REVOLT ON THE LEFT

Labour's UKIP problem and how it can be overcome

By Marcus Roberts

Incorporating research from Rob Ford and Ian Warren

FABIAN SOCIETY

ABOUT THE FABIAN SOCIETY

The Fabian Society is Britain's oldest political think tank. Since 1884 the society has played a central role in developing political ideas and public policy on the left. It aims to promote greater equality of power and opportunity; the value of collective public action; a vibrant, tolerant and accountable democracy; citizenship, liberty and human rights; sustainable development; and multilateral international co-operation.

Through a wide range of publications and events the society influences political and public thinking, but also provides a space for broad and open-minded debate, drawing on an unrivalled external network and its own expert research and analysis. Its programme offers a unique breadth, encompassing national conferences and expert seminars; periodicals, books, reports and digital communications; and commissioned and in-house research and comment.

The Society is alone among think tanks in being a democratically-constituted membership organisation, with almost 7,000 members. Over time our membership has included many of the key thinkers on the British left and every Labour prime minister. Today we count over 200 parliamentarians in our number. The voluntary society includes 70 local societies, the Fabian Women's Network and the Young Fabians, which is itself the leading organisation on the left for young people to debate and influence political ideas.

The society was one of the original founders of the Labour party and is constitutionally affiliated to the party. We are however editorially, organisationally and financially independent and work with a wide range of partners from all political persuasions and none.

CONTENTS

About the authors

Marcus Roberts is deputy general secretary of the Fabian Society and leads its Labour's Next Majority programme. He has written on electoral strategy, movement politics and the lessons of the Obama campaign. He served as field director on Ed Miliband's leadership campaign and has worked for over 15 years on campaigns for the Labour and Democratic parties on both sides of the Atlantic.

Rob Ford is a politics lecturer at the University of Manchester and the author, with Matthew Goodwin, of Revolt on the Right.

Ian Warren is an elections analyst, political consultant and author of the Election Data research blog. He has a doctorate in spatial data analysis from the University of Manchester and is a visiting research fellow in the School of Politics & International Relations at the University of Southampton.

Acknowledgements

Summary

Our research cross referenced demographic data based on 'Left behind' Mosaic groups favourable to UKIP with 2010 parliamentary majorities to create a UKIP Threat Index which considered the scale of UKIP threat in terms of critical, very serious, serious and moderate ratings.

There are five critical and high-risk seats under direct threat by UKIP, for both Labour and the Conservatives each:

• Labour seats under direct UKIP threat: Great Grimsby, Dudley North, Plymouth Moor View, Rother Valley, Rotherham

• Con seats under direct UKIP threat: Clacton, South Thanet, Thurrock, Great Yarmouth, Waveney

Six critical and very serious indirect threat seats that the Conservatives might lose to Labour as a result of the UKIP threat: Warwickshire North, Cardiff North, Broxtowe, Stroud, Carmarthen West & South Pembrokeshire, and Pudsey

Sixteen critical and very serious indirect threat seats which Labour might lose to Conservatives as a result of UKIP-Labour considerers: Southampton Itchen, Great Grimsby, Walsall North, Plymouth Moor View, Telford, Dudley North, Halifax, Wolverhampton NE, Birmingham Edgbaston, Blackpool South, Walsall South, Leicester West, Nottingham South, Southampton Test, Birmingham Northfield, and Wakefield

Four critical and very serious indirect threat Labour target seats which it could fail to win as a result of UKIP-Labour considerers: Plymouth Sutton & Devonport, Carlisle, Lincoln and Ipswich.

Policy: Labour should stress a combination of cost of living issues (energy price freeze, increasing the minimum wage, capping rent increases) with policies that speak to UKIP considerers core anxieties (such as the introduction by some Labour councils of residency requirements for council house waiting lists and curbs on welfare payments to families who live overseas). Beyond this, Labour should consider promoting more contribution in welfare, ring fence a large number of its proposed 200,000 new homes for local people and switch from EU free movement of labour, to fair movement of labour.

Message: Labour should cease using the top-down message of 'Only Labour' and embrace Ed Miliband's more inclusive language of 'Together we can' to signal the shift from a Labour party that presumes to have all the answers to one that listens and works with voters. This should speak to UKIP considerers distrust of politicians' promises through more inclusive language and politics.

Organisation: Labour should shift its campaigners efforts to community campaigning on local issues like pay day loan and betting shops, litter picks and night safety campaigns that reconnect Labour with the local community, demonstrate how change can happen, and help restore trust in politics. Doorstep conversations with UKIP considerers should be longer with voters' concerns genuinely listened to and repeat contacts made.

1 INTRODUCTION

"The problem is that when we talk about UKIP to a room full of Labour party people, half the heads in the room are nodding, but the other half of the heads are shaking."
Rob Ford, co-author of *Revolt on the Right*

UKIP doesn't just pose a problem for Labour strategically, but divides the party internally. Labour can't agree on whether the problem exists or how big it is, so agreeing on a solution has proved impossible so far. For every academic detailing the psephology by which UKIP threatens Labour,[1] an unnamed senior party source can quickly be found in the media confidently predicting that UKIP will divide the right, and help Labour to victory.

This paper will argue that UKIP poses a clear and present danger to Labour's 2015 hopes and, left unchecked, could threaten to pull apart the party's historic electoral coalition and challenge it in large swathes of its heartland territory. To understand the nature of this threat in both the short and long term we will explore the various false party's current UKIP debate, establish the complexity and variability of the UKIP threat in different areas, present new data on the social background and political priorities of the voters UKIP is competing for with Labour, and identify possible strategies for winning these voters' support.

In doing so, this paper draws heavily from British Future data that indicates that whilst roughly half of UKIP supporters are "irreconcilable" to the Labour party, nearly half are in fact "reconcilable" as their identity, issues, hopes and fears, all lie in areas in which Labour has much to offer.[2] With this in mind, this report seeks to lay out a path to winning these reconcilable voters back to Labour.

The strategic danger of oversimplification

Labour's UKIP debate is mired in a series of false choices. The first is the national versus local choice. Those that minimize the risk of UKIP to Labour do so on the grounds that nationally UKIP since 2010 have gained far more votes from those who backed the Conservatives in 2010 than from Labour 2010 voters.[3] They cite Lord Ashcroft's large-scale polling that consistently indicates that between 40 and 50 per cent of UKIP's post 2010 gains have come from ex-Conservative voters. This is in contrast to only 15-20 per cent from Labour 2010 voters.[4] As a consequence, UKIP minimisers make a simple argument: UKIP takes more votes from the Tories than from Labour and

therefore is a bigger problem for the Tories than Labour.[5] Indeed some senior strategists have gone so far as to state, albeit off the record, that a strong UKIP showing could be the key to Labour victory.[6]

The counter-argument to this begins by warning that the distribution of Conservative to UKIP and Labour to UKIP disadvantages Labour. In simple terms, UKIP may be taking a larger number of Conservative votes but this often occurs in seats where Tory majorities are large enough to absorb the defection.[7] In contrast, Labour as a party of opposition needs to grow its vote dramatically to win the general election. Labour to UKIP defectors make the climb to a constituency majority harder, longer and steeper than it would otherwise be.

A related problem which the UKIP minimisers neglect is that a new recruit gained by UKIP is a recruit lost to Labour. Direct switching from Conservatives to Labour has been very low since 2010, and UKIP are a key reason - for every four Tory switchers, three go to UKIP and only one goes to Labour.[8] The voters UKIP are picking up are often precisely those Labour would expect to naturally inherit by virtue of being in opposition. Yet UKIP's presence provides an alternative challenger for the mantle of insurgent. UKIP supporters are often very angry at the government's record, negative about David Cameron's leadership and pessimistic on the economy. UKIP are taking the discontented voters who should be the bread and butter of opposition renewal out of the electoral market. This makes the fight in marginal seats much harder - direct switches from the Conservatives are worth two votes in the key marginal seats - one vote scratched off the Conservative total and a one added to the Labour total. Switches to UKIP are only worth one.

Next, as Professor Stephen Fisher has noted, between 2010 and 2012, UKIP gained more from ex-Conservative voters. But from 2012 to 2014 has gained more from ex-Labour voters.[9] In other words, statistical evidence suggests that UKIP is a decreasing problem for the Conservatives and an increasing problem for the Labour party.

The most interesting argument of the UKIP minimizers is their case that the UKIP threat to Labour is only transitional, as changing demographics and socio-economics are turning Britain into less favourable UKIP turf. Labour strategists like John McTernan cite the examples of London, Manchester and the United States to argue that a declining blue collar Labour vote is a psephological inevitability and that the increased urbanization, ethnic diversity and progressive values of younger voters will combine to create a new electoral coalition in which middle class liberals, minorities and young people make a working class base unnecessary for Labour.[10] They point to Labour's recent local election successes in big diverse cities like London and Manchester and to President Obama's two election victories, built around a similar electoral coalition, as proof of this future.

Such an approach would be profoundly misguided. The crisis of trust in politics is now so profound that the traditional parties must be seeking every opportunity to engage with those who have turned away from them. At best, ignoring the disenfranchised looks callous. At worst, it confirms the suspicions of those who no longer engage that they were right to give up on Labour. It confirms their suspicion that the mainstream parties are, in fact, all the same.

Furthermore, the abandonment of Labour's traditional working class vote would represent a fundamental betrayal of a core part of the original working class/middle class coalition that founded the party over a century

ago. It was for the betterment of both classes that party was created. A shift to total control by one class for the benefit of that class at the expense of the other would be a change not just of strategy but of soul.

Yet even aside from such moral questions, the strategic problem of managing such a transition is pressing. For even if this electoral coalition change in response to demographic change is both desirable and real, the danger the interim poses between now and this promised future could prove fatal. For just as easy to imagine as a bright progressive destiny is a frightening conservative one in which a UKIP aligned Tory party withdraws from the EU, ends immigration as we know it and produces a generation of young people totally disengaged from politics. Of course the other danger inherent in waiting for a future electoral coalition to arrive is the risk of being confined to opposition for a generation whilst Labour awaits salvation in the form of demographic change.

The final problem that UKIP pose to Labour is their powerful and effective narrative, which resonates strongly with Labour's traditional working class vote. The UKIP narrative is that an elite class of politicians have sold out traditional British values leaving a culture of welfare scroungers and a tidal wave of immigrants stealing our jobs. Such populist rhetoric connects with the very real insecurities and pessimism of voters for whom uncertainty and decline are a fact of everyday life, and provide simple explanations for their worries. Labour faces an especially difficult challenge in combating this as its explanations for both the sources and solutions of these anxieties are considerably longer and more complex than UKIP's gross oversimplifications. Furthermore, UKIP is served by the fact that they are articulating an easily understood short hand argument about deindustrialisation, globalization and distrust of institutions and authority. Finally, UKIP is strengthened by the fact there are grains of truth in their arguments. Some Labour politicians did abuse their expenses, our immigration policy did have unintended consequences and our base of elected representatives does now come from a more elite pool.[11] Quite simply, in 1979 over 90 MPs came from working class backgrounds. By 2010 it was less than 20 with more former university lecturers than blue collar workers.[12]

As a consequence the Labour answer to the UKIP challenge must be more than mathematical, but must engage on matters of policy, message and organisation alike.

2 WHY IT MATTERS: UKIP'S 2015 CHALLENGE TO LABOUR

The impact of a fourth party insurgency on a first-past-the-post political landscape already fractured between three parties is hugely complex, and dependent on local social and political geography. What we need to understand is the power UKIP has to disrupt the local balance of power. Disruption can come in two ways - if local UKIP potential is very strong, UKIP have a direct impact on the result - they are part of the local race, with a chance of winning outright.

There are perhaps ten seats where UKIP are credible local contenders, including a top tier of four where they may be considered local favourites: South Thanet, where party leader Nigel Farage is standing; Thurrock, where UKIP policy chief Tim Aker is leading in constituency polls; Great Grimsby, where veteran Austin Mitchell is standing down and the Conservative candidate who nearly defeated him in 2010 is standing in UKIP colours this time and Clacton, home of Conservative defector Douglas Carswell. Beyond this is a lower tier of around 25 seats where UKIP could pull off a win if everything breaks in their favour. These seats split around evenly between the Conservatives and Labour, with a handful of Liberal Democrat seats as well.

In the vast majority of seats outside this list, the UKIP effect comes through indirect impact on the local balance of power. We calculate this by estimating the size of two social groups - Labour supporters tempted by UKIP and Conservative supporters attracted to Farage's insurgency. The relative size of these groups determines the UKIP effect - in a seat where Labour UKIP considerers are dominant, we expect UKIP to hurt Labour, where Conservative UKIP leaners predominate, the Tories will be more likely to suffer harm.

The raw size of the UKIP tempted electorates alone do not tell us where UKIP pose the biggest problems, however. A 20 per cent swing from Labour to UKIP surge is much less disruptive in a seat with a 45 per cent majority than a seat with a 5 per cent majority. We therefore scale our estimate of the UKIP threat against the size of the local majority.

