# <u>UK democratic forums – Report</u>

This preliminary report offers a rough analysis of data from the democratic forums in the United Kingdom, based on the initial round of coding agreed during the second co-ordination conference held in Copenhagen. It highlights the key issues discussed in all sessions; who were the most active participants; it summarises the key attitudes; and summarises statements on responsibility. Some additional thoughts are included for each breakout group, such as key statements, possible explanations, and issues that need some particular attention. The analysis of statements made during plenary sessions is more qualitative, as they did not offer the best environment for debating ideas.

The orange and green breakout groups were coded by Ben, while the yellow group was coded by our research assistant Owen. The additional thoughts for the yellow group were added by Ben, based on Owen's work.

Five country-specific issues were included as nodes, as they seemed to be discussed quite often in various sessions: zero-hours contracts; apprenticeships; housing; national service; and volunteering.

## 1. <u>Plenary sessions</u>

On **Day 1**, the <u>morning plenary</u> session aimed at understanding what people think of when they hear about 'welfare'. The first statements indicated that 'welfare' is strongly linked to 'social care and support'. Further key issues discussed include unemployment healthcare, education, childcare and old-age pensions (in that particular order). A series of challenges to welfare were also mentioned by participants: people abusing benefits and pejorative media coverage, the lack of self-reliance for many people, and lack of resources. Immigration only came up after eight minutes of discussion. Further to this brainstorm session which lasted around twenty minutes, participants selected the issues they consider as most important for the future. The five selected themes were:

    a. Immigration
    b. Lack of money (i.e. welfare state financing)
    c. Unemployment
    d. Overcrowding/ageing population
    e. Lack of/access to education

The <u>afternoon plenary</u> session allowed for all participants to exchange their views and summarise the discussions that took place during the breakout sessions. As expected, there was not much discussion in this plenary session, as participants just listen to each other. There was an overall consensus on the following:

- Immigration: leads to overcrowding and housing problems, strain on the NHS, education and the social safety net. Solution: establishing quotas (i.e. selective immigration), using a points-based system like in Australia. Immigrants who have already settled in the UK should learn English. The security argument against immigration was also mentioned.
- Lack of money: participants criticised the lack of transparency over government spending ("we don't know where the money is going"), thus asking for more accountability and more transparency from the government. Foreign aid should be cut down. In addition, the current system is being abused by some people: participants know or have heard of people abusing the system, "sitting on their bums and not doing anything"/"sitting on benefits", and say it is not

fair. Apprenticeships could be the solution for people to gain experience. Emphasis on education and training. Overall consensus on 'earning' benefits. Some participants say they would be ready to pay more tax if they knew it would help create jobs and apprenticeships for others.

- Unemployment: here again, participants stated that "the current system effectively encourages people to stay out of employment". Apprenticeships are perceived as a good policy. Zero-hours contracts are heavily criticised. Unemployment is also linked to the lack of education. Here again, participants believe that the way to fight against unemployment is through education, apprenticeships and training opportunities.

- Overcrowding and ageing population: as the population lives longer it creates a series of challenges in terms of labour market, housing and pensions. Privatising pensions is seen as a viable solution to put less strain on the state. Support for the elderly should be increased. As mentioned by a participant: "if we're going to teach our younger children now to work, there should be more money coming in and that money that's come from the unemployed, that's not getting paid there, should go to the elderly". Most of the plenary discussion focused on retirement villages.

- Lack of/access to education: higher education is too expensive and is likely to increase the gap between the rich and the poor. Participants also emphasised the need to learn 'life' skills and not only academic skills. Teachers are under a lot of stress and should be granted more authority and support. Some participants blamed parents who do not educate their children well, and say that education should be provided both at school and at home. For children, the notion of discipline is often mentioned.

At the end of this plenary session, participants mentioned what kind of information they want to be covered in the stimulus. The following were requested: statistics on immigration, demography, expected increase of population and government expenditure.

On **Day 2**, the morning plenary session started with a presentation of the stimulus by Peter, followed by questions from participants. Most of the discussion focused on taxation and tax avoidance from big corporations, education and parenting skills. One of the key statements made by one participants is related to the lack of social investment policies: "I think for me it's surprising how reactive we are as a country rather than proactive in terms of problem solving because when you look at where our money's being grown it's being thrown problems now. It's not being invested in areas where actually they need to either develop or we're forecasting problems for the future, education being the main one really. I'm gobsmacked we spend a lot less".

The afternoon plenary session consisted of participants presenting the policies discussed during breakout sessions. The first half of the plenary session did not lead to strong debates and discussions between participants. Here is the list of policies proposed by participants:

- Income inequality:
  - Make multinational companies employ a certain percentage of UK residents;
  - Cutting down benefits: people in work should always earn more than people that are on benefits by 25 per cent (one participant somewhat disagreed);
  - Obligation for people to pay a percentage of their wage into a private pension scheme (one participant disagreed);
  - Applied qualifications at GCSE level (16 years old) for students that are less academically able;
  - Pay rise/bonus caps for large corporation high earners (two participants disagreed);
- Immigration:

- o Deporting criminals;
- o Setting a points-based system for immigration (<u>common to all three breakout groups</u>): potential immigrants "must have language, a promise of a job, be able to employ people, no health issues, no criminal record, money in the bank, that sort of thing. Incomers need to bring something to the system";
- o An immigrant's employer should help pay for any healthcare they might need for a period of two years or so, "until they've paid into [the system] sufficiently";
- o No benefits for immigrants before residing in the country for a period of two to five years (one participant disagreed);
- o Introducing an ID card so that immigrants can be tracked when they use healthcare services in the UK (some participants disagreed).

- Gender:
  - o Flexible maternity/paternity leave "so the mother and father can choose which percentage has maternity leave", and possibility to take leave 'in blocks';
  - o Parents going on maternity/paternity leave should stay in touch with their employer on a regular basis (highly debated, disagreement between several participants);
  - o Compulsory volunteering work for unemployed mothers claiming free childcare (common to two breakout groups): "we don't want the child to suffer, we still want them to have free childcare, but we also believe that people that are getting benefits should also go and do some voluntary work at least because they're not earning";
  - o Larger corporations to offer crèche facilities with flexible hours (disagreement between participants on the feasibility);
  - o Equal pay for like for like jobs to fight against the gender pay gap.

- Intergenerational issues:
  - o Increase the retirement age between 70 and 75 (high level of disagreement between participants);
  - o Abolishing the state pension and private pensions should be compulsory (disagreement between the orange and green groups);
  - o Keeping the state pension (green group) and enforcing National Insurance contributions for all employed people;
  - o Keeping the current retirement age (green group);
  - o Phased and/or flexible retirement;
  - o Taxing unhealthy food.

- Labour market:
  - o Abolishing zero-hours contracts (overall consensus);
  - o Priority for UK nationals over available jobs in the UK. Following discussions between participants, the policy was changed as "making sure that a certain percentage of UK nationals are shortlisted for job interviews";
  - o More work-based training for children at school (no discussion);
  - o Mandatory national service for all young, unemployed people under the age of 21;
  - o Expanding the manufacturing sector in order to bring a balance between the financial and the non-financial sectors (slight disagreement);
  - o Reduced VAT on UK products to encourage people to buy British (agreement but some participants disagreed: "if you want a strong economy like Germany, you need a global market for everything and it needs to all work in unison");
  - o Regulating and maintaining trade unions, making sure that the unions are suitable for the businesses.

