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## Introduction

This data stems from a mixed-methods project (primarily in the UK, but with some data collection in Norway) on attitudes to disability benefits, in particular who should be entitled to them, and whether they should be subject to conditionality (i.e. the threat of sanctions). This user guide (alongside the wider documentation) provides sufficient documentation for any user to be able to interpret the enclosed data files. There are three parts to the data:

1. *YouGov UK-Norway data*: in this survey, all respondents gave responses about three vignette benefit claimants as well as answers to a series of wider questions on disability benefits and sickness absence. In this document I explain (i) the survey sample, (ii) the construction of the vignettes, and (iii) socio-demographic data taken from the YouGov profile. The questionnaire itself is given in four separate documents (the question text in both languages, the vignette text in both languages, and the UK and Norway survey scripts showing other survey details).
2. *NatCen UK data:* in this survey, all respondents gave responses about two vignette benefit claimants, but no further questions were asked. In this document I explain (i) the survey sample, (ii) the construction of the vignettes, and (iii) socio-demographic data taken from fed-forward data. The questionnaire itself is given in one separate document.

Two datasets are provided: a combined YouGov-NatCen dataset at the vignette level (i.e. with one record for each vignette, and 2-3 records per person, titled ‘Combined\_data\_file\_vignettelevel\_3-0’), and a YouGov dataset at the person level (‘Combined\_data\_file\_personlevel.dta’). Please note that variables whose answers were given in free text fields have been removed from the dataset for anonymity reasons.

1. *UK focus group data:* I also conducted six focus groups on these topics with different groups within the general public. The final section of this document briefly explains the circumstances of these focus groups; anonymisedqualitative transcripts are provided within the data deposit.

## Data part #1: YouGov UK-Norway survey data

### YouGov sample design

YouGov were chosen through a competitive tendering process, having demonstrated their experience in conducting both comparative studies and complex experimental designs, and given the size of their existing panels in the UK and Norway. YouGov provides more general descriptions of its panels at <https://yougov.co.uk/about/panel-methodology/> (UK), <https://yougov.no/about/panel/> (Norway), via the YouGov ESOMAR statement at <http://web.archive.org/web/20141113110233/http://cdn.yougov.com/cumulus_uploads/document/t3r5k565j5/ESOMAR_28.pdf> [all accessed 3/4/2018], and provided further information to us within the tendering process.

The panels represent a diverse group of people recruited from a variety of sources, at the time of tendering numbering 400,000 (UK) and 10,000 (Norway) active users. To generate approximately representative samples from this non-probability panel, YouGov offer incentives to a sub-sample of the panel to take part, who are designed to be representative of the national adult population. In Norway this was based on age interlocked with gender and region, and education,[[1]](#footnote-1) according to Statistics Norway data. In the UK this was based on age interlocked with gender and education; political attention; social grade; and vote in the 2015 general election interlocked with region.[[2]](#footnote-2) Non-response weights are also calculated to ensure that the final sample match these known population totals (and in the UK, to further match according to vote in the EU referendum).

Because the UK panel is larger than the Norwegian panel (not just because of the wider population sizes but also because the UK panel accounted for a higher proportion of the population, at 0.2% Norway vs. 0.7% UK), we allowed a longer fieldwork period in Norway than in the UK. For quotas that were under-represented among Norway respondents, we supplemented the YouGov panel with members of a separate panel (Userneeds), with the appropriate background information collected specifically for this project.

### Response rate and non-completion

The surveys were conducted in the UK in Feb-Mar 2017 and in Norway in Apr-May 2017, achieving sample sizes of 1,998 (Norway) and 1,973 (UK); ethical approval was given by the University of Kent.

It is not possible to provide a conventional response rate (as a proportion of the YouGov panel members invited to participate), because participants are allocated to surveys at the point they log in to the YouGov site, rather than at the point that they are invited to participate – something that has been noted by other political scientists using YouGov data (e.g. Kootstra 2016). For the same reason, however, this non-response is likely to be orthogonal to interest in disability benefits – participants will not be aware of the topic of the survey in question, which is a major contributor to non-response bias (Groves, et al. 2006). Across different surveys, about 1 in 5 of those invited to participate will ultimately do so, on average 19 hours after receiving the invitation email.