The results, detailed in the appendix, are revealing. There are 59 seats where we believe a surge in UKIP support has potential to seriously impair Labour's local prospects, including 39 Labour-Conservative marginal seats. These include Labour-Liberal Democrat marginals where the outflow of UKIP votes could negate the inflow of Lib Dems angry about the coalition, Conservative-held target seats where the leakage of support to UKIP stands to harm the Labour challenger more than the Tory incumbent, and Labour-held seats where losses to UKIP could enable a Conservative win against the tide. These are just the seats where the local potential for harm from UKIP is most clear cut - UKIP campaigns may also target current Labour voters where the social mix is more diverse, as is happening presently in Thanet.

There is some good news for Labour as well. In another 67 seats, we expect UKIP to damage local Conservative prospects. Yet this number is not as positive as it seems. Only 13 - less than a fifth of the total - are Conservative held Labour targets. Some seats are held by Labour already, so UKIP just adds a margin of safety, while the vast majority are Conservative-Liberal Democrat contests in the south of England where Labour are largely out of the running. With a large national swing against the Lib Dems likely, many of these seats will be races run backwards - the local winner will be the party who loses the least support. This is a mixed blessing for Labour. More Lib Dems means fewer Conservatives, but more Lib Dems from prosperous southern England seats may make a second Conservative-Lib Dem coalition more likely.

Taking everything together, Labour have few reasons to cheer about the UKIP insurgency and plenty to worry about. They are highly at risk of losing at least one seat, and several key targets, to UKIP challengers directly. The flow of Labour votes to UKIP will boost Conservative prospects in a broader swathe of over 50 key seats, including a large number of crucial marginals. The boost to Labour prospects in seats where the local impact of UKIP breaks the other way is less valuable, as Labour has no chance in most of these seats. A strong UKIP result presents Labour with many chances to lose, and few to gain.

Who UKIP/Labour considerers are

UKIP-Labour considerers can be divided into two broad groups. One that is now closed to the appeal of the Labour party, and a second that may be willing the party a chance if engaged in the right way. This point is well made in the research of British Future who note that roughly half of UKIP voters tend to be in broad terms culturally conservative, economically anxious and angry to the extreme with the state of politics and indeed Britain today.[13] But the second group are more willing to give Labour a hearing after they have had their grievances heard.

Where the first group's grievances cannot be assuaged, as they tend to demand for an end to globalisation and a restoration of a bygone era that in all likelihood never existed in reality, the second group is potentially persuadable. This is because the second group's concerns tend to be more concrete, and focused on practical concerns like working hours and pay, the conditions of schools and the NHS and a belief in a contributory welfare state. If their distrust and disappointment can be overcome, these are voters Labour has a chance to engage, and to win back.

To better understand the nature of UKIP-Labour considerers in political terms we grouped the voters into several broad catagories that help illustrate the voters and their concerns by means of a process called factor analysis (see Appendix 2 for a detailed breakdown of the groups).

Factor analysis is a technique used to replace a large number of variables, in this instance 69 Mosaic demographic groups, with a smaller number of "factors" that reflect what sets of variables have in common with one another. This process identified five distinct groups of Labour-UKIP considerers based on their recent voting behaviour and geographical distribution.

Group 1 – Struggling families

This factor is comprised of two demographic groups; poor, older tenants of social housing and vulnerable young parents needing substantial state support. Geographically these groups are found in areas of serious deprivation in cities and towns in the north and midlands. Whilst they have traditionally broken for Labour, in more recent times their disaffection with New Labour has manifested itself in either low turnout or a shift to UKIP. These groups are likely to feel Labour are out of touch with their concerns and thus wary of Labour's policy promises.

Group 2 – Blue Collar Strivers

This factor is comprised of three demographic groups: middle-aged families living in inter war suburban semis; comfortably-off industrial workers; and low income families reliant on low skill industrial jobs. Geographically these groups are concentrated in areas hard-hit by post-industrial transformation such as south Wales, the midlands and declining towns. These groups left school at 15 or 16 and took semi-skilled industrial jobs, only for those jobs to either disappear or leave them struggling to cope financially. These groups are attracted to UKIP because of the lack of mainstream voice for their combination of social conservatism, working-class identity and economic ambition.

Group 3 – Aging council estate households

This factor is comprised of middle-aged couples in right-to-buy homes and older people living on council estates on limited budgets. Geographically they are most concentrated in Wales and Scotland. These groups have been in their current residence for many years but feel threatened by social change and immigration. They are resentful of New Labour for allowing large-scale immigration and for failing to respond to their anxieties and concerns. For these groups the Labour party is dominated by professional politicians or socially liberal London-centric elites who treat them with disdain or condescension. UKIP are their way of attacking this perception.

Group 4 – Deprived and disaffected voters

This factor is comprised of old people in flats or social housing subsisting on welfare; childless tenants in social housing flats with modest social needs. Geographically these groups are concentrated in and around towns and cities which have experienced the negative effects of post-industrialisation, and have consequently borne the burden of social engineering in housing policies designed to ameliorate the same. These groups are intensely unhappy with their lives. They should be Labour's bread and butter but, desperate and angry, they vent their anger by voting UKIP.

Group 5 – The transient young

This group is comprised of young singles and couples in the early stages of

their adult life. They have low incomes from poorly paid jobs but find a way to make ends meet where they can. Geographically they are concentrated in neighbourhoods with low-value, poorly maintained private-rented homes and first-time buyer houses. Often these groups are in direct competition for jobs and housing with migrant labour or feel that immigrants receive beneficial treatment in the welfare system. Historically these groups would swing behind Labour but have started to vote UKIP.

3 LABOUR'S RESPONSE: POLICY

John Denham MP and advocates of the Blue Labour strand of thinking argue that blue-collar voters concerns stem from anxieties on the local, national and global levels.

At a local level UKIP considerers can feel a sense of exclusion or disconnection from the local community that used to give them a sense of belonging. Small things like the local news agent being replaced by a Polish food store where long term residents can't identify the products sold can create a cultural insecurity. Similarly, in communities which used to have strong neighbourhood ties, it can be hard when a new family moves in and doesn't speak English. Note that these concerns are not racist, rather they stem from a desire to connect with the local community, and from a sense of loss and insecurity when such a connection is eroded by changes they don't understand and feel they cannot control.[14]

At a national level, long term residents can feel as if their English culture is being swept away or, in extreme cases, persecuted. It is common to hear such voters saying that they are no longer allowed to fly the flag of St. George or put out Christmas decorations.[15] Although there is little or no evidence of these experiences, that truth is in some ways irrelevant as when people tell these stories they are simply used to express a feeling that is very definitely real - a strong anxiety about social change that can seem bewildering to such voters, and a strong desire for such change to be slowed down or at least controlled.

UKIP considerers also tend to be anxious and pessimistic about Britain's place in the world. Globalization has threatened many of the cornerstones of stable blue collar life, be it the decline in manufacturing, the drop in working class wages or increasing job insecurity. These voters, do not see 'change' as a necessarily progressive or positive force. While the young progressives Labour have successfully courted equate change with dynamism and progress, the older blue collar UKIP considerers associate change with loss and uncertainty. Labour campaigners often report that these voters don't see change as something they author, but as something which happens to them - a force beyond their control that threatens to undermine their way of life for both themselves and their families.

The solutions to these problems are less tangible and clear cut than that of say public service concerns. As cultural issues they are by their very nature less prone to short term policy correctives and more likely to be shaped through a combination of both political and community-oriented interventions over the long term.

Locally, Labour can respond to these worries by promoting the use of the English language through compulsory language classes and limiting the

use of translation services to that of a transitional tool as part of integration. Newham's Labour council has gone further in restricting the use of public funds only to those cultural events which are multi-ethnic in nature.[16]

As both John Denham and Jon Cruddas have argued, these cultural concerns necessitate a more explicitly English response from Labour.[17] Both have promoted St. George's Day celebrations and tied their local Labour parties to them, promoting Englishness in the community and emphasizing Labour's English heritage and pride. Even small symbols such as greater use of union flag colours and emblems or campaigning for the promotion of English history in schools can help counter the discontent felt by UKIP considerers and assuage their concerns that many in Labour regard their anxieties as expression of prejudice or intolerance.

But to address the root causes of these concerns in the long term, Labour must contribute to reforming globalization itself so that it better works for blue collar workers. Policy responses to this may include an active industrial strategy to significantly increase manufacturing's share of GDP, a gradual but steady deleveraging of the British economy as a whole, achieved through lower levels of both public and private debt and a shift to more sustainable forms of debt in which credit is used for capital rather than current spending needs. As part of this, the percentage share of the UK's economy that is financial services particularly in terms of trader speculation must also be reduced. This coincides with a regional rebalancing of the economy achieved through a combination of the establishment of regional banks to provide credit and investment outside of London.

Given the complexity of these ideas and the challenge of translating them into saleable doorstep language, campaigners may well prefer to talk about this agenda in more practical terms, emphasising examples such as Labour's commitment to expand apprenticeships or freeze business rates to help local companies grow.

These policy responses, a mixture of both the technocratic and the strategic, will help change the impact of globalisation on blue collar voters lives for the better in the long term. And for voters they should form part of the broader narrative that Labour must tell about rebuilding Britain and the shared sacrifice for the long term that this represents. Such an approach contrasts markedly with the Conservative's global race narrative in which the prospect of Brazil or China as rising economic powers is the excuse for Tories to threaten blue collar workers with ever lower wages, diminished workers' rights and greater job insecurity. Instead, Labour's story is of a "race to the top" in which high skill, high wage jobs achieved through an expansion of vocational education and smart growth policies as identified by both Heseltine and Adonis reviews allowed Labour to tell a realistic but hopeful story of Britain's future.

4 LABOUR'S RESPONSE: MESSAGE

Labour strategists struggle over which of its messages to deploy in order to tackle UKIP. Does it attempt to win on ground on which it is strong, or to take UKIP on on their own turf?

In caricatured terms, the debate over which issues to emphasise might be boiled down to the NHS vs immigration, with Labour talking about the health service and its opponents stressing immigration. This is in keeping with Labour's Brownite doctrine of dividing issues into "our issues" verses "their issues" and seeking to focus the election at every opportunity around "our issues".[18] But two decades of this approach have helped create a well of discontent around issues like immigration from which UKIP now draws.

Therefore the messaging around issues difficult for the Labour party like immigration, must be contested. UKIP considerers often express their wider and deeper concerns through the simple prism of anxiety over immigration. But as Ed Miliband himself has said, it is a mistake for Labour activists to not take such concerns seriously or to seek to change the subject.[19] Rather Miliband has argued that Labour should listen to voters' concerns about immigration, apologise for the mistakes made in government and offer a range of solutions to tackle the fallout from the issue.

Under this approach, Labour campaigners would contest all of the political space and earn permission with the voter to be heard on more pro-Labour issues such as the NHS by first seriously engaging with the voters' concerns on issues like immigration. Analysts such as Sunder Katwala and Robert Ford have shown that most British voters are more pragmatic about immigration than is commonly assumed.[20] Most are not focussed on numerical reductions, at any cost, but are very anxious about the damage done to wages, job prospects and services by "uncontrolled" immigration.[21] Labour campaigners must meet these concerns head on, by properly resourcing the immigration system, providing communities with the help they need to manage change, and by reforming the rules on benefits provision to ensure migrants pay in before they can access help. If voters are reassured that immigration is properly managed, this opens a conversation about making immigration work for Britain, by recruiting the best and brightest students, researchers, doctors and nurses - a message which has repeatedly been shown to win enthusiastic support from voters.

The second element of Labour messaging requiring adaptation for UKIP considerers is the question of 'gifts' vs 'sacrifice'. Labour orthodoxy stresses offering hard hit voters amelioration of their concerns through state delivered solutions paid for by wealthier tax payers. But again this approach is endangered by the fundamental distrust in the words of politicians shown by UKIP considerers. These voters may be sceptical of being promised gifts that will

solve their problems paid for by someone else.

An alternative approach would be to embrace concepts of shared sacrifice for the long term in making an appeal to these voters. In concrete terms, this would mean challenging the voter to be part of the change promised, be it through participation in parent teacher associations, worker representation on pay boards or even cutting down on cigarette and alcohol consumption. Such a message has greater credibility at a time of low trust in politics, because voters find it easier to believe those who honestly admit that life may be hard before it gets better than those who promise magical gains overnight.

Once the message areas to be contested are determined, delivery becomes the next question. Arguments about political messaging often break down into two categories: soundbites or stories. The New Labour tradition, and that of Clinton Democrats in the USA, is to favour soundbites with short, pithy lines to take that encapsulate big arguments. In contrast, politicians like Labour's Jon Cruddas, or Obama Democrats, favour a narrative approach in which a bigger argument is made with more words to explain where a problem comes from, how it effects people today and what the future looks like after it has been addressed.

Despite his natural inclination towards the story mould, Ed Miliband's Labour party has nonetheless strategically embraced soundbites over stories in constructing its message. The main pillars of Labour party messaging for the 2015 General Election are "Only Labour", "Same Old Tories", "Cost of Living Crisis", "The Choice" and the NHS. Whilst these messages may well have been tested on swing voters in marginal constituencies, it is unlikely that they are sufficient to win back UKIP considerers.

