0.3	1.9	0.1	1.1	0.9	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
English / Londoner		Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.4	-0.4	-0.1	0.1	
		Count	4	1	5	0	2	3	5
		Expected Count	4.4	0.6	4.7	0.3	2.7	2.3	5.0
		% within Geoattachment	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
English / Northerner		Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5	0.6	-0.6	-0.7	0.7	
		Count	4	0	4	0	2	2	4
		Expected Count	3.5	0.5	3.8	0.2	2.2	1.8	4.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
English / Other		Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.5	-0.5	-0.2	0.2	
		Count	4	0	4	0	3	1	4
		Expected Count	3.5	0.5	3.8	0.2	2.2	1.8	4.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
English / Rural person		Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.5	-0.5	0.8	-0.8	
		Count	1	1	2	0	2	0	2
		Expected Count	1.7	0.3	1.9	0.1	1.1	0.9	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
English / Southerner		Adjusted Residual	-1.6	1.6	0.4	-0.4	1.3	-1.3	
		Count	18	3	21	0	13	8	21
		Expected Count	18.3	2.7	19.7	1.3	11.5	9.5	21.0
		% within Geoattachment	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	0.0%	61.9%	38.1%	100.0%
European		Adjusted Residual	-0.2	0.2	1.2	-1.2	0.7	-0.7	

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
		Count	6	2	8	0	4	4	8
		Expected Count	7.0	1.0	7.5	0.5	4.4	3.6	8.0
		% within Geoattachment	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.1	1.1	0.7	-0.7	-0.3	0.3	
European / British		Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	0.9	-0.9	
European / British / English		Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.7	0.3	1.9	0.1	1.1	0.9	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.4	-0.4	-0.1	0.1	
European / British / Irish		Count	1	0	0	1	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	-3.9	3.9	0.9	-0.9	
European / British / Londoner		Count	4	0	4	0	3	1	4
		Expected Count	3.5	0.5	3.8	0.2	2.2	1.8	4.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.5	-0.5	0.8	-0.8	
European / British / Other		Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	0.9	-0.9	
European / British / Scottish		Count	3	1	3	1	2	2	4
		Expected Count	3.5	0.5	3.8	0.2	2.2	1.8	4.0
		% within Geoattachment	75.0%	25.0%	75.0%	25.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.7	0.7	-1.6	1.6	-0.2	0.2	
European / City		Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	-1.1	1.1	
European / English		Count	3	0	3	0	0	3	3
		Expected Count	2.6	0.4	2.8	0.2	1.6	1.4	3.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.4	-0.4	-1.9	1.9	
European / Irish		Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
		Adjusted Residual							
European / Irish / Celtic		Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
		Adjusted Residual							

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	-1.1	1.1	
European / Northerner	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
European / Other	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	-1.1	1.1	
	Count	5	0	4	1	2	3	5
	Expected Count	4.4	0.6	4.7	0.3	2.7	2.3	5.0
European / Scottish	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	-1.3	1.3	-0.7	0.7	
	Count	6	0	6	0	3	3	6
European / Southerner	Expected Count	5.2	0.8	5.6	0.4	3.3	2.7	6.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.6	-0.6	-0.2	0.2	
European / Welsh	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Irish	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	0.9	-0.9	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
Irish / English	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	-1.1	1.1	
	Count	5	1	5	1	5	1	6
Irish / Other	Expected Count	5.2	0.8	5.6	0.4	3.3	2.7	6.0
	% within Geoattachment	83.3%	16.7%	83.3%	16.7%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.3	0.3	-1.1	1.1	1.4	-1.4	
Londoner	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	-1.1	1.1	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	-1.1	1.1	
	Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	1.9	0.1	1.1	0.9	2.0

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.4	-0.4	-0.1	0.1	
	Count	2	0	2	0	0	2	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	1.9	0.1	1.1	0.9	2.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.4	-0.4	-1.6	1.6	
	Count	3	1	4	0	0	4	4
	Expected Count	3.5	0.5	3.8	0.2	2.2	1.8	4.0
	% within Geoattachment	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.7	0.7	0.5	-0.5	-2.2	2.2	
	Count	3	1	4	0	2	2	4
	Expected Count	3.5	0.5	3.8	0.2	2.2	1.8	4.0
	% within Geoattachment	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.7	0.7	0.5	-0.5	-0.2	0.2	
	Count	16	2	16	2	7	11	18
	Expected Count	15.7	2.3	16.9	1.1	9.8	8.2	18.0
	% within Geoattachment	88.9%	11.1%	88.9%	11.1%	38.9%	61.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	-0.9	0.9	-1.4	1.4	
	Count	4	0	4	0	2	2	4
	Expected Count	3.5	0.5	3.8	0.2	2.2	1.8	4.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.5	-0.5	-0.2	0.2	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	-1.1	1.1	
	Count	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	1.9	0.1	1.1	0.9	2.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.4	-0.4	1.3	-1.3	
	Count	5	1	6	0	3	3	6
	Expected Count	5.2	0.8	5.6	0.4	3.3	2.7	6.0
	% within Geoattachment	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.3	0.3	0.6	-0.6	-0.2	0.2	
	Count	2	0	2	0	0	2	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	1.9	0.1	1.1	0.9	2.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
TOTAL	Adjusted Residual		0.5	-0.5	0.4	-0.4	-1.6	1.6	
	Count		214	31	230	15	134	111	245
	Expected Count		214.0	31.0	230.0	15.0	134.0	111.0	245.0
	% within Geoattachment		87.3%	12.7%	93.9%	6.1%	54.7%	45.3%	100.0%
blame UK	Count		39	6	45	0	24	21	45
	Expected Count		38.3	6.7	44.2	0.8	22.0	23.0	45.0
	% within Geoattachment		86.7%	13.3%	100.0%	0.0%	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual		0.3	-0.3	1.0	-1.0	0.7	-0.7	
British	Count		1	1	2	0	1	1	2
	Expected Count		1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
	% within Geoattachment		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual		-1.4	1.4	0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.0	
British / Celtic	Count		3	0	3	0	2	1	3
	Expected Count		2.6	0.4	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
	% within Geoattachment		100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual		0.7	-0.7	0.2	-0.2	0.6	-0.6	
British / City	Count		10	2	12	0	5	7	12
	Expected Count		10.2	1.8	11.8	0.2	5.9	6.1	12.0
	% within Geoattachment		83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	41.7%	58.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual		-0.2	0.2	0.5	-0.5	-0.5	0.5	
British / English	Count		1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count		0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment		100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual		0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	-1.0	1.0	
British / English / Northerner	Count		2	1	3	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count		2.6	0.4	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
	% within Geoattachment		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual		-0.9	0.9	0.2	-0.2	-0.5	0.5	
British / English / Rural	Count		1	1	1	1	1	1	2
	Expected Count		1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
	% within Geoattachment		50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual		-1.4	1.4	-5.3	5.3	0.0	0.0	
British / English / Southerner	Count		4	1	5	0	3	2	5
	Expected Count		4.3	0.7	4.9	0.1	2.4	2.6	5.0
	% within Geoattachment		80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual		-0.3	0.3	0.3	-0.3	0.5	-0.5	
British / Londoner	Count		3	0	3	0	2	1	3
	Expected Count		3.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	2.0	1.0	3.0
British / Northerner	Count		3	0	3	0	2	1	3
	Expected Count		3.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	2.0	1.0	3.0

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
	Expected Count	2.6	0.4	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.2	-0.2	0.6	-0.6	
British / Other	Count	2	1	3	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	2.6	0.4	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
	% within Geoattachment	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
British / Rural	Adjusted Residual	-0.9	0.9	0.2	-0.2	-0.5	0.5	
	Count	4	0	4	0	2	2	4
	Expected Count	3.4	0.6	3.9	0.1	2.0	2.0	4.0
British / Scottish	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.3	-0.3	0.0	0.0	
	Count	1	1	2	0	1	1	2
British / Southerner	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
	% within Geoattachment	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.4	1.4	0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.0	
British / Welsh	Count	4	1	5	0	4	1	5
	Expected Count	4.3	0.7	4.9	0.1	2.4	2.6	5.0
	% within Geoattachment	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Celtic	Adjusted Residual	-0.3	0.3	0.3	-0.3	1.4	-1.4	
	Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
City person	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.0	
	Count	4	0	4	0	1	3	4
English	Expected Count	3.4	0.6	3.9	0.1	2.0	2.0	4.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.3	-0.3	-1.0	1.0	
English / City	Count	4	3	7	0	4	3	7
	Expected Count	6.0	1.0	6.9	0.1	3.4	3.6	7.0
	% within Geoattachment	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%	0.0%	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.1	2.1	0.4	-0.4	0.4	-0.4	
	Count	27	8	33	2	17	18	35
	Expected Count	29.8	5.2	34.4	0.6	17.1	17.9	35.0
	% within Geoattachment	77.1%	22.9%	94.3%	5.7%	48.6%	51.4%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.4	1.4	-1.9	1.9	0.0	0.0	
	Count	1	1	2	0	2	0	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
	% within Geoattachment	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.4	1.4	0.2	-0.2	1.5	-1.5	
	Count	4	0	4	0	1	3	4
	Expected Count	3.4	0.6	3.9	0.1	2.0	2.0	4.0
English / Northerner	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.3	-0.3	-1.0	1.0	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
English / Other	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	-1.0	1.0	
	Count	4	1	5	0	0	5	5
	Expected Count	4.3	0.7	4.9	0.1	2.4	2.6	5.0
English / Rural person	% within Geoattachment	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.3	0.3	0.3	-0.3	-2.2	2.2	
	Count	3	0	3	0	2	1	3
	Expected Count	2.6	0.4	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
English / Southerner	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.2	-0.2	0.6	-0.6	
	Count	10	2	12	0	3	9	12
	Expected Count	10.2	1.8	11.8	0.2	5.9	6.1	12.0
European	% within Geoattachment	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.2	0.2	0.5	-0.5	-1.7	1.7	
	Count	10	1	10	1	6	5	11
	Expected Count	9.4	1.6	10.8	0.2	5.4	5.6	11.0
European / British	% within Geoattachment	90.9%	9.1%	90.9%	9.1%	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	-1.9	1.9	0.4	-0.4	
	Count	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
European / British / English	% within Geoattachment	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.4	2.4	0.1	-0.1	-1.0	1.0	
	Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
European / British / Irish	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.0	
	Count	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
European / British / Londoner	% within Geoattachment	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
		Adjusted Residual	-2.4	2.4	0.1	-0.1	-1.0	1.0	
		Count	5	0	5	0	3	2	5
		Expected Count	4.3	0.7	4.9	0.1	2.4	2.6	5.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
European / British / Other		Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.3	-0.3	0.5	-0.5	
		Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
European / British / Scottish		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	-1.0	1.0	
		Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
European / English		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	-1.0	1.0	
		Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
		Expected Count	2.6	0.4	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
European / Irish		Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.2	-0.2	-0.5	0.5	
		Count	2	0	2	0	0	2	2
		Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
European / Irish / Celtic		Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	-1.4	1.4	
		Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
		Expected Count	2.6	0.4	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
European / Londoner		Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.2	-0.2	-0.5	0.5	
		Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
European / Northerner		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	-1.0	1.0	
		Count	2	1	3	0	2	1	3
		Expected Count	2.6	0.4	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
		% within Geoattachment	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
European / Other		Adjusted Residual	-0.9	0.9	0.2	-0.2	0.6	-0.6	
		Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
European / Scottish		Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.0	

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
		Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	1.0	-1.0	
European / Southerner		Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	1.0	-1.0	
European / Welsh		Count	1	1	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.4	1.4	0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.0	
Infrequent		Count	14	1	15	0	8	7	15
		Expected Count	12.8	2.2	14.7	0.3	7.3	7.7	15.0
		% within Geoattachment	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%	0.0%	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.5	-0.5	0.4	-0.4	
Irish		Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
		Expected Count	2.6	0.4	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.2	-0.2	-0.5	0.5	
Irish / Celtic		Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.0	
Irish / City		Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	-1.0	1.0	
Irish / English		Count	4	0	3	1	3	1	4
		Expected Count	3.4	0.6	3.9	0.1	2.0	2.0	4.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	-3.6	3.6	1.1	-1.1	
Irish / Other		Count	6	0	6	0	5	1	6
		Expected Count	5.1	0.9	5.9	0.1	2.9	3.1	6.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	0.3	-0.3	1.7	-1.7	
Londoner		Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Adjusted Residual							
Londoner / City		Count							
		Adjusted Residual							

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	1.0	-1.0	
Northerner	Count	10	2	12	0	4	8	12
	Expected Count	10.2	1.8	11.8	0.2	5.9	6.1	12.0
	% within Geoattachment	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Rural person	Adjusted Residual	-0.2	0.2	0.5	-0.5	-1.1	1.1	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
Scottish	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	1.0	-1.0	
	Count	17	4	21	0	13	8	21
Scottish / Celtic	Expected Count	17.9	3.1	20.6	0.4	10.2	10.8	21.0
	% within Geoattachment	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%	0.0%	61.9%	38.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.6	0.6	0.6	-0.6	1.2	-1.2	
Scottish / City	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Scottish / Rural	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	1.0	-1.0	
	Count	4	0	4	0	2	2	4
	Expected Count	3.4	0.6	3.9	0.1	2.0	2.0	4.0
Southernner	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.3	-0.3	0.0	0.0	
	Count	2	1	3	0	2	1	3
Southernner / Other	Expected Count	2.6	0.4	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
	% within Geoattachment	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.9	0.9	0.2	-0.2	0.6	-0.6	
Welsh	Count	3	0	3	0	0	3	3
	Expected Count	2.6	0.4	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.2	-0.2	-1.7	1.7	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	1.0	-1.0	
	Count	4	0	4	0	1	3	4
	Expected Count	3.4	0.6	3.9	0.1	2.0	2.0	4.0

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.3	-0.3	-1.0	1.0	
	Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.0	
	Count	246	43	284	5	141	148	289
	Expected Count	246.0	43.0	284.0	5.0	141.0	148.0	289.0
Welsh / Other	% within Geoattachment	85.1%	14.9%	98.3%	1.7%	48.8%	51.2%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL	Count	246	43	284	5	141	148	289
	Expected Count	246.0	43.0	284.0	5.0	141.0	148.0	289.0
no blame	% within Geoattachment	85.1%	14.9%	98.3%	1.7%	48.8%	51.2%	100.0%
	Count	36	18	49	5	30	24	54
	Expected Count	39.9	14.1	50.5	3.5	31.4	22.6	54.0
	% within Geoattachment	66.7%	33.3%	90.7%	9.3%	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
British	Adjusted Residual	-1.4	1.4	-0.9	0.9	-0.4	0.4	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
British / Celtic	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	-1.2	1.2	
	Count	2	2	4	0	4	0	4
	Expected Count	3.0	1.0	3.7	0.3	2.3	1.7	4.0
	% within Geoattachment	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
British / City	Adjusted Residual	-1.1	1.1	0.5	-0.5	1.7	-1.7	
	Count	12	0	9	3	11	1	12
	Expected Count	8.9	3.1	11.2	0.8	7.0	5.0	12.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	91.7%	8.3%	100.0%
British / English	Adjusted Residual	2.1	-2.1	-2.7	2.7	2.4	-2.4	
	Count	2	0	2	0	0	2	2
	Expected Count	1.5	0.5	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
British / English / Londoner	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	-1.7	1.7	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
British / English / Northerner	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	0.8	-0.8	
	Count	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
British / English / Rural	Adjusted Residual	-1.7	1.7	0.3	-0.3	0.8	-0.8	

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
		Count	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.7	1.7	-3.8	3.8	0.8	-0.8	
British / English / Southerner		Count	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.7	1.7	0.3	-0.3	0.8	-0.8	
British / Irish		Count	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.7	1.7	0.3	-0.3	0.8	-0.8	
British / Londoner		Count	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.7	1.7	0.3	-0.3	0.8	-0.8	
British / Northerner		Count	4	0	4	0	2	2	4
		Expected Count	3.0	1.0	3.7	0.3	2.3	1.7	4.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	1.2	-1.2	0.5	-0.5	-0.3	0.3	
British / Other		Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.5	0.5	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	-0.2	0.2	
British / Rural		Count	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
		Expected Count	1.5	0.5	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	1.2	-1.2	
British / Scottish		Count	2	1	3	0	1	2	3
		Expected Count	2.2	0.8	2.8	0.2	1.7	1.3	3.0
		% within Geoattachment	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.3	0.3	0.5	-0.5	-0.9	0.9	
British / Southerner		Count	4	2	6	0	5	1	6
		Expected Count	4.4	1.6	5.6	0.4	3.5	2.5	6.0
		% within Geoattachment	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.4	0.4	0.7	-0.7	1.3	-1.3	
British / Welsh		Count	1	1	2	0	2	0	2
		Expected Count	1.5	0.5	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.8	0.8	0.4	-0.4	1.2	-1.2	
Celtic		Count	4	0	4	0	1	3	4

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
	Expected Count	3.0	1.0	3.7	0.3	2.3	1.7	4.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.2	-1.2	0.5	-0.5	-1.4	1.4	
	Count	2	4	6	0	2	4	6
	Expected Count	4.4	1.6	5.6	0.4	3.5	2.5	6.0
	% within Geoattachment	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
City person	Adjusted Residual	-2.3	2.3	0.7	-0.7	-1.2	1.2	
	Count	32	7	35	4	28	11	39
	Expected Count	28.8	10.2	36.5	2.5	22.7	16.3	39.0
English	% within Geoattachment	82.1%	17.9%	89.7%	10.3%	71.8%	28.2%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.2	-1.2	-1.0	1.0	1.8	-1.8	
	Count	2	2	4	0	4	0	4
	Expected Count	3.0	1.0	3.7	0.3	2.3	1.7	4.0
	% within Geoattachment	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.1	1.1	0.5	-0.5	1.7	-1.7	
English / City	Count	5	2	7	0	3	4	7
	Expected Count	5.2	1.8	6.5	0.5	4.1	2.9	7.0
	% within Geoattachment	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
English / Northerner	Adjusted Residual	-0.2	0.2	0.7	-0.7	-0.8	0.8	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	-1.2	1.2	
	Count	4	0	3	1	2	2	4
	Expected Count	3.0	1.0	3.7	0.3	2.3	1.7	4.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.2	-1.2	-1.5	1.5	-0.3	0.3	
English / Rural person	Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	2.2	0.8	2.8	0.2	1.7	1.3	3.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
English / Southerner	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	0.5	-0.5	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	12	5	15	2	9	8	17
	Expected Count	12.6	4.4	15.9	1.1	9.9	7.1	17.0
	% within Geoattachment	70.6%	29.4%	88.2%	11.8%	52.9%	47.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.3	0.3	-0.9	0.9	-0.5	0.5	
	Count	5	3	8	0	3	5	8
European	Expected Count	5.9	2.1	7.5	0.5	4.7	3.3	8.0
European / British								

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
	% within Geoattachment	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%	0.0%	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.7	0.7	0.8	-0.8	-1.2	1.2	
	Count	2	1	3	0	1	2	3
European / British / English	Expected Count	2.2	0.8	2.8	0.2	1.7	1.3	3.0
	% within Geoattachment	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.3	0.3	0.5	-0.5	-0.9	0.9	
European / British / Irish	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
European / British / Other	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	-1.2	1.2	
	Count	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
European / British / Scottish	% within Geoattachment	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.7	1.7	0.3	-0.3	-1.2	1.2	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
European / City	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	-1.2	1.2	
European / English	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
European / Irish	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	0.8	-0.8	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
European / Irish / Celtic	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	0.8	-0.8	
	Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
European / Londoner	Expected Count	1.5	0.5	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
		Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	-0.2	0.2	
		Count	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
		Expected Count	1.5	0.5	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	European / Northerner	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	1.2	-1.2	
		Count	3	1	4	0	4	0	4
		Expected Count	3.0	1.0	3.7	0.3	2.3	1.7	4.0
		% within Geoattachment	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	European / Other	Adjusted Residual	0.0	0.0	0.5	-0.5	1.7	-1.7	
		Count	4	4	8	0	3	5	8
		Expected Count	5.9	2.1	7.5	0.5	4.7	3.3	8.0
		% within Geoattachment	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
	European / Scottish	Adjusted Residual	-1.6	1.6	0.8	-0.8	-1.2	1.2	
		Count	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	European / Welsh	Adjusted Residual	-1.7	1.7	0.3	-0.3	0.8	-0.8	
		Count	0	2	2	0	2	0	2
		Expected Count	1.5	0.5	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Infrequent	Adjusted Residual	-2.4	2.4	0.4	-0.4	1.2	-1.2	
		Count	6	2	8	0	1	7	8
		Expected Count	5.9	2.1	7.5	0.5	4.7	3.3	8.0
		% within Geoattachment	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	12.5%	87.5%	100.0%
	Irish	Adjusted Residual	0.1	-0.1	0.8	-0.8	-2.7	2.7	
		Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Irish / City	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	-1.2	1.2	
		Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Irish / English	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	0.8	-0.8	
		Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.5	0.5	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Irish / Other	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	-0.2	0.2	

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
		Count	0	4	3	1	4	0	4
		Expected Count	3.0	1.0	3.7	0.3	2.3	1.7	4.0
		% within Geoattachment	0.0%	100.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-3.4	3.4	-1.5	1.5	1.7	-1.7	
Londoner		Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.5	0.5	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	-0.2	0.2	
Londoner / City		Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
		Expected Count	2.2	0.8	2.8	0.2	1.7	1.3	3.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	0.5	-0.5	-0.9	0.9	
Northerner		Count	3	1	3	1	3	1	4
		Expected Count	3.0	1.0	3.7	0.3	2.3	1.7	4.0
		% within Geoattachment	75.0%	25.0%	75.0%	25.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.0	0.0	-1.5	1.5	0.7	-0.7	
Rural person		Count	19	4	22	1	11	12	23
		Expected Count	17.0	6.0	21.5	1.5	13.4	9.6	23.0
		% within Geoattachment	82.6%	17.4%	95.7%	4.3%	47.8%	52.2%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	0.4	-0.4	-1.1	1.1	
Scottish		Count	1	1	2	0	0	2	2
		Expected Count	1.5	0.5	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.8	0.8	0.4	-0.4	-1.7	1.7	
Scottish / Celtic		Count	4	0	4	0	3	1	4
		Expected Count	3.0	1.0	3.7	0.3	2.3	1.7	4.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	1.2	-1.2	0.5	-0.5	0.7	-0.7	
Scottish / City		Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.5	0.5	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	-0.2	0.2	
Scottish / Rural		Count	1	1	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.5	0.5	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
		% within Geoattachment	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.8	0.8	0.4	-0.4	-0.2	0.2	
Southerner		Count	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
		Adjusted Residual	-0.8	0.8	0.4	-0.4	-0.2	0.2	
Southerner / Other		Count	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
		Adjusted Residual	-0.8	0.8	0.4	-0.4	-0.2	0.2	

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
	Expected Count	1.5	0.5	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	1.2	-1.2	
	Count	8	1	9	0	3	6	9
	Expected Count	6.7	2.3	8.4	0.6	5.2	3.8	9.0
	% within Geoattachment	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	0.8	-0.8	-1.5	1.5	
	Count	3	0	3	0	2	1	3
	Expected Count	2.2	0.8	2.8	0.2	1.7	1.3	3.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	0.5	-0.5	0.3	-0.3	
	Count	216	76	273	19	170	122	292
TOTAL	Expected Count	216.0	76.0	273.0	19.0	170.0	122.0	292.0
	% within Geoattachment	74.0%	26.0%	93.5%	6.5%	58.2%	41.8%	100.0%
Adjusted residuals of ± 1.96 are significant at $p < 0.05$.								

A10.9. Political party support

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
blame EU	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
Alliance supporter	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	0.2	-0.2	-1.0	1.0	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
Brexit Party supporter	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	0.2	-0.2	-1.0	1.0	
Conservative supporter	Count	17	3	18	2	11	9	20
	Expected Count	18.3	1.7	19.4	0.6	9.7	10.3	20.0
	% within Political party support	85.0%	15.0%	90.0%	10.0%	55.0%	45.0%	100.0%
Conservative supporter	Adjusted Residual	-1.2	1.2	-1.9	1.9	0.7	-0.7	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
Conservative/UKIP	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	0.2	-0.2	-1.0	1.0	
	Count	6	0	6	0	3	3	6
Greens supporter	Expected Count	5.5	0.5	5.8	0.2	2.9	3.1	6.0
	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.5	-0.5	0.1	-0.1	
Infrequent inc combinations	Count	3	2	5	0	4	1	5
	Expected Count	4.6	0.4	4.8	0.2	2.4	2.6	5.0
	% within Political party support	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Labour supporter	Adjusted Residual	-2.6	2.6	0.4	-0.4	1.5	-1.5	
	Count	20	2	22	0	11	11	22
	Expected Count	20.1	1.9	21.3	0.7	10.6	11.4	22.0
Labour supporter	% within Political party support	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.1	0.1	1.0	-1.0	0.2	-0.2	
	Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
Labour/Greens	Expected Count	2.7	0.3	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.3	-0.3	-0.5	0.5	
Liberal Democrat supporter	Count	8	0	8	0	5	3	8
	Expected Count	7.3	0.7	7.7	0.3	3.9	4.1	8.0
	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
Liberal Democrat supporter	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.5	-0.5	0.8	-0.8	

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
Blame condition	Plaid Cymru supporter	Count	2	0	2	0	0	2	2
		Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.9	0.1	1.0	1.0	2.0
		% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	-1.4	1.4	
	SDLP supporter	Count	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	-5.5	5.5	-1.0	1.0	
	Sinn Fein supporter	Count	5	1	6	0	1	5	6
		Expected Count	5.5	0.5	5.8	0.2	2.9	3.1	6.0
		% within Political party support	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.7	0.7	0.5	-0.5	-1.6	1.6	
	SNP supporter	Count	14	0	14	0	6	8	14
		Expected Count	12.8	1.2	13.5	0.5	6.8	7.2	14.0
		% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	1.2	-1.2	0.7	-0.7	-0.4	0.4	
	UKIP supporter	Count	3	0	3	0	3	0	3
		Expected Count	2.7	0.3	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
		% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.3	-0.3	1.8	-1.8	
	TOTAL	Count	85	8	90	3	45	48	93
		Expected Count	85.0	8.0	90.0	3.0	45.0	48.0	93.0
		% within Political party support	91.4%	8.6%	96.8%	3.2%	48.4%	51.6%	100.0%
blame ourselves	Alliance supporter	Count	3	0	3	0	2	1	3
		Expected Count	2.5	0.5	2.8	0.2	1.6	1.4	3.0
		% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.5	-0.5	0.5	-0.5	
	Brexit Party supporter	Count	1	1	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.7	0.3	1.8	0.2	1.1	0.9	2.0
		% within Political party support	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.4	1.4	0.4	-0.4	-0.1	0.1	
	Conservative supporter	Count	17	1	16	2	14	4	18
		Expected Count	15.2	2.8	16.6	1.4	9.6	8.4	18.0
		% within Political party support	94.4%	5.6%	88.9%	11.1%	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	1.3	-1.3	-0.6	0.6	2.3	-2.3	
	Greens supporter	Count	5	1	5	1	3	3	6
		Expected Count	5.1	0.9	5.5	0.5	3.2	2.8	6.0

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
	% within Political party support	83.3%	16.7%	83.3%	16.7%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.1	0.1	-0.8	0.8	-0.2	0.2	
	Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	2.5	0.5	2.8	0.2	1.6	1.4	3.0
	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.5	-0.5	-0.7	0.7	
Infrequent inc combinations	Count	22	6	28	0	12	16	28
	Expected Count	23.6	4.4	25.8	2.2	14.9	13.1	28.0
	% within Political party support	78.6%	21.4%	100.0%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.0	1.0	1.9	-1.9	-1.3	1.3	
Labour supporter	Count	2	2	4	0	1	3	4
	Expected Count	3.4	0.6	3.7	0.3	2.1	1.9	4.0
	% within Political party support	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.9	1.9	0.6	-0.6	-1.2	1.2	
Labour/Greens	Count	7	1	7	1	4	4	8
	Expected Count	6.8	1.2	7.4	0.6	4.3	3.7	8.0
	% within Political party support	87.5%	12.5%	87.5%	12.5%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	-0.5	0.5	-0.2	0.2	
Liberal Democrat supporter	Count	2	0	2	0	0	2	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	1.8	0.2	1.1	0.9	2.0
	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.4	-0.4	-1.5	1.5	
Plaid Cymru supporter	Count	2	0	1	1	1	1	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	1.8	0.2	1.1	0.9	2.0
	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	-2.3	2.3	-0.1	0.1	
SDLP supporter	Count	11	2	11	2	8	5	13
	Expected Count	11.0	2.0	12.0	1.0	6.9	6.1	13.0
	% within Political party support	84.6%	15.4%	84.6%	15.4%	61.5%	38.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.0	0.0	-1.1	1.1	0.6	-0.6	
SNP supporter	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.8	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	0.9	-0.9	
UKIP supporter	Count	76	14	83	7	48	42	90
	Expected Count	76.0	14.0	83.0	7.0	48.0	42.0	90.0
	% within Political party support	84.4%	15.6%	92.2%	7.8%	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual							
TOTAL								