Any non-response among those who begin our disability benefit survey is more problematic, as this is likely to be associated with the phenomena we are interested in. We therefore specifically requested data on the non-completion rate, a figure not reported for most of the academic YouGov surveys reported in the wider literature. The overwhelming majority (83.5% in the UK, 77.9% in Norway) of those who visited the initial survey page (which gives the survey topic) went on to start the survey. Moreover, drop-out was overwhelmingly at this start page (only 3.4% UK and 5.2% Norway dropped out after this), before the respondent had been allocated to a particular experimental condition. Non-response bias in response to particular experimental conditions therefore seems likely to be negligible.

### Vignettes

#### Disability vignettes

The vignette text was adapted from previous studies, and (for symptoms and restrospective control) combined with symptom sets from medical texts and impairments defined in UK social security guidance (in particular, the functional descriptors used in the Work Capability Assessment). The resulting text was then checked via consultation with about a dozen disabled people and other experts, as well as a small number of cognitive tests on members of the general public. The surveys were then tested on 66 people (UK) and 51 people (Norway), for which timing data and response consistency was checked, and at the end of which pilot respondents were asked to provide qualitative feedback about the questionnaire.

All of the final vignettes had the following structure (the bold text is as displayed in the YouGov survey):

***The description below is about someone who is applying for out-of-work benefits – after you have read it, we will ask for your views about this person’s situation.***

* *Liz is 60, and has often been unemployed, though 2 years ago she was working*
* ***However, 5 years ago she left her job because she said she had the following:***
* *Started mostly feeling heavy and joyless, finding it difficult to get out of bed*
* *Can’t cope with unexpected changes (e.g. changing an appointment at short notice)*
* *Can still get to new places on her own, but can’t usually speak to new people*
* *Her doctors have signed a sick note for her & diagnosed her with depression*
* *Liz can't do her previous line of work. She has no qualifications, and can't think of any employers locally who would now employ her*

Each respondent was asked 3 vignettes in this format. Each of the elements of each vignettes was randomly varied according to the following characteristics:

|  |
| --- |
| **Symptom severity & retrospective control** |
| **Symptom severity 1: Back pain**  **Retrospective control: Low (Car accident)**  o Was in a severe car accident, and now has severe pain in his back and legs  o Can’t walk 100m in one go, or raise either arm above head height, or lift light bulky objects  o Finds it hard to concentrate, but can still stay sitting down for a while and use a keyboard/mouse |
| **Symptom severity 1: Back pain**  **Retrospective control: High (Overweight)**  o Has been overweight all his life, and now has severe pain in his back and legs  o Can’t walk 100m in one go, or raise either arm above head height, or lift light bulky objects  o Finds it hard to concentrate, but can still stay sitting down for a while and use a keyboard/mouse |
| **Symptom severity 2: Paraplegia**  **Retrospective control: Low (Car accident)**  o Was in a severe car accident, now has no feeling at all in his body from the chest down  o Can use his arms as normal, but uses a thin tube ('catheter') to empty his bladder during the day  o Can get around easily using a wheelchair to anywhere that is wheelchair-accessible |
| **Symptom severity 3: Depression**  o Started mostly feeling heavy and joyless, finding it difficult to get out of bed  o Can’t cope with unexpected changes (e.g. changing an appointment at short notice)  o Can still get to new places on his own, but can’t usually speak to new people |
| **Symptom severity 4: Schizophrenia**  **Retrospective control: Low (Trauma)**  o Suffered the trauma of the death of his son  o Started hearing voices even though no one else was around, which told him what to do and think  o Almost never leaves his home, and has been thinking about committing suicide |
| **Symptom severity 4: Schizophrenia**  **Retrospective control: High (Substance use)**  o Was drinking heavily and sometimes taking illegal drugs  o Started hearing voices even though no one else was around, which told him what to do and think  o Almost never leaves his home, and has been thinking about committing suicide  *[We should stress that standard medical sources such as the UK NHS website (*[*https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/schizophrenia/causes/#triggers*](https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/schizophrenia/causes/#triggers)*,* [*https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/clinical-depression/causes/*](https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/clinical-depression/causes/)*) are clear that illicit drug use – in particular cannabis, cocaine, LSD & amphetamines – raise the risk of developing schizophrenia, and that broader alcohol & drug use can raise the risk of clinical depression.]* |
| **Symptom severity 5: Fibromyalgia**  o Started feeling in pain across several different parts of her body  o Finds it difficult to sleep, feels tired most of the time, and can't think straight  o The pain stops him from moving around or doing everyday tasks around the house |
| **Other characteristics** |
| **Medicalisation**  • He does NOT have a sick note from his doctor  • His doctor has signed a sick note for him, but has not been able to confirm a diagnosis  • His doctor has signed a sick note for him & diagnosed him with [condition]  *[The named conditions are (in the same order of the symptoms/impairments presented above): sciatica & dorsalgia / sciatica & dorsalgia / paraplegia / depression / schizophrenia / schizophrenia / fibromyalgia]* |
| **Duration**  • ‘5 years ago’  • ‘12 months ago’ |
| **Prospective control (work capacity)**  • [name] can't do his previous line of work. He has no qualifications, and can't think of any employers locally who would now employ him  • [name] can't do his previous line of work. He has no qualifications, and the Jobcentre can't think of any jobs he could still do  • [name] can't do his previous line of work. While he has no qualifications, the Jobcentre can think of other sorts of work he could do  • [name] can't do his previous line of work. However, he has a degree, and can think of other sorts of work he could do |
| **Work history**  • … has often been unemployed, though [5 years ago/12 months ago] he was working  • …has worked all his adult life [so far] |
| **Age**  • Age 25  • Age 45  • Age 60 |
| **Gender (name)**  • [Male] John / Steve / Mike for vignettes 1, 2 & 3 respectively  • [Female] Liz / Sally / Kath for vignettes 1, 2 & 3 respectively |