Turning first to the "Only Labour" message. This is designed to raise the stakes in the voters' mind of the election and emphasise the single solution that can deliver on issues like the NHS and the cost of living crisis. But the problem with this branding for UKIP considerers is that it embraces a party-specific, partisan form of politics that is a major driver of these voters' disaffection. The antidote to this is an inclusive message with phrases like "Working With", "Together" and "Us". Words such as these accord the voter a greater degree of respect, presume the voters' active participation, values their contribution and offers the beginning of a relationship in which trust can be built through actions both shared and demonstrated.

As for the "Same Old Tories" message, this is designed to motivate voters on the basis of fear by reminding them of the Tory party's continued toxic image across issues like schools and hospitals, tax cuts for millionaires and the bedroom tax. But fear-based messaging whilst powerful for firing up a party's activists, is of limited value in appealing to voters tempted by a third party, particularly when such voters' anger and disaffection is directed at both governing parties in equal measure. A tribal attack focused on stoking fears and reinforcing negative stereotypes is exactly what UKIP considerers expect to hear, and exactly what they dislike about mainstream politics. As campaigners of all parties attest, UKIP considerers, and many other voters often express a concern that politicians are more interested in scoring points off of each other than serving the public interest, and there is a risk that these words reinforce that impression.

Even "change" has its own problems. Since its use in the Obama elections of 2008 it is probably the most used political message in the world. But for UKIP considerers change often comes with a negative, rather than a positive, meaning. This is encapsulated by the story of a pensioner who, when asked in

a focus group what "change" meant to her said that it was a more expensive bus journey to the hospital with a less reliable service and with different bus companies charging different amounts of money, or having to pay parking charges at her hospital when visiting her daughter.[22]

There are, however, some aspects of Labour's national messaging that may well appeal to UKIP considers – the NHS and the Cost of Living. Labour often enjoys a clear lead over the Conservatives on who is trusted with the health service. This issue ranks high on their list of concerns, which makes it attractive territory for Labour messaging.[23] Furthermore, the recent defection of Conservative MP Douglas Carswell to UKIP is an opportunity for Labour to toxify UKIP's brand on the NHS issue by tying Carswell's deeply held support for privatisation to the party. The disconnect between UKIP activists' views of the NHS and those of the party's supporter base is large, but poorly understood. Carswell's high profile provides an opportunity for Labour to attack this weak point, reminding UKIP considerers that UKIP threaten the public service they prize above all others.

On the cost of living, Labour has found an easily understood short turn of phrase that encapsulates a complicated mix of family finance concerns including energy prices, train fares, rents, mortgages, water bills and real terms pay cuts. In consequence, Labour has successfully framed a large part of the strategic argument around the economy on to terms favourable to them. Furthermore the cost of living crisis enables messaging to be built around stories rather than statistics.[24] So whilst George Osborne recites national numbers on unemployment, interest rates or GDP, Labour campaigners, are able to point to local stories that resonate with the real lived experiences of voters. The next chapter will address the field organisational structures that will help Labour activists to put this lived experience at the heart of their campaigning.

5 LABOUR'S RESPONSE: ORGANISATION

"You counter the politics of protest with a politics that's personal"
Caroline Badley, Birmingham Edgbaston Campaign Coordinator

The tactics of fighting UKIP on the ground are complicated. UKIP, like the Liberal Democrats before them, are not a single entity with a single campaigning style and message.

The challenge is local and thus the response must be local. The politics of protest that UKIP represents strongly includes a sense of communities left behind and Labour's organisation must reflect that. The lessons of this pamphlet are not one size fits all but that campaigns should be attuned to localities.

There are two directions of travel for Labour: one more modern one more 'traditional'. Neither corresponds exactly with the Labour party's preferred method of 'Voter ID-above-all' and while there is of course a place for traditional voter ID, when faced with the emergence of a right-wing populist party, it tends to put opponents in a 'do not contact' box rather than a 'let's persuade' box.

The more modern builds on some of the work of this report. Forward thinking political campaigners have long talked about the potential of big data to revolutionise politics and the analytics team in the 2012 US presidential election used it to great effect.[25] Its great strength is that rather than just aggregating groups into a mass of Mondeo Men or Soccer Moms. This allows greater texture to be applied to modelling to build up an individual picture of the voter – both breaking these voter categories down into smaller subsets as demonstrated in appendix 2 and going further to deal with voters as actual individuals. This is useful as it allows for extreme message segmentation. Before a conversation happens with a voter, it should be possible to establish the most effective message for persuasion (or potentially suppression).

The traditional method returns to the kind of campaigning techniques that one might associate with another era, such as public meetings. The growth in anti-immigration rhetoric can be ascribed, at least in part, to the idea that such attitudes are proscribed. Campaigners who frequently encounter UKIP supporters will have heard phrases like "Not allowed to say that", "people call you racist" and the like. When people are starved of public forums for expressing concern and unease about their changing communities, they will express their grievance at the ballot box.

Related to this is the work that Labour activists can do to support the development of intermediary political institutions. Richard Wilkinson and Kate Pickett in their report A Convenient Truth, published contemporaneously with this report, highlight expanding economic democracy as key to tackling inequality.[26] This is not just because employee representation and trade unionisation apply direct upward pressure on workers wages and

direct downward pressure on executive pay (although this is a part of their argument). It is because such institutions help inculcate a wider 'progressiveness' in society.

Something similar is in operation here. Labour should work with trade unions, community organising groups and local charitable and voluntary groups to form better forums for discussion and debate. For example, organisations like Resident's Associations and Tenant's Associations have fallen into abeyance in many areas. Issues that irritate people locally are now dealt with through a transactional, complaint/redress model that leaves people cold and politicians reduced to acting as complaints departments. In this highly individualised model, it is all too easy to see how immigration insinuates itself as an external cause.

At the heart of any organisational response to UKIP considerers is developing an individual relationship with each target voter. Doing so requires a greater understanding of the issues and concerns of these voters as well as a willingness to expend greater resource on them. In practical terms winning back UKIP considerers means campaigning in the following ways.

Many UKIP considerers are have high propensity to vote Labour but low propensity to actually vote. This means that they are less susceptible to low impact or short contact tactics like leafleting and pure voter ID visits by canvassers as these approaches lack the depth and duration required to leave a lasting imprint capable of increasing their fundamental likelihood to vote.[27] Indeed, low impact contact may be worse than no contact at all with such voters, as shallow engagement will reinforce their belief that politicians are fundamentally uninterested in their concerns. Previously the main battle for these votes was between Labour and non-voting, but the rise of UKIP has politically activated this demographic so that the debate has changed. In the past it was simply enough to remind these voters of election day on the grounds that if they did vote at all, they would overwhelmingly vote Labour. As such, high volume, low cost tactics like distributing mass risograph leaflets made a degree of sense. However, given that the current contest for these voters affections is now a partisan one as well as a battle for turnout itself, a greater effort is required to both persuade and turnout this group.

In canvassing terms, this should manifest as volunteers spending more time on the doorstep in longer conversations to listen to UKIP considerers' concerns, demonstratnig sympathy for their legitimate grievances around issues like wages and housing, and then carefully argue for Labour's positive policy agenda in those areas of concern.[28] Not only will this require a longer amount of time spent on the doorstep, but it also necessitates a greater degree of training on the part of volunteers. Organisers should train a special group of skilled volunteers in the art of persuading UKIP considerers by testing their policy knowledge, role playing difficult conversations and maximising their time spent with likely UKIP considerers. These volunteers should then be used to train the broader base of party activists at the start of any canvassing session in areas likely to possess a large degree of UKIP considerers. Furthermore, good practice in persuading and turning out these voters requires repeat visits with volunteers referencing the previous conversations had as well as timely follow up with direct mail on the issues raised.

The importance of timely follow up with direct mail or repeat contact by phone or in person within a short period of time of the first period of contact is important for two key reasons. The first is to ensure political credibility, so the voter knows when they are promised something action is taken. The second is because GOTV studies have shown that "sandwich tactics" (repeatedly contacting the same voter within a short period of time) lead to higher

BEATING UKIP ON THE GROUND – THE CAMPAIGN COMPANY'S ADVICE

http://www.theoptimisticpatriot.co.uk/post/93887140448/beating-ukip-on-the-ground

1. **Understand the profile of Labour people who consider UKIP**
Key question: Why do people turn to UKIP?
- UKIP vote = protest vote and the need for 'safety, sustenance, security'
- UKIP support therefore not based on poor information, but rather visceral sense of lack of security, fear of change, mourning loss of identity/culture
- This discontent is channelled via issues like immigration fears, loss of respect and discipline– but these are symptoms of a wider problem
- So Labour's aim should not be 'myth-busting' but rather regaining rapport and respect via traditional Labour movement principles like fairness and reciprocity

2. Train people to listen – the forgotten half of communication
Key question: How can campaigning help people believe Labour is listening?
- Communication on doorstep must be engaged, based on mutual exchange and be two-way
- Local UKIP narrative must be understood and rapport must be developed before Labour can offer effective rebuttal
- Campaigners must listen actively, understanding underlying feeling of opinions

3. Train people to have effective conversations
Key question: how do we move from listening to conversation?
- On doorstep, Labour must be seen to be genuinely empathetic especially about socially conservative and sensitive issues like immigration, crime, housing etc
- Need to be open about how to tackle these issues practically
- Party also needs to ensure that campaigners are clear on party line on controversial areas

4. Identify where your target audience is
Key question: who is it worth talking to?
- Use voting records, canvassing, Mosaics and local knowledge e.g. often there are neighbour clusters of UKIP voters while areas with local pubs more likely to vote UKIP

5. Campaign on local issues and build up your candidates
Key question: what are the practical, local issues you can rally support behind?
- People live lives in the local and you can reconnect with voters through local issues
- These issues need also to be practical e.g. street lighting or anti-social behaviour
- Local candidates must be seen to deliver – actions must match words, and must be located locally to e.g. litter – demonstrate how your candidate cares personally

6. Remind them why they are Labour and why Tories are toxic
- Use big emotive rallying points e.g. NHS support (older voters), tangible threat to local public services

7. Squeeze UKIP
- Strong focus on postal votes (where UKIP vote is weak) helps
- Local endorsers rallying support (not just local politicians)
- Squeeze most effective where rapport already established – then to remind people why they were Labour in the first place – sometimes more effective than looking at UKIP policies

voter turnout than making the same number of contacts spread out over a long period of time.

Alongside these canvassing actions are the community campaigning approaches promoted within Labour by Arnie Graf and practised by many of the top performing CLPs in the country.[29] In the short term Labour campaigners should embrace community campaigns around issues that these voters say matter to them on the doorstep. Organisers should assess canvas returns in terms of issues raised by these voters and launch small scale community campaigns on them as a response. Research indicates that these are often cost of living issues such as wages, bus fares or energy bills. These campaigns work best if they achieve active participation from the voters who raised the concerns. This in turn allows organisers to grow their volunteer capacity with that most prized of campaign assets - volunteers who are the target demographic.

TACTICS IN PRACTICE

CLPs like Southampton Itchen, Thurrock and Birmingham Edgbaston have embraced a variety of innovative approaches to tackling the UKIP Considerer problem. Here's some examples:
- In depth constituency analysis of likely Labour/UKIP considerer voters by UK Labour field staff or through Mosaic coding provided by @election_data's Ian Warren to tell Organisers exactly where and in what numbers UKIP considerers likely reside
- Mass survey calling of targeted voter groups to identify issues, gather voter ID and prepare bespoke email and Nationbuilder-based campaigns via @ Survation and Organise Consulting (@OrganiseC)*
- Switching volunteers from voter ID to supporter recruitment and volunteer training for weeks at a time so as to bolster activist numbers and allow for even greater voter ID returns in the long run (note the key to making this a success is a speedy follow-up to every registered supporter offering them a one-to-one meeting with the Organiser or trained activists to convert them from supporter to activist).
- Hand written letters on small letter paper, printed and delivered target voters. These should include a 'understand your anger' message that explicitly references voters concerns on issues such as immigration, the NHS and the cost of living but the tone should be constructive and non-partisan (i.e. avoid 'Only Labour' messaging). The letter should also invite voters to get in touch with the candidate at any time and include the candidate's business card with contact phone number. These letters will likely generate case work so prepare council colleagues accordingly.

Note: Constituency campaigns should consult with the relevant Labour party regional office before formally partnering with these organisations

In the long term Labour's transformation into what Ed Miliband once claimed would be the "largest movement force in British politics" has barely begun.[30] Post 2015, the party must make major changes to properly embed itself in the communities it wishes to represent, delivering real change on the ground in partnership with UKIP considerers. Such an approach will ensure that UKIP considerers become Labour's members, activists and candidates, councillors and MPs as well as Labour's voters.

To realise Badley's recommendation of a politics that is personal to counter UKIP's politics of protest, Labour must embrace a major shift in strategy from broadcast politics to interactive politics. The party must shift from shouting at voters about the virtues of Labour to listening to voters to shape its agenda and actions.