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
blame UK	Count	3	1	4	0	1	3	4
	Expected Count	3.4	0.6	4.0	0.0	1.9	2.1	4.0
Alliance supporter	% within Political party support	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.6	0.6	0.2	-0.2	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
Brexit Party supporter	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	0.9	1.1	2.0
	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.1	-0.1	0.1	-0.1	
Conservative supporter	Count	19	3	22	0	8	14	22
	Expected Count	18.8	3.2	21.8	0.2	10.4	11.6	22.0
	% within Political party support	86.4%	13.6%	100.0%	0.0%	36.4%	63.6%	100.0%
Conservative/UKIP	Adjusted Residual	0.1	-0.1	0.5	-0.5	-1.1	1.1	
	Count	1	0	0	1	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
Democratic Unionist Party supporter	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	-11.1	11.1	1.1	-1.1	
	Count	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
Greens supporter	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	0.9	1.1	2.0
	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.1	-0.1	1.5	-1.5	
Infrequent inc combinations	Count	13	3	16	0	6	10	16
	Expected Count	13.7	2.3	15.9	0.1	7.5	8.5	16.0
	% within Political party support	81.3%	18.8%	100.0%	0.0%	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
Labour supporter	Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5	0.4	-0.4	-0.8	0.8	
	Count	10	0	10	0	6	4	10
	Expected Count	8.5	1.5	9.9	0.1	4.7	5.3	10.0
Labour/Greens	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.4	-1.4	0.3	-0.3	0.8	-0.8	
	Count	20	8	28	0	12	16	28
Liberal Democrat supporter	Expected Count	23.9	4.1	27.8	0.2	13.2	14.8	28.0
	% within Political party support	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.4	2.4	0.5	-0.5	-0.5	0.5	
	Count	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	0.9	1.1	2.0
	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.1	-0.1	1.5	-1.5	
	Count	6	1	7	0	4	3	7

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
	Expected Count	6.0	1.0	6.9	0.1	3.3	3.7	7.0
	% within Political party support	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	0.0%	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.0	0.0	0.2	-0.2	0.5	-0.5	
	Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	0.9	1.1	2.0
	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.1	-0.1	0.1	-0.1	
	Count	2	1	3	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	2.6	0.4	3.0	0.0	1.4	1.6	3.0
	% within Political party support	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.9	0.9	0.2	-0.2	-0.5	0.5	
	Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	2.6	0.4	3.0	0.0	1.4	1.6	3.0
	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.2	-0.2	-0.5	0.5	
	Count	14	1	15	0	9	6	15
	Expected Count	12.8	2.2	14.9	0.1	7.1	7.9	15.0
	% within Political party support	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.4	-0.4	1.1	-1.1	
	Count	3	0	3	0	2	1	3
	Expected Count	2.6	0.4	3.0	0.0	1.4	1.6	3.0
	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.2	-0.2	0.7	-0.7	
	Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	2.6	0.4	3.0	0.0	1.4	1.6	3.0
	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.2	-0.2	-0.5	0.5	
	Count	105	18	122	1	58	65	123
	Expected Count	105.0	18.0	122.0	1.0	58.0	65.0	123.0
	% within Political party support	85.4%	14.6%	99.2%	0.8%	47.2%	52.8%	100.0%
no blame	Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
	Expected Count	1.4	0.6	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.3	-0.3	-0.3	0.3	
	Count	2	0	1	1	1	1	2
	Expected Count	1.4	0.6	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
	% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual							

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
		Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	-2.8	2.8	-0.3	0.3	
		Count	15	6	18	3	17	4	21
		Expected Count	15.2	5.8	19.8	1.2	12.6	8.4	21.0
		% within Political party support	71.4%	28.6%	85.7%	14.3%	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Conservative supporter		Adjusted Residual	-0.1	0.1	-1.9	1.9	2.2	-2.2	
		Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
		% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Conservative/UKIP		Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	0.8	-0.8	
		Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
		% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Democratic Unionist Party supporter		Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	0.8	-0.8	
		Count	9	2	11	0	4	7	11
		Expected Count	7.9	3.1	10.4	0.6	6.6	4.4	11.0
		% within Political party support	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%	0.0%	36.4%	63.6%	100.0%
Greens supporter		Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.8	-0.8	-1.7	1.7	
		Count	5	2	7	0	5	2	7
		Expected Count	5.1	1.9	6.6	0.4	4.2	2.8	7.0
		% within Political party support	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	0.0%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
Infrequent inc combinations		Adjusted Residual	0.0	0.0	0.7	-0.7	0.6	-0.6	
		Count	15	11	25	1	19	7	26
		Expected Count	18.8	7.2	24.6	1.4	15.6	10.4	26.0
		% within Political party support	57.7%	42.3%	96.2%	3.8%	73.1%	26.9%	100.0%
Labour supporter		Adjusted Residual	-1.9	1.9	0.4	-0.4	1.5	-1.5	
		Count	2	1	3	0	1	2	3
		Expected Count	2.2	0.8	2.8	0.2	1.8	1.2	3.0
		% within Political party support	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Labour/Greens		Adjusted Residual	-0.2	0.2	0.4	-0.4	-1.0	1.0	
		Count	5	1	6	0	5	1	6
		Expected Count	4.3	1.7	5.7	0.3	3.6	2.4	6.0
		% within Political party support	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
Liberal Democrat supporter		Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.6	-0.6	1.2	-1.2	
		Count	3	2	5	0	2	3	5
		Expected Count	3.6	1.4	4.7	0.3	3.0	2.0	5.0
		% within Political party support	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Plaid Cymru supporter		Adjusted Residual	-0.6	0.6	0.6	-0.6	-0.9	0.9	

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
	Sinn Fein supporter	Count	1	1	2	0	0	2	2
		Expected Count	1.4	0.6	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.8	2.0
		% within Political party support	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.7	0.7	0.3	-0.3	-1.8	1.8	
	SNP supporter	Count	14	2	15	1	4	12	16
		Expected Count	11.6	4.4	15.1	0.9	9.6	6.4	16.0
		% within Political party support	87.5%	12.5%	93.8%	6.3%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	1.5	-1.5	-0.1	0.1	-3.1	3.1	
	SNP/Greens	Count	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
		% within Political party support	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.6	1.6	0.2	-0.2	-1.2	1.2	
	UKIP supporter	Count	3	1	4	0	4	0	4
		Expected Count	2.9	1.1	3.8	0.2	2.4	1.6	4.0
		% within Political party support	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.1	-0.1	0.5	-0.5	1.7	-1.7	
TOTAL	Count	78	30	102	6	65	43	108	
	Expected Count	78.0	30.0	102.0	6.0	65.0	43.0	108.0	
	% within Political party support	72.2%	27.8%	94.4%	5.6%	60.2%	39.8%	100.0%	
Adjusted residuals of ±1.96 are significant at p<0.05.									

A10.10. Political values

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
blame EU	Count	41	1	41	1	20	22	42
	Expected Count	40.4	1.6	39.5	2.5	19.8	22.2	42.0
	% within Political values	97.6%	2.4%	97.6%	2.4%	47.6%	52.4%	100.0%
	Progressive Adjusted Residual	1.2	-1.2	2.3	-2.3	0.2	-0.2	
	Count	8	1	7	2	4	5	9
	Expected Count	8.6	0.4	8.5	0.5	4.2	4.8	9.0
	% within Political values	88.9%	11.1%	77.8%	22.2%	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%
	Traditional Adjusted Residual	-1.2	1.2	-2.3	2.3	-0.2	0.2	
	Count	49	2	48	3	24	27	51
	Expected Count	49.0	2.0	48.0	3.0	24.0	27.0	51.0
	% within Political values	96.1%	3.9%	94.1%	5.9%	47.1%	52.9%	100.0%
blame ourselves	Count	35	4	38	1	19	20	39
	Expected Count	34.3	4.7	38.2	0.8	19.5	19.5	39.0
	% within Political values	89.7%	10.3%	97.4%	2.6%	48.7%	51.3%	100.0%
	Progressive Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	-0.5	0.5	-0.3	0.3	
	Count	9	2	11	0	6	5	11
	Expected Count	9.7	1.3	10.8	0.2	5.5	5.5	11.0
	% within Political values	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%	0.0%	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
	Traditional Adjusted Residual	-0.7	0.7	0.5	-0.5	0.3	-0.3	
	Count	44	6	49	1	25	25	50
	Expected Count	44.0	6.0	49.0	1.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
	% within Political values	88.0%	12.0%	98.0%	2.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
blame UK	Count	0	1	1		1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0		0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Political values	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Ambiguous Adjusted Residual	-3.0	3.0			1.1	-1.1	
	Count	37	4	41		19	22	41
	Expected Count	36.9	4.1	41.0		19.7	21.3	41.0
	% within Political values	90.2%	9.8%	100.0%		46.3%	53.7%	100.0%
	Progressive Adjusted Residual	0.1	-0.1			-0.5	0.5	
	Count	8	0	8		4	4	8
	Expected Count	7.2	0.8	8.0		3.8	4.2	8.0
	% within Political values	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Traditional Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0			0.1	-0.1	

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
	Count	45	5	50		24	26	50
	Expected Count	45.0	5.0	50.0		24.0	26.0	50.0
	% within Political values	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%		48.0%	52.0%	100.0%
no blame	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Political values	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Ambiguous Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.3	-0.3	0.9	-0.9	
	Count	24	17	38	3	21	20	41
	Expected Count	28.5	12.5	37.5	3.5	22.2	18.8	41.0
	% within Political values	58.5%	41.5%	92.7%	7.3%	51.2%	48.8%	100.0%
	Progressive Adjusted Residual	-2.8	2.8	0.5	-0.5	-0.7	0.7	
	Count	16	1	15	2	10	7	17
	Expected Count	11.8	5.2	15.6	1.4	9.2	7.8	17.0
	% within Political values	94.1%	5.9%	88.2%	11.8%	58.8%	41.2%	100.0%
	Traditional Adjusted Residual	2.6	-2.6	-0.6	0.6	0.4	-0.4	
	Count	41	18	54	5	32	27	59
	Expected Count	41.0	18.0	54.0	5.0	32.0	27.0	59.0
	% within Political values	69.5%	30.5%	91.5%	8.5%	54.2%	45.8%	100.0%
Adjusted residuals of ± 1.96 are significant at $p < 0.05$.								

A10.11. Race

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
blame EU	Count	1	3	3	1	0	4	4
	Expected Count	3.4	0.6	3.9	0.1	1.8	2.2	4.0
	% within Race	25.0%	75.0%	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
African	Adjusted Residual	-3.4	3.4	-3.6	3.6	-1.8	1.8	
	Count	7	0	7	0	3	4	7
	Expected Count	5.9	1.1	6.9	0.1	3.1	3.9	7.0
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
Anglo-Saxon	Adjusted Residual	1.2	-1.2	0.4	-0.4	-0.1	0.1	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.8	0.2	1.0	0.0	0.4	0.6	1.0
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Bangladeshi	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	1	1	2	0	2	0	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	0.9	1.1	2.0
	% within Race	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Caribbean	Adjusted Residual	-1.4	1.4	0.2	-0.2	1.6	-1.6	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.8	0.2	1.0	0.0	0.4	0.6	1.0
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Chinese	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.8	0.2	1.0	0.0	0.4	0.6	1.0
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Indian	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	1.1	-1.1	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.8	0.2	1.0	0.0	0.4	0.6	1.0
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Infrequent inc combinations	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	1.1	-1.1	
	Count	2	2	4	0	0	4	4
	Expected Count	3.4	0.6	3.9	0.1	1.8	2.2	4.0
	% within Race	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mixed/multiple ethnic	Adjusted Residual	-2.0	2.0	0.3	-0.3	-1.8	1.8	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
Other Asian	Expected Count	0.8	0.2	1.0	0.0	0.4	0.6	1.0

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	64	10	73	1	34	40	74
	Expected Count	62.8	11.2	72.7	1.3	33.0	41.0	74.0
	% within Race	86.5%	13.5%	98.6%	1.4%	45.9%	54.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.5	-0.5	0.4	-0.4	
	Count	10	0	10	0	5	5	10
	Expected Count	8.5	1.5	9.8	0.2	4.5	5.5	10.0
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.4	-1.4	0.4	-0.4	0.4	-0.4	
	Count	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	0.9	1.1	2.0
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	1.6	-1.6	
	Count	1	1	2	0	1	1	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	0.9	1.1	2.0
	% within Race	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.4	1.4	0.2	-0.2	0.2	-0.2	
	Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	0.9	1.1	2.0
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	0.2	-0.2	
	Count	95	17	110	2	50	62	112
	Expected Count	95.0	17.0	110.0	2.0	50.0	62.0	112.0
	% within Race	84.8%	15.2%	98.2%	1.8%	44.6%	55.4%	100.0%
blame ourselves	Count	6	1	7	0	3	4	7
	Expected Count	6.3	0.7	6.4	0.6	4.2	2.8	7.0
	% within Race	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.4	0.4	0.8	-0.8	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	2	1	3	0	3	0	3
	Expected Count	2.7	0.3	2.7	0.3	1.8	1.2	3.0
	% within Race	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.3	1.3	0.5	-0.5	1.5	-1.5	
	Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
	Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.8	0.2	1.2	0.8	2.0
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total	
	Indian	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.4	-0.4	-0.3	0.3	
		Count	3	0	3	0	3	0	3
		Expected Count	2.7	0.3	2.7	0.3	1.8	1.2	3.0
		% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Infrequent inc combinations	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.5	-0.5	1.5	-1.5	
		Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
		% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Mixed/multiple ethnic	Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	0.3	-0.3	-1.2	1.2	
		Count	4	0	4	0	1	3	4
		Expected Count	3.6	0.4	3.7	0.3	2.4	1.6	4.0
		% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	Pakistani	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.6	-0.6	-1.4	1.4	
		Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
		% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	White	Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	0.3	-0.3	0.8	-0.8	
		Count	70	8	70	8	48	30	78
		Expected Count	69.9	8.1	71.4	6.6	46.4	31.6	78.0
		% within Race	89.7%	10.3%	89.7%	10.3%	61.5%	38.5%	100.0%
	White – Irish	Adjusted Residual	0.1	-0.1	-1.1	1.1	0.7	-0.7	
		Count	3	1	3	1	2	2	4
		Expected Count	3.6	0.4	3.7	0.3	2.4	1.6	4.0
		% within Race	75.0%	25.0%	75.0%	25.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	White and Asian	Adjusted Residual	-1.0	1.0	-1.2	1.2	-0.4	0.4	
		Count	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.8	0.2	1.2	0.8	2.0
		% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	White and Black Caribbean	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.4	-0.4	-0.3	0.3	
		Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
		% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	0.3	-0.3	-1.2	1.2	
		Count	95	11	97	9	63	43	106
		Expected Count	95.0	11.0	97.0	9.0	63.0	43.0	106.0
		% within Race	89.6%	10.4%	91.5%	8.5%	59.4%	40.6%	100.0%

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
blame UK	Count	5	1	6	0	3	3	6
	Expected Count	5.4	0.6	6.0	0.0	3.2	2.8	6.0
Anglo-Saxon	% within Race	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5	0.2	-0.2	-0.2	0.2	
Caribbean	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	0.1	-0.1	-1.1	1.1	
Chinese	Count	1	1	2	0	2	0	2
	Expected Count	1.8	0.2	2.0	0.0	1.1	0.9	2.0
	% within Race	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.8	1.8	0.1	-0.1	1.3	-1.3	
Indian	Count	5	1	6	0	4	2	6
	Expected Count	5.4	0.6	6.0	0.0	3.2	2.8	6.0
	% within Race	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5	0.2	-0.2	0.7	-0.7	
Infrequent inc combinations	Count	3	0	3	0	2	1	3
	Expected Count	2.7	0.3	3.0	0.0	1.6	1.4	3.0
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	0.5	-0.5	
Mixed/multiple ethnic	Count	3	0	3	0	2	1	3
	Expected Count	2.7	0.3	3.0	0.0	1.6	1.4	3.0
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	0.5	-0.5	
Other Asian	Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	2.7	0.3	3.0	0.0	1.6	1.4	3.0
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	-0.7	0.7	
Pakistani	Count	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
	Expected Count	1.8	0.2	2.0	0.0	1.1	0.9	2.0
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.1	-0.1	1.3	-1.3	
White	Count	79	8	86	1	43	44	87
	Expected Count	77.6	9.4	86.3	0.7	46.2	40.8	87.0
	% within Race	90.8%	9.2%	98.9%	1.1%	49.4%	50.6%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	-0.7	0.7	-1.2	1.2	

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
	Count	14	2	16	0	9	7	16
	Expected Count	14.3	1.7	15.9	0.1	8.5	7.5	16.0
	% within Race	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%	0.0%	56.3%	43.8%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.2	0.2	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	
	White – Irish							
	Count	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Race	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.9	2.9	0.1	-0.1	0.9	-0.9	
	White and Asian							
	Count	116	14	129	1	69	61	130
	Expected Count	116.0	14.0	129.0	1.0	69.0	61.0	130.0
	% within Race	89.2%	10.8%	99.2%	0.8%	53.1%	46.9%	100.0%
no blame	Count	1	2	2	1	3	0	3
	Expected Count	2.1	0.9	2.8	0.2	2.0	1.0	3.0
	% within Race	33.3%	66.7%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.5	1.5	-1.9	1.9	1.2	-1.2	
	African							
	Count	4	1	4	1	2	3	5
	Expected Count	3.6	1.4	4.7	0.3	3.4	1.6	5.0
	% within Race	80.0%	20.0%	80.0%	20.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	-1.3	1.3	-1.4	1.4	
	Anglo-Saxon							
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.7	0.3	1.0
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	-1.5	1.5	
	Caribbean							
	Count	4	2	6	0	4	2	6
	Expected Count	4.3	1.7	5.6	0.4	4.1	1.9	6.0
	% within Race	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.3	0.3	0.7	-0.7	-0.1	0.1	
	Indian							
	Count	3	2	4	1	5	0	5
	Expected Count	3.6	1.4	4.7	0.3	3.4	1.6	5.0
	% within Race	60.0%	40.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.6	0.6	-1.3	1.3	1.6	-1.6	
	Infrequent inc combinations							
	Count	1	1	2	0	1	1	2
	Expected Count	1.4	0.6	1.9	0.1	1.4	0.6	2.0
	% within Race	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.7	0.7	0.4	-0.4	-0.6	0.6	
	Mixed/multiple ethnic							
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Other Asian							

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.7	0.3	1.0
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	0.7	-0.7	
	Count	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.7	0.3	1.0
	% within Race	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.6	1.6	0.3	-0.3	0.7	-0.7	
	Count	71	24	90	5	63	32	95
	Expected Count	67.9	27.1	89.0	6.0	64.8	30.2	95.0
	% within Race	74.7%	25.3%	94.7%	5.3%	66.3%	33.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.4	-1.4	0.9	-0.9	-0.8	0.8	
	Count	3	1	4	0	3	1	4
	Expected Count	2.9	1.1	3.7	0.3	2.7	1.3	4.0
	% within Race	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	0.5	-0.5	0.3	-0.3	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.7	0.3	1.0
	% within Race	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	0.7	-0.7	
	Count	0	2	2	0	2	0	2
	Expected Count	1.4	0.6	1.9	0.1	1.4	0.6	2.0
	% within Race	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.3	2.3	0.4	-0.4	1.0	-1.0	
	Count	90	36	118	8	86	40	126
	Expected Count	90.0	36.0	118.0	8.0	86.0	40.0	126.0
	% within Race	71.4%	28.6%	93.7%	6.3%	68.3%	31.7%	100.0%
Adjusted residuals of ± 1.96 are significant at $p < 0.05$.								

A10.12. Religion

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
blame EU	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.4	0.6	1.0
Ambiguous	% within Religion	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	2	0	1	1	0	2	2
	Expected Count	1.8	0.2	1.9	0.1	0.8	1.2	2.0
Buddhist	% within Religion	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	-3.2	3.2	-1.2	1.2	
	Count	22	7	26	3	14	15	29
	Expected Count	25.4	3.6	27.7	1.3	12.2	16.8	29.0
Christian	% within Religion	75.9%	24.1%	89.7%	10.3%	48.3%	51.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.2	2.2	-1.8	1.8	0.8	-0.8	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.4	0.6	1.0
Hindu	% within Religion	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	1.2	-1.2	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.4	0.6	1.0
Jewish	% within Religion	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	2	1	3	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	2.6	0.4	2.9	0.1	1.3	1.7	3.0
Muslim	% within Religion	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.1	1.1	0.4	-0.4	-0.3	0.3	
	Count	89	8	95	2	40	57	97
	Expected Count	85.1	11.9	92.8	4.2	40.8	56.2	97.0
Non-religious	% within Religion	91.8%	8.2%	97.9%	2.1%	41.2%	58.8%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	2.2	-2.2	2.0	-2.0	-0.3	0.3	
	Count	3	1	4	0	2	2	4
	Expected Count	3.5	0.5	3.8	0.2	1.7	2.3	4.0
Other religious	% within Religion	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.8	0.8	0.4	-0.4	0.3	-0.3	
	Count	121	17	132	6	58	80	138
	Expected Count	121.0	17.0	132.0	6.0	58.0	80.0	138.0
TOTAL	% within Religion	87.7%	12.3%	95.7%	4.3%	42.0%	58.0%	100.0%

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
blame ourselves	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Religion	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Ambiguous	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-1.0	1.0
	Count	2	1	3	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	2.6	0.4	2.9	0.1	1.6	1.4	3.0
	% within Religion	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Buddhist	Adjusted Residual	-1.0	1.0	0.3	-0.3	-0.7	0.7
	Count	22	1	22	1	15	8	23
	Expected Count	19.9	3.1	22.3	0.7	12.0	11.0	23.0
	% within Religion	95.7%	4.3%	95.7%	4.3%	65.2%	34.8%	100.0%
	Christian	Adjusted Residual	1.4	-1.4	-0.3	0.3	1.4	-1.4
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Religion	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Hindu	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	1.0	-1.0
	Count	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Religion	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Jewish	Adjusted Residual	-2.5	2.5	0.2	-0.2	1.0	-1.0
	Count	81	14	92	3	46	49	95
	Expected Count	82.1	12.9	92.0	3.0	49.4	45.6	95.0
	% within Religion	85.3%	14.7%	96.8%	3.2%	48.4%	51.6%	100.0%
	Non-religious	Adjusted Residual	-0.7	0.7	0.0	0.0	-1.4	1.4
blame UK	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Religion	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Sikh	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	1.0	-1.0
	Count	108	17	121	4	65	60	125
	Expected Count	108.0	17.0	121.0	4.0	65.0	60.0	125.0
	% within Religion	86.4%	13.6%	96.8%	3.2%	52.0%	48.0%	100.0%
	TOTAL	Count	3	0	3	0	1	2
	Expected Count	2.6	0.4	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
	% within Religion	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Buddhist	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.3	-0.3	-0.6	0.6
	Count	24	4	27	1	17	11	28
	Expected Count	24.4	3.6	27.4	0.6	14.4	13.6	28.0

Blame condition		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
	% within Religion	85.7%	14.3%	96.4%	3.6%	60.7%	39.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.3	0.3	-0.6	0.6	1.1	-1.1	
	Count	2	1	3	0	3	0	3
	Expected Count	2.6	0.4	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
	% within Religion	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.1	1.1	0.3	-0.3	1.7	-1.7	
	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Religion	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	1.0	-1.0	
	Count	3	1	4	0	4	0	4
	Expected Count	3.5	0.5	3.9	0.1	2.1	1.9	4.0
	% within Religion	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.7	0.7	0.3	-0.3	2.0	-2.0	
	Count	86	12	96	2	46	52	98
	Expected Count	85.4	12.6	95.9	2.1	50.4	47.6	98.0
	% within Religion	87.8%	12.2%	98.0%	2.0%	46.9%	53.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	0.1	-0.1	-1.6	1.6	
	Count	3	0	3	0	0	3	3
	Expected Count	2.6	0.4	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
	% within Religion	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.3	-0.3	-1.8	1.8	
	Count	122	18	137	3	72	68	140
	Expected Count	122.0	18.0	137.0	3.0	72.0	68.0	140.0
	% within Religion	87.1%	12.9%	97.9%	2.1%	51.4%	48.6%	100.0%
no blame	Count	2	0	1	1	2	0	2
	Expected Count	1.4	0.6	1.9	0.1	1.3	0.7	2.0
	% within Religion	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	-2.8	2.8	1.1	-1.1	
	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
	% within Religion	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	-1.3	1.3	
	Count	25	12	34	3	28	9	37
	Expected Count	26.3	10.7	35.0	2.0	23.2	13.8	37.0
	% within Religion	67.6%	32.4%	91.9%	8.1%	75.7%	24.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5	-0.8	0.8	1.9	-1.9	

Blame condition			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
	Hindu	Count	3	1	4	0	3	1	4
		Expected Count	2.8	1.2	3.8	0.2	2.5	1.5	4.0
		% within Religion	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	0.5	-0.5	0.5	-0.5	
	Jewish	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
		% within Religion	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	0.8	-0.8	
	Muslim	Count	1	1	2	0	2	0	2
		Expected Count	1.4	0.6	1.9	0.1	1.3	0.7	2.0
		% within Religion	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-0.7	0.7	0.3	-0.3	1.1	-1.1	
	Non-religious	Count	69	27	92	4	53	43	96
		Expected Count	68.2	27.8	90.7	5.3	60.2	35.8	96.0
		% within Religion	71.9%	28.1%	95.8%	4.2%	55.2%	44.8%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	1.0	-1.0	-2.6	2.6	
	Other religious	Count	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
		% within Religion	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.2	-0.2	0.8	-0.8	
	Sikh	Count	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
		Expected Count	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.4	1.0
		% within Religion	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.6	1.6	0.2	-0.2	0.8	-0.8	
TOTAL		Count	103	42	137	8	91	54	145
		Expected Count	103.0	42.0	137.0	8.0	91.0	54.0	145.0
		% within Religion	71.0%	29.0%	94.5%	5.5%	62.8%	37.2%	100.0%

Adjusted residuals of ± 1.96 are significant at $p < 0.05$.

