

# Targeting Benefit Fraud: tracking research February 2011

DWP Communications

Research Report 6

December 2011

© Crown copyright 2011.

You may re-use this document/publication (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

This document/publication is also available on our website at:  
<http://www.dwp.gov.uk/comms-ci-research>

Any enquiries regarding this document/publication should be sent to us at:  
[CI.RESEARCHANDEVALUATION@DWP.GSI.GOV.UK](mailto:CI.RESEARCHANDEVALUATION@DWP.GSI.GOV.UK)

First Published 2011

ISBN 978-1-84947-623-2

Views expressed in this report are not necessarily those of the Department for Work and Pensions or any other Government Department.

# Executive summary

This report contains the findings of a piece of tracking research commissioned by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) Communications Directorate and undertaken in February 2011. The research was designed to provide a picture of attitudes and behaviour in relation to benefit fraud in order to inform the communications approach to support the delivery of the new fraud and error strategy introduced in October 2010.

Fieldwork was carried out by Ipsos MORI, using their face-to-face omnibus survey amongst a sample of 1072 adults. The sample included 479 individuals in receipt of Income Support, Housing Benefit, Jobseeker's Allowance or Council Tax Benefit.

The analysis focuses on two key audiences: general public and national claimants (consisting of those claiming the four benefits outlined above).

Key findings are as follows:

- The proportion of people claiming to have seen, read or heard anything about benefit fraud was high (79%), despite a decrease in campaign spend over the last year.
- Over half of the general public sample perceived benefit fraud as being easy to get away with (53%). This was lower amongst national claimants (41%).
- The general public are less likely to think that the consequences of getting caught committing fraud are serious than claimants. 44% of the general public sample agreed that the penalties of getting caught committing benefit fraud are 'not that bad', compared to 36% of the national claimant sample.
- There is a general acceptance amongst both the general public and national claimants that benefit fraud is wrong. 74% of the general public sample and 72% of the national claimants sample thought that benefit fraud is wrong all of the time, regardless of the circumstances.
- 65% of the national claimant sample said that they 'definitely would' report a change in their life or circumstances to JCP or their local council straight away.
- Around a quarter (26%) of the national claimant sample were 'on the cusp' of becoming fraudsters while 4% said that they 'definitely would not' report a change in circumstances straight away. 5% of the sample responded 'don't know' to this question.
- 42% of the general public sample said that they 'definitely' or 'probably' would report a neighbour who they knew was claiming more money than they were entitled to. This was slightly lower amongst national claimants at 36%.

# Acknowledgements

This research was commissioned by the Department for Work and Pensions Communications Directorate. Ipsos MORI were contracted to carry out the fieldwork, with analysis and reporting carried out in-house by the Communications Research and Evaluation team. DWP would like to thank all of those individuals who participated in or contributed to the development of the research.

# Contents

Executive summary .....	3
Acknowledgements .....	4
Contents .....	5
1 Background .....	6
1.1 Communications strategy .....	6
1.2 Target audience .....	6
1.3 Campaign activity and context .....	6
1.4 Research objectives .....	7
2 Research approach .....	8
2.1 Survey methodology .....	8
2.2 Sampling .....	8
2.3 Weighting .....	8
2.4 Questionnaire .....	9
2.5 Analysis .....	9
3 Key findings .....	10
3.1 Overall awareness .....	10
3.2 Perceptions of risk .....	10
3.3 Awareness of consequences .....	12
3.4 Attitudes towards benefit fraud .....	13
3.5 Behavioural intent .....	13
4 Summary of findings .....	
4.1 Conclusions .....	16
4.2 Interpretations .....	16
Appendix A: Questionnaire .....	17
Appendix B: Methodology .....	27

# 1 Background

## 1.1 Communications strategy

External communications have been employed as part of the wider strategy to deter benefit fraud since 2002/03.

In recent years the campaign has focused on increasing the fear of being caught by highlighting the tools used to catch people committing benefit fraud, and encouraging people to report those they suspect of doing so by publicising the National Benefit Fraud Hotline number and online reporting link.

