NORFACE Welfare State Futures (WSF)

Project: Welfare State Futures: Our Children's Europe (WelfSOC)

WelfSOC Germany – Final Report on Data Collection

2018-08-28, Jan-Ocko Heuer, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

Contact: steffen.mau@hu-berlin.de, jan-ocko.heuer@hu-berlin.de, katharina.zimmermann@hu-berlin.de

Introduction: About WelfSOC

The research project "Welfare State Futures: Our Children's Europe" (WelfSOC) was part of a transnational research programme on the topic of Welfare State Futures funded by the New Opportunities for Research Funding Agency Co-operation in Europe (NORFACE) network of 15 research funding organizations and the European Commission (grant number: 462-14-050). Funding in Germany was provided by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG).

From 2015 to 2018, the WelfSOC project examined the aspirations, ideas and assumptions of ordinary citizens about the future development of welfare in Europe and their priorities for the Europe their children will inhabit. WelfSOC used innovative qualitative methods such as deliberative forums – which had never been used in comparative social policy research before – and focus groups to investigate attitudes towards the future of welfare in five countries: Denmark, Germany, Norway, Slovenia and the United Kingdom (UK).

The project was led by Prof. Peter Taylor-Gooby, head of the co-ordinating UK research team at the University of Kent, Canterbury (members: Dr. Benjamin Leruth, Dr. Heejung Chung, Adrienn Győry). The German research team at Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin included Prof. Steffen Mau (Principal Investigator), Dr. Jan-Ocko Heuer and Dr. Katharina Zimmermann (and the student assistants Robert Tiede, Oscar Stuhler, Alexandra Machtchenko, Laura Lüth and Lisa Klein). The other research teams were located at Aalborg University (Prof. Christian Albrekt Larsen, Prof. Jørgen Goul Andersen, Dr. Morten Frederiksen, Dr. Mathias Herup Nielsen), NOVA Norwegian Social Research (Prof. Bjørn Hvinden, Dr. Mi Ah Schøyen) and Ljubljana University (Prof. Maša Filipovič Hrast, Dr. Tatjana Rakar). Associated researchers were Prof. Wim van Oorschot, Tijs Laenen and Federica Rossetti (KU Leuven).

In all countries, data were collected in two steps, with an identical design (determined by all research teams under the direction of the UK team at several co-ordination conferences) and in cooperation of each country's research team with a professional research institute; in Germany this was Ipsos Germany with its Qualitative Research Unit led by Dr. Hans-Jürgen Frieß (members: Dr. Katja Kiefer, Janine Freudenberg, Denise Sindermann), which had won a public tender among 14 research institutes.

The first round of data collection was a 'deliberative forum' (or democratic forum; short: DF) in autumn 2015. In each country, this two-day event assembled about 35 citizens – chosen by gender, age, educational qualification, employment status, household income, family status and children in the household, migration background or minority status, and political party

preferences to broadly reflect national demographic characteristics – to discuss and develop the initial question "What should the priorities of the [country's] government be for benefits and services in 25 years' time?". Discussions took place in plenary sessions and smaller breakout groups, with only light moderation asserting the principles of free, equal, open and respectful deliberation. On day 1 participants were free to choose five topics for discussion, while on day 2 five topics (work and occupations, inequalities, immigration, gender equality, and intergenerational fairness) were predetermined by the research teams to increase cross-country comparability, and participants were given expert input and opportunities to call on experts for information and advice; participants were also asked to develop policy guidelines to be voted on in the final plenary session. Before and after the event, participants filled out a questionnaire that included items from representative cross-national population surveys such as the European Social Survey (ESS Round 4, 2008, module 'Welfare Attitudes'; partly repeated in ESS Round 8, 2016) and the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP).

The second round of data collection were five (in some countries six) focus groups that took place in autumn 2016. The focus groups represented different social groups and cleavages regarding social status and stage of life: the middle class (i.e., relatively high social status, as determined by household income, education level and occupational status), the working class (lower social status), young people (below 35 years of age), retirees (aged 60 years and older), and women with care responsibilities managing work and family life. Aside from these criteria, it was aimed for a broad mix of people in terms of age, gender, educational qualification, occupational status, household income, family status, housing situation, migration background, and political orientation. In each focus group, after a short brainstorming on the welfare state, participants were presented six vignettes – an unemployed person, a retiree, a family, a low-income earner, a well-off earner, and an immigrant – with little further specification to prompt discussions about social rights, entitlements, conditions, obligations, responsibilities, deservingness and need. At the end of each two-hour discussion, participants were asked to rank the vignettes regarding the question about whom the welfare state should care most and least, and the resultant rank order was discussed.

Both the deliberative forum and the focus groups were audio- and video-recorded and transcribed and translated into English by each national research institute. The transcripts were imported into NVivo and coded for persons and themes by each national research team and – along with an SPSS file with the DF survey results – submitted to the UK co-ordination team.

For archiving and future secondary analyses of the WelfSOC data, this Final Report describes how the data were collected by the German team. The report is based on two German National Reports (National Report on the Deliberative Forum, National Report on the Focus Groups) that were written after each round of data collection and submitted along with the German data (transcripts, DF survey results) to the UK co-ordination team (the audio and video recordings had to be deleted in line with the Code of Conduct of German private research institutes). All WelfSOC data and documentation will be submitted by the co-ordination team via the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) to the UK Data Archive. The data will probably become publicly available in autumn 2019.

Part A of this report describes the deliberative forum, Part B the focus groups. Part C deals with the German WelfSOC data and documentation and its storage and availability.

A. Deliberative Forum

Deliberative forums or 'mini publics' exist in a variety of formats and have been used mainly in the context of participatory decision-making and democratic theory, but not in the field of comparative social policy and welfare state research. In fact, research on welfare attitudes is dominated by large-scale survey-studies, which allow for generalizations and cross-country comparisons, but usually do not capture the dynamic and contextual aspects of attitude formation and change, including patterns of reasoning and justifications. Thus, WelfSOC used the DF methodology to study attitude formation 'in vivo' and to explore the assumptions, aspirations and ideas that shape citizens' attitudes towards social policy and the welfare state.[1]

The WelfSOC DFs were two-day events, taking place in autumn 2015 in the five countries, in which about 35 citizens, broadly reflecting the national demographic composition, were free to discuss and develop the initial question "What should the priorities of the [country's] government in terms of benefits and services be in 25 years' time?" in plenary sessions and smaller breakout groups, with only light moderation asserting the basic principles of deliberation. On the second day, participants were asked to focus on five predetermined topics, with the opportunity to draw on expert input and advice, and to develop (bullet point) policy priorities to be voted on in the final plenary session. Before and after the event, participants filled out a questionnaire with items from the ESS4 2008 'Welfare Attitudes' module and the ISSP.