A10.13. Sexuality

Blame condition				Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
				False	True	False	True	False	True	
blame EU			Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
			Expected Count	0.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
			% within Sexuality	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
			Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	0.1	-0.1	-0.9	0.9	
	Ambiguous		Count	15	1	16	0	6	10	16
			Expected Count	14.5	1.5	15.8	0.2	7.3	8.7	16.0
			% within Sexuality	93.8%	6.3%	100.0%	0.0%	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
			Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	0.6	-0.6	-0.7	0.7	
	Bisexual		Count	8	1	9	0	4	5	9
			Expected Count	8.2	0.8	8.9	0.1	4.1	4.9	9.0
			% within Sexuality	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%	0.0%	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%
			Adjusted Residual	-0.2	0.2	0.4	-0.4	-0.1	0.1	
	Gay or lesbian		Count	36	4	39	1	20	20	40
			Expected Count	36.4	3.6	39.4	0.6	18.2	21.8	40.0
			% within Sexuality	90.0%	10.0%	97.5%	2.5%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
			Adjusted Residual	-0.3	0.3	-0.8	0.8	0.9	-0.9	
	Sexuality Heterosexual		Count	60	6	65	1	30	36	66
			Expected Count	60.0	6.0	65.0	1.0	30.0	36.0	66.0
			% within Sexuality	90.9%	9.1%	98.5%	1.5%	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
			Adjusted Residual							
	Total									
blame ourselves			Count	9	0	7	2	6	3	9
			Expected Count	7.9	1.1	8.3	0.7	4.4	4.6	9.0
			% within Sexuality	100.0%	0.0%	77.8%	22.2%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
			Adjusted Residual	1.2	-1.2	-1.8	1.8	1.1	-1.1	
	Bisexual		Count	10	0	9	1	5	5	10
			Expected Count	8.8	1.2	9.3	0.7	4.9	5.1	10.0
			% within Sexuality	100.0%	0.0%	90.0%	10.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
			Adjusted Residual	1.3	-1.3	-0.3	0.3	0.1	-0.1	
	Gay or lesbian		Count	40	8	46	2	22	26	48
			Expected Count	42.3	5.7	44.4	3.6	23.6	24.4	48.0
			% within Sexuality	83.3%	16.7%	95.8%	4.2%	45.8%	54.2%	100.0%
			Adjusted Residual	-1.9	1.9	1.6	-1.6	-0.9	0.9	
	Sexuality Heterosexual		Count	59	8	62	5	33	34	67
			Expected Count	59.0	8.0	62.0	5.0	33.0	34.0	67.0
			% within Sexuality	88.1%	11.9%	92.5%	7.5%	49.3%	50.7%	100.0%
			Adjusted Residual							
	Total									
blame UK	Sexuality	Bisexual	Count	13	2	15	0	5	10	15

Blame condition		Victim False	True	Victim uncreation False	True	(Re)blame present False	True	Total
	Expected Count	12.5	2.5	14.6	0.4	6.9	8.1	15.0
	% within Sexuality	86.7%	13.3%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.8	-0.8	-1.1	1.1	
	Count	6	1	7	0	4	3	7
	Expected Count	5.9	1.1	6.8	0.2	3.2	3.8	7.0
	% within Sexuality	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	0.0%	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	0.5	-0.5	0.6	-0.6	
	Count	37	8	43	2	22	23	45
	Expected Count	37.6	7.4	43.7	1.3	20.8	24.2	45.0
	% within Sexuality	82.2%	17.8%	95.6%	4.4%	48.9%	51.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.4	0.4	-1.0	1.0	0.6	-0.6	
	Count	56	11	65	2	31	36	67
	Expected Count	56.0	11.0	65.0	2.0	31.0	36.0	67.0
	% within Sexuality	83.6%	16.4%	97.0%	3.0%	46.3%	53.7%	100.0%
	Count	14	1	14	1	9	6	15
no blame	Expected Count	11.3	3.8	14.2	0.8	8.8	6.3	15.0
	% within Sexuality	93.3%	6.7%	93.3%	6.7%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.8	-1.8	-0.2	0.2	0.1	-0.1	
	Count	6	2	8	0	4	4	8
	Expected Count	6.0	2.0	7.6	0.4	4.7	3.3	8.0
	% within Sexuality	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.0	0.0	0.7	-0.7	-0.5	0.5	
	Count	34	15	46	3	29	20	49
	Expected Count	36.8	12.3	46.3	2.7	28.6	20.4	49.0
	% within Sexuality	69.4%	30.6%	93.9%	6.1%	59.2%	40.8%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.6	1.6	-0.3	0.3	0.2	-0.2	
	Count	54	18	68	4	42	30	72
	Expected Count	54.0	18.0	68.0	4.0	42.0	30.0	72.0
	% within Sexuality	75.0%	25.0%	94.4%	5.6%	58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
	Count	54	18	68	4	42	30	72
	Expected Count	54.0	18.0	68.0	4.0	42.0	30.0	72.0
	% within Sexuality	75.0%	25.0%	94.4%	5.6%	58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
Total		75.0%	25.0%	94.4%	5.6%	58.3%	41.7%	100.0%

Adjusted residuals of ± 1.96 are significant at $p < 0.05$.

A11. Annex: Emotional expressivity

Percentages reflect the survey-experiment responses in which a given item was present.

#		VP Leave	VP Remain	VP Other ⁵⁰	Notes
1	All emotions and affect	94.8%	97.0%	98.3%	Contains all emotions, including those appearing fewer than seven times.
2	Apathy, 'nothing', and 'same' only	36.8%	26.3%	35.7%	
3	Breath only	5.7%	11.8%	12.2%	Code includes breathless, lightheaded, dizzy
4	'Feel good' emotions only	47.3%	50.8%	53.0%	Better, calm, confident, content, fine, glad, good/great, happy, hopeful/optimistic, nice, okay, pleased, positive, proud, reassured, relieved, safe, satisfied
5	'Feel bad' emotions only	31.1%	47.9%	33.9%	afraid, angry, annoyed, anxious, bad, bored, cautious, concerned, disappointed, exasperated, frustrated, hopeless, irritated, miffed, narked, nervous, panicked, powerless, rushed, sad, scared, sceptical, sorry, stressed, sympathetic, tired, uneasy, upset, worried
6	'Unknown' only	4.0%	4.7%	7.0%	
7	All emotions, minus breath, apathy, and unknown	75.4%	85.7%	81.7%	Breath, apathy, 'nothing', 'same', and 'unknown' removed
8	As for (7) minus 'feel good' emotions	54.0%	71.7%	65.2%	
9	As for (7) minus 'feel bad' emotions	67.2%	74.7%	72.2%	
	Total number of documents	402	845	115	

⁵⁰ Would rather not say; Would not vote; Unsure.

A12. Annex: Ethics Review Forms

In this document:

- Introductory text from all ethics review forms
- Form for survey-experiment v1
- Form for survey-experiment v2
- Form for focus groups (including research consent form)
- Form for online focus groups and interviews (including research consent form)

Attached separately:

- Survey-experiment (v1)
- Shortened version of survey-experiment (v2)
- Optional follow-up research survey

A12.1. Introductory text from all ethics review forms

Brussels School of International Studies School of Politics and International Relations Ethical Review Form

The University of Kent requires that each School has procedures in place to ensure that the ethical implications of research involving human participants have been considered and that ethical standards of conduct are achieved. All research proposals that involve any human participants should therefore be subjected to an ethical review prior to their commencement. Projects which involve interviews and surveys of staff, students and other groups are included in this category, alongside scientific interventional techniques and the use of non-anonymised primary source data.

The standardised format is to be used for the review process and it is the responsibility of staff to ensure that where appropriate their own research, and that of students they supervise, is submitted for ethical scrutiny.

An ethical review form should be completed and submitted to Maria Mälksoo at m.malksoo@kent.ac.uk.

The form is in four parts. Part I provides general information about the research project. Part II consists of an ethics checklist. Part III asks for more detailed answers to the ethical implications of your research. Part IV is your signature and date.

A12.2. Survey-experiment v1

A12.2.a) Part I

1.1: Title of Project

PhD Thesis: "How blame makes a villain of the EU"

1.2: Details of researchers and project organisers

a) Name of main researcher

Laura Skillen

b) Name of others involved and role (e.g. supervisor) including affiliation if not in the School of Politics and IR:

Supervisor: Dr Bojan Savic

c) Which relevant research ethics guidelines have you consulted before completing this form? (One such set of guidelines is the ESRC's *Research Ethics Framework*, <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/about-esrc/information/research-ethics.aspx>).

(Please note that the above page has moved – see <https://esrc.ukri.org/funding/guidance-for-applicants/research-ethics/>). I've reviewed the above, as well as the *RCUK Policy and Guidelines on the Governance of Good Research Conduct*.

d) For students: please confirm that you have discussed this application with your supervisor.

Confirmed; Bojan has reviewed the related survey/experiment questions.

For amended application – I discussed the software and need to make certain of the questions compulsory with Bojan.

e) For supervisors: What are your comments, if any, on this application?

The questions are varied, specific, nuanced, well-conceptualized, clearly phrased, and strongly embedded in the candidate's overall research objectives, theoretical framework, and overarching research question.

She has adequately considered the ethical issues of harm and risk to research participants.

I advise the candidate to continue to re-evaluate what data analysis methods she intends to deploy once her survey is complete. Much like the survey design itself, these decisions should be tied to the candidate's research objective, theory, and research question. Also, while raw data will be collected at the individual level and will enable some individuated conclusions, the candidate should also reflect on population-level (aggregate) findings that might arise.

f) Expected start date and duration of the research?

End of July/start of August 2019 – October 31 2019 (potentially additional time, depending on whether Brexit goes ahead on October 31 or not).

1.3: Research funding

- a) **Are you applying for, or have you received, funding from the following research councils and foundations for this research project:** the ESRC or other members of Research Councils UK; The British Academy; the Leverhulme Trust; the Nuffield

Foundation; the Rowntree Foundation; CORDIS (European Commission); Commonwealth, Chevening, Fullbright or Marshall Scholarships.

My BSIS PhD scholarship is funded by the UK Research Council. Funding was not specifically requested for this survey/experiment.

- b) If you are seeking or receiving funding from different sources than above, please name the source(s). Please also discuss if there may be any conflicts of interest or possible impact on the independence of your research arising from this source of funding.

N/A – any additional costs self-funded. Note that my work (the International Mediation Institute) has given me permission to use their upgraded/premium SurveyMonkey account to conduct this survey; I am the only person who accesses that account, though theoretically the Board Co-Chair could find a way to access the account.

1.4: Purpose of Project/aims and Objectives

Provide a brief outline (one/two paragraphs) of the project written in lay-person's language, assuming that the reader is unfamiliar with the subject. Include how the project fits with existing knowledge and what are its intended benefits (e.g. to conceptual knowledge, specific groups, services etc). Include also a short description of methodology.

The overall research project asks “how blame makes a villain of the EU”, and develops a theory for how this operates. The survey/experiment discussed here aims to identify individuals' reactions to blame, and also measures some psychometric factors (agreeability, Just World Belief, group vs individual-based value systems, affect and emotional factors) to help explain individuals' reactions. This in turn helps point to ways to redress blame and associated polarisation in politics.

Four blame vignettes are used, with blaming of the EU, blaming of the UK Government/Westminster, blaming of ‘ourselves’, and no blame. Only one vignette is shown to each respondent.

A12.2.b) Part II: Research Ethics Checklist

Please think carefully through the potential risks to research participants (including the researcher) before filling in this checklist. If you are unsure which box to tick for any of these questions, and if consulting the ethics guidelines listed above do not help, please discuss it with Dr Hammerstad.

Please answer each question by ticking the appropriate box	YES	NO
1. Have you, before filling in this form, read a relevant research ethics guideline (e.g. from the ESRC)?	X	
2. Does the study involve participants who are particularly vulnerable? (e.g. refugees, prisoners, victims of violence)		X

3. Does the study involve participants who are unable to give informed consent? (e.g. children, people with learning disabilities)		X
4. Will the study require the co-operation of a gatekeeper for initial access to the groups or individuals to be recruited (e.g. pupils at a school, prisoners, refugees in camps)		X
5. Will it be necessary for participants to take part in the study without their knowledge and consent at the time? (e.g. covert observation of people in non-public places)		X
6. Will the study involve discussion of sensitive topics (e.g. sexual activity, drug use)		X
7. Could the study induce embarrassment, psychological stress or anxiety or cause harm or negative consequences?	X	
8. Will the study involve prolonged or repetitive testing?		X
9. Will financial inducements (other than reasonable expenses and compensation for time) be offered to participants?		X
10. Will the study involve recruitment of patients or staff through the NHS or Social Services?		X
11. Will the study involve the withholding of information from, or deliberate deception of, participants?	X	
12. Will the study involve any potential risk to the researcher(s)?		X

Re question 7: Participants are asked to hold their breath while reading a text; they are informed on the front page that this will be the case, and are reassured that it is okay if they failed to hold their breath while reading.

Re question 11: Falsified news vignettes are used in the survey/experiment, and this is addressed on the final page of the survey, where participants are told that the 'news article' was fictionalised.

A12.2.c) Part III: Research ethical considerations

3.1: Conduct of project

a) Location of the research: Online – SurveyMonkey

b) Brief description of participants, including location and number

People eligible to vote in the UK (i.e. 18+). More results would be more helpful, but 500 is realistic at this point. Participants will also be recruited online, using e.g. mTurk.

c) Brief description of controls and number

Several questions are given in alternating order. The main 'test' condition is a vignette, of which four variants are shown: blaming the EU, blaming the UK, blaming ourselves/us, and no blame. The no blame could be considered a control.

d) Brief account of how the Data Protection Act will be complied with

(for an outline of the main issues raised by the Act, see:

<http://www.kent.ac.uk/researchservices/docs/ethics-governance/Data%20Protection%20Act%201998%20-%20info%20for%20researchers.doc>)

Addressed in the introduction to the survey (see attached).

e) Payment of participants (if any):

Participants recruited via mTurk or similar will be paid for their time at the rate suggested by mTurk.

For survey/experiment participants gathered using mTurk or the like, a duplicate copy of the survey has been created that includes codes so that participants can seek payment. The code is clearly marked on the final page of the survey.

Given UK residents are sought, payment will be calculated at the level of minimum wage in the UK. As of April 2019, this was 8.21GBP per hour (10.03USD as of 23 August), and participants in the survey to date have taken around 8 minutes on average to complete the survey. Allowing for 10 minutes, this results in a payment of 1.67USD per survey response.

Exceptionally, the final four questions in the survey, those following the vignette, will be switched to 'response required', as without this data, completion of the survey is meaningless. The statement at the outset of the survey is to be amended such that *most* responses are optional, rather than *all* responses are optional.

g) Source of funding (if any):

As above – no funding specific to this survey/experiment.

h) Brief account of methodology/techniques (a summarised account of measures to be used should be included as should examples of any questionnaires etc):

Survey/experiment with alternating vignettes (see attached).

i) Brief account of how participants will be selected and any issues that arise relating to the selection of participants

Participants will be recruited using the researcher's networks (including via distribution within University of Kent), sample size/survey groups (e.g. www.reddit.com/r/samplesize), and via mTurk or the like where there are insufficient respondents. I am not looking for a specific demography, as the psychometric profile of participants is the more relevant factor.

3.2: Risk, harm and benefit

This section should address at least the following:

a) Any risks to the participants (including the researcher(s)): this might include all forms of harm, e.g. physical or psychological/emotional. Particular attention should be paid to the potential to cause distress and embarrassment. Measures to be taken where necessary to ensure the welfare and safety of participants.

- Participants are asked to briefly hold their breath while reading a text, in order to trigger heuristic processing. The need to hold their breath is advised in the survey/experiment cover sheet, before the participant starts the survey itself.
- Questions about voting preferences include answers such as “I don’t remember” and “Would prefer not to answer”.
- All questions are optional
- Questions are drawn from existing surveys and/or research where possible. The vignettes are drawn from existing news media, legislation, and political rhetoric.

b) Issues relating to confidentiality during the project and in subsequent data analysis, presentation and publication.

No identifiable information is collected within the survey itself (other than IP address).

When the survey is finished, a new survey opens to collect contact details for follow-up research. This is stressed as being optional. No IP address is collected for this survey, and the personal data is stored separately to the data from the main survey.

c) Anticipated difficulties, particularly those relating to power imbalances between researcher and participants, e.g. staff/students or where dependant relationships are involved.

N/A

d) Details of how the project meets the four main ethical principles of research i.e. non-maleficence (not causing harm), beneficence (doing good), autonomy (treating people with respect and enabling them to make their own choices), and justice (who will be advantaged and disadvantaged by the research).

Non-maleficence: No harm is anticipated as a result of this study. The falsified vignettes used are explained to be fiction on the page immediately after reading them.

Beneficence: This research will help in identifying factors and behaviours that relate to political blame, and thereby support a theory that may help to redress blame in the political arena.

Autonomy: Participation in the survey/experiment is voluntary, and questions can be skipped.

Justice: No anticipated advantage or disadvantage to any party.

e) Details of how the research will take account of cultural issues, including some understanding of the need to provide appropriate interpreters etc.

No anticipated cultural issues.

f) The rationale for the decision to pay, or not to pay, participants and the likely impact on participation. It should be noted that all incentives, whether monetary or otherwise may represent an unethical inducement to participation.

Payment (via mTurk) is not expected to skew results, and will only be used to reach the desired number of participants.

g) Issues relating to information to be provided to participants in advance of, or during the research. Issues relating to the intended feedback, or otherwise of research results to participants.

N/A

h) Information about other review procedures to which the research project has already been subjected, including management approval where staff are involved as subjects. Is further or alternative ethical review required?

N/A

3.3: Consent

It is essential that all those who participate in research should do so voluntarily, hence at a minimum this section should address:

a) Details of how it is intended that informed consent be obtained from the participants. Depending on the nature of the research, this can involve the production of a written information sheet that includes a mechanism for the participant to evidence that their consent has been obtained. Copies of any relevant documentation should be included.

The survey cover sheet includes relevant information, including a statement that participation is voluntary, and that they should close the survey if they do not wish their answers to be recorded. (See attached)

b) Procedures for gaining permission from participants who are unable to give informed consent (materials should be attached).

N/A

c) A special case has to be made for any cases where it is not possible to obtain consent.

N/A

A12.2.d) Part IV: Signature

This part must be signed and dated regardless of whether or not you need to fill in Part III. If you send the form by email, you do not need to sign (only date). It is enough that it is sent from your University of Kent email address.

Signature: Laura Skillen

Date: 17 July 2019

Amended ethics review submitted 27 August 2019

A12.3. Survey-experiment v2

A12.3.a) Part I

1.1: Title of Project

PhD Thesis: "How blame makes a villain of the EU"

1.2: Details of researchers and project organisers

a) Name of main researcher

Laura Skillen

b) Name of others involved and role (e.g. supervisor) including affiliation if not in the School of Politics and IR:

Supervisor: Dr Bojan Savic

c) Which relevant research ethics guidelines have you consulted before completing this form?

I've reviewed the ESRC's *Research Ethics Framework*, as well as the *RCUK Policy and Guidelines on the Governance of Good Research Conduct*.

d) For students: please confirm that you have discussed this application with your supervisor.

Confirmed; Bojan has reviewed the related survey/experiment questions. This survey-experiment is largely a shortened version of the previously-administered one.

e) For supervisors: What are your comments, if any, on this application?

It is unclear to me that supplementary data gathered through this follow-up survey will significantly help the candidate better address her research question. Moreover, I have concerns about the potential to over-interpret new data (since the candidate is not asking directly how the upcoming election affects the respondent's emotional experience of Brexit and/or the EU; at any rate, designing questions that would shed light on that dynamic would be difficult).

However, since administering the follow-up survey is unlikely to require significant time from the candidate, I am happy to review her findings once survey-based data collection is complete.

f) Expected start date and duration of the research?

Early November until midnight before the General Election takes place (currently likely to be December 12).

1.3: Research funding

- c) **Are you applying for, or have you received, funding from the following research councils and foundations for this research project:** the ESRC or other members of Research Councils UK; The British Academy; the Leverhulme Trust; the Nuffield Foundation; the Rowntree Foundation; CORDIS (European Commission); Commonwealth, Chevening, Fullbright or Marshall Scholarships.

My BSIS PhD scholarship is funded by the UK Research Council. Funding was not specifically requested for this survey/experiment.

- d) If you are seeking or receiving funding from different sources than above, please name the source(s). Please also discuss if there may be any conflicts of interest or possible impact on the independence of your research arising from this source of funding.

N/A – any additional costs self-funded. Note that my work (the International Mediation Institute) has given me permission to use their upgraded/premium SurveyMonkey account to conduct this survey; I am the only person who accesses that account, though theoretically the Board Co-Chair could find a way to access the account.

1.4: Purpose of Project/aims and Objectives

The overall research project asks “how blame makes a villain of the EU”, and develops a theory for how this operates. The survey/experiment discussed here aims to identify individuals’ reactions to blame.

Four blame vignettes are used, with blaming of the EU, blaming of the UK Government/Westminster, blaming of ‘ourselves’, and no blame. Only one vignette is shown to each respondent.

What has changed since the last survey-experiment?

Results from the last survey-experiment were a little surprising in that (a) Remainers were ‘annoyed’ after reading the EU-blaming vignette; (b) people didn’t want to *do* anything if they felt annoyed or angry after reading the EU-blaming vignette. I have several possible reasons this might be:

1. Vignette is poorly written
2. Emotions are completely divorced from practices
3. There are invisible ‘other factors’ at work (e.g. Leavers feel annoyed at the EU, want to leave the EU, but for some reason don’t want to do anything about this—considered unlikely)
4. Theory is wrong
5. People just don’t care about the floods if it’s not happening to them or their neighbours

6. Prior to the announcement of the General Election, there wasn't anything people could *do* if they were annoyed at the EU (other than write their MPs/lobby/organise/tell friends—i.e. not a lot that was EU-focused)

I've seen a couple of results to the existing survey-experiment come in since the announcement of the GE, and already people are talking more about 'voting' in response to the vignettes.

I would like to engage with these issues with an updated survey-experiment. Other than some wording tweaks indicated on the attached survey, and the removal of all demographic/psychometric questions (I've already got some 1100 results including this data, and it doesn't help get at the 'practices' issue), I have made the following changes:

1. Addition of question 'why do you feel that way?' after 'how do you feel after reading the text', so that people can explain their feelings. E.g. are Remainers 'annoyed' at the journalist/propaganda (some qualitative responses suggest this), rather than at the EU, after reading the vignette?
2. Addition of question regarding top priority for GE to final page of survey, to help detangle salience issues.

I wanted the survey to be shorter to encourage further responses—and save money when paying for responses. I kept the vignettes the same as before to allow direct data comparison between new responses and those already collected.

Note that the mTurk version of this survey-experiment includes an additional question to allow them to enter their worker ID.

A12.3.b) Part II: Research Ethics Checklist

Please think carefully through the potential risks to research participants (including the researcher) before filling in this checklist. If you are unsure which box to tick for any of these questions, and if consulting the ethics guidelines listed above do not help, please discuss it with Dr Hammerstad.

Please answer each question by ticking the appropriate box	YES	NO
1. Have you, before filling in this form, read a relevant research ethics guideline (e.g. from the ESRC)?	X	
2. Does the study involve participants who are particularly vulnerable? (e.g. refugees, prisoners, victims of violence)		X
3. Does the study involve participants who are unable to give informed consent? (e.g. children, people with learning disabilities)		X

4. Will the study require the co-operation of a gatekeeper for initial access to the groups or individuals to be recruited (e.g. pupils at a school, prisoners, refugees in camps)		X
5. Will it be necessary for participants to take part in the study without their knowledge and consent at the time? (e.g. covert observation of people in non-public places)		X
6. Will the study involve discussion of sensitive topics (e.g. sexual activity, drug use)		X
7. Could the study induce embarrassment, psychological stress or anxiety or cause harm or negative consequences?	X	
8. Will the study involve prolonged or repetitive testing?		X
9. Will financial inducements (other than reasonable expenses and compensation for time) be offered to participants?		X
10. Will the study involve recruitment of patients or staff through the NHS or Social Services?		X
11. Will the study involve the withholding of information from, or deliberate deception of, participants?	X	
12. Will the study involve any potential risk to the researcher(s)?		X

Re question 7: Participants are asked to hold their breath while reading a text; they are informed on the front page that this will be the case, and are reassured that it is okay if they failed to hold their breath while reading.

Re question 11: Falsified news vignettes are used in the survey/experiment, and this is addressed on the final page of the survey, where participants are told that the 'news article' was fictionalised.

A12.3.c) Part III: Research ethical considerations

3.1: Conduct of project

a) Location of the research: Online – SurveyMonkey

b) Brief description of participants, including location and number

People eligible to vote in the UK (i.e. 18+). An additional 300 results (75 no blame, EU blame, UK blame, selves blame) is the minimum sought, with more results desired.

c) Brief description of controls and number

The main 'test' condition is a vignette, of which four variants are shown: blaming the EU, blaming the UK, blaming ourselves/us, and no blame. The no blame could be considered a control.

d) Brief account of how the Data Protection Act will be complied with

(for an outline of the main issues raised by the Act, see:

<http://www.kent.ac.uk/researchservices/docs/ethics-governance/Data%20Protection%20Act%201998%20-%20info%20for%20researchers.doc>)

Addressed in the introduction to the survey (see attached).

e) Payment of participants (if any):

For survey/experiment participants gathered using mTurk or the like, a duplicate copy of the survey has been created that includes codes so that participants can seek payment. The code is clearly marked on the final page of the survey.

Given UK residents are sought, payment will be calculated at the level of minimum wage in the UK. As of April 2019, this was 8.21GBP per hour (10.64USD as of 1 November). Allowing for 5 minutes per response, this results in a payment of 0.89USD per survey response.

g) Source of funding (if any):

As above – no funding specific to this survey/experiment.

h) Brief account of methodology/techniques (a summarised account of measures to be used should be included as should examples of any questionnaires etc):

Survey/experiment with alternating vignettes (see attached).

i) Brief account of how participants will be selected and any issues that arise relating to the selection of participants

Participants will be recruited using the researcher's networks, sample size/survey groups (e.g. www.reddit.com/r/samplesize), and via mTurk.

3.2: Risk, harm and benefit

This section should address at least the following:

a) Any risks to the participants

- Participants are asked to briefly hold their breath while reading a text, in order to trigger heuristic processing. The need to hold their breath is advised in the survey/experiment cover sheet, before the participant starts the survey itself.
- Questions about voting preferences include answers such as "I don't remember" and "Would prefer not to answer".

- Most questions are optional. The five questions following the vignettes are marked 'required', as they are the core deliverable for the research.
- Questions are drawn from existing surveys and/or research where possible. The vignettes are drawn from existing news media, legislation, and political rhetoric.

b) Issues relating to confidentiality

No identifiable information is collected within the survey itself (other than IP address).

When the survey is finished, a new survey opens to collect contact details for follow-up research. This is stressed as being optional. No IP address is collected for this survey, and the personal data is stored separately to the data from the main survey.

c) Anticipated difficulties

N/A

d) Details of how the project meets the four main ethical principles of research

Non-maleficence: No harm is anticipated as a result of this study. The falsified vignettes used are explained to be fiction on the page immediately after reading them.

Beneficence: This research will help in identifying factors and behaviours that relate to political blame, and thereby support a theory that may help to redress blame in the political arena.

Autonomy: Participation in the survey/experiment is voluntary, and most questions can be skipped.

Justice: No anticipated advantage or disadvantage to any party.

e) Details of how the research will take account of cultural issues,

No anticipated cultural issues. Survey is addressed to 'UK' voters rather than 'British' voters in order to avoid isolating e.g. Northern Irish populations.

f) The rationale for the decision to pay, or not to pay, participants and the likely impact on participation.

Payment (via mTurk) is not expected to skew results, and will only be used to reach the desired number of participants.

g) Issues relating to information to be provided to participants in advance of, or during the research.

N/A

h) Information about other review procedures to which the research project has already been subjected

The previous survey-experiment passed ethics review.

3.3: Consent

It is essential that all those who participate in research should do so voluntarily, hence at a minimum this section should address:

a) Details of how it is intended that informed consent be obtained from the participants.

The survey cover sheet includes relevant information, including a statement that participation is voluntary, and that they should close the survey if they do not wish their answers to be recorded. (See attached)

b) Procedures for gaining permission from participants who are unable to give informed consent (materials should be attached).

N/A

c) A special case has to be made for any cases where it is not possible to obtain consent.

N/A

A12.3.d) Part IV: Signature

This part must be signed and dated regardless of whether or not you need to fill in Part III. If you send the form by email, you do not need to sign (only date). It is enough that it is sent from your University of Kent email address.

Signature: Laura Skillen

Date: 1 Nov 2019

A12.4. Focus groups

A12.4.a) Part I

1.1: Title of Project

PhD Thesis: "How blame makes a villain of the EU"

1.2: Details of researchers and project organisers

a) Name of main researcher

Laura Skillen

b) Name of others involved and role (e.g. supervisor) including affiliation if not in the School of Politics and IR:

Supervisor: Dr Tom Casier

c) Which relevant research ethics guidelines have you consulted before completing this form?

I've reviewed the ESRC's *Research Ethics Framework*, as well as the *RCUK Policy and Guidelines on the Governance of Good Research Conduct*.

d) For students: please confirm that you have discussed this application with your supervisor.

Confirmed.

e) For supervisors: What are your comments, if any, on this application?

Running focus groups is a long planned and essential component of Laura's PhD research. Laura has discussed the questions and planning with me in advance. She has taken the necessary precautions to make sure that possible risks of harm are kept to an absolute minimum. All measures are in place to guarantee strict confidentiality. I do not see any ethical issues.

f) Expected start date and duration of the research?

March 2020; 4-6 weeks.

1.3: Research funding

- e) **Are you applying for, or have you received, funding from the following research councils and foundations for this research project:** the ESRC or other members of Research Councils UK; The British Academy; the Leverhulme Trust; the Nuffield Foundation; the Rowntree Foundation; CORDIS (European Commission); Commonwealth, Chevening, Fullbright or Marshall Scholarships.

My BSIS PhD scholarship is funded by the UK Research Council. No other external funding received for this project.

- f) If you are seeking or receiving funding from different sources than above, please name the source(s). Please also discuss if there may be any conflicts of interest or possible impact on the independence of your research arising from this source of funding.

N/A – any additional costs self-funded.

1.4: Purpose of Project/aims and Objectives

Provide a brief outline (one/two paragraphs) of the project written in lay-person's language, assuming that the reader is unfamiliar with the subject. Include how the project fits with existing knowledge and what are its intended benefits (e.g. to conceptual knowledge, specific groups, services etc). Include also a short description of methodology.