Since 2010 there has been a move away from the traditional paid for advertising campaign, with the new communications approach to tackling fraud and error deeply embedded within the wider strategy initiatives.

Communications continues to be one of the key drivers to significantly increase the deterrent impact, as well as educating customers in their responsibility to keep their claim up to date and report any changes in circumstances.

## 1.2 Target audience

The primary campaign audience for DWP benefit fraud communications has been the working age benefit customers who are considered to be on the cusp of committing benefit fraud or have the propensity to do so under the right set of conditions.

Previous research identified these claimants as those that think benefit fraud is acceptable or who believe they won't be caught.

The general public has been the secondary audience in order to maintain levels of acceptability and promote the Government's zero tolerance approach to benefit fraud.

## 1.3 Campaign activity and context

The last paid for media campaign activity ran in March 2010 and since then there has been more limited activity with only periodic bursts of press coverage, the majority of which has been politically driven.

Additionally there have been a number of successful pieces of proactive PR and some press coverage of high profile fraud cases generated by the airing of the BBC TV series "Saints and Scroungers"

Additional coverage was generated by the publication of the new government fraud and error strategy in October 2010<sup>1</sup>, while ongoing debate about welfare reform continues to highlight the complexities of the current benefit system.

## **1.4 Research objectives**

Tracking research has always been a core element of the fraud and error campaign's evaluation framework. In the absence of data that can prove a causal link between communication and behaviour, particularly an individual's perception of risk, quantitative research is an effective tool that allows us to measure the impact of our messages and supplements the hard data that we are able to gather at organisational level.

This research dip was designed to enable us to understand the effect of having no advertising and whether this has had an impact on attitudes, understanding and intended behaviour in relation to committing benefit fraud and reporting of changes in circumstance.

This snapshot of the current position, in conjunction with operational data such as contact volumes, enables us to determine the most appropriate communications approach to support the new fraud and error strategy going forward.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.dwp.gov.uk/docs/tackling-fraud-and-error.pdf>

## 2 Research approach

### 2.1 Survey methodology

The research was conducted using Ipsos MORI's in-home face-to-face omnibus survey (Capibus), which surveys a representative sample of the Great British adult population. Interviews were carried out using CAPI (Computer Aided Personal Interviewing).

### 2.2 Sampling

The sample for this research was restricted to GB men aged 18-64 and women aged 18-60. Fieldwork ran over two consecutive weeks. Week one fieldwork took place from 4-10 February 2011. Week two fieldwork took place from 1-17 February 2011.

In week one, half of the sample (as defined above) was interviewed in full. In week two, and for the other half of the week one sample, a question was asked that identified anyone claiming any of the following 'key benefits':

1. Income Support
2. Housing Benefit
3. Jobseeker's Allowance
4. Council Tax Benefit

Subsequent questions were only asked of those respondents falling into any of these four claimant groups. This ensured that a sufficient sample of individuals claiming the four key benefits outlined above was included within the research. This was essential, as individuals claiming these benefits are a key audience for DWP benefit fraud communications.

In total, over the full two week sample, 14.4% of respondents reported to claim one of the four key benefits.

### 2.3 Weighting

Data from Ipsos MORI's Capibus survey is weighted to reflect the known profile of the adult population of Great Britain, based on age, social grade, region and work status. For this project, further weighting was applied to take account of the oversampling of key benefit claimants. This ensured that key benefit claimants comprised 14.4% of the sample within the weighted data. Further details of the survey, sampling and weighting can be found in Appendix B.

## 2.4 Questionnaire

The questionnaire contained questions designed to establish people's attitudes towards benefit fraud, perceptions of risks and consequences, and behavioural intent in relation to reporting changes in circumstance (for claimants) and reporting benefit fraud. The research also sought to understand levels of awareness in relation to benefit fraud messages and communications.

## 2.5 Analysis

The analysis in section 3 outlines the findings from the research, focusing on results for the general public sample and national claimants. Please note that 'national claimants' refers to those in receipt of the four key benefits outlined in section 2.2. The report highlights where differences between these groups are statistically significant at the 95% confidence level.