Towards the end of the plenary session, participants discussed about the European Union. Participants have mixed views, with some stating it would be damaging to leave the EU and others seeing economic opportunities. Finally, participants reflected on the event and wrote down some thoughts to be included in the suggestion box.

*Note: individual statements are yet to be identified in the database attached to this email.*

## 2. <u>**Orange breakout group (self-employed)**</u>

**<u>Top themes discussed:</u>**

|  | Orange group - self-employed |
|---|---|
| 1 : Labour market | 326 |
| 2 : Income inequality | 293 |
| 3 : Education | 251 |
| 4 : Intergenerational issues | 234 |
| 5 : Immigration | 191 |
| 6 : Old-age pensions | 172 |
| 7 : Social safety net | 137 |
| 8 : Taxation | 136 |
| 9 : Welfare state financing | 115 |
| 10 : Childcare and parenting | 109 |
| 11 : Other - various | 96 |
| 12 : Gender | 78 |
| 13 : Healthcare | 78 |
| 14 : Unemployment | 66 |
| 15 : Funding and or financing priority | 57 |
| 16 : Productivity | 54 |
| 17 : Zero-hours contracts | 39 |
| 18 : Housing | 34 |
| 19 : Volunteering | 21 |
| 20 : Apprenticeships | 14 |
| 21 : National service | 6 |

**<u>Most active participants:</u>**

1. Participant 84 (294 references)
   White British male, 50, self-employed recruitment director, Conservative, middle of the political spectrum, 2 children
2. Participant 80 (228 references)
   White British female, 51, stock controller part-time, Conservative, don't know about political spectrum, 2 children
3. Participant 89 (195 references)
   Black British male, 45, self-employed carpenter, Labour, middle, 1 child
4. Participant 88 (166 references)
   White British male, 32, bank manager, unknown vote, middle, 1 child
5. Participant 90 (96 references)
   Polish female, 27, self-employed legal secretary, Conservative, left, no children
6. Participant 86 (78 references)
   White British male, 27, Virgin Trains Manager, UKIP, middle to right, 1 child

7. Participant 85 (77 references)
   White British male, 75, retired hotelier (self-employed), Conservative, middle to right, empty nester
8. Participant 83 (72 references)
   White British female, 46, self-employed Counsellor Therapist, don't know, don't know, 2 children
9. Participant 87 (57 references)
   White Irish female, 74, retired lecturer, Conservative, middle, empty nester
10. Participant 81 (33 references in 7 breakout sessions out of 10)
    White British female, 23, payroll assistant, don't know, don't know, no children
11. Participant 82 (31 references in 8 breakout sessions out of 10)
    White British female, 39, self-employed wedding planner, Conservative, right, 1 child

## Attitudes:

- Mostly neutral (473 references) – logic as I coded most proposals and statement of facts as neutral
- Then negative (365 references), Mixed (125) and Positive (88).
- I also coded their reaction to our stimulus on Day 2, in order to determine the impact of the information we gave them. 6 references were coded.
- Only one formal attitude change was coded (Day 2 to Day 2, negative to mixed)

|  | Mixed | Negative | Neutral | Positive | Reaction to stimulus |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Day 1 - breakout 1 immigration | 13 | 41 | 25 | 8 | 0 |
| Day 1 - breakout 2 lack of money | 10 | 27 | 30 | 3 | 0 |
| Day 1 - breakout 3 unemployment | 15 | 32 | 21 | 14 | 0 |
| Day 1 - breakout 4 overcrowding and ageing population | 10 | 33 | 37 | 3 | 0 |
| Day 1 - breakout 5 lack of and access to education | 6 | 49 | 43 | 16 | 0 |
| Day 2 - breakout 1 Income inequality | 7 | 40 | 56 | 9 | 0 |
| Day 2 - breakout 2 Immigration | 35 | 44 | 38 | 6 | 2 |
| Day 2 - breakout 3 Gender | 5 | 31 | 78 | 8 | 1 |
| Day 2 - breakout 4 Intergenerational issues | 9 | 47 | 108 | 12 | 3 |
| Day 2 - breakout 5 Labour market | 15 | 21 | 37 | 9 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 125 | 365 | 473 | 88 | 6 |

## Responsibility:

|  | Community | Employer | Family | Public sector | Private sector | The individual |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Day 1 - breakout 1 immigration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 4 |
| Day 1 - breakout 2 lack of money | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2 | 9 |
| Day 1 - breakout 3 unemployment | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 |
| Day 1 - breakout 4 overcrowding and ageing population | 3 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| Day 1 - breakout 5 lack of and access to education | 2 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 6 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Day 2 - breakout 1 Income inequality | 1 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| Day 2 - breakout 2 Immigration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 2 |
| Day 2 - breakout 3 Gender | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Day 2 - breakout 4 Intergenerational issues | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 15 | 15 |
| Day 2 - breakout 5 Labour market | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| TOTAL | 7 | 15 | 27 | 75 | 20 | 49 |

**Preliminary observations**

- This was a very active group, with 4 dominant participants. There was a low level of disagreement. There were fewer statements coded for this group as statements were longer than in the two other groups.
- They tended to illustrate their arguments by using their own experience with family/friends where possible ("my parents/my dad", "my husband/my wife/my kid", "I have a friend who…",…)
- The discussion was much more active on Day 2, with almost the double of references for each breakout group. This is because (1) there was an element of deliberation on Day 2 as they had to formulate policy priorities, and (2) because they were more committed to exchange their views. Another potential factor is that they were much more informed and familiar with the process.
- They were extremely critical of the social safety net, thinking that people abuse the system and that the government is far too generous. They want the government to incite people to go to work, and believe that the current system makes people lazy.
- They perceive income inequality as an issue, but sometimes believed that the individual is the ultimate responsible for his/her own choices. Benefits were very often linked to unemployment and laziness.
- On immigration: they think there is a problem of overcrowding, and it is mostly because of uncontrolled immigration. The Australian point-based system was sometimes used as a good example. They want controlled immigration based on the skills needed in the country, and no access to benefits until you have contributed for a minimum of two years. They also suggested a higher income tax on immigrants. One of the most interesting aspects of this group was that the only immigrant in the group (participant 90 from Poland) said that EU migration is a massive issue because people can come to the UK, claim benefits and abuse the system.
  NOTE: When participants mentioned capping immigration, I coded this as "mixed attitude towards immigration".
- On education: all participants overwhelmingly agreed that access to education is very important, and that the government should invest more in it. They also think that more support should be given to teachers (other professions, such as doctors and nurses, were mentioned). In addition, they emphasised the importance of apprenticeships for young people as part of their education (either secondary or tertiary). Many saw grammar schools as a good thing and their disappearance as a "tragedy".
- On the labour market: they pinpointed a series of issues/challenges, such as the zero-hour contracts, lack of opportunities for people who want to start their own business, need for apprenticeships to help younger workers, etc.
- On gender: they did not perceive it as an issue at all (e.g. "I never hear people talking about this"). They think the gender gap is going to be fixed naturally and that there is no need to

introduce more quotas or equal pay. They think salary should be based on merit only and understand why employers would be tempted to hire men instead of women.

