



Deposited via The University of York.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/73243/>

---

**Monograph:**

Pires, C, Kazimirski, A, Shaw, A et al. (2006) New Deal for Disabled People Evaluation: Eligible population survey, wave three. Research Report. Department for Work and Pensions Research Report, vol. 324 . Corporate Document Services , Leeds.

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

**Department for Work and Pensions**

**Research Report No 324**

# **New Deal for Disabled People Evaluation: Eligible Population Survey, Wave Three**

**Candice Pires, Anne Kazimirski, Andrew Shaw, Roy Sainsbury and  
Angela Meah**

A report of research carried out by the National Centre for Social Research and the Social Policy Research Unit on behalf of the Department for Work and Pensions

**Corporate Document Services**

© Crown Copyright 2006. Published for the Department for Work and Pensions under licence from the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office by Corporate Document Services, Leeds.

Application for reproduction should be made in writing to The Copyright Unit, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ.

First Published 2006.

ISBN 1 84123 973 9

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

Printed by Corporate Document Services.

# Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Acknowledgements .....  | ix |
| Abbreviations and acronyms .....                                  | xi |
| Summary .....   | 1  |
| 1 Introduction .....  | 7  |
| 1.1 New Deal for Disabled People .....                            | 7  |
| 1.2 Overview of the New Deal for Disabled People evaluation ..... | 8  |
| 1.3 Survey of the Eligible Population .....                       | 9  |
| 1.3.1 <i>Sampling procedures</i> .....                            | 11 |
| 1.3.2 <i>Survey procedures</i> .....                              | 11 |
| 1.4 Study of 'knowledgeable non-registrants' .....                | 13 |
| 1.5 Structure of the report .....                                 | 14 |
| 2 Characteristics of survey respondents .....                     | 15 |
| 2.1 Summary .....   | 15 |
| 2.2 Personal characteristics .....                                | 16 |
| 2.3 Household characteristics .....                               | 18 |
| 2.4 Economic activity and benefit status .....                    | 19 |
| 2.5 Health and disability .....                                   | 22 |
| 3 Paid work: experience, expectations, barriers and bridges ..... | 27 |
| 3.1 Summary .....   | 27 |
| 3.2 Work experience .....   | 28 |
| 3.3 Work expectations .....                                       | 32 |
| 3.4 Qualifications .....  | 35 |
| 3.5 Bridges to work .....   | 36 |
| 3.6 Barriers to work .....  | 40 |

|       |   |    |
|-------|---|----|
| 4     | Awareness of New Deal for Disabled People .....                                   | 45 |
| 4.1   | Summary .....   | 46 |
| 4.2   | Awareness of NDDP .....   | 46 |
| 4.2.1 | <i>Awareness of NDDP at Wave Three</i> .....                                      | 46 |
| 4.2.2 | <i>Awareness of NDDP across waves</i> .....                                       | 50 |
| 4.3   | Awareness of Job Brokers .....  | 51 |
| 4.3.1 | <i>Awareness of Job Brokers at Wave Three</i> .....                               | 51 |
| 4.3.2 | <i>Awareness of Job Brokers across waves</i> .....                                | 54 |
| 4.4   | Combined awareness of NDDP and/or Job Brokers .....                               | 54 |
| 4.4.1 | <i>Combined awareness at Wave Three and across waves</i> ....                     | 54 |
| 4.4.2 | <i>Combined awareness across waves (Flow Voluntary group only)</i> .....          | 55 |
| 4.5   | Information received about NDDP and NDDP letter recall .....                      | 56 |
| 4.5.1 | <i>Information received about NDDP at Wave Three and NDDP letter recall</i> ..... | 56 |
| 4.5.2 | <i>NDDP letter recall across waves</i> .....                                      | 58 |
| 4.6   | Reactions to New Deal for Disabled People .....                                   | 59 |
| 5     | Participation and non-participation .....   | 61 |
| 5.1   | Summary .....   | 61 |
| 5.2   | Contact and awareness status .....  | 63 |
| 5.3   | Participation .....   | 64 |
| 5.3.1 | <i>Interviews and discussions with Job Brokers</i> .....                          | 64 |
| 5.3.2 | <i>Plans to contact Job Broker</i> .....  | 67 |
| 5.3.3 | <i>Registration with NDDP</i> .....   | 69 |
| 5.3.4 | <i>Reasons for contact</i> .....  | 71 |
| 5.4   | Non-participation .....   | 72 |
| 5.4.1 | <i>Aware, but no contact</i> .....  | 72 |
| 5.4.2 | <i>Contact, but no registration</i> .....   | 74 |
| 5.5   | Potential participation .....   | 75 |
| 6     | Target groups .....   | 81 |
| 6.1   | Summary .....   | 81 |
| 6.2   | The Interested Target Group .....   | 82 |
| 6.3   | The Non-interested Target Group .....   | 83 |
| 6.4   | Characteristics of the target groups .....  | 84 |
| 6.4.1 | <i>The Interested Target Group</i> .....  | 84 |
| 6.4.2 | <i>The Non-interested Target Group</i> .....                                      | 85 |

|            |  |     |
|------------|--|-----|
| 7          | Qualitative follow up of 'knowledgeable non-registrants' .....             | 89  |
| 7.1        | Background .....   | 89  |
| 7.1.1      | <i>The rationale for studying 'knowledgeable non-registrants'</i> .....    | 89  |
| 7.1.2      | <i>Findings from the survey</i> .....                                      | 90  |
| 7.2        | Characteristics of the achieved sample .....                               | 91  |
| 7.3        | Knowledge and experience of NDDP and Job Brokers .....                     | 91  |
| 7.3.1      | <i>Knowledge and understanding</i> .....                                   | 91  |
| 7.3.2      | <i>Experiences of contact with Job Brokers and others</i> .....            | 92  |
| 7.4        | Understanding why people did not become registered with a Job Broker ..... | 95  |
| 7.4.1      | <i>Deciding not to continue contact with a Job Broker</i> .....            | 96  |
| 7.4.2      | <i>Contact ended by the Job Broker</i> .....                               | 97  |
| 7.5        | How non-registrants moved towards work .....                               | 98  |
| 7.5.1      | <i>Moving towards work</i> .....   | 98  |
| 7.5.2      | <i>Thinking about work in the future</i> .....                             | 99  |
| 7.5.3      | <i>Respondents who had found paid or voluntary work</i> .....              | 99  |
| 7.6        | Lessons for policy .....   | 101 |
| 7.6.1      | <i>The range of Job Broker services</i> .....                              | 102 |
| 7.6.2      | <i>Potential clients' perceptions about Job Brokers</i> .....              | 102 |
| 7.6.3      | <i>Access and location as reasons for non-registration</i> .....           | 102 |
| 7.6.4      | <i>Staff treatment of people</i> .....                                     | 103 |
| 7.6.5      | <i>Use of alternative sources of help</i> .....                            | 103 |
| 8          | Conclusion .....   | 105 |
| 8.1        | The diversity of the Eligible Population .....                             | 105 |
| 8.2        | Similarities over time .....   | 106 |
| 8.3        | Continued interest in work .....   | 106 |
| 8.4        | Recommendations for marketing strategy .....                               | 107 |
| Appendix A | Sample details: all waves .....  | 109 |
| Appendix B | Weighting strategy .....   | 111 |
| Appendix C | Characteristics across waves .....   | 115 |
| Appendix D | Supporting logistics regressions .....                                     | 121 |
| References | .....  | 127 |

## List of tables

|            |  |    |
|------------|--|----|
| Table 2.1  | Personal characteristics of the Eligible Population .....  | 17 |
| Table 2.2  | Age and sex of the Eligible Population .....   | 18 |
| Table 2.3  | Household type .....   | 18 |
| Table 2.4  | Activities at time of interview .....  | 20 |
| Table 2.5  | Activities at time of interview by age .....   | 21 |
| Table 2.6  | Benefit status at time of interview .....  | 22 |
| Table 2.7  | Health status (grouped) at time of interview .....   | 23 |
| Table 2.8  | Presence of a health condition which affects everyday<br>activities .....                        | 24 |
| Table 2.9  | Nature of main health condition or disability .....  | 24 |
| Table 2.10 | Extent of effect of health condition on day-to-day activities<br>by age .....                    | 25 |
| Table 3.1  | Labour market experience .....   | 29 |
| Table 3.2  | Labour market experience by age group .....  | 29 |
| Table 3.3  | Labour market experience by health status .....  | 30 |
| Table 3.4  | Labour market experience by when health condition<br>started to limit activities .....           | 31 |
| Table 3.5  | Labour market experience by whether has a partner .....  | 31 |
| Table 3.6  | Work expectations by age group .....   | 33 |
| Table 3.7  | Work expectations by work experience .....   | 34 |
| Table 3.8  | Work expectations by work experience – Stock group only .....                                    | 35 |
| Table 3.9  | Whether has academic or vocational qualifications .....  | 35 |
| Table 3.10 | NVQ equivalents of highest qualifications .....  | 36 |
| Table 3.11 | Bridges to work .....  | 37 |
| Table 3.12 | Number of bridges identified .....   | 38 |
| Table 3.13 | Bridges to work by age .....   | 39 |
| Table 3.14 | Number of bridges by age .....   | 39 |
| Table 3.15 | Barriers to work .....   | 40 |
| Table 3.16 | Number of barriers identified, excluding ‘I cannot work<br>because of my health condition’ ..... | 41 |
| Table 3.17 | Barriers to work by age .....  | 42 |
| Table 4.1  | Spontaneous awareness of New Deals .....   | 47 |
| Table 4.2  | Awareness of NDDP by basic characteristics .....   | 48 |
| Table 4.3  | Awareness of NDDP by benefit and work characteristics .....                                      | 49 |
| Table 4.4  | Awareness of Job Broker by basic characteristics .....   | 52 |
| Table 4.5  | Awareness of Job Broker by work characteristics .....  | 53 |
| Table 4.6  | First way found out about NDDP .....   | 57 |
| Table 4.7  | Recall of NDDP letter .....  | 58 |
| Table 4.8  | View of NDDP letter .....  | 58 |
| Table 4.9  | Reactions to NDDP .....  | 60 |
| Table 5.1  | Contact and awareness status .....   | 64 |

|            |   |     |
|------------|---|-----|
| Table 5.2  | Had an interview or discussion with a Job Broker by basic characteristics .....                                 | 65  |
| Table 5.3  | Had an interview or discussion with a Job Broker by work characteristics .....                                  | 67  |
| Table 5.4  | Whether plans to have contact with Job Broker – Stock by work experience .....                                  | 69  |
| Table 5.5  | Whether plans to have contact with Job Broker – Flow by work expectations .....                                 | 69  |
| Table 5.6  | NDDP registration status .....  | 71  |
| Table 5.7  | Reasons for meeting with a Job Broker/registering multiple response .....                                       | 72  |
| Table 5.8  | Reasons for no contact with Job Broker Multiple response .....  | 74  |
| Table 5.9  | Reasons for not registering after meeting Job Broker multiple response .....                                    | 75  |
| Table 5.10 | Probably/definitely use service with advisers who would help find a suitable job by basic characteristics ..... | 76  |
| Table 5.11 | Probably/definitely use service with advisers who would help find a suitable job by work characteristics .....  | 77  |
| Table 5.12 | Whether would use a service giving support to stay in paid work .....   | 78  |
| Table 5.13 | Reasons why not interested in services .....  | 79  |
| Table 6.1  | Proportion of population in Interested Target Group by basic characteristics .....                              | 84  |
| Table 6.2  | Proportion of population in Interested Target Group by health characteristics .....                             | 85  |
| Table 6.3  | Proportion of population in Non-interested Target Group by basic characteristics .....                          | 86  |
| Table 6.4  | Proportion of population in Non-interested Target Group by health characteristics .....                         | 87  |
| Table 7.1  | Personal characteristics of achieved sample .....   | 91  |
| Table A.1  | Sample details: all waves .....   | 110 |
| Table C.1  | Gender – Wave One .....   | 115 |
| Table C.2  | Gender – Wave Two .....   | 115 |
| Table C.3  | Gender – Wave Three .....   | 116 |
| Table C.4  | Age – Wave One .....  | 116 |
| Table C.5  | Age – Wave Two .....  | 116 |
| Table C.6  | Age – Wave Three .....  | 116 |
| Table C.7  | Ethnicity – Wave One .....  | 117 |
| Table C.8  | Ethnicity – Wave Two .....  | 117 |
| Table C.9  | Ethnicity – Wave Three .....  | 118 |
| Table C.10 | Nature of main health condition – Wave One .....  | 118 |
| Table C.11 | Nature of main health condition – Wave Two .....  | 119 |
| Table C.12 | Nature of main health condition – Wave Three .....  | 120 |

|            |   |     |
|------------|---|-----|
| Table D.1  | Omnibus tests of model coefficients ..... | 121 |
| Table D.2  | Variables in the equation .....           | 121 |
| Table D.3  | Omnibus tests of model coefficients ..... | 122 |
| Table D.4  | Variables in the equation .....           | 122 |
| Table D.5  | Omnibus tests of model coefficients ..... | 122 |
| Table D.6  | Variables in the equation .....           | 122 |
| Table D.7  | Omnibus tests of model coefficients ..... | 123 |
| Table D.8  | Variables in the equation .....           | 123 |
| Table D.9  | Omnibus tests of model coefficients ..... | 123 |
| Table D.10 | Variables in the equation .....           | 123 |
| Table D.11 | Omnibus tests of model coefficients ..... | 124 |
| Table D.12 | Variables in the equation .....           | 124 |
| Table D.13 | Omnibus tests of model coefficients ..... | 124 |
| Table D.14 | Variables in the equation .....           | 125 |

## List of figures

|            |   |    |
|------------|---|----|
| Figure 2.1 | Health status at time of interview .....  | 23 |
| Figure 2.2 | When health condition or disability started to affect<br>'what you could do' .....    | 26 |
| Figure 3.1 | Work expectations .....   | 33 |
| Figure 4.1 | Awareness of NDDP at Wave Three .....   | 47 |
| Figure 4.2 | Awareness of NDDP across waves .....  | 51 |
| Figure 4.3 | Awareness of Job Brokers across waves .....   | 54 |
| Figure 4.4 | Awareness of NDDP and/or Job Broker aware across waves ....                           | 55 |
| Figure 4.5 | Combined awareness across waves<br>(Flow Voluntary group only) .....                  | 56 |
| Figure 4.6 | NDDP letter recall across waves .....   | 59 |
| Figure 5.1 | Had an interview or discussion with a Job Broker .....                                | 65 |
| Figure 5.2 | Whether plans to contact Job Broker .....   | 68 |
| Figure 5.3 | Whether had registered with NDDP after meeting<br>Job Broker .....                    | 70 |
| Figure 5.4 | Aware of NDDP and/or Job Brokers but no plans to<br>contact a Job Broker .....        | 73 |
| Figure 5.5 | Whether would use a service with advisers who would<br>help find a suitable job ..... | 76 |
| Figure 6.1 | The Interested Target group .....   | 82 |
| Figure 6.2 | The Non-interested Target Group .....   | 83 |

# Acknowledgements

This report was undertaken by the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen) and the Social Policy Research Unit (SPRU) and was commissioned by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP).

The authors would like to thank NatCen's Telephone Unit and Red Team at Brentwood for managing fieldwork and data processing, Mike Hart and Nafiis Boodhumeah for their work on the Blaise program, Kevin Pickering for his input to the sampling and weighting strategies, and Josephine Arch and Jane Mangla for their help with preparing the report. A huge thank you is also due to the interviewers who worked on this survey, without whom it would not have been successful, and to the respondents who gave so freely of their time.

The authors would also like to thank colleagues at the Centre for Research and Social Policy (CRSP), including Bruce Stafford, the NDDP Evaluation Consortium and Advisory Committee, and Carol Beattie, Antony Billingham, Vicki Brown, Martin Hill and Sally Rogers at the DWP.



# Abbreviations and acronyms

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
| <b>CRSP</b>   | Centre for Research in Social Policy       |
| <b>DEA</b>    | Disability Employment Adviser              |
| <b>DWP</b>    | Department for Work and Pensions           |
| <b>ES</b>     | Employment Service                         |
| <b>GCSE</b>   | General Certificate of Secondary Education |
| <b>GMS</b>    | Generalised Matching Service               |
| <b>GP</b>     | General Practitioner                       |
| <b>JB</b>     | Job Broker                                 |
| <b>JSA</b>    | Jobseeker's Allowance                      |
| <b>LMS</b>    | Labour Market System                       |
| <b>NatCen</b> | National Centre for Social Research        |
| <b>NDDP</b>   | New Deal for Disabled People               |
| <b>NVQ</b>    | National Vocational Qualification          |
| <b>SPRU</b>   | Social Policy Research Unit                |
| <b>WFI</b>    | Work-focused interview                     |



# Summary

The **Eligible Population Survey** is designed to obtain information about those eligible and invited to take part in the New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP). The survey aims to establish the characteristics of this population, their work aspirations and their awareness of, attitudes to and involvement with NDDP. A key feature of the study is to examine factors which affect participation and non-participation in NDDP.

The survey involved three waves of interviewing, and this publication reports on the findings from the third wave and, where appropriate, across all three waves.

This report also incorporates the results of a qualitative study following up a sub-sample of the Eligible Population Survey who did not register with a Job Broker (JB) even though they had apparently made some form of contact with one. These form a sub-group of people who can be thought of as 'knowledgeable non-registrants'.

The Eligible Population is divided into three distinct types:

- 1 **The Stock group** – 'Longer-term' qualifying benefit claimants, not eligible for a work focused interview (WFI).
- 2 **The Flow Voluntary group** – Recent qualifying benefit claimants who did not live in Jobcentre Plus areas and therefore were not eligible for a mandatory WFI.
- 3 **The Flow Mandatory group** – Recent qualifying benefit claimants who did live in Jobcentre Plus areas and were therefore eligible for a mandatory WFI.

It is important to note that these groups form distinct components of the Eligible Population and the samples interviewed for this survey are treated as such in this report. All respondents made a successful benefit claim in a time period that made them eligible to be sent a Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) mailshot on NDDP. Flow Mandatory respondents should also have been informed of the NDDP at their WFI.

## Characteristics

In Chapter 2, the key characteristics of the sample groups interviewed in Wave Three are outlined:

- Each sample group comprised more men than women. In terms of age, nearly half (47 per cent) of the Stock group were aged at least 50 years compared with only a quarter (26 per cent) of the Flow Mandatory group.
- Just under half of the respondents were living with a partner (40-45 per cent in the three sample groups), while just over a quarter lived alone (25-29 per cent). Only around a quarter of respondents had responsibility for children living in their household (21-27 per cent).
- Flow Voluntary respondents (19 per cent) were more likely than both of Mandatory (14 per cent) and Stock (five per cent) respondents to have been in paid work the week before the interview. Voluntary (15 per cent) and Mandatory (18 per cent) groups were both much more likely than their longer-term counterparts (five per cent) to have looked for work in the four weeks before interview.
- The vast majority (92 per cent) of longer-term claimants remained in receipt of an NDDP qualifying benefit at the time of interview. Majorities of the Flow groups (64 and 68 per cent) also remained eligible.
- Stock respondents were more likely to be in poor health than Flow respondents (55 per cent reporting bad or very bad health compared with 36 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 33 per cent of Flow Mandatory).
- Nearly all (95 per cent) of longer-term claimants had a health condition or disability at the time of the interview, as did 77 per cent of the Flow Voluntary and 80 per cent of the Flow Mandatory groups.
- The most common main health conditions or disabilities were problems with neck or back, legs or feet and mental health conditions.

## Paid work: experience, aspirations, barriers and bridges

Chapter 3 sets out the labour market experience and expectations of respondents, as well as outlining academic and vocational qualifications. It also explores a range of potential bridges and barriers to work for respondents:

- Approaching one-half of the longer-term claimants had either never worked or had not worked in the last nine years (44 per cent), in contrast to both the Flow groups where just under one-fifth were in the same position.
- Over half of the recent claimants were not in work, but had been in the last three years (51 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 56 per cent of Flow Mandatory) compared to less than one-third of the Stock group (18 per cent).

- More than one in two of the longer-term claimants said they did not expect to work in the future (56 per cent), in comparison to a still substantial one in four of the Flow Voluntary claimants and one in five of the Flow Mandatory claimants (24 per cent and 20 per cent respectively).
- The proportion of longer-term claimants who have looked for work in the last year or expect to work in the future (33 per cent) is similar to the proportion of all benefit claimants who want work (over three quarters of a million out of 2.7 million; DWP, 2002).
- Large proportions of all three sample groups reported having no qualifications, approaching two in five of the recent claimants (37 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 39 per cent of Flow Mandatory), and significantly more longer-term claimants (46 per cent).
- Reflecting higher work expectations and findings from past waves, recent claimants were more likely to respond positively to bridges to work, and to cite more than longer-term claimants. Accordingly, they also cited fewer barriers to work than longer-term claimants, with the most salient barrier among all three sample groups being inability to work due to their health condition or disability (90 per cent of Stock, 75 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 79 per cent of Flow Mandatory).

## Awareness of NDDP

Chapter 4 examines awareness among the Eligible Population both of NDDP as a programme and of the JBs who deliver the service. How respondents heard about NDDP and their recall of the NDDP mailshot are then described. Finally, attitudes towards the service are analysed:

- Over half of all respondents were aware of either NDDP and/or a JB among all sample groups at each wave (for Wave Three this was 56, 53 and 58 per cent among the Stock, Flow Voluntary and Flow Mandatory groups).
- At Wave Three, the Flow Voluntary group was less likely to be aware of NDDP than both other sample groups (24 per cent of Flow Voluntary compared to 30 per cent of both Stock and of Flow Mandatory).
- More than two in five respondents in each sample group said they had heard of at least one JB in their area (42 per cent of Stock, 44 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 45 per cent of Flow Mandatory).
- Looking across waves, there was a decrease in awareness of NDDP for both the longer-term claimant group and the Flow Voluntary group after Wave One. There was little movement between the Wave Two and Wave Three awareness levels of NDDP. On the other hand, there was an overall increase in the proportion of respondents aware of a JB in their area.
- As in previous waves, Wave Three recall of the NDDP mailshot was low, with only 14-15 per cent of each sample group remembering the letter.

- The Flow Mandatory group was more likely to be positive about NDDP when asked about their initial reactions to the programme.

## Participation and non-participation

Chapter 5 examines respondents' engagement with NDDP, from contact/plans to make contact to actual registration. Reasons for non-participation are considered, as well as the potential of those unaware of NDDP to participate:

- Contact with a JB differed between sample groups – eight per cent of all the longer-term claimants, 12 per cent of the Flow Voluntary group and 18 per cent of the Flow Mandatory group reported that they had had an interview or discussion with a JB.
- The most common reason for contact with a JB was to get help with moving (back) into work.
- Self-reported registration was around five per cent for each sample group (three per cent for Stock, five per cent for Flow Voluntary and six per cent for Flow Mandatory), although most of them did not appear on the NDDP registrations database.
- Less than one in ten of each group were aware of NDDP and/or JBs, had not had an interview or discussion with a JB, but had plans to do so (five per cent of the Stock group, eight per cent of Flow Voluntary and nine per cent of Flow Mandatory).
- Three-quarters of the Stock respondents who did not make contact with a JB said this was due to their health condition; this was a much larger proportion than both the recent claimant groups (76 per cent of Stock compared to 36 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 43 per cent of Flow Mandatory).
- Around one-half of the longer-term claimants and approaching two-thirds of the recent claimant groups who were not aware of NDDP said they would definitely or probably be interested in a service with advisers who would help them to find a suitable job.
- Those who said they would probably or definitely not be interested in such a service most commonly said it was because they could not work due to their health condition or disability – the figure for Stock respondents was around twice that of both Flow groups (79 per cent of Stock, 40 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 39 per cent of Flow Mandatory).

## Target groups

Chapter 6 defines and describes two groups within the Eligible Population who might reasonably be targeted for recruitment to NDDP:

- An 'Interested Target Group' can be identified. This group consists of respondents who were aware of NDDP and had plans to contact a JB, as well as those who were not aware of NDDP but had been looking for work recently and expressed definite interest in services that supported job entry and retention. Seven per cent of the longer-term claimants, 12 per cent of Flow Voluntary respondents, and 14 per cent of Flow Mandatory respondents belonged to this 'Interested Target Group'.
- Respondents who were looking or expecting to work but either had no plans to contact a JB, or were not aware of NDDP but were not interested in such a service, can be combined into the 'Non-interested Target Group'. Thirteen per cent of longer-term claimants and as many as 26 and 22 per cent of Flow Voluntary and Flow Mandatory respondents fell into this group.