## 3 Key findings

### 3.1 Overall awareness

79% of the general public sample claimed to have seen or heard anything about people claiming more money from benefits than they are entitled to recently, while 73% of national claimants reported that they had seen or heard anything. This difference is not statistically significant.

These high awareness levels indicate that the issue of benefit fraud remains high profile despite a decrease in campaign spend since March 2010. This may be partly driven by continued news coverage of stories relating to benefit fraud and TV programmes focusing on the subject. Welfare reform and the surrounding media coverage may also have contributed to this, by ensuring that the benefits system and its complexities remain high on the public agenda.

The main sources reported to be driving awareness were TV adverts, newspapers and TV programmes. Previous research has suggested that the 'Targeting Benefit Fraud' TV advertising achieved high levels of awareness, and this most recent research indicates that the TV advertising in particular has a continued impact. However, this can be expected to decrease over time.

**Figure 1: 'Have you seen or heard anything about people claiming more money from benefits than they are entitled to in any of these places recently?'**

	General Public	National Claimants
<b>Base: All respondents</b>	<b>(1072)</b>	<b>(479)</b>
TV advert at home	37%	36%
Newspaper	32%	23%
TV programme	36%	30%
Any poster	21%	19%
Radio	17%	10%
Magazine	5%	3%
None of these	18%	22%

### 3.2 Perceptions of risk

Around half (53%) of the sample thought that it is 'very easy' or 'fairly easy' for people to get away with claiming more money from benefits than they are entitled to. This was slightly lower amongst the national claimant sample at 41%. This difference is statistically significant.

This indicates that perceptions of risk are higher amongst claimants, perhaps reflecting the fact that benefit claimants may be in closer proximity to benefit fraud and therefore more likely to know, or be aware of, people who have been caught out.

**Figure 2: ‘In general, how easy or difficult do you think it is for people to get away with claiming more money from benefits than they are entitled to?’**

	<b>General public</b>	<b>National Claimants</b>
<b>Base: All respondents</b>	<b>(1072)</b>	<b>(479)</b>
Very easy	21%	15%
Fairly easy	32%	26%
Neither easy nor difficult	17%	18%
Fairly difficult	12%	18%
Very difficult	5%	11%
Don't know	13%	11%

Similarly to the above, the general public were more likely than national claimants to believe that the chances of getting caught abusing the benefits system are slim. 44% of the general public sample agreed with this statement, compared to 34% of the claimant sample. This difference is statistically significant.

These results suggest that, although benefit fraud remains a high profile topic, there is still work to be done around perceptions of risk in order to ensure that the end of the ‘Targeting Benefit Fraud’ campaign does not lead to lower perceptions of risk and a sense that tackling benefit fraud is less of a government priority.

**Figure 3: ‘How far do you agree or disagree with each statement: The chances of getting caught abusing the benefits system are slim?’**

	<b>General public</b>	<b>National Claimants</b>
<b>Base: All respondents</b>	<b>(1072)</b>	<b>(479)</b>
Agree strongly	13%	12%
Agree slightly	31%	22%
Neither agree or disagree	18%	19%
Disagree slightly	20%	22%
Disagree strongly	7%	14%
Don't know	10%	11%

Respondents were also asked whether they felt that benefit fraud is more difficult to get away with than it used to be. 39% of the general public sample thought that it was more difficult to get away with, while 24% disagreed with this statement. The results were similar for national claimants, with 44% agreeing and 20% disagreeing.

**Figure 4: ‘How far do you agree or disagree with each statement: Benefit fraud is more difficult to get away with than it used to be?’**

	General public	National Claimants
<b>Base: All respondents</b>	<b>(1072)</b>	<b>(479)</b>
Agree strongly	13%	19%
Agree slightly	27%	25%
Neither agree or disagree	19%	18%
Disagree slightly	15%	13%
Disagree strongly	9%	7%
Don't know	17%	18%

### 3.3 Awareness of consequences

The general public are less likely to perceive that the consequences of fraud are serious than claimants. 44% of the general public sample agreed that the penalties of getting caught committing benefit fraud are 'not that bad', compared to 36% of national claimants. This difference is statistically significant.

