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## Appendix A: Sensitivity analyses (Studies 1 & 2)

### Study 1: Sensitivity analyses

I conducted a number of sensitivity analyses.

Firstly, **if we include controls and weights**, the results are effectively identical. For example, the equivalent to the table in the main paper using weighted data with controls is as follows:

Table 1: Effect of mock stories on perceived deservingness

of disability benefit claimants, with weights and controls

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|   | **Vignette disability claimants**  |
|   | b | 95% CI |
| None (baseline) | 0 |  |
| ‘Benefits cheat’  | -0.24 | (-0.41, -0.08) |
| *Country* | *UK & Norway* |
| *Sample size (vignettes)* | *3646* |
| *Sample size (people)* | *8202* |

Controls are gender, age group, marital status, presence of children in the household, own benefits claim, disability, region, and working status.

Secondly, in our YouGov survey we have two measures of **whether the respondents were closely reading the questions**: the time they took to read the vignette screen, and two attention checks taken from (Berinsky *et al.*, 2014). In sensitivity analyses I excluded those who took less than 8 seconds to read the vignette, or who failed both attention screens (see Appendix D below for details). The results are effectively unchanged across specifications:

Table 2: Effect of ‘benefits cheat’ article on perceived deservingness

of disability benefit claimants, with weights and controls

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Main model** | **Excluding** **skim readers** | **Excluding** **low attention** |
|   | b | 95% CI | b | 95% CI | B | 95% CI |
| No article (baseline) | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| ‘Benefits cheat’ article | -0.31 | (-0.46, -0.15) | -0.34 | (-0.50, -0.17) | -0.35 | (-0.56, -0.13) |
| *Num. people* | *3836* | *3662* | *2072* |
| *Num. observations* | *8605* | *8013* | *4690* |

Overall, the main analyses alongside these sensitivity analyses show substantial support for my hypotheses: if respondents are primed to think about disability benefits fraud, they will judge claimants in general and hypothetical contact with a disability benefits claimant more harshly.

### Study 2 further results

Figure 2 in the main text shows the relationship between newspaper negativity and the perception of non-genuineness. The results for the additional analyses that further control for social trust and left-right ideology are shown in the right-hand column below:

Table 3: Perceived contact with a non-genuine disability benefit claimant: newspaper negativity, UK only

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | **Main model** | **Additional controls for trust & ideology** |
|   | Effect  | 95% CI | Effect  | 95% CI |
| *Effect of 1 unit of media negativity (0-100%) for…* |
| Close family | 0.1% | (-0.3, 0.6) | 0.0% | (-0.5, 0.5) |
| Close friends | 0.4% | (-0.2, 1.0) | 0.2% | (-0.6, 1.0) |
| Distant family | 1.1% | (0.3, 1.9) | 1.2% | (0.3, 2.1) |
| Neighbours | 2.1% | (1.0, 3.1) | 1.6% | (0.75, 2.5) |

Data: UK of YouGov survey 2017; samples sizes are 615 observations from 547 people.

## Appendix B: Measuring newspaper coverage of benefit claimants (Study 2)

Study 2 uses a measure of ‘newspaper negativity’ in the UK, capturing how negatively the respondents’ newspaper of choice frames benefits claimants in general. This is taken from an existing hand-coded content analysis of a stratified 10% sample of all newspaper stories on benefits 1995-2012, kindly shared by Declan Gaffney. While full details are given elsewhere (Baumberg *et al.*, 2012 Chapter 4 and Appendix 4),[[1]](#footnote-1) I briefly summarise the key features of the content analysis here, alongside my own validation of their measure.

### Gaffney et al content analysis

#### Sample of newspaper stories

Gaffney et al use the electronic database with the best coverage of UK newspapers, *Nexis*, which covers most – but not all – national newspapers 1995-2011.[[2]](#footnote-2) From this, Gaffney et al extract all articles meeting their search criteria.[[3]](#footnote-3) After initial cleaning (e.g. removing irrelevant articles and duplicates) and removing Sunday-only titles where possible (that are inconsistently included in *Nexis*), this produced a dataset of 6,612 articles, about half of the articles originally returned by the search. These steps have not been followed by all previous such analyses (Sage, 2012:369; (Taylor-Gooby, 2012:10), and Gaffney et al show that these can affect the temporal balance of the sample (Baumberg *et al.*, 2012:46).

#### Manual coding of newspaper stories

Gaffney et al extracted a sample of 20% of articles from the resulting dataset, stratified by title and year. They then manually coded three dimensions of these articles: type,[[4]](#footnote-4) newshook,[[5]](#footnote-5) and – more importantly for our own analysis – theme. They define themes as *“subjects which made a substantial contribution to the content of articles”* (as a contrast to their automatic coding of term lists, see below), which they split into the following negative themes:[[6]](#footnote-6)

* Fraud,
* ‘Shouldn’t be claiming’ (for reasons other than fraud),
* Never worked/hasn’t worked for very long time,
* Large families on benefits,
* Bad parenting/anti-social behaviour of families on benefits,
* Claimants better off on benefits than if they were working,
* Claimants better off than workers,
* Immigrants claiming benefits; and
* Compulsion of claimants (e.g. workfare, benefit conditionality).

My ‘newspaper negativity’ measure is based on articles that include any of the themes above, with the exclusion of ‘immigrants claiming benefits’ (Gaffney et al remove this from their summary ‘negative themes’ measure because it relates to a different aspect of the wider phenomenon of ‘deservingness’). My measure focuses on negativity in the most recent decade of data before the survey (2002-2011).

### Our validation of the Gaffney et al measure

To validate our Gaffney et al’s measure of newspaper negativity, I use the survey experiment in Study 1 which presented a 50% subsample of respondents with a mock ‘benefits cheat’ story. I followed this by asking, *“How often have you personally read articles like this in a newspaper (either hardcopy or online)?”* [The response options were Very often, Quite often, Not that often, Very rarely, or Never seen an article like this].