The final component of my PhD data collection is running focus groups in the UK. Focus groups bring together small groups to “discuss a series of open-ended questions”, with data generated through conversation and participant interaction. The researcher is therefore able to “capture nuance and tension surrounding potentially contested or highly contextualised subjects”—in this case, the EU as villain.⁶⁰

As my case study is Brexit, it is necessary to conduct my focus groups with UK voters. Staging the groups in different UK regions improves ecological validity.

Potential participants have been identified through a secondary survey associated with administration of a survey-experiment, with desired group size 6-8. Additional participants have been gathered via Reddit and Facebook groups specific to UK geographies and pro-Leave and right-wing groups.

Each focus group will contain either pro-Leave or pro-Remain people, to avoid them from blaming each other during the group; to reflect the ‘social bubbles’ in which Leavers and Remainers tend to find themselves; and because “focus groups composed of individuals with shared backgrounds and/or experiences are better at eliciting data on sensitive or vulnerable topics”⁶¹

Conducting these focus groups is essential to my PhD research. To consider not just population-level but also individual-level effects of blame, it is necessary to speak with people, to understand how blame is (re)produced, how spaces for EU-blaming are created, and how this space is disciplined. Focus groups allow me to access high-detail discursive data, including through observation of body language, vocal tone and other cues, that would otherwise be unavailable to me. They dramatically enrich my data collection to date, which has worked to (i) identify what blame takes place, (ii) the discursive background to blame, and (iii) population-level effects of blame.

⁶⁰ Cyr, J. (2017). The Unique Utility of Focus Groups for Mixed-Methods Research. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 50(4), 1038-1042. doi:10.1017/S104909651700124X

⁶¹ Ibid. 1041

The currently drafted questions for the focus group are attached.

A12.4.b) Part II: Research Ethics Checklist

Please answer each question by ticking the appropriate box	YES	NO
1. Have you, before filling in this form, read a relevant research ethics guideline (e.g. from the ESRC)?	X	
2. Does the study involve participants who are particularly vulnerable? (e.g. refugees, prisoners, victims of violence)		X
3. Does the study involve participants who are unable to give informed consent? (e.g. children, people with learning disabilities)		X
4. Will the study require the co-operation of a gatekeeper for initial access to the groups or individuals to be recruited (e.g. pupils at a school, prisoners, refugees in camps)		X
5. Will it be necessary for participants to take part in the study without their knowledge and consent at the time? (e.g. covert observation of people in non-public places)		X
6. Will the study involve discussion of sensitive topics (e.g. sexual activity, drug use)	X*	
7. Could the study induce embarrassment, psychological stress or anxiety or cause harm or negative consequences?	X*	
8. Will the study involve prolonged or repetitive testing?		X
9. Will financial inducements (other than reasonable expenses and compensation for time) be offered to participants?		X
10. Will the study involve recruitment of patients or staff through the NHS or Social Services?		X
11. Will the study involve the withholding of information from, or deliberate deception of, participants?	X*	
12. Will the study involve any potential risk to the researcher(s)?		X

Re question 6: The topic of Brexit is quite emotionally sensitive, and questions have been designed to ensure it will have minimum negative emotional affect, e.g. by starting and ending with 'feel-good' questions and through careful moderation inspired by the principles of mediation.

Re question 7: Emotions will be discussed during the focus group, but no long-term negative effects are anticipated.

Re question 11: In recruitment it is indicated that there will be focus groups for Remain groups as well as for Leave groups; this is untrue, only Leave groups are sought. This deception is to (a) avoid 'misfiling' people because they want to participate and so pretend to be part of the other group, and (b) minimise accusations of being part of a conspiracy etc when recruiting in Leave groups (this has happened to me rather a lot).

A12.4.c) Part III: Research ethical considerations

3.1: Conduct of project

a) Location of the research: UK – in person.

b) Brief description of participants, including location and number

UK Leave voters. While ideally focus groups will consist of 6-8 participants, a minimum of 4 would be acceptable. See (i) below for geographical locations. Logistically, focus groups will need to take place somewhere quiet enough to have and record conversations, and private enough that people aren't 'outed' as Leavers or otherwise feel hampered from giving full response.

c) Brief description of controls and number

N/A

d) Brief account of how the Data Protection Act will be complied with

Participation is voluntary, and only the researcher (and potentially their supervisor) has or will have access to the data generated during the focus groups. It will be stored on the researcher's laptop under password (screen lock is applied to the laptop), and backed up to OneDrive, which is GDPR-compliant. Once data is no longer required it will be deleted. Focus group participants will be given pseudonyms.

e) Payment of participants (if any):

15GBP Amazon/Waterstones voucher and light refreshments.

g) Source of funding (if any):

Self-funded.

h) Brief account of methodology/techniques (a summarised account of measures to be used should be included as should examples of any questionnaires etc):

Focus groups—please see below draft questions.

Question type	Question	Comment
<i>Introduction from facilitator</i>	* I'm Laura at Uni Kent Brussels * Australian, lived in the UK	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Research blame in politics * Session will involve me asking questions and them coming up with answers as a group * Session will be recorded and transcribed * Purpose is PhD thesis * Safe space; privacy, (kindness) * Voucher at end and details if need to contact me 	
Opening	Tell us who you are, where you live, and the best thing that's happened to you this week.	Ice-breaker; generate trust
Introduction	You each voted to 'Leave' the EU. Suppose that the EU was a person; tell me what this person would be like. [Or What first comes to mind when you think about the EU?]	Reassure them that they're all in the same space, all voted Leave, this is a safe area. I want to find out their existing impressions of the EU (are they a villain)
Introduction	For you, what does it mean to 'hold someone accountable'?	Get on same page, prime for ideas of justice (using accountability rather than 'blame' to get at next question).
Introduction	What are some ways in which political actors such as parties or politicians can be held accountable?	Get understanding of how they feel they can act to hold political body accountable
Introduction	What are ways people can hold the EU specifically accountable?	Hobolt and Tilley argue that the only way is by voting out, because representation invisible.
Transition	Think back to the EU referendum campaign. There were a number of things the EU was blamed for [or 'was held accountable for']. Please work together to come up with a list of as many of these things as you can remember.	I want them to work as a group to come up with a list of things the EU (or a part thereof) should be blamed for. Butcher's paper and markers provided. If they can't think of anything as a group, I'll get them to firstly write a list for themselves, and

	<p>All things considered, which of these was most important to you (and why)?</p> <p><i>[One of the things on the list is picked by the group]</i></p>	<p>then bring them back to the group. I'm hoping that via the invitation they've received, the consent form and the above context, they'll already be primed to think about the EU in terms of blame and accountability.</p> <p>I may need to ask which 'part' of the EU should be blamed in the given instance.</p> <p>Depending on how much time the following 'key' questions take, a second or third item could be considered.</p>
Key	Could you tell the group what happened in this situation?	Get them to reiterate the blame, group can add details (note they may have already done this when jotting down the list)
Key	How did that make you personally feel? (Why)	I expect they'll say why it made them feel that way, but otherwise, a follow-up question.
Key	How did it make you feel about the EU?	May again be blurred with the previous question.
Key	Was this important to your decision to vote Leave?	Perhaps it made them feel bad but it didn't have any influence on their vote.
Key	What (other) people do you think it would have influenced?	Victim identification; resolve internal contested victim status and allow people to talk about victims (potentially including themselves) without having to accept they're a victim.
Key	How do you think it influenced them <i>(and not you)</i> ?	
Key	How do you think it made them feel?	

<i>Extra</i>	If you were the facilitator, what question would you ask next?	
<i>Extra</i>	Do you have anyone in your life who voted Remain? What do you think could have changed their mind to voting Leave?	Check for reiteration of blame – expect them to use thinking/feeling language.
<i>Extra</i>	What could have been said to change your mind about voting Leave?	(Exploratory—consider overall context within which blame takes place, and also expect some reiteration of blame and accountability.)
Ending	Is there anything we should have talked about, but didn't?	
Ending	What are your hopes for the UK, now that you are leaving the EU?	Finishing up on a positive note; also getting at what they feel having FELT bad and then implemented practices to relieve those negative feelings.
<i>Summary and next steps from facilitator</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Reiterate next steps * Thank you * Here's your voucher * Here's how you can contact me 	

The questions marked 'extra' will ideally be asked to give context to and reinforce the research, but are not as vital as those marked 'key'.

i) Brief account of how participants will be selected and any issues that arise relating to the selection of participants

Those who indicated they would like to participate following the previous stage of research (survey-experiment) were contacted to gauge their ongoing interest. An RSVP was also set up and a brief description of the research was posted to social media (UK subreddits and pro-Leave and right-wing Facebook groups) along the lines of the following:

I'm looking for focus group participants for my PhD research on blame in Brexit. I appreciate your help!

I am a final-year PhD student at the University of Kent, where I am researching blame in politics using Brexit as a case study.

The final part of this research will be conducting focus groups in various locations in the UK in March. The focus group will take **approx. 90–110 minutes** to complete, and you will be given **light refreshments and a £15**

Amazon/Waterstones voucher in appreciation. Your help will directly contribute to work that aims to **reduce polarisation and division in society**.

Each focus group will consist of 6–8 people who voted **either** Remain **or** Leave in the 2016 referendum—i.e. there will not be any mixed groups. I will facilitate group discussion by asking you a series of questions about blame and accountability in the Brexit campaign.

If you are interested in participating, please fill in the form via the link, and thank you so much for your help.

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LMS88FG2020>

Those that didn't want to complete a SurveyMonkey survey—as apparently this is associated with left-wing spies—were invited to email me instead. Information requested was name, contact information (email, with the option to just use Facebook given where I was contacted via Messenger), location (most people gave full UK postcodes), and whether they voted Leave/Remain in the 2016 referendum.

Based on the given locations, all interested participants were mapped. This stage is ongoing as of 2 February. At the end of next week I'll be identifying loci where there are multiple interested participants, and will then schedule them and a location (e.g. university, library). If there are *almost* enough participants but not quite for a given location, I will invite people to bring friends or colleagues who also voted Leave to participate if interested.

3.2: Risk, harm and benefit

This section should address at least the following:

a) Any risks to the participants (including the researcher(s)): this might include all forms of harm, e.g. physical or psychological/emotional. Particular attention should be paid to the potential to cause distress and embarrassment. Measures to be taken where necessary to ensure the welfare and safety of participants.

Focus groups consist of Leave voters only, to avoid the potential emotional distress of discussing this charged issue with people seen as 'enemies' or 'betrayers'. No long-term emotional trauma for participants is likely, though as the research aims to get at the visceral components of blame—i.e. emotions—it is necessary to give people a forum to express their emotions. These emotions are to be expressed towards the EU, however, not others in the room.

b) Issues relating to confidentiality during the project and in subsequent data analysis, presentation and publication.

Personal data (voting behaviour, contact information) is accessible to the researcher only, is under two layers of passwords, and data for non-participants will be deleted once the focus groups have been conducted.

Participant information will be anonymised so that, while they may be able to identify *themselves* were they to read the researcher's work, no other third party would be able to. Personal/contact details will not be used in the thesis document or related publications/presentations.

c) Anticipated difficulties, particularly those relating to power imbalances between researcher and participants, e.g. staff/students or where dependant relationships are involved.

It's anticipated that participants may get quite fired up; based on previous experience, it's not out of the question that participants will accuse the researcher of being a Labour/BBC/MSM/Soros spy. For this reason I will be as open as I can be about my research and who I am, remain calm and objective during the focus group, and if really necessary, shorten or stop the group.

Other difficulties are logistical only.

d) Details of how the project meets the four main ethical principles of research i.e. non-maleficence (not causing harm), beneficence (doing good), autonomy (treating people with respect and enabling them to make their own choices), and justice (who will be advantaged and disadvantaged by the research).

Non-maleficence: No harm is anticipated as a result of this study.

Beneficence: This research problematises political blame with a view to finding ways to counter it or reduce people's susceptibility to it. This is particularly important in the context of Cambridge Analytica and its associated activities, plus social media and viral news more generally. Participants may also find it a cathartic experience.

Autonomy: Participation is voluntary, and while people will be encouraged to give a response to any question—in a safe space established by the facilitator and through the construction of the questions—they will not be forced to give a response at any time.

Justice: No anticipated advantage or disadvantage to any party.

e) Details of how the research will take account of cultural issues, including some understanding of the need to provide appropriate interpreters etc.

No anticipated cultural issues.

f) The rationale for the decision to pay, or not to pay, participants and the likely impact on participation. It should be noted that all incentives, whether monetary or otherwise may represent an unethical inducement to participation.

I was originally going to give a payment of 25GBP per participant, based on the UK minimum wage plus a small allowance for transport to/from. However it was suggested that this was too much, and that it might cause participants to try and give me the answer they thought I was looking for, rather than genuine responses. I spoke with some Brits and then ran a short poll, to which 40 people responded (<https://www.strawpoll.me/19319494/r>). 33% said a gesture of a 10-15GBP voucher would be expected; 25% said refreshments only; 13% 16-20GBP cash and 10% 10-15GBP. Only 20% wanted payment of over 20GBP, so I decided on the combination of the voucher as 'gesture' and light refreshments.

g) Issues relating to information to be provided to participants in advance of, or during the research. Issues relating to the intended feedback, or otherwise of research results to participants.

N/A

h) Information about other review procedures to which the research project has already been subjected, including management approval where staff are involved as subjects. Is further or alternative ethical review required?

N/A

3.3: Consent

It is essential that all those who participate in research should do so voluntarily, hence at a minimum this section should address:

a) Details of how it is intended that informed consent be obtained from the participants.

The focus groups are voluntary, and only those who have indicated interest are invited to participate; people can leave at any time. Please find informed consent form attached. This will be given to participants when they arrive for signing; additionally, the first and last few minutes of the focus group are dedicated to explaining the purpose of research and what's involved.

b) Procedures for gaining permission from participants who are unable to give informed consent (materials should be attached).

N/A

c) A special case has to be made for any cases where it is not possible to obtain consent.

N/A

A12.4.d) Part IV: Signature

This part must be signed and dated regardless of whether or not you need to fill in Part III. If you send the form by email, you do not need to sign (only date). It is enough that it is sent from your University of Kent email address.

Signature: Laura Skillen

Date: 3 February 2020

A12.4.e) Research Consent Form

Title of study: Focus groups on blame and accountability in the Brexit campaign

Researcher: Laura Skillen, PhD student at the University of Kent

1. I confirm that I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the study and the researcher has answered them to my satisfaction.
2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time, without giving a reason and without any consequences.
3. I understand that my data will be anonymised in the research, such that a third party who does not know me would not be able to identify me specifically.
4. I understand that any information recorded in the study will remain confidential, and no information that identifies me will be made publicly available or shared with any third parties.
5. I consent to the use of the data in research, publications, sharing and/or archiving.
6. I consent to audio/video being recorded as part of the project.

I agree to take part in the above study:

Name of Participant

Laura Skillen

Researcher

Signature

Signature

Date

Date

A12.5. Online focus groups and interviews

A12.5.a) Part I

1.1: Title of Project

PhD Thesis: "How blame makes a villain of the EU"

1.2: Details of researchers and project organisers

a) Name of main researcher

Laura Skillen

b) Name of others involved and role (e.g. supervisor) including affiliation if not in the School of Politics and IR:

Supervisor: Dr Tom Casier

c) Which relevant research ethics guidelines have you consulted before completing this form?

I've reviewed the ESRC's *Research Ethics Framework*, as well as the *RCUK Policy and Guidelines on the Governance of Good Research Conduct*.

d) For students: please confirm that you have discussed this application with your supervisor.

Confirmed.

e) For supervisors: What are your comments, if any, on this application?

Due to the special circumstances, the focus groups which Laura had planned for her PhD research, need to be replaced / complemented by online semi-structured interviews. Laura has discussed this change with me. The conditions and questions are similar to those of the earlier approved focus groups, so I see no new. I do not see any ethical issues.

f) Expected start date and duration of the research?

March 2020; 3 weeks.

1.3: Research funding

- g) **Are you applying for, or have you received, funding from the following research councils and foundations for this research project:** the ESRC or other members of Research Councils UK; The British Academy; the Leverhulme Trust; the Nuffield Foundation; the Rowntree Foundation; CORDIS (European Commission); Commonwealth, Chevening, Fullbright or Marshall Scholarships.

My BSIS PhD scholarship is funded by the UK Research Council. No other external funding received for this project.

- h) If you are seeking or receiving funding from different sources than above, please name the source(s). Please also discuss if there may be any conflicts of interest or possible impact on the independence of your research arising from this source of funding.

N/A – any additional costs self-funded.

1.4: Purpose of Project/aims and Objectives

Provide a brief outline (one/two paragraphs) of the project written in lay-person's language, assuming that the reader is unfamiliar with the subject. Include how the project fits with existing knowledge and what are its intended benefits (e.g. to conceptual knowledge, specific groups, services etc). Include also a short description of methodology.

The final component of my PhD data collection was supposed to be running focus groups in the UK. As of 8 March, the first of these focus groups has gone ahead, in London. However, there have been difficulties, namely due to coronavirus, with participants dropping out as they are too concerned to leave their house or meet with a group. This is in addition to the other logistical difficulties—namely, it has been difficult to find locations where multiple people are willing to meet with me, given the paranoia in pro-Leave Facebook groups and the fact I am not normally based in the UK. One focus group member in London pointed out that their group were fairly homogenous in terms of economic/educational background, and another said that I wouldn't have the most "paranoid" Brexiteers present due to fears of coronavirus. I.e. accessing additional voices is getting more difficult in the context of the looming pandemic.

I am seeking to supplement my focus groups via use of online semi-structured interviews using ~the same questions as those for focus groups, to access the otherwise-inaccessible audiences. I do have a couple of hundred people who are willing to participate, including at least one Brexit Party representative, and people in e.g. rural Wales and Northern Ireland, who I otherwise would not be able to speak with.

A short-coming of the interviews compared to focus groups will be the lack of interaction between participants, which might otherwise prompt further discussion and/or escalation (e.g. of emotions); likewise the researcher will be somewhat more involved in the conversation. however, an advantage is the ability to keep the interviews more 'on-track' in response to the questions—i.e. while the data will be less rich, it will be somewhat more targeted in response to the research question.

All other information is the same as per my focus group, e.g. with regard to recruitment of participants. Participants will not be given refreshments, given they will not be physically meeting with the researcher; they will also only have option of an Amazon voucher, as this can be arranged digitally, whereas Waterstones cannot (to values of 15GBP, anyway). Interviews would last ~30 minutes, as opposed to the ~100 minutes for a focus group.

The currently drafted questions for the interview are attached.

A12.5.b) Part II: Research Ethics Checklist

Please answer each question by ticking the appropriate box	YES	NO
1. Have you, before filling in this form, read a relevant research ethics guideline (e.g. from the ESRC)?	X	
2. Does the study involve participants who are particularly vulnerable? (e.g. refugees, prisoners, victims of violence)		X
3. Does the study involve participants who are unable to give informed consent? (e.g. children, people with learning disabilities)		X
4. Will the study require the co-operation of a gatekeeper for initial access to the groups or individuals to be recruited (e.g. pupils at a school, prisoners, refugees in camps)		X
5. Will it be necessary for participants to take part in the study without their knowledge and consent at the time? (e.g. covert observation of people in non-public places)		X
6. Will the study involve discussion of sensitive topics (e.g. sexual activity, drug use)	X*	
7. Could the study induce embarrassment, psychological stress or anxiety or cause harm or negative consequences?	X*	
8. Will the study involve prolonged or repetitive testing?		X
9. Will financial inducements (other than reasonable expenses and compensation for time) be offered to participants?		X
10. Will the study involve recruitment of patients or staff through the NHS or Social Services?		X
11. Will the study involve the withholding of information from, or deliberate deception of, participants?	X*	
12. Will the study involve any potential risk to the researcher(s)?		X

Re question 6: The topic of Brexit is quite emotionally sensitive, and questions have been designed to ensure it will have minimum negative emotional affect, e.g. by starting and ending with 'feel-good' questions and through careful moderation inspired by the principles of mediation.

Re question 7: Emotions will be discussed during the focus group, but no long-term negative effects are anticipated.

Re question 11: In recruitment it is indicated that there will be focus groups for Remain groups as well as for Leave groups; this is untrue, only Leave groups are sought. This deception is to (a) avoid 'misfiling' people because they want to participate and so pretend to be part of the other group, and (b) minimise accusations of being part of a conspiracy etc when recruiting in Leave groups (this has happened to me rather a lot).

A12.5.c) Part III: Research ethical considerations

3.1: Conduct of project

a) Location of the research: UK – via recorded videoconference (Zoom).

b) Brief description of participants, including location and number

UK Leave voters. 5-10 interviews, to supplement focus group data collection.

c) Brief description of controls and number

N/A

d) Brief account of how the Data Protection Act will be complied with

Participation is voluntary, and only the researcher (and potentially their supervisor) has or will have access to the data generated during the interviews. It will be stored on the researcher's laptop under password (screen lock is applied to the laptop), and backed up to OneDrive, which is GDPR-compliant. Interviewees will be given pseudonyms.

e) Payment of participants (if any):

15GBP Amazon voucher

g) Source of funding (if any):

Self-funded. I will use the premium Zoom account I have access to via work (International Mediation Institute) to conduct and record the meetings (note that theoretically somebody else could access these recordings, though in reality I am the only one to use the account; for this reason I will download the recordings and erase them from the cloud storage as soon as practicable following the interview).

h) Brief account of methodology/techniques (a summarised account of measures to be used should be included as should examples of any questionnaires etc):

Semi-structured interview, based on the questions used for my focus groups. I say 'semi' structured so that I can match the questions to the flow of the conversation, and ask probing questions as applicable. Questions will be as consistent as possible between interviewees to assist in data analysis. Please see below draft questions.

Question type	Question	Comment
---------------	----------	---------

Introduction from facilitator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * I'm Laura at Uni Kent Brussels * Australian, lived in the UK * Research blame in politics * Session will involve me asking about their personal thoughts and opinions * Session will be recorded and transcribed * Purpose is PhD thesis * Safe space; privacy * Voucher at end and details if need to contact me 	
Opening	What's the best thing that's happened to you this week.	Ice-breaker; generate trust
Introduction	<p>You voted to 'Leave' the EU. Suppose that the EU was a person; tell me what this person would be like.</p> <p>[Or What first comes to mind when you think about the EU?]</p>	Find out their existing impressions of the EU (are they a villain)
Introduction	For you, what does it mean to 'hold someone accountable'?	Prime for ideas of justice (using accountability rather than 'blame' to get at next question).
Introduction	What are some ways in which political actors such as parties or politicians can be held accountable?	Get understanding of how they feel they can act to hold political body accountable
Introduction	What are ways people can hold the EU specifically accountable?	Hobolt and Tilley argue that the only way is by voting out, because representation invisible.
Transition	Think back to the EU referendum campaign. What were some of the problems with the EU raised in the campaign?	I've been more explicit here than I am in the equivalent focus group question (<i>There were a number of things the EU was blamed for [or 'was held accountable for']</i>). Please work together

	<p>What should the EU be blamed for?</p> <p>(All things considered, which of these was most important to you (and why)?)</p>	<p><i>to come up with a list of as many of these things as you can remember.</i>), based on my experience in the London focus group. In that group, people re-iterated all arguments raised in the campaign, and mainly rebutted Remain's claims, rather than re-blaming.</p> <p>I may need to ask which 'part' of the EU should be blamed in the given instance.</p> <p>Depending on how much time the following 'key' questions take, a second or third item could be considered.</p>
Key	What happened in this situation?	Get them to reiterate the blame, group can add details (note they may have already done this when jotting down the list)
Key	How did that make you personally feel? (Why)	I expect they'll say why it made them feel that way, but otherwise, a follow-up question.
Key	How did it make you feel <u>about the EU</u> ?	May again be blurred with the previous question.
Key	Was this important to your decision to vote Leave?	Perhaps it made them feel bad but it didn't have any influence on their vote.
Key	Who (else) do you think this would have been important to, when voting in the referendum?	Victim identification; resolve internal contested victim status and allow people to talk about victims (potentially including themselves) without having to accept they're a victim.
Key	How do you think it influenced them (<i>and not you</i>)?	

Key	How do you think it made them feel?	
Key	You describe parties ___ and ___ as feeling ___ about this; you felt _____. Why do you think there's a difference?	
Extra	If you were the facilitator, what question would you ask next?	
Extra	Do you have anyone in your life who voted Remain? What do you think could have changed their mind to voting Leave?	Check for reiteration of blame – expect them to use thinking/feeling language.
Extra	What could have been said to change your mind about voting Leave?	(Exploratory—consider overall context within which blame takes place, and also expect some reiteration of blame and accountability.)
Ending	Is there anything we should have talked about, but didn't?	
Ending	What are your hopes for the UK, now that you are leaving the EU?	Finishing up on a positive note; also getting at what they feel having FELT bad and then implemented practices to relieve those negative feelings.
Summary and next steps from facilitator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Reiterate next steps * Thank you * Here's your voucher * Here's how you can contact me 	

The questions marked 'extra' will ideally be asked to give context to and reinforce the research, but are not as vital as those marked 'key'.

i) Brief account of how participants will be selected and any issues that arise relating to the selection of participants

Those who indicated they would like to participate following the previous stage of research (survey-experiment) were contacted to gauge their ongoing interest. An RSVP was also set up and a brief description of the research was posted to social media (UK subreddits and

pro-Leave and right-wing Facebook groups). Participants were invited to invite friends, colleagues or family.

I'm looking for focus group participants for my PhD research on blame in Brexit. I appreciate your help!

I am a final-year PhD student at the University of Kent, where I am researching blame in politics using Brexit as a case study.

The final part of this research will be conducting focus groups in various locations in the UK in March. The focus group will take **approx. 90–110 minutes** to complete, and you will be given **light refreshments and a £15 Amazon/Waterstones voucher** in appreciation. Your help will directly contribute to work that aims to **reduce polarisation and division in society**.

Each focus group will consist of 6–8 people who voted **either** Remain **or** Leave in the 2016 referendum—i.e. there will not be any mixed groups. I will facilitate group discussion by asking you a series of questions about blame and accountability in the Brexit campaign.

If you are interested in participating, please fill in the form via the link, and thank you so much for your help.

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LMS88FG2020>

Those that didn't want to complete a SurveyMonkey survey—as apparently this is associated with left-wing spies—were invited to email me instead. Information requested was name, contact information (email, with the option to just use Facebook given where I was contacted via Messenger), location (most people gave full UK postcodes), and whether they voted Leave/Remain in the 2016 referendum.

3.2: Risk, harm and benefit

This section should address at least the following:

a) Any risks to the participants

No long-term emotional trauma for participants is likely, though as the research aims to get at the visceral components of blame—i.e. emotions—it is necessary to give people a forum to express their emotions. These emotions are to be expressed towards the EU. The question are designed to start and end on positive notes. London focus group participants did get quite emotional during the group, with one person crying, and another two choking up with the passion of their beliefs. However, all described it as an interesting experience, and potentially a cathartic one—they said they felt reassured and validated. All seemed very happy upon leaving, and I aim to replicate this during the interviews.

b) Issues relating to confidentiality

Personal data (voting behaviour, contact information) is accessible to the researcher only, is under two layers of passwords, and data for non-participants will be deleted once the focus groups and interviews have been conducted.

Participant information will be anonymised so that, while they may be able to identify *themselves* were they to read the researcher's work, no other third party would be able to. Personal/contact details will not be used in the thesis document or related publications/presentations.

c) Anticipated difficulties

It's anticipated that participants may get quite fired up; based on previous experience, it's not out of the question that participants will accuse the researcher of being a Labour/BBC/MSM/Soros spy. For this reason I will be as open as I can be about my research and who I am, remain calm and objective during the interview, and if really necessary, shorten or stop the interview.

d) Details of how the project meets the four main ethical principles of research i.e. non-maleficence (not causing harm), beneficence (doing good), autonomy (treating people with respect and enabling them to make their own choices), and justice (who will be advantaged and disadvantaged by the research).

Non-maleficence: No harm is anticipated as a result of this study.

Beneficence: This research problematises political blame with a view to finding ways to counter it or reduce people's susceptibility to it. This is particularly important in the context of Cambridge Analytica and its associated activities, plus social media and viral news more generally. Participants may also find it a cathartic experience.

Autonomy: Participation is voluntary, and while people will be encouraged to give a response to any question—in a safe space established by the facilitator and through the construction of the questions—they will not be forced to give a response at any time.

Justice: No anticipated advantage or disadvantage to any party.

e) Details of how the research will take account of cultural issues, including some understanding of the need to provide appropriate interpreters etc.