**Figure 5: 'How far do you agree or disagree with each statement: If people do get caught the penalties are not that bad?'**

	General public	National Claimants
<b>Base: All respondents</b>	<b>(1072)</b>	<b>(479)</b>
Agree strongly	20%	16%
Agree slightly	23%	20%
Neither agree or disagree	19%	19%
Disagree slightly	11%	15%
Disagree strongly	8%	11%
Don't know	19%	20%

Beliefs about the punishments that people will receive for committing benefit fraud were similar amongst both claimants and the general public. Both groups were most likely to believe that people would either receive a fine or be made to pay back overpaid benefits. Around a quarter of both groups thought that people could receive a prison sentence. The full breakdown of answers is provided in figure 6 below.

**Figure 6: 'What punishment do you think someone is likely to receive if they get caught claiming more money from benefits than they are entitled to?'**

	General Public	National Claimants
<b>Base: All respondents</b>	<b>(1072)</b>	<b>(479)</b>
Paying back overpaid benefits	36%	40%
Fine	40%	36%
Imprisonment	25%	26%

Criminal record	15%	15%
Loss of all future benefits	11%	11%
Reduction in future benefits	8%	6%
Community Service	18%	16%
Don't know	10%	10%

(All mentions over 5% shown)

## 3.4 Attitudes towards benefit fraud

The results indicate that there is a general acceptance amongst both the general public and national claimants that benefit fraud is wrong. 74% of the general public sample and 72% of the claimant sample thought that benefit fraud is wrong all of the time, regardless of the circumstances. 90% of the claimants sample selected 7-10 for this question, as did 90% of the national claimant sample. This indicates that these groups are similar in the extent to which they believe that benefit fraud is wrong.

**Figure 7: 'How wrong do you think each of the following are?: Claiming more money from the benefits system than you are entitled to.'**

	General public	National Claimants
<b>Base: All respondents</b>	<b>(1072)</b>	<b>(479)</b>
1 - Acceptable in some circumstances	2%	2%
2	*	1%
3	1%	1%
4	1%	1%
5	3%	3%
6	1%	1%
7	3%	3%
8	7%	6%
9	6%	10%
10 - Wrong all of the time, regardless of the circumstances	74%	72%

\* Small base

## 3.5 Behavioural intent

The research asked respondents how likely they would be to tell Jobcentre Plus or the local council about a change in their circumstances straight away. A lack of commitment to reporting changes straight away is used as an indication of the likelihood of an individual committing benefit fraud. People who state that they 'probably would' or 'probably would not' report a change in circumstances are seen as being 'on the cusp' of committing benefit fraud. The question was only asked of the national claimant sample.

65% of this sample said that they 'definitely would' report a change in circumstances straight away. Around a quarter (26%) of respondents were 'on the cusp' of becoming fraudsters while 4% said that they 'definitely would not' report a change in circumstances straight away. 5% of the sample responded 'don't know' to this question.

This indicates that around a third of national claimants lack certainty around whether they would report a change in their circumstances straight away. This suggests that further work may be required in order to increase the proportion of claimants who answer 'definitely would' to this question.

Behavioural intent in relation to reporting changes in circumstance may be connected to perceptions of risk. The data provides some indication of this (though sample sizes mean that this is not conclusive for all of the relevant questions). For example, 'definite reporters' are twice as likely as those who are 'on the cusp' to strongly agree that benefit fraud is more difficult to get away with than it used to be (22% v 11%) and this difference is statistically significant. They are also statistically significantly more likely to strongly disagree that the chances of getting caught abusing the system are slim (17% v 6%).

This suggests that increasing perceptions of risk amongst claimants may have a knock-on effect on intended behaviour in relation to reporting changes.

**Figure 8: 'If there was a change in your life or circumstance, how likely would you be to tell Jobcentre Plus or the local council straight away?'**

	National claimants
All respondents	(479)
Definitely would	65%
Probably would	17%
Probably would not	8%
Definitely would not	4%
Don't know	5%

The other behavioural intent question in the survey asked people about the likelihood of reporting a neighbour who they knew was committing benefit fraud. This question was asked of both claimants and non-claimants.