The results are shown in the table below. Across the 8 coded papers, the correlation of newspaper negativity with having (very or quite) often having seen an article like this was 0.86. (As an aside, the correlation with ‘fraud’ code from Gaffney et al is much lower at 0.58, further justifying our use of the overall ‘negativity’ code rather than the more specific ‘fraud’ code).

Table 4: Validating Gaffney et al ‘newspaper negativity’ measure

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Gaffney et al coded measure*** | ***% often seen articles like this***  (YouGov survey) |
|  | % negativity | % fraud |
| The Sun | 79.8 | 45.0 | 50.4 |
| The Daily Mail | 72.4 | 22.4 | 63.0 |
| The Mirror / Daily Record | 69.3 | 26.7 | 57.5 |
| The Express | 65.5 | 30.0 | 55.1 |
| The Daily Telegraph | 61.0 | 14.6 | 49.2 |
| The Independent | 55.3 | 10.5 | 35.7 |
| The Times | 52.5 | 16.4 | 35.5 |
| The Guardian | 36.4 | 11.0 | 27.6 |
| No newspaper |   |   | 34.7 |
| Other Newspaper |  |   | 38.4 |

## Appendix C: Further details on free text coding (Study 3)

As described in the main text, to explore the *meaning* of ‘non-genuineness’ in the UK and Norway, I asked respondents, *“Think of the non-genuine claimant that you know best. How could you tell that they were not a genuine claimant?”*

To analyse these responses, Norwegian responses were translated into English, and then responses from both countries were coded to an inductively-derived coding frame (≈20% of responses in each country were either un-code-able or blank – 21.9% in Norway, 17.4% in the UK). Some free-text responses in Norway suggest that people had misunderstood the original question (e.g. ‘Sorry, I meant that these people ARE genuine’); reported non-genuineness is set to zero in these cases. We should also note that the Norwegian responses on average are also slightly shorter than those in the UK (101 characters vs. 115).

Results for code-able responses are shown in the following table:

### Further detail underlying Table 4: Justifications for perceived non-genuineness

The main text presents the summary codes of the free text justifications for saying a known non-disabled claimant is non-genuine. The table below shows how the more detailed codes vary between the UK and Norway:

| **Code** | **Explanation** | **UK** | **Norway** | *UK vs. Norway95% CI* |  | **p** forcontrast |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Main summary codes** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Able to do more than they claim | The claimant was believed to be less sick/disabled than they claim. This referred to either general functioning (being healthy/not sick or having an active life); specific tasks they have been observed doing (e.g. walking, odd jobs/gardening, sport/partying/socialising, holidays, shopping); lying (e.g. not using a wheelchair/stick when they think they cannot be seen, or vaguer accusations of ‘malingering’); or the claimant admitting fraud/being well. | 77.9% | 41.1% | *[-44.7%, -28.8%]* |  | **0.00** |
| Lazy/bad attitude | The claimant was believed to be lazy, or not trying hard enough to find work (or more rarely, not trying hard enough to get better). In Norway this occasionally included references to people being young, with the implication that efforts should be greater at their age. | 15.8% | 34.2% | *[10.8%, 25.9%]* |  | **0.00** |
| Could work (with support/adaptations) | The claimant was believed to be capable of doing *some* work (though not all work), or comments that they could be working, without attaching any blame (and sometimes explicitly saying that it is society’s fault that they are given inadequate support). | 3.0% | 22.6% | *[14.7%, 24.5%]* |  | **0.00** |
| **Detailed sub-codes** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Functioning-related reason** | *Any of the below:* | **59.2%** | **32.6%** | ***[-35.3%, -18.0%]*** |  | **0.00** |
| Could work (given observed functioning) | Able to work given the things that they are observed doing. | 0.0% | 2.0% | *[0.4%, 3.5%]* |  | **0.01** |
| Healthy / not sick | ‘Healthy’, ‘not sick’ | 5.5% | 13.0% | *[2.5%, 12.4%]* |  | **0.00** |
| Doing things (unidentified) | Justification simply refers to ‘things’ or ‘activities’ that they’re observed doing. | 6.8% | 5.8% | *[-5.4%, 3.4%]* |  | 0.65 |
| Full life / active | Living a 'full life' / 'enjoys life' . Also includes: 'out and about'. [Excludes 'active social life', which goes under 'socialising'] | 6.5% | 3.4% | *[-6.9%, 0.7%]* |  | 0.11 |
| Can walk/run about | Mostly walking, but also running if this is not for sport/exercise (e.g. for bus). | 12.9% | 1.6% | *[-16.2%, -6.3%]* |  | **0.00** |
| Does odd jobs | Varied collection of odd jobs, including general things ('odd jobbing work'), housework (e.g. ‘cleaning’) or wider things like 'install a laminate flooring'. [Excludes anything that mentions payment/job/work, which is coded under 'Paid work'. Also excludes gardening, which has a separate code] | 6.3% | 6.4% | *[-4.3%, 4.6%]* |  | 0.96 |
| Sport/partying | Physical exertion in a variety of sport (inc. going to a gym, hiking, riding a bike) or ‘dancing’/‘partying’. [Excludes taking the dog for a walk or running for a bus, which are under ‘can walk/run about’] | 8.6% | 4.2% | *[-8.6%, -0.1%]* |  | **0.05** |
| Socialise | Includes anything around drinking if this suggests leaving the house/being with house (e.g. ‘go drinking’). [Excludes ‘partying’/’dancing’, which is under ‘Sport/partying’]. | 6.5% | 2.4% | *[-7.8%, -0.4%]* |  | **0.03** |
| Goes on holiday |  | 6.4% | 2.2% | *[-7.8%, -0.7%]* |  | **0.02** |
| Gardening | Purely for gardening (e.g. ‘working in the garden’). [Excludes heavy odd jobs in the garden e.g. ‘building a garden shed’, which is under ‘Odd jobs’]. | 5.8% | 1.7% | *[-7.7%, -0.4%]* |  | **0.03** |
| Lifting/carry heavy objects |  | 6.1% | 0.6% | *[-9.1%, -2.0%]* |  | **0.00** |
| Shopping |  | 5.4% | 0.6% | *[-8.3%, -1.5%]* |  | **0.01** |
| Driving | Driving *per se* as justification, whether or not specified that this is an ‘unadjusted car’. | 2.9% | 0.4% | *[-4.8%, -0.1%]* |  | **0.04** |
| Working on cars | Both working on car and washing car. | 3.0% | 0.2% | *[-5.0%, -0.5%]* |  | **0.02** |
| Displayed through social media |  | 0.8% | 0.3% | *[-1.8%, 0.8%]* |  | 0.45 |
| Functioning - other specific task | Other specific tasks, mostly caring for others (esp. grandchildren), but also being pregnant, using a computer, being well turned out, and for claimed alcoholics, being able to go for a week without drinking. | 3.0% | 0.6% | *[-4.8%, -0.1%]* |  | **0.04** |
| Misc. physical | Very varied catch-all code for anything left over - includes:>'Do physical tasks' (unspecified)> Twisting> Standing for long periods> ‘Participating fully at theme parks’ | 1.8% | 0.9% | *[-3.0%, 1.0%]* |  | 0.34 |
| Inconsistent functioning | Explicitly said that the person can sometimes do things and sometimes they can't (not as strong as 'only if they want to') | 2.2% | 0.6% | *[-3.9%, 0.8%]* |  | 0.19 |
| Can do things if wants to | That person concerned usually can't do X, but if they really want to do it then they can. Mostly used alongside other codes, but occasionally just used in general terms. Close to (but not quite as strong as) ‘specific deception’.  | 2.9% | 0.7% | *[-4.5%, 0.2%]* |  | 0.07 |
| **Deservingness: deception** | *Any of the below:* | **19.7%** | **13.1%** | ***[-13.6%, 0.2%]*** |  | **0.06** |
| Specific deception | Seeing people only using aids (e.g. crutches, walking stick, mobility scooter) when they're going to a benefits disability assessment or when visible to others. | 10.1% | 2.2% | *[-12.8%, -3.0%]* |  | **0.00** |
| Vague deception | Things like 'faking it', 'fools doctor', 'got better', 'malingering' without any detail. [Excludes 'not sick', which can mean a multitude of things, and is instead coded under ‘Healthy/not sick’. If says anything more detailed, should go under 'specific deception'].  | 9.3% | 9.8% | *[-4.8%, 5.8%]* |  | 0.86 |
| No medical evidence | Explicitly saying that there’s no medical evidence for what the person claims. | 1.3% | 2.1% | *[-1.4%, 3.0%]* |  | 0.47 |
| **Deservingness: admits** | *Any of the below:* | **8.9%** | **1.0%** | ***[-12.4%, -3.4%]*** |  | **0.00** |
| Admits fraud | People telling others that they are lying or exaggerating in order to get benefits. | 6.5% | 1.0% | *[-9.3%, -1.6%]* |  | **0.01** |
| Admits being well | People telling others that they are well / healthy (but without explicitly saying that they’re admitting fraud), e.g. ‘told me they were fine’. | 2.4% | 0.0% | *[-4.9%, 0.0%]* |  | 0.05 |
| **Deservingness: amount** | *Any of the below:* | **10.4%** | **4.5%** | ***[-10.5%, -1.2%]*** |  | **0.01** |
| Wealth / comfortable lifestyle | That the person does not seem to be in need, e.g. ‘family has nice cars/clothing’. | 3.2% | 1.3% | *[-4.5%, 0.8%]* |  | 0.17 |
| Mobility car (UK only) | In the UK, a number of justifications explicitly referred to people having a mobility car (which comes through a separate scheme). | 4.6% | 0.0% | *[-7.3%, -1.8%]* |  | **0.00** |
| Admits better-off on benefits | People telling others that they get more on benefits than they would working, or ‘told me they preferred not to work’ (hence some overlaps with ‘Lazy’). | 4.4% | 1.0% | *[-6.5%, -0.2%]* |  | **0.04** |
| Perceived to be better off on benefits | The respondent saying that they think the claimant is better-off on benefits, but not saying that the claimant themselves told others of this. | 0.0% | 2.2% | *[0.7%, 3.6%]* |  | **0.00** |
| **Deservingness: other** | *Any of the below:* | **15.2%** | **3.7%** | ***[-16.9%, -6.1%]*** |  | **0.00** |
| Drink/drugs/fags | Any mention of pubs, drinking or alcoholism, smoking, drugs. | 12.3% | 2.6% | *[-14.5%, -4.8%]* |  | **0.00** |
| Overweight | Any mention of overweight/obesity, whether or not this seems to be the reason for their disability benefit claim. | 2.9% | 0.4% | *[-5.0%, 0.0%]* |  | **0.05** |
| Migrants/refugees | Any mention of people being migrants or refugees (sometimes with an implication that people have not paid into the system, though coded here for any mention). | 0.0% | 1.0% | *[-0.1%, 2.1%]* |  | 0.09 |
| **Deservingness: efforts** | *Any of the below:* | **15.8%** | **34.2%** | ***[10.8%, 25.9%]*** |  | **0.00** |
| Lazy / lacking motivation | Any suggestion that the person is lazy, lacking motivation, or that their attitude is the reason that they are not working. | 13.5% | 26.2% | *[5.5%, 19.7%]* |  | **0.00** |
| Could work (blaming claimant) | Explicitly saying that the person could work if they tried harder to find work, putting the blame on the claimant. | 4.1% | 10.3% | *[1.9%, 10.4%]* |  | **0.00** |
| Not trying hard enough to get better | Not trying hard enough to either get better (whether general lifestyle or taking medication) or to undertake rehabilitation. | 0.0% | 2.4% | *[0.9%, 4.0%]* |  | **0.00** |
| Young | Claimant is young (sometimes with an implication that at their age they need to try harder to find work, though coded here for any mention). | 0.0% | 1.7% | *[0.6%, 2.8%]* |  | **0.00** |
| **Work capacity** | *Any of the below:* | **3.0%** | **22.6%** | ***[14.7%, 24.5%]*** |  | **0.00** |
| Could work (society's fault) | Saying that it's society's fault for not giving them more support – often expressed when explicitly saying that the person’s functioning is genuine. | 0.8% | 6.7% | *[2.9%, 8.9%]* |  | **0.00** |
| Could work (no blame) | Saying that the claimant could work, but giving no further detail that would blame either the claimant or society. | 2.2% | 12.1% | *[6.1%, 13.7%]* |  | **0.00** |
| Partial capacity/adapted work | Includes anything about partial work capacity, inc.:- could do adapted/reduced hrs work- could do some jobs/change career- needs support to work- where say that people are not very disabled so should be able to do some work | 0.3% | 14.9% | *[11.0%, 18.3%]* |  | **0.00** |
| **Other codes** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Claimant is working** | *Any of the below:* | **15.0%** | **12.5%** | ***[-8.9%, 3.9%]*** |  | **0.45** |
| Voluntary work | Doing voluntary work | 1.2% | 0.6% | *[-2.1%, 0.9%]* |  | 0.45 |
| Paid work (inc. allowed by system) | Doing paid work – mostly ‘cash in hand’ or ‘undeclared’ work, but sometimes that they are doing paid work that is allowed by the system. | 12.5% | 10.9% | *[-7.7%, 4.5%]* |  | 0.60 |
| Unspecified | Doing an activity for other people, but not saying explicitly whether they get paid for this or not. | 1.5% | 0.9% | *[-2.5%, 1.3%]* |  | 0.54 |
| **Deservingness: other** | *Any of the below:* | **5.6%** | **8.0%** | ***[-1.6%, 6.5%]*** |  | **0.23** |
| Educated | That the claimant is educated – either saying that the claimant is skilled, so could get some work; or that they’re educated and are too choosy about work. | 1.0% | 2.1% | *[-0.9%, 3.1%]* |  | 0.27 |
| System fault (Norway only) | That the benefits system is too lax, and people should have more frequent / more stringent disability assessments. | 0.0% | 3.5% | *[1.6%, 5.4%]* |  | **0.00** |
| Other deservingness-related | Anything else that is intelligible but not included in the codes above – primarily things about having worked in the past (implying that they have capacity to work now), having children (expressed as undeservingness), being an unpleasant person. | 4.6% | 2.5% | *[-5.2%, 1.0%]* |  | 0.18 |
| **Uncertain if ungenuine** | Where the respondent explicitly says that they are not certain if the person is non-genuine (but that they may be). | **2.1%** | **1.6%** | ***[-2.6%, 1.6%]*** |  | **0.64** |