This section presents the DF organization and team members (Section 1), recruitment process and participants (2), date, location and overall structure (3), before- and after-survey (4), plenary sessions and breakout groups on day 1 (5), plenary sessions and breakout groups on day 2 (6), and data processing and coding (7). For data and documentation see Part C of this report.

1. DF Organization and Team Members

The DF was organized by the German research team in cooperation with the co-ordinating UK research team, the other national research teams, and the implementing research institute Ipsos Germany. The preparation had begun with a WelfSOC co-ordination conference on 12/13 February 2015 in London and continued at a second co-ordination conference on 6/7 September 2015 in Copenhagen and via subsequent e-mail exchanges. The co-ordinating UK team usually prepared drafts and templates which were modified and later translated (and adapted, if necessary) by the national research teams.

All national DFs took place on two Saturdays (with two weeks in between) in October/November 2015 (beginning on October 3 with the Danish DF and finishing with the Slovenian DF on November 28). After each DF-day, the responsible national research team sent a short report via e-mail to the other teams to document the process and allow for adaptations.

The German research team included Prof. Steffen Mau, the postdoctoral researchers Jan-Ocko Heuer and Katharina Zimmermann, and the student assistants Alexandra Machtchenko and (on day 2 and afterwards) Oscar Stuhler and Robert Tiede.

The DF was implemented by members of the Qualitative Research Unit of Ipsos Germany: Hans-Jürgen Frieß (main organizer and moderator of the plenary sessions), Katja Kiefer (assistant organizer and moderator of the green/'self-employed' breakout group), Janine Freudenberg (moderator of the blue/'migrants' breakout group), and Denise Sindermann (moderator of the orange/'unemployed' breakout group). To prepare for the moderation, Ipsos members had received a background paper on social policy in Germany from the research team (topics: history and structure of the German welfare state, inequalities, migration, gender equality, intergenerational fairness, work and labour markets).

The DF was prepared in several meetings and phone calls between the research team and Ipsos (mainly involving Jan-Ocko Heuer and Hans Frieß). The meetings and calls as well as the co-ordination conferences and all preparatory materials were documented by Jan-Ocko Heuer and are available from the Principal Investigator Steffen Mau.

2. Recruitment Process and Participants

Recruitment of DF participants was conducted by the agency *items* on behalf of Ipsos. The recruitment criteria were (in line with the criteria formulated by all WelfSOC teams): gender, age, educational qualification, employment status (including full-time employed, involuntary and voluntary part-time employed, self-employed, unemployed/'Arbeitslosengeld'/ALG I, unemployed/ALG II, retired, student, homemaker), family status, children in household (including persons with children under the age of six), household net income, migration background (from the following countries: Turkey, Poland, Arab countries, Eastern European countries, Western European countries), and political orientation (measured via long-term party orientation). For each category, the research team set recruitment quota.

The aim was to assemble a 'mini public' roughly representative of the population in Germany. The most important limitation in terms of representativeness is that due to budget constraints the research teams had agreed not to recruit on the urban/rural or any geographical dimension; thus, the German DF participants were mainly from Berlin and surrounding areas. Also, while the discussions showed that participants were from both the former German Democratic Republic ('East Germany', including East Berlin) and the former Federal Republic of Germany ('West Germany', including West Berlin), this was not part of the recruitment criteria and thus the participants' origins are not documented.

To encourage participation, participants received an expense allowance of EUR 280 (EUR 100 for day 1, and further EUR 180 for day 2), paid after the event. 35 persons were recruited, of which 34 showed up at the first day of the DF (one had cancelled his participation on short notice); no person dropped out between day 1 and day 2.

To ensure anonymity of the participants, the identity and contact details of the participants were known only to the recruitment agency *items*, not to Ipsos or the research team. The research team received from Ipsos a list with first names and socio-demographic characteristics of the participants. The participants' first names were used during the DF to create a natural atmosphere, but in materials distributed to the other research teams and used for publication, the participants' first names were replaced by fictitious names and numbers/IDs. Each participant received a unique identifier (ID), with numbers from 1 to 35 assigned on a random

basis (as participant 25 dropped out, this number is not assigned to a participant). During the DF, these numbers were transformed into the numbers 31 to 65 by adding 30 but these transformations were only made to avoid giving participants small-digit numbers (e.g. number 1) and do NOT appear in the archived data. The fictitious first names ('pseudonyms') were chosen to roughly reflect some socio-demographic characteristics of the participant (e.g. gender, age).

The participants signed a letter of consent in which they agreed to the video- and tape-recording of the DF and the receipt of an ID to allow identification of their statements, their survey questionnaire (see Section 4) and their voting behaviour in the final plenary session (see Sections 5 and 6).

The appendix contains a list of DF participants with socio-demographic characteristics in both German (Appendix A-1a) and English (Appendix A-1b); both can be – and have been – used for publications. Moreover, Appendix A-1c is an Excel file with socio-demographic characteristics of the DF participants that allows easy finding, filtering and sorting. Data in these appendices stem from the SPSS file on the before-/after-survey (cf. Section 4), complemented by additional information such as the number of coded statements during the DF.

3. Date, Location and Overall Structure

The DF took place on two Saturdays (November 7 and 21, 2015) for eight hours (9 a.m. to 5 p.m.) in facilities of the Department of Social Sciences at the Humboldt Universität zu Berlin (HU), located at Universitätsstraße 3b in the city centre, close to the HU main building.

Within the building, there was a 'Welcome Area' at the entrance – where participants were welcomed and checked for their recruitment status and received the DF materials, such as a name tag, writing pads, pens and pins/stickers for voting – and a large room in which food and drinks were served throughout the day. The plenary sessions took place in another large room, while each breakout group was assigned a smaller room for discussions (with the rooms for the breakout groups being switched between day 1 and day 2).

Both days of the DF had roughly the same structure: participants first met for a morning plenary session, then split up into three breakout groups of 11 or 12 participants to discuss the selected topics, and finally met again in an afternoon plenary session to present their results. In between there were several coffee breaks and a lunch break; catering was provided.

The plenary sessions took place in a circle of chairs (with the Ipsos team and the research team sitting at one side, next to the moderator Hans Frieß), and it was made sure that participants who were in the same breakout group were not sitting next to each other. In addition to voice recorders and a video camera, a 'cube microphone' was used that was thrown to the person who wanted to speak. This created a lively atmosphere and animated discussions.