42% of the general public sample said that they 'definitely' or 'probably' would report a neighbour who they knew was claiming more money than they were entitled to. This is similar to the proportion of this sample who said that they 'definitely' or 'probably' would not report a neighbour (46%).

National claimants were significantly less likely to indicate that they would report a neighbour. 36% said that they 'definitely' or 'probably' would, while 52% said that they 'definitely' or 'probably' would not. It is interesting to note that claimants are less likely than the general public to report benefit fraud, as the results outlined in section 3.4 indicate that they are no less likely to believe that benefit fraud.

**Figure 9: 'If you knew that a neighbour was claiming more money from the benefits system than they were entitled to, how likely would you be to report them to Jobcentre Plus or the benefit fraud hotline?'**

	General public	National Claimants
<b>Base: All respondents</b>	<b>(1072)</b>	<b>(479)</b>
Definitely would	15%	14%
Probably would	27%	22%
Probably would not	31%	26%
Definitely would not	15%	26%
Don't know	13%	12%

## 4 Conclusion

### 4.1 Summary of findings and analysis

It is clear from the results that there is a high level of general awareness around benefit fraud and those claiming more from the benefits system than they are entitled to. Whilst this may not seem to correlate with the fact that there has been no focused campaign activity, it can possibly be attributed to the prolific media interest in benefit fraud in the 6 months prior to the tracking being carried out. This activity included newspaper coverage in relation to ministerial comment following a change in Government and a number of different TV programmes on the subject of fraud.

In line with high levels of general awareness, the report also shows that 90% of both the general public and national claimant sample stated that benefit fraud is wrong almost all of the time/ all of the time regardless of the circumstances. This is in line with the desired views that are required to encourage positive behaviour.

However, in contrast the results around perceptions of risk amongst claimants do not present a wholly positive picture, both in relation to the likelihood of being caught and the severity of punishments. These results suggest that although benefit fraud remains a high profile topic and is seen as being wrong, the messages that are getting through to claimants and the general public require further support to have an impact on the behaviours and beliefs that will help to reduce fraud and error.

As the results show, almost half of claimants stated that they were less likely to report changes in circumstances straight away, or to report a neighbour if they suspected them of committing benefit fraud. Therefore, despite the high levels of belief that fraud is wrong, there is far lower percentage who would take action to address this. This may be linked to a belief that there is either a low risk of being caught and/or limited punishment as a result.

It would appear that there is a gap between the core awareness and beliefs that provide a foundation to addressing fraud and error in the benefit system, and the underpinning beliefs and behaviours that actually drive down fraud and error. The future role for communications will be to focus on these underpinning beliefs and behaviours, with a view to developing the most effective messages and methods for engaging claimants and the general public.

# Appendix A: Questionnaire

## ***INTRODUCTION***

**Good morning/afternoon/evening, my name is ..... I am from Ipsos MORI an independent market research company.**

We are conducting a survey in the area about people's understanding of and attitudes to the benefits system and would be interested in your views (even if you have no direct contact with the system).

- Your name and individual details will remain confidential to the research company and will not be revealed to the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) or Jobcentre Plus (which is part of the DWP) or any other organisation.
  - INTERVIEWER ADD IF NECESSARY: DWP was previously known as DSS (Department for Social Security) and DHSS (Department for Health and Social Security).
- 

First of all, some background questions.....

## **A: IDENTIFYING CLAIMANTS**

S1. Firstly may I check, which of these benefits if any, do you yourself currently receive? *PROBE Any others?*

### **SHOW CARD A. CAN MULTICODE**

5. Income Support
  6. Housing Benefit
  7. Jobseeker's Allowance
  8. Incapacity Benefit/ Employment and Support Allowance (ESA)
  9. Disability Living Allowance
  10. Social Fund
  11. Council Tax Benefit
  12. Attendance Allowance
  13. Carer's Allowance (formally known as Invalid Care Allowance)
  14. Other (please specify)
- 

NONE OF THESE

**ASK IF "NONE OF THESE" OR IF NONE OF CODES 1,2,3,7 AT S1:**

S1b. Does anyone else in your household aged 18 to 65 receive **any of the benefits on this list?**

### **SHOW CARD C**

Yes                    - TRANSFER / ARRANGE APPOINTMENT

---

No / DK              - CLOSE INTERVIEW

**ASK ALL:**

S2a. INTERVIEWER PLEASE CODE GENDER OF RESPONDENT:

Male

Female

S2b. IF MALE RESPONDENT ASK:

Please could you tell me your age, last birthday?