## Qualitative follow-up of knowledgeable non-registrants

Chapter 7 presents findings from the qualitative study on 'knowledgeable non-registrants':

- Most respondents in this group remembered receiving a letter from Jobcentre Plus or DWP advertising a scheme to get people back into work but could demonstrate little understanding of NDDP.
- Much of the terminology around NDDP and JB's was not recognised and it was not clear from interviews whether the experiences of contact described were actually with a JB, or with Jobcentre Plus or some other organisation.
- Some respondents decided not to continue contact with a JB – this was often due to ill health. It was not uncommon that they said they would contact a JB once their health had improved.
- Others felt that the JB had effectively ended contact, making a decision not to register them, not offering them the opportunity and, in some cases, not even informing them of the possibility.
- Despite not registering with a JB after contacting them, many people were still motivated to move towards and into work. In these cases, non-registration was not necessarily a bad thing.

## Conclusions

In conclusion (Chapter 8), what emerges predominantly is the importance of recognising the diversity of the Eligible Population in terms of their work experience, expectations and health. These three factors play a part in respondents' low

awareness and participation in NDDP. Nevertheless, the substantial proportions looking for work, or at least interested in working, suggest that changes in the marketing approach could make a difference. There is some evidence for the personal interview-based approach being more effective than the mailshot at leading to positive views of NDDP. The study also indicates that relying on localised, JB-focused marketing may be better for raising awareness. Also, more frequent contact about the programme could enable catching people at the right time – when they are eligible *and* well enough to consider work. Such variations in the form, branding, frequency and timing of NDDP marketing, informed by this study, could help make the potential target groups more likely to participate in the programme.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 New Deal for Disabled People

The New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP) was implemented nationally in July 2001. It is a voluntary programme that aims to help people on incapacity-related benefits move into sustained employment. There is a large Eligible Population for the programme – about 2.7 million people, or 7.5 per cent of the working age population, receive incapacity-related benefits, and of these, over three quarters of a million would like to work (Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), 2002). Moreover, ministers have argued that work is the best route out of poverty and look to NDDP to provide innovative ways of assisting Incapacity Benefit recipients into paid work. There has also been concern expressed that some older people on Incapacity Benefit had ‘effectively...moved into early retirement’ and additionally there was a growing number of communities ‘with a particularly high reliance’ on incapacity-related benefits (DWP, 2002).

NDDP is available to people claiming one of the following incapacity-related ‘qualifying benefits’:

- Incapacity Benefit;
- Severe Disablement Allowance;
- Income Support with a Disability Premium;
- Income Support pending the result of an appeal against disallowance from Incapacity Benefit;
- Housing Benefit or Council Tax Benefit with a Disability Premium – provided clients are not in paid work of 16 hours a week or more, or getting Jobseeker’s Allowance;
- Disability Living Allowance – provided clients are not in paid work of 16 hours a week or more, or getting Jobseeker’s Allowance;
- War Pension with an Unemployability Supplement;
- Industrial Injuries Disablement Benefit with an Unemployability Supplement;

- National Insurance credits on grounds of incapacity; and
- Equivalent benefits to Incapacity Benefit being imported into Great Britain under European Community Regulations on the co-ordination of social security and the terms of the European Economic Area Agreement.

The national extension to NDDP introduced (Employment Service, 2000) a:

- single gateway provided by Jobcentre Plus offices to new claimants of incapacity-related benefits;
- network of around 65 Job Brokers (JBs) who provide services to help people gain employment;
- choice of JB for potential clients, as in many areas more than one JB operates; and
- focus on sustained employment outcomes.

## 1.2 Overview of the New Deal for Disabled People evaluation

The evaluation of the NDDP is a comprehensive research programme designed to establish the:

- experiences and views of NDDP stakeholders, including JB, registrants (also referred to as clients), the Eligible Population and Jobcentre Plus staff;
- operational effectiveness, management and best practice aspects of the JB service;
- effectiveness of the JB service in helping people into sustained employment and the cost effectiveness with which this is achieved.

The **Eligible Population Survey** is designed to obtain information about those eligible for the programme and invited to take part. The survey aims to establish the characteristics of this population, their work aspirations and their awareness of, attitude to and involvement with NDDP.

The survey involved three waves of interviewing, and Woodward *et al.* (2003) reports on the first wave.

For the third wave a qualitative study was also undertaken, following-up a sub-sample of the Eligible Population survey who did not register with a JB even though they had apparently made some form of contact with one. These form a sub-group of people who can be thought of as 'knowledgeable non-registrants'.

Other elements of the evaluation include:

- The Survey of Registrants, which is designed to obtain information about NDDP participant characteristics, their experiences of and views on the programme. The survey involves three cohorts, with the first two having two waves of interviewing and the third one wave.

- Qualitative research to explore the organisation, operation and impacts of the JB service from the perspective of key stakeholders, including in-depth interviews with: NDDP participants, JB managerial and front-line staff, Jobcentre Plus Personal Advisers, and Disability Employment Advisers.
- Qualitative and Quantitative Employer Research to assess employers' awareness, understanding and experiences of NDDP national extension and if/how these change over time.
- Documentary analysis and a survey of JB's to establish information on the range and nature of individual JB organisations, the services they provide and the costs of that provision.
- Cost-effectiveness analysis to provide an overall estimate of the extent and distribution of the costs (e.g. average cost per job entry) in the context of the apparent benefits of NDDP.

The consortium carrying out this work consists of Centre for Research in Social Policy (CRSP), Social Policy Research Unit (SPRU), National Centre for Social Research (NatCen), Institute for Employment Studies (IES), the Urban Institute and Abt Associates.

The original research design included an impact analysis and cost benefit analysis based on random assignment techniques, but this element of the design was removed in December 2001. Alternative methods for analysing impact are being explored by colleagues at the Urban Institute and Abt Associates in the United States. Results of the varying strands of the evaluation are synthesised by CRSP (Stafford et al, 2004)

### 1.3 Survey of the Eligible Population

This study and reporting on it was conducted by the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen) for the DWP. The survey aimed to find out:

- people's attitudes to work and whether they are able to work;
- awareness and attitudes towards the NDDP programme.

The study was conducted in three waves via telephone interview with a probability sample of the Eligible Population. Each wave varied in size and timing:

- The first wave comprised 1,168 interviews which took place between 12 August and 25 October 2002.
- The second wave comprised 1,303 interviews which took place between 8 May and 29 June 2003.
- The third and final wave comprised 2,284 interviews which took place between 22 January and 21 April 2004.

The Eligible Population can be divided into three groups for analysis purposes (see Section 1.3.1 for how these groups were sampled):

- 1 **Stock claimants** – ‘Longer-term’ qualifying benefit claimants, not eligible for a work focused interview (WFI).
- 2 **Flow Voluntary claimants** – Recent qualifying benefit claimants who did not live in Jobcentre Plus areas and therefore were not eligible for a mandatory WFI.
- 3 **Flow Mandatory claimants** – Recent qualifying benefit claimants who did live in Jobcentre Plus areas and were therefore eligible for a mandatory WFI.

It is important to note that these groups form distinct components of the Eligible Population and the samples interviewed for this survey are treated as such in this report, using the above phraseology.

The study was designed to interview people a few months after they were likely to have been informed of NDDP by DWP. At Wave Three, Stock and Flow Voluntary claimants were within scope of the survey if they had made a successful claim within a certain period and were then sent an NDDP mailshot consisting of a letter and leaflet<sup>1</sup>. For the Stock group, the claim must have been made before 28 July 2003. For the Flow Voluntary group the claim must have been made between 28 July 2003 and 23 August 2003. The Flow Mandatory group must also have made a claim in this period, but as well as being sent a letter, to be included in the sample they must have been booked to have their mandatory WFI. The sampling methodology for Waves One and Two was similar to that of Wave Three, with the use of different claim dates (see Appendix A). The main differences however were with the Flow Mandatory group, which has grown in size in recent years with the expansion of Jobcentre Plus and to whom mailshots were not dispatched at the time Waves One and Two samples were selected.

For each wave, three to four months was left between receipt of the mailshot and the survey interview (see Appendix A for the exact dates of the claim periods, mailshot dates and survey period for all waves).

The survey was initially designed so that the Stock claimants were those in receipt of a qualifying benefit before September 2001 (around the time NDDP began to

---

<sup>1</sup> All who make successful claims within a six week period ahead of a mailshot preparation are entitled to have materials posted to them – if they appear on the appropriate database in time. This means that the nearer a claim date is to the end of that ‘window’, the less likely it is that a letter will be dispatched. In theory, this is of little consequence to the survey, since by design it samples from among Flow Voluntary members who are sent letters. In practice, that this sample is distinct from a representative sample of all Flow claims may not always be appreciated. Hence for each wave, the last two weeks of the window were not included in the sample, since claims in this fortnight are those most likely not to appear in time for inclusion. For the Stock group, National Insurance numbers were used to determine to whom each round of the mailshot is dispatched.

operate nationally) – this applied to Waves One and Two. However, due to a delay in Wave Three and the depletion of this group (due to moving off qualifying benefits), the Stock group for Wave Three were defined as those who were in receipt of a qualifying benefit prior to the claim period used to define the Flow groups. This has a small effect on the comparability of the Stock group between waves, in that the time between claim and survey interview is slightly shorter for Wave Three.

### 1.3.1 Sampling procedures

The sampling frame used was based on benefit records for each wave<sup>2</sup>. Initially, a large sample of people meeting the criteria for a survey interview was selected at random from these benefit records<sup>3</sup>. Telephone number availability on the sampling frames provided was very low (see Appendix A). Once a large random sample was selected, efforts were then made to improve the availability of telephone numbers on the sampling frame by further searching of benefit records and by using an automatic telephone look-up system (at NatCen)<sup>4</sup>.

Separate sub-samples for each sample type were then selected from the first random sample, but selection at this stage was dependent on the availability of a telephone number. Once selected, respondents were eligible for survey interview, regardless of their benefit or work circumstances.

At Wave One, the sample consisted mainly of an equal split between Stock and Flow Voluntary respondents (with a very small number of Flow Mandatory people). At Wave Two, the Flow Mandatory sample was increased in size to be about the same as the other two sample types, as they were becoming a more important group with the roll out of Jobcentre Plus. At Wave Three, the Flow Mandatory sample was larger than the other two samples (see Appendix A for the exact number of interviews).

### 1.3.2 Survey procedures

The questionnaire was developed in Spring 2002 and a pilot was conducted with 70 respondents. Amendments were made to the questionnaire after the pilot to adjust interview length and question wording.

---

<sup>2</sup> Although the Flow groups were determined by geographical area (Flow Mandatory lived in Jobcentre Plus areas, Flow Voluntary did not), no geographical clustering was used in the sampling.

<sup>3</sup> Stock and Flow Voluntary samples were taken from MIDAS files of those receiving the mailshot, and then matched to the most recent Generalised Matching Service (GMS) information. Further matching for telephone numbers was done on Labour Market System (LMS) records. Flow Mandatory samples were taken from GMS records, those who had had a WFI booked were then matched in. All three sample groups were selected on benefit claim periods (for dates see Appendix A).

<sup>4</sup> Manual look up within a national telephone database was also undertaken in Waves One and Two.

For each wave, respondents were sent an advance letter informing them about the study and asking for their co-operation. It also provided them with a clear opportunity to contact NatCen by telephone or letter to opt out of the survey<sup>5</sup>.

Those who did not opt out were issued to the NatCen's dedicated Telephone Unit. Interviews averaging 20 minutes in duration were conducted using Computer Assisted Interviewing. Code frames for open questions were developed from the open answers from the first few hundred cases. The data were coded by a team of coders under the management of one of NatCen's Operations Teams. Queries and difficulties which could not be resolved by a coder or the team were referred to researchers.

Although the intensive efforts to improve telephone number coverage were successful, at each wave around one-third of the issued telephone numbers were established to be unusable. Among the remainder, a response rate of 61 per cent was achieved at Wave One, and 55 per cent at both Waves Two and Three. Response rates for Wave Three were 52, 53 and 58 per cent respectively for Stock, Flow Voluntary and Flow Mandatory samples. This resulted in productive interviews with 658 Stock respondents, 657 Flow Voluntary respondents and 969 Flow Mandatory respondents.

Levels of co-operation among selected individuals with whom direct contact was made was good. Only around one-half of the non-response was due to refusal by the selected respondent. However, making direct contact was frequently problematic. At Wave Three, of those with usable telephone numbers, 23 per cent of respondents refused to participate (either by responding to the advance letter, refusing when called for interview, or by proxy refusal), 12 per cent could not be contacted (either after a minimum of eight calls, because no direct contact could be established or because they had an anonymous call bar), and a further 10 per cent could not participate for other reasons (including respondent being ill and broken appointments).

Since samples were drawn from benefit records, certain characteristics of the achieved samples can be compared to the populations from which they were drawn. In order to improve representativeness of the samples in respect of these known characteristics, the data were weighted prior to analysis.<sup>6</sup> Of course, this weighting cannot ensure that the data collected from respondents fully represents the Eligible Population. Most of those selected could not be interviewed by telephone. The results from any telephone survey where this is so should be used cautiously.

---

<sup>5</sup> Respondents were also informed that, if they had hearing difficulties, it would be possible to use the Type Talk facility to do the interview.

<sup>6</sup> Weights adjust for the differential probability of achieving an interview with different groups within the population. Weights are then scaled so that the weighted bases for each sample type equal the unweighted bases, i.e. the number of interviews. See Appendix B for further details.

## 1.4 Study of 'knowledgeable non-registrants'

The qualitative study of 'knowledgeable non-registrants'<sup>7</sup>, and the reporting on it, was conducted by the Social Policy Research Unit (SPRU) at York University. It aimed to explore further whether there are any measures that can be taken at the level of policy and practice that can improve the flow of these 'non-registrants' onto NDDP.

This follow-up study was designed to investigate the following questions in relation to non-registration:

- Why does this group find out about and/or make contact with a JB?
- What do they know about JB's and what their services are?
- Why does this group not register with a JB?
- Do they pursue the aim of working in some other way?
- What can be learned from this group's experiences for developing the job broking service?

In pursuing these questions, the intention was to generate data that would help understanding about a number of important policy and practice issues, including:

- whether JB's are providing the range of services needed by potential clients;
- whether this group has misperceptions about JB's;
- whether access or location act as reasons for non-participation;
- the relevance and importance of how staff treat this group when they contact a JB;
- what alternative sources of help this group use in getting back to, and staying in, work.

The aim was to interview by telephone 'knowledgeable non-registrants' selected purposively from the third wave of the Eligible Population survey who, at the end of the survey interview, had consented to being contacted again as part of the research programme and who had provided telephone contact numbers. The intention was to achieve a sample whose characteristics reflected diversity in age, primary health condition, gender and employment status. DWP also requested that the sample concentrated on people who made contact with a JB voluntarily rather than because they thought contact was compulsory.

In May 2004, attempts were made to contact 74 people from the Eligible Population who satisfied the definition of 'knowledgeable non-registrant'. Thirty successful interviews were eventually achieved. Of the 44 non-productive contacts, 25 were because telephone contact was never established. Twelve people refused to take

---

<sup>7</sup> This was carried out for Wave Three only.

part but did not specify any reason. Four people explained that they felt too unwell to take part; two people had moved. In one instance, the person did not want to proceed with the interview because they said they were registered with a JB. Although not a primary sampling criterion, we prioritised interviews with people who had made contact with NDDP or a JB voluntarily (21 of the achieved sample).

## 1.5 Structure of the report

This publication reports on the findings from the third wave of interviewing and, where appropriate, across all three waves.

The key characteristics of each sample group are outlined in Chapter 2, and their experience of paid work and aspirations, as well as their 'barriers and bridges' to entering work are discussed in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 focuses on awareness of NDDP, while Chapter 5 looks into the factors affecting contact with JBs and participation in NDDP. Potential 'target groups' are explored in Chapter 6. Chapter 7 presents findings from the qualitative study on 'knowledgeable non-registrants'. Conclusions are drawn in Chapter 8.

The tables presented in this report are rounded to the nearest whole number and, as a consequence, may not always sum to 100 per cent. Estimates presented in tables are column percentages unless otherwise specified. The following conventions have also been used in the tables:

- [] indicates that the unweighted number of cases is less than 50;
- \* indicates that the percentage is less than 0.5 based on the weighted number of cases;
- indicates that the percentage is zero.

Where the statistical significance of the difference is tested for comparisons of percentages, the following notation is used:

$p < 0.01$  indicates statistical significance at the 99 per cent level;

$p < 0.05$  indicates statistical significance at the 95 per cent level.

## 2 Characteristics of survey respondents

In this chapter, the key characteristics of the sample groups interviewed in the Wave Three are outlined, some of which help to explain the subsequent findings relating specifically to New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP) and to paid work in general.

### 2.1 Summary

- Each group comprised more men than women, though the proportions were noticeably more equal among the longer-term Stock claimants (53 per cent men) than among the Flow Mandatory sample (62 per cent men). Differences were also observed with respect to age: nearly half (47 per cent) of the Stock group were aged at least 50 years compared with only a quarter (26 per cent) of the Flow Mandatory group, over one-third (37 per cent) of whom were under 35 years old.
- Just under half of the respondents were living with a partner (40-45 per cent in the three sample groups), while just over a quarter lived alone (25-29 per cent), with the rest living with their children only, their parents or other relatives, or had another arrangement (26-31 per cent). Only around a quarter of respondents had responsibility for children living in their household (21-27 per cent).
- Flow Voluntary respondents (19 per cent) were more likely than both Mandatory (14 per cent) and Stock (five per cent) respondents to have been in paid work the week before the interview. Voluntary (15 per cent) and Mandatory (18 per cent) groups were both much more likely than their longer-term counterparts (five per cent) to have looked for work in the four weeks before interview. Older Stock respondents were particularly likely to have been neither in work nor looking for work.
- The vast majority (92 per cent) of longer-term claimants remained in receipt of an NDDP qualifying benefit at the time of interview. The Flow groups (64 and 68 per cent) also remained eligible, though significant numbers were in work, receiving Jobseeker's Allowance (JSA) or neither receiving benefits nor doing paid work.

- Stock respondents were more likely to be in poor health than Flow respondents (55 per cent reporting bad or very bad health compared with 36 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 33 per cent of Flow Mandatory). Stock respondents were also more likely to say that their health condition affected their normal day-to-day activities a great deal (67 per cent compared with 57 per cent Flow Voluntary and 50 per cent Flow Mandatory).
- Nearly all (95 per cent) of longer-term claimants had a health condition or disability at the time of the interview, as did 77 and 80 per cent of the Flow Voluntary and Mandatory groups (among whom 12 and nine per cent respectively reported they had not had a condition or disability which affected their everyday activities).
- The most common main health conditions or disabilities were problems with neck or back, legs or feet and mental health conditions.

## 2.2 Personal characteristics

Table 2.1 shows the gender, age group and ethnic group distributions of the three sample groups. Each group comprised more men than women, though the proportions were noticeably more equal among the longer-term claimants (53 per cent men) than among the Flow Mandatory sample (62 per cent men). Differences were also observed with respect to age: nearly half (47 per cent) of the Stock group were aged at least 50 years compared with only a quarter (26 per cent) of the Flow Mandatory group, over one-third (37 per cent) of whom were under 35 years old. In contrast, the three groups shared similar ethnic profiles: 12-14 per cent of respondents described their ethnicity as other than 'White'. Black and Asian groups were represented in roughly equal numbers.

The characteristics of the Stock group of longer-term claimants will be influenced by the rates with which people with different characteristics both move on and off qualifying benefits. If, for instance, women and older claimants average longer periods of receipt, then they will be represented in greater numbers among the longer-term population. Similarly, it may be that the new Mandatory claiming process is filtering a higher proportion of younger than older claimants and of men than women into work-focused interviews. If so, then the characteristics of this group will diverge from those of the broader group of new claimants represented by the Flow Voluntary sample. Thus there are plausible substantive explanations for the gender and age differences between the groups, though of course sampling error may also be playing a part.

**Table 2.1 Personal characteristics of the Eligible Population**

|                                 | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|---------------------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>Gender</b>                   |         |             |             |
| Men                             | 53      | 57          | 62          |
| Women                           | 47      | 43          | 38          |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>    |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>            | 658     | 657         | 969         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>          | 658     | 657         | 969         |
| <b>Age group</b>                |         |             |             |
| 18 to 34                        | 19      | 28          | 37          |
| 35 to 49                        | 35      | 41          | 37          |
| 50+                             | 47      | 32          | 26          |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>    |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>            | 658     | 657         | 968         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>          | 658     | 657         | 968         |
| <b>Ethnic group<sup>1</sup></b> |         |             |             |
| White                           | 88      | 87          | 86          |
| White Irish                     | 2       | 2           | 2           |
| Black                           | 2       | 4           | 4           |
| Black African                   | *       | 1           | 3           |
| Black Caribbean                 | 2       | 1           | 1           |
| Other Black                     | 1       | 1           | 1           |
| Asian                           | 4       | 3           | 4           |
| Bangladeshi                     | 1       | 1           | *           |
| Chinese                         | *       | -           | *           |
| Indian                          | 1       | *           | 2           |
| Pakistani                       | 2       | 2           | 2           |
| Other                           | 3       | 2           | 3           |
| Prefer not to say               | 1       | 1           | 1           |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>    |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>            | 658     | 656         | 968         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>          | 658     | 657         | 969         |

<sup>1</sup> Overall and detail figures do not always match exactly due to rounding effects.

Table 2.2 illustrates the age profile of men and women within each of the sample groups. It confirms that the overall pattern – more older people among the Stock group and more young adults among the Flow Mandatory sample – applies for both genders.

**Table 2.2 Age and sex of the Eligible Population**

|                              | Stock% |       | Voluntary % |       | Mandatory % |       |
|------------------------------|--------|-------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|
|                              | Men    | Women | Men         | Women | Men         | Women |
| 18 to 34                     | 19     | 18    | 28          | 27    | 38          | 35    |
| 35 to 49                     | 37     | 32    | 40          | 42    | 36          | 40    |
| 50+                          | 44     | 50    | 32          | 31    | 26          | 26    |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i> |        |       |             |       |             |       |
| <i>Weighted base</i>         | 347    | 311   | 375         | 282   | 598         | 370   |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>       | 331    | 327   | 362         | 295   | 532         | 436   |

### 2.3 Household characteristics

A little less than three in ten of each group of respondents lived alone (29 per cent of Stock, 25 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 28 per cent of Flow Mandatory, as shown in Table 2.3). A larger proportion, though still under one in two, lived with a partner (45 per cent of Stock and Flow Voluntary groups 40 per cent of Flow Mandatory group). Somewhat fewer of these partners were in paid work at the time of interview than were not.

Only around one-fifth (21 per cent) of the longer-term claimants and one-quarter (26/27 per cent) of the Flow groups lived with children under 16 for whom they were responsible.<sup>8</sup> A third of these parents (seven to nine per cent of the samples as whole) were lone parents. A fifth of respondents lived with people other than partners or children.

**Table 2.3 Household type**

|                                       | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|---------------------------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|
| Lives alone                           | 29      | 25          | 28          |
| Lives with partner:                   | 45      | 45          | 40          |
| children in the household             | 14      | 18          | 18          |
| partner is in paid work               | 17      | 21          | 17          |
| Children in household, no partner     | 7       | 8           | 9           |
| Lives with parents or other relatives | 10      | 11          | 13          |
| Other type of household               | 9       | 12          | 11          |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>          |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>                  | 657     | 653         | 966         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>                | 657     | 654         | 966         |

<sup>8</sup> Children were defined as aged 16 and under.

## 2.4 Economic activity and benefit status

To obtain a picture of the activities of the Eligible Population, respondents in this survey were asked whether they were in work one week before interview and, also, to indicate from a list read to them which other activities they had participated in, if any, in the four weeks preceding interview (Table 2.4). Economic activity varied between sample groups. As expected, the longer-term claimants were substantially less likely to have been in work than the more recent claimants (five per cent of Stock, 19 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 14 per cent of Flow Mandatory).