Each of the three breakout groups – in which the main discussions took place – was formed around a 'core group' consisting of people from a specific socio-demographic group, while the other participants were allocated to the three breakouts randomly but with an eye towards creating a broad mixture of persons regarding age, gender, educational qualifications, socio-

economic background and political party preferences. The three 'core groups' were (with randomly assigned colours): 1) self-employed persons ('green group'); 2) persons with migration background ('blue group'); 3) unemployed persons or persons in precarious employment ('orange group'). During the DF, groups were only referred to by their colour, and participants seemed not to be aware of the allocation criteria. Each breakout group had its own room for discussion, in which the tables were arranged in a rectangle, with the moderator and a member of the research team sitting at the top (i.e., next to the video camera).

The members of Ipsos and the research team introduced themselves with their name and function as part of the general introduction on both DF days. The research team was present in the plenary sessions and the breakout group sessions, with each breakout group allocated one member of the research team (Steffen Mau: green/'self-employed' group; Katharina Zimmermann: blue/'migrants' group; Jan-Ocko Heuer: orange/'unemployed' group).

While on day 1 the research team was mainly listening and taking notes on 'who said what' (to complement the audio- and video-recordings and facilitate the allocation of statements to DF participants), on day 2 this task was handed over to student assistants, and the senior members of the research team could be approached during the discussions as social policy experts that answered questions on social policy and the welfare state (see also Section 6).

An overview of the DF structure is provided in Appendix A-2; the detailed structured of each day is presented in Sections 5 and 6.

4. Before- and After-Survey

The DF started and concluded with the participants being asked to fill out a questionnaire; this was referred to as 'before- and after-survey'. The German survey questionnaire is contained in Appendix A-3. Questionnaires were matched to participants via the participants' unique IDs (see Section 2). This before- and after-survey allows comparisons of welfare attitudes in the DF with those in the German population (and from other countries), studying whether and how opinions have changed during the DF (by comparing survey answers before and after the event), and studying the reasoning behind survey answers (by linking the participants' statements during the DF to their answers in the survey questionnaire).

The participants filled out these questionnaires on day 1 before the first plenary session (i.e., between 9:00 a.m. and 9:45 a.m.); this was done in the 'Welcome Area', with members of the research team present to provide support. On day 2, the questionnaires were filled out as part of the final plenary session. While the questionnaires were identical on day 1 and day 2, on day 2 participants could skip the introductory part with socio-demographic items.

The questionnaires contained eleven questions with socio-demographic items (A1-A11; some had also been part of the recruitment criteria and have thus been gathered twice) and 46 items on attitudes towards social policy and the welfare state (D1-D46). Most items were taken from the European Social Survey (ESS) Round 4 of 2008's 'Welfare Attitudes' module (which was partly replicated in the ESS Round 8 in 2016)[2] and from the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) 'Role of Government' module from 2006 (also conducted in 1985, 1990, 1996 and more recently in 2016).[3] A few items were modified, and some additional

items were created by the co-ordinating UK team (e.g. on attitudes towards parental leave schemes). The questionnaire had been developed by the co-ordinating UK team and translated (and adapted if necessary) by each national research team. The ESS and ISSP items were taken directly from the respective national versions of these surveys (ESS 2008; ISSP 2006).[4]

After the event, the answers to the questionnaires were entered into an SPSS file by the research team and supplemented with data from the recruitment process (i.e., from a list of participants with their socio-demographic characteristics that the research team had received from Ipsos). As some information had been gathered both in the recruitment process and via the survey questionnaire (and sometimes in slightly different versions), the data from the recruitment process were preferred, as these were based on the transnationally agreed criteria. Appendix A-4 contains a list of variables from the resultant SPSS file on all five DFs; it also offers information on the source of each item (e.g. ESS Round 4, 2008, 'Welfare Attitudes' module; ISSP 2006 'Role of Government' module; WelfSOC team) and, if applicable, references to the latest round of the 'Welfare Attitudes' module in ESS Round 8 of 2016. This should be a good starting point for working with the DF survey data and participants' characteristics.

For a few variables, the questions and categories on the German DF differ from those of the other national DFs; this applies most notably to political orientation (where Ipsos had recommended using long-standing political party preference instead of current voting behaviour and political ideology), ethnic background (where a question on 'ethnicity' had been replaced by the more common concept of 'migration background' and specific quota for countries/regions had been added), and educational qualifications (which was gathered in more detail). For information on storage and availability of the SPSS file with the before-/after-survey see Part C.

5. Day 1: Plenary Sessions and Breakout Groups

Morning Plenary Session

Day 1 of the DF started – after the arrival of participants and the filling out of the survey questionnaires – with a morning plenary session. In this session, the moderator Hans Frieß (Ipsos) welcomed the participants, presented the overall topic ('The welfare state of the future') and the structure of the two days, emphasized basic principles of deliberation (listen and do not interrupt, accept other's opinions, be respectful and tolerant etc.), and encouraged the participants to voice their opinions; also, several organizational aspects were outlined.

Then began a round of introductions in which a microphone cube was thrown and the catcher said a few words about her-/himself (starting with the members of Ipsos and the research team and then randomly among all participants). To avoid stigmatization of unemployed persons, the members of Ipsos and the research team had agreed not to speak about occupations but hobbies or other private matters, and this example was followed by most participants.

The participants were then asked what associations come up when they hear the word 'welfare state' (German: *Sozialstaat*); this was to learn about participants' understanding of social policy and the welfare state, to make sure that people know roughly what they will be talking about in the DF, and to collect topics for the subsequent selection of themes for discussion.

People linked several topics to the welfare state, and the moderator wrote down these associations (partly already grouped) on large paper sheets that were later hung on the walls.

During the subsequent coffee break the research team grouped the topics into overarching themes, and afterwards the participants were asked to vote for the themes they wanted to discuss from eight themes (also written on paper sheets): inequality and basic social security, labour markets and employment, retirement and intergenerational issues, health care, families, immigration and refugees, gender equality, and administration and bureaucracy.

Participants voted by placing green stickers next to the topics they wanted to discuss; each participant had up to five stickers but could use only one sticker per topic. Two topics – gender equality, and administration and bureaucracy – received very few votes; the other six topics received a high number of votes, and thus it was decided that all six topics were included by merging two topics – retirement and intergenerational issues, and families – into one, so that the sixth-placed topic immigration/refugees could also be discussed. Thus, the following topics were selected for discussion in the breakout groups on day 1:

1) Inequality and basic social security (28 votes);
2) Labour markets and employment (27 votes); on par with
3) Families, retirement and intergenerational issues (27 votes);
4) Health care (26 votes);
5) Immigration and refugees (20 votes).

The plenary session concluded with a short presentation by the moderator about the welfare state and the five topics predetermined by the research teams for discussion on day 2 (see Appendix A-5). This was supposed to familiarize the participants with social policy and the welfare state, and with the idea that on day 2 they will be discussing other/additional topics. Afterwards, the participants were asked to follow the moderators into the breakout groups.