#### Unemployment vignettes

For two-thirds of respondents, the third vignette was an unemployment vignette rather than a disability vignette. This had the following structure:

*• Kath is 60, and has often been unemployed, though a few weeks ago she was working*

*• However, a few weeks ago she lost her job*

*• This wasn't her fault - her employer went bankrupt*

*• There are no jobs locally in her previous line of work, and she is still unemployed*

*• She has no qualifications, and the Jobcentre can't think of any employers locally who would now employ her*

As this shows, four of the dimensions are the same as the disability vignettes (gender, age, prospective control, and duration). A further dimension is very similar (work history), and a sixth dimension is an analogous version of retrospective control, as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to dimensions of unemployment vignettes** |
| **Retrospective control (unemployment vignettes)**  • This wasn't his fault - his employer went bankrupt  • This wasn't his fault - his temporary contract came to an end  • He was sacked for an argument with a colleague |
| **Work history (unemployment vignettes)**  • [name] has no qualifications, and the Jobcentre can't think of any employers locally who would now employ him  • While [name] has no qualifications, the Jobcentre can think of other sorts of work he could do  • However, [name] has a degree, and the Jobcentre can think of other sorts of work he could do  *[This is the same as work history for the disability vignettes, but excluding the text at the start, ‘[name] can't do his previous line of work’, and without the category “He has no qualifications, and the Jobcentre can't think of any jobs he could still do”]* |

#### Vignette allocation

Most factorial survey experiments use either the full vignette universe (all possible vignettes), or a random selection of levels within each dimension (Wallander 2009:512). It is possible to create more efficient designs that ensure that vignette dimensions are not (randomly) correlated with one another (or which minimise this correlation), but this is not necessary for samples of more than 200 vignettes (Auspurg and Hinz 2015), and comes at the cost of additional complexity and often by assuming that higher-order interactions are negligible, which we felt was not necessarily justified in our case.

We therefore used the full vignette universe generated by the design above: this created 5184 vignettes (3 vignettes for each of 1728 respondents, formed by 288 (23\*32\*4) vignettes per condition for each of seven types of symptom/impairment and for unemployment, of which each unemployment vignette was seen twice). Due to the complexities of assigning vignettes to participants in the YouGov panel, the final sample size necessary to achieve the full vignette universe was 1,998 (Norway) and 1,973 (UK); in the main analyses we use the duplicate vignettes, but in a sensitivity analysis we restrict the data to the first respondent to each vignette in the universe.