*(WRITE IN, AGE 18-65) – GO TO Q1, IF NOT AGED 18-65 THE SCRIPT  
WILL CLOSE*

---

REFUSED              - ASK S2b

S2c. IF FEMALE RESPONDENT ASK:

Please could you tell me your age, last birthday?

*(WRITE IN, AGE 18-60) – GO TO Q1, IF NOT AGED 18-60 THE SCRIPT  
WILL CLOSE*

---

REFUSED              - ASK S2b

**IF REFUSED AT S2b:**

S2d. INTERVIEWER - ESTIMATE AGE GROUP OF RESPONDENT

READ OUT IF NECESSARY. SINGLE CODE

18-24

25-34

35-44

45-54

55-65

66+ - thank and close

***IF REFUSED AT S2c:***

S2d. INTERVIEWER - ESTIMATE AGE GROUP OF RESPONDENT  
READ OUT IF NECESSARY. SINGLE CODE

18-24

25-34

35-44

45-54

55-60

60+ - thank and close

---

**READ OUT FOR ALL:**

Please note that nothing you say throughout this survey will affect your entitlement to benefits.

***RELATIVE SERIOUSNESS OF BENEFIT FRAUD***

**INTERVIEWER - Q1 – Q4B ARE SELF COMPLETION (PASS CAPI MACHINE TO RESPONDENT TO COMPLETE). THE NEXT SCREEN WILL BE AN EXAMPLE QUESTION ONLY SO THE RESPONDENT CAN GET USED TO USING THE MACHINE. PLEASE ASSIST THE RESPONDENT IN COMPLETING THE EXAMPLE QUESTION**

**ASK ALL**

Q1. Some things that people do are seen as being more wrong to some people than to others. The computer will display a list of different activities, and we would like you to select how wrong you personally think each of these is:

So, on a scale of 1 to 10, where 10 means “this is wrong all of the time, regardless of the circumstances” and 1 means “this is acceptable in some circumstances”, how wrong do you think each of the following are:

**EXAMPLE QUESTION – please assist respondent in completing this first question**

Q1x - Allowing a dog to foul the pavement without clearing the mess up

**ROTATE ORDER**

- (a) Avoiding paying the right amount of income tax
- (b) Bringing cigarettes into the country to sell on, without paying tax duty
- (c) Burglary from someone's home
- (d) Claiming more from the benefits system than you are entitled to
- (e) Mugging
- (f) TV licence fee evasion

**ROTATED. SINGLE CODE:**

1 – Acceptable in some circumstances

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 – Wrong all of the time, regardless of the circumstances

DON'T KNOW

**ASK ALL:**

- Q2. And in general, how easy or difficult do you think it is for people to get away with claiming more money from benefits than they are entitled to?**

**ROTATED. SINGLE CODE**

Very easy

Fairly easy

Neither easy nor difficult

Fairly difficult

Very difficult

DON'T KNOW

**ATTITUDES TO BENEFITS SYSTEM**

- Q3. Please read the following list of several things that people have said about the benefits system. Using the following scale, could you tell me how far you agree or disagree with each statement?