Breakout Group Sessions

Since the plenary session had concluded earlier than expected, there was more time for discussion in the breakout groups: Before lunch, there were 50 minutes for each of the first two topics, and during lunch it was decided to allow for each of the other three topics about 40 minutes (cutting a bit of the afternoon plenary session based on the impression that in the other national DFs there had been not much discussion in the plenary sessions). The breakout groups usually discussed the topics in descending order of the votes they had received.

As outlined in Section 3, three breakout groups were formed, each with a 'core group' and a broad mixture of other participants (for each participant's membership in a breakout group see the List of Participants in Appendix A-1).

The green group (core group: self-employed) included 11 participants, five of which had stated that they are self-employed (two with regular, three with irregular income; four working full-time, one involuntary working part-time). Among the other six participants, two were full-time employed, two retirees, and two homemakers. There were five women and six men; the age range was from 28 to 66 years. Overall, household net earnings and educational qualifications were higher than in the other groups (e.g., seven persons with a university degree). The group

sessions were chaired by Katja Kiefer from Ipsos and accompanied by Steffen Mau from the research team.

The blue group (core group: migrants) comprised 11 participants, including seven persons with migration background (three from Turkey, and one each from Poland, Macedonia, an Arab country, and a Western European country; one participant from Romania did not show up); yet, all persons were born in Germany. There were five women and six men; the age range was from 18 to 69 years. The employment statuses were: five full-time employed, two part-time employed (one voluntarily, one involuntarily), two students, and two retirees. The group sessions were chaired by Janine Freudenberg from Ipsos and accompanied by Katharina Zimmermann from the research team.

The orange group (core group: unemployed) consisted of 12 participants, including four unemployed persons (three receiving ALG II, one receiving ALG I), three persons in part-time employment (two involuntarily, one voluntarily; two were high-school graduates living with their parents), two full-time employed persons, and three retirees. There were eight women and four men; the age range was from 18 to 70 years. The group sessions were chaired by Denise Sindermann from Ipsos and accompanied by Jan-Ocko Heuer from the research team.

The discussion of each topic started with a short brainstorming on relevant aspects, followed by a focus on those aspects that were considered most relevant by participants. Participants were asked to outline problems and to propose future priorities of the welfare state regarding each topic. The moderators were supposed to give participants room to present their ideas, assumptions and aspirations, to ensure equal opportunities for participation, and to structure the discussions and prevent digressions.

After they had discussed all five topics, each breakout group was asked to (collectively) identify three issues or policies that had created the most conflict during the discussions or had seemed particularly important to them and should thus be presented in the following plenary session. The focus on conflicts departed from the original plan to simply ask groups to report on each topic in the plenary session, because experiences from the other national DFs had shown that this would bore the participants and stifle discussion in the plenum and thus not add much new insight into people's ideas and preferences.

Afternoon Plenary Session

The afternoon plenary session was devoted to the presentation and discussion of results from the breakout groups. Thus, volunteers from the breakout groups reported shortly what their group had considered most important or contested, and from this followed short discussions of these topics within the plenum.

During the debates, it turned out that the groups had similar impressions and had selected similar topics, namely: immigration/refugees, unconditional basic income, educational opportunities, and performance and pay of individuals and occupations. Yet, it also turned out that these topics had been chosen for different reasons – with immigration/refugees and the unconditional basic income selected due to their polarizing effects, while there was agreement

about the importance of education – and had been discussed differently in the groups. Especially notable was that the green ('self-employed') and the blue ('migrant') breakout group had accepted immigration (as part of the European refugee crisis of autumn 2015) as a matter of fact and primarily focused on how the integration of refugees could be financed (via raises in either taxes or public debts), whereas the orange ('unemployed') group had focused on problems of integration and argued for less immigration.[5] In regard to the unconditional basic income, the plenum was also split, with some – apparently mainly individuals with high educational qualifications and high incomes – emphasizing positive effects on individual freedom and self-determination as well as for the welfare state and the economy, and others warning about its costs and its effects on waged labour.[6] The topic of education was unanimously depicted by participants as universal remedy against various kinds of social problems, including growing inequalities, unemployment, a decreasing financial base for the welfare state, and low economic growth.

The moderator concluded this first day by asking for feedback, and this feedback was very positive, with participants stressing not only the good organization, but also that they felt a community spirit and had learned a lot. Participants were also given the opportunity to provide anonymous feedback by writing comments on paper and putting them into a feedback box, and this feedback was positive as well.

6. Day 2: Plenary Sessions and Breakout Groups

Morning Plenary Session

In the two weeks between day 1 and day 2 of the DF, the participants had received (via e-mail from the recruitment agency) an information sheet (internally also called 'stimulus document' or 'expert input') on the five topics for discussion on day 2 that were set by the research teams: work and occupations, economic inequalities, migration, gender equality, and intergenerational fairness. The preparation of this sheet was left to the national research teams, and in some countries the research teams also included answers to questions posed by participants on day 1 into the sheet. The sheet was supposed to give a broad overview and some basic facts about the five topics to enable the participants to prepare for the task of developing policy proposals on these issues on day 2 (see Appendix A-6 for the information sheet).

On day 2, the morning plenary session also began with a round of introductions. To raise spirits, participants were asked to say their name and state what animal, music instrument or piece of furniture they felt like, possibly with a short justification. The Ipsos team had also voiced concerns that the Islamic terrorist attacks of 13 November 2015 in Paris might influence discussions, but it had been decided not to explicitly mention this topic beforehand, and the attacks were not mentioned by the participants during the discussions.

After the introductory round, Prof. Mau provided an 'expert input' to stimulate discussions and to bring all participants on the same level regarding the information sheet that had been sent to them (and that was handed out to them during the session). After noting that the aim of day 2 was that the participants come up with something like guidelines for policy that arise

from a democratic process (but without the necessity to be consensually formed) and emphasizing that the information sheet and the presentation were only intended as help or impetus, Prof. Mau presented the basic contents of the information sheet (supported by a PowerPoint presentation; see Appendix A-7).

The presentation was followed by a Q&A session with Prof. Mau. Questions revolved around old-age poverty and the number of retirees receiving basic security benefits in old-age ('Grundsicherung im Alter'; introduced in 2005 as part of the 'Hartz'-reforms) as compared to all retirees, but also dealt with the relationship between financial inequality and tax burden.

The session concluded with a short introduction by the moderator Hans Frieß of what was expected from the participants during the breakout group sessions (see below).

Breakout Group Sessions

The breakout groups were identical in their composition to those on day 1 (including 'core group', assigned colour, and allocation of moderators and members of the research team): the green ('self-employed') group was moderated by Katja Kiefer from Ipsos and accompanied by Steffen Mau from the research team; the blue ('migrants') group was chaired by Janine Freudenberg from Ipsos and accompanied by Katharina Zimmermann from the research team; and the orange ('unemployed') group was chaired by Denise Sindermann from Ipsos and accompanied by Jan-Ocko Heuer from the research team.