6 CONCLUSION

UKIP poses a dual threat to Labour in 2015. As our research shows there are first the five seats that Labour currently holds at risk of turning purple, but more serious is the indirect threat. There are sixteen Labour seats that could turn blue because of UKIP and there are four Labour target seats in which UKIP voters could deny Labour the gains it needs. Given how close the 2015 general election is likely to be, it is clear that Labour needs to strengthen its response to the rising tide of UKIP / Labour considerers, both to maintain its current hold on seats, as well as make the gains needed to form a government.

This report has argued that Labour's response should be based on adjusting messaging, emphasising specific policy offers and transforming party organisation. In messaging, Labour should stress the 'Together' approach outlined in Ed Miliband's 2014 conference speech which seeks to rebuild trust with disillusioned voters by promising change done with them, not to them. In policy, the higher minimum wage, residency requirements for immigrants to access council house waiting lists, and pledges of more vocational education and manufacturing jobs can help assuage UKIP considerers' direct concerns. Whilst in organisation, Labour on the ground must have longer conversations with voters, listen to their concerns, and practice community organising techniques like Living Wage or Zero Hour contract campaigns that demonstrate to UKIP considerers the trustworthiness of Labour, not by words but by deeds.

Taken together, a cold-headed understanding of the nature, scale and location of the UKIP threat, alongside an optimistic message of changing communities together, a strong policy agenda that targets the root causes of UKIP considerers' concerns, and a reformed Labour party that practices movement politics rather than machine politics, taking action with voters rather than just leafleting them, can win UKIP considerers to Labour's side and ensure victory in 2015.

Endnotes

1 http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jun/24/labour-ukip-appeal-to-angry-white-voters

2 http://www.britishfuture.org/articles/ukippers-can-talk-cant/

3 http://www.fabians.org.uk/election-2014-the-experts-view/

4 See http://lordashcroftpolls.com/2012/12/the-ukip-threat-is-not-about-europe/ and http://lordashcroftpolls.com/2012/11/project-red-alert/ and http://lordashcroftpolls.com/2013/12/counting-the-kippers/

5 http://www.conservativehome.com/thecolumnists/2014/09/stephan-shakespeare-for-every-labour-voter-who-shifts-to-ukip-two-or-three-tories-shift-too.html

6 http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/ukip/10994493/Ukip-voters-will-make-Ed-Miliband-Prime-Minister-Labour-claims.html

7 See UKIP Threat Index, Appendix 1

8 http://www.thesundaytimes.co.uk/sto/public/article1464338.ece

9 http://www.fabians.org.uk/election-2014-the-experts-view/

10 http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/8577d9aa-e270-11e3-a829-00144feabdc0.html#axzz3EbewlwJq

11 http://www.totalpolitics.com/articles/4488/the-new-house-of-commons.thtml

12 Cowley and Kavangh, The British General Election of 2010, ed. D. Butler

13 http://www.britishfuture.org/articles/ukippers-can-talk-cant/

14 This point is raised often by Labour campaigners with experience of UKIP/Labour considerers and is explored more academically in the work of British Future http://www.britishfuture.org/articles/katwala-whats-driving-immigration-concern/

15 A point raised by UKIP considerers in conversation with Labour campaigners with surprising frequency

16 http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-24146572

17 http://www.theoptimisticpatriot.co.uk/post/97077689103/whatever-happens-we-need-an-english-labour-party

18 http://www.fabians.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/remakingthestate_full.pdf chapter 3: Getting to government and explored in detail in http://www.amazon.co.uk/Talking-Brick-Wall-listening-politics/dp/184954056X

19 http://www.politics.co.uk/comment-analysis/2012/06/22/ed-miliband-s-immigration-speech-in-full

20 http://www.britishfuture.org/articles/immigration-making-promises-can-keep/

21 'Revolt on the Right', R. Ford & M. Goodwin, p.125-126

22 Fabian Society focus group, Enviorment & Citizenship programme, 2011

23 http://d25d2506sfb94s.cloudfront.net/cumulus_uploads/document/yoh7f4x8x5/YG-Archive-Pol-Sun-results-300914.pdf

24 http://shiftinggrounds.org/2012/10/labours-economic-attack-act-ii/

25 http://www.thevictorylab.com/

26 http://www.fabians.org.uk/publications/a-convenient-truth/

27 See both the large body of US research on GOTV best practice http://gotv.research.yale.edu/?q=node/10 as well as the UK experiments of Dr. Florian Foos of Nuffield College Oxford due to be published in December 2014

28 http://www.fabians.org.uk/publications/labours-next-majority-a-constituency-guide/

29 http://www.fabians.org.uk/organise/

30 http://www.newstatesman.com/blogs/the-staggers/2011/01/labour-government-politics

APPENDIX 1:
UKIP THREAT INDEX
METHODOLOGY

Quantifying the risk of UKIP: who will be hurt, where and how much?

Understanding the potential effects of UKIP in 2015 requires us to estimate where UKIP leaning voters are concentrated. A general election is in reality 650 local winner takes all battles, so we cannot understand the impact of UKIP without going to the local level.

What we need to understand is the power UKIP has to disrupt the local balance of power. Disruption can come in two ways - if there is a very large local UKIP vote, and a strong local UKIP campaign then the insurgents have the power to upend the local landscape, radically shifting the balance of power, or even taking the seat themselves. In such seats, we say UKIP have a direct impact on the result - they are part of the local race, and all the other parties' strategies will need reshaping in response.

UKIP are already showing a capacity for such direct impact in several seats such as South Thanet (where Nigel Farage is standing), Thurrock (where rising star Tim Aker is leading in the most recent Ashcroft constituency poll) and Clacton, where Conservative defector Douglas Carswell is set to become the party's first elected MP in next month's by-election. However, even with a strong 2015 showing, UKIP can only have a direct impact in a small set of seats. Based on local demographics, local election results and expectations about UKIP targeting, we estimate there are around 20-30 seats where a direct UKIP impact is possible.

The more significant influence UKIP will exercise on the result will come through indirect impact. In many seats, the size of the UKIP leaning local electorate is not large enough to make a UKIP challenge viable, but is more than large enough to shift the local balance of power. This is less of a problem if the local incumbent has a big cushion of votes to offset the local challenge. A UKIP surge to 20 per cent is much less disruptive in a seat with a 45 per cent majority than a seat with a 5 per cent majority. UKIP insurgencies in safe seats may be a long run problem for all the mainstream parties, but our focus here is on the immediate UKIP threat in 2015. This means a focus on seats where UKIP voters may change the outcome.

How can we define such seats? Three conditions need to be met. Firstly, the local UKIP leaning electorate needs to be large enough to alter the result - we define this as a UKIP electorate larger than the current majority in the seat. Secondly, UKIP needs to draw local support from one party disproportionately - thereby tipping the local balance of power. Thirdly, the size of this effect needs to be large enough that we have some confidence it is real. Where the UKIP vote is small or politically balanced, it is too hard to predict the likely political effects with any confidence, given the limits of the data.

Defining the UKIP risk

We use a three stage process to get a handle on the UKIP risk. Firstly, we analyse the voting patterns of the 61 social groups in the Mosaic database of British voters in the 2012 and 2014 local elections to identify the groups of voters who seem to have shown a willingness to support.

The Mosaic database provides the finest grained categorisation of voters into social groups possible using nationally available data, improving on census based estimates using larger, overlapping categories. The 2012 and 2014 local elections are the most recent first past the post elections in large and socially diverse swathes of the country. As they are fought in wards, they have the largest and most diverse range of local contests and the best available data for identfying local variations in UKIP impact.

These data come with important limitations. The Mosaic categorisation of voters is primarily economic and social, and does not capture important characteristics such as ethnicity which have large effects on UKIP support. The local elections data are partial, as different parts of the country vote at different times. Both sets of data are about groups of voters, not individuals, meaning they are subject to the ecological fallacy. We cannot know for certain that UKIP takes voters from Labour if a group of voters shows an affinity for Labour and for UKIP. It is possible that the voters UKIP poach in this group came from the minority who already opposed Labour. What we present here is therefore indicative, not definitive.[i]

By looking at the correlations between Mosaic categories and party support, we define two groups - UKIP-Labour considerers and UKIP-Conservative considerers. Each group consists of all the Mosaic categories who show a positive correlation with UKIP support, and with support for one of the governing parties over the other. We weight the size of the groups by the strength of the correlation with UKIP support - the greater the attraction to UKIP a group has shown in local elections, the larger it looms in our data.

We apply the groups constructed in this way to each constituency in England and Wales to get an estimate of the overall UKIP considering electorate in each seat, and the size of both the Labour leaning and Conservative leaning UKIP considerer groups.

These UKIP considering groups can be used to figure out where UKIP defections have the most potential to tip the local balance of power, and who they may hurt most. This requires three further steps. Firstly, we subtract the Conservative-UKIP considerers from the Labour-UKIP considerers to create an index of UKIP's net political impact - a summary of how they tile the local balance of power between Labour and the Conservatives in each seat. A positive score (more Labour than Conservative UKIP leaners) mean UKIP has the potential to hurt Labour more than the Conservatives locally. A negative score means UKIP hurt the Tories stand to lose more votes to UKIP than Labour.

However, the raw impact alone only tells us so much - parties with large local majorities can weather a big UKIP insurgency. Therefore, we divide the political impact score by the local majority to produce our estimate of UKIP influence. Higher scores mean a bigger potential impact relative to the local majority.

We take one final step due to the limitations inherent in our data - we exclude all seats where the estimated UKIP impact is below three points, focusing on the constituencies where we can be more sure of the likely direction of UKIP influence.

Results

The first issue to consider is the direct electoral threat from UKIP. In Table 1, we classify seats into three categories. Seats at critical risk are those we think UKIP are in a strong position to win - these seats combine strong demographics, strong UKIP candidates and intense local UKIP campaigns. Douglas Carswell's seat of Clacton, and South Thanet, where UKIP leader Nigel Farage is standing, both fall into this category. So do two other seats - Thurrock, an ultra-marginal and key Labour target where rising UKIP star Tim Aker is running a strong campaign and is already ahead in polling, and Great Grimsby, where the local demographics are highly favourable to UKIP and the veteran Labour MP is standing down after 38 years.

The second category is seats at high risk from a direct UKIP challenge. These are all seats where UKIP has typically performed well in local elections, where the demographics are favourable, and where a strong UKIP local campaign is very likely. A UKIP election win is quite plausible in any of these seats. Seats held by all three parties feature here, including Plymouth Moor View, Great Yarmouth and Eastleigh (where UKIP scored a close second in the 2013 by-election). We include both Rotherham and Rother Valley in this category - UKIP have had strong results here in both local elections and the 2012 by-election, and are well placed to capitalise on local anger following the recent child abuse scandal.

The final category is seats at moderate risk from UKIP. These are seats where we see strong demographics, active local branches and impressive local election results, but where the challenge facing the party is steeper. A UKIP breakthrough is possible in any of these seats, but it would require a lot of things to break in the party's favour. These are all seats where the other parties will want to take UKIP very seriously, but in most cases we expect the challenge will be fended off, in 2015 at least.

Table 1: Seats at risk from a direct UKIP challenge

Seat	Incumbent	2010 majority
Critical risk		
• Clacton	Conservative/UKIP	28
• Great Grimsby	Labour	2.2
• South Thanet	Conservative	16.6
• Thurrock	Conservative	0.2
High risk		
• Dudley North	Labour	1.7
• Eastleigh	Liberal Democrat	4.3
• Great Yarmouth	Conservative	9.9
• Plymouth Moor View	Labour	3.8
• Rother Valley	Labour	12.6
• Rotherham	Labour	24.5
• Waveney	Conservative	1.5

Moderate risk

• Amber Valley	Conservative	7.3
• Ashfield	Labour	0.4
• Basildon South & Thurrock East	Conservative	12.9
• Blackpool South	Labour	5.3
• Boston & Skegness	Conservative	28.8
• Broadland	Conservative	13.8
• Cannock Chase	Conservative	7.0
• Castle Point	Conservative	16.9
• Dudley South	Conservative	10.1
• Folkestone & Hythe	Conservative	19.2
• Hartlepool	Labour	14.4
• Harwich & North Essex	Conservative	23.4
• Hull East	Labour	25.1
• Hull North	Labour	1.9
• Hull West & Hessle	Labour	18.2
• Louth & Horncastle	Conservative	27.5
• Norfolk North	Liberal Democrat	23.4
• Norfolk South West	Conservative	26.7
• Normanton, Pontefract & Castleford	Labour	23.4
• Penistone & Stocksbridge	Labour	6.5
• Portsmouth North	Conservative	16.5
• Redcar	Liberal Democrat	12.4
• Sittingbourne & Sheppey	Conservative	25.5
• Walsall North	Labour	2.7
• Wolverhampton South East	Labour	19.0

Table 2 shows the estimated indirect impact of UKIP in all marginal seats with majorities under 20 per cent, tabulated against the 2010 local winner. The story is far more complicated than the common narrative of "UKIP will split the right and hurt the Tories". In 83 seats UKIP hurt Labour locally - including 68 Labour held marginal seats and 15 marginal targets. In 111 seats, UKIP hurt the Conservatives more than Labour, including 81 Conservative held marginals, and 31 marginal seats held by other parties. The simple message is this: there is no single "UKIP effect", but instead UKIP have the power to muddy the waters across a wide range of crucial local battles.