***ROTATED. SINGLE CODE***

Agree strongly

Agree slightly

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree slightly

Disagree strongly

DON'T KNOW

***STATEMENTS ROTATED***

...the chances of getting caught abusing the benefits system are slim

...if people do get caught the penalties are not that bad

...abusing the benefits system is no different to stealing

...Benefit fraud is more difficult to get away with than it used to be

...People who abuse the system should feel guilty about what they are doing

ASK KEY BENEFIT CLAIMANTS ONLY (S1 CODES 1,2,3 AND 7)

Q4a

**Examples of changes in someone's life or circumstances that would need to be reported are:**

- when a partner moves in
- any changes in their work (e.g. starting a job when they weren't working before, taking on extra hours at work)
- any income they might get from casual or occasional work

**If there was a change in your life or circumstances, how likely would you be to tell Jobcentre Plus or the Local Council straight away?**

***ROTATED. SINGLE CODE***

Definitely would,

Probably would,

Probably would not,

Definitely would not,

Don't know

ASK ALL:

Q4b

If you knew that a neighbour was claiming more money from the benefits system than they were entitled to, how likely would you be to report them to Jobcentre Plus or the Benefit Fraud Hotline?

***ROTATED. SINGLE CODE***

Definitely would  
Probably would  
Probably would not  
Definitely would not  
Don't know

**This is the end of the self-completion section; PLEASE NOW HAND THE LAPTOP BACK TO THE INTERVIEWER**

ASK ALL:

Q5a. What punishment do you think someone is likely to receive, if they get caught claiming more money from benefits than they are entitled to?

***DO NOT PROMPT, CAN MULTI CODE***

Imprisonment / prison sentence  
Criminal record  
Community Service  
A taped interview under caution  
A fine  
Paying back overpayment of benefits  
Loss of all future benefits  
Reduction in future benefits  
Having their name made public (e.g. in local press)  
Having their home or possessions taken away  
No punishment at all  
Other (specify)  
DON'T KNOW

**Q5b. Can I just check, have you seen or heard anything about people claiming more money from benefits than they are entitled to, in any of these places recently?**

**SHOW CARD F. CAN MULTICODE**

01. TV advert at home
02. TV programme
03. Newspaper
04. Magazine
05. Radio
06. Poster on bus
07. Poster in Benefits Office/Job Centre/Social Security office/Council office
08. Poster site/billboard/bus shelter
09. Poster in a washroom/ pub toilet
10. Poster in a phone booth
11. Poster elsewhere
12. Leaflet in Benefits Office/Job Centre/Social Security Office/Council office
13. Told by staff in Benefits Office/Jobcentre/ Job Centre Plus/Social Security Office/Council office
14. Internet  
Elsewhere (please specify)

DK/CR

NONE OF THESE

**F: CLASSIFICATION**

*I now just have a few classification questions I would like to ask you.....*

**C1. CODE SEX OF RESPONDENT (DO NOT ASK!)**

Male

Female

**C2. (Marital status): Are you ....**  
**READ OUT. SINGLE CODE**

Married

Living with partner

Single

Widowed

Separated

Divorced

ASK ALL:

C5. And what is YOUR working status?

**SHOWCARD K. SINGLE CODE**

1. Employee full time (30+ hours)
2. Employee part time (8-29 hours)
3. Self-employed full time (30+ hours)
4. Self-employed part time (8-29 hours)
5. Still at school
6. In full time higher education
7. Retired
8. Not able to work
9. Unemployed and seeking work
10. Not working for other reason

C6. How many ADULTS (that is people aged 15 and over) are there in your household altogether, including you?

1, 2, 3, 4, 5+

C7. And how many children under the age of 15 are there in your household?

0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5+

**IF NONE, SKIP TO C9**

**ASK FOR EACH CHILD AT C7, UP TO FIVE IN TOTAL:**

**C8. COLLECT AGE OF EACH CHILD (UNDER 15), STARTING WITH THE ELDEST:**

**RECORD AGE (0-14)**

**INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF CHILD UNDER 1 YEAR OLD, CODE AS 0**

C8b Are you the parent of all the children in your household? This can include any stepchildren.

**PROBE TO CORRECT PRECODE, SINGLE CODE**

Yes – all children are own

No – none of the children are own

Yes – some children are own

**ASK ALL:**

C9. Please tell me whether your home is ....