- On old-age pensions: overwhelming consensus on privatisation. They think the state pension should be abolished, and that the government should make it compulsory to invest a certain percentage of your salary into a private pension fund.

- On healthcare: mixed attitudes towards the NHS. They think the system as it is does not work very well. Many participants believe that people who can afford private healthcare should do it. They also think that the NHS will have disappeared by 2040 (no one said that it should be saved).

## 3. Yellow breakout group (ethnic minority)

**Top themes discussed:**

| | Yellow breakout group – ethnic minority |
|---|---|
| 1 : Labour market | 532 |
| 2 : Intergenerational issues | 255 |
| 3 : Education | 193 |
| 4 : Productivity | 177 |
| 5 : Welfare state financing | 166 |
| 6 : Immigration | 140 |
| 7 : Childcare and parenting | 131 |
| 8 : Unemployment | 116 |
| 9 : Gender | 101 |
| 10 : Funding and or financing priority | 88 |
| 11 : Income inequality | 85 |
| 12 : Old-age pensions | 73 |
| 13 : Healthcare | 65 |
| 14 : National service | 62 |
| 15 : Taxation | 58 |
| 16 : Social safety net | 48 |
| 17 : Apprenticeships | 41 |
| 18 : Other - various | 30 |
| 19 : Volunteering | 13 |
| 20 : Zero-hours contracts | 11 |
| 21 : Housing | 0 |

**Most active participants:**

1. Participant 67 (304 references)
   White British male, 26, Science teacher (full time), Labour, don't know about political spectrum, no children
2. Participant 69 (293 references)
   White British male, 29, police officer (full time), Labour, middle of political spectrum, one child
3. Participant 68 (267 references)
   Mixed race female, 36, sales assistant part-time, Labour, don't know about political spectrum, 3 children
4. Participant 66 (164 references)
   Asian Indian male, 46, security supervisor local authority, Labour, Middle to Left, 2 children who left the house
5. Participant 64 (129 references)
   While British male, 34, DHL operative, Lib Dem, Middle, no children

6. Participant 63 (115 references)
   Greek Cypriot female, 18, Student full time, Conservative, don't know, no children
7. Participant 61 (47 references)
   Eastern European male, 32, fork lift supervisor full time, Lib Dem, Middle, 3 children
8. Participant 60 (45 references)
   Eastern European male, 28, metal polisher part-time, don't know, middle, no children
9. Participant 62 (43 references)
   Black Caribbean male, 27, Pharmacy assistant full time, Labour, middle, no children
10. Participant 70 (43 references)
    Asian Pakistani male, 56, foster carer full-time, Lib Dem, left, one child
11. Participant 65 (34 references)
    Mixed race female, 22, nurse full time, don't know, don't know, no children
12. Participant 71 (27 references)
    Eastern European female, 27, assistant director full time, don't know, middle, no children (but pregnant)

## Attitudes:

- Mostly neutral as expected (295 references; but Owen did not systematically code most statements or reactions as neutral)
- Then negative (286 references), positive (140) and mixed (130)
- Participants reacted to the stimulus on six occasions, mostly to discuss facts. One participant (69) said he was surprised by "how much we pay out in pensions, state pension".

| | Mixed | Negative | Neutral | Positive | Reaction to stimulus |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Day 1 - breakout 1/2 immigration and lack of money | 28 | 77 | 22 | 12 | 0 |
| Day 1 - breakout 3 unemployment | 15 | 64 | 4 | 11 | 0 |
| Day 1 - breakout 4 overcrowding and ageing population | 6 | 26 | 14 | 16 | 0 |
| Day 1 - breakout 5 lack of and access to education | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Day 2 - breakout 1 Income inequality | 18 | 27 | 37 | 34 | 4 |
| Day 2 - breakout 2 Immigration | 16 | 22 | 43 | 11 | 1 |
| Day 2 - breakout 3 Gender | 13 | 28 | 64 | 16 | 1 |
| Day 2 - breakout 4 Intergenerational issues | 17 | 16 | 23 | 27 | 0 |
| Day 2 - breakout 5 Labour Market | 17 | 26 | 88 | 13 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 130 | 286 | 295 | 140 | 6 |

- One participant (69) was surprised by how much is paid out in state pensions.

## Responsibility:

| | Community | Employer | Family | Public | Private | The |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | sector | sector | individual |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Day 1 - breakout 1/2 immigration and lack of money | 2 | 2 | 2 | 22 | 2 | 12 |
| Day 1 - breakout 3 unemployment | 1 | 5 | 13 | 13 | 4 | 1 |
| Day 1 - breakout 4 overcrowding and ageing population | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 7 |
| Day 1 - breakout 5 lack of and access to education | 21 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 2 |
| Day 2 - breakout 1 Income inequality | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 |
| Day 2 - breakout 2 Immigration | 0 | 5 | 0 | 28 | 2 | 2 |
| Day 2 - breakout 3 Gender | 0 | 7 | 2 | 21 | 0 | 8 |
| Day 2 - breakout 4 Intergenerational issues | 0 | 6 | 0 | 37 | 2 | 19 |
| Day 2 - breakout 5 Labour Market | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 25 | 29 | 28 | 140 | 17 | 62 |

- Overall, the government is perceived as the most responsible for key welfare issues such as pensions, immigration and childcare.
- The responsibility of family and parents was often mentioned when it comes to encouraging children to find a job. According to participants, 'lazy' and unemployed parents give a bad example to their children, who are likely to do the same.
- "Family" was discussed during Day 1 in the breakout session on unemployment because the moderator brought in the issue of gender and parenting roles. The family was not perceived as responsible for issues related to unemployment.

**Preliminary observations:**

- There is a higher degree of disagreement in this breakout group compared to the two other ones. People exchanged their views and in many cases tended to disagree.
- Mixed attitudes towards immigration. Overall consensus on fighting against illegal immigration but benefits from letting people in were also emphasised, especially with regards to the ageing population. Positive attitudes towards immigration were also recorded as long as immigrants "contribute to the system".
- Unemployment is against perceived negatively here. A majority (if not all) of the participants believe that many unemployed people abuse the system and that the social safety net should be reformed. Throughout the discussions, the notion of "contributing to the system/society" was mentioned. Participants agreed that long-term unemployed people should volunteer or do a compulsory national service.
- The minimum wage is perceived as an efficient way to tackle income inequality.
- Social investment is widely advocated by this group, as the following quote suggests: "I think the problem is that we're just throwing money at everything rather than look at a long term solution to things like care, we're just throwing money at the resource rather than throwing money into the training and development of people"
- As part of this emphasis on social investment, education, apprenticeships and trainings were often discussed in order to tackle unemployment.
- On education: participants do not believe there is a lack of education opportunities per se, but that it is not the right "kind" of education that is being taught to young people. They emphasised

the need to learn life skills (e.g. first aid, cleaning, cooking, parenting/taking care of children,…) on top of academic skills. Like the green group, even though they say that going to university is important though costly, they believe that some university degrees are useless.