Table 2: Summary of UKIP indirect impact in marginal seats (majority under 20 per cent)

Winning party 2010	UKIP hurt Labour	UKIP hurt Conservatives	UKIP hurt neither (impact below 3 per cent)
Labour	68	11	48
Conservatives	8	81	70
Lib Dem	7	17	13
Other	0	2	1
Total	**83**	**111**	**132**

Table 3 shows the 20 marginal seats in England and Wales with the largest shares of voters in UKIP considering Mosaic social groups.[ii] We exclude Scotland both because UKIP has been consistently much weaker there, and because the presence of the SNP in most seats complicates patterns of party competition.

The table illustrates the complexity of UKIP's potential impact. All combinations of party competition are represented here - Labour vs Conservative, Labour vs Liberal Democrat and Conservative vs Liberal Democrat. The net effect of UKIP is shown in the final column, which calculates the likely UKIP impact on the balance of votes for Labour and the Conservatives. A positive score indicates UKIP will weaken Labour's position relative to the Conservatives, while a negative score indicates the Conservatives' position will be weakened relative to Labour by a UKIP insurgency. However, the patterns of impact are a little more consistent - in 13 of the marginals with the largest UKIP leaning electorates, UKIP's net effect is to damage Labour. The expected impact is often quite large - swinging the local balance of power by over 10 points, but in most of the cases here the UKIP influence is unlikely to be decisive as the local majority is large enough to absorb this damage. This is why the impact of UKIP needs to be considered in terms of the local balance of power, as well as the local partisan context. UKIP defections in safe seats are less threatening in 2015 than defections in marginals.

Table 3: 20 marginal seats with the largest UKIP considering electorates

Seat	UKIP potential	Incumbent party	Maj.	UKIP impact on Lab-Con balance
1. Hull North	19.1	Labour	1.9	17.0
2. Great Yarmouth	18.5	Conservative	9.9	2.6
3. Hartlepool	18.2	Labour	14.4	11.5
4. Stoke-on-Trent South	18.0	Labour	10.4	9.6
5. Sheffield Heeley	17.9	Labour	14.2	12.6
6. Broadland	17.8	Conservative	13.8	-14.8
7. Mansfield	17.7	Labour	12.4	7.6
8. Merthyr Tydfil and Rhymney	17.6	Labour	12.6	13.3
9. Great Grimsby	17.6	Labour	2.2	11.5
10. Norfolk South	17.1	Conservative	19.9	-12.8
11. Redcar	17.1	Lib Dem	12.4	7.1
12. Stoke-on-Trent Central	17.0	Labour	17.1	13.9
13. Waveney	17.0	Conservative	1.5	-1.1
14. Hull West and Hessle	16.9	Labour	18.2	14.3
15. Castle Point*	16.8	Conservative	16.9	-12.6
16. Wolverhampton SE	16.6	Labour	19.0	13.5
17. Staffordshire Moorlands	16.6	Conservative	15.3	-9.3
18. Leicester West	16.5	Labour	11.2	14.5
19. Brigg and Goole	16.3	Conservative	11.7	-7.5
20. Camborne & Redruth	16.2	Conservative	0.2	-6.3

UKIP's influence is not largest where UKIP sympathisers are most concentrated - but rather where they have the greatest opportunity to change the outcome. It is to these seats we now turn - the seats where a thumb on the scale from Farage's insurgents weighs most heavily on the local result. We break this down by who UKIP hurt, starting in Table 3 with the seats where UKIP have the most potential to tilt the local balance against Labour.

In all of these seats, we estimate that the potential net loss of Labour votes to UKIP outweighs the current majority in the seat, potentially tipping the balance decisively against Labour. The seats on the list include a number of key Labour targets and defences where the UKIP leaning electorate is not massive, but is large enough, and Labour-leaning enough, to alter the outcome. In a seat such as Southampton Itchen, where the current majority stands at 0.4 per cent, a 6 per cent net shift in the balance of power could be the difference between victory and defeat.

Meanwhile, in Great Grimsby Labour face a dual challenge. The party could lose outright to UKIP there, as it is a key UKIP target with a large "left behind" electorate. But even if they see off the direct challenge from UKIP, the bleeding of Labour support to UKIP could tip the local balance enough to let the Conservatives in.

A number of the top twenty seats - including five of the top six - are Labour-Lib Dem marginals. Here the impact of UKIP may be less serious than the table suggests, as Labour losses to UKIP may be offset by gains from the Liberal Democrats. Survey data has consistently shown Labour picking up a large share of 2010 Liberal Democrat voters, and evidence from local elections suggests this shift in support is strongest in poorer northern heartland areas where the two parties compete directly, such as Sheffield, Hull and Bradford. UKIP's effect in such seats may be less to slow Labour rebounds in these seats, as the inflow of Liberal Democrat recruits is offset by an outflow of left behind voters to UKIP. With the Liberal Democrats highly likely to fall back, holding steady with a changed electorate should be sufficient for Labour to defend most of these seats easily. In some cases, a Liberal Democrat challenger may be replaced with a UKIP challenger, but in most cases UKIP do not look strong enough to win outright.

Table 4: Seats where UKIP have most potential to damage Labour prospects

Seat	UKIP potential	Incumbent party	Maj.	UKIP impact on Lab-Con balance
1. Sheffield Central	9.6	Labour	0.4	CRITICAL
2. Southampton Itchen	6.2	Labour	0.4	CRITICAL
3. Ashfield	4.7	Labour	0.4	CRITICAL
4. Hull North	17.0	Labour	1.9	CRITICAL
5. Bradford East	11.1	Lib Dem	0.9	CRITICAL
6. Norwich South	5.8	Lib Dem	0.7	CRITICAL
7. Great Grimsby	11.5	Labour	2.2	CRITICAL
8. Walsall North	10.8	Labour	2.7	CRITICAL
9. Thurrock***	1.6	Conservative	0.2	CRITICAL
10. Rochdale	6.5	Labour	1.9	CRITICAL
11. Plymouth Sutton & Devonport	7.9	Conservative	2.6	CRITICAL
12. Chesterfield	3.3	Labour	1.2	VERY SERIOUS
13. Plymouth Moor View	9.3	Labour	3.8	VERY SERIOUS
14. Carlisle	4.8	Conservative	2.0	VERY SERIOUS
15. Lincoln	5.4	Conservative	2.3	VERY SERIOUS
16. Telford	5.4	Labour	2.4	VERY SERIOUS
17. Dudley North	3.4	Labour	1.7	VERY SERIOUS
18. Halifax	6.5	Labour	3.4	VERY SERIOUS
19. Wolverhampton NE	12.5	Labour	7.1	VERY SERIOUS
20. Birmingham Edgbaston	5.1	Labour	3.1	VERY SERIOUS
21. Burnley	6.6	Lib Dem	4.3	SERIOUS
22. Manchester Withington	6.6	Lib Dem	4.2	SERIOUS
23. Blackpool South	7.8	Labour	5.3	SERIOUS
24. Walsall South	6.2	Labour	4.3	SERIOUS
25. Newcastle-under-Lyme	4.8	Labour	3.6	SERIOUS
26. Ipswich	5.8	Conservative	4.4	SERIOUS
27. Leicester West	14.5	Labour	11.2	SERIOUS
28. Nottingham South	4.92	Labour	4.3	SERIOUS
29. Southampton Test	6.08	Labour	5.5	SERIOUS
30. Methyr Tydfil & Rhmney	12.6	Labour	13.3	SERIOUS
31. Birmingham Northfield	6.7	Labour	6.9	SERIOUS
32. Wakefield	3.6	Labour	3.7	SERIOUS
33. Birmingham Yardley	7.3	Labour	7.2	SERIOUS
34. Stalybridge & Hyde	6.2	Labour	6.7	MODERATE

35. Darlington	7.3	Labour	7.9	MODERATE	
36. Stoke-on-Trent South	9.6	Labour	10.4	MODERATE	
37. Hyndburn	6.6	Labour	7.2	MODERATE	
38. Scunthorpe	6.3	Labour	6.9	MODERATE	
39. Newcastle upon Tyne East	10.5	Labour	11.8	MODERATE	
40. Sheffield Heeley	12.6	Labour	14.2	MODERATE	
41. Birmingham Erdington	8.1	Labour	9.2	MODERATE	
42. Worsley and Eccles South	9.0	Labour	10.4	MODERATE	
43. Nottingham North	20.3	Labour	23.7	MODERATE	
44. Stoke-on-Trent Central	13.9	Labour	17.1	MODERATE	
45. Salford and Eccles	11.2	Labour	13.8	MODERATE	
46. Newcastle upon Tyne North	6.3	Labour	7.8	MODERATE	
47. Hartlepool	11.5	Labour	14.4	MODERATE	
48. Hull West and Hessle	14.3	Labour	18.2	MODERATE	
49. Bolton North East	7.4	Labour	9.4	MODERATE	
50. West Bromwich West	11.2	Labour	15.6	MODERATE	
51. Wolverhampton South East	13.5	Labour	19.0	MODERATE	
52. Hull East	17.8	Labour	25.1	MODERATE	
53. Huddersfield	7.4	Labour	11.0	MODERATE	
54. Bradford South	8.1	Labour	12.2	MODERATE	
55. Bristol North West	4.3	Conservative	6.5	MODERATE	
56. Bristol South	6.4	Labour	9.8	MODERATE	
57. Redcar	7.1	Lib Dem	12.4	MODERATE	
58. Peterborough	6.1	Conservative	10.8	MODERATE	
59. Pendle	3.5	Conservative	8.0	MODERATE	

*Weighted share of UKIP-Labour considerers - Weighted share of UKIP-Conservative considerers
**Net damage to Labour vs Conservatives divided by current parliamentary majority. 3 and over = Critical 1.5-3 = Very Serious 1.0-1.5 = Serious 0.7-1.0 = Moderate
***Thurrock included despite small estimate of net damage, as evidence from Lord Ashcroft's constituency surveys suggests UKIP's strong campaign in the seat is primarily hurting Labour

As the impact of UKIP is likely to be muted in Labour-Lib Dem seats, we focus in the next table on the Conservative-Labour marginals where UKIP may have the most critical impact. Table 4 provides the top 20. In all of these seats, UKIP's likely impact will be to reduce Labour support by more than the current majority, often a great deal more.

The list includes a small number of key Labour marginals, including Plymouth Sutton, Lincoln and Ipswich, and a much larger list of current Labour seats with small majorities. Here UKIP pose an interesting challenge. In most such seats, we would expect the swing from government to opposi-

tion to rebuild majorities cut to the bone in 2010. The natural tendency for party strategists planning on a national swing to Labour would be to focus resources away from such seats, which should be easy defences.

The intervention of UKIP, however, changes this dynamic. Instead of rebounding, the UKIP insurgency in these seats is likely to further cut the local Labour vote, and tip the balance in the Conservatives' favour. Seats such as Southampton Itchen, Walsall North and Plymouth Moor View could therefore fall to the Conservatives even if the national swing is towards Labour. Strong local campaigns to see off the UKIP challenge in such seats will be vital - particularly with the polls pointing to a second hung parliament in which every seat will be critical.