No anticipated cultural issues.

f) The rationale for the decision to pay, or not to pay, participants and the likely impact on participation. It should be noted that all incentives, whether monetary or otherwise may represent an unethical inducement to participation.

For the focus groups, I was originally going to give a payment of 25GBP per participant, based on the UK minimum wage plus a small allowance for transport to/from. However it was suggested that this was too much, and that it might cause participants to try and give me the answer they thought I was looking for, rather than genuine responses. I spoke with

some Brits and then ran a short poll, to which 40 people responded (<https://www.strawpoll.me/19319494/r>). 33% said a gesture of a 10-15GBP voucher would be expected; 25% said refreshments only; 13% 16-20GBP cash and 10% 10-15GBP. Only 20% wanted payment of over 20GBP, so I decided on the combination of the voucher as 'gesture' and light refreshments.

For the interviews, recompense will be a 15GBP Amazon voucher, as this is able to be delivered online; participants' expectations have already been set based on emails they saw about the focus group, so despite the length of time being shorter, I don't think it's reasonable to reduce this amount.

g) Issues relating to information to be provided to participants in advance of, or during the research.

N/A

h) Information about other review procedures to which the research project has already been subjected

N/A

3.3: Consent

It is essential that all those who participate in research should do so voluntarily, hence at a minimum this section should address:

a) Details of how it is intended that informed consent be obtained from the participants.

The interviews are voluntary, and only those who have indicated interest are invited to participate; people can leave at any time. Please find informed consent form attached. This will be emailed to participants prior to the interview, with digital or vocal confirmation understood to construe acceptance; additionally, the first and last few minutes of the interview are dedicated to explaining the purpose of research and what's involved.

b) Procedures for gaining permission from participants who are unable to give informed consent (materials should be attached).

N/A

c) A special case has to be made for any cases where it is not possible to obtain consent.

N/A

A12.5.d) Part IV: Signature

This part must be signed and dated regardless of whether or not you need to fill in Part III. If you send the form by email, you do not need to sign (only date). It is enough that it is sent from your University of Kent email address.

Signature: Laura Skillen

Date: 9 March 2020

A12.5.e) Research Consent

Title of study: Interview on blame and accountability in the Brexit campaign

Researcher: Laura Skillen, PhD student at the University of Kent

7. I confirm that I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the study and the researcher has answered them to my satisfaction.
8. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time, without giving a reason and without any consequences.
9. I understand that my data will be anonymised in the research, such that a third party who does not know me would not be able to identify me specifically.
10. I understand that any information recorded in the study will remain confidential, and no information that identifies me will be made publicly available or shared with any third parties.
11. I consent to the use of the data in research, publications, sharing and/or archiving.

I consent to audio/video being recorded as part of the project.

A13. Annex: Ethics Review Attachments

These attachments were included with the ethics review submissions given above.

A13.1. Survey-experiment v1

<p>How British voters interact with news information</p> <p>About this survey</p> <p>Purpose: This survey aims to understand how British voters interact with information from the news. To that end, you will be asked some basic information about yourself, your values, beliefs, and emotions. You will then read a short text and answer some related questions.</p> <p>Eligibility requirements: Participants must be eligible to vote in the United Kingdom.</p> <p>Effort required: This survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete in full.</p> <p>Risks/discomforts involved in participating: At one point you will be asked to hold your breath for a short period. No other discomfort is anticipated.</p> <p>Researcher: Laura Skillen, PhD candidate in International Relations at the University of Kent Brussels. She can be reached via LMS88@kent.ac.uk.</p> <p>Privacy and confidentiality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any responses you provide will be treated confidentially. • To enable this study, some basic demographic information about you is collected. However, any publication resulting from this work will report only aggregated findings or fully anonymised examples that will not identify you. • You may optionally provide your name and contact information to take part in a further activity in relation to this study. This information will be stored securely and separately from your other responses. Any identifying information will be removed and destroyed as soon as possible after data processing has been completed. • Once fully anonymised, responses to this survey may be used by the researcher, shared with other researchers, or made available in an online data repository. • Participation in this study is completely voluntary, and once you have started, you are free to withdraw at any time and for any reason. Note that once your data have been included in published analysis or data repositories, it cannot be withdrawn. • If you have any complaints or concerns about this research, you may direct them to the researcher's supervisor, Dr Bojan Savic, via B.SAVIC@kent.ac.uk. • See also the University of Kent's GDPR Privacy Notice https://research.kent.ac.uk/researchservices/wp-content/uploads/sites/51/2018/05/GDPR-Privacy-Notice-Research.pdf <p>If you do not wish to take part in this survey, please close this window now Proceeding to the next page and filling in the survey will mean your answers are recorded.</p>	<p>1</p>
---	----------

How British voters interact with news information

About you

- Highest level of educational attainment
- Of the following, which is the area of your greatest personal or intellectual interest?
- Would you say your own health, in general, is excellent, good, fair, or poor?
 - Poor
 - Fair
 - Good
 - Excellent
- Now thinking about your mental health, which includes stress, depression, and problems with emotions, for how many days during the past 30 was your mental health not good?
- Did you vote in the UK's 2016 referendum to leave the EU?
 - Yes
 - No
 - Ineligible to vote
 - I don't remember
- If you answered 'no', why didn't you vote in the referendum?
(Skip this question if it does not apply.)
- If you did vote in the referendum, how did you vote?
(Skip this question if it does not apply.)
 - Leave
 - Remain
 - Unsure
 - I don't remember
 - I would rather not say
- How would you vote if the referendum were to be held today?
 - Leave
 - Remain
 - Unsure
 - Would not vote
 - I would rather not say
- Generally, how much control do people have over their lives?

Things people do are subject only to their free will

People are just instruments in the hands of somebody or something else

2

Levels per Regulated Qualifications Framework – applies to England, Wales, Northern Ireland.

From "Fields of Study" used by Australian institutions

This and following question from US General Social Survey...

Amended to a slider, 0 to 30 left to right.

Order changes

Order changes

Order changes

Slider starts in middle and is in 7 steps; questions 9 and 10 drawn from Sense of Agency Scale 2017

10. How much control do you feel you have over your life?

I am in full control over what I do in life Nothing I do is actually voluntary

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

11. When you decide whether something is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your thinking?

Not at all relevant Slightly relevant Moderately relevant Very relevant Extremely relevant

Whether or not someone's action showed love for his or her country	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. Please read the following sentences and indicate your agreement or disagreement:

Strongly disagree Disagree Neither agree nor disagree Agree Strongly agree

I am proud of my country's history.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
People should be loyal to their family members, even when they have done something wrong.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel that people earn the rewards and punishments they get.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel that people who meet with misfortune have brought it on themselves.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I basically feel that the world is a fair place.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. How accurately do the following statements describe you?

Very inaccurate Inaccurate Neither accurate nor inaccurate Accurate Very accurate

I feel little concern for others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am interested in people.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I insult people.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I sympathise with others' feelings.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am not interested in other people's problems.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have a soft heart.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am not really interested in others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I take time out for others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel others' emotions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I make people feel at ease.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

This and first two items in question 12 from the abridged Moral Foundations Questionnaire (2008).

Items iii-iv from the Lipkus measures of Just World Belief (1991). Order for these questions changes.

'Agreeability' as one of the Big Five. Questions from IPIP, based on Goldberg 1991. Order changes.

How British voters interact with news information

14. Take a moment to think about how you would finish the sentence "I am (a)...". Which answers best complete that sentence for you? Select up to five (5).

<input type="checkbox"/> Leaver	<input type="checkbox"/> White – Irish	<input type="checkbox"/> Celtic
<input type="checkbox"/> Remainer	<input type="checkbox"/> White – Gypsy or Irish Traveller	<input type="checkbox"/> Northerner
<input type="checkbox"/> Conservative supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> White and Black Caribbean	<input type="checkbox"/> Southerner
<input type="checkbox"/> Labour supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> White and Black African	<input type="checkbox"/> Londoner
<input type="checkbox"/> Liberal Democrat supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> White and Asian	<input type="checkbox"/> Rural person
<input type="checkbox"/> SNP supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Mixed/multiple ethnic	<input type="checkbox"/> City person
<input type="checkbox"/> Greens supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Woman	<input type="checkbox"/> Westerner
<input type="checkbox"/> UKIP supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Man	<input type="checkbox"/> Immigrant
<input type="checkbox"/> Plaid Cymru supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Transgender	<input type="checkbox"/> Expat
<input type="checkbox"/> Democratic Unionist Party supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-binary	<input type="checkbox"/> International
<input type="checkbox"/> Sinn Féin supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Cisgender	<input type="checkbox"/> Multi-cultural
<input type="checkbox"/> Ulster Unionist supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Gay or lesbian	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-religious
<input type="checkbox"/> SDLP supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Bisexual	<input type="checkbox"/> Christian
<input type="checkbox"/> Alliance supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Heterosexual	<input type="checkbox"/> Buddhist
<input type="checkbox"/> Progressive	<input type="checkbox"/> Gen Z	<input type="checkbox"/> Hindu
<input type="checkbox"/> Traditional	<input type="checkbox"/> Millennial	<input type="checkbox"/> Jewish
<input type="checkbox"/> African	<input type="checkbox"/> Gen X	<input type="checkbox"/> Muslim
<input type="checkbox"/> Anglo-Saxon	<input type="checkbox"/> Baby Boomer	<input type="checkbox"/> Sikh
<input type="checkbox"/> Arab	<input type="checkbox"/> Silent Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> Other religious
<input type="checkbox"/> Caribbean	<input type="checkbox"/> Greatest Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> Upper class
<input type="checkbox"/> Indian	<input type="checkbox"/> European	<input type="checkbox"/> Upper middle class
<input type="checkbox"/> Pakistani	<input type="checkbox"/> British	<input type="checkbox"/> Middle class
<input type="checkbox"/> Bangladeshi	<input type="checkbox"/> Irish	<input type="checkbox"/> Lower middle class
<input type="checkbox"/> Chinese	<input type="checkbox"/> Scottish	<input type="checkbox"/> Skilled working class
<input type="checkbox"/> Other Asian	<input type="checkbox"/> English	<input type="checkbox"/> Working class
<input type="checkbox"/> White	<input type="checkbox"/> Welsh	

Order of items reverses 50% of the time. Despite asking for up to 5, any number can be selected. Responses drawn from:

(a) Simple Politics - list of UK political parties

(b) Office for National Statistics - race/ethnicity

(c) ONS - gender/sexuality (including test questions for next census)

(d) Website "Which generation are you"

(e) Religion - ONS.

(f) Region drawn from prior survey by same researcher (Emotion Concepts survey).

4

How British voters interact with news information

15. In the last question, you described yourself using the following words. Please now put them in order of how important they are to you, with the first item being the most important, and the last item being the least important.

- ☐ Leaver
- ☐ Remainer
- ☐ Conservative supporter
- ☐ Labour supporter
- ☐ Liberal Democrat supporter
- ☐ SNP supporter
- ☐ Greens supporter
- ☐ UKIP supporter
- ☐ Plaid Cymru supporter
- ☐ Democratic Unionist Party supporter
- ☐ Sinn Féin supporter
- ☐ Ulster Unionist supporter
- ☐ SDLP supporter
- ☐ Alliance supporter
- ☐ Progressive
- ☐ Traditional
- ☐ African
- ☐ Anglo-Saxon
- ☐ Arab
- ☐ Caribbean
- ☐ Indian
- ☐ Pakistani
- ☐ Bangladeshi
- ☐ Chinese
- ☐ Other Asian
- ☐ White

Only the items selected in the previous questions appear for ranking here.

5

<input type="checkbox"/>	White – Irish
<input type="checkbox"/>	White – Gypsy or Irish Traveller
<input type="checkbox"/>	White and Black Caribbean
<input type="checkbox"/>	White and Black African
<input type="checkbox"/>	White and Asian
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed/multiple ethnic
<input type="checkbox"/>	Woman
<input type="checkbox"/>	Man
<input type="checkbox"/>	Transgender
<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-binary
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cisgender
<input type="checkbox"/>	Gay or lesbian
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bisexual
<input type="checkbox"/>	Heterosexual
<input type="checkbox"/>	Gen Z
<input type="checkbox"/>	Millennial
<input type="checkbox"/>	Gen X
<input type="checkbox"/>	Baby Boomer
<input type="checkbox"/>	Silent Generation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Greatest Generation
<input type="checkbox"/>	European
<input type="checkbox"/>	British
<input type="checkbox"/>	Irish
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scottish
<input type="checkbox"/>	English
<input type="checkbox"/>	Welsh
<input type="checkbox"/>	Celtic
<input type="checkbox"/>	Northerner
<input type="checkbox"/>	Southerner
<input type="checkbox"/>	Londoner

<input type="checkbox"/>	Rural person
<input type="checkbox"/>	City person
<input type="checkbox"/>	Westerner
<input type="checkbox"/>	Immigrant
<input type="checkbox"/>	Expatriate
<input type="checkbox"/>	International
<input type="checkbox"/>	Multi-cultural
<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-religious
<input type="checkbox"/>	Christian
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buddhist
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hindu
<input type="checkbox"/>	Jewish
<input type="checkbox"/>	Muslim
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sikh
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other religious
<input type="checkbox"/>	Upper class
<input type="checkbox"/>	Upper middle class
<input type="checkbox"/>	Middle class
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lower middle class
<input type="checkbox"/>	Skilled working class
<input type="checkbox"/>	Working class

16. Compared to how you usually feel, how do you feel today?

	Much less than usual		About the same as usual		Much more than usual
Happy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sad	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Angry	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Anxious	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Scared	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Uses the five most-mentioned emotions in the researcher's "Emotion Concepts" survey, plus scared as 'fear' is discussed in populism contexts. 'Scared' was the word preferred in the emotion concepts survey.

How British voters interact with news information

Flooding in the UK

For this exercise, you will be asked to hold your breath. You will then read the text below and answer the questions. Do not take a new breath until you have finished reading the text.

Take a deep breath, hold it, and read the following.

A 25.0% Thanks to the EU, the UK's big flooding problem is only going to get worse

The UK's summer has gotten off to an exceedingly soggy start. In Lincolnshire, the residents of more than 580 homes were evacuated in mid-June after the town of Wainfleet endured the equivalent of two months' rain in just two days. In Edinburgh and Stirling, people had to be rescued by boat on June 24 after flash floods left people stranded on top of cars and inside their homes.

The politicians swanking around the disaster zones in hard hats and hi-viz jackets are pointing the finger at climate change – a convenient bogeyman in this situation, but in truth this is an unnatural disaster which was made to order in Brussels.

There are a number of different factors to consider, of course, but none have had a bigger impact than EU regulations such as the Habitats Directive, Water Framework Directive and Floods Directive, which have hugely increased the difficulty and expense of dredging our rivers.

Managing floods costs the UK around £2.2 billion each year.

B 25.0% Thanks to Westminster, the UK's big flooding problem is only going to get worse

The UK's summer has gotten off to an exceedingly soggy start. In Lincolnshire, the residents of more than 580 homes were evacuated in mid-June after the town of Wainfleet endured the equivalent of two months' rain in just two days. In Edinburgh and Stirling, people had to be rescued by boat on June 24 after flash floods left people stranded on top of cars and inside their homes.

The politicians swanking around the disaster zones in hard hats and hi-viz jackets are pointing the finger at climate change – a convenient bogeyman in this situation, but in truth this is an unnatural disaster which was made to order in Westminster.

There are a number of different factors to consider, of course, but none have had a bigger impact than home-grown UK legislation such as the 2014 Water Act, Flood and Water Management Act 2010 and Land Drainage Act, which have hugely increased the difficulty and expense of dredging our rivers.

Managing floods costs the UK around £2.2 billion each year.

C 25.0% Thanks to our collective inaction, the UK's big flooding problem is only going to get worse

The UK's summer has gotten off to an exceedingly soggy start. In Lincolnshire, the residents of more than 580 homes were evacuated in mid-June after the town of Wainfleet endured the equivalent of two months' rain in just two days. In Edinburgh and Stirling, people had to be rescued by boat on June 24 after flash floods left people stranded on top of cars and inside their homes.

The politicians swanking around the disaster zones in hard hats and hi-viz jackets are pointing the finger at climate change – a convenient bogeyman in this situation, but in truth this is an unnatural disaster which was made to order in our own backyards.

There are a number of different factors to consider, of course, but none have had a bigger impact than our day-to-day lives, whether it's irresponsible water use, dumping rubbish into waterways, or choosing paved courtyards over the trees that help to soak up excess rain. Each of these has hugely increased the likelihood of flooding.

Managing floods costs the UK around £2.2 billion each year.

D 25.0% The UK's big flooding problem

The UK's summer has gotten off to an exceedingly soggy start. In Lincolnshire, the residents of more than 580 homes were evacuated in mid-June after the town of Wainfleet endured the equivalent of two months' rain in just two days. In Edinburgh and Stirling, people had to be rescued by boat on June 24 after flash floods left people stranded on top of cars and inside their homes.

Managing floods costs the UK around £2.2 billion each year.

You can now breathe normally.

If you didn't manage to hold your breath the whole time, don't worry - that is also okay.

Please answer the following questions.

Only one vignette is shown to each participant. Vignettes are:
 1. Blame EU
 2. Blame Westminster/UK Government
 3. Blame ourselves
 4. No blame

<p>17. How do you feel after reading the above text?</p> <input type="text"/>	
<p>18. What should be done about the situation?</p> <input type="text"/>	
<p>19. What could you personally do to ensure these actions are taken?</p> <input type="text"/>	
<p>20. How will you feel after these actions are taken?</p> <input type="text"/>	

<p>How British voters interact with news information</p> <p>Thank you for participating</p> <p>Don't forget to 'submit' below.</p> <p>The text about flooding you read on the previous page was fiction , drawn from current news media, information about flooding, and political rhetoric. Different survey participants have been given different situations, with the flooding blamed on the EU, UK Government, the British population, or not blamed on any party. The floods are real, but the 'agent' of the disaster was made up. Please do not share this information with others, so that survey results are not biased.</p> <p>Thank you for your time in taking part in this survey.</p>	
--	--

10

A13.2. Survey-experiment v2

FIRST PAGE

Changed from 'British' voters to 'UK' voters throughout survey, following feedback from Irish participants in prior survey-experiment.

How UK voters interact with news information

About this survey

Purpose: This survey aims to understand how UK voters interact with information from the news. To that end, you will be asked some basic information about yourself and your voting preferences. You will then read a short text and answer some related questions. This survey has 12 questions in total.

Removed text talking about demographic information and emotions.

Added total number of questions

Eligibility requirements: Participants must be eligible to vote in the United Kingdom.

Effort required: This survey will take approximately 4-5 minutes to complete in full.

Risks/discomforts involved in participating: At one point you will be asked to hold your breath for a short period. No other discomfort is anticipated.

Previous survey said 10 minutes

Researcher: Laura Skillen, PhD candidate in International Relations at the University of Kent Brussels. She can be reached via LMS88@kent.ac.uk.

Privacy and confidentiality:

- Any responses you provide will be treated confidentially.
- To enable this study, some basic information about you is collected. However, any publication resulting from this work will report only aggregated findings or fully anonymised examples that will not identify you.
- You may optionally provide your name and contact information to take part in a further activity in relation to this study. This information will be stored securely and separately from your other responses. Any identifying information will be removed and destroyed as soon as possible after data processing has been completed.
- Once fully anonymised, responses to this survey may be used by the researcher, shared with other researchers, or made available in an online data repository.
- Participation in this study is completely voluntary, and once you have started, you are free to withdraw at any time and for any reason. Note that once your data have been included in published analysis or data repositories, it cannot be withdrawn.
- If you have any complaints or concerns about this research, you may direct them to the researcher's supervisor, Dr Bojan Savic, via B.SAVIC@kent.ac.uk.
- See also the University of Kent's GDPR Privacy Notice <https://research.kent.ac.uk/researchservices/wp-content/uploads/sites/51/2018/05/GDPR-Privacy-Notice-Research.pdf>

If you do not wish to take part in this survey, please close this window now Proceeding to the next page and filling in the survey will mean your answers are recorded.

SECOND PAGE

How UK voters interact with news information

About you

1. Did you vote in the UK's 2016 referendum on membership of the European Union?

☐ Yes
 ☐ Ineligible to vote

☐ No
 ☐ I don't remember

2. If you answered 'no', why didn't you vote in the referendum?
(Skip this question if it does not apply.)

3. If you did vote in the referendum, how did you vote?
(Skip this question if it does not apply.)

☐ Leave
 ☐ I don't remember

☐ Remain
 ☐ I would rather not say

4. How would you vote if the referendum were to be held today?

☐ Leave
 ☐ Would not vote

☐ Remain
 ☐ I would rather not say

☐ Unsure

Changed from 'referendum to leave the EU' following feedback that this could be misinterpreted.

Question previously included on a separate page; now included on same page as Leave/Remain questions.

5. Take a moment to think about how you would finish the sentence "I am (a) ...". Which answers best complete that sentence for you? Select up to five **(5)** **Now in bold**

<input type="checkbox"/> Leaver	<input type="checkbox"/> White	<input type="checkbox"/> Welsh
<input type="checkbox"/> Remainer	<input type="checkbox"/> White – Irish	<input type="checkbox"/> Celtic
<input type="checkbox"/> Conservative supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> White – Gypsy or Irish Traveller	<input type="checkbox"/> Northerner
<input type="checkbox"/> Labour supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> White and Black Caribbean	<input type="checkbox"/> Southerner
<input type="checkbox"/> Liberal Democrat supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> White and Black African	<input type="checkbox"/> Londoner
<input type="checkbox"/> SNP supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> White and Asian	<input type="checkbox"/> Rural person
<input type="checkbox"/> Greens supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple ethnic	<input type="checkbox"/> City person
<input type="checkbox"/> UKIP supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Man	<input type="checkbox"/> Westerner
<input type="checkbox"/> Brexit Party supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Transgender	<input type="checkbox"/> Immigrant
<input type="checkbox"/> Plaid Cymru supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-binary	<input type="checkbox"/> Expat
<input type="checkbox"/> Democratic Unionist Party supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Cisgender	<input type="checkbox"/> International
<input type="checkbox"/> Sinn Fein supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Gay or lesbian	<input type="checkbox"/> Multi-cultural
<input type="checkbox"/> Ulster Unionist supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Bisexual	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-religious
<input type="checkbox"/> SDLP supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Heterosexual	<input type="checkbox"/> Christian
<input type="checkbox"/> Alliance supporter	<input type="checkbox"/> Gen Z	<input type="checkbox"/> Buddhist
<input type="checkbox"/> Progressive	<input type="checkbox"/> Millennial	<input type="checkbox"/> Hindu
<input type="checkbox"/> Traditional	<input type="checkbox"/> Gen X	<input type="checkbox"/> Jewish
<input type="checkbox"/> African	<input type="checkbox"/> Baby Boomer	<input type="checkbox"/> Muslim
<input type="checkbox"/> Anglo-Saxon	<input type="checkbox"/> Silent Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> Sikh
<input type="checkbox"/> Arab	<input type="checkbox"/> Greatest Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> Other religious
<input type="checkbox"/> Caribbean	<input type="checkbox"/> European	<input type="checkbox"/> Upper class
<input type="checkbox"/> Indian	<input type="checkbox"/> British	<input type="checkbox"/> Upper middle class
<input type="checkbox"/> Pakistani	<input type="checkbox"/> Irish	<input type="checkbox"/> Middle class
<input type="checkbox"/> Bangladeshi	<input type="checkbox"/> Scottish	<input type="checkbox"/> Lower middle class
<input type="checkbox"/> Chinese	<input type="checkbox"/> English	<input type="checkbox"/> Skilled working class
<input type="checkbox"/> Other Asian		<input type="checkbox"/> Working class

Added following feedback

3

THIRD PAGE

How UK voters interact with news information

6. In the last question, you described yourself using the following words. Please now put them in order of how important they are to you, with the first item being the most important, and the last item being the least important.

Only those answers selected in question 5 appear here to be placed in order.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Leaver
<input type="checkbox"/>	Remainer
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conservative supporter
<input type="checkbox"/>	Labour supporter
<input type="checkbox"/>	Liberal Democrat supporter
<input type="checkbox"/>	SNP supporter
<input type="checkbox"/>	Greens supporter
<input type="checkbox"/>	UKIP supporter
<input type="checkbox"/>	Brexit Party supporter
<input type="checkbox"/>	Plaid Cymru supporter
<input type="checkbox"/>	Democratic Unionist Party supporter
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sinn Fein supporter
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ulster Unionist supporter
<input type="checkbox"/>	SDLP supporter
<input type="checkbox"/>	Alliance supporter
<input type="checkbox"/>	Progressive
<input type="checkbox"/>	Traditional
<input type="checkbox"/>	African
<input type="checkbox"/>	Anglo-Saxon

4

<input type="checkbox"/>	Arab
<input type="checkbox"/>	Caribbean
<input type="checkbox"/>	Indian
<input type="checkbox"/>	Pakistani
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bangladeshi
<input type="checkbox"/>	Chinese
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other Asian
<input type="checkbox"/>	White
<input type="checkbox"/>	White – Irish
<input type="checkbox"/>	White – Gypsy or Irish Traveller
<input type="checkbox"/>	White and Black Caribbean
<input type="checkbox"/>	White and Black African
<input type="checkbox"/>	White and Asian
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed/multiple ethnic
<input type="checkbox"/>	Woman
<input type="checkbox"/>	Man
<input type="checkbox"/>	Transgender
<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-binary
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cisgender
<input type="checkbox"/>	Gay or lesbian
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bisexual
<input type="checkbox"/>	Heterosexual
<input type="checkbox"/>	Gen Z

<input type="checkbox"/>	Millennial
<input type="checkbox"/>	Gen X
<input type="checkbox"/>	Baby Boomer
<input type="checkbox"/>	Silent Generation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Greatest Generation
<input type="checkbox"/>	European
<input type="checkbox"/>	British
<input type="checkbox"/>	Irish
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scottish
<input type="checkbox"/>	English
<input type="checkbox"/>	Welsh
<input type="checkbox"/>	Celtic
<input type="checkbox"/>	Northerner
<input type="checkbox"/>	Southerner
<input type="checkbox"/>	Londoner
<input type="checkbox"/>	Rural person
<input type="checkbox"/>	City person
<input type="checkbox"/>	Westerner
<input type="checkbox"/>	Immigrant
<input type="checkbox"/>	Expat
<input type="checkbox"/>	International
<input type="checkbox"/>	Multi-cultural
<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-religious

<input type="checkbox"/>	Christian
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buddhist
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hindu
<input type="checkbox"/>	Jewish
<input type="checkbox"/>	Muslim
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sikh
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other religious
<input type="checkbox"/>	Upper class
<input type="checkbox"/>	Upper middle class
<input type="checkbox"/>	Middle class
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lower middle class
<input type="checkbox"/>	Skilled working class
<input type="checkbox"/>	Working class

FOURTH PAGE

How UK voters interact with news information

Flooding in the UK

For this exercise, you will be asked to **hold your breath**. You will then read the text below and answer the questions. Do not take a new breath until you have finished reading the text.

Take a deep breath, hold it, and read the following.

A 25.0% Thanks to the EU, the UK's big flooding problem is only going to get worse

The UK's summer has gotten off to an exceedingly soggy start. In Lincolnshire, the residents of more than 580 homes were evacuated in mid-June after the town of Wainfleet endured the equivalent of two months' rain in just two days. In Edinburgh and Stirling, people had to be rescued by boat on June 24 after flash floods left people stranded on top of cars and inside their homes.

The politicians swanking around the disaster zones in hard hats and hi-viz jackets are pointing the finger at climate change – a convenient bogeyman in this situation, but in truth this is an unnatural disaster which was made to order in Brussels.

There are a number of different factors to consider, of course, but none have had a bigger impact than EU regulations such as the Habitats Directive, Water Framework Directive and Floods Directive, which have hugely increased the difficulty and expense of dredging our rivers.

Managing floods costs the UK around £2.2 billion each year.

B 25.0% Thanks to Westminster, the UK's big flooding problem is only going to get worse

The UK's summer has gotten off to an exceedingly soggy start. In Lincolnshire, the residents of more than 580 homes were evacuated in mid-June after the town of Wainfleet endured the equivalent of two months' rain in just two days. In Edinburgh and Stirling, people had to be rescued by boat on June 24 after flash floods left people stranded on top of cars and inside their homes.

The politicians swanking around the disaster zones in hard hats and hi-viz jackets are pointing the finger at climate change – a convenient bogeyman in this situation, but in truth this is an unnatural disaster which was made to order in Westminster.