- Interesting statement from participant 69 (Labour supporter): "I think I'm in quite a fortunate position in that I probably pay more tax than I get out of it but I fully subscribe to that in that I know there are people who are worse off than me but I'm more than happy that my tax goes to make sure that they can eat. On the flip side of that, I think I pay enough tax and I think if that was to increase I think I'd feel a little bit miffed in that there are people that do take advantage of the system and that's where, for me, that's where we need to start pinching and we need to actually start saying 'well actually we're not going to pay for that'".

- Zero hours contracts are seen as harmful and incite people not to work because of the instability. Benefits are perceived as more attractive than zero hours contracts.

- Intergenerational issues are perceived as a major theme for the future, due to the ageing population. While participants indicated that solidarities between younger and older people are necessary in order to maintain a good working force (e.g. via teaching, knowledge transfer) and not to put a strain on the labour market, many seemed to indicate that retirement/pensions decisions should be down to the individual. Flexible retirement was often discussed and perceived as a good policy for the future.

- Overall consensus on privatising pensions to reduce government spending.

- Gender was discussed more often than in the two other breakout groups, however on Day 1, the issue was brought up by the moderator. Discussion mostly focused on childcare. One participant (68) mentioned her own situation to illustrate her argument (i.e. paying 1600 per month for childcare).

## 4. **Green breakout group (unemployed)**

**Top themes discussed:**

|                                      | Green breakout group - unemployed |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 : Labour market                    | 759                               |
| 2 : Income inequality                | 498                               |
| 3 : Immigration                      | 470                               |
| 4 : Intergenerational issues         | 388                               |
| 5 : Education                        | 379                               |
| 6 : Childcare and parenting          | 272                               |
| 7 : Old-age pensions                 | 224                               |
| 8 : Other - various                  | 224                               |
| 9 : Social safety net                | 210                               |
| 10 : Unemployment                    | 179                               |
| 11 : Taxation                        | 150                               |
| 12 : Healthcare                      | 148                               |
| 13 : Gender                          | 112                               |
| 14 : Welfare state financing         | 77                                |
| 15 : Funding and or financing priority | 53                              |
| 16 : Apprenticeships                 | 51                                |
| 17 : Housing                         | 49                                |
| 18 : Zero-hour contracts             | 39                                |
| 19 : Productivity                    | 30                                |
| 20 : Volunteering                    | 4                                 |
| 21 : National service                | 4                                 |

**Most active participants:**

- Participant 44
  White British female, 38, Letting Agents part time, Conservative, middle, two children
- Participant 45
  White British female, 68, retired commercial manager, don't know, middle, empty nester
- Participant 41
  White British female, 49, Housewife, Don't know, middle, no children
- Participant 46
  White British male, 41, Afterschool play scheme part timer, don't know, middle, one child
- Participant 48
  Asian Indian male, 52. Long-term disabled, unemployed, Labour, don't know, empty nester
- Participant 47
  White British female, 69, unemployed many years now retired, don't know, don't know, no children
- Participant 51
  White British female, 21, stay at home mom, UKIP, middle, one child
- Participant 40
  Asian Bangladeshi, 28, unemployed, don't know, middle, no children
- Participant 49
  Afghan/Mongolian, 51, unemployed, Labour, left, empty nester
- Participant 43
  White British male, 18, student, Labour, don't know, no children
- Participant 42
  Asian Pakistani female, 32, stay at home mom, Labour, right, 3 children.

**Attitudes:**

|  | Neutral | Negative | Mixed | Positive | Reaction to stimulus |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Day 1 - breakout 1 Immigration | 89 | 92 | 31 | 27 | 0 |
| Day 1 - breakout 2 lack of money | 103 | 95 | 14 | 7 | 0 |
| Day 1 - breakout 3 unemployment | 111 | 44 | 12 | 1 | 0 |
| Day 1 - breakout 4 overcrowding and ageing population | 88 | 29 | 9 | 12 | 0 |
| Day 1 - breakout 5 lack of and access to education | 86 | 38 | 29 | 22 | 0 |
| Day 2 - breakout 1 income inequality | 154 | 30 | 22 | 15 | 2 |
| Day 2 - breakout 2 immigration | 145 | 27 | 27 | 11 | 3 |
| Day 2 - breakout 3 gender | 209 | 19 | 10 | 21 | 8 |
| Day 2 - breakout 4 Intergenerational issues | 161 | 9 | 26 | 18 | 0 |
| Day 2 - breakout 5 labour market | 119 | 9 | 29 | 13 | 3 |
| TOTAL | 1265 | 392 | 209 | 147 | 16 |

- Mostly neutral with 1265 references (as for the orange group);
- Then negative (392 references), mixed (209 references) and positive (147 references);
- 16 reactions to the stimulus on Day 2;

- As far as attitude changes are concerned, only one occurrence has been found (Day 1 to Day 1 – mixed to neutral on zero-hour contracts). However, there *might* be an interesting case of attitude change taking place on Day 2 regarding immigration and labour market (distinction between UK nationals and UK residents, see below for more information).

**<u>Responsibility:</u>**

| | Community - charities | Employer | Family | Public sector | Private sector |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Day 1 - breakout 1 Immigration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 1 |
| Day 1 - breakout 2 lack of money | 1 | 2 | 0 | 17 | 6 |
| Day 1 - breakout 3 unemployment | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Day 1 - breakout 4 overcrowding and ageing population | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 |
| Day 1 - breakout 5 lack of and access to education | 14 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Day 2 - breakout 1 income inequality | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 14 |
| Day 2 - breakout 2 immigration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Day 2 - breakout 3 gender | 0 | 6 | 11 | 1 | 12 |
| Day 2 - breakout 4 Intergenerational issues | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| Day 2 - breakout 5 labour market | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| TOTAL | 26 | 15 | 20 | 60 | 35 |

- The government / public sector is mostly seen as responsible (60 references), especially when it comes to dealing with immigration (e.g. quotas, monitoring who comes in,…), lack of money (e.g. the government should be more transparent and let us know where the money goes) and intergenerational issues (e.g. the government should force people to invest in private pensions)
- The responsibility of the private sector / the market was mostly discussed in the "income inequality" group, but this was mostly related to immigration and labour market issues (i.e. multinational companies and corporation should use a percentage of the workforce from the UK). As far as gender is concerned, participants believe that the private sector should invest in childcare facilities such as crèches. See comments below for more comments on the gender breakout session.
- Community/charities responsibility includes statements on what schools should do – this was mostly discussed with regards to education.

**<u>Preliminary observations:</u>**

- Compared to the orange group, more references were coded. This is because there was much more interaction between participants in this group than in the orange one. Statements were also much shorter, and people tended to interrupt each other too.
- In this group as well, many participants used their own experiences, or those from family members and friends to illustrate some key issues.
- Immigration:
    - Attitudes are much more mixed than in the orange group (e.g. they make a distinction between "good" and "bad" immigration and also discuss about emigration).
    - Interestingly enough, in the first breakout group of the second day, participants said that multinationals should employ UK <u>residents</u>. However, on the same day in the last group,

they opted for UK <u>nationals</u>. This could suggest a change in attitudes. I will make sure of this by identifying each participant (this still needs to be done – it is quite time-consuming).