Yet, three things differed from the breakout group sessions on day 1. First, the groups were asked to discuss the five topics that had been set by the research teams before the event (and that had already been presented in the morning plenary session on day 1 by the moderator Hans Frieß and presented in more detail in the information sheet and the accompanying presentation by Prof. Steffen Mau in the morning plenary session on day 2). These topics were:

1) Work and occupations;
2) Economic Inequalities;
3) Immigration;
4) Gender equality;
5) Intergenerational equality/fairness.

While in some national DFs the topics selected by participants for discussion on day 1 differed considerably from those selected by the research teams for discussion on day 2, in the German case four of the five topics were rather similar (although the topics on day 1 were somewhat broader). Basically, only the topic 'health care' from day 1 was replaced on day 2 by the topic 'gender equality' (which had also been part of the voting on day 1 but received the lowest number of votes by participants). This similarity of topics between day 1 and day 2 does not only provide more material on certain topics, but also seemed helpful for the development of policy guidelines, as the participants could draw on insights from their prior discussions.

The second difference compared to the breakout group sessions on day 1 was that this time the participants were expected to develop policy guidelines (also referred to as 'proposals' or 'priorities') for the future of the welfare state that could be hypothetically delivered in a report to the German government; these proposals should be voted on in the final plenary session.

The UK team had asked the breakout groups for three guidelines per topic and delivered a template for the guidelines that included questions on which social groups would be advantaged or disadvantaged by the proposal. Yet, it had turned out that this was very ambitious and people in other DFs had lacked time to prepare and discuss the policy guidelines. Thus, the German research team had decided to ask for two (instead of three) guidelines per topic and to use a simplified template which focused on three aspects: problem (what is the problem that should be solved?), goal (what is the goal in solving this problem?), and measure(s) (what measures should be used to achieve this goal?). This template had been introduced to the DF participants at the end of the morning plenary session and exemplified using the case of health care (which had been a topic for discussion on day 1 but was not a topic on day 2). The moderators were also instructed to question the participants what social groups would be advantaged or disadvantaged by their policy guidelines. Yet, the 'problem-goal-measure'-framework turned out to be still cumbersome, and thus breakout groups occasionally managed to come up with only one policy guideline per topic.

A third difference was that the senior members of the research team that accompanied each breakout group were now supposed to serve as social policy experts that could be approached by the participants for information and advice. Therefore, the task of noting down 'who said what' during the breakout group sessions was handed over to student assistants.

The theoretical background to these changes was threefold: First, the determination of five common topics for discussion in all national DFs was supposed to increase cross-country comparability of discussions and results, because it had been expected that otherwise the topics might fundamentally differ and not allow any meaningful comparative analyses. Second, asking the participants to come up with policy priorities was supposed to give point to the discussion and add elements of strategy, negotiation and compromise into the discussions, because it required each breakout group to settle on priorities for presentation to the other groups in the final plenary session. Third, the 'expert input' via information sheet and the availability of social policy experts were supposed to indicate whether and how expert information and advice might influence subsequent debates in the DF.

Afternoon Plenary Session

In the concluding afternoon plenary session, the policy guidelines developed by the breakout groups were shortly presented and then voted on. Before voting, the moderator of the plenary session, Hans Frieß, merged similar guidelines if the participants consented.

For the voting, each participant received two green and two red dots (marked with the participant's ID), and participants were asked to place their desired number of green dots next to guidelines they thought should be prioritized by policymakers, and to place their red dots next to the guidelines they did not like. For the voting results in the first thematic fields, the moderator initiated a short discussion, but due to time constraints the following topics were only voted on but not discussed.

During the discussion, it turned out that the 'no'-votes (red dots) were sometimes not supposed to express opposition to the goal itself, but to the measures proposed to achieve it. For example, participants argued that they had voted against a one-time wealth tax because they

did not like the accompanying measure of allowing the taxed persons to decide themselves to which projects their money should go to instead of leaving this to government decision.

The voting results are depicted in Appendix A-8. They show strong support for better and fairer educational opportunities, more recognition of work and performance, and better compatibility of work and family life; by contrast, some issues were rather contested, such as immigration (where the vote was basically split between a permissive/enabling and a restrictive/demanding approach towards integration of migrants/refugees), and the unconditional basic income. A more detailed analysis of each breakout group's voting behaviour was made for a book chapter on attitudes towards migration/refugees in the German DF. This analysis shows that DF participants voted primarily for guidelines from 'their' breakout group and shows interesting patterns of support from guidelines from 'other' breakout groups (see also Appendix A-8).

Finally, the participants were asked to fill out the survey questionnaire again (see Section 4 and Appendix A-3), to give feedback on the DF, and to write down their three overall policy priorities (chosen from the ones prepared by the breakout groups) on a paper signed with their individual number. The DF concluded with closing words by Hans Frieß and Steffen Mau thanking the participants.

7. Data Processing and Coding

A few days after the DF, members of Ipsos and the research team met to share impressions and discuss avenues for analysis. The discussion focused on differences between breakout groups and attitude profiles of individual participants. The meeting, which was audio-recorded and in part transcribed, formed the basis for subsequent analyses and the National Report on the German DF.

The research team received video and audio recordings as well as transcripts in English from Ipsos. The transcripts were merged into ten transcripts (one for each plenary session and breakout group session; i.e., five transcripts for day 1 and day 2 respectively), imported into NVivo 11, and person-coded by student assistant Robert Tiede based on the audio and video recordings and the 'who said what' notes.

Subsequently, a first round of content coding was performed. Robert Tiede coded the broad themes that had been agreed by the research teams (e.g. education, gender, healthcare, housing etc.; with the exception of income inequalities); Katharina Zimmermann coded topics that had to do with the participants' reasoning (main node 'reasoning'; second-level nodes: problem, solution, opinion, prioritization, rationale, source, spontaneous topics & priorities, voting results, country references) and with procedural aspects of deliberation (main node 'deliberation'; second-level nodes: expert information, feedback & reflection, group dynamics, other-regarding); and Jan-Ocko Heuer coded topics that had to do with inequalities (for which the German team had the main responsibility for all five national DFs and was supposed to write a book chapter;[7] this included the internationally agreed theme 'income/wealth inequalities') and topics that were of interest for planned journal articles (e.g. social investment policies, active labour market policies, deservingness and conditionality of welfare benefits) or had

been agreed with the UK research team for a joint article (attributions of responsibility for welfare between state, market, family, individual, and community).

As some codes were of interest mainly for specific articles, these did not become part of the NVivo file that was sent to the UK team for distribution among all WelfSOC teams. Also, on a WelfSOC meeting in Florence in 2018 it was agreed that for data archiving the co-ordinating UK team would keep only codes for persons and for the internationally agreed broad themes.