There are a number of different factors to consider, of course, but none have had a bigger impact than home-grown UK legislation such as the 2014 Water Act, Flood and Water Management Act 2010 and Land Drainage Act, which have hugely increased the difficulty and expense of dredging our rivers.

Managing floods costs the UK around £2.2 billion each year.

C 25.0% Thanks to our collective inaction, the UK's big flooding problem is only going to get worse

The UK's summer has gotten off to an exceedingly soggy start. In Lincolnshire, the residents of more than 580 homes were evacuated in mid-June after the town of Wainfleet endured the equivalent of two months' rain in just two days. In Edinburgh and Stirling, people had to be rescued by boat on June 24 after flash floods left people stranded on top of cars and inside their homes.

The politicians swanking around the disaster zones in hard hats and hi-viz jackets are pointing the finger at climate change – a convenient bogeyman in this situation, but in truth this is an unnatural disaster which was made to order in our own backyards.

There are a number of different factors to consider, of course, but none have had a bigger impact than our day-to-day lives, whether it's irresponsible water use, dumping rubbish into waterways, or choosing paved courtyards over the trees that help to soak up excess rain. Each of these has hugely increased the likelihood of flooding.

Managing floods costs the UK around £2.2 billion each year.

D 25.0% The UK's big flooding problem

The UK's summer has gotten off to an exceedingly soggy start. In Lincolnshire, the residents of more than 580 homes were evacuated in mid-June after the town of Wainfleet endured the equivalent of two months' rain in just two days. In Edinburgh and Stirling, people had to be rescued by boat on June 24 after flash floods left people stranded on top of cars and inside their homes.

Managing floods costs the UK around £2.2 billion each year.

You can now breathe normally.

If you didn't manage to hold your breath the whole time, don't worry - that is also okay.

Please answer the following questions.

* 7. How do you feel after reading the above text?

* 8. Why do you feel that way?

* 9. What should be done about the situation?

* 10. What could you personally do to ensure these actions are taken?

* 11. How will you feel after these actions are taken?

Answer now required.

New question aimed at digging into unexpected responses from prior survey. Answer required.

Answer now required.

Answer now required.

Answer now required.

9

12. The UK will hold a General Election on December 12. What is the **most important** issue for you this election?

New question; includes an 'other' box. Answers based on those used by YouGov. Items with an asterisk differ from YouGov, with explanations given below.

Crime
 Defence and Security
 Economy
 Education
 Environment / Climate Change*1
 Family Life / Childcare
 Health
 Housing
 Immigration and Asylum
 Pensions
 Relationship with the EU (Brexit)*2
 Tax
 Transport
 Welfare Benefits
 Unsure*3
 Will not vote*4
 I would rather not say*5

1: YouGov uses "Environment". "Climate Change" added by researcher.
 2: YouGov uses "Britain leaving the EU". Could be read as pro-Brexit by respondents.
 3-5: added by researcher.

Note: I have now moved question 12 to the start of the final page. I.e. it does not appear on the same page as the vignettes.

10

FIFTH PAGE

How UK voters interact with news information

~~Thank you for participating~~
~~Don't forget to 'submit' below.~~

Since printing this survey, I have removed this text, in case people exit the survey before reading the note informing them the vignettes were fictionalised; I have also moved question 12 to the start of this page.

The text about flooding you read on the previous page was fiction, drawn from current news media, information about flooding, and political rhetoric. Different survey participants have been given different situations, with the flooding blamed on the EU, UK Government, the UK population, or not blamed on any party. The floods are real, but the 'agent' of the disaster was made up. Please do not share this information with others, so that survey results are not biased.

Thank you for your time in taking part in this survey.

11

A13.3. Interest in follow-up research

How British voters interact with news information - follow-up interest

Thank you for completing the survey "How British voters interact with news information".

The next stage of research will be conducted with small groups in the UK in early 2020. Please submit your information below if you may be interested in participating. This is entirely optional.

1. Contact details for follow-up research (optional)

Name	<input type="text"/>
Postal Code	<input type="text"/>
Email Address	<input type="text"/>
Phone Number	<input type="text"/>

A14. Annex: FGI questions

Below is the list of questions asked in the focus groups and interviews. Several questions included in the ethics review were never asked, as they were invariably answered by respondents in responses to prior questions; those questions are omitted here.

Qu type	Question	Comment
<i>Introduction from facilitator</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I'm Laura from the University of Kent Brussels • Australian, lived in the UK • Research blame in politics • Session will involve me asking about their personal thoughts and opinions • Session will be recorded and transcribed • Purpose is PhD thesis • Safe space; privacy • Voucher at end and details if need to contact me 	Introduction, start creating sense of safety, and ensure the participant/s understand the process and privacy issues.
<i>Opening</i>	What's the best thing that's happened to you this week?	Ice-breaker; generate trust
<i>Introduction</i>	You voted to 'Leave' the EU. Suppose that the EU was a person; tell me what this person would be like.	Find out their present characterisation of the EU
<i>Introduction</i>	For you, what does it mean to 'hold someone accountable'?	Prime for ideas of justice (using 'accountability' rather than 'blame' to establish consistency for next question).
<i>Introduction</i>	What are some ways in which political actors such as parties or politicians can be held accountable?	Get understanding of how they feel they can act to hold political body accountable—links to 'what should be done about it' questions in survey-experiment and helps emerge the link between blame, emotions, and behaviour circumscription
<i>Introduction</i>	What are ways people can hold the EU specifically accountable?	Hobolt and Tilley imply that the only way to hold the EU accountable may be by voting out, because of clarity of responsibility and accountability is murky per the literature review. ⁵¹
<i>Introduction</i>	<i>Asked for most of the online interviews:</i> When you speak about the EU, who does that refer to? Who 'are' or who 'is' the EU?	Understanding the role of 'the EU' as a potentially empty/floating signifier. This question had the side effect of giving insight into participants' knowledge of the EU.
<i>Transition</i>	Think back to the EU referendum campaign. What were some of the	The interview version of this question was more explicit than for the focus group (<i>There</i>

⁵¹ Hobolt and Tilley, *Blaming Europe?*; Skillen, 'Leave.EU's Blaming Strategies and Implications for Their "Brexit" Campaign'.

Qu type	Question	Comment
	<p>problems with the EU raised in the campaign?</p> <p><i>Where not answered with blame:</i> What was or should the EU be blamed for?</p> <p><i>Where still not answered, Zoom's 'whiteboard' function was used to add a heading "because of the EU, ...".</i></p> <p><i>Where there multiple instances of blame:</i> All things considered, which of these was most important to you (and why)?</p>	<p><i>were a number of things the EU was blamed for [or 'was held accountable for']. Please work together to come up with a list of as many of these things as you can remember.), based on the experience in the London focus group. In that group, people re-iterated all arguments raised in the campaign, and mainly rebutted Remain's claims, rather than re-blaming.</i></p>
Key	When the EU did [thing described by participant/s], how did that make you personally feel? (Why)	What emotions are associated with EU-blaming?
Key	How did it make you feel <u>about the EU</u> ?	Participants typically answered this when addressing the previous question.
Key	Was this important to your decision to vote Leave?	Perhaps it made them feel bad but it didn't have any influence on their vote. Again, participants typically answered this with the previous question.
Key	Who (else) do you think this would have been important to, when voting in the referendum?	Victim identification; resolve internal contested victim status and allow people to talk about victims (potentially including themselves) without having to accept they're a victim. (Rarely asked, as again, was typically answered with previous questions.)
Extra	If you were the facilitator, what question would you ask next?	Generate potential further information related to key questions on blame.
Extra	<p>The Remain campaign was sometimes known as 'Project Fear'. Did it make you feel fearful?</p> <p>What would be an equivalent name for the Leave campaign?</p>	This question was asked to get participants to speak using explicit emotion words where they appeared to have difficulty (or be avoiding) doing so. It would be reasonable to not expect to talk about your 'feelings' when participating in scientific research. The word 'anger' in relation to the Leave campaign ('Project Anger') was intentionally not used to avoid priming the participants.
Extra	Do you have anyone in your life who voted Remain? What do you think could have changed their mind to voting Leave?	Check for reiteration of blame
Extra	What could have been said to change your mind about voting Leave?	Exploratory—consider overall context within which blame takes place, and also expect some reiteration of blame and accountability.

Qu type	Question	Comment
<i>Ending</i>	Is there anything we should have talked about, but didn't?	Several participants said they would like to talk about how they had been made to feel by Remainers.
<i>Ending</i>	What are your hopes for the UK, now that you are leaving the EU?	Finishing up on a positive note.
<i>Summary and next steps from facilitator</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reiterate next steps • Thank you • Here's your voucher • Here's how you can contact me 	

A15. Annex: Identity by victims, victim uncreation, and presence of (re)blame

Crosstab analyses conducted using SPSS. Adjusted residuals outside ± 1.96 are significant at $p < 0.05$. Note that where values were ambiguous (e.g. “Christian, Muslim”) they were grouped as such; otherwise, items that appeared fewer than three times were collected under ‘infrequent’. Where somebody selected multiple ‘identities’ within one category, namely geo-attachment, additional grouping was occasionally done such that English/Celtic and English/City person (for example) may not be associated with a minimum of three people; these were then grouped into English / Other. Grouping like this was only done for British / Other, English / Other, European / British / Other.

A15.1. Brexit-specific identity

Cases					
Valid		Missing		Total	
N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
552	40.4%	816	59.6%	1368	100.0%

			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		
			False	True	False	True	False	True	Total
Brexit-specific identity	Ambiguous	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
		Expected Count	0.8	0.2	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
		% within Brexit-specific identity	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-1.0	1.0	
	Leaver	Count	179	21	190	10	109	91	200
		Expected Count	167.8	32.2	193.8	6.2	102.2	97.8	200.0
		% within Brexit-specific identity	89.5%	10.5%	95.0%	5.0%	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	2.7	-2.7	-2.0	2.0	1.2	-1.2	
	Remainer	Count	283	68	344	7	173	178	351
		Expected Count	294.4	56.6	340.2	10.8	179.3	171.7	351.0
		% within Brexit-specific identity	80.6%	19.4%	98.0%	2.0%	49.3%	50.7%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-2.7	2.7	2.0	-2.0	-1.1	1.1	
Total	Count	463	89	535	17	282	270	552	
	Expected Count	463.0	89.0	535.0	17.0	282.0	270.0	552.0	
	% within Brexit-specific identity	83.9%	16.1%	96.9%	3.1%	51.1%	48.9%	100.0%	
Adjusted residuals of ± 1.96 are significant at $p < 0.05$.									

A15.2. Political party

Cases					
Valid		Missing		Total	
N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
414	30.3%	954	69.7%	1368	100.0%

			Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
			False	True	False	True	False	True	
Political party support	Alliance supporter	Count	9	1	10	0	4	6	10
		Expected Count	8.3	1.7	9.6	0.4	5.2	4.8	10.0
		% within Political party support	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	0.7	-0.7	-0.8	0.8	
	Brexit Party supporter	Count	6	1	6	1	3	4	7
		Expected Count	5.8	1.2	6.7	0.3	3.7	3.3	7.0
		% within Political party support	85.7%	14.3%	85.7%	14.3%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	-1.4	1.4	-0.5	0.5	
	Conservative supporter	Count	68	13	74	7	50	31	81
		Expected Count	67.3	13.7	77.7	3.3	42.3	38.7	81.0
		% within Political party support	84.0%	16.0%	91.4%	8.6%	61.7%	38.3%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	-2.3	2.3	1.9	-1.9	
	Conservative/UKIP	Count	3	0	2	1	2	1	3
		Expected Count	2.5	0.5	2.9	0.1	1.6	1.4	3.0
		% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	-2.6	2.6	0.5	-0.5	
	Democratic Unionist Party supporter	Count	3	0	3	0	3	0	3
		Expected Count	2.5	0.5	2.9	0.1	1.6	1.4	3.0
		% within Political party support	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	1.7	-1.7	
	Greens supporter	Count	33	6	38	1	16	23	39
		Expected Count	32.4	6.6	37.4	1.6	20.3	18.7	39.0
		% within Political party support	84.6%	15.4%	97.4%	2.6%	41.0%	59.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.3	0.5	-0.5	-1.5	1.5	
	Infrequent inc combinations	Count	21	4	25	0	16	9	25
		Expected Count	20.8	4.2	24.0	1.0	13.0	12.0	25.0
		% within Political party support	84.0%	16.0%	100.0%	0.0%	64.0%	36.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	0.1	-0.1	1.1	-1.1	1.2	-1.2	
	Labour supporter	Count	77	27	103	1	54	50	104
		Expected Count	86.4	17.6	99.7	4.3	54.3	49.7	104.0

		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
	% within Political party support	74.0%	26.0%	99.0%	1.0%	51.9%	48.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.8	2.8	1.9	-1.9	-0.1	0.1	
	Count	9	3	12	0	5	7	12
	Expected Count	10.0	2.0	11.5	0.5	6.3	5.7	12.0
Labour/Greens	% within Political party support	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	41.7%	58.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.8	0.8	0.7	-0.7	-0.7	0.7	
	Count	26	3	28	1	18	11	29
	Expected Count	24.1	4.9	27.8	1.2	15.1	13.9	29.0
Liberal Democrat supporter	% within Political party support	89.7%	10.3%	96.6%	3.4%	62.1%	37.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	0.2	-0.2	1.1	-1.1	
	Count	9	2	11	0	3	8	11
	Expected Count	9.1	1.9	10.5	0.5	5.7	5.3	11.0
Plaid Cymru supporter	% within Political party support	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%	0.0%	27.3%	72.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.1	0.1	0.7	-0.7	-1.7	1.7	
	Count	5	1	4	2	2	4	6
	Expected Count	5.0	1.0	5.8	0.2	3.1	2.9	6.0
SDLP supporter	% within Political party support	83.3%	16.7%	66.7%	33.3%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.0	0.0	-3.6	3.6	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	9	2	11	0	2	9	11
	Expected Count	9.1	1.9	10.5	0.5	5.7	5.3	11.0
Sinn Fein supporter	% within Political party support	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%	0.0%	18.2%	81.8%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.1	0.1	0.7	-0.7	-2.3	2.3	
	Count	53	5	55	3	27	31	58
	Expected Count	48.2	9.8	55.6	2.4	30.3	27.7	58.0
SNP supporter	% within Political party support	91.4%	8.6%	94.8%	5.2%	46.6%	53.4%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.8	-1.8	-0.4	0.4	-0.9	0.9	
	Count	3	1	4	0	2	2	4
	Expected Count	3.3	0.7	3.8	0.2	2.1	1.9	4.0
SNP/Greens	% within Political party support	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.4	0.4	0.4	-0.4	-0.1	0.1	
	Count	10	1	11	0	9	2	11
	Expected Count	9.1	1.9	10.5	0.5	5.7	5.3	11.0
UKIP supporter	% within Political party support	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%	0.0%	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.7	-0.7	2.0	-2.0	
	Count	344	70	397	17	216	198	414
	Expected Count	344.0	70.0	397.0	17.0	216.0	198.0	414.0
Total		83.1%	16.9%	95.9%	4.1%	52.2%	47.8%	100.0%

	Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
	False	True	False	True	False	True	
Adjusted residuals of ±1.96 are significant at p<0.05.							

A15.3. Religion

Cases					
Valid		Missing		Total	
N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
548	40.1%	820	59.9%	1368	100.0%

		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
Ambiguous	Count	4	0	3	1	2	2	4
	Expected Count	3.3	0.7	3.8	0.2	2.1	1.9	4.0
	% within Religion	100.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	-2.2	2.2	-0.1	0.1	
Buddhist	Count	8	1	8	1	2	7	9
	Expected Count	7.5	1.5	8.7	0.3	4.7	4.3	9.0
	% within Religion	88.9%	11.1%	88.9%	11.1%	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.5	-0.5	-1.1	1.1	-1.8	1.8	
Christian	Count	93	24	109	8	74	43	117
	Expected Count	96.9	20.1	112.5	4.5	61.1	55.9	117.0
	% within Religion	79.5%	20.5%	93.2%	6.8%	63.2%	36.8%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.1	1.1	-1.9	1.9	2.7	-2.7	
Hindu	Count	7	2	9	0	8	1	9
	Expected Count	7.5	1.5	8.7	0.3	4.7	4.3	9.0
	% within Religion	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%	0.0%	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.4	0.4	0.6	-0.6	2.2	-2.2	
Jewish	Count	3	1	4	0	3	1	4
	Expected Count	3.3	0.7	3.8	0.2	2.1	1.9	4.0
	% within Religion	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.4	0.4	0.4	-0.4	0.9	-0.9	
Muslim	Count	6	3	9	0	7	2	9
	Expected Count	7.5	1.5	8.7	0.3	4.7	4.3	9.0
	% within Religion	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.3	1.3	0.6	-0.6	1.5	-1.5	
Non-religious	Count	325	61	375	11	185	201	386
	Expected Count	319.8	66.2	371.2	14.8	201.5	184.5	386.0
	% within Religion	84.2%	15.8%	97.2%	2.8%	47.9%	52.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.3	-1.3	1.8	-1.8	-3.1	3.1	
Other religious	Count	7	1	8	0	3	5	8

		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
Sikh	Expected Count	6.6	1.4	7.7	0.3	4.2	3.8	8.0
	% within Religion	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%	0.0%	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.6	-0.6	-0.8	0.8	
	Count	1	1	2	0	2	0	2
	Expected Count	1.7	0.3	1.9	0.1	1.0	1.0	2.0
	% within Religion	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.2	1.2	0.3	-0.3	1.4	-1.4	
TOTAL	Count	454	94	527	21	286	262	548
	% within Religion	82.8%	17.2%	96.2%	3.8%	52.2%	47.8%	100.0%
Adjusted residuals of ± 1.96 are significant at $p < 0.05$.								

A15.4. Sexuality

Cases					
Valid		Missing		Total	
N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
272	19.9%	1096	80.1%	1368	100.0%

		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
Ambiguous	Count	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
	Expected Count	0.8	0.2	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0
	% within Sexuality	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.2	-0.2	-1.0	1.0	
Bisexual	Count	51	4	52	3	26	29	55
	Expected Count	46.3	8.7	52.6	2.4	27.5	27.5	55.0
	% within Sexuality	92.7%	7.3%	94.5%	5.5%	47.3%	52.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.9	-1.9	-0.4	0.4	-0.5	0.5	
Gay or lesbian	Count	30	4	33	1	17	17	34
	Expected Count	28.6	5.4	32.5	1.5	17.0	17.0	34.0
	% within Sexuality	88.2%	11.8%	97.1%	2.9%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.4	-0.4	0.0	0.0	
Heterosexual	Count	147	35	174	8	93	89	182
	Expected Count	153.2	28.8	174.0	8.0	91.0	91.0	182.0
	% within Sexuality	80.8%	19.2%	95.6%	4.4%	51.1%	48.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.2	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.5	-0.5	
TOTAL	Count	229	43	260	12	136	136	272
	Expected Count	229.0	43.0	260.0	12.0	136.0	136.0	272.0
	% within Sexuality	84.2%	15.8%	95.6%	4.4%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

Adjusted residuals of ± 1.96 are significant at $p < 0.05$.

A15.5. Generation

Cases					
Valid		Missing		Total	
N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
234	17.1%	1134	82.9%	1368	100.0%

		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
Baby Boomer	Count	9	0	9	0	7	2	9
	Expected Count	7.2	1.8	8.6	0.4	4.4	4.6	9.0
	% within GENERATION	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.6	-1.6	0.6	-0.6	1.8	-1.8	
Gen X	Count	37	1	37	1	15	23	38
	Expected Count	30.2	7.8	36.4	1.6	18.7	19.3	38.0
	% within GENERATION	97.4%	2.6%	97.4%	2.6%	39.5%	60.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	3.0	-3.0	0.5	-0.5	-1.3	1.3	
Gen Z	Count	25	14	36	3	18	21	39
	Expected Count	31.0	8.0	37.3	1.7	19.2	19.8	39.0
	% within GENERATION	64.1%	35.9%	92.3%	7.7%	46.2%	53.8%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.6	2.6	-1.2	1.2	-0.4	0.4	
Greatest Generation	Count	5	1	6	0	3	3	6
	Expected Count	4.8	1.2	5.7	0.3	2.9	3.1	6.0
	% within GENERATION	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	0.5	-0.5	0.0	0.0	
Millennial	Count	107	32	133	6	71	68	139
	Expected Count	110.5	28.5	133.1	5.9	68.3	70.7	139.0
	% within GENERATION	77.0%	23.0%	95.7%	4.3%	51.1%	48.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.7	-0.7	
Silent Generation	Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	2.4	0.6	2.9	0.1	1.5	1.5	3.0
	% within GENERATION	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.4	-0.4	-0.6	0.6	
TOTAL	Count	186	48	224	10	115	119	234
	Expected Count	186.0	48.0	224.0	10.0	115.0	119.0	234.0
	% within GENERATION	79.5%	20.5%	95.7%	4.3%	49.1%	50.9%	100.0%

Adjusted residuals of ± 1.96 are significant at $p < 0.05$.

A15.6. Geo-attachment

Cases					
Valid		Missing		Total	
N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
1090	79.7%	278	20.3%	1368	100.0%

		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
British	Count	139	32	160	11	93	78	171
	Expected Count	142.8	28.2	163.3	7.7	88.5	82.5	171.0
	% within Geoattachment	81.3%	18.7%	93.6%	6.4%	54.4%	45.6%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.8	0.8	-1.3	1.3	0.8	-0.8	
British / Celtic	Count	2	1	3	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	2.5	0.5	2.9	0.1	1.6	1.4	3.0
	% within Geoattachment	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.8	0.8	0.4	-0.4	-0.6	0.6	
British / City	Count	7	2	9	0	7	2	9
	Expected Count	7.5	1.5	8.6	0.4	4.7	4.3	9.0
	% within Geoattachment	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%	0.0%	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5	0.7	-0.7	1.6	-1.6	
British / English	Count	38	3	36	5	23	18	41
	Expected Count	34.2	6.8	39.2	1.8	21.2	19.8	41.0
	% within Geoattachment	92.7%	7.3%	87.8%	12.2%	56.1%	43.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.6	-1.6	-2.4	2.4	0.6	-0.6	
British / English / Londoner	Count	4	0	4	0	1	3	4
	Expected Count	3.3	0.7	3.8	0.2	2.1	1.9	4.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.4	-0.4	-1.1	1.1	
British / English / Northerner	Count	7	0	7	0	6	1	7
	Expected Count	5.8	1.2	6.7	0.3	3.6	3.4	7.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.2	-1.2	0.6	-0.6	1.8	-1.8	
British / English / Rural	Count	4	2	6	0	3	3	6
	Expected Count	5.0	1.0	5.7	0.3	3.1	2.9	6.0
	% within Geoattachment	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.1	1.1	0.5	-0.5	-0.1	0.1	

		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
British / English / Southerner	Count	4	2	3	3	3	3	6
	Expected Count	5.0	1.0	5.7	0.3	3.1	2.9	6.0
	% within Geoattachment	66.7%	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.1	1.1	-5.4	5.4	-0.1	0.1	
British / Irish	Count	2	2	4	0	3	1	4
	Expected Count	3.3	0.7	3.8	0.2	2.1	1.9	4.0
	% within Geoattachment	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.8	1.8	0.4	-0.4	0.9	-0.9	
British / Londoner	Count	7	5	11	1	9	3	12
	Expected Count	10.0	2.0	11.5	0.5	6.2	5.8	12.0
	% within Geoattachment	58.3%	41.7%	91.7%	8.3%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.4	2.4	-0.6	0.6	1.6	-1.6	
British / Northerner	Count	19	2	20	1	9	12	21
	Expected Count	17.5	3.5	20.1	0.9	10.9	10.1	21.0
	% within Geoattachment	90.5%	9.5%	95.2%	4.8%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	-0.1	0.1	-0.8	0.8	
British / Other	Count	15	4	19	0	8	11	19
	Expected Count	15.9	3.1	18.1	0.9	9.8	9.2	19.0
	% within Geoattachment	78.9%	21.1%	100.0%	0.0%	42.1%	57.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5	1.0	-1.0	-0.8	0.8	
British / Rural	Count	12	3	15	0	9	6	15
	Expected Count	12.5	2.5	14.3	0.7	7.8	7.2	15.0
	% within Geoattachment	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.4	0.4	0.8	-0.8	0.6	-0.6	
British / Scottish	Count	11	3	13	1	8	6	14
	Expected Count	11.7	2.3	13.4	0.6	7.2	6.8	14.0
	% within Geoattachment	78.6%	21.4%	92.9%	7.1%	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5	-0.5	0.5	0.4	-0.4	
British / Southerner	Count	13	4	17	0	11	6	17
	Expected Count	14.2	2.8	16.2	0.8	8.8	8.2	17.0
	% within Geoattachment	76.5%	23.5%	100.0%	0.0%	64.7%	35.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.8	0.8	0.9	-0.9	1.1	-1.1	
British / Welsh	Count	6	1	7	0	5	2	7
	Expected Count	5.8	1.2	6.7	0.3	3.6	3.4	7.0
	% within Geoattachment	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	0.0%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	0.6	-0.6	1.0	-1.0	

		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
Celtic	Count	9	0	9	0	2	7	9
	Expected Count	7.5	1.5	8.6	0.4	4.7	4.3	9.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.3	-1.3	0.7	-0.7	-1.8	1.8	
City person	Count	15	10	25	0	12	13	25
	Expected Count	20.9	4.1	23.9	1.1	12.9	12.1	25.0
	% within Geoattachment	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%	0.0%	48.0%	52.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-3.2	3.2	1.1	-1.1	-0.4	0.4	
English	Count	116	27	135	8	82	61	143
	Expected Count	119.4	23.6	136.6	6.4	74.0	69.0	143.0
	% within Geoattachment	81.1%	18.9%	94.4%	5.6%	57.3%	42.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.8	0.8	-0.7	0.7	1.4	-1.4	
English / City	Count	9	3	12	0	11	1	12
	Expected Count	10.0	2.0	11.5	0.5	6.2	5.8	12.0
	% within Geoattachment	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	91.7%	8.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.8	0.8	0.8	-0.8	2.8	-2.8	
English / Londoner	Count	4	0	4	0	1	3	4
	Expected Count	3.3	0.7	3.8	0.2	2.1	1.9	4.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.4	-0.4	-1.1	1.1	
English / Northerner	Count	15	4	19	0	7	12	19
	Expected Count	15.9	3.1	18.1	0.9	9.8	9.2	19.0
	% within Geoattachment	78.9%	21.1%	100.0%	0.0%	36.8%	63.2%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5	1.0	-1.0	-1.3	1.3	
English / Other	Count	6	0	6	0	2	4	6
	Expected Count	5.0	1.0	5.7	0.3	3.1	2.9	6.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.1	-1.1	0.5	-0.5	-0.9	0.9	
English / Rural person	Count	14	1	14	1	7	8	15
	Expected Count	12.5	2.5	14.3	0.7	7.8	7.2	15.0
	% within Geoattachment	93.3%	6.7%	93.3%	6.7%	46.7%	53.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	-0.4	0.4	-0.4	0.4	
English / Southerner	Count	12	1	13	0	7	6	13
	Expected Count	10.9	2.1	12.4	0.6	6.7	6.3	13.0
	% within Geoattachment	92.3%	7.7%	100.0%	0.0%	53.8%	46.2%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.8	-0.8	0.2	-0.2	

		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
European	Count	51	10	59	2	34	27	61
	Expected Count	50.9	10.1	58.3	2.7	31.6	29.4	61.0
	% within Geoattachment	83.6%	16.4%	96.7%	3.3%	55.7%	44.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.0	0.0	0.5	-0.5	0.6	-0.6	
European / British	Count	28	6	33	1	16	18	34
	Expected Count	28.4	5.6	32.5	1.5	17.6	16.4	34.0
	% within Geoattachment	82.4%	17.6%	97.1%	2.9%	47.1%	52.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.2	0.2	0.4	-0.4	-0.6	0.6	
European / British / English	Count	4	3	7	0	4	3	7
	Expected Count	5.8	1.2	6.7	0.3	3.6	3.4	7.0
	% within Geoattachment	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%	0.0%	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.9	1.9	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	
European / British / Irish	Count	5	0	5	0	2	3	5
	Expected Count	4.2	0.8	4.8	0.2	2.6	2.4	5.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	0.5	-0.5	-0.5	0.5	
European / British / Londoner	Count	2	1	2	1	2	1	3
	Expected Count	2.5	0.5	2.9	0.1	1.6	1.4	3.0
	% within Geoattachment	66.7%	33.3%	66.7%	33.3%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.8	0.8	-2.4	2.4	0.5	-0.5	
European / British / Other	Count	12	1	13	0	8	5	13
	Expected Count	10.9	2.1	12.4	0.6	6.7	6.3	13.0
	% within Geoattachment	92.3%	7.7%	100.0%	0.0%	61.5%	38.5%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.8	-0.8	0.7	-0.7	
European / British / Scottish	Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	2.5	0.5	2.9	0.1	1.6	1.4	3.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	-0.6	0.6	
European / City	Count	5	1	5	1	3	3	6
	Expected Count	5.0	1.0	5.7	0.3	3.1	2.9	6.0
	% within Geoattachment	83.3%	16.7%	83.3%	16.7%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.0	0.0	-1.4	1.4	-0.1	0.1	
European / English	Count	5	1	6	0	4	2	6
	Expected Count	5.0	1.0	5.7	0.3	3.1	2.9	6.0
	% within Geoattachment	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.0	0.0	0.5	-0.5	0.7	-0.7	