- o On Day 2, the immigration breakout session was all about access to healthcare and the introduction of an ID card to make sure immigrants do not exploit the NHS.

- Income inequality:
  - o There was a general consensus on taxation: participants believed that there's no need to tax the rich more.
  - o They seemed to accept income inequality as a fact. On day 2, they said that it is fine if income inequality gets worse as long as the government does something to "raise the bottom". They agree with the fact that the minimum wage should go up, though some participants were divided over this issue as it puts a strain on small businesses.
  - o One participant is employed under a zero-hour contract. He shared his own experience and explained that it can also be beneficial for him despite a certain degree of insecurity.
  - o Social safety net: there needs to be more control to check who abuses the system. They recognise that vulnerable people need benefits, with some discussing about their own experiences as unemployed people or earning disability benefits.
  - o They stigmatised a specific group of people, the "alcoholics", as unemployed people who use their Job Seeker's allowance to get drunk and not to help their families.

- Education:
  - o Just like the orange group, participants emphasised the importance of education and training. Yet they also stated that some university degrees can be useless.

- Gender:
  - o Gender was NOT regarded as an issue. Participants discussed it because it is needed, but that is all (they were keen to move on and discuss intergenerational issues). At first, the discussion felt a bit "forced", with some people looking annoyed. The issue of childcare was addressed in this breakout group, and the discussion mostly focused on facilities such as crèches.

- Two key statements that basically summarise the content of the DFs: "*fundamentally, that's all I'm interested in, for me. No offence*"; and "*When you vote I find, I don't think about what they're going to do for my mom or my sister. I think about what they are going to do now for me and how it is going to affect me*".

- Just like the orange group, professional football is used as an example to illustrate income inequality.

- A conflict has been noted on Day 2 in the fourth breakout session on intergenerational issues. On participant was unhappy about the information provided in the stimulus, and said that more should have been given. She also thought we were wasting their time.

- The quality of the moderation was quite different compared to the Orange group. On Day 2, the green group moderator insisted more on justifying policies (i.e. who will benefit, who will be worse off, what is the rationale etc.).

## 5. <u>Breakout sessions in comparative perspective</u>

While some differences are noticeable between groups (e.g. on immigration, gender, income inequality), there was a broad consensus on the following issues:

- a. The benefits system is too generous and people abuse the system. The system should be controlled by the government in order to avoid such situation.

b. Unemployed people are often assimilated as "lazy". Discussions were focused on long-term unemployment and how to put long-term unemployed back to the labour market.

c. Individual responsibility was heavily mentioned across all sessions, but this was often linked to the need to "contribute to the society".

d. Immigration rules need to be changed, and the Australian point-based system was often used as a model. However, some participants voiced their concerns over introducing quotas as unskilled migration is also needed in the UK.

e. As far as pensions are concerned, government spending should decrease and the emphasis was put on private pensions.

f. Social investment seems to be advocated by an overwhelming majority of participants. Education, apprenticeships and (re)training were often discussed as a solution to fight against income inequality and unemployment.

g. Family responsibility was often discussed in terms of parenting, with parents being responsible for transmitting society values to their children. Many participants (especially in the yellow group) were concerned over the fact that unemployed parents are not likely to teach good values to their children, who are likely to replicate what their parents did.

## 6. **Before and after surveys + socio-demographic information**

### a. *Socio-economic variables*

- 34 participants, no drop-outs.
- Gender: 18 (52.94) female, 16 (47.06%) male.
- Age: 4 (11.76%) under 24; 12 (35.29%) 25-34; 4 (11.76%) 35-44; 8 (23.53%) 45-54; 1 (2.94%) 55-64; 4 (11.76%) 65+.
- Education: 3 (8.82%) ISCED2; 19 (55.88) ISCED3; 12 (35.29%) tertiary, bachelor or equivalent.
- Work status: 19 (55.88%) working full-time; 6 (17.65%) working part-time; 1 (2.94%) permanently disabled; 2 (5.88%) stay at home; 2 (5.88%) in full-time education; 4 (11.76%) retired.
- Marital status: 18 (52.94%) married/in a civil partnership; 6 (17.65%) separated or divorced; 1 (2.94%) widowed; 9 (26.47%) never married/in a civil partnership.
- Politics: the forum was mostly composed of Labour (11, or 32.35%) and Conservative (7, 20.59%) sympathisers. 26.47% of participants do not know who they would vote for in the next election. Half of the respondents (17, 50%) positioned themselves to the middle of the political spectrum, 3 (8.82%) to the right and 4 (11.76%) to the left. 10 respondents (29.41%) do not know.
- Household's net income:

```
           '
   Household's
    total net
   income, all
       sources       Freq.       Percent        Cum.
───────────────────────────────────────────────────────
 J - 1st decile           4         11.76       11.76
 R - 2nd decile           2          5.88       17.65
 C - 3rd decile           1          2.94       20.59
 M - 4th decile           4         11.76       32.35
 F - 5th decile           2          5.88       38.24
 S - 6th decile           4         11.76       50.00
 K - 7th decile           2          5.88       55.88
 P - 8th decile           5         14.71       70.59
 D - 9th decile           6         17.65       88.24
 H - 10th decile          3          8.82       97.06
             .            1          2.94      100.00
───────────────────────────────────────────────────────
         Total           34        100.00
```

- Ethnic minority: 14 (41.18) yes; 20 (28.82) no.

## b. Attitude changes

- <u>Large differences in income acceptable to reward talents and efforts:</u>
  **Significant attitude change** as people tend to agree more after the event (19 people or 55.88% agree before; 26 people or 76.47% after). In contrast, the proportion of people disagreeing fell from 7 (20.59%) to 4 (11.76%).
  **Is this attitude change statistically significant?** The t-statistic is 2.0418 with 33 degrees of freedom. The corresponding two-tailed p-value is 0.0492 which is smaller than 0.05. This means that we can conclude that the mean difference of dfincac_1 (before) and dfincac_2(after) is different from 0 (our null hypothesis is rejected). In other words, the fact that the t-value is a positive number tells us that the first condition (the before condition) had a bigger mean than the second( the after condition) and so **the people's attitude has been statistically significantly changed after the event towards agreeing.**
  **Comparison to ESS 2008: 63.9% agree; 19.5% disagree (somewhat similar).**
- <u>Women should be prepared to cut down on paid work for the sake of family:</u>
  **No attitude change**: only three people (8.82%) switched from disagree to neither agree nor disagree. The majority of respondents disagree overall with this statement (20 or 58.82% before the event, 17 or 50% after the event), while only a small minority agree (4 or 11.76% before and after)
  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 39.0% agree, 40.3% disagree (big difference).**
- <u>For fair society, differences in standard of living should be small:</u>
  **Major attitude change at first glance, but not statistically significant**: the number of people agreeing with this statement increased from 11 (32.35%) to 15 (44.12%) and people disagreeing increased from 13 (38.24%) to 15 (41.18%). The number of participants who neither agreed nor disagreed decreased from 10 to 4 (-17.65%).