Less predictable was the finding that recent claimants who had not had a work-focused interview (WFI) (Flow Voluntary) were more likely to have been in work a week before the survey interview than those that had (Flow Mandatory). There are several possible explanations for this finding. It could be that some of the most job ready claimants in Mandatory areas secured work before a WFI was booked and thus did not become eligible for this survey. Secondly, Flow Mandatory respondents may be facing greater barriers to work: they may have somewhat less skills or experience, on average, and/or their local labour markets may, on average, be less buoyant than Flow Voluntary claimants. Thirdly, WFIs may be engendering a more medium- to long-term perspective, resulting in more respondents in this group taking actions and time to try to secure good, long-term employment. Fourthly, it is plausible if unlikely that WFIs are having a negative impact on employment rates, perhaps by actually focusing claimants attention on securing their benefit and being careful to meet the new rules rather than their own job-search efforts. Some people may be apprehensive about seeking and taking a job due to fear of re-entering the WFI claim process should they not be able to continue to work. This survey has not however been designed to collect data to test these hypotheses or, indeed, others which might be put forward.

The numbers of respondents who reported that they had been looking for work were broadly similar to those who had worked. Five per cent of the longer-term claimants reported this activity, so underlining the lack of economic activity among the overwhelming majority of the Stock group. However, most are active in other ways (see below). Among the Flow groups it was notable that more Mandatory than Voluntary respondents said they had been looking for work. As a result, the proportion of the former and latter groups who were economically active did not differ significantly.

Of activities participated in in the four weeks prior to interview, looking after the home or family was the most common. Around one-half of each group had been doing this (46 per cent of Stock, 50 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 49 per cent of Flow Mandatory). The differences in the proportions of men and women who report this activity remains significant though not huge. For example, while 57 per cent of women in the Flow Voluntary group said they had been looking after home or family, so did 45 per cent of men ( $p < 0.01$ ).

One in ten respondents in all three groups said that they had been caring for a sick or disabled adult. Seven to nine per cent were engaged in education or training, while four to six per cent had undertaken voluntary work.

In total, a little under one-half (45 per cent) of the longer-term claimants and a third of the Flow groups (35 per cent Voluntary, 33 per cent Mandatory) reported doing none of the activities included in the list.

**Table 2.4 Activities at time of interview**

|   | <i>Multiple response</i> |                    |                    |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|   | <b>Stock %</b>           | <b>Voluntary %</b> | <b>Mandatory %</b> |
| In paid work in the last week             | 5                        | 19                 | 14                 |
| <b>Activities in the last four weeks:</b> |                          |                    |                    |
| Looking after the home or family          | 46                       | 50                 | 49                 |
| Caring for a sick or disabled adult       | 10                       | 11                 | 10                 |
| Doing any education or training           | 7                        | 7                  | 9                  |
| Looking for paid work                     | 5                        | 15                 | 18                 |
| Doing any voluntary work                  | 6                        | 4                  | 4                  |
| Being a hospital inpatient                | 2                        | 3                  | 2                  |
| <b>Spontaneous only: sick or disabled</b> | 11                       | 8                  | 8                  |
| <b>Spontaneous only: retired</b>          | 1                        | 0                  | *                  |
| None of these                             | 33                       | 27                 | 25                 |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>              |                          |                    |                    |
| <i>Weighted base</i>                      | 658                      | 657                | 969                |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>                    | 658                      | 657                | 969                |

When NDDP registrants were asked what activities they had been involved in one month prior to registration, 28 per cent said that they had been looking for paid work (Ashworth et al., 2003). This is a higher proportion than among the Eligible Population, and implies that those who were already looking for work are more likely to register with the programme.

There were no significant differences by age in the proportions who were in paid work. However, respondents under 50 years old were a good deal more likely to have been in education or training and/or looking for paid work, whereas older respondents were more likely to have been looking after a sick or disabled adult (Table 2.5).

**Table 2.5 Activities at time of interview by age**

|   | <i>Multiple response</i> |     |             |     |             |     |
|---|--------------------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|
|   | Stock %                  |     | Voluntary % |     | Mandatory % |     |
|   | 18-49                    | 50+ | 18-49       | 50+ | 18-49       | 50+ |
| In paid work in the last week             | 6                        | 4   | 19          | 18  | 14          | 12  |
| <b>Activities in the last four weeks:</b> |                          |     |             |     |             |     |
| Looking after the home or family          | 48                       | 44  | 49          | 53  | 48          | 51  |
| Caring for a sick or disabled adult       | 9                        | 11  | 10          | 14  | 8           | 15  |
| Doing any education or training           | 10                       | 3   | 7           | 6   | 10          | 5   |
| Looking for paid work                     | 8                        | 2   | 18          | 9   | 20          | 13  |
| Doing any voluntary work                  | 5                        | 7   | 4           | 2   | 4           | 4   |
| Being a hospital inpatient                | 2                        | 3   | 4           | 1   | 3           | 1   |
| <b>Spontaneous only: sick or disabled</b> | 10                       | 12  | 7           | 9   | 7           | 11  |
| <b>Spontaneous only: retired</b>          | *                        | 1   | –           | –   | *           | *   |
| None of these                             | 30                       | 37  | 26          | 30  | 27          | 24  |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>              |                          |     |             |     |             |     |
| <i>Weighted base</i>                      | 353                      | 306 | 450         | 208 | 716         | 253 |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>                    | 313                      | 345 | 413         | 244 | 668         | 300 |

Just over nine out of ten longer-term claimants said they were in receipt of an NDDP qualifying benefit at the time of the survey interview (Table 2.6), compared to around two-thirds of both the recent claimant groups (92 per cent of Stock, 64 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 68 per cent of Flow Mandatory). So the overwhelming majority of the longer-term claimants had remained eligible for NDDP whereas a sizeable minority of the more recent claimants had flowed off qualifying benefits and, thus, out of eligibility for NDDP. This reflects an established pattern whereby the rate of exit off incapacity-related benefits decreases as duration of receipt increases. Flow group members were more likely to have reported being on JSA, probably due to recent disallowance of IB claims (eight or nine per cent compared with two per cent among the Stock;  $p < 0.01$ ) or to report neither work nor benefit receipt (16 or 15 per cent compared with five per cent of the Stock;  $p < 0.01$ ).

**Table 2.6 Benefit status at time of interview**


|  | <i>Multiple response</i> |                    |                    |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|  | <b>Stock %</b>           | <b>Voluntary %</b> | <b>Mandatory %</b> |
| On NDDP qualifying benefit               | 92                       | 64                 | 68                 |
| Incapacity Benefit                       | 57                       | 40                 | 42                 |
| Income Support with a Disability Premium | 35                       | 21                 | 2                  |
| Severe Disablement Allowance             | 10                       | 2                  | 1                  |
| Other qualifying benefit                 | 61                       | 41                 | 40                 |
| On JSA                                   | 2                        | 8                  | 9                  |
| In paid work                             | 5                        | 19                 | 14                 |
| None of these                            | 5                        | 16                 | 15                 |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>             |                          |                    |                    |
| <i>Weighted base</i>                     | 658                      | 657                | 969                |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>                   | 658                      | 657                | 969                |

## 2.5 Health and disability

All respondents were asked how their health was in general at the time of interview. Figure 2.1 and Table 2.7 show this data, firstly in detail and then into the groups used in subsequent analysis: i) very good/good/fair and ii) bad/very bad. Both the table and figure show that again, the longer-term claimants differ from the more recent claimants. Few Stock respondents described their health as good; more than one-half (55 per cent) said it was bad or very bad. In contrast only around one-third of the more recent claimants reported bad or very bad general health (Flow Voluntary 36 per cent and Flow Mandatory 33 per cent).

Examining health status by gender and age group, there were no significant differences.

**Figure 2.1 Health status at time of interview**



**Table 2.7 Health status (grouped) at time of interview**

|                              | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|------------------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|
| Very good/good/fair          | 45      | 64          | 67          |
| Bad/very bad                 | 55      | 36          | 33          |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i> |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>         | 656     | 654         | 966         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>       | 655     | 654         | 966         |

The definition of disability for the research was the presence of a health condition or disability which affects everyday activities. Respondents were asked whether this applied to them at the time of interview, and if not, whether it had in the past (Table 2.8). Almost all respondents in the longer-term claimants group said they had a health condition or disability which affected them at the time of interview (95 per cent). This figure was lower for the more recent claimants where 77 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 80 per cent of Flow Mandatory had a health condition or disability.

The respondents who did not have a health condition or disability at the time of interview were quite evenly divided between those who had had a health condition or disability in the past and those that said they had never had one. It may seem surprising that as many as 12 and 9 per cent of the Flow Voluntary and Mandatory groups reported never having had a health condition or disability. However, the concept of incapacity in the eligibility requirements for benefits does not require

claimants to perceive themselves as having a disability affecting everyday activities, however, they would have had to have received a medical certificate from their General Practitioner (GP). The varied ways in which some individuals in the Eligible Population conceive their circumstances, and the language used and shunned, may present a particular challenge in labelling and marketing relevant employment services.

**Table 2.8 Presence of a health condition which affects everyday activities**

|                              | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|------------------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|
| Yes – now                    | 95      | 77          | 80          |
| Yes – in past                | 2       | 11          | 11          |
| No, not now or in past       | 3       | 12          | 9           |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i> |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>         | 658     | 655         | 967         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>       | 657     | 655         | 967         |

Respondents were asked the nature of their main health condition (some respondents also had other, secondary health conditions). As Table 2.9 shows, a similar, diverse set of disabilities and conditions is experienced by all three groups. However, the rankings of the most common conditions did differ between the Stock and Flow groups. Among the longer-term claimants, problems with neck or back had the highest prevalence (33 per cent of Stock compared with 25/26 per cent of the Flow groups;  $p < 0.01$ ). However, among the Flow groups, mental health conditions were more prevalent (26 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 30 per cent of Flow Mandatory, but only 18 per cent among the Stock;  $p < 0.01$ ).

**Table 2.9 Nature of main health condition or disability**

|  | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|--|---------|-------------|-------------|
| Problems with your arms or hands                             | 14      | 10          | 13          |
| Problems with your legs or feet                              | 27      | 22          | 22          |
| Problems with your neck or back                              | 33      | 25          | 26          |
| Difficulty in seeing   | 2       | 2           | 2           |
| Difficulty in hearing  | 1       | 1           | *           |
| Speech impediment  | *       | *           | -           |
| Skin conditions or allergies                                 | *       | 1           | 1           |
| Chest or breathing problems                                  | 6       | 5           | 6           |
| Heart problems or blood pressure                             | 7       | 7           | 5           |
| Problems relating to the stomach, liver, kidney or digestion | 4       | 6           | 6           |

Continued

**Table 2.9 Continued**

|   | Stock<br>% | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% |
|---|------------|----------------|----------------|
| Diabetes  | 3          | 2              | 3              |
| Mental health condition   | 18         | 26             | 30             |
| Epilepsy  | 3          | 3              | 1              |
| Learning difficulties   | 1          | *              | *              |
| Progressive illness not covered above                             | 4          | 2              | 2              |
| Other disability  | 14         | 11             | 7              |
| <i>Base: All respondents with a disability now or in the past</i> |            |                |                |
| <i>Weighted base</i>  | 643        | 593            | 899            |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>  | 642        | 596            | 902            |

Respondents who had a health condition at the time of interview or in the past were asked how it affected their ability to 'carry out normal day-to-day activities'. In all groups, 'a great deal' was the most common response (67 per cent of Stock, 57 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 50 per cent of Flow Mandatory). The next most common answer was that it affected respondents somewhat (27 per cent of Stock, 29 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 35 per cent of Flow Mandatory). Seven per cent of the longer-term claimants said it affected them a little or not at all, as did 14 and 15 per cent of the Flow Voluntary and Mandatory groups. When broken down by age (Table 2.10), older respondents in the Stock group were more likely to say it affected them 'a great deal' than younger respondents (73 per cent compared to 61 per cent respectively,  $p < 0.01$ ), but age made little difference among the Flow groups.


**Table 2.10 Extent of effect of health condition on day-to-day activities by age**

|   | Stock % |     |     | Voluntary % |     |     | Mandatory % |     |     |
|---|---------|-----|-----|-------------|-----|-----|-------------|-----|-----|
|   | 18-49   | 50+ | All | 18-49       | 50+ | All | 18-49       | 50+ | All |
| Yes, a great deal   | 61      | 73  | 67  | 56          | 59  | 57  | 49          | 53  | 50  |
| Yes, some   | 32      | 21  | 27  | 29          | 30  | 29  | 36          | 33  | 35  |
| Yes, just a little  | 6       | 5   | 6   | 12          | 8   | 11  | 11          | 11  | 11  |
| Not at all  | 1       | 2   | 1   | 3           | 3   | 3   | 4           | 3   | 4   |
| <i>Base: All respondents with a disability now or in past</i> |         |     |     |             |     |     |             |     |     |
| <i>Weighted base</i>  | 339     | 299 | 638 | 379         | 197 | 579 | 631         | 244 | 875 |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>  | 300     | 337 | 637 | 347         | 231 | 578 | 594         | 288 | 882 |

As longer-term claimants have been on benefit for a longer period of time than recent claimants, it is to be expected that their health condition or disability has affected them for a greater length of time as Figure 2.2 illustrates. For both the Flow groups, the greatest proportion of respondents said that they were affected in the

last three years (49 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 57 per cent of Flow Mandatory). The distribution of the Stock claimants was less extreme, but respondents were more likely to say that they had been affected either four to nine, or more than ten years ago (43 and 39 per cent respectively).

**Figure 2.2 When health condition or disability started to affect 'what you could do'**



## 3 Paid work: experience, expectations, barriers and bridges

Work experience and expectations play important roles in a person's work prospects. This chapter begins by setting out the labour market experience of all respondents by looking at when they last worked (Section 3.2). We then turn to respondents' expectations and, for those not in work, look at whether they intend to move into work, and if so, when (Section 3.3). The academic and vocational qualifications of respondents are then considered.

Experience and expectations aside, there are other more practical things that can help or hinder people into work, such as the need for flexible working hours, or better transport. During the course of the interview, respondents were read a range of potential bridges and barriers to work, that is circumstances in which they may be able to go to work and circumstances which may be preventing them from working at the current time. These are explored in the final section of the chapter.

### 3.1 Summary

- The work experience of respondents differed vastly between the longer-term and more recent claimants. Approaching one-half of the longer-term claimants had either never worked or had not worked in the last nine years (44 per cent), in contrast to both the Flow groups where just under one-fifth were in the same position (15 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 18 per cent of Flow Mandatory;  $p < 0.01$  in comparison to Stock group).
- Over half of the recent claimants were not in work, but had been in the last three years (51 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 56 per cent of Flow Mandatory) compared to less than one-third of the Stock group (18 per cent).

- Those with a partner in paid work were more likely to be in work or have worked recently themselves. Thirty-one per cent of longer-term claimants with a partner in work had done so compared to 19 per cent of those with a non-working partner ( $p < 0.05$ ).
- More than one in two of the longer-term claimants said they did not expect to work in the future (56 per cent), in comparison to a still substantial one in four of the Flow Voluntary claimants and one in five of the Flow Mandatory claimants (24 per cent and 20 per cent respectively).
- Flow Mandatory respondents were more likely than the other sample groups to have looked for work in the last 12 months which could be a possible effect of having a work-focused interview (WFI) (37 per cent of Flow Mandatory compared to 28 per cent of Flow Voluntary;  $p < 0.01$ , and 13 per cent of Stock;  $p < 0.01$ ).
- The proportion of longer-term claimants who have looked for work in the last year or expect to work in the future (33 per cent) is similar to the proportion of all benefit claimants who want work (over three quarters of a million out of 2.7 million, Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), 2002).
- Large proportions of all three sample groups reported having no qualifications, approaching two in five of the recent claimants (37 and 39 per cent of Flow Voluntary and Flow Mandatory groups), and significantly more longer-term claimants (46 per cent).
- Reflecting higher work expectations, and findings from past waves, recent claimants were more likely to respond positively to bridges to work, and to cite more than longer-term claimants. Accordingly, they also cited fewer barriers to work than longer-term claimants, with the most salient barrier among all three sample groups as having a health condition (90 per cent of Stock, 75 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 79 per cent of Flow Mandatory).

### 3.2 Work experience

During the survey interview respondents were asked if they were currently in work. If not, they were asked if they had ever worked, and if so, when was the last time they had done so.

Approaching one-half of the longer-term claimants group had either never worked, did not know when they had last worked or had not worked in the last nine years (44 per cent). This was in stark contrast to both the Flow groups where just under one-fifth were in the same position (15 and 18 per cent of the Flow Voluntary and Mandatory groups;  $p < 0.01$  in comparison to the Stock).

The more detailed breakdown in Table 3.1 however shows that this large gap actually applies only to those who had not worked in the last nine years. Proportions who had never worked are similar across sample type, with around one-tenth of both longer-term claimants and Flow Mandatory respondents, and six per cent of the Flow Voluntary group in that situation. As detailed in Section 2.4, there are a

number of possible reasons why Flow Voluntary respondents were more likely to have been in paid work at the time of the survey interview. Some of these apply to why they were also less likely to have never worked. This includes some of the most job ready claimants in Mandatory areas securing work before a WFI was booked and thus not becoming eligible for this survey – those who are most job ready are less likely to never have worked.

Around one-third of the longer-term claimants had last worked four to nine years ago, compared to 15 and 12 per cent of the Flow Voluntary and Mandatory groups ( $p < 0.01$ ). The biggest group among recent claimants consisted of those who had worked within the last three years (around half of both groups).

**Table 3.1 Labour market experience**

|  | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|--|---------|-------------|-------------|
| Currently in work                      | 5       | 19          | 14          |
| Within last 3 years (2001-2004)        | 18      | 51          | 56          |
| 4-9 years ago (1994-2000)              | 33      | 15          | 12          |
| 10+ years ago (1993 or before)         | 32      | 8           | 7           |
| Never worked                           | 9       | 6           | 10          |
| Worked in the past, does not know when | 3       | 1           | 2           |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>           |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>                   | 655     | 658         | 967         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>                 | 656     | 657         | 968         |

Differences in work experience by characteristics are to be expected. Table 3.2 shows that this was the case with work experience by age group among the longer-term claimants. As may be expected, those in the younger age group were more likely to be currently in work or had worked in the last three years than those in the older age group (29 per cent compared to 17 per cent;  $p < 0.01$ ). There were few differences between the work experience of the two age groups among the more recent claimants (no differences were statistically significant).

**Table 3.2 Labour market experience by age group**

|                                 | Stock % |     | Voluntary % |     | Mandatory % |     |
|---------------------------------|---------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|
|                                 | 18-49   | 50+ | 18-49       | 50+ | 18-49       | 50+ |
| Currently in work, last 3 years | 29      | 17  | 72          | 67  | 71          | 69  |
| 4-9 years ago                   | 30      | 37  | 13          | 18  | 11          | 13  |
| 10+ years ago, never worked     | 42      | 46  | 16          | 15  | 18          | 18  |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>    |         |     |             |     |             |     |
| <i>Weighted base</i>            | 352     | 305 | 450         | 207 | 713         | 253 |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>          | 313     | 343 | 413         | 244 | 667         | 300 |

A different picture emerged when considering work experience by health status, where those in better health were much more likely than those in poorer health to have worked recently within all sample groups (Table 3.3). This was most striking among longer-term claimants, as a third of those in better health had worked recently compared to 17 per cent of those in poorer health ( $p < 0.01$ ). Among recent claimants, around three-quarters of those in better health had worked recently compared to 56 to 59 per cent of those in poorer health ( $p < 0.01$ ). Here the causality could run either way in that being in good health could increase the chances of working, and working could lead to an improvement in perceived health.

An unusual pattern among the longer-term claimants was that those in better health were almost equally likely to have worked recently (31 per cent), four to nine years ago (34 per cent) or at least ten years ago or never (35 per cent). This suggests the presence of barriers to work other than health. In comparison, half of those in bad or very bad health had never worked or last worked ten years or more ago.

Among recent claimants, those in better health were much more likely to have been in work recently than four years or more ago.

**Table 3.3 Labour market experience by health status**

|                              | Stock %                 |                  | Voluntary %             |                  | Mandatory %             |                  |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
|                              | Very good/<br>good/fair | Bad/<br>very bad | Very good/<br>good/fair | Bad/<br>very bad | Very good/<br>Good/fair | Bad/<br>very bad |
| Currently, last 3 years      | 31                      | 17               | 78                      | 56               | 76                      | 59               |
| 4-9 years                    | 34                      | 33               | 11                      | 21               | 11                      | 13               |
| 10+ years, never worked      | 35                      | 50               | 11                      | 23               | 13                      | 28               |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i> |                         |                  |                         |                  |                         |                  |
| <i>Weighted base</i>         | 292                     | 363              | 416                     | 236              | 643                     | 322              |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>       | 301                     | 352              | 422                     | 232              | 631                     | 334              |

Table 3.4 looks at work experience by when the health condition of respondents started to limit their activities. As would be expected, respondents who were affected by their health condition within the last three years were much more likely than those who had been affected more than ten years ago to be in work or have worked recently (all differences;  $p < 0.01$ ). Similarly, those who had been affected more than ten years ago were much more likely than those who were affected within the last three years to have last worked more than ten years ago or never worked (all differences;  $p < 0.01$ ).

**Table 3.4 Labour market experience by when health condition started to limit activities**

|                              | Stock %    |            |            | Voluntary % |            |            | Mandatory % |            |            |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|
|                              | 3 years    | 4-9 years  | 10+ years  | 3 years     | 4-9 years  | 10+ years  | 3 years     | 4-9 years  | 10+ years  |
| <b>Work experience</b>       |            |            |            |             |            |            |             |            |            |
| Currently, last 3 years      | 60         | 17         | 13         | 87          | 49         | 48         | 81          | 51         | 56         |
| 4-9 years                    | 17         | 53         | 19         | 8           | 31         | 16         | 6           | 24         | 15         |
| 10+ years, never worked      | 23         | 30         | 68         | 6           | 20         | 36         | 13          | 25         | 29         |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i> |            |            |            |             |            |            |             |            |            |
| <i>Weighted base</i>         | <i>107</i> | <i>267</i> | <i>241</i> | <i>275</i>  | <i>167</i> | <i>121</i> | <i>487</i>  | <i>216</i> | <i>154</i> |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>       | <i>123</i> | <i>273</i> | <i>218</i> | <i>286</i>  | <i>163</i> | <i>116</i> | <i>475</i>  | <i>223</i> | <i>166</i> |

For all three groups, those with a partner in work were more likely to have worked recently themselves than those with a non-working partner or those without a partner (although the latter difference was only statistically significant among recent claimants – Table 3.5)<sup>9</sup>. Thirty-one per cent of longer-term claimants with a partner in work had worked recently compared to 19 per cent of those with a non-working partner ( $p < 0.05$ ). Eighty-five per cent of Flow Voluntary and 90 per cent of Flow Mandatory respondents with a partner in work had themselves worked recently, compared to about two-thirds of both those with a non-working partner or those without a partner ( $p < 0.01$ ).

**Table 3.5 Labour market experience by whether has a partner**

|                              | Stock % Partner |               |               | Voluntary % Partner |               |               | Mandatory % Partner |               |               |
|------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------|
|                              | No              | Yes – no work | Yes – in work | No                  | Yes – no work | Yes – in work | No                  | Yes – no work | Yes – in work |
| <b>Work experience</b>       |                 |               |               |                     |               |               |                     |               |               |
| Currently, last 3 years      | 23              | 19            | 31            | 66                  | 65            | 85            | 66                  | 65            | 90            |
| 4-9 years                    | 33              | 30            | 38            | 16                  | 17            | 9             | 14                  | 9             | 6             |
| 10+ years, never worked      | 44              | 51            | 31            | 18                  | 18            | 7             | 20                  | 26            | 4             |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i> |                 |               |               |                     |               |               |                     |               |               |
| <i>Weighted base</i>         | <i>361</i>      | <i>182</i>    | <i>113</i>    | <i>366</i>          | <i>156</i>    | <i>137</i>    | <i>586</i>          | <i>213</i>    | <i>166</i>    |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>       | <i>344</i>      | <i>177</i>    | <i>135</i>    | <i>358</i>          | <i>147</i>    | <i>152</i>    | <i>578</i>          | <i>215</i>    | <i>174</i>    |

<sup>9</sup> Respondents were asked whether they had a partner or spouse living with them, and whether their partner was currently in work.


### 3.3 Work expectations

Figure 3.1 summarises the employment status of respondents in a hierarchy of current work, job-search activity and, neither of these applying, future expectations of work. This measure is described by the shorthand 'work expectations', since the focus of this analysis is on attachment to the labour market and prospects of those not currently working.