Table 5: Labour-Conservative local contests where UKIP have most potential to damage Labour prospects

Seat	UKIP potential	Incumbent party	Maj.	UKIP impact on Lab-Con balance
1. Southampton Itchen	6.2	Labour	0.4	CRITICAL
2. Great Grimsby	11.5	Labour	2.2	CRITICAL
3. Walsall North	10.8	Labour	2.7	CRITICAL
4. Plymouth Sutton & Devonport	7.9	Conservative	2.6	CRITICAL
5. Plymouth Moor View	9.3	Labour	3.8	VERY SERIOUS
6. Carlisle	4.8	Conservative	2.0	VERY SERIOUS
7. Lincoln	5.4	Conservative	2.3	VERY SERIOUS
8. Telford	5.4	Labour	2.4	VERY SERIOUS
9. Dudley North	3.4	Labour	1.7	VERY SERIOUS
10. Halifax	6.5	Labour	3.4	VERY SERIOUS
11. Wolverhampton NE	12.5	Labour	7.1	VERY SERIOUS
12. Birmingham Edgbaston	5.1	Labour	3.1	VERY SERIOUS
13. Blackpool South	7.8	Labour	5.3	SERIOUS
14. Walsall South	6.2	Labour	4.3	SERIOUS
15. Ipswich	5.8	Conservative	4.4	SERIOUS
16. Leicester West	14.5	Labour	11.2	SERIOUS
17. Nottingham South	4.9	Labour	4.3	SERIOUS
18. Southampton Test	6.1	Labour	5.5	SERIOUS
19. Birmingham Northfield	6.9	Labour	6.7	SERIOUS
20. Wakefield	3.7	Labour	3.6	SERIOUS
21. Stalybridge & Hyde	6.2	Labour	6.7	MODERATE
22. Darlington	7.3	Labour	7.9	MODERATE
23. Stoke-on-Trent South	9.6	Labour	10.4	MODERATE
24. Hyndburn	6.6	Labour	7.2	MODERATE

25. Scunthorpe	6.3	Labour	6.9	MODERATE	
26. Birmingham Erdington	8.1	Labour	9.2	MODERATE	
27. Worsley and Eccles Sth	9.0	Labour	10.4	MODERATE	
28. Nottingham North	20.3	Labour	23.7	MODERATE	
29. Stoke-on-Trent Central	13.9	Labour	17.1	MODERATE	
30. Hartlepool	11.5	Labour	14.4	MODERATE	
31. Bolton North East	7.4	Labour	9.4	MODERATE	
32. West Bromwich West	11.2	Labour	15.6	MODERATE	
33. Wolverhampton SE	13.5	Labour	19.0	MODERATE	
34. Huddersfield	7.4	Labour	11.0	MODERATE	
35. Bradford South	8.1	Labour	12.2	MODERATE	
36. Bristol North West	4.3	Conservative	6.5	MODERATE	
37. Peterborough	10.8	Conservative	6.1	MODERATE	
38. Pendle	8.0	Conservative	3.5	MODERATE	

*Weighted share of UKIP-Labour considerers - Weighted share of UKIP-Conservative considerers

**Net damage to Labour vs Conservatives divided by current parliamentary majority. 3 and over = Critical 1.5-3 = Very Serious 1.0-1.5 = Serious 0.7-1.0 = Moderate

Table 6 turns to the seats where UKIP have the most potential to damage Conservative prospects. The striking thing about this table is how few Conservative held Labour targets feature. Just 9 of the 37 seats where we rate the UKIP damage to Conservative prospects at "Serious" or above are Lab-Con contests, and two of those are held by Labour already. Only 11 of the 67 seats in the whole table are Conservative held seats where Labour stand to gain from a "split on the right". Although the national polling suggests that UKIP split the Conservative vote to Labour's gain, when we disaggregate this socially and geographically, the gain to Labour is very modest.

UKIP's benefit does not fall mainly to Labour in these seats because most of them are constituencies Labour has no prospect of winning. Instead, the big beneficiaries in seats where UKIP insurgencies stand to split the right are the Liberal Democrats. In a neat piece of electoral irony, UKIP's ability to damage the Conservatives reduces the Conservatives' ability to gain from their junior coalition partners' current unpopularity. In seats such as Mid Dorset, Newton Abbott, and Somerton and Frome, it is possible that both Coalition partners' votes will fall sharply, and the winner will be the candidate who falls back the least.

A healthier Liberal Democrat performance is a mixed blessing for Labour, however - while it will increase the chances that a Labour-Liberal Democrat will have a strong Parliamentary majority, it may reduce the prospects of such a coalition forming in the first place. A larger contingent of more centre-right Lib Dems from rural and suburban Southern seats may leave the Parliamentary party more attracted to the Conservatives than it is at present, particularly if - as looks likely - many of the more left wing Lib Dems lose in battles with Labour.

Table 6: Seats where UKIP have the most potential to damage Conservative prospects

Seat	UKIP potential	Incumbent party	Maj.	UKIP impact on Lab-Con balance
1.Camborne and Redruth	-6.3	Conservative	0.2	CRITICAL
2.Warwickshire North	-3.0	Conservative	0.1	CRITICAL
3. Dorset Mid & Poole North	-11.9	Lib Dem	0.6	CRITICAL
4. Oxford West & Abingdon	-5.8	Conservative	0.3	CRITICAL
5. Solihull	-4.0	Lib Dem	0.3	CRITICAL
6. Truro & Falmouth	-8.0	Conservative	0.9	CRITICAL
7. Newton Abbott	-9.0	Conservative	1.1	CRITICAL
8. Cardiff North	-3.2	Conservative	0.4	CRITICAL
9. Wells	-9.3	Lib Dem	1.4	CRITICAL
10. Broxtowe	-3.2	Conservative	0.7	CRITICAL
11. Somerton & Frome	-11.4	Lib Dem	3.0	CRITICAL
12. Stroud	-8.0	Conservative	2.2	CRITICAL
13. Montgomeryshire	-12.5	Conservative	3.5	CRITICAL
14. St Austell & Newquay	-8.2	Lib Dem	2.8	VERY SERIOUS
15. St. Ives	-8.7	Lib Dem	3.7	VERY SERIOUS
16. Harrogate & Knaresbor-ough	-4.6	Conservative	2.0	VERY SERIOUS
17. Devon West & Torridge	-10.0	Conservative	5.3	VERY SERIOUS
18. Cornwall North	-9.9	Lib Dem	6.4	VERY SERIOUS
19. Delyn	-8.8	Labour	6.1	SERIOUS
20. Cornwall South East	-9.3	Conservative	6.5	SERIOUS
21. Ynys Mon***	-10.1	Labour	7.1	SERIOUS
22. Dorset West	-9.5	Conservative	6.8	SERIOUS
23. Carmarthen East and Dinefwr	-12.7	Conservative	9.2	SERIOUS
24. Arfon***	-7.3	Plaid Cymru	5.6	SERIOUS
25. Winchester	-7.1	Conservative	5.5	SERIOUS
26. Chippenham	-6.0	Lib Dem	4.7	SERIOUS
27. Carmarthen W & Pembsh	-10.7	Conservative	8.4	SERIOUS
28. Brecon and Radnorshire	-12.4	Lib Dem	9.7	SERIOUS
29. York Outer	-8.5	Conservative	6.9	SERIOUS
30. Dunbartonshire East	-5.6	Lib Dem	4.5	SERIOUS
31. Eastleigh	-5.2	Lib Dem	4.3	SERIOUS
32.Vale of Clwyd	-8.2	Labour	7.1	SERIOUS
33.Cambridgeshire South East	-11.6	Conservative	10.3	SERIOUS

34. Broadland	-14.8	Conservative	13.8	SERIOUS
35. Hereford and Hereford-shire S	-5.3	Conservative	5.1	SERIOUS
36. Wyre Forest****	-5.1	Conservative	5.2	SERIOUS
37. Pudsey	-3.3	Conservative	3.4	SERIOUS
38. Alyn and Deeside	-6.9	Labour	7.3	SERIOUS
39. Gower	-6.0	Labour	6.4	MODERATE
40. Worcestershire West	-11.5	Conservative	12.5	MODERATE
41. Somerset North East	-8.7	Conservative	9.6	MODERATE
42. Romsey & Southampton N	-7.4	Conservative	8.5	MODERATE
43. Weston-Super-Mare	-4.4	Conservative	5.1	MODERATE
44. Dorset North	-12.1	Conservative	14.1	MODERATE
45. Totnes	-8.7	Conservative	10.3	MODERATE
46. Derbyshire North East	-4.4	Labour	5.2	MODERATE
47. Aberconwy	-9.5	Conservative	11.3	MODERATE
48. Preseli Pembrokeshire	-9.4	Conservative	11.6	MODERATE
49. Devon North	-8.9	Lib Dem	11.3	MODERATE
50. Berwick-upon-Tweed	-5.4	Lib Dem	7.0	MODERATE
51. Bridgend	-4.5	Labour	5.9	MODERATE
52. Argyll and Bute	-5.8	Lib Dem	7.6	MODERATE
53. Clwyd South	-6.2	Labour	8.2	MODERATE
54. Devon Central	-12.9	Conservative	17.1	MODERATE
55. Castle Point****	-12.6	Conservative	16.9	MODERATE
56. Sefton Central	-5.6	Labour	8.0	MODERATE
57. Cambridgeshire South	-9.2	Conservative	13.3	MODERATE
58. St Albans	-3.03	Conservative	4.4	MODERATE
59. Taunton Deane	-4.7	Lib Dem	6.9	MODERATE
60. Bosworth	-6.3	Conservative	9.3	MODERATE
61. Somerset North	-9.16	Conservative	13.6	MODERATE
62. Norfolk South	-12.8	Conservative	19.9	MODERATE
63. Brigg & Goole	-7.5	Conservative	11.2	MODERATE
64. Staffordshire Moorlands	-9.3	Conservative	15.3	MODERATE
65. High Peak	-5.6	Conservative	9.3	MODERATE
66. Skipton & Ripon	-10.2	Conservative	18.2	MODERATE
67. Lewes	-9.1	Lib Dem	15.3	MODERATE

*Weighted share of UKIP-Labour considerers - Weighted share of UKIP-Conservative considerers **Net damage to Conservatives vs divided by current parliamentary majority. 3 and over = Critical 1.5-3 = Very Serious 1.0-1.5 = Serious 0.7-1.0 = Moderate ***Labour-Plaid Cymru contest   **** Conservative-Independent contest in 2010

Table 6 focuses on the much smaller set of Conservative-Labour contests where UKIP are most likely to harm Conservative prospects. Comparing this with table 4 reveals that there are fewer Conservative-Labour marginals where UKIP are expected to tilt the local balance towards Labour and away from the Conservatives than vice versa. In only 9 seats is the negative impact of UKIP on the Conservatives expected to be serious or worse, compared to 20 for Labour. There are, however, some crucial marginals where UKIP are likely to help Labour efforts - in seats such as Stroud, Derbyshire and Worcestershire West defections to UKIP have the potential to eliminate the local Conservative majority entirely. While our previous tables highlighted seats where Labour cannot afford to ignore the local UKIP challenge, this table highlights seats where Labour may want to leave UKIP alone.

There is, however, one unusual aspect about this list that suggests caution about the UKIP effect even in this limited set of marginals: the preponderance of Welsh seats in it. Nearly half of the seats shown here are in the principality. Although UKIP may well perform strongly in some of these seats - they put in some impressive performances in Welsh local authorities in the 2014 European Parliament elections- there are reasons for caution. There is little evidence that UKIP are targetting Wales, and their organisation and activist base are weaker there than in many parts of England. UKIP may also struggle in parts of Wales if they are perceived as a party of English nationalism - as they often are in Scotland. The benefit UKIP provide to Labour in Wales may therefore be smaller than these figures suggest.

Table 7: Labour-Conservative seats where UKIP have most potential to damage Conservative prospects

Seat	UKIP potential *	Incumbent party	Maj.	UKIP impact on Lab-Con balance
1. Warwickshire North	-3.0	Conservative	0.1	CRITICAL
2. Cardiff North	-3.2	Conservative	0.4	CRITICAL
3. Broxtowe	-3.2	Conservative	0.7	CRITICAL
4. Stroud	-8.0	Conservative	2.2	CRITICAL
5. Delyn	-8.8	Labour	6.1	SERIOUS
6. Carmarthen W and S Pembrok	-10.7	Conservative	8.4	SERIOUS
7. Vale of Clwyd	-8.2	Labour	7.1	SERIOUS
8. Pudsey	-3.3	Conservative	3.4	SERIOUS
9. Alyn & Deeside	-6.9	Labour	7.3	SERIOUS
10. Gower	-6.0	Labour	6.4	MODERATE
11. Worcestershire West	-11.5	Conservative	12.5	MODERATE
12. Somerset North East	-8.7	Conservative	9.6	MODERATE
13. Derbyshire North East	-4.4	Labour	5.2	MODERATE

15. Preseli Pembrokeshire	-9.4	Conservative	11.6	MODERATE
16. Bridgend	4.5	Labour	5.9	MODERATE
17. Clwyd South	-6.2	Labour	8.2	MODERATE
18. Sefton Central	-5.6	Labour	8.0	MODERATE
19. Brigg and Goole	-7.5	Conservative	11.7	MODERATE
20. Staffordshire Moorlands	-9.3	Conservative	15.3	MODERATE
21. High Peak	-5.6	Conservative	9.3	MODERATE

*Weighted share of UKIP-Labour considerers - Weighted share of UKIP-Conservative consider-ers **Net damage to Conservatives vs divided by current parliamentary majority. 3 and over = Critical 1.5-3 = Very Serious 1.0-1.5 = Serious 0.7-1.0 = Moderate ***Conservative majority over independent, but a Conservative-Labour marginal in earlier elections

Conclusion

The only clear UKIP effect is to increase the uncertainty of outcomes across the electoral map. Britain's electoral battlefield was already complex and fractured even before UKIP's emergence, with three (sometimes four) parties competing for seats under a system designed for two party competition, and very large regional variation in the strength of party. The UKIP insurgency thus has to be understood in the context of an electoral map where Labour-Lib Dem and Conservative-Lib Dem local contests are as common as the traditional Labour-Conservative marginals that loom largest in determining the Westminster balance of power.

The traditional view, based on a narrow focus on the national polling, has been that Labour benefit from UKIP "splitting the right". Our evidence, drawing on the most recent elections UKIP have contested, and the most detailed social classification data available, suggests this is misleading.

Like the other parties, UKIP have clear social and geographical variations in their support, and these variations have a crucial impact on UKIP's political effects. There are indeed many seats where UKIP harm Conservative prospects relative to Labour, but the largest two groups of these are safe Conservative seats where the Tory majority is far too large for UKIP to tip the balance, and Conservative-Lib Dem marginals where UKIP's intervention will benefit Nick Clegg's party rather than Ed Miliband's.