The t-statistic is 0.4658 with 32 degrees of freedom. The corresponding two-tailed p-value is 0.6445 which is bigger than 0.05. This means that we can conclude that the mean difference of dsmdfslv_1 (before) and smdfslv_2(after) is not different from 0 (our null hypothesis is not rejected). In other words, the fact that the t-value is a positive number tells us that the first condition (the before condition) had a bigger mean than the second (the after condition) but so the **people's attitude has not been statistically significantly changed after the event towards agreeing**.
**Comparison with ESS 2008: 51.3% agree; 27.2% disagree (significant difference).**

- Jobs for everyone, government's responsibility:
  **Minor attitude change**: even though the proportion of participants agreeing that it is the government's <u>entire</u> responsibility increased (from 6 or 17.65% to 11 or 32.35%), there is no significant change in responses ranging from 6 to 10 (25 or 73.53% before; 26 or 76.47% after). Two additional participants (from 3 to 5, +5.88%) chose the median value, while a minority of respondents said that the government is less responsible (4 or 11.76% before the event, 3 or 8.82% after).
  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 26.5% less responsible; 57.1% responsible (significant difference)**

- Health care for the sick, government's responsibility:
  **Minor attitude change**: the proportion of participants agreeing that it is the government's <u>entire</u> responsibility significantly decreased from 25 (73.53%) to 11 (-32.35%). These participants became more moderate yet the proportion of respondents picking values ranging from 6 to 10 remained stable (from 32 or 94.12% to 31 or 91.18%). Only 2 participants (5.88%) believed the government is less responsible before and after the event.
  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 1.5 less responsible; 96.5% responsible (very similar)**

- Standard of living for the old, government's responsibility:
  **Minor attitude change**: same observation as above. The proportion of participants agreeing that it is the government's entire responsibility significantly decreased from 22 to 13 (-26.47%), but 100% of participants selected answers ranging from 6 to 10.
  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 1.2% less responsible; 96.2% responsible (very similar)**

- Standard of living for the unemployed, government's responsibility:
  **Major attitude change at first glance, but not statistically significant**: While the proportion of respondents picking responses ranging from 0 to 4 and from 6 to 10 was the same (15, 44.11% for both), the after survey shows a switch in favour of less responsibility: -6 (or -17.65%) for responses ranging from 6 to 10, and +3 (+8.82) for responses ranging from 0 to 4. One more participant picked the median value (from 4 participants to 5) and 2 participants switched from values of 5 and 7 to 'don't know'.
  The t-statistic is 0.9388 with 30 degrees of freedom. The corresponding two-tailed p-value is 0.3553 which is bigger than 0.05. This means that we can conclude that the mean difference of gvslvue_1 (before) and gvslvue_2(after) is not different from 0 (our null hypothesis is not rejected). In other words, the fact that the t-value is a positive number tells us that the first condition (the before condition) had a bigger mean than the second (the after condition) but so **the people's attitude has not been statistically**

**significantly changed towards in favour of less responsibility of government after the event.**

**Comparison with ESS 2008: 22.0% less responsible; 57.3% responsible (big difference)**

- Standard of living for low wage workers, government's responsibility:
  **Minor attitude change**: same observation as for the standard of living for the old. The majority of respondents picked values ranging from 6 to 10 (27 in the 'before' survey, 25 'after'), and the proportion of participants agreeing that it is the government's entire responsibility slightly decreased from 11 to 7 (-11.76%).
  *Not in ESS 2008*

- Child care services for working parents, government's responsibility:
  **Minor attitude change**: while 4 participants (11.76%) picked responses ranging from 2 to 4 and 25 participants (73.53%) picked responses ranging from 6 to 10 before the event, 32 (94.12%) selected responses ranging from 6 to 10 after the event. Only two respondents selected the median value.
  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 11.3% less responsible; 74.0% responsible (very similar before the event, somewhat similar after)**

- Paid leave from work for parents with preschool children, government's responsibility:
  **No attitude change**: the proportion of participants selecting responses ranging from 6 to 10 (from 20 to 22) and responses ranging from 0 to 4 (from 5 to 4) remained stable.
  *(Not in ESS 2008)*

- Paid leave from work to care for sick family, government's responsibility:
  **Minor attitude change**: the proportion of respondents who selected values ranging from 6 to 10 fell from 27 (79.41%) to 19 (55.88%). In contrast, the proportion of respondents who selected values ranging from 0 to 4 increased from 3 (8.82%) to 8 (23.53%).
  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 8.1% less responsible; 79.0% responsible (very similar before the event, somewhat similar after)**

- Paid leave from work for mothers and fathers, preference:
  **No attitude change**: proportions remain similar, as the majority of participants believe that mothers should take most of the leaves but fathers should also have the possibility to take a small part of the leave (19 before the event, 22 after, +8.82%).
  *Not in ESS 2008*

- Jobs for everyone, government's level of spending:
  **No attitude change**: proportions remain similar, as the majority of participants believe that the government should spend more (23 before the event, and 22 after).
  *Not in ESS 2008*

- Health care for the sick, government's level of spending:
  **No attitude change**: proportions remain similar, as the majority of participants believe that the government should spend more (27 before the event, 24 after).
  *Not in ESS 2008*

- Standard of living for the old, government's level of spending:
  **Minor attitude change**: the proportion of people believing that the government should spend more fell from 28 to 23 (-14.71%).

*Not in ESS 2008*

- Standard of living for the unemployed, government's level of spending:
  **Minor attitude change**: the proportion of people believing that the government should spend more fell from 7 to 3 (-11.76%). In contrast, participants believing that the government should spend less reached the majority after the event, increasing from 14 (41.18%) to 19 (55.88%).
  *Not in ESS 2008*

- Standard of living for low wage workers, government's level of spending:
  **No attitude change** at all: the proportions remained exactly the same, with 18 participants believing that the government should spend more and 11 people saying that the current level of spending is about right.
  *Not in ESS 2008*

- Child care services for working parents, government's level of spending:
  **No attitude change**: proportions remain similar, as the majority of participants believe that the government should spend more (22 before the event, 24 after).
  *Not in ESS 2008*

- Paid leave from work for parents with preschool children, government's level of spending:
  **Minor attitude change**: for this questions, the proportion of participants believing that the government should spend more or that the current level of spending is about right are quite similar. The proportion of people saying that the government should spend more increased from 13 to 15, while people saying that the current level of spending is about right decreased from 16 to 14.
  *Not in ESS 2008*

- Paid leave from work to care for sick family, government's level of spending:
  **Major attitude change at first glance, but not statistically significant**: before the event, 23 participants (67.65%) believed that the government should spend more. However, after the event, this proportion significantly decreased from 23 to 14 (-26.47%). The proportion of people saying that the current level of spending is about right increased from 11 to 15 (+11.76%).
  The t-statistic is 1.8949 with 31 degrees of freedom. The corresponding two-tailed p-value is 0.0675 which is bigger than 0.05. But sometimes, social scientists accept the result of the p-value under 0.1 (You can discuss this issue with Heejung and Peter). This means that we can conclude that the mean difference of gvpdlwk_1 (before) and gvpdlwk_2(after) is not different from 0 (our null hypothesis is not rejected). In other words, the fact that the t-value is a positive number tells us that the first condition (the before condition) had a bigger mean than the second (the after condition) but so the **people's attitude has not been statistically significantly changed towards in favour of less responsibility of government after the event.**
  *Not in ESS 2008*