## Appendix D: REFERENCE: Descriptive statistics

**Descriptive statistics (deservingness)**

Descriptive statistics for deservingness (the outcome in Studies 1-3) are given in the table below (using weighted data).

Table 5: Descriptive statistics for post-vignette questions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | **YouGov-UK** | **YouGov-Norway** |
|  | Missing | Response | 95% CI | Missing | Response | 95% CI |
| **Outcome variable** |  |   |   |  |   |   |
| Deservingness | 8% | 6.1 | *(6.0, 6.2)* | 7% | 7.0 | *(6.9, 7.0)* |

Histograms showing the full distribution of deservingness on the 0-10 scale are shown below. This shows that the distribution is highly skewed; the modal response is 10 (which can be interpreted as either judging that the respondent is highly deserving, or to refusing to make a deservingness judgement at all), but 70% (Norway) to 80% (UK) of respondents give deservingness ratings of less than the maximum.



**Descriptive statistics (benefit claims)**

As noted in the main paper, official statistics show that 2-3 times as many people claim disability benefits in Norway than in the UK (figures taken from the OECD Social Recipients Database (SOC R); the latest data available is for 2014):

* Work Assessment Allowance and Disability Benefits in Norway are claimed by 13.8% of the working-age population.
* From official Norwegian (NAV) data we can add a further group who are assessed as having reduced working capacity but who do not actually receive Work Assessment Allowance (instead receiving other support); adding this to the previous category suggests that roughly 15% of the working-age population in Norway are classified as having reduced working capacity.
* The equivalent figure for out-of-work disability benefits in the UK is 5.8% UK.

In the survey, I found even greater differences between the two countries; among working-age respondents in our survey, 24.5% say they currently claim disability benefits in Norway, compared to only 6.0% in the UK. It seems likely that part of the reason for the greater figure in Norway is due to interpreting my question too broadly (despite our explicit instructions).[[7]](#footnote-7)

**Descriptive statistics (control variables)**

Descriptive statistics for the sociodemographic variables in the YouGov data are given in the table below (using weighted data). Variables that are comparable between Norway and UK samples are put alongside one another; similarly labelled variables that are offset are not constructed in comparable ways:

Table 6: Descriptive statistics for control variables

|   | **YouGov-UK** | **YouGov-Norway** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Response | 95% CI | Response | 95% CI |
| **Sociodemographic variables** |   |   |   |   |
| **Gender** |   |   |   |   |
| Male | 48% | *(46.1, 50.7)* | 50% | *(47.7, 52.6)* |
| Female | 52% | *(49.3, 53.9)* | 50% | *(47.4, 52.3)* |
| **Age group** |   |  |   |  |
| 18to24 | 12% | *(10.1, 13.1)* | 16% | *(13.7, 17.7)* |
| 25to34 | 16% | *(14.6, 18.1)* | 13% | *(11.7, 15.0)* |
| 35to44 | 16% | *(13.8, 17.3)* | 16% | *(14.0, 17.4)* |
| 45to54 | 17% | *(15.3, 18.9)* | 19% | *(17.3, 21.0)* |
| 55to64 | 18% | *(16.7, 20.2)* | 20% | *(18.3, 22.2)* |
| 65to74 | 17% | *(15.7, 19.0)* | 14% | *(11.9, 15.2)* |
| 75+ | 4% | *(2.9, 4.5)* | 2% | *(1.6, 3.0)* |
| **Marital status** |   |  |   |  |
| Married/cohabiting | 58% | *(55.3, 59.9)* | 57% | *(54.6, 59.6)* |
| Separated/divorced/widowed | 13% | *(11.2, 14.3)* | 10% | *(8.9, 11.9)* |
| Never married | 30% | *(27.5, 31.8)* | 33% | *(30.1, 34.9)* |
| **Children in the household** |   |  |   |  |
| None | 74% | *(71.8, 76.0)* | 78% | *(76.5, 80.4)* |
| 1 child | 12% | *(10.4, 13.6)* | 10% | *(8.5, 11.3)* |
| 2 or more | 12% | *(10.5, 13.6)* | 12% | *(10.2, 13.2)* |
| *(Don't know/refused)* | 2% | *(1.3, 2.8)* |   |  |
| **Working status (UK version)** |   |  |   |  |
| Working | 53% | *(50.6, 55.2)* |   |  |
| Unemployed | 5% | *(3.7, 5.8)* |   |  |
| Student | 7% | *(6.1, 8.4)* |   |  |
| Other inactive | 35% | *(32.9, 37.3)* |   |  |
| **Working status (Norway version)** |   |  |   |  |
| Working |   |  | 46% | *(44.1, 48.9)* |
| Unemployed |   |  | 17% | *(14.8, 18.7)* |
| Student |   |  | 14% | *(11.7, 15.4)* |
| Other inactive |   |  | 23% | *(21.1, 25.3)* |
| **Education (UK version)** |   |  |   |  |
| Less than GCSEs | 22% | *(19.7, 23.5)* |   |  |
| GCSEs or A-levels | 40% | *(37.3, 41.8)* |   |  |
| Degree or other HE | 35% | *(32.4, 36.9)* |   |  |
| **Education (Norway version)** |   |  |   |  |
| Primary school |   |  | 25% | *(22.3, 27.6)* |
| Secondary school |   |  | 42% | *(39.5, 44.1)* |
| University-level |   |  | 33% | *(31.1, 35.4)* |
| **Incapacity benefits** |   |  |   |  |
| Currently claiming | 5% | *(3.7, 5.7)* | 21% | *(18.5, 22.7)* |
| **Does illness/disability limit activity** |   |  |   |  |
| Yes, a lot | 10% | *(8.6, 11.3)* | 16% | *(13.8, 17.5)* |
| Yes, a little | 22% | *(19.8, 23.6)* | 27% | *(24.8, 29.3)* |
| None | 64% | *(61.6, 66.2)* | 53% | *(50.2, 55.1)* |
| *(Don't know/refused)* | *4%* | *(3.3, 5.5)* | *5%* | *(3.5, 5.8)* |
| *Sample size* | *1,973* |  | *1,988* |  |

## Appendix E: REFERENCE: Methodology for UK-Norway YouGov 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](http://web.archive.org/web/20141113110233/http%3A//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,[[8]](#footnote-8) 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.[[9]](#footnote-9) 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, I supplemented the YouGov panel with members of a separate panel with a similar methodology and quality standards owned by a different panel provider (Userneeds), with the appropriate background information for weighting and analysis collected specifically for this project.

### Response rate and non-completion

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. I 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 the experimental conditions used in Study 3. Non-response bias in response to particular experimental conditions therefore seems likely to be negligible.

### 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.

## Appendix F: REFERENCE: Question full text (Study 1)

### Experimental manipulation

As explained in the main text, our experimental manipulation in Study 1 is taken from a study by Rob Ford and colleagues. That is, a random half of the respondents were shown the following story (the remaining half of respondents moved straight onto the next question):

Figure 1: Mock story used for survey experiment



I also asked a follow-up question following the story. This was done to discourage respondents from consciously connecting the experimental manipulation to the vignettes that followed (i.e. so that there was another apparent purpose to presenting them with the story above). Respondents who saw the story were therefore asked:

 *How often have you personally read articles like this in a newspaper (either hardcopy or online)?*

*Very often*

*Quite often*

*Not that often*

*Very rarely*

*Never seen an article like this*

### Vignettes

I then tested whether the experimental manipulation above influenced how respondents evaluated the deservingness of a vignette claimant that they are presented with – which I refer to as ‘hypothetical contact’. All respondents were given three vignettes with randomly allocated characteristics as follows.

#### Disability vignettes

The vignette text was adapted from previous studies, and (for symptoms and retrospective 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 5 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 (the maximum number we could include for reasons of space, given the number of follow-on questions after each vignette, and the other questions within the survey).

Effectively all of the vignette text was randomly varied, according to the following eight elements (the text that was included in the sample vignette above is presented first, in red type):

|  |
| --- |
| **Symptom severity & retrospective control** |
| **Symptom severity 1: Depression** o Started mostly feeling heavy and joyless, finding it difficult to get out of bedo 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 2: Back pain****Retrospective control: Low (Car accident)**o Was in a severe car accident, and now has severe pain in his back and legso Can’t walk 100m in one go, or raise either arm above head height, or lift light bulky objectso Finds it hard to concentrate, but can still stay sitting down for a while and use a keyboard/mouse |
| **Symptom severity 2: Back pain****Retrospective control: High (Overweight)**o Has been overweight all his life, and now has severe pain in his back and legso Can’t walk 100m in one go, or raise either arm above head height, or lift light bulky objectso Finds it hard to concentrate, but can still stay sitting down for a while and use a keyboard/mouse |
| **Symptom severity 3: 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 downo Can use his arms as normal, but uses a thin tube ('catheter') to empty his bladder during the dayo Can get around easily using a wheelchair to anywhere that is wheelchair-accessible |
| **Symptom severity 4: Schizophrenia****Retrospective control: Low (Trauma)**o Suffered the trauma of the death of his sono Started hearing voices even though no one else was around, which told him what to do and thinko 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 drugso Started hearing voices even though no one else was around, which told him what to do and thinko 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 bodyo Finds it difficult to sleep, feels tired most of the time, and can't think straighto The pain stops him from moving around or doing everyday tasks around the house |
| **Other characteristics** |
| **Medicalisation**In the sample vignette above, this is the 3 lines of further indented text starting, “Started mostly feeling heavy and joyless…”• 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): depression / sciatica & dorsalgia / sciatica & dorsalgia / paraplegia / 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] she was working• …has worked all her 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 capacity (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.