To ensure that respondents perceived each vignette as a unique person, the symptoms and names were varied across the 3 vignettes: the first vignette used symptoms #1-3 (physical), the second vignette used symptoms #4-6 (mental), and the third vignette used symptoms #7 (for the one-third of people who saw a disability vignette, the others seeing an unemployment vignette).

### Other questions

Users are referred to the questionnaires in the separate files for details of the questions, both those that refer to each vignette, and the more general questions.

### Sociodemographic questions from YouGov profile data

The following variables are available as YouGov profile data – that is, variables that have already been collected on panel members for all the surveys they complete.

| **Measure** | **Details** |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions comparable across UK/Norway** | |
| Age | Single-year age is available. For analysis, this is recoded to the following age bands: 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75+. |
| Gender | Binary gender (male/female) is available. |
| Marital status | Respondents were asked, *“Which of the following options best describes your current situation?”* Response options were grouped into (1) Married/cohabiting (those responding, ‘Married’, ‘Civil partnership’, ‘Cohabiting’), (2) Separated/widowed/divorced (those responding ‘Separated’, ‘Widowed’ or ‘Divorced’), or (3) Never married (those responding ‘Single’ or in Norway, ‘In a relationship but do not live together’ [I et forhold, men bor ikke sammen]. |
| Children in household | Respondents were asked, *“How many children under 18 live in your household that you (or your partner) have parental responsibility for?”* For analysis this was grouped into three categories: None, 1, or 2+. |
| Region | Region of residence was categorised as follows:   * UK (Government Office Region): North, Midlands, East, London, South, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland. * Norway: Oslo/Akershus, Rest Østland, Sørlandet, Vestlandet, Trøndelag/Nord-Norge. |
| **Questions not comparable across UK/Norway** | |
| Highest educational level | In Norway, respondents highest educational level was only available at a coarse level: (1) Primary school (Grunnskole / folkeskole); (2) Upper secondary school (Videregåendeskolenivå); (3) University level 1-3 years (Universitets- og høgskolenivå kort 1-3 år); and 4 University level 4+ years (Universitets- og høgskolenivå lang 4 år+). For analysis, categories 3 & 4 were grouped into a single ‘university’ category, leaving three categories.  In the UK, respondents highest educational level was available at a much more detailed 18-category level. To make this broadly comparable to the Norwegian variable, we grouped this as follows:   1. Less than GCSEs (1\_No formal qualifications, 2\_Youth training certificate/skillseekers, 4\_Clerical and commercial, 8\_CSE grades 2-5, 18\_Other technical, professional or higher qualification) 2. GCSEs or A-levels (5\_City and Guild certificate, 9\_CSE grade 1, GCE O level, GCSE, School Certificate, 10\_Scottish Ordinary/ Lower Certificate, 3\_Recognized trade apprenticeship completed, 6\_City and Guild certificate – advanced, 7\_ONC, 11\_GCE A level or Higher Certificate, 12\_Scottish Higher Certificate) 3. Degree or other HE (13\_Nursing qualification (eg SEN, SRN, SCM, RGN), 14\_Teaching qualification (not degree), 15\_University diploma, 16\_University or CNAA first degree (eg BA, B.Sc, B.Ed), 17\_University or CNAA higher degree (eg M.Sc, Ph.D)) |
| Work status | In Norway, respondents were asked, *“What is your main employment? If you are currently in maternity leave or are ill-registered, choose the time before the leave / sick leave”* [Dersom du for tiden er i fødselspermisjon eller er sykemeldt, velger du med tanke på tiden før permisjonen/sykemeldingen]. We grouped the responses as follows:   * Working: Yrkesaktiv - kontorjobb, undervisning m.m [Working- office work, teaching] | Yrkesaktiv - fagarbeider, handels- og serviceansatt, helsearbeider m.m [Working - skilled worker/trade/services/health etc] | Selvstendig næringsdrivende [Self-employed]. * Student: Student/lærling/elev [Student/apprentice] * Unemployed: Ikke yrkesaktiv - arbeidsledig, langtidssykemeldt, trygdet, i praksis via NAV [Inactive - Unemployed, long-term sick, on social security, work experience with (the social insurance agency) NAV] * Other inactive: Ikke yrkesaktiv - pensjonert [Inactive-retired] | Hjemmeværende [Homeworker] | Annet [Other]   In the UK, respondents were grouped as follows:   * Working: Working full time (30 or more hours per week) | Working part time (8-29 hours a week) | Working part time (Less than 8 hours a week) * Student: Full time student * Unemployed * Other inactive: Retired | Not working | Other   When analysing the countries separately, we use these four-level categorical variables. In some analyses across both countries, to avoid assuming that these categories are comparable internationally, we use a simple dummy variable for ‘working’ vs. all other statuses. |