On the other side of the ledger, we find a large set of seats where UKIP's insurgency is most likely to hurt Labour more than the Conservatives. These include many safe Labour seats with large concentrations of the "left behind" electoral groups most attracted to UKIP where Farage's insurgency poses little immediate threat, but may cause serious problems if it becomes established. There are also many Labour-Conservative marginals where the local social balance is such that a strong UKIP showing will harm Labour's chances - including crucial marginals such as Southampton Itchen, Plymouth Sutton and Ipswich. Many of the most potent UKIP threats come in seats Labour narrowly held in 2010. A swing to the opposition would normally make such seats certain, but UKIP cast doubt on that calculation.

We should caution that the social and electoral data we have used here can only paint a partial picture. Many aspects of UKIP support are not captured in this data, and we have no information on local UKIP campaigning,

APPENDIX 2: UKIP CONSIDERER CATEGORIES

Factor 1: Struggling families

This factor is most strongly focussed on two demographic groups:

• Older tenants on low-rise social housing estates where jobs are scarce
• Vulnerable young parents needing substantial state support

Three other groups also contribute:

• Older town centre terraces with transient, single populations
• Low income older couples long established in former council estates
• Older families in low value housing in traditional industrial areas

Highest proportion "struggling families", all seats	Highest proportion "struggling families", target marginal seats
Nottingham North (19.32 per cent)	Great Grimsby (9.2 per cent)
Liverpool Walton (16.1 per cent)	Rotherham (9.0 per cent)
Hull North (15.7 per cent)	Redcar (8.1 per cent)
Hull East (14.5 per cent)	Plymouth Moor View (8.1 per cent)
Sheffield Brightside & Hillsb' (14.5 per cent)	Burnley (6.1 per cent)
Liverpool West Derby (14.4 per cent)	Manchester Withington (5.8 per cent)
Knowsley (14.2 per cent)	Ashfield (5.8 per cent)
Merthyr Tydfil and Rhymney (13.2 per cent)	Bradford East (5.6 per cent)
Middlesborough (13.0 per cent)	Dudley North (5.3 per cent)
Manchester Central (11.6 per cent)	Peterborough (5.1 per cent)

Social profile

Both of these groups score highly in levels of deprivation as one would expect, renting poorly-maintained terraced or semi-detached properties from the council or from housing associations. Their unemployment levels are high, and when these groups are employed it is usually in routine occupations on low pay. Their typical annual household income is less than £20k, with many below £10k. They have little if any household wealth or equity, and no savings to speak of. They find it difficult to cope financially. They receive a wide range of state benefits, whether it is pension credit, lone parent

allowances, disability, jobseekers allowance, etc.

These groups cannot afford a holiday and are unlikely to have access to a car. They are aware of green issues but constrained in their choices by price. The younger groups are motivated to achieve something in life but both groups believe there is little that can be done to change their circumstances. In addition they generally do not like being surrounded by people from different cultures and likely feel threatened by local immigration. They are also very likely to have witnessed drug-taking or dealing in their locality, as well as rowdiness and drunken behaviour, and to be concerned about it.

Both groups are unlikely to have progressed to university for their education, and have relatively few qualifications, completing their education by the age of 16. Both groups are also very likely to have had health problems. The most common complaints are respiratory illness, complications from pregnancy and delivery, diabetes, depression. Both groups report being either 'permanently sick' or 'working with limiting long-term illness'. Smoking levels are high and levels of exercise are low.

Political profile

These groups have traditionally identified strongly with Labour but in more recent times have been attracted to UKIP. However, their turnout record in local, European and general elections is poor. Moreover, there is now evidence of long running disaffection with Labour among this group, manifesting in both low and declining turnout, and large shifts against Labour. These voters are heavy on the ground in some of UKIP's strongest areas, including Great Grimsby, Great Yarmouth and Rotherham. Other seats where these voters congregate have seen large surges of Liberal Democrat support in earlier election cycles - Redcar, Ashfield, Bradford East and Manchester Withington all fall into this category.

Key messages

Anger and disillusionment are the key barriers to communicating with this group. These are voters who feel let down by the previous Labour government, who did not address longstanding problems in their constituencies. Many will feel that things were going backwards under Labour, and that this has only accelerated under the coalition. It is vital that campaigners take a patient and understanding approach with this group, allowing them to "vent", and resisting the urge to correct them.

This is a group where anger at immigrants is likely to run particularly high - but this anger will often reflect more general frustration at chronic insecurity, struggle and failure to progress. It will be vital that canvassers listen respectfully to voters' frustrations on these issues but channel them into more productive discussions.

This is a low turnout group, and motivating them to participate will be a key challenge. Their latent loyalties, and economic interests, are with Labour, but they are very low trust disaffected voters, who have little faith that Labour can make a difference for them. Campaigners will need to provide them with clear, concrete, local examples of how a Labour government will benefit them.

This is a marginal group, often reliant on state support for housing and

income. Messages should focus on these immediate material needs. The policies focussed on the cost of living, and on housing, will have strong appeal, but must be fleshed out in concrete terms - how much they will save, how many houses their area will get.

Employment policies such as work guarantees, zero hours contract bans and living wage incentives will also appeal, but campaigners will need to overcome ingrained scepticism. These voters will be inclined to think of this as so much hot air, so such appeals will fall flat without specific, local detail.

Repeal of the bedroom tax is likely to be very popular with this group, which is particularly reliant on social housing. This can also be used to tap into latent anti-Conservative sentiment - the bedroom tax can be used as an example of the dangers posed by continued Conservative government. The NHS can be used in a similar way with older voters from this group - they are likely both to make heavy use of the NHS and be very threatened by Conservative reforms to it.

Immigration reforms will appeal to this group but they are likely to be very sceptical about implementation. Appeals to this issue should be used with caution - the risk is that the doorstep conversation is diverted back into an argument about Labour's failings on this issue, reinforcing these voters' alienation.

Broader proposals on the economy, banking, environment and devolution are not likely to engage these voters and may risk further alienating by painting Labour (and the canvasser) as out of touch with their concerns.

Group 2: Blue collar strivers

The core of this group is two Mosaic categories:

• Middle aged families living in less fashionable inter war suburban semis
• Comfortably off industrial workers owning their own homes

Two other categories also contribute:

• Low income communities reliant on low skill industrial jobs
• Older families in low value housing in traditional industrial areas

Highest proportion "blue collar strivers", all seats	Highest proportion "blue collar strivers", marginal seats
Twickenham (8.9 per cent)	Finchley & Golders Green (6.3 per cent)
Wimbledon (8.7 per cent)	Ilford North (5.5 per cent)
Islwyn (8.7 per cent)	Blackpool North & Cleveleys (5.3 per cent)
Enfield Southgate (7.6 per cent)	Southampton Itchen (5.1 per cent)
Bristol South (7.3 per cent)	Erewash (5.1 per cent)
Romford (7.0 per cent)	Kingswood (5.1 per cent)
Richmond Park (6.9 per cent)	Ealing Central & Acton (4.6 per cent)
Bristol East (6.9 per cent)	Ashfield (4.6 per cent)
Sutton and Cheam (6.6 per cent)	Bristol North West (4.6 per cent)
Aberavon (6.5 per cent)	Halesowen & Rowley Regis (4.6 per cent)

Social profile

This is the most economically prosperous of the Labour-UKIP considering groups. People in this group are likely to be employed, and to own their own homes. They will often be in blue collar jobs, but skilled and often well-paid jobs. Those in the lower-paid jobs will be looking for opportunities to advance. These are often traditional working class individuals and families, from communities where skilled blue collar jobs were once the route to social mobility.

These groups are either just about coping financially or finding it difficult to cope, without ever incurring serious financial difficulties. They claim few benefits. Where they do claim it is normally for carer's allowances or disability, not for unemployment benefits.

These groups take one budget holiday a year and have access to one or two vehicles for the house. There have a mix of environmental awareness; some are convinced whilst others are sceptical. These groups are not motivated by responsibility. They would rather be told what to do, take few risks and tend not to like change, believing it will not improve their lives, but may well make things worse. They also do not like being surrounded by people from different cultures.

Whilst some of these groups will have gone on to further education (not University) the vast majority left school at 15 or 16. These groups report relatively good health when compared to other groups, although some have received treatment for early onset of particular cancers.

Political profile

This group's attraction to UKIP is most likely based on the party's articulation of their sense of frustration and decline. Frustration because the security and social mobility they once took for granted is no longer so easy to come by - wages are stagnant, jobs are scarce, and promotions are rare. They feel a sense of decline because they have been hard hit by post-industrial transformation - these are people who once took skilled employment, job security and a respected place in the community for granted. They are unhappy that such options are no longer available as they once were, and they worry about the prospects of their children and grandchildren now the traditional ladders to advancement have been kicked away.

This group is found in large numbers in a lot of the key Labour-Conservative marginals, as these are the kind of 'C2' skilled blue collar workers who have shown a greater willingness to swing between Conservatives and Labour in line with the changing national mood. Their heritage and social identity often pull them to Labour, but their economic interests and desire for advancement can pull them to the Conservatives.

At present, they are frustrated with both mainstream parties. They see the Conservatives as elitist and out of touch, and uninterested in ordinary workers' ambitions. They see Labour as too socially liberal, and overly concerned with immigrants and welfare "scroungers". This is not a group that is entirely disaffected from mainstream politics, or British society, but which is currently attracted to UKIP because of the lack of a mainstream voice for their combination of social conservatism, working class identity and economic ambition - a combination which figures such as Margaret Thatcher, James Callaghan and David Blunkett would have symbolised in past governments.

This is not a group of voters likely to be much interested in Labour's proposals to assist the most vulnerable. These voters are employed, and fiercely proud of advancing through their own effort. Economic messages should focus on these voters' interests, and seek to convince them that, contrary to their perceptions, Labour want to help them get ahead. Messages on house building, extra provision of child care and the freeze on energy bills may have the most resonance on this front.

This is also a group that is concerned that their incomes are stagnating and their costs rising while "fat cats get ahead. The "cost of living crisis" framing may resonate with them, and proposals for a lower rate of income tax and the reintroduction of a 50p rate for the very rich

Immigration is a key source of this group's alienation from Labour and their attraction to UKIP. It is important that campaigners do not get caught up in arguments over this, but allow voters to "vent" - often the frustrations about immigration also relate to broader anxieties. They are likely to find Labour's proposals on the issue appealing, but have little faith that they will be implemented properly.

This group of voters are keen on enterprise and getting ahead. Another concern many will have with Labour is that they are anti-business. Therefore, proposals such as the freeze on business rates for small businesses and the business investment bank will appeal for them.

Group 3: Ageing council estate households

The core of this group is two Mosaic categories:

• Middle aged couples in right to buy homes
• Older people living on social housing estates on limited budgets

One other category also contributes:

• Low income older couples long established in former council estates

Highest proportion "ageing council estate households", all seats	Highest proportion "ageing council estate households", marginal seats
Harlow (7.7 per cent)	Dumfriesshire, C & T (6.2 per cent)
Llanelli (6.3 per cent)	Argyll & Bute (5.1 per cent)
Dumfriesshire, C & T (6.2 per cent)	Arfon (4.8 per cent)
Neath (6.1 per cent)	Stevenage (4.4 per cent)
Torfaen (5.8 per cent)	Dunbartonshire East (4.0 per cent)
Islwyn (5.6 per cent)	Carmarthen East and Dinefwr (4.0 per cent)
Aberavon (5.4 per cent)	Dundee East (4.0 per cent)
Argyll & Bute (5.1 per cent)	Dover (4.0 per cent)
Clwyd South (4.9 per cent)	Edinburgh West (4.0 per cent)
Arfon (4.8 per cent)	Preseli Pembrokeshire (3.9 per cent)

Social profile

These groups have been resident in their current (terraced or semi-detached) home for many years, and have likely seen their children grow up in these homes and leave the nest. They are most likely in very long-term stable marriages and belong most likely to social grade 'C2DE'. These groups are disproportionately housed in council or housing association accommodation.

Net household incomes for these groups are below £20,000 per annum and the middle-aged group is likely to be employed in routine or semi-skilled occupations. They have few savings and find it difficult or very difficult to cope financially. These groups draw a wide range of benefits from the state to supplement income from employment rather than drawing benefits as the main source of income.

Living as they do in poorer estates they are troubled and concerned by noisy neighbours, abandoned cars, casual vandalism or graffiti. These factors negatively impact their views of the area in which they have lived all their lives. They are personally worried about having things stolen from their house or car. Few, if any, of these groups completed any form of further education.

Political profile

These are voters with strong economic and cultural attachments to Labour - they live on council estates, often the same council estates they grew up in, and have often needed state assistance to get by. But they are not welfare dependent, and resent those who are. They are older voters threatened by social change, in particular identity change and immigration. They are resentful of Labour for allowing large scale immigration and welfare abuse, and for failing to respond to their anxieties about these concerns. These will often be traditional Labour voters who feel alienated from the party today on cultural/values grounds rather than economic grounds. They see the contemporary Labour party as dominated by educated, socially liberal "do gooders" who do not understand their anxieties and often condescend to them. Yet many will have deep seated Labour loyalties founded in family upbringing and local culture, most will never consider voting Conservative, and therefore express their anger and disaffection at Labour through abstention or (now) support for UKIP.