I 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 (which involves some duplication), the final sample size necessary to achieve the full vignette universe was 1,998 (Norway) and 1,973 (UK).

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).

#### Vignette outcomes

Eight questions were asked after each of the disability vignettes; our focus here is the main outcome of ‘deservingness’;[[10]](#footnote-10) using an 11-point scale in line with the recommendations of Auspurg & Hinz 2015).

*In your opinion, does [name] \*\*deserve\*\* to receive support from the Government while [he/she] is out-of-work?*

*0 - Definitely does \*\*not\*\* deserve support*

*to*

*10 - Definitely \*\*does\*\* deserve support*

*Don't know*

### Sociodemographic controls

These are used in sensitivity analyses only; their details are listed in Appendix G.

### Attention checks

The problem with experimental studies that include people who are not paying attention is that this introduces additional noise into the analyses, which serve to attenuate the resulting effects (Berinsky *et al.*, 2014). The use of timing data is standard in experimental analyses to check that people are reading the treatments (Mutz, 2011), and Berinsky et al further show that ‘instructional manipulation checks’ are an effective way of focussing on those respondents who were paying attention to the experimental treatment. It is worth noting that these attention checks do not necessarily lead to improved estimates; Montgomery et al 2018) caution against using any post-treatment variables that can interfere with the (average) unbiasedness of the experimental manipulation.

Based on Berinsky et al, I used two experimental checks in our YouGov study, one at the start and one near the end of the study:

***Instructional manipulation check #1 [near the start]***

*When a major news story happens, people often go online to get up-to-the-minute details on what is going on. We want to know which websites people trust to get this information. We also want to know if people are paying attention to the question. To show that you’ve read this much, please ignore the question and select The Huffington Post and Daily Mail Website as your two answers. That's right, ignore the rest of the question and just select The Huffington Post and Daily Mail Website.*

*When there is a big news story, which is the one news website you would visit first? (Please only choose one)*

*BBC News Online | Sky News website | Daily Mail website | Guardian website | Sun website | Huffington Post | None of these websites*

***Instructional manipulation check #2 [near the end]***

*People are very busy these days and many do not have time to follow what goes on in politics. Some do pay attention but do not read questions carefully. To show that you've read this much, please select both 'extremely interested' and 'not at all interested'. That's right, just select both 'extremely interested' and 'not at all interested' and ignore the actual question instructions below.*

*How interested are you in information about what's going on in politics?*

*Extremely interested | Very interested | Moderately interested | Slightly interested | Not interested at all.*

Based on the timing and attention screens, I do two further sensitivity analyses on all of the analyses reported in the main paper. Firstly, based on the timing data for the vignette pages, I exclude those who spent less than 8 seconds (disability vignettes) / 6 seconds (unemployment vignettes) on the relevant page. This overlapped strongly with the attention screens – only 0.6% of those passing both attention screens took less than these benchmarks, compared to 16.6% of those failing both screens – and the main concern is to capture the spike of respondents taking 0-2 seconds, as shown in Figure 2 below. 11.8% of the YouGov-NO sample and 6.1% of the YouGov-UK sample were excluded from these analyses.

Figure 2: Timing data for first disability vignette page

for the YouGov samples, in seconds



In a second sensitivity analysis, I also exclude those who failed both instructional manipulation checks. This is 50.8% of the YouGov-NO sample and 42.8% of the YouGov-UK sample (only 24.1% and 33.9% respectively passed both checks).

The results of both sensitivity analyses are given in Appendix A above.

## Appendix G: REFERENCE: Question full text (Studies 2 & 3)

### Questions on interpersonal contact

The following questions were asked about people’s contact with incapacity benefit claimants:[[11]](#footnote-11)

KNOW ANY: “*Do you personally know anyone that currently receives incapacity benefits, or has received them in the past 12 months? [This includes people you think have probably claimed, even if you are not completely sure]. Please tick all that apply:*

 *No, I do not know anyone who has claimed incapacity benefits in the past 12 months*

 *Yes - a member of my close family*

 *Yes - a member of my distant family*

 *Yes - a close friend*

 *Yes - a neighbour*

 *Yes - someone else (please specify)”*

KNOW NON-GENUINE: “*Do you know of any incapacity benefit claimants who you think are NOT GENUINELY SICK OR DISABLED? Please tick all that apply:*

 *No, I do not know any incapacity benefit claimants who I think are not genuinely disabled*

 *Yes - a member of my close family*

 *Yes - a member of my distant family*

 *Yes - a close friend*

 *Yes - a neighbour*

 *Yes - someone else (please specify)”*

REASONS FOR PERCEPTION: *“Think of the non-genuine claimant that you know best. How could you tell that they were not a genuine claimant? Please write as full an explanation as you can in the text box below.”*

In the text I omit any mentions of the ‘someone else’ category. I decided to ignore this category after checking the associated free text responses that respondents gave to explain it – it most commonly referred to acquaintances, but sometimes referred to the respondent’s own claim, and at other times referred to generalised hearsay rather than a particular instance of interpersonal contact.