### Translation

Ensuring comparability in welfare attitudes surveys is challenging, not only because of the formidable problems of translation, but also because of the different structures of the benefits systems involved. The translation was therefore done in conjunction with a language expert (a professional Norwegian-English survey translator) and a subject expert (a bilingual Norwegian academic who does research in this field), as well as using the lead author’s knowledge of both the UK and Norwegian welfare states (and their rudimentary knowledge of Norwegian). The translation was done in several stages:

1. An initial draft questionnaire in English was formulated.
2. The draft was revised in discussion with the subject expert, to try and phrase the survey in English in ways that are translatable into Norwegian, and to ensure that the objects of the questions exist in both welfare states.
3. The revised survey was then translated by the language expert.
4. A three-way meeting was held between the lead author, the language expert and the subject expert to go through the translation question-by-question, to identify problems and make revisions to ensure comparability.

The full translation is part of the replication materials included alongside these appendices.

## Data part #2: NatCen UK survey data

### Sample

The NatCen UK data uses a probability-based panel follow-up of participants from the face-to-face 2015 and 2016 British Social Attitudes (BSA) surveys, which are based on a random probability sample of those aged 18+ across Britain (south of the Caledonian canal). More details of the BSA sampling approach can be found at <http://bsa.natcen.ac.uk/latest-report/british-social-attitudes-33/technical-details.aspx>.

The NatCen panel is a mixed-mode survey, which uses online surveys for those with internet access and phone interviews for those without; 15% of respondents were by telephone. Fieldwork was conducted 27/04/17 – 28/05/17. The response rate is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Survey response to NatCen panel*** | |
| **Response to the survey** |  |
| Issued | 3,729 |
| Deadwood | 2 |
| Achieved | 2,223 |
| **Survey response rate** | **60%** |
|  | |
| **Overall response** |  |
| BSA issued | 16,458 |
| BSA deadwood | 1,561 |
| BSA productive | 7,270 |
| Recruited to panel | 4,205 |
| BSA response rate | 49% |
| Panel recruitment rate | 58% |
| Panel deadwood | 17 |
|  | |
| **Overall survey response rate** | **15%** |

The data file includes the NatCen supplied weight (adjusting for non-coverage and non-response across the BSA, the panel per se and among panel members.[[3]](#footnote-3)

### Vignettes

#### Vignette text

The vignette text was identical to the YouGov UK survey, with the following exceptions:

* Fibromyalgia (one of the levels of ‘symptom severity’) was not used.
* A further level of medicalisation was added: *“[His/her] doctor has signed a sick note for [him/her], diagnosed [him/her] with [condition name], and said that [he/she] is unlikely to ever get better”*

#### Vignette allocation

We adopted a simple random allocation of vignettes to respondents. Each respondent saw two vignettes: half of the respondents saw two disability vignettes, while the remaining half of respondents saw a disability vignette followed by an unemployment vignette. For the disability vignettes, the first vignette’s symptom severity was randomly allocated to back pain (car accident), back pain (overweight), paraplegia or depression, while the second vignette was either schizophrenia (trauma) or schizophrenia (substance use).

### Other questions

Users are referred to the questionnaires in the separate files for details of the questions, which in this case refer always to the vignette (with one exception).