*Note: questions on government's priority for 2015 and 2040 have been ignored as they were largely misinterpreted in the UK.*

- Social benefits/services place too great strain on the economy:
  **Statistically significant attitude change**: the proportion of respondents agreeing overall with this statement increased from 13 (38.24%) to 20 after the event (58.82%). In contrast, the proportion of respondents disagreeing fell from 7 (20.59%) to 4 (11.76%) The t-statistic is 2.8844 with 26 degrees of freedom. The corresponding two-tailed p-value is 0.0078 which is smaller than 0.05. This means that we can conclude that the mean difference of sbstrec_1 (before) and sbstrec_2(after) is different from 0 (our null hypothesis is rejected). In other words, the fact that the t-value is a positive number tells us that the first condition (the before condition) had a bigger mean than the second (the after condition) and so the people's attitude **has been statistically significantly changed** after the event towards agreeing (agree =1/2 and disagree =4/5).
  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 51.8% agree; 22.0% disagree (significant difference)**
- Social benefits/services prevent widespread poverty:
  **No attitude change**: proportions remain similar, as the majority of participants agree overall with this statement (19 or 55.88% before the event, 18 or 52.94% after) and a minority disagree (5 or 14.71% before, 6 or 14.65% after).
  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 57.3% agree; 19.0% disagree (very similar)**
- Social benefits/services lead to a more equal society:
  **No attitude change**: proportions remain similar, and participants are divided over this issue (15 or 44.12% before, 14 or 41.18% after agree overall; 10 or 29.41% before and after disagree).
  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 41.6% agree; 31.2% disagree (very similar)**
- Social benefits/services encourage people from other countries to come live here:
  **No attitude change**: proportions remain similar, as the majority of participants agree overall with this statement (19 or 55.88% before, 21 or 61.76% after) and a minority disagree (4 or 11.76% before, 6 or 17.65% after).
  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 76.0% agree; 12.0% disagree (somewhat similar)**
- Social benefits/services cost businesses too much in taxes/charges:
  **Minor attitude change**: while 18 (52.94%) respondents agreed overall with this statement before the event, the proportion fell to 13 after the event (38.24%). However, the proportion of participants disagreeing remained the same (6, or 17.65%). The participants who changed their mind mostly selected "neither agree nor disagree" after the event (increase from 8 or 23.53% to 11, or 32.35%).
  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 51.3% agree; 23.5% disagree (somewhat similar)**
- Social benefits/services make it easier to combine work and family:
  **No attitude change**: proportions remain similar, as the majority of participants agree overall with this statement (23 or 67.65% before, 19 or 55.88% after) and a minority disagreed (3 or 8.82% before; 2 or 5.88% after). The few participants who changed their mind selected "neither agree not disagree" after the event (increase from 8 or 23.53% to 11 or 32.35%).
  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 58.1% agree; 15.5% disagree (somewhat similar)**
- Social benefits/services make people lazy:
  **Statistically significant attitude change**: the proportion of participants overall agreeing overall with this statement increased from 17 (50%) to 24 (70.59%). More strikingly, the proportion of people who agreed strongly with this statement increased

from 8 (23.53%) to 14 (41.18%). In contrast, the proportion of people who disagreed overall decreased from 12 (35.29%) to 5 (14.71%).

The t-statistic is 3.0582 with 30 degrees of freedom. The corresponding two-tailed p-value is 0.0047 which is smaller than 0.05. This means that we can conclude that the mean difference of sblazy_1 (before) and sblazt_2(after) is different from 0 (our null hypothesis is rejected). In other words, the fact that the t-value is a positive number tells us that the first condition (the before condition) had a bigger mean than the second (the after condition) and so the people's attitude **has been statistically significantly changed** after the event towards agreeing (agree =1/2 and disagree =4/5). This means that **quite surprisingly, the proportion of people who agreed with this statement statistically significantly increased after the event.**

**Comparison with ESS 2008: 65.9% agree; 18.4% disagree (somewhat similar before, very similar after)**

- Social benefits/services make people less willing to care for one another:

  **Minor attitude change**: while 14 (41.18%) respondents disagreed overall with this statement before the event, the proportion fell to 9 after the event (26.47%). 9 (26.47%) before and 11 (32.35%) after agreed with this statement, and the proportion of participants who neither agreed nor disagreed increased from 9 to 11 after the event.

  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 48.8% agree; 26.8% disagree (significant difference before, somewhat similar after)**

- Social benefits/services make people less willing to look after themselves/family:

  **Minor attitude change**: while 12 (35.29%) respondents disagreed overall with this statement before the event, the proportion slightly increased to 14 (41.18%) after the event. In contrast, the proportion of people disagreeing overall with this statement decreased from 14 (41.18%) to 10 (29.41%).

  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 49.7% agree; 27.7% disagree (significant difference before, somewhat similar after)**

- Government should decrease/increase taxes and social spending:

  **Major attitude change at first glance, but not statistically significant**: before the event, most participants selected the median value (12 people, or 35.29%), while 11 people (32.35%) selected values ranging from 0 to 4 (i.e. decrease taxes and social spending) and 7 (20.59%) selected values ranging from 6 to 10 (i.e. increase taxes and social spending). After the event however, 8 participants moved away from the median value: 15 people (44.12%) selected values from 0-4 and 13 (38.26%) selected values from 6-10.

  The t-statistic is 0.0677 with 29 degrees of freedom. The corresponding two-tailed p-value is 0.9465 which is bigger than 0.05. This means that we can conclude that the mean difference of ditxssp_1 (before) and ditxspp_2(after) is not different from 0 (our null hypothesis is not rejected). In other words, the fact that the t-value is a positive number tells us that the first condition (the before condition) had a bigger mean than the second (the after condition) but the **people's attitude has <u>not</u> been statistically significantly changed** towards in favour of decreasing the taxes and social spending(0 = decreasing a lot , 10 = increasing a lot).

  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 31.8% decrease; 38.4% increase (significant difference)**

- Taxation for higher versus lower earners:

**Statistically significant attitude change**: before the event, participants were divided over this issue, with 11 (32.35%) saying that everyone should pay the same share of earnings in tax and 13 (38.24%) saying that they should pay the same amount in tax, while only 6 (17.65%) said that higher earners should pay a higher share. However, after the event, the majority of participants (20, 58.82%) opted for the first option, i.e. everyone should pay the same share. Only 5 respondents (14.71%, -8) said people should pay the same amount of money, while 9 of them (26.47%, +3) said that higher earners should pay a higher share.

The t-statistic is 3.0423 with 29 degrees of freedom. The corresponding two-tailed p-value is 0.0049 which is smaller than 0.05. This means that we can conclude that the mean difference of txearn_1 (before) and txearn_2(after) is different from 0 (our null hypothesis is rejected). In other words, the fact that the t-value is a positive number tells us that the first condition (the before condition) had a bigger mean than the second (the after condition) and so the people's attitude has been statistically significantly changed after the event towards paying same share of earnings in tax. This means that after the event, **people's attitude has been statistically significantly changed towards everyone should pay the same share**.