### Sociodemographic questions

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, I 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]. I 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, I use a simple dummy variable for ‘working’ vs. all other statuses. |

We also asked two sociodemographic and two political questions in the survey:

| **Measure** | **Details** |
| --- | --- |
| Disability | *“Are you hampered in your daily activities in any way by any longstanding illness, or disability, infirmity or mental health problem?”* The response options were: Yes, a lot | Yes, to some extent | No | Don't know (treated as missing). |
| Own incapacity benefit claims | *“Have you ever \*\*tried\*\* to claim incapacity benefits yourself?”.* The response options were:* *I currently receive incapacity benefits*
* *I have tried to claim them in the past 12 months*
* *I have tried to claim them in the past 5 years*
* *I have tried to claim them more than 5 years ago*
* *I have never tried to claim incapacity benefits*

For our analysis, I use a dummy for those saying ‘I currently receive incapacity benefits’. |
| Left-right Ideology | This uses a measure adapted from the European social survey: “*In politics people sometimes talk of 'left' and 'right'. Where would you place yourself on this scale?”*, with the scale ranging from ‘*0 - Extreme Left’* to ‘*10 - Extreme Right’*.  |
| Social trust | This uses a measure adapted from the European social survey: *“Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people?”,* with the scale ranging from ‘*0 you can’t be too careful’* to *‘10 most people can be trusted’.*  |

##

## Appendix H: REFERENCE: Tables underlying figures (Studies 1-3)

### Study 2 further results

Figure 2 in the main text shows the relationship between newspaper negativity and the perception of non-genuineness. These are shown visually in the main paper; this refers to the following results (left-hand column\_:

Table 7: Perceived contact with a non-genuine disability benefit claimant: newspaper negativity, UK only

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | **Main model** | **Additional controls for trust & ideology** |
|   | Effect  | 95% CI | Effect  | 95% CI |
| *Effect of 1 unit of media negativity (0-100%) for…* |
| Close family | 0.1% | (-0.3, 0.6) | 0.0% | (-0.5, 0.5) |
| Close friends | 0.4% | (-0.2, 1.0) | 0.2% | (-0.6, 1.0) |
| Distant family | 1.1% | (0.3, 1.9) | 1.2% | (0.3, 2.1) |
| Neighbours | 2.1% | (1.0, 3.1) | 1.6% | (0.75, 2.5) |

Data: UK of YouGov survey 2017; samples sizes are 615 observations from 547 people.

This table also includes the results for the additional analyses that further control for social trust and left-right ideology (right-hand column).

The coefficients on the control variables in the underlying regression model (rather than presenting average marginal effects, as used in the tables in the main paper / just above) are as follows – note that each control variable was allowed to vary by relationship type, hence there are e.g. four coefficients for the control variable ‘male’:

Table 8: Coefficient on control variables underlying Error! Reference source not found.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Close family(effect, 95% CI) | Close friends(effect, 95% CI) | Distant family(effect, 95% CI) | Neighbours(effect, 95% CI) |
| ***Newspaper negativity*** |
| **Male** vs. female | 0.0 | (-1.0, 1.0) | 0.1 | (-1.0, 1.1) | -0.6 | (-2.1, 0.9) | -0.8 | (-2.2, 0.5) |
| **Age group** |  |   |  |   |  |   |  |  |
| 18-34 | (base) |  |   |  |   |  |  |
| 35-44 | -0.4 | (-2.3, 1.6) | 0.9 | (-0.8, 2.6) | 0.5 | (-1.7, 2.7) | 2.0 | (0.1, 3.9) |
| 45-54 | -1.6 | (-4.3, 1.1) | -1.6 | (-4.1, 0.8) | 1.5 | (-0.6, 3.6) | 0.7 | (-1.5, 2.8) |
| 55-64 | 0.8 | (-0.9, 2.5) | 0.5 | (-1.2, 2.2) | 0.3 | (-1.9, 2.5) | 0.5 | (-1.7, 2.8) |
| 65+ | 0.7 | (-1.0, 2.5) | 1.0 | (-0.7, 2.7) | 0.5 | (-2.3, 3.2) | 1.8 | (-0.7, 4.2) |
| **Marital status** |  |   |  |   |  |   |  |  |
| Married/cohabiting | (base) |  |   |  |   |  |  |
| Separated/widowed | -0.9 | (-2.6, 0.8) | 0.3 | (-0.9, 1.5) | -0.4 | (-2.1, 1.3) | -0.3 | (-2.1, 1.5) |
| Never married | -1.0 | (-3.0, 1.0) | -0.1 | (-1.3, 1.0) | 0.8 | (-0.8, 2.4) | -0.8 | (-2.4, 0.7) |
| **Any children** | 0.0 | (0.0, 0.0) | 0.0 | (0.0, 0.0) | 0.0 | (0.0, 0.0) | 0.0 | (0.0, 0.0) |
| **Any disability** | -1.2 | (-2.7, 0.3) | 0.2 | (-1.2, 1.6) | -1.8 | (-5.5, 1.9) | -2.7 | (-5.3, -0.1) |
| **Claims benefits** | 0.0 | (0.0, 0.0) | 0.0 | (0.0, 0.0) | 0.0 | (0.0, 0.0) | 0.0 | (0.0, 0.0) |
| **Education** |  |   |  |   |  |   |  |  |
| <GCSEs | (base) |  |   |  |   |  |  |
| GCSE/A-levels | 0.5 | (-0.8, 1.7) | 0.4 | (-1.0, 1.7) | 0.3 | (-1.5, 2.0) | -1.4 | (-3.1, 0.4) |
| Degree or other HE | 0.4 | (-1.0, 1.8) | 0.0 | (-1.3, 1.3) | -0.5 | (-2.1, 1.1) | -0.4 | (-1.8, 1.1) |
| **Working** | 0.6 | (-0.4, 1.6) | 0.4 | (-0.8, 1.5) | 0.3 | (-1.4, 2.1) | 0.2 | (-0.9, 1.3) |
| **Relationship type** |  | (base) | -0.6 | (-6.6, 5.4) | -3.5 | (-9.8, 2.7) | -8.1 | (-17.6, 1.4) |
| **Reads any newspaper** | 0.3 | (-1.3, 1.9) | -0.6 | (-2.0, 0.8) | -2.3 | (-4.9, 0.3) | -2.8 | (-5.6, 0.1) |
| **Newspaper negativity** (per unit) | 0.02 | (-0.04, 0.07) | 0.03 | (-0.02, 0.08) | 0.08 | (0.03, 0.14) | 0.18 | (0.06, 0.29) |
| Constant term | -3.6 |   |  |   |  |   |  |  |
| Observations | 615 |   |  |   |  |   |  |  |
| Individuals | 547 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