		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
European / Other	Count	14	2	15	1	8	8	16
	Expected Count	13.4	2.6	15.3	0.7	8.3	7.7	16.0
	% within Geoattachment	87.5%	12.5%	93.8%	6.3%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	-0.3	0.3	-0.1	0.1	
European / Irish	Count	12	1	12	1	4	9	13
	Expected Count	10.9	2.1	12.4	0.6	6.7	6.3	13.0
	% within Geoattachment	92.3%	7.7%	92.3%	7.7%	30.8%	69.2%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	-0.6	0.6	-1.5	1.5	
European / Irish / Celtic	Count	5	0	4	1	1	4	5
	Expected Count	4.2	0.8	4.8	0.2	2.6	2.4	5.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	-1.7	1.7	-1.4	1.4	
European / Londoner	Count	6	0	6	0	2	4	6
	Expected Count	5.0	1.0	5.7	0.3	3.1	2.9	6.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.1	-1.1	0.5	-0.5	-0.9	0.9	
European / Northerner	Count	5	0	5	0	3	2	5
	Expected Count	4.2	0.8	4.8	0.2	2.6	2.4	5.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	0.5	-0.5	0.4	-0.4	
European / Scottish	Count	19	4	22	1	9	14	23
	Expected Count	19.2	3.8	22.0	1.0	11.9	11.1	23.0
	% within Geoattachment	82.6%	17.4%	95.7%	4.3%	39.1%	60.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	-1.2	1.2	
European / Southerner	Count	3	0	3	0	2	1	3
	Expected Count	2.5	0.5	2.9	0.1	1.6	1.4	3.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	0.5	-0.5	
European / Welsh	Count	3	1	4	0	2	2	4
	Expected Count	3.3	0.7	3.8	0.2	2.1	1.9	4.0
	% within Geoattachment	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5	0.4	-0.4	-0.1	0.1	
Infrequent	Count	2	3	5	0	3	2	5
	Expected Count	4.2	0.8	4.8	0.2	2.6	2.4	5.0
	% within Geoattachment	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.6	2.6	0.5	-0.5	0.4	-0.4	


		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
Irish	Count	33	5	36	2	18	20	38
	Expected Count	31.7	6.3	36.3	1.7	19.7	18.3	38.0
	% within Geoattachment	86.8%	13.2%	94.7%	5.3%	47.4%	52.6%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	-0.2	0.2	-0.5	0.5	
Irish / Celtic	Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	2.5	0.5	2.9	0.1	1.6	1.4	3.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	-0.6	0.6	
Irish / City	Count	4	1	5	0	2	3	5
	Expected Count	4.2	0.8	4.8	0.2	2.6	2.4	5.0
	% within Geoattachment	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.2	0.2	0.5	-0.5	-0.5	0.5	
Irish / English	Count	3	0	3	0	1	2	3
	Expected Count	2.5	0.5	2.9	0.1	1.6	1.4	3.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.8	-0.8	0.4	-0.4	-0.6	0.6	
Irish / Other	Count	7	0	6	1	4	3	7
	Expected Count	5.8	1.2	6.7	0.3	3.6	3.4	7.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	85.7%	14.3%	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.2	-1.2	-1.3	1.3	0.3	-0.3	
Londoner	Count	9	6	14	1	13	2	15
	Expected Count	12.5	2.5	14.3	0.7	7.8	7.2	15.0
	% within Geoattachment	60.0%	40.0%	93.3%	6.7%	86.7%	13.3%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.5	2.5	-0.4	0.4	2.7	-2.7	
Londoner / City	Count	6	0	6	0	3	3	6
	Expected Count	5.0	1.0	5.7	0.3	3.1	2.9	6.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.1	-1.1	0.5	-0.5	-0.1	0.1	
Northerner	Count	22	4	26	0	8	18	26
	Expected Count	21.7	4.3	24.8	1.2	13.5	12.5	26.0
	% within Geoattachment	84.6%	15.4%	100.0%	0.0%	30.8%	69.2%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	1.1	-1.1	-2.2	2.2	
Rural person	Count	12	2	12	2	9	5	14
	Expected Count	11.7	2.3	13.4	0.6	7.2	6.8	14.0
	% within Geoattachment	85.7%	14.3%	85.7%	14.3%	64.3%	35.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	-1.8	1.8	0.9	-0.9	

		Victim		Victim uncreation		(Re)blame present		Total
		False	True	False	True	False	True	
Scottish	Count	70	11	78	3	35	46	81
	Expected Count	67.6	13.4	77.4	3.6	41.9	39.1	81.0
	% within Geoattachment	86.4%	13.6%	96.3%	3.7%	43.2%	56.8%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.7	-0.7	0.4	-0.4	-1.6	1.6	
Scottish / Celtic	Count	3	1	4	0	1	3	4
	Expected Count	3.3	0.7	3.8	0.2	2.1	1.9	4.0
	% within Geoattachment	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.5	0.5	0.4	-0.4	-1.1	1.1	
Scottish / City	Count	14	0	14	0	7	7	14
	Expected Count	11.7	2.3	13.4	0.6	7.2	6.8	14.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.7	-1.7	0.8	-0.8	-0.1	0.1	
Scottish / Rural	Count	6	1	7	0	4	3	7
	Expected Count	5.8	1.2	6.7	0.3	3.6	3.4	7.0
	% within Geoattachment	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	0.0%	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.2	-0.2	0.6	-0.6	0.3	-0.3	
Southerner	Count	8	1	9	0	4	5	9
	Expected Count	7.5	1.5	8.6	0.4	4.7	4.3	9.0
	% within Geoattachment	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%	0.0%	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.4	-0.4	0.7	-0.7	-0.4	0.4	
Southerner / Other	Count	4	0	4	0	3	1	4
	Expected Count	3.3	0.7	3.8	0.2	2.1	1.9	4.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.9	0.4	-0.4	0.9	-0.9	
Welsh	Count	23	2	25	0	10	15	25
	Expected Count	20.9	4.1	23.9	1.1	12.9	12.1	25.0
	% within Geoattachment	92.0%	8.0%	100.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.2	-1.2	1.1	-1.1	-1.2	1.2	
Welsh / Other	Count	9	0	9	0	3	6	9
	Expected Count	7.5	1.5	8.6	0.4	4.7	4.3	9.0
	% within Geoattachment	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Adjusted Residual	1.3	-1.3	0.7	-0.7	-1.1	1.1	
TOTAL	Count	910	180	1041	49	564	526	1090
	Expected Count	910.0	180.0	1041.0	49.0	564.0	526.0	1090.0
	% within Geoattachment	83.5%	16.5%	95.5%	4.5%	51.7%	48.3%	100.0%
Adjusted residuals of ± 1.96 are significant at $p < 0.05$.								

A16. Annex: SE education levels

In the survey-experiment, participants were invited to give their highest level of educational attainment, according to the Regulated Qualifications Framework depicted in Figure 2.


Figure 2: Regulated Qualifications Framework⁵²



Consistent with prior research, those with voting preference 'Remain' had a mean higher level of education (5.2 (~Foundation Degree), SD 1.7) than those with VP Leave (2.9 (~A levels), SD 1.9); see Figure 3.

⁵² CareersInc, 'Students'.

Figure 3: Normal distribution curve for education level, VP Leavers and VP Remainders.



A17. Annex: SE emotions by vignette and voting preference

Percentage of survey-experiment responses in which an emotion appeared, by voting preference and vignette. Researcher groupings are indicated; only emotions appearing at least seven times are included. Darker shading indicates higher prevalence; voting preferences other than Leave/Remain are not included due to the small count (N=115).

Response count:

VP Leave				VP Remain			
blame EU	blame ourselves	blame UK	no blame	blame EU	blame ourselves	blame UK	no blame
103	100	101	98	201	188	230	226

	VP Leave				VP Remain			
	blame EU	blame ourselves	blame UK	no blame	blame EU	blame ourselves	blame UK	no blame
~ ANNOYED	16.5%	9.0%	12.9%	7.1%	29.4%	27.1%	20.9%	6.2%
Consists of the following:								
annoyed	4.9%	4.0%	5.9%	2.0%	16.4%	11.7%	10.4%	2.7%
angry	7.8%	2.0%	5.0%	3.1%	6.0%	9.0%	4.3%	0.9%
exasperated	1.0%	0	0	1.0%	0.5%	0	0.4%	0
frustrated	1.9%	2.0%	1.0%	1.0%	3.0%	5.9%	2.6%	2.7%
irritated	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0	3.5%	1.1%	3.0%	0.4%
miffed	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
narked	0	0	0	0	0	0.5%	0	0
APATHETIC⁵³	13.6%	15.0%	15.8%	9.2%	6.5%	12.8%	12.2%	15.9%
~ COMPASSION	9.7%	12.0%	12.9%	21.4%	12.9%	9.6%	11.3%	25.7%
Consists of the following:								
empathetic	0	1.0%	0	2.0%	0	0.5%	0.4%	2.2%
have-trying	5.8%	6.0%	5.9%	4.1%	6.5%	2.7%	4.8%	7.5%
sad	3.9%	5.0%	6.9%	12.2%	6.0%	6.4%	4.8%	14.6%
sorry	0	0	1.0%	1.0%	0.5%	0	1.7%	3.1%
sympathetic	1.9%	1.0%	0	4.1%	0	0	0	2.2%
~ GOOD	16.5%	19.0%	16.8%	19.4%	7.0%	10.6%	12.6%	13.3%
Consists of the following:								
good	3.9%	6.0%	5.0%	4.1%	2.0%	3.7%	6.5%	4.9%
fine	5.8%	10.0%	8.9%	7.1%	2.5%	3.7%	3.0%	5.3%
nice	0	1.0%	0	0	0	0.5%	0.4%	0
okay	5.8%	2.0%	4.0%	8.2%	2.0%	1.6%	2.6%	3.1%

⁵³ Due to researcher error, this emotion grouping was created at the point of initial coding; as such, 'sub' emotions such as 'indifference' are not shown separately. As it is antipathy that creates villains, not apathy, this was not considered an issue in the present research.

	VP Leave				VP Remain			
	blame EU	blame ourselves	blame UK	no blame	blame EU	blame ourselves	blame UK	no blame
positive	1.0%	1.0%	0	1.0%	1.0%	2.1%	0.4%	0.9%
~ HAPPY	11.7%	14.0%	12.9%	9.2%	10.4%	12.8%	10.4%	15.0%
Consists of the following:								
happy	7.8%	5.0%	5.9%	4.1%	6.0%	8.0%	6.1%	9.3%
content	3.9%	4.0%	5.0%	3.1%	3.0%	3.7%	3.5%	2.7%
glad	0	1.0%	0	0	1.5%	1.1%	0	1.8%
pleased	0	4.0%	2.0%	2.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.9%	1.3%
~ RELIEVED	1.9%	5.0%	3.0%	4.1%	4.5%	4.3%	7.8%	4.9%
Consists of the following:								
relieved	1.9%	4.0%	3.0%	4.1%	4.0%	3.7%	7.4%	4.0%
reassured	0	1.0%	0	0	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.9%
~ SCARED	0	0	1.0%	0	0	1.6%	0.4%	0.9%
Consists of the following:								
scared	0	0	1.0%	0	0	1.1%	0.4%	0.9%
afraid	0	0	0	0	0	0.5%	0	0
~ SURPRISED	1.0%	4.0%	4.0%	2.0%	2.5%	3.7%	0.9%	0.4%
Consists of the following:								
surprised	0	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	1.5%	2.7%	0.9%	0.4%
shocked	1.0%	2.0%	2.0%	0	1.0%	1.1%	0	0
~ WORRIED	5.8%	7.0%	3.0%	8.2%	9.5%	12.2%	11.3%	17.7%
Consists of the following:								
worried	1.9%	3.0%	1.0%	2.0%	4.5%	4.8%	3.9%	7.1%
anxious	0	0	1.0%	0	2.0%	2.1%	2.6%	3.5%
cautious	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
concerned	3.9%	4.0%	1.0%	6.1%	3.5%	4.8%	4.8%	8.0%
nervous	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
panicked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.4%	0
uneasy	0	0	0	0	0	0.5%	0.4%	0
UNGROUPED								
bad	0	0	1.0%	1.0%	0	1.1%	2.6%	0.4%
better	9.7%	5.0%	13.9%	10.2%	12.4%	19.1%	15.2%	14.6%
bored	1.9%	6.0%	1.0%	0	1.0%	0	1.7%	0
breath	3.9%	6.0%	9.9%	3.1%	10.4%	16.0%	11.3%	10.2%
calm	1.9%	3.0%	0	1.0%	1.0%	1.6%	1.7%	2.2%
confident	1.0%	2.0%	0	0	0.5%	0	0.9%	1.8%
confused	2.9%	1.0%	2.0%	0	5.5%	3.2%	4.8%	1.3%
curious	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0	0	0.4%
disappointed	0	0	1.0%	0	1.0%	2.1%	2.6%	0
hopeful	1.9%	4.0%	0	1.0%	4.0%	3.2%	3.0%	2.2%
hopeless	0	0	1.0%	0	0.5%	0	2.2%	0.4%
informed	2.9%	0	1.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.1%	3.0%	1.3%
interested	1.0%	4.0%	3.0%	0	1.5%	1.6%	0.4%	0.4%


	VP Leave				VP Remain			
	blame EU	blame ourselves	blame UK	no blame	blame EU	blame ourselves	blame UK	no blame
nothing	8.7%	6.0%	8.9%	15.3%	6.0%	4.8%	6.1%	9.3%
powerless	1.0%	0	1.0%	1.0%	0.5%	0	0.9%	0
proud	0	0	1.0%	2.0%	0.5%	1.6%	0.9%	0.4%
rushed	0	0	0	0	0.5%	1.6%	1.3%	0.9%
safe	1.9%	1.0%	0	1.0%	2.5%	1.6%	1.7%	1.3%
same	14.6%	13.0%	17.8%	24.5%	12.4%	8.5%	10.9%	11.1%
satisfied	2.9%	3.0%	2.0%	3.1%	4.5%	3.2%	3.0%	2.2%
sceptical	2.9%	0	0	0	1.5%	0.5%	1.7%	0.4%
stressed	0	3.0%	2.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.1%	2.6%	1.3%
tired	1.9%	0	1.0%	0	0	0	1.7%	1.3%
unknown	3.9%	4.0%	5.0%	3.1%	6.5%	5.3%	3.5%	4.0%
unsurprised	1.9%	3.0%	0	1.0%	0.5%	0.5%	2.6%	1.3%
upset	0	0	1.0%	0	0.5%	1.6%	0.9%	0.9%

A18. Annex: SE emotions by vignette

This table shows the percentage of responses to a given vignette that included a particular emotion. Only emotions that appear at least seven times are included; researcher groupings are included. Darker shading indicates higher frequency. An indicative chart is included below.

	blame EU	blame UK	blame ourselves	no blame
~ ANNOYED	24.8%	18.2%	19.7%	5.8%
APATHETIC	9.1%	13.2%	13.9%	14.3%
~ COMPASSION	11.5%	12.1%	10.6%	24.7%
~ GOOD	10.0%	14.0%	13.5%	15.4%
~ HAPPY	10.9%	10.5%	13.5%	13.7%
~ RELIEVED	3.9%	5.8%	4.5%	4.9%
~ SCARED	0	0.6%	1.0%	0.5%
~ SURPRISED	2.1%	1.7%	3.9%	0.8%
~ WORRIED	7.9%	8.5%	10.3%	14.6%
bad	0	1.9%	0.6%	1.1%
better	11.2%	15.4%	14.2%	12.4%
bored	1.2%	1.4%	1.9%	0
breath	7.6%	11.3%	12.6%	8.8%
calm	1.5%	1.4%	2.3%	1.6%
confident	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	1.1%
confused	4.8%	3.6%	2.3%	0.8%
curious	0.9%	0.3%	0.6%	0.5%
disappointed	0.9%	1.9%	1.3%	0
hopeful	3.3%	2.2%	3.2%	2.2%
hopeless	0.3%	1.7%	0	0.5%
informed	2.1%	2.2%	1.3%	1.6%
interested	1.2%	1.1%	2.3%	0.3%
nothing	6.6%	8.0%	5.8%	11.0%
powerless	0.9%	0.8%	0	0.3%
proud	0.3%	0.8%	1.0%	0.8%
rushed	0.3%	0.8%	1.3%	1.1%
safe	2.4%	1.7%	1.3%	1.4%
same	13.3%	12.7%	10.0%	15.7%
satisfied	3.9%	2.5%	2.9%	2.7%
sceptical	1.8%	1.1%	0.3%	0.3%
stressed	0.9%	2.5%	1.6%	1.1%
tired	0.6%	1.4%	0	0.8%
unknown	5.7%	4.7%	4.8%	3.6%
unsurprised	1.2%	1.7%	1.3%	1.1%
upset	0.6%	0.8%	1.0%	1.1%

Figure 4: Indicative chart of emotions by vignette. Best viewed in colour; rows always follow the order blame-EU, -UK, -selves, and no blame.




A19. Annex: SE geo-attachment

In the survey-experiment, 39.6% VPL and 43% VPR included a single geographical region as part of their identity, i.e. English or European, rather than both. ('Celtic' is included in geo-attachment data in that, like 'Welsh' or 'English', it may be an identity linked to a particular location, as well as having cultural or ethnic implications.)

Results are shown in Figure 5. People with Voting Preference Leave (VP Leavers) identified as British (16.4%) followed by English (16.2%). 2.7% identified as Northerners, 1.7% as Scottish, and just 0.2% as European. VP Remainders also identified as British first (10.2%), followed by Scottish (8%), English (7%) and European (6.6%).

Figure 5: Geo-attachment as percentage of participants



Identifying with more than one geography was common: while 39.6% of Leavers identified with a single geography, 78.6% identified with one or more.

For Leavers, per Figure 6, the most common geo-attachments were local. It is not until the 17th item that 'European' makes an entry, and it is included just twice in the top twenty VPL geo-attachments. For Remainders, 'European' appears four times in the top twenty.

Further, per Figure 6 and Figure 7, Leavers seem to identify more locally (Northerner/Southerner) than Remainders. Leavers also identify as more 'rural', while Remainders identify more as 'city people'.

Figure 6: Top twenty geo-attachments for VP Leavers. Note that 23 items are shown due to a five-way tie for 19th spot. British, English, and local geo-attachments dominate the top of the list.

	Geo-attachment	VP Leave (%) ▼
1	British	16.4
2	English	16.2
3	British, English	6
4	Northerner	2.7
5	English, Northerner	2.5
6	English, Rural person	2.5
7	British, Northerner	2.2
8	British, Scottish	2.2
9	English, Southerner	2.2
10	British, Southerner	2
11	British, Rural person	1.7
12	Scottish	1.7
13	Rural person	1.5
14	British, English, Rural person	1.2
15	British, English, Northerner	1
16	City person	1
17	European, British	1
18	Irish	1
19	British, English, Londoner	0.7
20	British, English, Southerner	0.7
21	European, British, English	0.7
22	Scottish, Rural person	0.7
23	Welsh	0.7

Figure 7: Top twenty geo-attachments for VP Remainers. 22 items are shown due to a seven-way tie for 16th spot. British and country-based identities dominate, with 'European' making several appearances.


	Geo-attachment	VP Remain (%) ▼
1	British	10.2
2	Scottish	8
3	English	7
4	European	6.6
5	Irish	4
6	European, British	3.4
7	City person	2.5
8	Welsh	2.5
9	European, Scottish	2.4
10	British, English	1.7
11	Northerner	1.7
12	European, Irish	1.5
13	Scottish, City person	1.5
14	Londoner	1.2
15	British, Northerner	1.1
16	English, Northerner	0.9
17	British, Southerner	0.9
18	British, Rural person	0.9
19	Rural person	0.9
20	English, City person	0.9
21	Southerner	0.9
22	Celtic	0.9

The following tornado chart (Figure 8) of the twenty most frequent geo-attachments demonstrates differences in how the survey-experiment participants identified. It clearly shows that VP Leavers identify more as British, English, British and English, Northerner (Northern England), English and Northerner, or British and Northerner; Remainers identify more as Scottish, European, Irish, European and British, City person, and Welsh. This echoes existing work on Brexit as an 'English' phenomenon and relating to English identity,⁵⁴ though previous work has not considered more local identities such as 'Northerner'.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ E.g. Henderson et al., 'England, Englishness and Brexit'.

⁵⁵ See also Berry, 'Brexit'. on the role of the 'North' and particularly blaming of the North in Brexit discourses.

Figure 8: Tornado chart showing top twenty geo-attachments for VPLs and VPRs



A20. Annex: Suppose the EU was a person

Focus group and interview participants were asked the question, “Suppose the EU were a person—what would that person be like?”. This question was asked in the opening section, meaning responses indicate pre-existing beliefs rather than resulting from reiteration of blame within the FGI itself.

This question was asked on the basis that if blame does indeed lead to vilification, the Leave campaign blamed the EU, and Leavers were audience to that blame, then there should be some portrayal of the EU as a villain apparent in what Leavers say. A lack of villain tropes would help invalidate the present research.

The EU was severally characterised by FGI participants, and conceptions are grouped and presented in approximate order of 'villainy' below. All themes identified in FGI responses are included, with no other characterisations evident.⁵⁶

A20.1. The EU as (unwanted) family

The EU and Europeans were something akin to family for several of the FGI interlocutors. Leaving the EU is like 'leaving home', and at worst, the EU is perhaps overprotective:

Jamal, a low-blame participant: Someone who maybe kind of tells you what to do in many cases; maybe sometimes being overprotective, and not letting you kind of make your own choices sometimes. ... they obviously care for you and want to look out for you; and I suppose they've always been kind of friendly, but I suppose they're maybe disappointed that you are leaving. ... it's kind of a bit like someone kind of leaving home ... we do have a lot in common and we obviously wouldn't want to stop being in contact. ⁵⁷

Alternatively, the EU was an *unwelcome* member of the family—a wicked step-parent like the archetypal Disney villain—who has come in and started ordering the children around (UK as child).

Steve: For me, it would be the overbearing step parent. So it would be someone who has come into the family but is determined to be in that family straight away. So someone who has decided that they're going to be that parent, you're going to listen to their rules, you're going to decide how as a—you're going to behave, when they didn't have impacts in your formative years. ... if a new parent comes into the family, someone that has their own way of doing stuff, that might be at odds with everybody else in the family. So therefore they've decided that you will have family time on this day. You won't be going out at certain times like you used to with your mum. ... They've just decided to bear in as parent, you conform to what they wanted rather than them trying to fit into your family.

A third 'family' metaphor related to the connection between the EU and the UK, understanding it as akin to an abusive relationship. This is interesting, in the different power dynamic discussed. Whereas the EU as family home, or step-parent, indicates a

⁵⁶ See also Methodology > Data analysis > Reading process and quote selection.

⁵⁷ See E2 > Post-referendum performance of blame.

hierarchy whereby the EU is more powerful and the UK is like a growing child—somewhat bizarre to contemplate, given the history of the British Empire and Commonwealth—in an abusive relationship, the partners are more equal.

John, with Russia as tyrant: If I was going to put myself in an position of being Greek or Portuguese, I'd almost feel like the EU was an abusive partner who you really love but you couldn't leave, because it's the only bulwark that you've got against tyranny.

Liz also uses the family metaphor, but stresses that *Europe* is her family, not the EU.

Liz:⁵⁸ I'm certainly not talking about the European country, I'm not talking about the European citizens, I'm not talking about the European cultures, because I love all those and I—you know—they're part of my family; they're part of my life in a sense.

The EU is then like a home that the UK is moving out of; the relationship between the EU and UK is perhaps caring, but that may be counteracted by over-protectiveness or abuse. Nevertheless, there *is* a relationship, and it will not be sundered simply by 'moving out'.

A20.2. The EU as a boring, disconnected bureaucrat

The least common conception of the EU was essentially as boring—safe, bland, and lacking personality. This is compared to the 'big' personalities supporting the Leave campaign. FGI participant Luke said that part of the reason he voted out was because the EU and Remainers lacked personality—"they weren't interesting, positive personalities, or sort of, it was quite dower and negative. So I suppose that's how I see the EU as a person". Jacob echoed this, to the broad agreement of the London focus group, saying that the EU is "kind of like a mystery figure", because it doesn't have "a 'face' as the EU". He pointed out that how you understand the EU is seen through the "prism of your government, or your media." Mac likewise wondered as to the mystery of the EU, saying that it is "quite opaque".

Others suggested that the EU may be good at heart, but with poor implementation. Oliver said that the EU as a person would be "someone who ultimately has good intentions", having sought power in order to do good, but who then became too scared of losing power. Douglas echoed this sentiment, saying that he thinks the EU has "good intentions", but lives "very much in a bubble". The EU is "disconnected", and it was up in the air "how much they understand the average life of the citizens". This idea of disconnection was reiterated by Steve (see also below), who suggested that the EU would be akin to "upper management", and particularly, *poor* upper management, who "haven't got an understanding" of how to implement their "orders and virtues". Sam (the other 'low blame' participant)⁵⁹ pictured the EU as a bureaucratic figure, or "corporate fat cat".

At best, then, the EU is faceless and dull, possibly well-meaning, but disconnected from the populace. Even *if* it means well, its good intentions do not make up for its poor execution.

⁵⁸ Originally Australian.

⁵⁹ See E2 > Post-referendum performance of blame.

A20.3. The EU as a know-it-all control freak

The EU was consistently described as controlling. Beyond being simply 'disconnected', it does not listen, and impose what it says are solutions despite what people might actually want; the EU 'knows best'.

Douglas: I think they genuinely believe that they know better than other people. So I think they genuinely believe that the decisions, whether we like it or not, are the right ones

Todd: to boil it down to one phrase: a control freak. A **narcissistic** control freak.
(Todd)

Mac: A control freak [laughs] I think. That would have—it would be very artsy and interesting, and very well-educated. But they'd want to do everything by their rules. And even if that left us at a slight disadvantage or—or other people out of kilter, you know, it doesn't matter as long as their plan is carried out sort of thing.

This non-listening is reflected in the EU's narrow-mindedness.

Megan: it would be somebody who was very narrow-minded, and didn't see anyone else's point of view. And only wanted their way of living.

They are selfish, and untrustworthy:

John: I think it's **exceptionally** self-interested. I think it wants to gather far, far more power from itself. It don't think it really gives a damn about the nation state.

Liz, speaking of the EU Commission: It's not somebody I would trust to have a very close relationship with. ... I wouldn't trust them with members of my family, ... I wouldn't want them in my house. If I had to associate with them in the workplace or whatever, I could tolerate that,.... But really, I'd like to get away from them.

Georgina: it's kind of like Silvio Berlusconi type ... or one of the people that are running FIFA, and just a very slimy, slippery, untrustworthy, unpleasant character really, that probably want to avoid.

Bronwyn suggests that, as a large organisation, the EU is "unwieldy and undemocratic and **brutal**; brutally **uncaring**"—and the more the EU expands, the more this is the case. Others agree that the EU is unfriendly, even hostile:

Bronwyn: in a way I've always felt that they're not actually **friends**. They're not **friendly** towards us. They haven't **acted** like friends, it's always been a slightly **hostile** thing and trying to, you know, impose **their** view instead of them **listening** to our concerns or what suits **our country** best.

Alex: I think fairly strong anti-Anglophone sentiments and hostility

John, who described the EU's handling of the financial crisis as the turning point for him, labels the EU as "Authoritarian. Controlling. Unapproachable. Arrogant." and illiberal.

This conception of the EU's rather rote villainy was the most common amongst FGI participants.

A20.4. The EU as an inexorable fascist

Several participants—Steve, John, Abigail, and Todd, most of whom additionally contributed metaphors in the preceding sections—went even further.

The EU is fascistic.