Key messages

Insecurity and the cost of living loom large with this group, and proposals to support hard up workers will have a strong appeal. The lower rate of income tax, tax breaks for using the living wage and banning zero hour contracts will all have a strong appeal for this group, who are often in work but struggling. The job guarantee may also appeal as many will be worried about unemployment.

Appeals on housing are likely to have less resonance for this group, who have lived in their current houses for a long time and are unlikely to be looking to change houses. However, many may be concerned about the struggles of children or relatives due to the housing shortage, so the house building proposals will have some appeal. These voters will want reassur-

ance that such houses will go to the right kind of people (i.e. responsible long term residents with a link to the area, like them). They are likely to worry about new houses going to "scroungers" or immigrants.

The "bedroom tax" is likely to be a powerful issue for this group, who mostly live in council accommodation. Many of whom are likely to have been forced to pay it, or know people who have. This issue provides an excellent opportunity to motivate these voters, and direct their anger towards the Conservatives. It provides a concrete example of how a Labour vote matters for issues of direct relevance to their everyday lives.

These are middle aged and older voters and so both further education and health are likely to be live issues for many. Their children will be leaving school and will often not be going on to university. The technical baccalaureate and the jobs guarantee will both appeal to voters worried about opportunities for their children. These are also voters worried about their health needs, so Labour messages on the NHS and on social care will resonate.

Finally, these voters are likely to strongly identify with their local area, where they have deep roots. This is something campaigners should harness in discussions of issues like housing, schools and health care. Name specific estates, local schools or hospitals that will benefit from Labour investment proposals. Making these issues concrete and locally focussed will help overcome these voters' suspicions of Labour as a party that no longer cares about people like them.

Factor 4: Deprived and disaffected

The core of this factor is two groups:

• Old people in flats subsisting on welfare payments
• Childless tenants in social housing flats with modest social needs

One other group also contributes:

• People living in social accommodation designed for older people

Highest proportion "deprived and disaffected", all seats	Highest proportion "deprived and disaffected", marginal seats
Gateshead (5.1 per cent)	Southampton Itchen (4.2 per cent)
Southampton Itchen (4.2 per cent)	Norwich South (3.7 per cent)
Blackley and Broughton (4.2 per cent)	Rotherham (3.4 per cent)
South Shields (4.1 per cent)	Peterborough (3.3 per cent)
West Bromwich West (4.1 per cent)	Great Yarmouth (3.3 per cent)
Manchester Central (4.0 per cent)	Hastings and Rye (3.1 per cent)
Wolverhampton South East (3.9 per cent)	Great Grimsby (3.0 per cent)
Liverpool Walton (3.8 per cent)	Plymouth Sutton and Devonport (2.9 per cent)
Nottingham North (3.8 per cent)	Ipswich (2.6 per cent)
Newcastle-upon-Tyne Central (3.7 per cent)	Norwich North (2.5 per cent)

Social profile

These groups are similar to factor 3 except they are more economically deprived and are often forced to live with the consequences of serious financial difficulties on a daily basis. There are high levels of divorce and separation amongst these groups and many of the older households have been widowed. Amongst younger groups levels of lone parenting are high.

These groups belong to social grade 'E' and are amongst the most deprived of all demographic groups. Accommodation is most likely to be in council or housing association owned converted flats with few rooms. Where they are employed it is in routine occupations, most likely on the minimum wage and in service industries. Most of these groups left school at 15 or 16. Levels of teenage pregnancy or obesity are relatively high amongst these groups.

Net annual household incomes for these groups are below £10,000. Some are in debt to credit card companies. All these groups are in receipt of very substantial welfare payments, which makes up either all or a very high proportion of their entire income. Levels of car ownership are low and many use public transport regularly.

These groups are intensely unhappy with their standard of living and often sacrifice time with family in order to try to get ahead but find themselves disadvantaged in labour markets. Despite their current position many of the younger childless groups are still ambitious and are quite happy to live amongst residents of all backgrounds.

Political profile

These voters, like factor 1, tend to congregate in some of the deprived and economically declining constituencies where overall UKIP performance has been strongest. These are voters with very high levels of poverty and economic insecurity who are struggling or failing to make ends meet. Desperate to change their circumstances they vent their anger at the party which historically was there to represent them.

Historically these voters would have two choices come election time; vote Labour or stay at home. However, in more recent times UKIP have occupied a space on the ballot form where these voters can exercise their frustration and deliver a forceful kick at what they perceive to be a Labour party out of touch with their concerns.

In places like Sunderland and South Shields, areas with high proportions of these groups, UKIP has performed very well in recent local elections and in the case of South Shields the by-election triggered by the resignation of David Miliband, where UKIP took 24 per cent of the vote, coming second to Labour.

Key messages

Labour messages targeted at this group need to focus on two concerns - these voters' deep economic difficulties and their pessimism about their own prospects, and those of their community.

These voters are very reliant on the state for support and often not in employment. The repeal of the "bedroom tax", the jobs guarantee, the fuel bills freeze and the promise of housing investment will all appeal to them. For those in this group who have work, the ban on zero hours contracts, the

minimum wage, the lower rate of income tax and the expansion of child care will also have a lot of appeal.

However, these are voters who feel Labour has left them behind, focusing instead on better-off voters and immigrants. On issues such as house building, "rip-off" rent, and the ban on recruitment agencies using foreign workers, there will be a lot of initial distrust to overcome. These voters will tend to believe that such policies either won't be implemented, or will not benefit them.

A concrete local focus will therefore be essential to win trust. On house building, for example, saying how many houses will be built locally, and where, and who will get access to them, will help to convince voters this is a real proposal. Local knowledge regarding "rip off" landlords or exploitative agencies will also be a significant asset, helping campaigners connect with voters and overcome distrust.

Campaigners will also need a response to these voters' deep seated pessimism. These groups are at the core of the "left behind" electorate who have found UKIP most appealing - voters who have been pushed to the margins of British society, often living in towns which were decimated by industrial decline in the 1980s and have never recovered. They tend to believe that Labour have given up on them and their communities, and that voting for Labour will make little different to their lives.

Addressing this deep seated pessimism requires a mix of clear and concrete proposals, to demonstrate that Labour can make a difference, and rebuild trust, and a broader narrative of renewal and change. This is a group of voters who need reassurance that the Labour of Ed Miliband is different to the Labour of Tony Blair - more responsive to their concerns and more willing to take action on them.

Factor 5: Transient families in struggling towns

Comprised of one group:

• Older town centres terraces with transient, single populations

Highest proportion "Transient families in struggling towns", all seats	Highest proportion "Transient families in struggling towns", marginal seats
Leeds West (13.3 per cent)	Lincoln (10.9 per cent)
Hyndburn (12.9 per cent)	Carlisle (8.6 per cent)
Stoke-on-Trent Central (12.4 per cent)	Erewash (8.3 per cent)
Blackpool South (11.6 per cent)	Plymouth Sutton and Devonport (8.0 per cent)
Preston (11.2 per cent)	Great Grimsby (7.8 per cent)
Lincoln (10.9 per cent)	Lancaster and Fleetwood (7.7 per cent)
Barnsley Central (9.5 per cent)	Rossendale and Darwen (7.5 per cent)
Northampton South (9.4 per cent)	Ipswich 7.3 per cent)
Newcastle-under-Lyme (9.0 per cent)	Norwich North (7.2 per cent)
Leicester West (8.9 per cent)	Burnley (7.1 per cent)

Social profile

This group is typically aged in its early 20s, most likely living as a couple with small children but at the bottom rung of the housing ladder, normally in terraced housing and renting from the private sector. These groups tend to stay at their current address for periods of less than three years.

They are most likely in social grade 'C1C2D' and are employed in routine or semi-routine occupations. Net annual household incomes are in the £15k to £25k range but net disposable income is low. This group finds it difficult to make ends meet, and as a result is often in debt with credit card companies or loan sharks.

This group wonders why it should bother being 'green-aware', constrained as it is in its shopping choices by price. As a result they are wasteful and unconvinced by environmental concerns. They are also risk-takers and like a life of challenge and change. They like to take control of their circumstances and have keen sense of adventure. They believe a woman's place is in the home and that contraception is a woman's responsibility.

This group is relatively reckless with its own health, and are more likely than other groups to be treated for obesity, liver complaints, alcoholism and depression. They believe strongly that cannabis should be legalised.

Political profile

These voters, like group 1, tend to congregate in some of the deprived and economically declining constituencies where overall UKIP performance has been strongest. These are transient populations who are content not to stay too long in one place. However, geographically they are most common in the towns and cities of the north and the midlands, as well as pockets in Essex and the east coast.

Historically this is a group of voters which has voted exclusively, and quite strongly, for Labour. However, in more recent times that strength has weakened, and these groups have begun to get behind UKIP. They are virulently antagonistic towards both the Conservatives and Lib Dems but UKIP provides them with an option to kick the Labour party.

However, turnout amongst this group is relatively poor, and it is also important to recognise that registration may be difficult in a demographic group which is transient in nature.

Key messages

A critical first task for campaigners with this group will be ensuring that voters are registered and motivated to turn out. These voters move around a great deal, and have low engagement with politics, so registration rates are likely to be low. Campaigners in seats with large clusters of these voters should invest heavily in registration efforts ahead of the election, and turnout efforts close to polling day. Policy messaging should be focussed on providing these groups with a strong motivation to register and to vote, as political engagement does not come naturally to them.

In policy terms, this is a group who struggle with insecure work and debt, and often rely on state assistance. Insecurity is a chronic problem for them. Policies such as the zero hours contract ban, the 10p tax rate, the living wage

tax break and boosts to the minimum wage all stand to deliver immediate tangible gains for these voters and will therefore have a strong appeal.

The bedroom tax and the provision of social housing are less likely to resonate with this group, as they are less likely to have access to council housing or to be subject to the bedroom tax. On the state benefits front, they are more likely to value the regulation of "rip off" landlords - many will be private renters with few affordable options, so this speaks to their day to day experience.

Childcare is also likely to be a central issue for many of these voters, particularly female voters who may be forced into worse paid, less secure or part time employment by the lack of affordable child care options. This issue could provide a powerful specific motive for such voters to engage.

---

i However, the relationship is suggestive rather than decisive. We cannot prove a link between groups and vote choices in this way - it may be that other kinds of voters defect to UKIP more often in areas where a particular group is present. For example, the BNP did better in local elections in the mid 2000s in areas with large Muslim populations - but this was not because Muslims were voting for the BNP. This problem, known as the "ecological fallacy", means we have to interpret our findings with caution - this is only one rough estimate of UKIP influence. Other sources of data may paint a different picture. However, one reason to have some confidence in the estimates of UKIP support is that other research has shown that UKIP support has a very clearly drawn social profile - some groups of voters find UKIP very attractive, while many others would never consider the party at all (see Ford and Goodwin, 2014).

ii Note that the figures paint a similar, but distinct, picture to the figures shown in Ford and Goodwin's "UKIP attraction index", developed for "Revolt on the Right". This is for three reasons. Firstly, the Revolt on the Right index is based on broader demographic categories, derived from census data, while our index employs the finer grained Mosaic categories. Secondly, the Revolt on the Right index does not weight for the relative strength of the link between census categories and UKIP voting. Thirdly, the Revolt on the Right index is derived from UKIP support in survey data, whereas our index uses UKIP voting in local elections. Each index provides a useful guide to UKIP local strength, so both should be considered by campaigners. There is a lot of overlap in terms of the seats and areas each highlight as high UKIP potential. However, there are some differences. For example, Clacton scores highest in the Revolt on the Right index, due to a very high proportion of pensioners and less qualified voters, and very low proportions of graduates and ethnic minorities. It scores much lower on our index, because the seat does not have so many of the particular Mosaic categories associated with strong UKIP support in 2012 and 2014. Each index captures a different part of the story in Clacton, and of course demographics are only ever one piece of the puzzle - Douglas Carswell's personal links with the electorate are an important factor as well.

REVOLT ON THE LEFT |

LABOUR'S UKIP PROBLEM AND HOW IT CAN BE OVERCOME

By Marcus Roberts

Incorporating research from Rob Ford and Ian Warren

UKIP divides the Labour party internally. To date, senior Labour figures have been unable to agree whether a UKIP really problem exists and, if it does, how problematic it is likely to prove.

'Revolt on the Left' argues that UKIP poses a clear and present danger to Labour's 2015 hopes and, left unchecked, could threaten to pull apart the party's historic electoral coalition and challenge it in large swathes of its heartland territory. It incorporates new demographic analysis that, constituency by constituency, measures UKIP's threat to the two main political parties.

To tackle this threat Labour must pursue an optimistic message of changing communities together, a strong policy agenda that targets the root causes of UKIP considerers' concerns, and a reformed Labour party that practices movement, rather than, machine politics.