# Web Appendices for Baumberg (2012) in *Journal of Poverty and Social Justice*

The article refers to the appendices for three analyses, all of which use the publicly available British Social Attitudes datasets from the UK Data Service (weighted using the supplied weight WTFACTOR). Following standard academic practice, although unlike the policy in the British Social Attitudes reports themselves, missing data is excluded from the displayed percentages – see the BSA reports for an analysis that also takes into account changing item non-response (refusal / don’t knows) over time.

## Figure 1

The note under Figure 1 in the text notes, *“Source: author’s analysis of British Social Attitudes data, accessed via the UK Data Archive (details on variables, weights etc. are given in the Web Appendix).”* Details of the two variables are given in this section.

The variable labelled ‘Many claim falsely (agree)’ in the Figure is the variable FALSECLM in the dataset, based on the following question:

*I will read two statements. For each one please say whether you agree or disagree. Firstly... Large numbers of people these days falsely claim benefits. IF AGREE OR DISAGREE: Strongly or slightly?*

*Response options:*

*1 Agree strongly*

*2 Agree slightly*

*3 Disagree slightly*

*4 Disagree strongly*

The variable labelled ‘Unemployment benefits too high and discourage work (agree)’ is the variable DOLE, based on the following question:

*Opinions differ about the level of benefits for unemployed people. Which of these two statements comes closest to your own view ...READ OUT...*

*1 ...benefits for unemployed people are too low and cause hardship,*

*2 or, benefits for unemployed people are too high and discourage them from finding jobs?*

*3 (Neither)*

## Footnote 7

The text notes, *"before the crisis, the public thought that as many as 37 out of every 100 sickness/claimants were falsely claiming7"* Footnote 7 then said, *“Author’s analysis of BSA 2007 data, accessed via the UK Data Archive (details on variables, weights etc are given in the Web Appendix).”*

These data have since been more fully analysed in the report Baumberg et al (2012), *Benefits Stigma in Britain*, page 29. Please see [www.benbaumberg.com/publications](http://www.benbaumberg.com/publications) for further details and links to the report and its own appendices.

## Footnote 8

The text notes, *"Using the same data, but focusing on the belief that large numbers of people falsely claim benefits,8 I find that Labour identifiers were 12% more positive than non-Labour identifiers from 1983 to 1994, but only 6% more positive between 1998 and 2008. Similarly, the Labour versus non-Labour gap for believing that unemployment benefits are too low and cause hardship was 27% before 1997 and 11% after 1997."* Footnote 8 then says, *“BSA data; further details available from the Web Appendix at* [*www.benbaumberg.com*](http://www.benbaumberg.com)*”*

The questions on perceptions of false claims and that unemployment benefits are too low are the same as described above. The new part of the analysis is the use of Labour vs. non-Labour identifiers. This comes from the variable PARTYID2, a derived variable from the British Social Attitudes team supplied with the data, based on the following questions:

*SUPPARTY: Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a supporter of any one political party?*

*CLOSEPTY: Do you think of yourself as a little closer to one political party than to the others?*

*[If yes to either question] PARTYFW: Which one?*

*[Else] PARTYFW: If there were a general election tomorrow, which political party do you think you would be most likely to support?*

For the analysis mentioned above, I compared Labour identifiers (people responding ‘Labour’ to any of the questions above) vs. all others. The prevalence of Labour identification (and the gap between Labour identifiers and non-identifiers for the two questions above) is as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | ***Labour vs. non-Labour gap*** | |
| **Year** | **Labour  identifiers** | Falsely  claiming | Unemp bens  too low |
| 1983 | 33% | 10% | 27% |
| 1984 | 35% | 11% | 25% |
| 1985 | 36% | 15% | 33% |
| 1986 | 35% | 11% | 29% |
| 1987 | 29% | 12% | 30% |
| 1989 | 34% | 11% | 30% |
| 1990 | 39% | 13% | 30% |
| 1991 | 35% |  | 27% |
| 1993 | 38% |  | 23% |
| 1994 | 40% | 10% | 23% |
| 1995 | 44% |  | 28% |
| 1996 | 42% |  | 24% |
| ***1997*** | ***42%*** |  | ***22%*** |
| 1998 | 45% | 5% | 15% |
| 1999 | 43% | 4% | 8% |
| 2000 | 40% | 6% | 19% |
| 2001 | 45% | 4% | 11% |
| 2002 | 41% | 7% | 11% |
| 2003 | 37% | 4% | 9% |
| 2004 | 32% | 5% | 12% |
| 2005 | 40% |  | 10% |
| 2006 | 33% | 6% | 11% |
| 2007 | 34% |  | 8% |
| 2008 | 27% | 8% | 9% |
| 2009 | 26% |  | 14% |