***INTERVIEWER NOTE: Please note that if respondent lives with parents, we still need to know the tenure. Only code 'Other' as last resort***

***READ OUT. SINGLE CODE***

Being bought on a mortgage

Owned outright by household

Rented from Local Authority

Rented from private landlord

Rented from Housing Association

Other (specify)

**C10. Which of the following groups would you say applies to you?**

SHOWCARD L. SINGLE CODE

01. White
02. Black – Caribbean
03. Black – African
04. Black – Other
05. Indian
06. Pakistani
07. Bangladeshi
08. Chinese
09. Other Asian
10. Any other ethnic group

REFUSED

C11. I would now like to ask you about the member of your household who is the person with the largest income, whether from employment, pensions, state benefits, investments or any other source?

Are they/you .....

***READ OUT. SINGLE CODE***

Working (either full or part time)

Retired/Not working with private pension/means

**ASK**

**OCCUPATION**

Unemployed less than 6 months

---

Unemployed more than 6 months

**CODE AS "E"**

Retired with STATE BENEFIT ONLY

Not working with STATE BENEFIT ONLY

---

Student

**CODE AS "C1"**

OCCUPATION OF CHIEF INCOME EARNER :Job

Title/Description/Industry/Number employed/Qualifications Industry.

If manager/Supervisor/Self-Employed Number of People Responsible for.

**CODE SOCIAL GRADE:**

A

B

C1

C2

D

E

**THANK & CLOSE**

# Appendix B: Methodology

## Sample structure

The questions for this project were included on Ipsos MORI's *Capibus*. This omnibus survey uses a two-stage random location sample design which generates a sample, representative of the Great Britain adult population (aged 15+). In the first stage, approximately 145 postal districts are selected.

Each week on *Capibus*, one paired-adjacent **Output Area (OA)** from each district is randomly selected using probability proportional to size (grouped adjacent Output Areas are used in Scotland). Each paired-adjacent OA is comprised of an average of 250 residential addresses. The selection process is random but uses the MOSAIC geodemographic system and Census Ethnicity data to control the representativeness of the sample.

Adopting this approach helps to eliminate any possible bias in the sample caused by interviewing people all with the same background. Using MOSAIC allows us to select OAs with differing profiles such that we can be sure we are interviewing a broad cross-section of the public; since even people of the same age and working status may have a different viewpoint depending on their background.

Each paired-adjacent OA is defined by the list of addresses (extracted from the Postal Address File) contained within it. Interviewers are given a randomly selected start address and a list of addresses within the district.

## Target filtering

For this project, the sample was restricted to the target audience specified by DWP, ie: men aged 18-64 and women aged 18-60 in Great Britain.

Fieldwork was run over two consecutive weeks. Week one fieldwork took place between: 4-10 February 2011. Week two fieldwork took place between 1-17 February 2011.

In week 1, half of the sample (as defined above) was interviewed in full. In week 2 (and the other half of the week 1 sample) a question was asked that filtered out those defined as *key benefit claimants*, ie. those claiming to receive:

1. Income Support
2. Housing Benefit
3. Jobseeker's Allowance
4. Council Tax Benefit

On these parts of the sample (ie. week two and the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of week one), subsequent questions were only asked of those falling into these four claimant groups. Over the two week sample, 14.4% defined themselves as such *key benefit claimants*.

## Quota controls

On this omnibus, general controls are set for age, gender and work status using the most up to date mid-year local authority estimates for age and gender and Census 2001 data for working status. Thus, quota controls are specifically tailored to each sampling point. The use of MOSAIC ensures that the sample selected is nationally representative in terms of social grade without the need for setting quotas at the interviewing stage. The sample design described ensures that each weekly Capibus accurately reflects the GB population in terms of region and area types as well as informant demographics.

### **Weighting**

The data are then weighted to reflect the known profile of the adult population in Great Britain. Capibus uses a rim weighting system which weights to NRS defined profiles for age, social grade, region and work status - within gender. We also weight on tenure and ethnicity.

For this project, a further rim weight was applied to take account of the over-sampling of *key benefit claimants* (see above). This was necessary because *key benefit claimants* were interviewed across the entire two week sample, but non claimants were only interviewed on half of the sample in week one. *Key benefit claimants* were found to comprise 14.4% of the **total** sample over the two weeks (ie men aged 18-64 and women aged 18-60). Consequently, weights were applied to ensure that the split between *key benefit claimants* and other respondents was 14.4: 85.6.