As with labour market experience, the work expectations of the longer-term claimants were further from the labour market than those of the more recent claimant groups. More than one in two of the longer-term claimants said they did not expect to work in the future (56 per cent), in comparison to a still substantial one in four of the Flow Voluntary claimants and one in five of the Flow Mandatory claimants (24 per cent and 20 per cent respectively). Similar proportions of respondents in all sample groups expected to work in the future, although had not looked for work in the 12 months before interview (20 per cent of Stock, 26 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 25 per cent of Flow Mandatory).

Recent claimants who had had a WFI (Flow Mandatory) were more likely than the other sample groups to have looked for work in the last 12 months (37 per cent of Flow Mandatory compared to 28 per cent of Flow Voluntary;  $p < 0.01$ , and 13 per cent of Stock;  $p < 0.01$ ). This finding does suggest that having a WFI did have an effect on respondents' job-search. As already mentioned in Sections 2.4 and 3.2, this apparent 'WFI effect,' will be repeated throughout the report, especially in relation to participation in the New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP) (Chapter 5).

Encouragingly, the proportion of longer-term claimants who have looked for work in the last year or expect to work in the future (33 per cent) is similar to the estimate of the proportion of all benefit claimants who want work (over three quarters of a million out of 2.7 million, DWP, 2002).

**Figure 3.1 Work expectations**

Work expectations tended to decrease with age (Table 3.6). Three-quarters of longer-term claimants aged 50 or over did not expect to work in the future, compared to 39 per cent of those less than 50 years old ( $p < 0.01$ ). The same pattern can be seen among recent claimants, despite work experiences having been shown (Figure 3.1) to be similar between the two age groups. Hence those aged 50 or over coming onto benefits were more likely to expect to stay on benefits, even though their work experience was similar to the younger age group.

**Table 3.6 Work expectations by age group**

|                                   | Stock % |     | Voluntary % |     | Mandatory % |     |
|-----------------------------------|---------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|
|                                   | 18-49   | 50+ | 18-49       | 50+ | 18-49       | 50+ |
| Currently in work                 | 6       | 4   | 19          | 18  | 14          | 12  |
| Looked for work in past 12 months | 19      | 7   | 32          | 19  | 40          | 29  |
| Expects to work in the future     | 30      | 9   | 29          | 18  | 27          | 20  |
| Does not expect to work in future | 39      | 76  | 17          | 39  | 16          | 34  |
| Does not know                     | 6       | 5   | 2           | 6   | 3           | 5   |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>      |         |     |             |     |             |     |
| <i>Weighted base</i>              | 352     | 306 | 450         | 207 | 715         | 254 |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>            | 313     | 345 | 413         | 244 | 668         | 300 |

Not surprisingly, those in better health had higher work expectations. Half of longer-term claimants in better health had been looking for work or were expecting to work in the future, compared to just under a third of those in poorer health (51 per cent compared to 30 per cent,  $p < 0.01$ ). Among both groups of recent claimants, 84 per cent of those in better health had been looking for work or were expecting to work in the future, compared to 53 to 59 per cent of those in poorer health ( $p < 0.01$ ).

Work expectations correlated with work experience (Table 3.7). Two-thirds of longer-term claimants who were far from the labour market (worked at least 10 years ago/never worked) did not expect to work in the future, compared to one-third of those who had worked recently (within the last three years;  $p < 0.01$ ). Similarly, half of the Flow Voluntary group and 38 per cent of Flow Mandatory respondents who were far from the labour market did not expect to work in the future, compared to 15 per cent and 14 per cent respectively of those who had worked recently ( $p < 0.01$ ).

**Table 3.7 Work expectations by work experience**

|  | Stock %        |              |                        | Voluntary %    |              |                        | Mandatory %    |              |                        |
|--|----------------|--------------|------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------------|
|  | Now/3<br>years | 4-9<br>years | 10+<br>years/<br>never | Now/3<br>years | 4-9<br>years | 10+<br>years/<br>never | Now/3<br>years | 4-9<br>years | 10+<br>years/<br>never |
| Currently in work                        | 22             | –            | –                      | 27             | –            | –                      | 20             | –            | –                      |
| Looked for work in<br>the past 12 months | 23             | 13           | 9                      | 30             | 26           | 20                     | 40             | 28           | 32                     |
| Expects to work<br>in the future         | 20             | 23           | 19                     | 26             | 28           | 22                     | 24             | 32           | 24                     |
| Does not expect to<br>work in the future | 31             | 57           | 68                     | 15             | 40           | 51                     | 14             | 32           | 38                     |
| Does not know                            | 5              | 7            | 4                      | 2              | 5            | 8                      | 2              | 8            | 7                      |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>             |                |              |                        |                |              |                        |                |              |                        |
| <i>Weighted base</i>                     | 153            | 217          | 287                    | 460            | 95           | 102                    | 678            | 112          | 178                    |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>                   | 173            | 233          | 250                    | 474            | 90           | 93                     | 675            | 114          | 179                    |

As there is particular interest in distinguishing the longer-term claimants according to proximity to labour market, Table 3.8 concentrates on the relationship between labour market experience and work expectations for longer-term claimants only.

The table shows cell per cents, with the base as all Stock respondents. Nineteen per cent of longer-term claimants last worked four to nine years ago and do not expect to work in the future, while the biggest group – almost one-third of longer-term claimants – have not worked for ten years or more or have never worked and do not expect to work in the future. Nevertheless, there are many longer-term claimants who have not worked for a while but whose work expectations are relatively high. Those looking for work or expecting to work in the future – which adds up to 11 to 12 per cent in each case – remains a relatively steady group even when moving

further from the labour market. Twelve per cent of longer-term claimants had either last worked ten or more years ago or had never worked, but were still either looking for work or expecting to work in the future. This reinforces the importance of supporting those who are far from the labour market, and including them when deciding on how to focus NDDP services.

**Table 3.8 Work expectations by work experience – Stock group only**

|                                       | <i>cell per cents</i> |         |           |                 |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|-----------|-----------------|
|                                       | Currently             | 3 years | 4-9 years | 10+ years/never |
| Currently in work                     | [5]                   | –       | –         | –               |
| Looked for work in the past 12 months | –                     | 5       | 4         | 4               |
| Expects to work in the future         | –                     | 6       | 8         | 8               |
| Does not expect to work in the future | –                     | 7       | 19        | 30              |
| Does not know                         | –                     | 1       | 2         | 2               |

*Base: All Stock respondents*

*Weighted base: 657*

*Unweighted base: 656*

### 3.4 Qualifications

As well as work-related characteristics, qualifications can affect a person's ability to move into employment. Following the pattern of being further from the labour market in terms of work experience and work expectations, longer-term claimants were also more likely to have no qualifications than both of the more recent claimant groups (Table 3.9 – 46 per cent of Stock compared to 37 and 39 per cent of Flow Voluntary and Mandatory; both  $p < 0.01$ ). Around half of recent claimants had academic qualifications, compared to 42 per cent of longer-term claimants ( $p < 0.01$  between Stock and Flow Voluntary,  $p < 0.05$  between Stock and Flow Mandatory), while 37 to 38 per cent of recent claimants had vocational qualifications, compared to 29 per cent of longer-term claimants ( $p < 0.01$ ).

**Table 3.9 Whether has academic or vocational qualifications**

|                               | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|-------------------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|
| Has academic qualifications   | 42      | 51          | 48          |
| Has vocational qualifications | 29      | 38          | 37          |
| Has no qualifications         | 46      | 37          | 39          |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>  |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>          | 658     | 657         | 969         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>        | 658     | 657         | 969         |

Within each sample type, those with qualifications were more likely to have been looking for work or expecting to work. Half of longer-term claimants with a qualification had been looking or expecting to work compared to 27 per cent of those without a qualification ( $p < 0.01$ ). Among recent claimants, 78 to 82 per cent of those with a qualification had been looking for work or expecting to work, compared to about two-thirds of those without a qualification ( $p < 0.01$ ).

Table 3.10 shows the NVQ equivalents of the highest qualification held by respondents, whether that is a vocational or academic qualification<sup>10</sup>. Similar proportions across sample type had qualifications at NVQ level one, and levels three to five (and at unknown level), so the additional respondents with qualifications among recent claimants consisted mainly of respondents with a qualification at NVQ level two.

**Table 3.10 NVQ equivalents of highest qualifications**

|   | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|---|---------|-------------|-------------|
| NVQ level 5 (Higher degree)                     | 2       | 2           | 1           |
| NVQ level 4 (Degree or equivalent)              | 13      | 13          | 12          |
| NVQ level 3 (A level equivalent)                | 10      | 12          | 10          |
| NVQ level 2 (O level/GCSE Grade A-C equivalent) | 17      | 24          | 24          |
| NVQ level 1 (GCSE Grades D-G)                   | 6       | 7           | 7           |
| Has qualification, level not known              | 7       | 5           | 6           |
| No qualifications                               | 46      | 37          | 39          |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>                    |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>                            | 658     | 656         | 969         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>                          | 658     | 657         | 969         |

Among those who registered with NDDP, 23 per cent reported having no qualifications (Ashworth *et al.*, 2003). As this is lower than the equivalent proportion in the Eligible Population, it does suggest that those with qualifications are more likely to register. In support of this, 20 per cent of registrants had an NVQ level four compared to 12-13 per cent of the Eligible Population, and 17 per cent had a level three compared to 10-12 per cent of the Eligible Population.

### 3.5 Bridges to work

During the course of the interview, a series of statements about the kinds of things which might enable people to work were read to respondents who were not in work (as well as to the small number of respondents both working less than eight hours a

<sup>10</sup> A limited amount of qualification information was collected in the survey. Where the answer category could imply two NVQ level equivalents, the highest of these was coded.

week and wanting to increase their hours). For each, they were asked whether it applied to them<sup>11</sup>. The items in Table 3.11 are sorted by the most salient reasons for the longer-term claimants.

For each item, recent claimants were more likely to respond positively, reflecting their higher work expectations. As in previous waves, an important factor for all sample types was knowing whether they could return to their original benefit, with around a third of longer-term claimants responding positively to this bridge to work, and around one-half of recent claimants ( $p < 0.01$ ). Flexibility of working was important, with the possibility of working at home applying to about half of recent claimants and 41 per cent of longer-term claimants ( $p < 0.01$ ). Forty-one to 44 per cent of recent claimants, and around one-third of longer-term claimants said they would be able to work if they were able to take breaks, and deciding the number of hours worked applied to very similar proportions.

**Table 3.11 Bridges to work**

| I would be able to work if...                                  |            |                |                | <i>Base: weighted<br/>(Unweighted)</i> |                |                |
|--|------------|----------------|----------------|--|----------------|----------------|
|  | Stock<br>% | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% | Stock<br>%                             | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% |
| ...I could work at home  | 41         | 51             | 52             | 629<br>(628)                           | 538<br>(531)   | 838<br>(838)   |
| ...I knew I could return to my original benefit if I needed to | 36         | 46             | 51             | 629<br>(628)                           | 538<br>(531)   | 837<br>(838)   |
| ...I was able to take breaks when I needed to during the day   | 36         | 41             | 44             | 629<br>(628)                           | 539<br>(531)   | 840<br>(838)   |
| ...I could decide how many hours I worked                      | 32         | 43             | 47             | 629<br>(628)                           | 538<br>(531)   | 839<br>(838)   |
| ...someone could support me at work at least some of the time  | 32         | 37             | 39             | 629<br>(628)                           | 538<br>(531)   | 837<br>(838)   |
| ...I had access to affordable childcare                        | 23         | 33             | 31             | 127<br>(120)                           | 127<br>(116)   | 227<br>(230)   |
| ...I had special equipment to do a job                         | 22         | 25             | 31             | 628<br>(628)                           | 539<br>(531)   | 839<br>(838)   |
| ...public transport was better                                 | 19         | 31             | 35             | 629<br>(628)                           | 539<br>(531)   | 839<br>(838)   |
| ...I had my own transport                                      | 17         | 29             | 33             | 629<br>(628)                           | 538<br>(531)   | 838<br>(838)   |
| ...something else would help me to work                        | 15         | 18             | 23             | 628<br>(628)                           | 539<br>(531)   | 838<br>(838)   |

*Base: All those not in work or working less than eight hours (includes those that said 'do not know' to statements and those that spontaneously said that they could not work in any circumstances)*

<sup>11</sup> Those respondents – 20 from both the Stock and the Flow – who were working less than eight hours were asked whether the items would help them to work more hours.

At all items, interviewers were given the option of coding 'Respondents could not work in any circumstances'. This was to be used only if the respondent mentioned it spontaneously.

In similar proportions to previous waves, 41 per cent of the longer-term claimants did not respond positively to any of the statements about circumstances that might enable them to work, compared to 28 and 25 per cent of the Flow Voluntary and Mandatory groups ( $p < 0.01$ , Table 3.12). Taking into account the findings above on work experience and expectations, the number of bridges identified can therefore be interpreted as reflecting proximity to the labour market, with those who identify more bridges (recent claimants) also being more likely to expect to work in the future. In contrast to these findings, when NDDP registrants were read the same list of bridges, only six per cent did not identify with any of them (Ashworth *et al.*, 2003).

**Table 3.12 Number of bridges identified**

|   | Stock<br>% | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% |
|---|------------|----------------|----------------|
| No bridges  | 41         | 28             | 25             |
| 1-2 bridges   | 18         | 19             | 18             |
| 3-5 bridges   | 20         | 26             | 25             |
| 6+ bridges  | 21         | 28             | 33             |
| <i>Base: All those not in work or working less than eight hours</i> |            |                |                |
| <i>Weighted base</i>  | 659        | 539            | 838            |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>  | 628        | 531            | 838            |

Table 3.13 looks at bridges to work by age. Reflecting the finding that the younger age group was closer to the labour market, those aged less than 50 years old tended to be more likely to identify with each bridge to work, across sample type. For example, 47 per cent of longer-term claimants less than 50 years old felt that being able to work at home would make a difference, compared to only a third of those aged 50 or over ( $p < 0.01$ ). Fifty-five to 56 per cent of recent claimants less than 50 years old also identified with that bridge to work, compared to 41 to 43 per cent of those aged 50 or over ( $p < 0.01$ ).

**Table 3.13 Bridges to work by age<sup>12</sup>**

| <b>I would be able to work if...</b>                                | <b>Stock %</b> |            | <b>Voluntary %</b> |            | <b>Mandatory %</b> |            |
|---|----------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|
|   | <b>18-49</b>   | <b>50+</b> | <b>18-49</b>       | <b>50+</b> | <b>18-49</b>       | <b>50+</b> |
| ...I could work at home   | 47             | 34         | 55                 | 41         | 56                 | 43         |
| ...I knew I could return to my original benefit if I needed to      | 45             | 25         | 50                 | 36         | 56                 | 37         |
| ...I was able to take breaks when I needed to during the day        | 40             | 31         | 40                 | 42         | 47                 | 38         |
| ...someone could support me at work at least some of the time       | 39             | 23         | 40                 | 31         | 42                 | 29         |
| ...I could decide how many hours I worked                           | 36             | 28         | 46                 | 36         | 50                 | 38         |
| ...I had special equipment to do a job                              | 27             | 16         | 27                 | 19         | 36                 | 18         |
| ...public transport was better                                      | 25             | 13         | 35                 | 23         | 39                 | 23         |
| ...I had my own transport   | 24             | 9          | 34                 | 19         | 37                 | 19         |
| ...something else would help me to work                             | 16             | 14         | 20                 | 15         | 24                 | 20         |
| <i>Base: All those not in work or working less than eight hours</i> |                |            |                    |            |                    |            |
| <i>Weighted base (range)</i>  | <i>336</i>     | <i>294</i> | <i>370</i>         | <i>170</i> | <i>615</i>         | <i>224</i> |
| <i>Unweighted base (range)</i>                                      | <i>298</i>     | <i>330</i> | <i>334</i>         | <i>197</i> | <i>572</i>         | <i>265</i> |

Again, looking at the number of bridges identified, the proportions who did not respond positively to any of the statements when focusing on those aged 50 years or over increased to half of the longer-term claimants, 41 per cent of Flow Voluntary respondents and 35 per cent of the Flow Mandatory group ( $p < 0.01$  in comparison to the younger age group in each case, Table 3.14).

**Table 3.14 Number of bridges by age**

|   | <b>Stock %</b> |            | <b>Voluntary %</b> |            | <b>Mandatory %</b> |            |
|---|----------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|
|   | <b>18-49</b>   | <b>50+</b> | <b>18-49</b>       | <b>50+</b> | <b>18-49</b>       | <b>50+</b> |
| No bridges  | 34             | 49         | 21                 | 41         | 21                 | 35         |
| 1-2 bridges   | 17             | 20         | 21                 | 14         | 17                 | 21         |
| 3-5 bridges   | 22             | 17         | 27                 | 23         | 25                 | 25         |
| 6+ bridges  | 27             | 14         | 30                 | 21         | 38                 | 20         |
| <i>Base: All those not in work or working less than eight hours</i> |                |            |                    |            |                    |            |
| <i>Weighted base (range)</i>  | <i>336</i>     | <i>293</i> | <i>369</i>         | <i>169</i> | <i>615</i>         | <i>223</i> |
| <i>Unweighted base (range)</i>                                      | <i>298</i>     | <i>330</i> | <i>334</i>         | <i>197</i> | <i>572</i>         | <i>265</i> |

<sup>12</sup> 'Childcare responsibilities' was not included in this table as the base for those aged 50 and over was very small.

### 3.6 Barriers to work

Respondents were also read a series of potential barriers to working (Table 3.15). Again, the factors are sorted by the most salient reasons for not working for the longer-term claimants. The most salient barrier to work, as in previous waves, was having a disability or a health condition, cited by 90 per cent of longer-term claimants, and 75 to 79 per cent of recent claimants ( $p < 0.01$ ). The next most important barrier for all three groups was their doctor having told them not to work, which applied to a very similar proportion of each type of claimant (67 to 69 per cent).

Considering the different work experience and work expectations of longer-term claimants and recent claimants, it is surprising that there is not more of a gap in the proportions identifying with a lack of confidence as a barrier to work (39 per cent of longer-term claimants compared to 34 to 36 per cent of recent claimants). There was a bigger gap for other people's attitudes to their disability (this barrier applied to one-half of longer-term claimants compared to one-third of recent claimants,  $p < 0.01$ ).

When the same list was read to NDDP registrants, the most popular barrier cited was that of not enough suitable job opportunities locally (63 per cent). However, there were much lower levels of agreement for most barriers. The most common barrier among the Eligible Population, not being able to work because of disability, was cited by less than half of the registrants (45 per cent, Ashworth *et al.*, 2003).

**Table 3.15 Barriers to work**

|   | Stock<br>% | Volunt'y<br>% | Mandat'y<br>% | <i>Base: weighted<br/>(unweighted)</i> |                  |                  |
|---|------------|---------------|---------------|--|------------------|------------------|
|   |            |               |               | <i>Stock</i>                           | <i>Voluntary</i> | <i>Mandatory</i> |
| I cannot work because of my disability or health condition  | 90         | 79            | 75            | 629<br>(628)                           | 538<br>(531)     | 838<br>(838)     |
| My doctor has told me not to work   | 69         | 68            | 67            | 628<br>(628)                           | 538<br>(531)     | 838<br>(838)     |
| I cannot work because I'm caring for someone who has a health condition or disability               | 65         | 42            | 57            | 63<br>(66)                             | 60<br>(59)       | 74<br>(75)       |
| I am not sure I would be able to work regularly   | 61         | 52            | 49            | 629<br>(628)                           | 538<br>(531)     | 838<br>(838)     |
| Other people's attitudes towards my health condition or disability make it difficult for me to work | 51         | 34            | 34            | 629<br>(628)                           | 538<br>(531)     | 837<br>(838)     |
| I'm unlikely to get a job because of my age   | 40         | 30            | 28            | 628<br>(628)                           | 538<br>(531)     | 839<br>(838)     |
| I don't feel confident about working  | 39         | 36            | 34            | 629<br>(628)                           | 538<br>(531)     | 838<br>(838)     |

Continued

**Table 3.15 Continued**

|   | Stock<br>% | Volunt'y<br>% | Mandat'y<br>% | Base: weighted<br>(unweighted) |              |              |
|---|------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
|   |            |               |               | Stock                          | Voluntary    | Mandatory    |
| I haven't got enough qualifications and experience to find the right work | 34         | 36            | 40            | 629<br>(628)                   | 537<br>(531) | 839<br>(838) |
| There aren't enough suitable job opportunities locally                    | 31         | 40            | 44            | 628<br>(628)                   | 538<br>(531) | 838<br>(838) |
| I'm not sure I would be better off in work than on benefits               | 21         | 23            | 23            | 628<br>(628)                   | 538<br>(531) | 839<br>(838) |
| I cannot work because of my childcare responsibilities                    | 18         | 28            | 26            | 128<br>(120)                   | 127<br>(116) | 227<br>(230) |
| My family don't want me to work   | 9          | 7             | 6             | 629<br>(628)                   | 539<br>(531) | 839<br>(838) |

The statement 'I cannot work because of my health condition' was excluded from the count of barriers to work as it applied to almost all of the longer-term claimants and a large proportion of recent claimants. Unlike the number of bridges, each group had broadly similar numbers of barriers to work (Table 3.16). Nevertheless, longer-term claimants were slightly less likely to identify with one or two barriers (27 per cent compared to 32 to 33 per cent of recent claimants,  $p < 0.05$ ), and more likely to identify with six or more barriers (20 per cent compared to 13 to 14 per cent of recent claimants,  $p < 0.01$ ).

**Table 3.16 Number of barriers identified, excluding 'I cannot work because of my health condition'**

|   | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|---|---------|-------------|-------------|
| No barriers   | 4       | 5           | 4           |
| 1-2 barriers  | 27      | 33          | 32          |
| 3-5 barriers  | 49      | 49          | 51          |
| 6+ barriers   | 20      | 14          | 13          |
| <i>Base: All those not in work or working less than eight hours</i> |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>  | 629     | 538         | 838         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>  | 628     | 531         | 838         |

In Table 3.17, it can be seen that those aged 50 or over were more likely to identify with some of the barriers, in particular having a health condition. Ninety-three per cent of longer-term claimants and 83 to 86 per cent of respondents aged 50 or over said they could not work because of their health condition (in comparison to 87 per cent for Stock  $p < 0.05$ , and 73 to 76 per cent of recent claimants,  $p < 0.01$ ), however there are not as many differences between the two age groups as for bridges to

work. Barriers to work did not therefore reflect work expectations and experience as clearly as bridges to work.<sup>13</sup>

**Table 3.17 Barriers to work by age<sup>14</sup>**

|   | Stock %    |            | Voluntary % |            | Mandatory % |            |
|---|------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
|   | 18-49      | 50+        | 18-49       | 50+        | 18-49       | 50+        |
| I cannot work because of my disability or health condition          | 87         | 93         | 76          | 86         | 73          | 83         |
| My doctor has told me not to work                                   | 66         | 72         | 66          | 73         | 64          | 73         |
| Not sure I would be able to work regularly                          | 63         | 58         | 48          | 59         | 47          | 56         |
| Other peoples' attitudes about my health/disability                 | 57         | 45         | 33          | 36         | 34          | 32         |
| I don't feel confident about working                                | 42         | 35         | 36          | 36         | 33          | 35         |
| Not enough qualifications and experience to find the right work     | 38         | 31         | 38          | 31         | 42          | 34         |
| There aren't enough job opportunities locally                       | 36         | 25         | 42          | 35         | 46          | 41         |
| Not sure I'd be better off in work than on benefits                 | 24         | 18         | 24          | 20         | 26          | 14         |
| I'm unlikely to get a job because of my age                         | 23         | 59         | 16          | 59         | 18          | 57         |
| My family don't want me to work                                     | 7          | 11         | 5           | 9          | 5           | 10         |
| <i>Base: All those not in work or working less than eight hours</i> |            |            |             |            |             |            |
| <i>Weighted base (range)</i>  | <i>337</i> | <i>294</i> | <i>369</i>  | <i>170</i> | <i>615</i>  | <i>224</i> |
| <i>Unweighted base (range)</i>                                      | <i>298</i> | <i>330</i> | <i>334</i>  | <i>197</i> | <i>572</i>  | <i>265</i> |

It is apparent from this chapter that the work experience, work expectations, qualification levels, and cited bridges and barriers to work differ vastly between the longer-term and more recent claimants, with the former being further from the labour market on all measures. This is not to say that there are not longer-term claimants who are interested in working – indeed, 33 per cent had looked for work

<sup>13</sup> It is acknowledged that the interpretation of bridges and barriers has complexities. For some respondents who recognise very few barriers, this may not be because others do not apply but rather because they appear irrelevant and so not worth considering or mentioning. For example, somebody who is absolutely clear that they cannot work because of a disability may not see any relevance in whether or not they would be better off in work.