### Political & sociodemographic questions

We also include a battery of more detailed information on the respondent’s ideology. These are measures fed-forward from the 2015 and 2016 BSA surveys, in particular three attitude multi-item scales: left-right, liberal-authoritarian, and welfarism. As described in the 2015 BSA Technical Report (Clery, et al. 2016:194-5):

*“Since 1986, the British Social Attitudes surveys have included two attitude scales which aim to measure where respondents stand on certain underlying value dimensions – left–right and libertarian– authoritarian. Since 1987 (except in 1990), a similar scale on ‘welfarism’ has also been included. Some of the items in the welfarism scale were changed in 2000–2001. The current version of the scale is shown below.*

*“A useful way of summarising the information from a number of questions of this sort is to construct an additive index (Spector, 1992; DeVellis, 2003). This approach rests on the assumption that there is an underlying – ‘latent’ – attitudinal dimension which characterises the answers to all the questions within each scale. If so, scores on the index are likely to be a more reliable indication of the underlying attitude than the answers to any one question. Each of these scales consists of a number of statements to which the respondent is invited to “agree strongly”, “agree”, “neither agree nor disagree”, “disagree” or “disagree strongly”. The items are:*

*“Left–right scale*

*Government should redistribute income from the better off to those who are less well off [Redistrb]*

*Big business benefits owners at the expense of workers [BigBusnN]*

*Ordinary working people do not get their fair share of the nation’s wealth [Wealth]*

*There is one law for the rich and one for the poor [RichLaw]*

*Management will always try to get the better of employees if it gets the chance [Indust4]*

*“Libertarian–authoritarian scale*

*Young people today don’t have enough respect for traditional British values. [TradVals]*

*People who break the law should be given stiffer sentences. [StifSent]*

*For some crimes, the death penalty is the most appropriate sentence. [DeathApp]*

*Schools should teach children to obey authority. [Obey]*

*The law should always be obeyed, even if a particular law is wrong. [WrongLaw]*

*Censorship of films and magazines is necessary to uphold moral standards. [Censor]*

*“Welfarism scale*

*The welfare state encourages people to stop helping each other. [WelfHelp]*

*The government should spend more money on welfare benefits for the poor, even if it leads to higher taxes. [MoreWelf]*

*Around here, most unemployed people could find a job if they really wanted one. [UnempJob]*

*Many people who get social security don’t really deserve any help. [SocHelp]*

*Most people on the dole are fiddling in one way or another. [DoleFidl]*

*If welfare benefits weren’t so generous, people would learn to stand on their own two feet. [WelfFeet]*

*Cutting welfare benefits would damage too many people’s lives. [DamLives]*

*The creation of the welfare state is one of Britain’s proudest achievements. [ProudWlf]*

*The indices for the three scales are formed by scoring the leftmost, most libertarian or most pro-welfare position, as 1 and the rightmost, most authoritarian or most anti-welfarist position, as 5. The “neither agree nor disagree” option is scored as 3. The scores to all the questions in each scale are added and then divided by the number of items in the scale, giving indices ranging from 1 (leftmost, most libertarian, most pro-welfare) to 5 (rightmost, most authoritarian, most anti-welfare). The scores on the three indices have been placed on the dataset.[[4]](#footnote-4) The scales have been tested for reliability (as measured by Cronbach’s alpha). The Cronbach’s alpha (unstandardised items) for the scales in 2014 are 0.82 for the left–right scale, 0.82 for the welfarism scale and 0.74 for the libertarian–authoritarian scale. This level of reliability can be considered “good” for the left–right and libertarian–authoritarian scales and “respectable” for the welfarism scale (DeVellis, 2003: 95–96).*

Full details on the references listed above (Spector 1992, DeVellis 2003) are given in the bibliography at the end of the online appendices. A further guide to the items in early versions of BSA can be found in Evans (1996).

### Sociodemographic questions

The following variables are available in the NatCen profile, fed-forward from the 2015 or 2016 BSA surveys (as for the just-described ideology variables). For full information see the respective BSA user guides (including questionnaires) and technical reports; these were included in the analysis as follows:

* Age
* Gender
* Marital status
* Children in household
* Region
* Urban-rural indicator
* Highest educational level
* Work status
* Benefit claims
* News media use.