### Study 3 further results

The main text presents a figure showing perceptions of non-genuineness for each type of social relationship in each of the UK and Norway; the underlying table is as follows:

Table 9: Perceived contact with a non-genuine disability benefit claimant (as % of knowing any claimant in this category), UK vs. Norway

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | **UK** | **Norway** | **Difference** |
|   | Effect  | 95% CI | Effect  | 95% CI | Effect  | 95% CI |
| Close family | 10.7% | (6.7, 14.6) | 14.8% | (11.7, 18.0) | 4.2% | (-0.9, 9.2) |
| Close friends | 18.7% | (12.8, 24.6) | 25.1% | (20.7, 29.4) | 6.3% | (-1.0, 13.7) |
| Distant family | 22.1% | (13.2, 30.9) | 29.1% | (22.1, 36.1) | 7.1% | (-4.2, 18.4) |
| Neighbours | 31.7% | (22.7, 40.8) | 29.3% | (21.8, 36.9) | -2.4% | (-14.1, 9.3) |

## Appendix I: Guide to replication data & code

The datasets collected specifically for this project are freely and publicly available at OSF (the project is at <https://osf.io/sn6m8/?view_only=f938d656c4e9416f93a372171cf0b2a5>). (This data deposit also includes the Stata code used to analyse the data, and Norwegian translations of the survey).

**Please read the file 0\_readme before starting to use any of the materials in this deposit.**

(Note that an earlier version of the YouGov/NatCen files is publicly available at <https://reshare.ukdataservice.ac.uk/853231/>. However, this does not include certain derived variables, and therefore cannot be used to replicate the analyses in this paper. The dataset is also made available in the replication file for a separate paper, available at OSF from <https://osf.io/94hck/>).

If you have any problems or spot any errors, then please do not hesitate to get in touch with me (currently at ben.geiger@kcl.ac.uk) and I will try to help as best I can. But this should not be necessary – as of today (12th July 2023), I have tested the replication files and they work without errors, so I hope they work for you too!
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1. The Appendices are available from <https://wwwturn2us-2938.cdn.hybridcloudspan.com/T2UWebsite/media/Documents/Appendices-Benefits-Stigma-in-Britain.pdf> (Archived by WebCite® at <http://www.webcitation.org/73BLnihE8>). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The Sun, Telegraph and Express are only included from 2000, and the Express is missing 2006-2008. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The Nexis search was: ‘benefits’ at the start of the article, AND ‘welfare’ OR ‘social security’ OR ‘dole’ anywhere in the article, with ‘moderate similarity’ duplicates excluded. Gaffney et al report that they chose this search to maximise specificity as well as sensitivity – that is, the term ‘benefits’ alone is not specific because it is often used as an antonym to ‘risks’. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. i.e. news, feature, opinion piece, letter, other, [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. i.e. policy, statistics, human interest, other. For articles that used a statistical newshook, they also coded the source of the statistic (government, organisation, political party etc). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. They note, *“The themes we chose were based on our own reading of newspaper coverage on benefits (and are therefore no doubt influenced by stories which have been prominent in recent years – had we been doing this in the early 2000s or mid 1990s we might well have chosen a different set of themes).”* [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. It seems likely that this includes sickness benefits, which in Norway are paid from the Government after about three weeks (rather than in the UK, where they are paid through the employer), and which were claimed by 7.8% of the population in 2017 – see [https://www.nav.no/no/NAV+og+samfunn/Statistikk/Sykefravar+-+statistikk/Tabeller/sykepengetilfeller-betalt-av-folketrygden.1-kvartal-2003-2018.antall](https://www.nav.no/no/NAV%2Bog%2Bsamfunn/Statistikk/Sykefravar%2B-%2Bstatistikk/Tabeller/sykepengetilfeller-betalt-av-folketrygden.1-kvartal-2003-2018.antall).

It is also worth noting that more of the reported disability benefits claimants in Norway are working than in the UK (18.7% vs. 6.0%), although the proportion of the Norwegian working-age population who claim disability benefits *and* are not working is still relatively high (19.9%). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. 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-8)
9. 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-9)
10. The other seven outcomes were not relevant – these were (i) whether the vignette is a ‘typical’ claimant; (ii) whether they would be eligible for incapacity benefits; (iii) how easy it would be for them to get a job if they wanted one; (iv) how much they should receive per week (UK only); and how much their benefits should be cut if they (v) sometimes turns up late for meetings at the Jobcentre; (vi) refuse to do suitable training or rehabilitation; (vii) doesn't apply for a job as they disagrees with the Jobcentre that they are capable of doing it. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. To clarify the meaning of ‘incapacity benefits’, we say at the start of the UK survey:

*This survey mainly asks about \*\*incapacity benefits\*\* - the out-of-work benefits paid to working-age people who are not working because of long-term sickness or disability (currently called 'ESA'). We are \*\*not\*\* asking about benefits that cover disabled people's extra costs of travel or other everyday activities, which are paid to people whether or not they work ('PIP' or 'DLA'). In the survey, you can hover over the phrase 'incapacity benefits' where it is underlined if you want to see this definition again.*

The start of the Norway survey analogously referred to ‘arbeidsavklaringspenger og uføretrygd’ – referring to Work Assessment Allowance and the permanent disability benefit, but excluding sickness benefits (which in Norway can last up to one year). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)