<sup>14</sup> Childcare responsibilities and caring for someone with a health condition or disability were not included in this table as the bases for sub-groups aged 50 and over were very small.

in the last year or expected to work in the future. There was still interest from those further from the labour market, with 12 per cent of longer-term claimants who had either last worked ten or more years ago or had never worked, still either looking or expecting to work in the future. As emphasised throughout this chapter, even though there is more homogeneity among the Flow Voluntary and Flow Mandatory respondents when compared to the Stock, the two Flow groups do differ in terms of work experience and expectations. As will be explored in further chapters, some of these differences may be due to Flow Mandatory claimants having attended a WFI.



## 4 Awareness of New Deal for Disabled People

This study was designed to interview people with disabilities who were eligible to participate in NDDP, most of whom should have been informed about the programme. As inherent in the sampling criteria, the Stock and Flow Voluntary groups should have been informed through the NDDP mailshot which they should have all been sent in September 2003.<sup>15</sup> The Flow Mandatory group may have been made aware via the work focused interview (WFI) most of them should have attended at a Jobcentre Plus office. Although respondents should have been sent the NDDP letter, and the Flow Mandatory group should have attended a WFI, recall of both of these is so low it suggests they may not have taken place in all cases (see Section 4.5.1).

Combined with the previous two waves, this third wave of reporting lends itself well to time-series analysis of awareness<sup>16</sup>. Comparisons are made between Wave One data collection which took place around September 2002, Wave Two from around June 2003 and Wave Three from around February 2004 (for exact fieldwork dates, see Appendix A).

This chapter explores awareness among the Eligible Population, firstly of NDDP only (Section 4.2) and then of the Job Brokers (JBs) who deliver the service (Section 4.3); this is done for Wave Three respondents and then across waves in each section. Combined awareness of NDDP and JB's is then examined in Section 4.4, and the Flow Voluntary group is focused upon to investigate awareness patterns across waves. Section 4.5 looks at the first way respondents heard about NDDP and their recall of the NDDP letter. Finally, attitudes towards the programme of those who are aware are examined in Section 4.6.

---

<sup>15</sup> Respondents in the Flow Mandatory group were also sent the NDDP letter, but the Flow Mandatory sample was not selected on this criteria, unlike the Stock and Flow Voluntary groups.

<sup>16</sup> When looking at the Stock group in time-series analysis, it must be remembered that the Wave One and Two samples were taken from the same claim period, whereas Wave Three was from a later claim period.


## 4.1 Summary

- Over half of all respondents were aware of either NDDP and/or a JB among all sample groups at each wave (for Wave Three this was 56 per cent among Stock, 53 per cent among Flow Voluntary and 58 per cent among Flow Mandatory).
- At Wave Three, the Flow Voluntary group was less likely to be aware of NDDP than both other sample groups (24 per cent of Flow Voluntary compared to 30 per cent of Stock and 30 per cent of Flow Mandatory).
- The following groups of respondents were more likely to have heard of NDDP: men (among the Flow Mandatory group), those with qualifications (among the Stock and the Flow Mandatory groups), those who had worked recently (among the Stock group), and those were looking or expecting to work (among the Stock and the Flow Mandatory groups).
- More than one in five respondents in each sample group said they had heard of at least one JB in their area (42 per cent among Stock, 44 per cent among Flow Voluntary and 45 per cent among Flow Mandatory).
- Looking across waves, there was a decrease in awareness of NDDP for both the longer-term claimant group and the Flow Voluntary group after Wave One. There was little movement between the Wave Two and Wave Three awareness levels of NDDP. On the other hand, there was an overall increase in the proportion of respondents aware of a JB in their area.
- As in previous waves, Wave Three recall of the NDDP letter was low, with less than one-sixth of each sample group remembering the letter. Letter recall has remained relatively steady across waves and sample groups.
- The Flow Mandatory group was more likely to be positive about NDDP when asked about their initial reactions to the programme, while just under half of all those aware of NDDP in each group agreed that they 'weren't too sure what it was all about'.

## 4.2 Awareness of NDDP

### 4.2.1 Awareness of NDDP at Wave Three

The Flow Voluntary group was less likely to be aware of NDDP than both other sample groups as Figure 4.1 shows (24 per cent of Flow Voluntary compared to 30 per cent among both Stock and Flow Mandatory groups,  $p < 0.05$ ). This difference could be explained by those in the Stock group having been on benefits for a longer period of time and hence could have had greater exposure to NDDP. The 'WFI effect' as described in previous chapters may again be evident when we compare the two Flow groups. The Flow Mandatory group may have shown greater awareness due to the WFI they attended being more effective at conveying the NDDP brand/message than the NDDP letter on its own.

**Figure 4.1 Awareness of NDDP at Wave Three**

The above figures on awareness of NDDP were made up of spontaneous and prompted mentions of the programme. Respondents were first asked if they had heard of any of the New Deals and if so, which ones. Although awareness of specific New Deals was low among all those interviewed at Wave Three, more respondents from the Eligible Population cited the New Deal for Disabled People than any of the others. Table 4.1 shows that six per cent of the longer-term claimants and seven per cent of both Flow groups showed spontaneous awareness of the programme.

**Table 4.1 Spontaneous awareness of New Deals**

|   | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory %              |
|---|---------|-------------|--------------------------|
|   |         |             | <i>Multiple response</i> |
| New Deal for Disabled People            | 6       | 7           | 7                        |
| New Deal 50 plus                        | 2       | 4           | 4                        |
| New Deal for lone parents               | 2       | 2           | 3                        |
| New Deal for young people               | 1       | 3           | 3                        |
| New Deal 25 plus                        | 1       | 3           | 3                        |
| New Deal for communities                | 0       | *           | -                        |
| New Deal for partners of the unemployed | *       | 1           | 1                        |
| Heard of New Deal generally             | 35      | 39          | 39                       |
| Not heard of New Deal                   | 55      | 48          | 48                       |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>            |         |             |                          |
| <i>Weighted base</i>                    | 657     | 656         | 969                      |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>                  | 657     | 656         | 969                      |

Larger proportions had heard of the New Deal generally – 35 per cent of Stock, and 39 per cent of both Flow groups. More still had not heard of the New Deal at all, including more than one-half of Stock respondents and very nearly one-half of the Flow groups (55 per cent of Stock and 48 per cent of both Flow groups).

Those that did not mention NDDP spontaneously were read a description of the programme and asked if they had heard of it. This prompted description accounted for most of the awareness with 24 per cent of the longer-term claimants, 17 per cent of the Flow Voluntary group and 23 per cent of the Flow Mandatory group responding positively to the full description.

Awareness of NDDP at Wave Three differed by certain characteristics for each of the three sample groups. The following tables compare different sub-groups and are divided into basic characteristics (Table 4.2), and benefit and work characteristics (Table 4.3).

Among the Flow Mandatory group, men were more likely than women to be aware of the programme (32 per cent compared with 26 per cent respectively,  $p < 0.05$ ). Comparing those that had qualifications with those that did not, those that did were more likely to be aware of NDDP (35 per cent and 22 per cent for Stock;  $p < 0.01$ , and 33 and 24 per cent for Flow Mandatory;  $p < 0.01$ ).

**Table 4.2 Awareness of NDDP by basic characteristics**

|                           | Stock<br>% | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% | <i>Base: weighted<br/>(unweighted)</i> |                  |                  |
|---------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|--|------------------|------------------|
|                           |            |                |                | <i>Stock</i>                           | <i>Voluntary</i> | <i>Mandatory</i> |
| <b>Gender</b>             |            |                |                |  |                  |                  |
| Men                       | 32         | 23             | 32             | 347<br>(331)                           | 375<br>(362)     | 599<br>(533)     |
| Women                     | 26         | 26             | 26             | 310                                    | 282<br>(327)     | 370<br>(295)     |
| (436)                     |            |                |                |  |                  |                  |
| <b>Has qualifications</b> |            |                |                |  |                  |                  |
| Yes                       | 35         | 27             | 33             | 354                                    | 414<br>(354)     | 591<br>(414)     |
| (582)                     |            |                |                |  |                  |                  |
| No                        | 22         | 20             | 24             | 303                                    | 244<br>(304)     | 378<br>(243)     |
| (387)                     |            |                |                |  |                  |                  |

*Base: All respondents aware of NDDP and/or JB.*

Within the longer-term claimants group and the Flow Voluntary group, those who received Incapacity Benefit were more likely to be aware, as were the Stock group who did not receive Severe Disablement Allowance (see Table 4.3 for figures). Awareness levels by work experience differed most among the longer-term claimants with those closer to the labour market being more likely to be aware of NDDP. More than one-third of those currently in work or who had worked in the last

three years were aware of NDDP, compared to around one-quarter of those who had worked ten or more years ago or who had never worked (37 per cent and 26 per cent respectively;  $p < 0.05$ ).

With the expectation that those looking or expecting to work are more actively seeking paths to work, it is not surprising that they are more likely to be aware of NDDP than those who are unsure or not expecting to work (35 per cent compared with 26 per cent for Stock;  $p < 0.05$ , 32 per cent compared with 22 per cent for Flow Mandatory;  $p < 0.01$ ).

**Table 4.3 Awareness of NDDP by benefit and work characteristics**

|   | Stock<br>% | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% | Base: weighted<br>(unweighted) |              |              |
|---|------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
|   |            |                |                | Stock                          | Voluntary    | Mandatory    |
| <b>In receipt of Incapacity Benefit</b>                       |            |                |                |                                |              |              |
| Yes   | 33         | 30             | 33             | 379<br>(401)                   | 264<br>(266) | 406<br>(413) |
| No  | 25         | 20             | 28             | 280<br>(257)                   | 394<br>(391) | 563<br>(556) |
| <b>In receipt of Severe Disablement Allowance<sup>1</sup></b> |            |                |                |                                |              |              |
| Yes   | [19]       | a              | a              | 65<br>(42)                     | a            | a            |
| No  | 31         | 24             | 30             | 594<br>(616)                   | 642<br>(644) | 960<br>(959) |
| <b>Work experience</b>  |            |                |                |                                |              |              |
| Currently in work/within<br>the last 3 years                  | 37         | 27             | 31             | 153<br>(173)                   | 459<br>(474) | 678<br>(675) |
| 4-9 years ago   | 30         | 18             | 28             | 217<br>(233)                   | 95<br>(90)   | 111<br>(114) |
| 10+ years/never worked  | 26         | 19             | 25             | 286<br>(250)                   | 102<br>(93)  | 179<br>(179) |
| <b>Work expectations</b>                                      |            |                |                |                                |              |              |
| Looking/expecting to work                                     | 35         | 25             | 32             | 256<br>(250)                   | 476<br>(476) | 735<br>(712) |
| Unsure/not expecting to work                                  | 26         | 21             | 22             | 403<br>(408)                   | 180<br>(181) | 234<br>(257) |

Base: All respondents aware of NDDP and/or JB

<sup>1</sup> Recent changes in benefit rules mean that there should be no Severe Disablement Allowance recipients among the new claimants. The small numbers of those who say that they do probably reflects confusion surrounding actual benefit receipt.

a Figures not reported. Base less than 30.

Awareness also differed by bridges and barriers cited. In general, bridges were more commonly cited among those who were aware of NDDP, which indicates that those who are thinking about work generally are more likely to recognise possible bridges.

There was no clear relationship between number of bridges cited and awareness except, as would be expected, those identifying with none of the bridges demonstrated the lowest levels of awareness.

Looking at specific bridges, for the longer-term claimants, those that stated having their own transport as a bridge to work were more likely to be aware of NDDP than those who did not see this as a bridge (40 per cent compared to 29 per cent;  $p > 0.05$ ). Within the Stock and Flow Mandatory groups, being able to return to their original benefit corresponded to a greater awareness of NDDP (37 per cent compared to 27 per cent for Stock;  $p < 0.05$ , 34 per cent compared with 24 per cent for Flow Mandatory;  $p < 0.01$ ). For the Flow Mandatory group, 34 per cent of those who felt that being able to take breaks would help them to work were aware of NDDP. Of those who did not see this as a bridge, 26 per cent were aware of NDDP ( $p < 0.05$ ).

There was a less clear pattern between identifying barriers to work and levels of awareness. Indeed it was not the case that those identifying no barriers had the lowest levels of awareness of NDDP. However, there were several barriers to work that related to an increased awareness among the Flow Mandatory group. These were a doctor telling the respondent not to work (32 per cent compared to 24 per cent;  $p < 0.05$ ), not being sure they would be better off in work than on benefits (38 per cent compared to 27 per cent;  $p < 0.01$ ) and other people's attitudes to their health condition or disability (38 per cent compared to 27 per cent;  $p < 0.05$ ).


Logistic regression was carried out to check whether certain characteristics had a significant impact on awareness of NDDP when controlling for all other variables. Although the previous two tables show differences in awareness by a number of characteristics, few characteristics had a significant effect in the model. Among both the Stock and Flow Mandatory groups, those with qualifications were more likely to be aware than those without. Among the Stock group also, those who said that knowing they could return to their original benefit would be a bridge to work were also more likely to be aware of the programme. This association may reflect a higher level of interest in returning to work among these respondents.

#### **4.2.2 Awareness of NDDP across waves**

Looking across waves, Figure 4.2 shows a decrease in awareness of NDDP for both the longer-term claimant group and the Flow Voluntary group after Wave One (for Stock, Wave One compared to Wave Three,  $p < 0.05$ ; for Flow Voluntary, Wave One compared to Wave Three,  $p < 0.01$ ). There was little movement between the Wave Two and Wave Three awareness levels of JB's. Although the chart implies that there was an increase in awareness among the Flow Mandatory group from Wave Two to Three (25 per cent to 30 per cent), this difference is not statistically significant.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Data not reported on Wave One Flow Mandatory group due to small sample size.

**Figure 4.2 Awareness of NDDP across waves**

Encouragingly, there were increases in the Flow groups of those who said they had heard of *any* of the New Deals (specifically and generally) across the waves. At Wave One, around one-quarter of both groups said they had heard of the New Deal generally (27 per cent of the Stock group and 25 per cent of the Flow groups). By Wave Three, around one-half of each group had (45 per cent of Stock, 52 per cent of both Flow groups). As awareness of NDDP has not increased among the Eligible Population, this can be accounted for by an increase in awareness of New Deals generally and specifically, in turn due to a growth in the public and media profile of the initiative. It could also be due to the New Deal logo being used on the NDDP mailshot.

### 4.3 Awareness of Job Brokers

#### 4.3.1 Awareness of Job Brokers at Wave Three

More than one in five respondents in each sample group said they had heard of at least one JB in their area (42 per cent among Stock, 44 per cent among Flow Voluntary and 45 per cent among Flow Mandatory). There was little difference between sample groups' JB awareness (in contrast to the differences in NDDP awareness). With little difference between longer-term claimants and more recent claimants, this suggests JB awareness has little to do with length of claim period. Again, with little difference between the two recent claimant groups, whether a WFI is attended seems to have no impact on JB awareness. This is supported by qualitative findings in this evaluation which found 'The main ways in which Job Brokers said that clients heard about their services were from the Department of Work and Pensions mailshots to eligible claimants, from DEAs, from health-care professionals and social workers and from Job Broker publicity' (Corden *et al.*, 2003).

JB awareness was established by interviewers reading respondents a list of JB in their area (which was matched by their Local Authority Code) and asking if they recognised any. It should be noted that some JB work as partnerships, consisting of different organisations with different names (up to 12 for one consortium), therefore some respondents may have known their local JB by a name which was not listed and hence said that they had not heard of the JB. On the other hand, as JB may already have been providing help to find work or training to disabled people or had offered them support more generally before becoming part of NDDP, it is possible respondents' awareness was based on initiatives unrelated to NDDP.

JB awareness differed by respondent characteristics. Those with qualifications were more likely than those without to be aware of a JB (47 compared to 37 per cent respectively for Stock;  $p < 0.05$ , 47 per cent compared to 38 per cent for Flow Voluntary;  $p < 0.05$ , and 48 per cent compared to 40 per cent for the Flow Mandatory;  $p < 0.05$ ). Flow Mandatory respondents who had been looking after the home or family in the last four weeks were more likely to be aware than those who had not (49 per cent compared to 41 per cent respectively;  $p < 0.05$ ). Within the group of longer-term claimants, those with a mental health condition were less likely to be aware of a JB (36 per cent compared to 45 per cent;  $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 4.4 Awareness of Job Broker by basic characteristics**

|   | <i>Cell per cent</i> |                |                |  |                  |                  |
|---|----------------------|----------------|----------------|--|------------------|------------------|
|   | Stock<br>%           | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% | <i>Base: weighted<br/>(unweighted)</i> |                  |                  |
|   |                      |                |                | <i>Stock</i>                           | <i>Voluntary</i> | <i>Mandatory</i> |
| <b>Has qualifications</b>               |                      |                |                |  |                  |                  |
| Yes                                     | 47                   | 47             | 48             | 354<br>(354)                           | 414<br>(414)     | 591<br>(582)     |
| No                                      | 37                   | 38             | 40             | 303<br>(304)                           | 244<br>(243)     | 378<br>(387)     |
| <b>Looking after the home or family</b> |                      |                |                |  |                  |                  |
| Yes                                     | 45                   | 45             | 48             | 304<br>(317)                           | 329<br>(333)     | 472<br>(495)     |
| No                                      | 40                   | 42             | 41             | 354<br>(341)                           | 328<br>(324)     | 497<br>(474)     |
| <b>Mental health condition</b>          |                      |                |                |  |                  |                  |
| Yes                                     | 36                   | 42             | 45             | 172<br>(167)                           | 161<br>(155)     | 278<br>(270)     |
| No                                      | 45                   | 44             | 45             | 487<br>(491)                           | 496<br>(502)     | 691<br>(699)     |

*Base: All respondents aware of NDDP and/or JB*

Awareness differed by proximity to labour market, with those currently in work or who had worked within the last three years more likely to be aware than those who last worked ten years or more ago or had never worked (Flow Voluntary 47 per cent compared to 27 per cent respectively,  $p < 0.01$ ; Flow Mandatory 46 per cent compared to 35 per cent,  $p < 0.01$ ). Among the longer-term respondents, work experience made little difference to their awareness of JB's. Similarly, those looking or expecting to work were more likely to be aware than those unsure or not expecting to work (Stock 49 per cent compared to 39 per cent,  $p < 0.05$ ; Flow Voluntary 47 per cent compared to 34 per cent,  $p < 0.01$ ; Flow Mandatory 47 per cent compared to 38 per cent,  $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 4.5 Awareness of Job Broker by work characteristics**

|                                       | Stock<br>% | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% | Base: weighted<br>(unweighted) |              |              |
|---------------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
|                                       |            |                |                | Stock                          | Voluntary    | Mandatory    |
| <b>Work experience</b>                |            |                |                |                                |              |              |
| Currently in work/within last 3 years | 45         | 47             | 46             | 152<br>(173)                   | 460<br>(474) | 678<br>(675) |
| 4-9 years ago                         | 41         | 45             | 51             | 218<br>(233)                   | 95<br>(90)   | 111<br>(114) |
| 10+ years/never worked                | 43         | 27             | 35             | 287<br>(250)                   | 101<br>(93)  | 179<br>(179) |
| <b>Work expectations</b>              |            |                |                |                                |              |              |
| Looking/ expecting to work            | 49         | 47             | 47             | 255<br>(250)                   | 476<br>(476) | 734<br>(712) |
| Unsure/not expecting to work          | 39         | 34             | 38             | 403<br>(408)                   | 180<br>(181) | 235<br>(257) |


*Base: All respondents aware of NDDP and/or JB*

Logistic regression was carried out on awareness of JB's at Wave Three. Among the longer-term claimants, those who were looking or expecting to work were more likely to be aware of a JB in their area, and those with a mental health condition were less likely. Flow Voluntary respondents who last worked five to nine years ago were more likely to be aware than those who had last worked more than ten years ago or had never worked. For both those who have work expectations and who have been in work more recently, the fact that they are closer to the labour market makes them more likely to be looking for or attracted to Welfare to Work initiatives. Among the Flow Mandatory group, respondents who said that knowing they could return to their original benefit was a bridge to work were also more likely to be aware of a JB in their area.

### 4.3.2 Awareness of Job Brokers across waves

Looking across waves, Figure 4.3 shows an overall increase in the proportion of respondents aware of a JB in their area. This increase is most evident among the longer-term claimants (35 per cent at Wave One, 39 per cent at Wave Two, 42 per cent at Wave Three; Wave One compared to Wave Three,  $p < 0.01$ ; all other differences not statistically significant). For all groups, there was little change between awareness at Waves Two and Three. Among the Flow Voluntary group, the only statistically significant increase was between Waves One and Two (38 per cent at Wave One, 45 per cent at Wave Two and 44 per cent at Wave Three; Wave One compared to Wave Two,  $p < 0.05$ ). Notable among the Flow Mandatory group there was no change between awareness of JB's from Wave Two to Wave Three.

**Figure 4.3 Awareness of Job Brokers across waves**




## 4.4 Combined awareness of NDDP and/or Job Brokers

### 4.4.1 Combined awareness at Wave Three and across waves

To get an overall picture, awareness of NDDP and/or a JB was combined. As Figure 4.4 shows, both within sample groups and within waves there were only slight changes in combined awareness; indeed, all awareness figures are within a five percentage point difference of each other. However, as discussed in the next section, there is more movement in respect to a shift in the balance from NDDP to JB awareness than is revealed in Figure 4.4.

**Figure 4.4 Awareness of NDDP and/or Job Broker aware across waves**



#### 4.4.2 Combined awareness across waves (Flow Voluntary group only)


This section focuses on the awareness of the Flow Voluntary group across all three waves.<sup>18</sup> Figure 4.5 shows, as above, that since Wave One, combined awareness has stayed very steady (56 per cent at Wave One, 56 per cent at Wave Two and 53 per cent at Wave Three; difference between Waves Two and Three is not statistically significant). The most noticeable shift has been the increase in awareness of JB's only (23 per cent, 30 per cent and 39 per cent respectively) which compensates for the decrease in awareness of NDDP only (17 per cent, 11 per cent and ten per cent respectively).

This increase in JB-only awareness and decrease in NDDP-only awareness probably reflects a shift from a national marketing approach to a more local JB-orientated one.

Still focusing on the Flow Voluntary group, logistic regression on awareness of NDDP confirmed there were no significant changes between Waves Two and Three, unlike Waves One and Two where wave of interview was a significant predictor of NDDP awareness. Logistic regression on JB awareness showed that again, wave of interview at Waves Two and Three was not a significant predictor.

<sup>18</sup> Due to the Stock groups being sampled from different periods, as mentioned previously, and the Flow Mandatory group having a small sample size at Wave One, the Flow Mandatory group were the most suitable for in-depth time-series analysis.

**Figure 4.5 Combined awareness across waves (Flow Voluntary group only)**



## 4.5 Information received about NDDP and NDDP letter recall

### 4.5.1 Information received about NDDP at Wave Three and NDDP letter recall

As mentioned at the start of this chapter, the longer-term claimants group and the Flow Voluntary group were selected into the sample on the basis that they had been sent the NDDP mailshot in September 2003. Therefore, it is not surprising to see that almost one in four of both these groups had first heard of the programme through this medium (39 per cent of Stock and 36 per cent of Flow Voluntary), making it the most common method among the Stock and Flow Voluntary groups (Table 4.6). Similarly, the Flow Mandatory sample were selected on having had a WFI booked at a Jobcentre Plus office, so again, it is not surprising to find that this is the most commonly reported way they had first heard of the programme.

Of all Flow Mandatory respondents, 17 per cent said that NDDP was mentioned at their WFI – seven per cent overall had said it was the first time they had heard of it. However, only 55 per cent of Flow Mandatory respondents actually remembered having a WFI. There are a number of explanations for this – having a WFI deferred or waived, not realising they were attending a WFI, not remembering the WFI, and not having turned up for it.