The participants' socio-demographic and attitude data from the recruitment screener and the before-/after-surveys were entered into SPSS and submitted to the WelfSOC co-ordination team; the SPSS file also contains some additional data compiled by the recruitment agency. On storage and availability of the German WelfSOC DF data see Part C of this report.

B. Focus Groups

The second and final step of data collection were five focus groups conducted in autumn 2016. Each focus group was supposed to represent a distinct social group regarding status and stage of life: the middle class (determined via income, education and occupation), the working class (ditto), young people (below 35 years of age), retirees (aged 60 years or above) and women with care responsibilities managing work and family life. The aim was to explore the groups' reasoning about welfare rights, entitlements, conditions, obligations, responsibilities, needs and deservingness. This should be achieved by presenting them six vignettes representing different target groups of the welfare state – an unemployed person; an elderly person; a family with median income; a low-income earner on minimum wage; a well-off earner; and an immigrant – and asking what social benefits and services the person(s) on the vignettes should receive and what should be demanded from them – and why. At the end, the focus groups were asked to rank the vignettes in terms of about whom the welfare state should care most/least and to discuss the resultant rank order and justify their ranking decisions.

For this exploration of welfare solidarities and cleavages and underlying patterns of reasoning, focus groups were selected because they have the advantage over surveys that they allow the analysis of arguments, justifications and judgments that lie behind evaluations and rankings. Moreover, in contrast to qualitative interviews, focus groups generate insights into shared meanings and processes of collective reasoning and create "a natural environment … because participants are influencing, and influenced by others – just as they are in real life" (Krueger & Casey 2015: *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE, p. 7).

The overall design of the focus groups was agreed upon by all national research teams at a co-ordination conference on 30 June/1 July 2016 in Berlin and via subsequent e-mail exchanges. From the German research team, Steffen Mau, Jan-Ocko Heuer, Katharina Zimmermann and the student assistant Robert Tiede were involved in the preparation of the focus groups.

The focus groups in Germany took place on three days (Monday, 10 October, to Wednesday, 12 October 2016) at the facilities of the qualitative research agency *items* in Berlin (in rooms specifically designed for group discussions, with cameras, microphones, one-way mirror etc.). The five groups were scheduled as follows:

Date	Time	Focus group
10 October 2016	4:00 – 6:00 p.m.	Middle class
10 October 2016	6:45 – 8:45 p.m.	Working class
11 October 2016	4:00 – 6:00 p.m.	Younger people
11 October 2016	6:45 – 8:45 p.m.	Women with care responsibilities
12 October 2016	10:00 – 12:00 a.m.	Retirees

The groups had been organized and were conducted by the Qualitative Research Unit of Ipsos Germany, led by Dr. Hans Frieß, who also moderated all discussions. From the research team were present (behind a mirror and not visible for the participants) Jan-Ocko Heuer, Katharina Zimmermann and Robert Tiede.

In each focus group were eight participants (10-for-8 recruitment), in the group of younger people only seven (three non-show-ups). The groups had been recruited on the basis of the criteria provided by the co-ordination team, and for each participant the following data were available: age, gender, occupation, education level, family status (with number and age of children), household income, housing situation, migration background, and political orientation. A list of participants with their socio-demographics is contained in Appendix B-1.

The groups were seated around a block table with the moderator at the top; snacks, small dishes and beverages were provided. Each session lasted a bit longer than 2 hours (without a break) and had the same structure. It began with the moderator introducing the main theme – the (future of the) German welfare state with the main question 'who should get what from the welfare state under what conditions (and who should not), and who should finance this' –, outlying the structure of the session – with six vignettes representing persons who might be supported by the welfare state in order to discuss issues of solidarity, responsibility and deservingness – and explaining legal aspects (recordings; anonymity) and communication rules (e.g. voicing one's own opinion; no right or wrong; respecting opinions of others; no interruptions etc.). This was followed by a short round of introductions (name, age, occupation, family situation, hobbies).

Then started a short brainstorming in which the participants were asked to give their associations in regard to the term 'welfare state' (German: *Sozialstaat*). The aim was to offer all participants a broad range of aspects that are connected to the welfare state, including various benefits and services, policy fields, administrative aspects, normative underpinnings, and relations to similar topics. This worked very well in all groups, with the participants mentioning a broad range of areas, benefits and services (e.g. old-age pensions, healthcare, unemployment insurance, income support, minimum wage, education, daycare facilities) as well as various administrative and normative aspects; it was particularly interesting that participants from the working class group frequently mentioned rather abstract notions (e.g. human dignity, constitutionality and democracy), and that participants from the younger-people group were very informed about the range of policy fields, benefits and services and their intricate details.

The moderator then asked the participants for whom the welfare state is or should be (i.e. about target groups) to lead over to the discussion of the vignettes and to raise awareness that the welfare state does not only deal with poverty and need, but also with insurance and various life-course risks. Indeed, in all groups the participants argued that the welfare state is targeted at the whole population. All in all, these introductions and warm-up exercises lasted about 15 to 20 minutes.

Then the moderator presented the six vignettes (written on DIN A3-boards with small stylized icons next to the text) to the participants (see Appendix B-2). These were (always in the same order and here translated into English):

- An unemployed person: 'Udo is 45 years old and in good health. He has been unemployed for some time.'
- An elderly person: 'Gisela is 70 years old and in good health. She is not working anymore.'
- A family with roughly the median income and two children under three years: 'Family Meyenberg has two children under the age of three years. The family has 2,940 Euro per month at their disposal.'
- A low-income earner with the minimum wage: 'Hannes is thirty years old and earns 1,400 Euro gross per month. After taxes and social security contributions he has 1,045 Euro net per month.'
- A well-off earner (with corresponding higher taxes and contributions): 'Jens is thirty years old and earns 4,500 Euro gross per month. After taxes and social security contributions he has 2,660 Euro net per month.'
- An immigrant: 'Adrian has immigrated to Germany.'

The vignettes were designed to provide the least information necessary to identify a certain welfare target group, so that an open discussion about this target group would be fostered. Yet, specifications were provided to avoid technical discussions (e.g. on gross and net income in the case of minimum wage) or misleading debates (e.g. on disability/illness in the case of the 'unemployed' vignette).

In contrast to some other WelfSOC countries, the German research team had decided to use names on the vignettes instead of labels such as 'unemployed person'; this was also supposed to give the participants more room for interpretations and to test on what criterion participants would focus. Using a pre-test, it was aimed for names that were common, status-neutral and not invoking stigmata. This seemed to work well; e.g., the immigrant 'Adrian' was seen by participants both as a Syrian refugee and a Swiss tax dodger.