**Comparison with ESS 2008: 40.6% same share; 46.4% higher earner pay higher share; 11.7% same amount of money (big difference)**

- Higher or lower earners should get larger old age pensions:

  **Major attitude change at first glance, but not statistically significant**: before the event, the majority participants (18, 52.94%) believed that higher earners should get larger pensions, while 9 (26.47%) said that high and low earners should get the same level of pension. After the event, these proportions changed significantly, as 18 participants (52.94%, +9 participants) opted for the latter option (i.e. same level of pension) and 13 (38.26%, -5 participants) chose the former (i.e. higher earners should get larger pensions). The t-statistic is -1.4422 with 26 degrees of freedom. The corresponding two-tailed p-value is 0.1612 which is bigger than 0.05. This means that we can conclude that the mean difference of earnpen_1 (before) and earnpen_2(after) is not different from 0 (our null hypothesis is not rejected). In other words, the fact that the t-value is a negative number tells us that the first condition (the before condition) had a smaller mean than the second (the after condition) but the **people's attitude has not been statistically significantly changed** towards in favour of the egalitarian way of distributing pension (1= higher earners should get larger pension, 2= high and low earners same pension 3 = lower earner should get larger pension).

  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 17.2% larger pension for higher earner; 65.1% same level; 16.7% larger pension for lower earner (big difference)**

- Higher or lower earners should get larger unemployment benefits:

  **No attitude change**: proportions remain similar, as the majority of participants believe that high and low earners should get the same amount of unemployment benefits (20 or 58.82% before the event, 21 or 61.67% after).

  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 13.6% larger benefits for higher earner; 71.7% same; 13.6% larger benefit for lower earner (somewhat similar)**

- Higher or lower earners should get larger parental leave benefits:

**Minor attitude change**: only 4 participants said that higher earners should get larger parental leave benefits before the event and 7 after (+8.82%); the majority of respondents (24 before or 70.59%, 22 after or 64.71%) believe that high and low earners should have the same amount.

*Not in ESS 2008*

- When should immigrants obtain rights to social benefits and services?

  **Major attitude change at first glance, but not statistically significant**: before the event 50 per cent (17) of participants said that immigrants should obtain rights to social benefits and services after having worked and paid taxes for at least a year. This proportion significantly increased after the event, from 17 participants to 24 (70.59%). The proportion of participants who said they should have such rights once they have become a citizen slightly decreased (from 8 to 5), and the proportion of those saying that immigrants should never get the same rights slightly increased (from 2 or 5.88% to 5 or 14.71%).

  The t-statistic is -0.7504 with 29 degrees of freedom. The corresponding two-tailed p-value is 0.4591which is bigger than 0.05. This means that we can conclude that the mean difference of imsclbn_1 (before) and imsclbn_2(after) is not different from 0 (our null hypothesis is not rejected). In other words, the fact that the t-value is a negative number tells us that the first condition (the before condition) had a smaller mean than the second (the after condition). The **people's attitude has not been statistically significantly changed** before and after the event on immigrants' right to social benefits and services.

  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 5.7% immediately; 5.5% after one year even no work; 48.5% after one year work and taxes; 31.5% after becoming citizen; 8.9% never (somewhat similar before, significant difference after)**

- Immigrants receive more or less than they contribute:

  **Minor attitude change**: the proportion of participants who said that immigrants receive more than they contribute (i.e. values ranging from 0 to 4) was of 47.06% before the event (16 participants); 9 participants (26.47%) chose the median value; and 6 (17.65%) believed that immigrants contribute more than they receive (i.e. values ranging from 6 to 10). These proportions slightly changed after the event: 19 (+3, or 55.88%) said they receive more, while 10 (+4, or 29.41%) said they contribute more. Only 4 participants picked the median value after the event (-5).

  **Comparison with ESS 2008: 56.7% receive more; 19.1% contribute more; 24.2% median (somewhat similar)**

- Level of old age pensions affordable 25 years from now:

  **Statistically significant attitude change**: in both before and after surveys, the majority of participants believe that the UK will not be able to afford the present level of old age pensions, but this majority significantly increased after the event (from 19 or 55.88% to 27 or 79.41%).

  The t-statistic is 2.4083 with 29 degrees of freedom. The corresponding two-tailed p-value is 0.0226 which is smaller than 0.05. This means that we can conclude that the mean difference of txearn_1 (before) and txearn_2(after) is different from 0 (our null hypothesis is rejected). In other words, the fact that the t-value is a positive number tells us that the first condition (the before condition) had a bigger mean than the second (the

after condition) and so the **people's attitude has been statistically significantly changed** after the event towards believing that the UK will not be able to afford the present level of old age pensions.
*Not in ESS 2008*

- Level of public health care affordable 25 years from now:
  <span style="color:red">No attitude change</span>: proportions remain similar, as the majority of participants believe that the UK will not be able to afford the present level of public health care (24 before the event, 27 after) and a 5 (before) to 6 (after) participants said that the UK will be able to afford the present level but not to increase it.
  *Not in ESS 2008*

### c. Conclusion

The democratic forums do appear to have an impact on people's attitudes, though this impact depends on the issue. The questions were significant attitude changes are noticeable are related to income inequality: after the democratic forums, more people tend to agree that differences in income are acceptable to reward talents and efforts; that social benefits/services place too great strain on the economy and make people lazy. This goes in the direction of individualism. However, significant attitude changes can also go in the other direction. For instance, when asked whether higher or lower earners should get larger old-age pensions, participants moved towards a more egalitarian response (i.e. same level of pension for all).

Questions related to the level of taxation also produced some attitude changes, e.g. the current level of taxes and social spending as well as the level of taxation for higher and lower earners.

The question related to the level of taxes and social spending (ranging from 0 for less taxes and social spending to 10 for more taxes and social spending) produced some striking results. Before the event, participants tended to have moderate views (with 12 of them selecting the median value). However, after the event, most participants moved away from this median value but responses did not go in any particular direction (15 responses ranging from 0 to 4, and 13 responses ranging from 6 to 10).

As far as the results of the ESS 2008 survey and this survey are concerned, only four questions produced some major differences (i.e. completely different results). Six questions produced significant differences (i.e. major differences in terms of proportions), while fourteen other questions showed similar results.

## 7. Conclusion

Even though this preliminary report, based on the initial rounds of coding, offers some very interesting findings, more needs to be done in order to take advantage of the data we collected. For instance, one of the key objectives of the democratic forums is to detect the source of each individual attitudes and why such attitudes might change. Hence we suggest adding four layers of coding:

- a. **Source of the argument** (personal experience, media, stimulus, politician or political party statement, other);

b. **Justification for the argument** (personal impact, economic impact, societal impact positive (e.g. encourages/helps people to work; keeps families together; meets people's needs, makes society fairer), societal impact negative (e.g. discourages work, makes people lazy);
c. **Level of conflict** in the group, i.e. agreement/disagreement between participants;
d. **Attitude changes per individual** (last round of coding). For this final round I suggest to check all statements made by an individual by double-clicking on the participant's node. This is quite time-consuming but indispensable in order to determine whether the exercise has an impact on people's attitudes.

One additional node should also be included in the themes: disability. The coding scheme has been added to the UK dataset for your information. Please feel free to copy it to your own dataset.