Abigail: Adolf Hitler. [group laughs] And I'm not exaggerating. That's how I feel about it. I think it would be a very aggressive person. Somebody that wanted their own way, and wouldn't give in to anybody else.

Abigail: I actually see that project as a fascist project. *You* have to do what *I* tell you. You cannot think for yourself.

Todd: They're a bunch of mandarins. They're not democratically elected. They can't be democratically got rid of. ... the Mandarin in China wasn't elected. He sat there, imposed his will on everybody else. There was absolutely no comeback.

It is a malign "cabal", a capitalist plot, and the Commission is the "heart of darkness" around which states orbit in search of ever closer union (John).

John: You know, it's the *one thing* where I think I actually agree with Jeremy Corbyn. Jeremy Corbyn and others in the Labour Party call the EEC a capitalist plot. ... I take a stage further, because again because I'm *exceptionally* liberal on the economic side, it's a crony capitalist plot. It's there for the benefit of the big states; it's there for the benefit of the big banks; it's there for the benefit of big, *existing* institutions; and any organisation that exists for the benefit of the already-powerful and the already wealthy is *malign* in my opinion.

The EU is an inexorable force, like an oil tanker or a steamroller (John and Steve)—and "resistance is futile", with Steve saying that "the Borg is just the best description". The Borg, from *Star Trek* (see Figure 9), transform "individual beings into 'drones'" in a process of one-way "assimilation".⁶⁰ The EU is then a dictatorial force that crushes individual differences between peoples and states.

Steve: ... it's a very very dictatorial way of doing stuff. *Apart* from assimilating more people into your *corporation*, what have you actually done to adapt to everybody else?

⁶⁰ 'Borg'.

Figure 9: Picture of a 'Borg'. Note the disfigurement of human actors to illustrate monstrosity⁶¹



Several participants referred to the EU's 'caring' or not caring; suggesting an emotional relationship—and an 'incorrect' emotional relationship—between the EU and UK. The relationship is perceived as emotionally imbued, and apparently with feelings of 'uncaringness' and 'hostility', as expected of a relationship with a villain. This 'uncaringness' is in comparison with 'love'⁶² shared with the UK. Because the EU doesn't 'like' him, Steve is separate to or unrepresented by it:

Steve: "Because I do like this country, I do love this country. I do think that despite all its problems it's not as bad as a lot people make out. But with the EU I look at it and I just think 'that is totally separate to me. It doesn't represent me. It doesn't involve me. It doesn't *want* me. And it doesn't like me."

It is clear from each of these characterisations that the EU is not *loved* by the FGI participants, with only some ambivalence demonstrated by Jamal (EU as home that's been outgrown), Mac (EU as unknown/opaque), and Sam (EU as bureaucrat/fat cat). The majority of participants saw the EU as a controlling, untrustworthy, uncaring, or even hostile character, akin to a wicked step-parent, while others went further, understanding the EU as a fascistic, malign, dictatorial force, akin to Hitler. For most participants, the EU is *unlikable*, and perhaps even deserving of hatred or fear. They would not want to spend time with the EU (as a person), through to actively avoiding them. The EU is, effectively, the 'bad guy'.

⁶¹ FC: *Borg Drones*.

⁶² E.g. Liz

A21. Annex: Vignettes

Each participant in the survey-experiment was exposed to one of the below vignettes. The vignettes were kept as similar as possible, with only the blamee changing between variations. Such changing parts are underlined below, but were not distinguished in any way in the survey-experiment itself. The article's 'heading' is in **bold** text; the variation number and title were not displayed to participants. See also Methodology > Data sources > Survey-experiment and E3 > Villains at large > Analysing the vignette.

A21.1. Variation 1: Blame the EU

Thanks to the EU, the UK's big flooding problem is only going to get worse

The UK's summer has gotten off to an exceedingly soggy start. In Lincolnshire, the residents of more than 580 homes were evacuated in mid-June after the town of Wainfleet endured the equivalent of two months' rain in just two days. In Edinburgh and Stirling, people had to be rescued by boat on June 24 after flash floods left people stranded on top of cars and inside their homes.

The politicians swanking around the disaster zones in hard hats and hi-viz jackets are pointing the finger at climate change – a convenient bogeyman in this situation, but in truth this is an unnatural disaster which was made to order in Brussels.

There are a number of different factors to consider, of course, but none have had a bigger impact than EU regulations such as the Habitats Directive, Water Framework Directive and Floods Directive, which have hugely increased the difficulty and expense of dredging our rivers.

Managing floods costs the UK around £2.2 billion each year.

A21.2. Variation 2: Blame the UK Government

Thanks to Westminster, the UK's big flooding problem is only going to get worse

The UK's summer has gotten off to an exceedingly soggy start. In Lincolnshire, the residents of more than 580 homes were evacuated in mid-June after the town of Wainfleet endured the equivalent of two months' rain in just two days. In Edinburgh and Stirling, people had to be rescued by boat on June 24 after flash floods left people stranded on top of cars and inside their homes.

The politicians swanking around the disaster zones in hard hats and hi-viz jackets are pointing the finger at climate change – a convenient bogeyman in this situation, but in truth this is an unnatural disaster which was made to order in Westminster.

There are a number of different factors to consider, of course, but none have had a bigger impact than home-grown UK legislation such as the 2014 Water Act, Flood and Water Management Act 2010 and Land Drainage Act, which have hugely increased the difficulty and expense of dredging our rivers.

Managing floods costs the UK around £2.2 billion each year.

A21.3. Variation 3: Blame selves

Thanks to our collective inaction, the UK's big flooding problem is only going to get worse

The UK's summer has gotten off to an exceedingly soggy start. In Lincolnshire, the residents of more than 580 homes were evacuated in mid-June after the town of Wainfleet endured the equivalent of two months' rain in just two days. In Edinburgh and Stirling, people had to be rescued by boat on June 24 after flash floods left people stranded on top of cars and inside their homes.

The politicians swanking around the disaster zones in hard hats and hi-viz jackets are pointing the finger at climate change – a convenient bogeyman in this situation, but in truth this is an unnatural disaster which was made to order in our own backyards.

There are a number of different factors to consider, of course, but none have had a bigger impact than our day-today lives, whether it's irresponsible water use, dumping rubbish into waterways, or choosing paved courtyards over the trees that help to soak up excess rain. Each of these has hugely increased the likelihood of flooding.

Managing floods costs the UK around £2.2 billion each year.

A21.4. Variation 4: No blame

The UK's big flooding problem

The UK's summer has gotten off to an exceedingly soggy start. In Lincolnshire, the residents of more than 580 homes were evacuated in mid-June after the town of Wainfleet endured the equivalent of two months' rain in just two days. In Edinburgh and Stirling, people had to be rescued by boat on June 24 after flash floods left people stranded on top of cars and inside their homes.

Managing floods costs the UK around £2.2 billion each year

A22. Annex: What the campaigns talked about

This table shows the relative frequency of primary policy concerns and political meta apparent in BSIE texts and Leave.EU news items. It provides the data for Figure 33 (Donut chart showing Leave.EU News discourse prevalence and intersection of that discourse with blame) in E2 > Pre-referendum performance of blame > What topics drew blame?. Each column adds up to 100%; items are counted each time they occur. Subcodes are not shown.

	BSIE	Leave.EU - News
Discourses - policy concerns		
Business, industry, fisheries	5.2%	2.2%
Climate change / environment	1.6%	2.6%
Crime	4.3%	2.7%
Economy	23.9%	19.7%
Education / universities / research / qualifications	4.6%	0.5%
Identity / traditions / values / culture	0.7%	3.5%
Jobs (inc trade unions)	13.1%	4.2%
Migration	8.5%	18.4%
Public services inc NHS	5.6%	0.6%
Quality of life	15.4%	1.8%
Rights and standards	4.6%	2.6%
Security	3.3%	0.5%
Status / voice / influence / global representation	5.2%	3.2%
UK pays money to the EU	2.0%	5.0%
Discourses - political meta		
Accountability	0	2.7%
Control / sovereignty / independence	2.0%	10.4%
Democracy / elections	0	8.4%
Freedom / liberty	0	1.2%
Populism (inc establishment conspiracies)	0	10.0%

A23. Annex: Who is blamed for what?

This table shows who was blamed for a given item in the text-based data used in E2 per Methodology > Data sources. It was calculated using 'collapsed codes' such that all subcodes for a given item were collapsed into it (see E2 > Introduction > The meaning of numbers). Such collapsing is marked with (+). Migrants/the migrant crisis are not collapsed into 'other' due to the salience of the migrant crisis (see E1).

The first column shows the blamee, followed by what they were blamed for, the number of instances in which that takes place and the relative frequency of that blamee/discourse combination (%), then the group where that blame intersection happens (BSIE, the Metro etc).

The table is sorted from highest frequency to lowest, such that the most common blame was the EU being blamed for something to do with migration. This happens 16 times in the Metro, and 77 times in Leave.EU materials.

Blamee	Item	#	%	BSIE	The Metro	MetroTalk	Farage	LNAM	LBROCH	L(ALL)	Ads
	<i>N</i>	930	100	2	132	80	69	484	110	594	53
EU (+)	Migration (+)	114	12.26	0	16	5	8	69	8	77	8
EU (+)	Economy (+)	100	10.75	0	16	4	3	54	16	70	7
EU (+)	Business, industry, fisheries	52	5.59	0	3	2	5	23	19	42	0
EU (+)	Control / sovereignty / independence	46	4.95	0	4	0	1	30	8	38	3
EU (+)	Jobs (inc trade unions)	48	5.16	0	6	5	0	21	12	33	4
EU (+)	Climate change / environment	35	3.76	0	0	0	2	31	1	32	1
EU (+)	Democracy / elections	34	3.66	0	5	0	1	20	6	26	2
EU (+)	UK pays money to the EU	45	4.84	0	4	2	1	24	1	25	13
Political party (+)	Migration (+)	49	5.27	0	17	3	9	18	1	19	1
EU (+)	Crime	19	2.04	0	0	2	2	12	2	14	1
EU (+)	Rights and standards	19	2.04	0	0	4	1	11	3	14	0
EU (+)	Quality of life (+)	24	2.58	0	2	2	0	12	2	14	6
Other (+)	Economy (+)	17	1.83	0	2	1	0	8	6	14	0
EU (+)	Populism (inc establishment conspiracies)	14	1.51	0	1	0	1	12	0	12	0
Political party (+)	Economy (+)	28	3.01	0	9	7	0	10	2	12	0
EU (+)	Accountability	11	1.18	0	0	0	0	9	2	11	0
EU (+)	Identity / traditions / values / culture	11	1.18	0	0	0	0	10	1	11	0
Migrants, migrant crisis (inc implied)	Migration (+)	20	2.15	0	1	5	4	10	0	10	0

Blamee	Item	#	%	BSIE	The Metro	MetroTalk	Farage	LNAM	LBROCH	L(ALL)	Ads
EU (+)	Status / voice / influence / global representation	12	1.29	0	2	1	1	7	1	8	0
Part of EU/EEC (+)	Economy (+)	9	0.97	0	0	0	1	8	0	8	0
Other (+)	Jobs (inc trade unions)	9	0.97	0	1	1	0	3	4	7	0
EU (+)	Freedom / liberty	13	1.40	0	5	0	0	6	1	7	1
Other (+)	Populism (inc establishment conspiracies)	8	0.86	0	1	0	1	6	0	6	0
Part of EU/EEC (+)	Migration (+)	11	1.18	0	1	0	5	5	0	5	0
Other (+)	Migration (+)	13	1.40	0	3	3	2	4	1	5	0
Political party (+)	Populism (inc establishment conspiracies)	10	1.08	0	2	2	1	5	0	5	0
Political party (+)	Control / sovereignty / independence	6	0.65	0	0	1	0	5	0	5	0
Other (+)	Democracy / elections	5	0.54	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	0
EU (+)	Education / universities / research / qualifications	8	0.86	0	2	0	2	4	0	4	0
Other (+)	Climate change / environment	4	0.43	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	0
Political party (+)	Jobs (inc trade unions)	8	0.86	0	0	4	1	3	0	3	0
Non-agent / situation (+)	Economy (+)	10	1.08	1	4	1	1	2	1	3	0
Political party (+)	UK pays money to the EU	5	0.54	0	0	1	1	3	0	3	0
Political party (+)	Democracy / elections	4	0.43	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	0
Migrants, migrant crisis (inc implied)	Crime	7	0.75	0	1	3	0	3	0	3	0
EU (+)	Public services inc NHS	11	1.18	0	2	0	0	3	0	3	6
Non-agent / situation (+)	Climate change / environment	3	0.32	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0
EU (+)	Security (+)	3	0.32	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	0
Political party (+)	Identity / traditions / values / culture	3	0.32	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	0
Non-agent / situation (+)	Migration (+)	5	0.54	0	3	0	0	2	0	2	0
Part of EU/EEC (+)	Business, industry, fisheries	2	0.22	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0
Other (+)	Control / sovereignty / independence	2	0.22	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0
Other (+)	Quality of life (+)	2	0.22	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0
Other (+)	Education / universities / research / qualifications	4	0.43	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	0
Political party (+)	Climate change / environment	3	0.32	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0
Political party (+)	Quality of life (+)	7	0.75	0	3	2	1	1	0	1	0

Blamee	Item	#	%	BSIE	The Metro	MetroTalk	Farage	LNAM	LBROCH	L(ALL)	Ads
Non-agent / situation (+)	Business, industry, fisheries	4	0.43	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
Political party (+)	Accountability	2	0.22	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
Political party (+)	Crime	4	0.43	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	0
Political party (+)	Public services inc NHS	3	0.32	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0
Political party (+)	Freedom / liberty	3	0.32	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0
Migrants, migrant crisis (inc implied)	Economy (+)	2	0.22	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Part of EU/EEC (+)	Climate change / environment	1	0.11	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Part of EU/EEC (+)	Control / sovereignty / independence	1	0.11	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Part of EU/EEC (+)	Crime	1	0.11	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Other (+)	Identity / traditions / values / culture	1	0.11	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Other (+)	Public services inc NHS	1	0.11	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Other (+)	Rights and standards	1	0.11	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Part of EU/EEC (+)	Status / voice / influence / global representation	1	0.11	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Non-agent / situation (+)	UK pays money to the EU	1	0.11	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Political party (+)	Business, industry, fisheries	7	0.75	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0
Other (+)	Crime	2	0.22	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Other (+)	UK pays money to the EU	1	0.11	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Migrants, migrant crisis (inc implied)	Jobs (inc trade unions)	3	0.32	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Political party (+)	Education / universities / research / qualifications	2	0.22	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Non-agent / situation (+)	Jobs (inc trade unions)	2	0.22	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Part of EU/EEC (+)	Jobs (inc trade unions)	1	0.11	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Migrants, migrant crisis (inc implied)	Public services inc NHS	1	0.11	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Migrants, migrant crisis (inc implied)	Quality of life (+)	1	0.11	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Political party (+)	Rights and standards	1	0.11	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Non-agent / situation (+)	Public services inc NHS	3	0.32	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other (+)	Business, industry, fisheries	2	0.22	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Political party (+)	Security (+)	2	0.22	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0

Blamee	Item	#	%	BSIE	The Metro	MetroTalk	Farage	LNAM	LBROCH	L(ALL)	Ads
Non-agent / situation (+)	Democracy / elections	1	0.11	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other (+)	Freedom / liberty	1	0.11	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-agent / situation (+)	Quality of life (+)	1	0.11	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

A24. Annex: Who is the EU?

"it is a kind of faceless block of paper pushers and bureaucrats where you don't get to talk to anyone" (Alex)⁶³

The thesis refers to the EU as 'it' and 'its', using impersonal pronouns. However, this belies the fact that 'the EU' is treated as some kind of actor with agency throughout campaign materials as well as in the research itself—as in the survey-experiment vignette. The focus groups/interviews ('FGIs') presented an opportunity to interrogate this nebulous conception of 'the EU'. A number of participants explained who the EU 'is' in the course of responding to the question "Suppose the EU was a person; what would that person be like?" Where they did not do so, the semi-structured nature of the interview allowed the researcher to ask, "Who are the EU?" or similar. The ways in which it was constructed as an institution were then grouped into themes as follows.

A24.1. The EU is not Europe

Several FGI participants made sure to point out the EU is 'not Europe', in a similar way to that found in Leave campaign materials.

I'm talking about the EU Commission, I'm not talking about Europe, okay. (Liz)

A24.2. The EU is Merkel, or the Establishment

For others, 'the EU' either meant particular European stakeholders—particularly Angela Merkel or Jean-Claude Juncker—or a political 'establishment'.

for me, I would say it's not particularly *one* person. Guy Verhofstadt, Juncker, your von der Leyens, people like that. I think there's a very small group—I would probably even say 10 to 15 people within that organisation that all have the same view. Merkel, even though she isn't officially EU she's Chancellor of Germany, pretty much as she clicks her fingers everybody jumps anyway. ... I think Macron *wants* to be part of that, but I don't think he is—because he does go a bit rogue sometimes. (Steve)

recently [the EU] has been Barnier ["Barmy-A"], and Juncker, and ...Verhofstadt, can never remember him, ... *they're* the ones who been having a go at us lately. And then Angela Merkel. ... I *don't* see [the EU] as the Parliament. I see that as a *fake* [chuckles], but there we are. (Bronwyn)

[The EU Commission is] a Joseph Conrad, it's the heart of darkness you know. ...But I don't think it...sets its own agenda; I think it takes its lead from—from establishments in those particularly powerful countries like Germany, like France, Belgium, Netherlands, those sorts of things. And I don't think it's necessarily just from politicians; I think it's from *establishment* (John)

A24.3. The EU is the Commission

The Commission seems particularly central to the idea of 'the EU', likely reflecting discourses around the EU Commission being the decision-maker and full of 'unelected bureaucrats' per

⁶³ See also Annex: Who is the EU?.

campaign materials. The Commission appears as key decision-maker, if not the power behind the throne.

it's the Commission, and the Commission are directed pretty much by the—the most powerful states within the EU, provided that those powerful states in the EU agree with the direction of travel. (John)

I think there's nothing wrong with Europeans, and I don't think any leader would say that there's anything wrong with Europeans. It's the *EU Commission* where everything is done behind closed doors. (Abigail)

It's the European Commission that actually impose these ludicrous pieces of legislation. They're a bunch of mandarins. They're not democratically elected. They can't be democratically got rid of. (Todd)

A24.4. The EU is composed of several institutions

Jamal (of little blame) showed the greatest familiarity with the institutional structure of the EU, saying that

I would probably consider it to be like Brussels, like the EU—the Parliament—the ... people that gather to kind of make decisions at a European level. And then, when they obviously meet up that that I would consider that the EU, I suppose they have a kind of like the equivalent of the government like Westminster here. So that's kind of the entity that I kind of associate with the EU—obviously as a geography...it's obviously all the countries, it's spread quite far and wide. But I think if—well when I think about the EU, what usually comes to mind is Brussels and the kind of the EU Parliament, that kind of thing. (Jamal)

Mac acknowledged the existence of the EU Council ("I know that the people within the EU Council maybe elect their peers? But I don't know how that started off, or the actual process by which they're voted in."), while Liz described the European Parliament as part of the EU, but stressed that the European Commission is primary in that the Parliament is 'tied up' with it:

Well the European Parliament is—I mean there's individual parliaments in each of the countries—but the European Parliament is tied up with the European Commission. So I'm talking about them in total there. (Liz)

Todd meanwhile said that the EU was composed of multiple institutions, listing the Parliament and Commission, but suggested that it had deliberately been designed to be confusing.

a guy landed at Brussels Airport, and went to a taxi driver and said "take me to the EU". And the guy didn't know what he was on about, because there's *five different things* that make it up with I think five or is it seven presidents, I can't remember exactly how many, but it's—it's *bewildering*, and in my view, deliberately so." (Todd)

Overall, it appeared that FGI participants centred the Commission as the EU, with the Commission controlling other institutions and their processes. The Commission itself is perhaps controlled by European figures such as Merkel, or a possibly transnational

'establishment'. The 'EU' being blamed by FGI participants could then largely be considered the EU Commission—essentially, the EU's civil service.

A25. Confidential Annex: Focus group and interview participants

FGI participants were not asked to provide psychometric or personality data separately, meaning descriptions here are limited to observable characteristics, and information uncovered in the course of discussion. All names have been changed.

This annex is not included in the version of the thesis submitted to the university repository.

This page intentionally left blank.

A26. References

- Banks, Arron, and Isabel Oakeshott. *The Bad Boys of Brexit: Tales of Mischief, Mayhem & Guerrilla Warfare in the EU Referendum Campaign*, 2017.
- BBC News Service. 'EU Referendum Campaigns Suspended until Sunday after Jo Cox Attack'. *BBC News*, 17 June 2016, sec. EU Referendum. <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-eu-referendum-36553442>.
- Berry, Craig. 'Brexit: How Both Sides of the Political Divide Have Co-Opted the "Left behind" North'. *LSE Brexit* (blog), 19 July 2019. <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/brexit/2019/07/19/brexit-how-both-sides-of-the-political-divide-have-co-opted-the-left-behind-north/>.
- Bilney, Liz. 'Leave.EU Responds to Reports of an "emergency Brake" on Welfare Payments to EU Migrants'. *Leave.EU*, 1 February 2016. <https://web.archive.org/web/20160624132023/https://leave.eu/en/news/2016-02-01/leaveeu-responds-to-reports-of-an-emergency-brake-on-welfare-payments-to-eu-migrants>.
- . 'Leave.EU Responds to the PM's Speech in Davos'. *Leave.EU*, 24 June 2016. <https://web.archive.org/web/20160624132009/https://leave.eu/en/news/2016-01-21/leaveeu-responds-to-the-pms-speech-in-davos>.
- 'Borg'. In *Wikipedia*, 27 October 2020. <https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Borg&oldid=985779053>.
- Britain Stronger In Europe. 'Condensed Report: Top 10 Facts'. Condensed Report. Britain Stronger in Europe, 2016.
- . 'Get the Facts'. Britain Stronger In Europe. Accessed 24 January 2020. https://www.strongerin.co.uk/get_the_facts.
- . 'Why We Need to Remain in the EU: What the Experts Say'. Britain Stronger In Europe. Accessed 24 January 2020. <https://www.strongerin.co.uk/experts>.
- Britain Stronger In Europe and Vote Leave. 'In or Out? The Two Sides Give Their Reasons for Us to Remain - or Brexit'. *The Metro*. 3 May 2016.
- CareersInc. 'Students'. *CareersInc*, 2021. <https://www.careersinc.uk/delta-dewarenne/students/>.
- Centre for European Reform. 'Brexit Timeline'. Centre for European Reform, 2021. <https://www.cer.eu/brexit-timeline>.
- Cobain, Ian, Nazia Parveen, and Matthew Taylor. 'The Slow-Burning Hatred That Led Thomas Mair to Murder Jo Cox'. *The Guardian*, 23 November 2016, sec. UK news. <http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/nov/23/thomas-mair-slow-burning-hatred-led-to-jo-cox-murder>.
- Directorate-General for Parliamentary Research Services, David Eastock, and Eva-Maria Poptcheva. 'The UK's "new Settlement" in the European Union. Renegotiation and Referendum: In-Depth Analysis'. Website. Publications Office of the European Union, 27 May 2016. <http://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/1e8d4675-e4fa-11e5-8a50-01aa75ed71a1>.
- Eardley, Nick. 'Election Results 2019: Boris Johnson Returns to Power with Big Majority'. *BBC News*, 13 December 2019, sec. Election 2019. <https://www.bbc.com/news/election-2019-50765773>.
- Facebook. 'Brexit Central BeLeave Ads'. Information Commissioner's Office, 24 July 2018.
- Farage, Nigel. 'The Designation Is This Week... Now Let's Unite And Fight!' *Breitbart*, 10 April 2016.

- <https://web.archive.org/web/20160416234330/http://www.breitbart.com/london/2016/04/10/farage-breitbart-designation-week-now-lets-unite-fight/>.
- . 'Time for Tory Eurosceptics to Put up or Shut Up, Do the "Bastards" Have the Balls?' Breitbart, 2 July 2015.
<https://web.archive.org/web/20161119154729/http://www.breitbart.com/london/2015/07/02/farage-for-breitbart-time-for-tory-eurosceptics-to-put-up-or-shut-up-do-the-bastards-have-the-balls/>.
- FC: *Borg Drones - Borg Drones - TrekCore 'Star Trek' Movie Screenshot & Image Galleries*. 5 July 2017. Screenshot, 2943 x 1969 px.
<http://movies.trekcore.com/gallery/displayimage.php?pid=83136>.
- Henderson, Ailsa, Charlie Jeffery, Robert Liñeira, Roger Scully, Daniel Wincott, and Richard Wyn Jones. 'England, Englishness and Brexit'. *The Political Quarterly* 87, no. 2 (April 2016): 187–99. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-923X.12262>.
- Hobolt, Sara Binzer, and James Tilley. *Blaming Europe? Responsibility without Accountability in the European Union*. 1st ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Kuenssberg, Laura. 'Cameron Calls EU Referendum for June', 20 February 2016, sec. EU Referendum. <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-35621079>.
- Leave.EU. 'Can We Secure a Brighter Future Outside of Political Union? Yes We Can!' Leave.EU, 22 April 2016.
<https://web.archive.org/web/20160624130556/https://leave.eu/en/news/2016-04-22/can-we-secure-a-brighter-future-outside-of-political-union-yes-we-can>.
- . 'EU Summit Deal Plays with Fire'. Leave.EU, 8 March 2016.
<https://web.archive.org/web/20160624132201/https://leave.eu/en/news/2016-03-08/eu-summit-deal-plays-with-fire>.
- . 'Fishy Business'. Leave.EU, 30 September 2015.
<https://web.archive.org/web/20160624140408/https://leave.eu/en/news/2015-09-30/fishy-business>.
- . 'Merger between Vote Leave and Leave.EU'. Leave.EU, 4 February 2016.
<https://web.archive.org/web/20160624132025/https://leave.eu/en/news/2016-02-04/merger-between-vote-leave-and-leaveeu>.
- . 'Sources to Advertisement'. Leave.EU, 16 March 2016.
<https://web.archive.org/web/20160624132157/https://leave.eu/en/news/2016-03-16/ad-sources>.
- . 'The Lifesaving Innovation Helping Smokers Quit Is Being Hampered by Overzealous EU Regulation'. Leave.EU, 15 October 2015.
<https://web.archive.org/web/20160624140347/https://leave.eu/en/news/2015-10-15/the-lifesaving-innovation-helping-smokers-quit-hampered-by-overzealous-eu-regulation>.
- . 'We're at War Again, for Some Reason!' Leave.EU, 9 May 2016.
<https://web.archive.org/web/20160624123157/https://leave.eu/en/news/2016-05-09/were-at-war-again-for-some-reason>.
- León, Sandra, Ignacio Jurado, and Amuitz Garmendia Madariaga. 'Passing the Buck? Responsibility Attribution and Cognitive Bias in Multilevel Democracies'. *West European Politics* 41, no. 3 (4 May 2018): 660–82.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2017.1405325>.
- Lerner, Jennifer S., Julie H. Goldberg, and Philip E. Tetlock. 'Sober Second Thought: The Effects of Accountability, Anger, and Authoritarianism on Attributions of

- Responsibility'. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 24, no. 6 (1998): 563–74.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167298246001>.
- Skillen, Laura May. 'Leave.EU's Blaming Strategies and Implications for Their "Brexit" Campaign', 2016. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.4315.5441>.
- Tahir, Tariq. 'Children Miss out on School Places "Because of Europe"'. *The Metro*, 18 April 2016.
- The Metro. 'Leaving "Would Mean More Work and Less Holiday Pay"'. *The Metro*, 12 May 2016.
- . 'MetroTalk'. *The Metro*, 2016.
- Tice, Richard. 'Leave.Eu Responds to William Hague's Recent Comments on Our EU Membership'. Leave.EU, 23 December 2015.
<https://web.archive.org/web/20160624132047/https://leave.eu/en/news/2015-12-23/leaveeu-responds-to-william-hagues-recent-comments-on-our-eu-membership>.
- UK Parliament. 'European Union Referendum Act 2015 Royal Assent'. UK Parliament Parliamentary Bills, 17 December 2015.
<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/1570/stages/8244>.
- . 'European Union Referendum Act 2015 Stages'. UK Parliament Parliamentary Bills, 17 December 2015. <https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/1570/stages>.
- Wallenfeldt, Jeff. 'Theresa May'. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 27 September 2020.
<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Theresa-May>.
- Yeatman, Dominic. 'Deadline for EU Register Is Extended to Midnight'. *The Metro*. 9 June 2016.