Each vignette was discussed 15-20 minutes (with the first vignette usually taking a bit longer to make the participants familiar with the format). The discussion of each vignette had the same format (which had been fixed in a moderation guideline based on moderation pre-tests by Ipsos and the research team):

- *Spontaneous reactions*: First the moderator asked the participants what they thought spontaneously about the person(s). This usually evoked comments that showed that the participants perceived the persons as they were supposed to; for example: in the

case of the old-age person they assumed that she is a retiree; in the case of the family they discussed if the disposable income is high or low (and usually agreed that it is 'an average family'); in the case of the low-income worker they were surprised or even shocked how little a job can pay (and sometimes assumed that this was the minimum wage); and in the case of the well-off worker they congratulated the person to his income, but also complained about the high level of taxes and contributions. Yet, sometimes – primarily in the case of the unemployed person and the immigrant – they demanded more information to give an appropriate assessment and offered first specifications.

- *Specification (if required)*: If the participants demanded more information on the vignette/person, the moderator asked the participants what information they needed and mirrored their answer in order to learn why the needed the specification to assess the case (e.g. "Why is it important to know his education level? Why is it important if he is married or not? Why is it important for how long he is unemployed?"); also, he gave the group the opportunity to specify the persons themselves ("Ok. So, what is Udo's level of education/qualification? For how long has he been unemployed?") and wrote down these specifications on a flipchart. Yet, the demand for specifications was quite diverse: While the middle class group required many specifications, the working class group rarely asked for more information to discuss the case; the other groups were in-between, but as we had made the experience that the fixed specification in the middle class group had little impact on the following discussion of benefits and services (and their level and financing), the moderator did not encourage detailed and shared specifications (which saved time and also turned out useful for the concluding card-sorting/ranking; see below).

- *Discussion*: Then the moderator initiated a discussion about what the person should receive from the welfare state (and what not), the level and conditions of benefits and services, and the underlying reasoning and justifications. These discussions were very lively and provided many insights into participants' ideas of justice, fairness, equality, need, solidarity, responsibility and deservingness as well as inherent contradictions and inconsistencies. The participants were especially engaged in the working-class group (not least as some recognized their own situation in the low-income worker vignette), the women-with-care-responsibilities group, and the retirees group.

- *In-depth/focus*: During these discussions, the moderator at times focused on topics and issues that had been identified by the research team as particularly interesting for current welfare state research and asked the participants to elaborate on their views and ideas. While some themes – such as individual responsibility, social investment, or inequality – were discussed in regard to all vignettes, others were more specifically adapted to the social situation represented by the vignette; e.g.: a) *unemployment*: status-preserving versus basic security benefits; need versus contributions; active labour market policies and the balance between promotion and demands; b) *old-age*: retirement age and labour market participation; status-preserving versus basic security public pensions; public versus private old-age provision; c) *families*: care within the

family versus external care; social investment; d) *low-income earners*: wage levels versus benefit levels; top-up benefits versus higher minimum wage; responsibilities and balances in qualification and labour market services; e) *well-off earners*: comparison of income with low-income earner; financing of the welfare state; level of taxes and contributions; relationship between contributions and benefits; f) *immigrants*: labour market access; access to welfare benefits and services; balance of societal versus individual responsibility. During these discussions, various specifications of the vignettes were tested (those suggested by the co-ordination team and additional ones particularly relevant in regard to the institutional structure of the German welfare state).

Finally, the participants were asked to sort the vignettes in order of who should receive benefits and services from the welfare state or about whom the welfare state should care most or least. For this, each participant received six cards containing the vignettes and was asked to assign them within 30 seconds to the numbers 1 to 6 on the table (with '1' indicating who should receive the most from the welfare state, and '6' indicating who should receive the least from the welfare state).

This procedure differs from those in some other WelfSOC countries, as it had only been agreed among research teams that the participants should rank the vignettes, but not how, and thus in some countries the vignettes were ranked collectively. The German team had decided for an individualized ranking because it offers more possibilities for analysis by allowing to study both individual and group rankings and to match individual rank orders of participants to their statements during the focus group discussions.

As a pre-test had shown that the participants might have problems to rank the persons after they had specified them in detail, it had been decided that the vignettes/persons were reduced to their main characteristics (which also facilitates comparisons with quantitative studies on deservingness perceptions); thus, the moderator pinned the following terms on the DIN A3-posters: 'unemployed', 'retiree', 'family', 'low-income earner' (German: *Geringverdiener*), 'well-off income earner' (German: *Gutverdiener*), 'immigrant'. This worked well, although due to space constraints and possible misunderstandings in some groups some cards were not clearly assigned to a number (these were excluded from the analysis).

The results were often in line with previous research on deservingness perceptions (e.g. the retiree and the family were often ranked relatively high, the unemployed and immigrant ranked relatively low), but there were also considerable differences between groups (e.g. almost all participants in the younger-people group and the care-women group ranked the well-off income earner the lowest, while in the other groups he was often ranked higher).[8] In the concluding discussion, the participants were asked why specific vignettes were ranked high or low, and which difficulties they had in ranking the vignettes. The results of the ranking exercise are contained in Appendix B-3.

After the event, the research team received the audio and video recordings and the English transcripts from Ipsos and imported them into NVivo and person-coded them. For data storage and availability see Part C of this report.

C. Data and Documentation

The German WelfSOC team produced the following data files:

- [DF I] **SPSS file** with socio-demographic data and attitudes data from the before-/after-survey complemented by socio-demographic data from the recruitment process (see Part A, Section 4) → submitted to the co-ordinating UK team and resulting in a joint SPSS file
- [DF II] **NVivo file** with the transcripts of the German DF, coded for persons and themes (see Part A, Section 7) → submitted to the co-ordinating UK team
- [Focus groups] **NVivo file** with the transcripts of the German focus groups, coded for persons → submitted to the co-ordinating UK team

These files are available from the Principal Investigator Prof. Steffen Mau and will be archived (along with documentation) by the co-ordinating UK research team with the UK Data Archive; the files are supposed to become publicly available in autumn 2019.