**Table 4.6 First way found out about NDDP**

|  | Stock %    | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|--|------------|-------------|-------------|
| NDDP letter                                | 39         | 36          | 20          |
| Radio or television                        | 22         | 23          | 14          |
| NDDP leaflet                               | 12         | 5           | 7           |
| Jobcentre (Plus) interview                 | 5          | 10          | 25          |
| Newspaper or magazine                      | 5          | 7           | 4           |
| Friend or relative                         | 4          | 5           | 4           |
| Jobcentre (Plus) member of staff           | 4          | 2           | 10          |
| JB (personal contact or advertising)       | 3          | 4           | 7           |
| Permitted work mailing                     | 2          | 1           | 2           |
| Doctor or other medical professional       | 1          | 1           | –           |
| Other                                      | 6          | 6           | 6           |
| <i>Base: All respondents aware of NDDP</i> |            |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>                       | <i>191</i> | <i>156</i>  | <i>286</i>  |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>                     | <i>201</i> | <i>162</i>  | <i>286</i>  |

Respondents were specifically asked if they remembered receiving the NDDP mailshot that was sent to sections of the Eligible Population, in which they were included, in September 2003 (Table 4.7). Even though the Stock and Flow Voluntary groups were more likely than the Flow Mandatory group to say they had first heard of NDDP through the NDDP letter, there were very similar levels of prompted recall. These were strikingly low, with less than one-sixth of each sample group remembering the letter (either in the month specified or a different month). This may be explained partially by the period between letter receipt and survey interview (around five to six months), all respondents not having received the mailshot (due to incorrect/changes in contact details and postal problems), and the question being asked over the telephone (not giving respondents the opportunity to see the letter that was being described to them). Even so, it is difficult to explain why so few remembered the letter.

As seen in the Registrants Survey part of this evaluation, letters/leaflets from the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) are effective at communicating the NDDP message. Indeed, almost one-third of registrants reported that it was the first way they had heard of the programme and from the same group, 40 per cent said they used a DWP letter/leaflet to get information on the programme before registering (Ashworth *et al.*, 2003). Although these would not have all been the DWP mailshot marketing as explored in this part of the evaluation, it is a testament to the efficacy of this method.

**Table 4.7 Recall of NDDP letter**

|  | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|--|---------|-------------|-------------|
| Remembered receiving letter in September       | 12      | 12          | 11          |
| Remembered receiving letter in different month | 3       | 3           | 3           |
| Not sure whether received letter               | 9       | 4           | 7           |
| Aware of NDDP but did not remember letter      | 5       | 4           | 8           |
| Not aware of NDDP                              | 72      | 77          | 71          |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>                   |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>                           | 645     | 645         | 956         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>                         | 646     | 645         | 956         |

Of those who did remember receiving the letter, around three quarters of each group thought it was clear.

**Table 4.8 View of NDDP letter**


|  | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|--|---------|-------------|-------------|
| Letter was clear                                       | 75      | 79          | 77          |
| Letter was confusing                                   | 6       | 10          | 8           |
| Cannot remember  | 19      | 11          | 15          |
| <i>Base: Those who remember the letter<sup>1</sup></i> |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>                                   | 124     | 107         | 157         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>                                 | 135     | 110         | 166         |

<sup>1</sup> This base includes those who said they first heard of NDDP from a letter, but were not sure following the description of the mailshot whether this was the letter they were thinking of.

#### 4.5.2 NDDP letter recall across waves

Figure 4.6 shows letter recall across the waves. The most striking differences occur among the Stock group. This can be explained by the fact that for Wave One and Wave Three, the distance between claim period and survey interview was the same. However, the distance at Wave Two was longer, as this Stock group was sampled from the same period as its Wave One counterparts. Therefore, Wave Two Stock respondents were more likely to have been on NDDP qualifying benefits for a longer period of time than Wave One respondents, and hence be further from the labour market. Discounting the Wave Two Stock group for these reasons, letter recall has remained relatively steady across waves and sample groups, always within two percentage points of 15 per cent.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>19</sup> The Flow Mandatory group previously did not receive the NDDP mailshot, hence were not asked about it at Waves One and Two.

**Figure 4.6 NDDP letter recall across waves**

## 4.6 Reactions to New Deal for Disabled People

Those who were aware of NDDP were asked their initial reactions to the programme. The list of statements in Table 4.9 was read out to respondents, who were then asked if they agreed or disagreed with each of them. The results at Wave Three were similar to the first two waves. It is worth noting a possible WFI effect in the Flow Mandatory group who were more likely to be in agreement with the first five positive statements than the other two groups. Similarly, they were less likely to agree with the statement 'I knew straightaway it wasn't for me.' Whether these findings are due to the positive influence of face-to-face contact at the WFI or the compulsory nature of attendance for benefit receipt, or some other factor, is not easy to determine.

Looking at the sixth statement of whether they thought they had to get in touch with an adviser, a possible WFI effect is in place here again, with more of the Mandatory group thinking it was the case (however, sizeable proportions of all three groups agreed with this statement).

The final two more negative statements drew mixed responses with just over one-half of the longer-term claimants who were aware of the programme saying that they 'knew straightaway it wasn't for me.' Turning to the last statement, approaching half of all those aware of NDDP in each sample group agreed that they 'weren't too sure what it was all about'. There was little variation among groups on this statement. So, even among those who were aware of the programme and who had gained their awareness from different sources in accordance to their varied disability and benefit backgrounds, there was still much confusion as to what it was about.

**Table 4.9 Reactions to NDDP**

|  | Stock<br>% | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% | <i>Base: weighted<br/>(unweighted)</i> |                  |                  |
|--|------------|----------------|----------------|--|------------------|------------------|
|  |            |                |                | <i>Stock</i>                           | <i>Voluntary</i> | <i>Mandatory</i> |
| It was worth thinking about              | 59         | 61             | 72             | 193<br>(203)                           | 155<br>(160)     | 282<br>(283)     |
| Good opportunity to talk about situation | 40         | 53             | 63             | 189<br>(198)                           | 154<br>(159)     | 284<br>(285)     |
| It would help me find work               | 39         | 52             | 64             | 189<br>(199)                           | 155<br>(160)     | 278<br>(280)     |
| I would get advice about benefits        | 36         | 43             | 51             | 188<br>(197)                           | 155<br>(160)     | 282<br>(283)     |
| It would help me find training           | 35         | 50             | 60             | 189<br>(198)                           | 153<br>(158)     | 278<br>(280)     |
| Thought had to get in touch with adviser | 26         | 29             | 37             | 190<br>(198)                           | 151<br>(157)     | 279<br>(280)     |
| I knew straight away it wasn't for me    | 51         | 43             | 34             | 190<br>(198)                           | 151<br>(156)     | 277<br>(278)     |
| Wasn't too sure what it was all about    | 48         | 45             | 49             | 189<br>(198)                           | 157<br>(161)     | 283<br>(284)     |

Base: All aware of NDDP

# 5 Participation and non-participation

This study contacted people who claimed benefits which made them eligible for participation in NDDP. However, in any Welfare to Work scheme, factors other than benefit status play a role in participation – these may include health status, qualifications held, motivation and past work experience. Therefore, with so many factors in play, modest levels of participation are to be expected.

This chapter begins with an overview of all respondents' participation activity and awareness (Section 5.2). Section 5.3 focuses only on those that were aware of NDDP and explores their participation in the programme. Those that had had an interview or discussion with a Job Broker (JB) are considered, and for those that did not, their plans to make contact are reported. The section ends with a look at the modest registration levels onto the programme. For those who were aware of the programme but did not participate, Section 5.4 considers their reasons for not doing so. Finally, Section 5.5 looks at those who were not aware of NDDP or JB's and their potential participation in such a service.

## 5.1 Summary

- Contact with JB's differed between sample groups – eight per cent of all the longer-term claimants, 12 per cent of the Flow Voluntary group and 18 per cent of the Flow Mandatory group reported that they had had an interview or discussion with a JB.
- Flow Mandatory respondents were more likely than the others to have had an interview. Of those aware of NDDP, more than twice the proportion of Flow Mandatory claimants than Stock claimants had done so (32 per cent compared to 15 per cent respectively;  $p < 0.01$ ).

- Around three quarters of those who said they had had an interview or discussion with a JB reported that it took place at the Jobcentre, bringing into question whether respondents were correctly identifying JB contact.<sup>20</sup>
- The most common reason for contact with a JB was to get help with moving (back) into work.
- Health status, health severity and presence of a mental health condition did not affect the likelihood that the more recent claimants had had an interview/discussion with a JB.
- Self-reported registration was around five per cent for each sample group (three per cent for Stock, five per cent for Flow Voluntary and six per cent for Flow Mandatory). However, there was little overlap in this group and those shown to be registered on the NDDP registrations database – resulting in less than one per cent reporting they were registered **and** appearing on the database.
- Less than one in ten of each group were aware of NDDP and/or JBs, had not had an interview or discussion with a JB, but had plans to contact a JB (five per cent of the Stock group, eight per cent of Flow Voluntary and nine per cent of Flow Mandatory).
- Seventy-seven per cent of the longer-term claimants, 68 per cent of Flow Voluntary respondents and 58 per cent of the Flow Mandatory group who were aware of NDDP and/or JBs and had not had an interview/discussion with a JB said that they did not have any plans to contact one.
- Three-quarters of the Stock respondents who did not make contact with a JB said this was due to their health condition; this was a much larger proportion than both the recent claimant groups (76 per cent of Stock compared to 36 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 43 per cent of Flow Mandatory;  $p < 0.01$ ).
- Around one-half of the longer-term claimants and approaching two-thirds of the recent claimant groups said they would definitely or probably be interested in a service with advisers who would help them to find a suitable job.
- The most common reason for not being interested in a service with advisers who would help find a suitable job was not being able to work due to health condition or disability – the figure among Stock respondents was twice that of both Flow groups (79 per cent of Stock, 40 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 39 per cent of Flow Mandatory).

---

<sup>20</sup> A small number of Job Brokers do work from Jobcentre premises but this is not sufficiently widespread to make this proportion credible.

## 5.2 Contact and awareness status

There was much variation in the sample's proximity to NDDP in terms of awareness and participation. Table 5.1 illustrates this through a summary measure of NDDP contact and awareness, starting with those who had had an interview or discussion with a JB, through to those who were completely unaware of the programme. Of all respondents at Wave Three, eight per cent of the longer-term claimant group, 12 per cent of the Flow Voluntary group and 18 per cent of the Flow Mandatory group reported that they had had an interview or discussion with a JB. This is expanded on in Section 5.3.1.

Less than one in ten of each group were aware of NDDP and/or JBs, had not had an interview or discussion with a JB, but had plans to contact a JB (five per cent of the Stock group, eight per cent of Flow Voluntary and nine per cent of Flow Mandatory) as investigated further in Section 5.3.2. This group of respondents is larger than those actually registered at present (overall, five per cent of all respondents reported that they were registered at the time of survey interview – see Section 5.3.3), and therefore should be interpreted as showing potential, but not definite interest in the programme. The effects of social desirability or auspices bias may be evident here.<sup>21</sup>

Having no plans to make contact with a JB differed by sample group. More than one-third of all the longer-term claimants said they had no plans, compared to 29 per cent of Flow Voluntary claimants and less than one-quarter of the respondents who had had a mandatory WFI (36 per cent, 29 per cent and 23 per cent respectively; all differences,  $p < 0.01$ ). With the knowledge that the Stock claimants were more likely to not have worked recently, and had health conditions and disabilities for longer periods of time than the Flow groups, it is not surprising that they are less likely to show interest in participating in the programme. Their reasons for this are explored in Section 5.4.1.

The last line of the table illustrates all those who reported absolutely no experience of NDDP and/or JBs (i.e. they were not aware of the programme). This was less than one-half of all sample groups (45 per cent of the Stock group, 47 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 42 per cent of Flow Mandatory; all differences not statistically significant). This group's attitude to the programme when it is suggested to them are considered in Section 5.5.

---

<sup>21</sup> Auspices bias occurs where responses are influenced by the organisation carrying out the survey. Although this survey was carried out by NatCen, the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) name is more familiar to respondents and hence, more likely to remain with them from both the advance letter and the telephone introduction. Consequently, respondents may have expressed interest in contacting a Job Broker/the programme if they thought this could impact on their benefit claim.

**Table 5.1 Contact and awareness status**

|   | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|---|---------|-------------|-------------|
| Had interview or discussion with JB         | 8       | 12          | 18          |
| Plans to have interview with JB             | 5       | 8           | 9           |
| Undecided whether to have interview with JB | 6       | 5           | 7           |
| No plans to have interview with JB          | 36      | 29          | 23          |
| Not aware of NDDP and/or JB                 | 45      | 47          | 42          |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>                |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>                        | 658     | 657         | 963         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>                      | 658     | 657         | 963         |


## 5.3 Participation

### 5.3.1 Interviews and discussions with Job Brokers

Twice the proportion of Flow Mandatory claimants than Stock claimants who were aware of NDDP and/or a JB, had had an interview or discussion with a JB (32 per cent compared to 15 per cent respectively;  $p < 0.01$ , Figure 5.1). Of the two groups of more recent claimants, Flow Mandatory were more likely to have done so than Flow Voluntary (32 per cent compared to 20 per cent respectively;  $p < 0.01$ ).

Although it was shown in Section 4.3.1 that sample type had no effect on awareness of JB's, it does appear to have an effect on contact with JB's. Again, an apparent work-focused interview (WFI) influence can be inferred, with those who had one, more likely to follow through to JB contact. Some JB's do sit in at Jobcentre Plus offices, making contact for the Flow Mandatory group more acceptable. Indeed, if they had just attended a WFI they may have thought the JB interview was also mandatory (see Section 5.3.2). Evaluation of the New Deal for Lone Parents also showed that those attending compulsory meetings were more likely to participate in that programme than the general population of lone parents on Income Support (Evans *et al.*, 2003).

Around three-quarters of those who said they had had an interview or discussion reported that it took place at the Jobcentre. Although some JB's do sit in at Jobcentres, this does bring into question whether the interview was with an actual JB, or with someone else at the Jobcentre. As can be seen in Chapter 7, which explores knowledgeable non-registrants, some respondents did not draw a distinction between the two.

**Figure 5.1 Had an interview or discussion with a Job Broker**

Respondents' characteristics played a part in how likely they were to have had an interview or discussion with a JB. Within the Stock, men were more likely than women to have had an interview (19 per cent and ten per cent respectively;  $p < 0.05$ ). Among Stock, almost one in five 18 to 49 year olds had had an interview with a JB compared to one in ten of those aged 50 and over (18 per cent compared to ten per cent respectively;  $p < 0.05$ ). A similar pattern exists when comparing those with qualifications and those without - those with were more likely to have had an interview (18 per cent compared to nine per cent;  $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 5.2 Had an interview or discussion with a Job Broker by basic characteristics**

|        | Stock<br>% | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% | <i>Base: weighted<br/>(unweighted)</i> |                  |                  |
|--------|------------|----------------|----------------|--|------------------|------------------|
|        |            |                |                | <i>Stock</i>                           | <i>Voluntary</i> | <i>Mandatory</i> |
| Gender |            |                |                |  |                  |                  |
| Men    | 19         | 22             | 34             | 199<br>(190)                           | 193<br>(189)     | 360<br>(320)     |
| Women  | 10         | 17             | 26             | 165<br>(178)                           | 155<br>(164)     | 197<br>(237)     |

Continued

Table 5.2 Continued

|                           | Stock<br>% | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% | Base: weighted<br>(unweighted) |              |              |
|---------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
|                           |            |                |                | Stock                          | Voluntary    | Mandatory    |
| <b>Age</b>                |            |                |                |                                |              |              |
| 18 to 49                  | 18         | 20             | 31             | 200<br>(184)                   | 235<br>(219) | 407<br>(379) |
| 50 and over               | 10         | 21             | 32             | 164<br>(184)                   | 112<br>(134) | 150<br>(178) |
| <b>Has qualifications</b> |            |                |                |                                |              |              |
| Yes                       | 18         | 23             | 33             | 223<br>(222)                   | 236<br>(240) | 365<br>(360) |
| No                        | 9          | 15             | 28             | 141<br>(146)                   | 112<br>(113) | 192<br>(197) |

Base: All respondents aware of NDDP and/or JB

Looking at work characteristics, those currently in work or who had worked in the last three years were more likely to have had an interview with a JB than those who last worked ten or more years ago or had never worked for both the Stock and Flow Mandatory groups. Within Stock, almost one-quarter of those currently in work or who had worked in the last three years had had an interview or discussion with a JB compared to six per cent of those who had last worked ten or more years ago or had never worked (24 per cent compared to six per cent,  $p < 0.01$ ). Similarly, looking at Flow Mandatory, over one-third of those who were currently or recently in work had had an interview compared to less than one-quarter of those who had worked ten or more years ago or had never worked (33 per cent compared to 22 per cent;  $p < 0.05$ ). Those looking for or expecting work were more likely to have had an interview than those unsure or not expecting to work in the future among the longer-term claimants and Flow Voluntary group (20 per cent compared with 10 per cent,  $p < 0.01$ ; and 23 per cent compared with 10 per cent,  $p < 0.05$  respectively).

Table 5.3 Had an interview or discussion with a Job Broker by work characteristics

|                                       | Stock<br>% | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% | Base: weighted<br>(unweighted) |              |              |
|---------------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
|                                       |            |                |                | Stock                          | Voluntary    | Mandatory    |
| <b>Work experience</b>                |            |                |                |                                |              |              |
| Currently in work/within last 3 years | 24         | 21             | 33             | 92<br>(105)                    | 259<br>(268) | 409<br>(408) |
| 4-9 years ago                         | 19         | [12]           | 35             | 117<br>(127)                   | 49<br>(46)   | 63<br>(63)   |
| 10+ years/never worked                | 6          | [25]           | 22             | 154<br>(136)                   | 40<br>(39)   | 85<br>(85)   |

Continued

**Table 5.3 Continued**

|                          | Stock<br>% | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% | <i>Base: weighted<br/>(unweighted)</i> |                  |                  |
|--------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|--|------------------|------------------|
|                          |            |                |                | <i>Stock</i>                           | <i>Voluntary</i> | <i>Mandatory</i> |
| <b>Work expectations</b> |            |                |                |  |                  |                  |
| Looking/expecting        | 20         | 23             | 31             | 159<br>(158)                           | 271<br>(273)     | 445<br>(429)     |
| Unsure/not expecting     | 10         | 10             | 34             | 205<br>(210)                           | 77<br>(80)       | 112<br>(128)     |

*Base: All respondents aware of NDDP and/or JB*

Although logistic regression showed that longer-term claimants with no mental health condition were more likely to be aware of JB, this had no effect on whether or not this group had had an interview with one. Similarly, health status and health severity did not affect the likelihood that claimants had had an interview/discussion with a JB. Having an interview/discussion with a JB is far from a work-related outcome, however, it can be a long path to an interview/discussion, and it is encouraging that obstacles along the way do not dissuade those with greater health needs from approaching JB.


Respondents were asked about access to the venue their interview or discussion with a JB took place in<sup>22</sup>. The vast majority of all three sample groups agreed that it was very or fairly easy to get to the particular building (91 per cent overall) and to get into and around it (95 per cent overall).

The majority of respondents who had an interview or discussion with their JB thought that they had been listened to and understood very or quite well (87 per cent of Stock, 93 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 91 per cent of Flow Mandatory).

### 5.3.2 Plans to contact Job Broker

Those who were aware of NDDP and/or a JB and who had not had an interview or discussion with a JB were asked whether they planned to contact one (Figure 5.2). The longer-term claimants were less likely than both of the more recent claimant groups to be planning to contact a JB (11 per cent of Stock compared to 19 per cent of Flow Voluntary;  $p < 0.05$ , and 24 per cent of Flow Mandatory;  $p < 0.01$ ). Around one-sixth of each group remained undecided as to whether they were going to contact a JB (12 per cent of the Stock group, 13 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 18 per cent of Flow Mandatory). The most common reason given for being undecided was unstable health.

<sup>22</sup> Where the interview/discussion was not conducted at the respondent's home, over the telephone or by e-mail/internet.

**Figure 5.2 Whether plans to contact Job Broker**

The following tables show the Stock group by work experience (Table 5.4), and the Flow groups by their work expectations (Table 5.5). There is particular policy interest in the Stock group's behaviour by work experience in relation to the roll out of the Incapacity Benefit pilots. This group is known to have longer-term and more serious health conditions and to be further from the labour market, and hence, require more help (back) into work. When broken down by work experience, this group shows varied backgrounds (see also Figure 5.4 for differences among the Stock's contact plans by work experience).

Among the longer-term claimants, the closer respondents were to the labour market the more likely they were to be planning to contact a JB (18 per cent of those who were currently in work/had worked in the last three years compared to six per cent of those who last worked ten or more years ago/never worked;  $p < 0.01$ ).

As would be expected, those who were looking or expecting to work were more likely than those who were unsure or not expecting to work to be planning to contact a JB in both the Flow groups.

**Table 5.4 Whether plans to have contact with Job Broker – Stock by work experience**

|  | Currently in work/<br>within last 3 years | Stock%        |                            |
|--|---|---------------|----------------------------|
|  |   | 4-9 years ago | 10+ years/<br>never worked |
| Yes  | 18  | 15            | 6                          |
| No   | 66  | 77            | 83                         |
| Undecided  | 16  | 9             | 12                         |
| <i>Base: All those aware and have not had an interview or discussion with a JB</i> |   |               |                            |
| <i>Weighted base</i>   | 71  | 94            | 145                        |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>   | 81  | 100           | 127                        |

**Table 5.5 Whether plans to have contact with Job Broker – Flow by work expectations**


|  | Voluntary %           |                          | Mandatory %           |                          |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
|  | Looking/<br>expecting | Unsure/<br>not expecting | Looking/<br>expecting | Unsure/<br>not expecting |
| Yes  | 24                    | 6                        | 28                    | 7                        |
| No   | 64                    | 80                       | 54                    | 78                       |
| Undecided  | 13                    | 15                       | 18                    | 15                       |
| <i>Base: All those aware who have not had an interview or discussion with a JB</i> |                       |                          |                       |                          |
| <i>Weighted base</i>   | 208                   | 69                       | 307                   | 73                       |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>   | 208                   | 71                       | 296                   | 82                       |

Those that had had an interview or discussion with a JB or planned to do so were asked whether they thought it was compulsory. More than one-third of the Flow Mandatory group thought this was the case, but so did one-quarter of both the Stock group and the Flow Voluntary group (35 per cent of Flow Mandatory compared to 25 per cent of Flow Voluntary;  $p < 0.05$ ), showing a difference in attitude among Flow Mandatory respondents, but not a large one. This difference is likely to be due to the compulsory nature of the WFI.

### 5.3.3 Registration with NDDP

Respondents were asked during the interview whether they had registered with NDDP (Figure 5.3). Of those who said they had had contact with a JB, just over one-third of the longer-term claimants and the Flow Mandatory respondents said they had registered, and almost one-half of the Flow Voluntary respondents said they had. Although the difference is not statistically significant, it is not surprising that the proportion of the Flow Voluntary respondents registering after a discussion/interview is larger than that among Flow Mandatory claimants as the former group voluntarily showed interest in the programme and were more likely to have to go out of their way to meet a JB as they did not attend a WFI.

**Figure 5.3 Whether had registered with NDDP after meeting Job Broker**



This study has found that there was much confusion around registration on NDDP (Table 5.6). As in Waves One and Two, respondents' registration status as reported in the survey interview was matched to DWP's NDDP registration database – only one per cent of all respondents reported in the interview and appeared on the database as being registered (less than one per cent for Stock, and two per cent for both Flow groups).

Of all respondents, self-reported registration was around five per cent for each sample group (three per cent for Stock, five per cent for Flow Voluntary and six per cent for Flow Mandatory). Among the Stock and the Flow Voluntary groups registration on the NDDP database was slightly lower (less than one per cent for Stock, two per cent for Flow Voluntary and six per cent for Flow Mandatory). However, there was little overlap in these groups and less than one per cent reported they were registered and were shown on the database to be registered.

Some respondents reported in the interview that they had registered but when checked against the database they had not (three per cent of the Stock group and four per cent of both Flow groups). When checked against who they said they had registered with, this tended to match mentions of 'Jobcentre.' This ties in with evidence that some respondents confused meetings with Jobcentre or Jobcentre Plus staff for meetings with JB's (Section 5.2.2 and KNP chapter).

The branding and recognition of the terms 'NDDP' and 'JB's' helps to explain some of the confusion. Qualitative research as part of this evaluation showed that many JB's '*used their own brand name, for example the name of their organisation, rather*

than NDDP, and where the JB logo was used in publicity it was kept inconspicuous' (Corden *et al.*, 2003). Therefore, some respondents may have registered without realising they were doing so, and hence were not able to identify their registration. This was most common among the Flow Mandatory group (Flow Mandatory was four per cent, the other two sample groups one per cent or less).