## Data part #3: UK focus group data

### Focus groups among the public

For the qualitative part of the project, researchers from the think-tank Demos and I conducted six focus groups with the general public between July and September 2016. The people taking part fell into three overlapping groups (working people, unemployed people and disabled people), each of which was hosted once in London and once in the North of England. Each focus group included seven or eight people and was recruited via a professional focus group recruitment agency; 47 people took part in total. The anonymised transcripts of these focus groups are included in the data deposit.

Again, much of the discussion focused on vignettes of different types of disabled people, some of which overlapped with the vignettes used in the survey. The wording of the vignettes changed slightly group-to-group, so the materials for each focus group are also enclosed as part of the data deposit.

### Focus groups among policymaker elites

Alongside the focus groups with the public, researchers from Demos and I also conducted six focus groups with key actors in disability policy between September 2016 and March 2017. The first five were conducted separately with Maximus WCA assessors, welfare-to-work providers (via the Employment Related Services Association), other organisations helping disabled people into work, disability charities (via the Disability Benefits Consortium), and disabled people’s organisations and disability activists. The final group was a policy event with 21 people, including Conservative and Labour MPs, civil servants from the DWP, disability charity staff, welfare-to-work providers, academics and medical professionals.

Due to the risk of identifying individuals among policy elites, these transcripts are *not* provided within the data deposit (as I explained in the original ESRC application).
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1. Education was added to the quotas for the Norway panel specifically for this project. These were added as ‘soft quotas’, providing an acceptable range rather than a fixed target:

   Grunn-/folkeskole (Primary School): Target 27%, Window 22-32%

   Videregåendeskolenivå (High School): Target 40%, Window 35-45%

   Universitets- og høgskolenivå kort (1-3 år) (university 1-3 years): Target 21%, Window 17-25%

   Universitets- og høgskolenivå lang (4 år+) (univeristy 4 years +): Target 8%, Window 5-11%

   Prefer not to say: Target 4%, Window 1-7%. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The known totals are taken from large random surveys (the Labour Force Survey, the National Readership Survey and the British Election Study) and administrative data (the Census, official ONS population estimates, electoral results). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. NatCen’s survey report describes the three weights involved in some detail.

   **BSA weight**: this adjust for non-response using region, type of dwelling, whether there were entry barriers to the selected address, the relative condition of the immediate local area, the relative condition of the address, the percentage of owner occupied properties in quintiles and population density; it then matches known population totals using gender, age and Government Office Region. Further details are given in the BSA technical reports.

   **Panel weight**: this accounts for non-response at the panel recruitment stage. A logistic regression model has been used to derive the probability of response of each panel member; the panel weight is computed as the inverse of the probabilities of response. This weight adjusts the panel for non-response using the following variables: age and sex groups, GOR, BSA year, household type, household income, education level, internet access, ethnicity, tenure, social class group, economic activity, political party identification, and interest in politics (The characteristics that are likely to change with time for an individual and whose distribution differed between 2015 and 2016 BSA sample have been entered into the model in interaction with BSA year). The resulting panel weight has been multiplied by the BSA 2015 and 2016 weights, so the panel is representative of the population.

   **Survey weight**: to adjust the bias caused by non-response to this particular panel survey. A logistic regression model has been used to compute the probabilities of response of each participant. The panel survey weight is equal to the inverse of the probabilities of response. The initial set of predictors used to build the model was the same as for the panel weight; and at this wave the final set of variables used was also the same. The final survey weight is the result of multiplying the survey weight by the compounded panel weight. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. “*In constructing the scale, a decision had to be taken on how to treat missing values (“Don’t know” and “Not answered”). Respondents who had more than two missing values on the left–right scale and more than three missing values on the libertarian–authoritarian and welfarism scales were excluded from that scale. For respondents with fewer missing values, “Don’t know” was recoded to the midpoint of the scale and “Not answered” was recoded to the scale mean for that respondent on their valid items”* [↑](#footnote-ref-4)