The main source of information on the data are this Report and its appendices, which are:

- **Appendix A-1a**: List of DF Participants (with pseudonym, socio-demographic profile)
- **Appendix A-1b**: List of DF Participants in German [Liste DF-TeilnehmerInnen] (with breakout group, pseudonym, number of coded statements during DF, socio-demographic profile; sorted by breakout group and number of DF-statements)
- **Appendix A-1c**: List of DF Participants as MS Excel file [for improved search and sorting options; excerpt from SPSS file on Before-/After-Survey, complemented by German versions and additional information]
- **Appendix A-2**: Overview of DF Structure
- **Appendix A-3**: Before-/After-Survey Questionnaire of German DF
- **Appendix A-4**: List of Variables in SPSS file on before-/after-survey [with information on sources (e.g. ESS Round 4 of 2008 'Welfare Attitudes' module; ISSP 2006 'Role of Government' module) and replications in ESS Round 8 of 2016
- **Appendix A-5**: Slides of the Introductory Presentation on the Welfare State (Presented by the Ipsos Moderator Hans Frieß in the Morning Plenary Session on Day 1)
- **Appendix A-6**: Information Sheet on the Five Topics for Discussion on Day 2 (Sent to the Participants before Day 2)
- **Appendix A-7**: Slides of the Presentation on the Five Topics for Discussion on Day 2 (Presented by Prof. Steffen Mau in the Morning Plenary Session on Day 2)
- **Appendix A-8**: Voting of DF Participants on Policy Guidelines from the Breakout Groups (in the Afternoon Plenary Session on Day 2)
- **Appendix B-1**: List of Focus Groups' Participants
- **Appendix B-2**: Vignettes for Focus Group Discussions
- **Appendix B-3**: Results of the Vignette-Ranking by Focus Groups' Participants

Further documentation (and some preliminary results) is provided by the two reports on the DF and focus groups that were for internal use in the WelfSOC project and are available from the research team:

- German National Report on the Deliberative Forum [alternative title: WelfSOC-report on the deliberative forum in Germany; 31 May 2016]
- German National Report on the Focus Groups [alternative title: WelfSOC focus groups Germany – report; 14 October 2016]

Publications that contain information on the German WelfSOC sub-project are (as of August 2018; further publications in preparation):

- Taylor-Gooby, Peter; Leruth, Benjamin (eds.) (2018) *Attitudes, aspirations and welfare: Social policy directions in uncertain times*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. [Monograph with the DF results, including two chapters by members of the German research team on attitudes to inequalities and to labour markets & social investment]
- Taylor-Gooby, Peter; Hvinden, Bjørn; Mau, Steffen; Leruth, Benjamin; Schøyen, Mi Ah; Győry, Adrienn (in press) 'Moral economies of the welfare state: A qualitative comparative study', in *Acta Sociologica*. DOI: 10.1177/0001699318774835.
- Zimmermann, Katharina; Heuer, Jan-Ocko; Mau, Steffen (2018) 'Changing preferences towards redistribution: How deliberation shapes welfare attitudes', in *Social Policy & Administration* 52 (5): 969–982.
- Mau, Steffen; Heuer, Jan-Ocko; Zimmermann, Katharina (2018) 'Zur Akzeptanz des Wohlfahrtsstaates: Fixe Meinungen oder Willensbildung durch Deliberation?', in Karl Ulrich Mayer (ed.) *Gutes Leben oder gute Gesellschaft? Symposium der Deutschen Akademie der Naturforscher Leopoldina - Nationale Akademie der Wissenschaften und der VolkswagenStiftung am 17. und 18. Juni 2016 in Hannover*. Stuttgart: Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft (Nova Acta Leopoldina, Neue Folge, Nummer 417), pp. 203–220.
- Heuer, Jan-Ocko; Mau, Steffen; with assistance of Robert Tiede (2018) 'Ängste in der Bevölkerung bei der sozialpolitischen Integration von Migrant*innen', in Sigrid Betzelt, Ingo Bode (eds.) *Angst im neuen Wohlfahrtsstaat: Kritische Blicke auf ein diffuses Phänomen*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, pp. 109–145.

Several publications (including working papers and conference presentations) and documentation are also available from the WelfSOC weblog: https://blogs.kent.ac.uk/welfsoc/.

All documentation regarding the organization of the German WelfSOC sub-project (including information about WelfSOC in general, the international co-ordination conferences, the public tender among research institutes and the contract with Ipsos Germany, and the minutes and materials of the preparation of data collection and analysis in Germany) has been submitted in electronic form by the responsible Postdoc Jan-Ocko Heuer to the Principal Investigator Steffen Mau and can be made available if necessary.

---

[1] For the theoretical background to studying welfare attitudes with DFs see e.g.: 1) Zimmermann, Katharina; Heuer, Jan-Ocko; Mau, Steffen (2018) 'Changing preferences towards redistribution: How deliberation shapes welfare attitudes', in *Social Policy & Administration* 52 (5): 969–982. 2) Mau, Steffen; Heuer, Jan-Ocko; Zimmermann, Katharina (2018) 'Zur Akzeptanz des Wohlfahrtsstaates: Fixe Meinungen oder Willensbildung durch Deliberation?', in Karl Ulrich Mayer (ed.) *Gutes Leben oder gute Gesellschaft? Symposium der Deutschen Akademie der Naturforscher Leopoldina - Nationale Akademie der Wissenschaften und der VolkswagenStiftung am 17. und 18. Juni 2016 in Hannover*. Stuttgart: Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft (Nova Acta Leopoldina, Neue Folge,

Nummer 417), pp. 203–220. – For further information on the DF methodology see also the working papers on the WelfSOC weblog: https://blogs.kent.ac.uk/welfsoc/.

[2] For information on the European Social Survey see http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/ with information on the 'Welfare Attitudes' module: http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/data/themes.html?t=welfare.

[3] For information on the International Social Survey Programme see https://www.gesis.org/issp/home/ with information on the 'Role of Government' module: https://www.gesis.org/issp/modules/issp-modules-by-topic/role-of-government/.

[4] Note that the Danish team accidentally used a wrong question for item D1 ("Large differences in people's incomes are acceptable to properly reward differences in talents and efforts") and thus this item cannot be analysed for the Danish DF.

[5] See also: Heuer, Jan-Ocko; Mau, Steffen; with assistance of Robert Tiede (2018) 'Ängste in der Bevölkerung bei der sozialpolitischen Integration von Migrant*innen', in Sigrid Betzelt, Ingo Bode (eds.) *Angst im neuen Wohlfahrtsstaat: Kritische Blicke auf ein diffuses Phänomen*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, pp. 109–145.

[6] For the research team it was surprising that the unconditional basic income was frequently brought forward by DF participants and seemed to have many supporters among well-earning participants; studying the underlying motivations might be a fruitful topic for future studies.

[7] See: Heuer, Jan-Ocko; Mau, Steffen; Zimmermann, Katharina (2018) 'Attitudes to inequalities: Citizen deliberation about the (re-)distribution of income and wealth in four welfare state regimes', in Peter Taylor-Gooby, Benjamin Leruth (eds.) *Attitudes, aspirations and welfare: Social policy directions in uncertain times*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 93–135.

[8] See: Heuer, Jan-Ocko; Zimmermann, Katharina (2018) 'Unravelling deservingness: Which criteria do people use to judge the relative deservingness of welfare target groups?', journal article (under review).