**Table 5.6 NDDP registration status**

|   | Stock<br>% | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% | Total<br>% |
|---|------------|----------------|----------------|------------|
| <b>Registration status</b>                            |            |                |                |            |
| Self-reported registration in interview               | 3          | 5              | 6              | 5          |
| Registered on NDDP database                           | *          | 2              | 6              | 3          |
| <b>Actual and identified registrations</b>            |            |                |                |            |
| Self-reported and NDDP database registration          | *          | 2              | 2              | 1          |
| <b>Confused registrations</b>                         |            |                |                |            |
| Self-reported registration but not on NDDP database   | 3          | 4              | 4              | 4          |
| On NDDP database but did not self-report registration | *          | 1              | 4              | 2          |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>                          |            |                |                |            |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>                                | 658        | 657            | 969            | 2,284      |

### 5.3.4 Reasons for contact

Those that had had an interview or discussion with a JB and/or had registered with a JB were asked their reasons for doing so (Table 5.7). As in the First Wave of the First Cohort of the Survey of Registrants report (Ashworth *et al.*, 2003), the most common reason for doing so was to get help with moving (back) into work (39 per cent of the Stock group and 37 per cent of both Flow groups). Around one in five said they did it to find out whether they were able to get back to work (20 per cent of the Stock group, 18 and 19 per cent among the Flow Voluntary and Mandatory groups). A number of the reasons given – including the two most popular – were job related, indicating an awareness of what the service was offering.

Although it appears that the Flow Voluntary group were less likely to have attended an interview or registered because they thought it was compulsory, the difference between the groups is not statistically significant (18 per cent of the Stock group, 11 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 16 per cent of Flow Mandatory). Other reasons given by more than ten per cent of some sample groups were that it was a good opportunity to talk about their situation/prospects; to help find training; to get more information on benefits and to find a job tailored to their needs.

**Table 5.7 Reasons for meeting with a Job Broker/registering – multiple response**

|   | Stock<br>% | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% |
|---|------------|----------------|----------------|
| To help me move (back) into work  | 39         | 37             | 37             |
| To find out whether I am able to get back into work   | 20         | 18             | 19             |
| I thought it was compulsory   | 18         | 11             | 16             |
| It was an opportunity to talk about my situation/<br>prospects with someone                         | 13         | 15             | 15             |
| To help me find training  | 10         | 14             | 14             |
| To provide me with more information about<br>my benefits  | 10         | 6              | 12             |
| It was arranged for me by someone else  | 9          | 3              | 6              |
| To find a job that is tailored to my needs  | 7          | 15             | 12             |
| I thought I would lose benefits if I did not  | 7          | 7              | 6              |
| I was already receiving help from this organisation   | –          | –              | 1              |
| Other reason  | 8          | 11             | 12             |
| <i>Base: All those who had an interview or discussion with<br/>a JB or who registered with NDDP</i> |            |                |                |
| <i>Weighted base</i>  | 52         | 68             | 174            |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>  | 57         | 71             | 175            |

## 5.4 Non-participation


### 5.4.1 Aware, but no contact

Of all those who were aware of NDDP and/or JB (55 per cent of all Stock, 53 per cent of all Flow Voluntary and 58 per cent of all Flow Mandatory), most did not make any contact with a JB and did not plan to. Discounting those that had an interview from this group, 77 per cent of the longer-term claimants, 68 per cent of Flow Voluntary respondents and 58 per cent of the Flow Mandatory group said that they did not have any plans to contact a JB. This is an important group who may be demonstrating that they are unlikely to participate in NDDP as it is currently designed (although as Table 5.8 shows, for around 10 per cent of respondents they have no plans to make contact because they 'Don't know enough about it'). Figure 5.4 illustrates this group, and breaks the longer-term claimants down by work experience. Respondents were also asked their reasons for not planning to contact a JB – the striped section of the bars represents those who said it was due to being unwell (full reasons for not participating are explored in Table 5.8).

Focusing on the longer-term claimants, Figure 5.4 shows that those who had not worked in recent years were more likely to have no plans to contact a JB. The group that had been in work most recently, or currently in work, were closer in proportion to the two Flow groups of recent claimants. It is also evident that being unwell was

more commonly given as a reason for non-participation among the longer-term than the recent claimants. This is supported by the fact that the longer-term claimants have mainly been out of work for a longer period than the recent claimants. Although there were respondents who reported having a health condition or disability and wanted to get back into work, there was a large group that said they were unable to do this.

**Figure 5.4 Aware of NDDP and/or Job Brokers but no plans to contact a Job Broker**



As mentioned above, respondents were asked their reasons for not getting in touch with a JB even when they were aware of NDDP and/or JB. Three quarters of the Stock respondents who were aware and did not make contact (Table 5.8) said this was due to their health condition; this was a much larger proportion than both the recent claimant groups (76 per cent of Stock compared to 36 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 43 per cent of Flow Mandatory;  $p < 0.01$ , difference between the Flow groups was not statistically significant).

Among both the recent claimant groups, already having a job, or a possible job was a common reason for not contacting a JB. Almost one-third of Flow Voluntary respondents gave this as a reason, as did almost one-quarter of the Flow Mandatory group (32 per cent and 23 per cent respectively;  $p < 0.05$ ). There is a possible Flow Mandatory effect here in that those who knew they had a job to return to never booked the WFI they were eligible for and were therefore not included in the sample, the result being that those with potential jobs made up a smaller proportion of the Flow Mandatory sample. This effective 'self-elimination' was not possible in the Flow Voluntary sample. Among the longer-term claimants, only one in twenty

said they had a job or a possible job. When we consider that the Flow groups had come onto benefit more recently and hence had been in employment more recently, this is not surprising. Also, the nature of the health conditions and disabilities among the more recent claimants is more likely to be temporary than that of the longer-term claimants. Hence, the more recent claimants are more likely to have previous jobs to return to.

Around one in ten of all claimants said that they had not been in contact with a JB as they had not known enough about the programme (eight per cent of the Stock group, nine and 11 per cent of the Flow Voluntary and Mandatory groups). Whether this is due to the marketing not having an effective impact on them or there was a lack of interest on the respondents' behalf is not possible to tell. Other reasons given included the scheme not being their sort of thing, caring responsibilities and not wanting to work.

**Table 5.8 Reasons for no contact with Job Broker**

|  | <i>Multiple response</i> |                    |                    |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|  | <b>Stock %</b>           | <b>Voluntary %</b> | <b>Mandatory %</b> |
| Too unwell   | 76                       | 36                 | 43                 |
| Don't know enough about it   | 8                        | 9                  | 11                 |
| Already got (possible) job   | 5                        | 32                 | 23                 |
| Scheme not my sort of thing/rather do something else   | 4                        | 7                  | 5                  |
| Have caring responsibilities   | 3                        | 2                  | 4                  |
| Do not want to work  | 2                        | 4                  | 3                  |
| Too old  | 2                        | 2                  | 2                  |
| Not heard of JB's/NDDP before  | 2                        | 1                  | 4                  |
| I am worried about losing benefits   | 2                        | *                  | 1                  |
| Already involved/ getting help elsewhere   | 1                        | 3                  | 4                  |
| Just haven't got round to it   | 1                        | –                  | 2                  |
| No access to suitable transport  | *                        | –                  | –                  |
| I'm not disabled   | –                        | 3                  | 2                  |
| Tried to contact but not successful  | –                        | 1                  | *                  |
| I had no-one to take me  | –                        | –                  | 1                  |
| <i>Base: All those aware and who had not had an interview with a JB, or plans to have one (and had not registered)</i> |                          |                    |                    |
| <i>Weighted base</i>   | 236                      | 187                | 219                |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>   | 241                      | 188                | 226                |

#### 5.4.2 Contact, but no registration

Having looked at absolute non-participation of those aware, we now turn to those who contacted a JB but did not register on the programme. As Figure 5.3 showed,

after attending a JB discussion/interview, more respondents did not register than those that did. These respondents were asked why they did not do so (Table 5.9). Although these were modest numbers, and this is explored in greater depth in Chapter 7, it is useful to consider the reasons given. Concentrating on the Flow Mandatory figures, for which the base is more than 50, the most common reason for not registering as cited by one-third of the group was their health. Another fifth said that they had had a lack of information on NDDP or the registration process. The fact that this was after a meeting with a JB is of significance, and explored further in Section 7.4.2.

**Table 5.9 Reasons for not registering after meeting Job Broker – multiple response**


|   | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|---|---------|-------------|-------------|
| Cannot help me, waste of time   | [26]    | [7]         | 6           |
| Too ill/waiting for health to get better  | [25]    | [26]        | 33          |
| Lack of information on NDDP/registration process                                  | [16]    | [20]        | 20          |
| I'm already working   | [7]     | [6]         | 12          |
| I'm not disabled  | [4]     | [7]         | 9           |
| Did not really consider it/not sure   | [4]     | [7]         | 8           |
| Wanted to get work myself   | [3]     | [2]         | 2           |
| Other reason  | [21]    | [29]        | 16          |
| <i>Base: Those who had an interview/discussion with a JB but did not register</i> |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>  | 34      | 35          | 110         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>  | 39      | 37          | 112         |

## 5.5 Potential participation

Having looked at the participation and non-participation in NDDP services of those who were aware of the programme, we now turn to the potential participation of those who were not aware. These respondents were asked whether they would firstly be interested in a service with advisers who would help them find a suitable job and secondly, a service giving support to stay in paid work.

Table 5.10 shows that around one-half of the longer-term claimants said they would definitely or probably be interested in a service with advisers who would help them to find a suitable job – this approaches two thirds for the more recent claimant groups.

**Figure 5.5 Whether would use a service with advisers who would help find a suitable job**



Exploring the basic and work characteristics of those who said they would definitely or probably use it, certain groups of respondents were more likely than others to say they would use a service with advisers who would help them find a suitable job (Table 5.10 and 5.11). Among the longer-term claimants the following groups were significantly more likely to say they would definitely or probably use such a service at the  $p < 0.01$  level – men than women, respondents aged 49 and younger than those aged 50 and over, those with very good/good/fair health than those with bad/very bad health, those with qualifications than those without, and those currently in work/worked within the last three years than those who last worked more than ten years ago/never worked.

**Table 5.10 Probably/definitely use service with advisers who would help find a suitable job by basic characteristics**

|        | Stock<br>% | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% | <i>Base: weighted<br/>(unweighted)</i> |                  |                  |
|--------|------------|----------------|----------------|--|------------------|------------------|
|        |            |                |                | <i>Stock</i>                           | <i>Voluntary</i> | <i>Mandatory</i> |
| All    | 46         | 62             | 69             | 455<br>(455)                           | 497<br>(492)     | 673<br>(672)     |
| Gender |            |                |                |  |                  |                  |
| Men    | 54         | 60             | 70             | 232<br>(220)                           | 287<br>(273)     | 401<br>(355)     |
| Women  | 38         | 64             | 66             | 224<br>(225)                           | 211<br>(219)     | 271<br>(317)     |

Continued

**Table 5.10 Continued**

|                           | Stock<br>% | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% | <i>Base: weighted<br/>(unweighted)</i> |                  |                  |
|---------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|--|------------------|------------------|
|                           |            |                |                | <i>Stock</i>                           | <i>Voluntary</i> | <i>Mandatory</i> |
| <b>Age</b>                |            |                |                |  |                  |                  |
| 18 to 49                  | 60         | 66             | 71             | 238<br>(207)                           | 348<br>(316)     | 500<br>(468)     |
| 50+                       | 31         | 52             | 61             | 218<br>(238)                           | 151<br>(176)     | 172<br>(203)     |
| <b>Health status</b>      |            |                |                |  |                  |                  |
| Very good/good/ fair      | 57         | 63             | 71             | 207<br>(211)                           | 315<br>(315)     | 447<br>(439)     |
| Bad/very bad              | 38         | 58             | 63             | 245<br>(231)                           | 180<br>(175)     | 224<br>(231)     |
| <b>Has qualifications</b> |            |                |                |  |                  |                  |
| Yes                       | 53         | 64             | 71             | 223<br>(219)                           | 303<br>(301)     | 390<br>(382)     |
| No                        | 39         | 58             | 66             | 233<br>(226)                           | 194<br>(191)     | 282<br>(290)     |

*Base: Respondents not aware of NDDP and have not retired*

**Table 5.11 Probably/definitely use service with advisers who would help find a suitable job by work characteristics**

|                                       | Stock<br>% | Voluntary<br>% | Mandatory<br>% | <i>Base: weighted<br/>(unweighted)</i> |                  |                  |
|---------------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|--|------------------|------------------|
|                                       |            |                |                | <i>Stock</i>                           | <i>Voluntary</i> | <i>Mandatory</i> |
| <b>Work experience</b>                |            |                |                |  |                  |                  |
| Currently in work/within last 3 years | 59         | 65             | 72             | 96<br>(111)                            | 337<br>(345)     | 461<br>(456)     |
| 4-9 years ago                         | 48         | 56             | 67             | 148<br>(155)                           | 78<br>(73)       | 82<br>(82)       |
| 10+ years/never worked                | 39         | 51             | 59             | 210<br>(177)                           | 82<br>(74)       | 132<br>(134)     |
| <b>Work expectations</b>              |            |                |                |  |                  |                  |
| Looking/expecting to work             | 75         | 69             | 77             | 163<br>(160)                           | 335<br>(351)     | 493<br>(479)     |
| Unsure/not expecting to work          | 30         | 43             | 45             | 292<br>(285)                           | 142<br>(141)     | 180<br>(193)     |

*Base: Respondents not aware of NDDP and have not retired*

When the same group of those not aware were asked if they would use a service that gives support to stay in paid work, the response was slightly more positive than to the first question of a service with advisers to help find a suitable job.

**Table 5.12 Whether would use a service giving support to stay in paid work**

|   | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|---|---------|-------------|-------------|
| Definitely use it   | 22      | 31          | 35          |
| Probably use it   | 29      | 37          | 36          |
| Probably not use it   | 18      | 13          | 12          |
| Definitely not use it   | 28      | 16          | 13          |
| Don't know  | 4       | 4           | 4           |
| <i>Base: All respondents looking/ expecting to work, not aware of NDDP and have not retired</i> |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>  | 456     | 498         | 673         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>  | 445     | 492         | 672         |

Respondents who said they would probably or definitely not be interested in such services were asked their reasons why. Again, the most common reason among all sample groups was that they could not work because of their health condition or disability (79 per cent of the Stock group, 40 and 39 per cent of the Flow Voluntary and Mandatory groups). Around twice the proportion of longer-term claimants said it was due to their health condition or disability than both the more recent claimant groups ( $p < 0.01$ ).

Among the more recent claimants, other common reasons included not being disabled, wanting to look for work without help, and having a job to return to. The more recent claimants were more likely to give each of these three reasons than the longer-term claimants ( $p < 0.01$  for all three reasons). Although the difference is not statistically significant, as with Table 5.8 which looks at respondents who were aware of NDDP and/or JB's but had no contact, a larger proportion of Flow Voluntary than Flow Mandatory respondents said they had a job to return to (19 per cent compared to 13 per cent respectively). Whether this is because they are self-employed, have an understanding employer keeping their job open, or are confident they will return to their regular occupation (even if it is to another employer) is not known.

**Table 5.13** Reasons why not interested in services

|   | <i>Multiple response</i> |                    |                    |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|   | <b>Stock %</b>           | <b>Voluntary %</b> | <b>Mandatory %</b> |
| Cannot work because of health condition or disability   | 79                       | 40                 | 39                 |
| Is not disabled, would not use services   | 9                        | 21                 | 21                 |
| Does not want to work   | 5                        | 5                  | 8                  |
| Wants to look for work without help   | 4                        | 14                 | 14                 |
| Cannot work because of caring responsibilities  | 4                        | 1                  | 2                  |
| Has a job to return to  | 1                        | 19                 | 13                 |
| Retired   | *                        | 1                  | –                  |
| Other reason  | 5                        | 9                  | 12                 |
| <i>Base: Respondents not aware of NDDP, have not retired and probably/definitely not interested in services</i> |                          |                    |                    |
| <i>Weighted base</i>  | <i>198</i>               | <i>131</i>         | <i>151</i>         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>  | <i>194</i>               | <i>136</i>         | <i>154</i>         |



## 6 Target groups

The NDDP programme is open to all those in receipt of one of the qualifying benefits mentioned in Chapter 1 – realistically it will draw its participants from the subset of this group that want to work. From this study it is evident that there is a section of the Eligible Population who want to work and are interested in the programme, but are not registered with NDDP. There are also people within the population who want to work and are not interested in the programme.

This chapter begins by focusing on respondents who were aware of NDDP and had plans to contact a Job Broker (JB), and those who were not aware of NDDP but had been looking for work recently and expressed interest in services that supported job entry and retention (Section 6.2). They are referred to as the 'Interested Target Group.' In order to explore the scope for a larger target group, as well as what both limits and motivates interest in NDDP, respondents who were looking or expecting to work but showed no interest in NDDP are also explored (Section 6.3). This latter group is referred to as the 'Non-Interested Target Group.' Section 6.4 looks at some of the characteristics of both these potential target groups.

### 6.1 Summary

- An 'Interested Target Group' can be identified. This group consists of respondents who were aware of NDDP and had plans to contact a JB, as well as those who were not aware of NDDP but had been looking for work recently and expressed definite interest in services that supported job entry and retention. Seven per cent of the longer-term claimants, 12 per cent of the Flow Voluntary group and 14 per cent of Flow Mandatory claimants fell into the 'Interested Target Group'.
- Respondents who were looking or expecting to work but either had no plans to contact a JB, or were not aware of NDDP but were not interested in such a service, can be combined into the 'Non-interested Target Group'. Thirteen per cent of longer-term claimants and as many as 26 and 22 per cent of Flow Voluntary and Mandatory groups fell into the 'Non-interested Target Group'.


- Younger respondents, those with qualifications, and those with better health tended to be more likely to fall into each target group, although there were some differences across the types of respondents. Nevertheless, those who might find it harder to secure and retain work, for example respondents who consider their own health to be 'bad', are represented in sizeable numbers.

## 6.2 The Interested Target Group

There is a distinct group of both longer-term and recent claimants within the Eligible Population who express an interest in or desire for the NDDP service, but at present are not registered (Figure 6.1). Those who were aware of NDDP and/or JB's and planned to contact a JB (five per cent of Stock, eight per cent of Flow Voluntary and nine per cent of Flow Mandatory) can be combined with those who had looked for work in the last four weeks, and said they would definitely be interested in a service that would assist job entry or retention (two per cent of Stock, four per cent of Flow Voluntary and six per cent of Flow Mandatory).

This gives a total 'Interested Target Group' of seven per cent of all Stock respondents, 12 per cent of the Flow Voluntary group and 14 per cent of the Flow Mandatory group. As would be expected from previous findings in this report, the longer-term claimants were less likely than the more recent claimants to express serious interest (Stock compared to Flow Voluntary and Flow Mandatory separately;  $p < 0.01$ ). Reasons for this include the longer-term claimants being in poorer health (Section 2.5), being further from the labour market in terms of work experience (Section 3.2) and work expectations (Section 3.3), and citing fewer bridges and more barriers to work (Section 3.4) than recent claimants.

**Figure 6.1 The Interested Target Group**




### 6.3 The Non-interested Target Group

As well as those who express interest in work and NDDP, there are those who express interest in work but **not** NDDP. This section considers the latter group, but broadening the definition of interest in work to include those expecting to work in the future as well as looking for work.

Again, firstly looking at those who were aware of NDDP and/or JB, looking or expecting to work, but had no plans to contact a JB: this is around one in ten of the longer-term claimants, one in five of the Flow Voluntary respondents, and around one-sixth of the Flow Mandatory respondents (11 per cent, 20 per cent and 17 per cent respectively). Turning to those who were unaware of NDDP, were looking for work or expecting to work in the future, and would definitely not be interested in a service that would assist with job entry or retention, two per cent of Stock claimants, eight per cent of Flow Voluntary respondents and six per cent of the Flow Mandatory sample fall in this group.

Combining these gives a total 'Non-interested Target Group'<sup>23</sup> of 13 per cent of Stock respondents and as many as 26 and 22 per cent of the Flow Voluntary and Mandatory claimants. Again, a smaller proportion of longer-term claimants than recent claimants belonged to this group.

**Figure 6.2 The Non-interested Target Group**



<sup>23</sup> A very small proportion of these respondents (n=17) were also in the Interested Target Group. This 'dual membership' was possible because those who were aware of JB only and not of NDDP were asked whether they would be interested in such a service.

## 6.4 Characteristics of the target groups

### 6.4.1 The Interested Target Group

The following three tables explore the characteristics of the Interested Target Group – Table 6.1 looks at basic characteristics, Table 6.2 at health characteristics and Table 6.3 at work characteristics. It is apparent from these tables that those sub-groups who may be referred to as ‘harder to help’ are less likely to fall into the Interested Target Groups. This was true of older respondents, those with no qualifications, those whose health was bad or very bad and those whose health affected them a great deal or to some extent.

For all three sample types, men were slightly more likely than women to have shown serious interest in the programme, significantly so among the Flow Mandatory group (17 per cent compared to ten per cent;  $p < 0.01$ ). As may be expected, younger respondents were more likely to express serious interest (ten per cent compared to three per cent of Stock;  $p < 0.01$ , 13 per cent compared to eight per cent of Flow Voluntary; difference not statistically significant, 16 per cent compared to eight per cent of Flow Mandatory;  $p < 0.01$ ). Longer-term claimants and Flow Mandatory respondents were more likely to be in the Interested Target Group if they had qualifications (nine per cent compared to four per cent;  $p < 0.05$ , 16 per cent compared to 11 per cent;  $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 6.1 Proportion of population in Interested Target Group by basic characteristics<sup>24</sup>**

|                           | Stock | Voluntary | Mandatory | <i>Base: weighted (unweighted)</i> |              |              |
|---------------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
|                           | %     | %         | %         | Stock                              | Voluntary    | Mandatory    |
| <b>Gender</b>             |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |
| Men                       | 8     | 13        | 17        | 348<br>(331)                       | 375<br>(362) | 599<br>(533) |
| Women                     | 6     | 10        | 10        | 311<br>(327)                       | 282<br>(295) | 370<br>(436) |
| <b>Age</b>                |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |
| 18 to 49                  | 10    | 13        | 16        | 352<br>(313)                       | 450<br>(413) | 716<br>(668) |
| 50 and over               | 3     | 8         | 8         | 306<br>(345)                       | 207<br>(244) | 253<br>(300) |
| <b>Has qualifications</b> |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |
| Yes                       | 9     | 12        | 16        | 354<br>(354)                       | 414<br>(414) | 591<br>(582) |
| No                        | 4     | 11        | 11        | 303<br>(304)                       | 243<br>(243) | 378<br>(387) |

*Base: All respondents*

<sup>24</sup> Those in Interested Target Group with characteristic, as a percentage of all in population with same characteristic.

Health characteristics also played a role in whether respondents were in the Interested Target Group. Those in poor health among the longer-term claimants and Flow Mandatory group were less likely to have expressed considerable interest than those in better health (four per cent compared to ten per cent for Stock;  $p < 0.01$ , and 17 per cent compared to nine per cent for Flow Mandatory;  $p < 0.01$ ). There was no statistically significant difference among those in the Flow Mandatory group.

Respondents in the Flow Mandatory group who had a mental health condition were more likely to demonstrate receptiveness than those who did not (19 per cent compared to 12 per cent).

**Table 6.2 Proportion of population in Interested Target Group by health characteristics<sup>25</sup>**

|   | Stock | Voluntary | Mandatory | <i>Base: weighted (unweighted)</i> |              |              |
|---|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
|   | %     | %         | %         | Stock                              | Voluntary    | Mandatory    |
| <b>Health status</b>                                    |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |
| Very good/food/fair                                     | 10    | 12        | 17        | 293<br>(302)                       | 417<br>(422) | 645<br>(632) |
| Bad/very bad  | 4     | 11        | 9         | 363<br>(353)                       | 237<br>(232) | 322<br>(334) |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>                            |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |
| <b>Effect of health condition</b>                       |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |
| Not at all/a little                                     | [16]  | 18        | 11        | 44<br>(47)                         | 78<br>(79)   | 129<br>(128) |
| Some/a great deal                                       | 6     | 12        | 14        | 594<br>(590)                       | 498<br>(499) | 747<br>(755) |
| <i>Base: All respondents who had a health condition</i> |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |
| <b>Mental health condition</b>                          |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |
| Yes   | 8     | 16        | 19        | 172<br>(167)                       | 161<br>(155) | 279<br>(270) |
| No  | 6     | 11        | 12        | 468<br>(472)                       | 416<br>(424) | 600<br>(614) |
| <i>Base: All respondents who had a health condition</i> |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |

#### 6.4.2 The Non-interested Target Group

Although the characteristics of the Non-interested Target Group differed in proportions to that of the Interested Target Group, similarities were evident in that the 'harder to help' were less likely to be represented in both groups. This is even despite extending the definition of the Non-interested Target Group to include

<sup>25</sup> Those in Interested Target Group with characteristic, as a percentage of all in population with same characteristic.

those expecting to work as well as looking for work. This provides little evidence of any pattern behind what motivates interest in NDDP.

Men were slightly more likely than women to be in the Non-interested Target Group among the Stock and Flow Voluntary respondents (16 per cent compared to ten per cent for Stock;  $p < 0.05$ , and 30 per cent compared to 22 per cent for Flow Voluntary;  $p < 0.05$ ). For the same two sample types, there were more younger respondents in this group (18 per cent compared to eight per cent respectively for Stock;  $p < 0.01$ , and 29 per cent compared to 21 per cent for Flow Voluntary;  $p < 0.01$ ), and a larger proportion of those with qualifications (16 per cent compared to nine per cent respectively for Stock;  $p < 0.01$ , and 25 per cent compared to 17 per cent for Flow Mandatory;  $p < 0.01$ ).

**Table 6.3 Proportion of population in Non-interested Target Group by basic characteristics<sup>26</sup>**

|                           | Stock | Voluntary | Mandatory | <i>Base: weighted (unweighted)</i> |              |              |
|---------------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
|                           | %     | %         | %         | Stock                              | Voluntary    | Mandatory    |
| <b>Gender</b>             |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |
| Men                       | 16    | 30        | 22        | 347<br>(331)                       | 375<br>(362) | 599<br>(533) |
| Women                     | 10    | 22        | 22        | 310<br>(327)                       | 282<br>(295) | 370<br>(436) |
| <b>Age</b>                |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |
| 18 to 49                  | 18    | 29        | 22        | 352<br>(313)                       | 450<br>(413) | 715<br>(668) |
| 50 and over               | 8     | 21        | 21        | 306<br>(345)                       | 207<br>(244) | 253<br>(300) |
| <b>Has qualifications</b> |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |
| Yes                       | 16    | 28        | 25        | 355<br>(354)                       | 414<br>(414) | 590<br>(582) |
| No                        | 9     | 24        | 17        | 304<br>(304)                       | 243<br>(243) | 379<br>(387) |

*Base: All respondents*

Respondents' health characteristics played a large part in whether they were in the Non-interested Target Group for the two Flow groups (Table 6.4). Over one-third of those in better health fell into this target group, compared to just over one in ten of those in poorer health among Flow Voluntary respondents (35 per cent compared to 12 per cent respectively;  $p < 0.01$ ). A similar pattern was seen among Flow Mandatory respondents – 25 per cent of those in good health compared to 16 per cent of those in poor health ( $p < 0.01$ ).

<sup>26</sup> Those in Non-interested Target Group with characteristic, as a percentage of all in population with same characteristic.

Looking at the effect of a health condition, among the Flow groups, those who were affected less were more likely to be in the Non-interested Group (36 per cent compared to 22 per cent for the Flow Voluntary;  $p < 0.01$ , and 33 per cent compared to 18 per cent of the Flow Mandatory;  $p < 0.01$ ). There was little difference among the longer-term claimants in terms of both health status and the effect of a health condition.

Having a mental health condition made little difference among the Stock and Flow Voluntary groups, but for the Flow Mandatory respondents, a larger proportion of those without a mental health condition were in the Non-interested Group (23 per cent compared to 14 per cent respectively;  $p < 0.01$ ). This is in contrast to the Interested Target Group, hence hinting that recent claimants with a mental health condition are more likely to be attracted to the programme, but again this is not supported by other analysis.

**Table 6.4 Proportion of population in Non-interested Target Group by health characteristics<sup>27</sup>**

|   | Stock | Voluntary | Mandatory | <i>Base: weighted (unweighted)</i> |              |              |
|---|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
|   | %     | %         | %         | Stock                              | Voluntary    | Mandatory    |
| <b>Health status</b>                                    |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |
| Very good/good/fair                                     | 15    | 35        | 25        | 293<br>(302)                       | 417<br>(422) | 644<br>(632) |
| Bad/very bad  | 11    | 12        | 16        | 362<br>(353)                       | 237<br>(232) | 322<br>(334) |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i>                            |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |
| <b>Effect of health condition</b>                       |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |
| Not at all/a little                                     | [11]  | 36        | 33        | 44<br>(47)                         | 78<br>(79)   | 130<br>(128) |
| Some/a great deal                                       | 13    | 22        | 18        | 594<br>(590)                       | 498<br>(499) | 747<br>(755) |
| <i>Base: All respondents who had a health condition</i> |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |
| <b>Mental health condition</b>                          |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |
| Yes   | 13    | 22        | 14        | 172<br>(167)                       | 160<br>(155) | 279<br>(270) |
| No  | 12    | 24        | 23        | 469<br>(472)                       | 416<br>(424) | 599<br>(614) |
| <i>Base: All respondents who had a health condition</i> |       |           |           |                                    |              |              |

<sup>27</sup> Those in Non-interested Target Group with characteristic, as a percentage of all in population with same characteristic.

It is encouraging that potential target groups can be identified, supporting the need for services like NDDP. Even though the group interested in NDDP is small, it may represent an ideal target market for NDDP, and marketing should take into account the 'easier-to-help' composition of this group. Indeed, looking at the sample groups combined, the Interested Target Group makes up 11 per cent of the Eligible Population. It would only take around one in three of these to register with NDDP to double the prevailing registration rate (where the database registration rate for this sample was three per cent). However, as seen in this analysis, there are diverse needs in this group of potential interest and those of the 'harder to help' should not be neglected.

The similarity of the characteristics of the 'Non-interested Group' may suggest that it could take little effort to swing their attitudes to NDDP from negative to positive. Marketing and designing the NDDP programme to meet the needs of this group who want to work is important. This group expressed non-interest in the programme for varied reasons. They may feel happy to find work on their own – however, NDDP may be more attractive to them if they were told that it can provide JB's with specialised and local knowledge of job markets, and also the offer of support after job entry. On the other end of the scale, some may not be interested because they think NDDP could not help them – however, if they were directed to a JB with specialist knowledge in their health condition or disability, they may be more inclined to participate.

# 7 Qualitative follow up of 'knowledgeable non-registrants'

This chapter presents findings from the qualitative study on 'knowledgeable non-registrants'.<sup>28</sup> It begins with the background to the study including an explanation of why this group of the Eligible Population are important and a summary of the relevant findings so far from the survey. Section 7.2 describes the principal characteristics of the achieved sample. In Section 7.3 the sub-sample's knowledge and experiences of the New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP) and Job Brokers (JBs) are explored. Section 7.4 deals with the central question of why people do not become registered with a JB after having made some form of contact. One important finding that will emerge is that, despite not being registered with a JB, many people were still motivated to move towards and into work (some of whom actively pursued some other course of action). In Section 7.5 these alternative routes towards paid and voluntary work are explored. In the final section of the chapter, an attempt is made to draw some policy lessons from the study.

## 7.1 Background

### 7.1.1 The rationale for studying 'knowledgeable non-registrants'

The proportion of the Eligible Population that register with a NDDP JB has stayed persistently low since the inception of the programme. A key policy question is therefore whether there are any measures that can be taken at the level of policy and practice that can improve the flow of these 'non-registrants' onto NDDP.

---

<sup>28</sup> For methods of the follow-up study, see Section 1.5.

In thinking about policy responses it is important to recognise that non-registrants are not a homogenous group. For example, some people in receipt of incapacity-related benefits that make them eligible for NDDP services might not have heard of what is available, or will forget information if it is not relevant to them at the time. The policy response to this group would likely to be initially to try to get information to them at the appropriate time, and might lead to thinking about advertising, publicity and other promotional strategies as well as the use of work-focused interviews (WFIs) and the way in which they are delivered. In contrast, a different group of non-registrants are those who can be thought of as 'knowledgeable'. Such people will have some degree of knowledge about NDDP or JB services picked up from a variety of sources but will not have registered with a JB to receive help to get them back to work. This latter group is particularly interesting to consider. Strategies around advertising and publicity might not be the only or the most appropriate policy response since they will already have heard about JB services. However, if it is known **why** they did not become registered then other strategies that could turn them from non-registrants to registrants might be possible, potentially including changes to the service on offer.

### 7.1.2 Findings from the survey

The survey of the Eligible Population provided initial data on non-registration. Respondents were asked separately if they had had contact with a JB and if they were registered with one. People answering yes to the first question and no to the second therefore constitute a group who fit the idea of a 'knowledgeable non-registrant'. As shown in Figure 5.3, there were 296 respondents who said they had made contact with a JB. Of these, 188 (see Table 5.9) also said they did not register and hence appear to fall within the definition of a knowledgeable non-registrant. There seems therefore to be a high rate of non-participation in NDDP and JB services among knowledgeable incapacity-related benefits recipients in the region of 60-65 per cent, which suggests that this is an important group to study.

The 188 'knowledgeable non-registrants' were asked a follow-up, open-ended question about why they did not register with a JB. As expected, there was a range of responses given though not all were clear or easy to interpret. The analysis of responses was presented earlier in Table 5.9. As the table shows, most of the responses were not seemingly connected directly to the services offered by JBs. The only category of responses that concerns a possible mismatch between what JBs offer clients and what people wanted from them comprised people who said a JB 'cannot help me/waste of time', but such responses were made by only just over one in ten respondents. In contrast, Table 5.9 shows that being 'too ill/waiting for health to get better' was the most common reason cited (about one in three responses). Just under one in five respondents said that they were unaware of the process of registration. The follow-up qualitative study has allowed further, in-depth exploration of these responses and their implications for policy.

## 7.2 Characteristics of the achieved sample

Table 7.1 presents the characteristics of the achieved sample.

**Table 7.1 Personal characteristics of achieved sample**

|                                      | Number |
|--------------------------------------|--------|
| <b>Gender</b>                        |        |
| Men                                  | 19     |
| Women                                | 11     |
| <b>Age group</b>                     |        |
| 18 to 34                             | 14     |
| 35 to 49                             | 11     |
| 50+                                  | 5      |
| <b>Primary health condition</b>      |        |
| Musculoskeletal                      | 15     |
| Cardiovascular                       | 4      |
| Mental health                        | 6      |
| Other                                | 5      |
| <b>Employment status</b>             |        |
| In paid work, full-time (> 30 hours) | 2      |
| In paid work, part time (< 30 hours) | 5      |
| Not in paid work                     | 23     |

As fieldwork progressed it became increasingly difficult to maintain a balance within each of the main sampling criteria above. It proved particularly hard to recruit older people and people with cardiovascular and mental health conditions. The number of achieved interviews was therefore disappointing. It was expected that the response rate would be very high given that people had already participated in the survey and had consented to further contact.

## 7.3 Knowledge and experience of NDDP and Job Brokers

### 7.3.1 Knowledge and understanding

When respondents were asked about their knowledge of NDDP and JB's, responses varied considerably. Unlike the survey of the Eligible Population, as would be expected in this sub-group, most people recalled receiving a letter, from Jobcentre Plus or the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), advertising a scheme aimed at getting people back to work; others described having been made aware of the service by Jobcentre Plus staff. Some people were aware that the focus of the scheme was on people who were disabled or had health problems. A number of respondents understood the service to be part of Jobcentre Plus.

When asked, many said that they had heard of NDDP, but few were able to demonstrate any understanding of the programme. However, many were unfamiliar with 'Job Broker' and, for some, this was a term introduced by the interviewer. One respondent commented that *'you're actually using words that I don't really understand'* and a number of respondents were unable to recall having received any information or being told about NDDP and job broking services at all. This was an unexpected finding given that people selected for the qualitative study had already responded that they had had some form of contact with a JB and were prompted during the interview with the names of local JB organisations.

A minority were under the impression that contacting a JB was compulsory, which was initially a cause for concern to them. The majority understood their involvement to be voluntary and sought information on this basis.

Most of those who had made enquiries about the service or had contacted specific JBs had done so because they were highly motivated in seeking routes back into work. This confirms the finding from the survey that most of the reasons given by respondents for contacting a JB were connected with thinking about returning to work (see Table 5.7). Only one person in the qualitative study group made contact for what might be thought a 'negative' reason, i.e. the belief that benefit might be affected unless she made contact. Of the six people who thought contacting a JB was compulsory, all expressed the view that they were interested in working or training. For some of these, contact was no more than the receipt of a package of information and a follow-up enquiry, for others contact involved a telephone conversation and subsequent appointment and meeting. For one respondent, the receipt of a flyer prompted self-directed research through the NDDP website, the identification of a local provider and a subsequent appointment to find out more about what was available. Other respondents had heard of the programme via their General Practitioner, a drugs worker, television, friends or relatives, an 'advert', or by telephoning or 'dropping by' provider offices.

Most respondents were influenced by their understanding that the service was specifically tailored to provide support for people looking for ways back into work. Many had been in receipt of Incapacity Benefit for a considerable period and spoke of the obstacles preventing them from making successful job applications. Consequently, a number of respondents understood that JBs could help both with job-search and liaising with potential employers or in assisting them to set up a programme of retraining, and were particularly interested in these aspects of the service.

### **7.3.2 Experiences of contact with Job Brokers and others**

As explained above, many respondents did not recognise some of the terminology around NDDP or JBs. It is not clear from the interviews therefore whether the experiences of contact they described were actually with a JB, with someone from Jobcentre Plus, or from some other organisation. (Analysis of the survey findings points to a similar interpretation; see Sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.3.) It is also possible that

some respondents had contacted an organisation that was a NDDP JB but in some other capacity. A few people were able to describe an experience that involved contact with an organisation they knew to be independent of Jobcentre Plus. Some people knew they had contacted a JB (and named them in the interview) but other people referred, for example, to 'DEAs' or 'disability advisers' and other people whom they associated with Jobcentre Plus.

The extent of people's contact with a JB varied. Sometimes recall about the first contact or contacts with JB's was not totally clear and it was hard for people to remember what they were told, when and by whom. However, for some people, contact with a JB seemed to be minimal, consisting of a single telephone call. Others had had a number of telephone calls or had made a visit to a JB's office or a Jobcentre Plus office and met a JB adviser. This was a pattern of responses that was expected; in the survey respondents had all been asked 'Have you had an interview or discussion (including a telephone or email discussion) with a Job Broker adviser?' However, because the sample was also selected on the basis of **non-registration**, it was not expected that respondents would have had any form of extended contact. This was not the case, however. Several people described contact over weeks or months, which included discussions about possible types of job, and help with applying for vacancies.

Among respondents who could definitely recall having had contact with what they thought was a JB, the quality of their experiences again varied considerably. Given that the people in the sample were selected on the basis of having either made contact with a JB or sought information on the service, but who did not register, it is to be expected that negative experiences would be reported more often than positive. Nevertheless, some positive experiences were reported by a number of respondents. Respondents' views and assessments of their experience were sometimes linked to their reasons for making contact in the first place, and the expectations they had.

Positive experiences were mostly associated with the personal treatment that people had received from JB staff. People appreciated the attention paid to them by JB staff and the time they were prepared to spend with them. For example, one man described how the adviser he met asked how he managed the stairs with his disability, and had empathised with his condition and related depression. He said his contact with this woman was one of the reasons '*I'm not so down today*' at the time of interview, and he hoped that this particular adviser would still be available to help him when he had a better idea of how long it would take to make a full recovery from his condition and was in a position to start thinking about his future.

Some people had been in touch with a JB organisation to find out more about what they did and could offer. They could be reassured that although they were not ready to register at the time that they had initiated contact, a JB had maintained contact, including corresponding with them. It could be important for people to feel that they had not been '*forgotten*' by the JB.

Conversely, other respondents had approached Job Broking services as 'work ready' and in the hope that they would be able to receive support in finding work, but were disappointed with the experiences they had. There was a range of critical comments regarding the amount of help that was offered (if any); feelings of being pressured into doing things they did not want to and not being listened to; feelings of being rejected because of their health condition; lack of sensitivity; and poor advice and recommendations.

For example, one woman was critical at the lack of assistance she was offered. She had picked up a leaflet about NDDP at a job fair and sent away for more information. She then telephoned to make a further enquiry as she felt that much of the information contained within the pack was not relevant to her. She said that she had found out from the website of a '*disabled organisation*' that there were employers who employed disabled people and specifically wanted more information about this. She reported being told, '*you've got all the information in front of you, you don't need to come in and see me*'.

Another respondent also described how he had initially understood the programme to be compulsory and explained that he had initially felt pressured into making a choice between what he understood to be four options, including attending a course or setting up his own business. He said that he felt '*a bit better*' when he discovered that this was not the case and is now taking his time in considering the options available to him.

Although many respondents spoke positively about JB staff, others felt that they lacked sensitivity and, as a result, experienced strong feelings of rejection following their contact. One man in his 50s said he was told that his heart condition would prevent him from finding work and it was suggested that he go back to his doctor and ask to be put on '*the permanent sick*'. He said he felt like he had been '*put in a cupboard somewhere...getting me out of the way*'. Another man, also in his 50s, described being told by a disabled adviser: '*Even I can't help you... there's just too much wrong with you*' and then reported that he saw her throw his details in the bin. He says he felt he had been '*thrown on the tip*'.

As mentioned earlier, some respondents reported what appeared to be contact with a JB that might be expected **after** a client had been registered. (It is possible that some people may actually have been registered with a JB but were unaware of it, as suggested also in Section 5.3.3.) In some of these periods of contact there was dissatisfaction with the type of job advice given by JBs. A woman who had approached a particular provider, because they had helped an acquaintance with learning disabilities, was particularly critical. She had expressed an interest in childcare opportunities, but the JB later suggested this was an oversubscribed area and she should instead try to find work in fast food outlets, which she felt was unsuitable because of her health condition. The respondent felt she was being '*railroaded into a different job*'. Similarly, a professional woman in her 30s described how her experience with a '*work assistance person*' made her feel like she was being '*dumbed down*'. As she saw it, the programme was geared toward people with

mental health conditions or learning disabilities and that people who did not fit these criteria '*fall through the cracks in the pavement*'. Another respondent felt she had been misled into taking a job that did not turn out as she had expected, and that the JB had done this in order to '*get their numbers up*'.

More generally, respondents were critical of the failure of JBs to signpost other help or sources of information. None of the sample spoke of JB staff telling them about other sources or organisations that might be useful.

There appeared to be two distinct impacts from people's early experiences of contact with JBs. Respondents who had had positive experiences, including those who had been reassured that participation was not compulsory, were left with positive impressions of the organisation and many said they might or would make contact in the future at a time when they felt able to start thinking about working again. In contrast, those who had negative experiences could be left feeling let down, rejected and cynical, and unlikely to make contact with a JB in the future.

#### 7.4 Understanding why people did not become registered with a Job Broker

As explained earlier, all of the respondents in this qualitative study were identified as **non-registrants** through the survey of the Eligible Population. However, some seemed to have extended periods of contact with someone in a JB organisation which suggests they may have been receiving services similar to NDDP. It is possible, for example, that someone could receive services from a JB organisation but not under their NDDP contract. One explanation that can reconcile this apparent contradiction is the emerging practice among JBs of providing services and support for some people but *not* registering them until they are confident of getting them into a job (this practice is described in full in the report of the second wave of the qualitative element of the full NDDP evaluation; see Lewis *et al.*, 2004). Nevertheless, the people in the sample who had apparently started work after contact with a JB seem to be an anomaly.

Among the sample there were two groups of people who did not become registrants with a JB, i.e. those:

- who do not continue contact with a JB;
- for whom a JB effectively ended contact.

It should be noted here that in the interviews few respondents identified with the concepts of 'registration' or 'non-registration'. They talked more in terms of contact stopping for some reason or other. Also, it is not possible to consider 'non-registration' for those in the sample who appeared to have had no contact with a JB.

### 7.4.1 Deciding not to continue contact with a Job Broker

Non-registration was mostly the choice of respondents and, for many, was because they felt simply too ill at the time that contact was initiated. This finding is similar to the survey findings presented in Table 5.9, where the most common reason for not registering was connected to the respondent's health. However, what has emerged as an additional finding from the qualitative study is that some of these thought they might resume their contact with JB organisations at some point in the future when they either felt well enough to look for work or when they had a better idea of how long it would take to recover from surgery. For example, one man specifically explained to the JB that he was not looking to register at that time, but perhaps in six months time, when he hoped that he would be in less pain. Other respondents were unable to be more specific about how long they would need before they could see themselves as being in a position to think about returning to work. In one example, a man in his 20s was awaiting a diagnosis of his condition, after which he stated that he would contact the JB organisation with a view to finding out more about how to set himself up in his own business.

A number of respondents suggested that the decision not to register at the time of initial contact was based on a longer-term view of getting back to work. Typically these had contacted a JB organisation with the aim of gathering as much information as they could about the options available to them, with a view to taking this information away in order to make an informed choice about the direction they would like to take in relation to finding ways back into work. For example, this involved making decisions about different types of retraining opportunities; a number of respondents were considering some form of IT training. Some of these wanted to pursue careers that would enable them either to work in less physical environments than they had been used to, or to work from home, or to become self employed to allow them greater flexibility around their disability. Other respondents were either already on training programmes, which they did not want to interrupt, or waiting to start courses later in the year.

A different explanation for non-registration was the fear of losing benefits should a job not work out, particularly when these benefits had been hard fought for. Some respondents suggested that the risks were too great as they were uncertain about the changeable nature of their conditions. One respondent explained that he did not feel sufficiently reassured by the explanations that were provided regarding the benefits rules, describing them as 'fuzzy'. In one case, a respondent was also caring for a disabled partner and had complicated calculations to consider about his own Incapacity Benefit and the Carer's Allowance that he received. Given his caring commitments, he only felt able to work for three to four hours a week on a flexible basis and acknowledged the JB's concern that this would restrict his search for work considerably. He described it a 'mutual decision' not to pursue any further contact through the programme.

For a small number of respondents the decision not to continue contact was based on negative experiences of contact with a JB. For example, one respondent was put

off registering with a JB organisation she had contacted because she felt uncomfortable in their offices. She complained that they were located at the top of a building and she had had to wait for the lift to be unlocked, that she had been kept waiting before anyone attended to her, that the chairs were uncomfortable and that when she was eventually seen, she was given a form to complete, but no-one asked if she needed any help in completing it. She observed that the staff seemed very young and that the atmosphere unwelcoming and uninviting and that there did not appear to be any disabled staff. Other respondents' dissatisfaction appeared to be based on more extended contact with a JB and about advice and referrals regarding actual jobs (which were described in Section 7.3 above).

These findings add depth to the survey findings summarised above. It appears that many of the contacts with JBs were not fruitless but could be seen as part of a logical and rational process of investigating options that might contribute later to people's return to work. It would be misleading therefore to draw the conclusion that for such people, non-registration at this stage constituted in any way a negative outcome or failure of the JB programme.

#### **7.4.2 Contact ended by the Job Broker**

In contrast to the respondents who could give an account of why they had not pursued further contact with a JB, and who appeared to make a definite choice about non-registration, some of the sample did not appear to have been given the option of registering, or even knew that registration was a possibility.

Some respondents felt that a JB, rather than themselves, had ended their contact, but their perception of why this was so varied. The reasons suggested included their health; a mismatch between themselves and the target client group of the JB; or a mismatch between their needs and what the JB could offer. Some respondents could offer no explanation and remained confused as to why a JB had not helped them.

Some respondents said that it appeared that a JB had made the decision that, regardless of their motivation, they were too ill to work. This could be particularly demoralising; one man was critical that no-one seemed to acknowledge the importance that work can have in restoring someone's sense of dignity. Another recognised that it was a possibility that he might be '*dumped*' but his criticism was that in such circumstances there was not anyone '*to pick you up*'. He was given no advice about alternative sources of help or information.

Feeling like one did not fit the criteria that a particular provider was working within was an observation made by a number of respondents. Many people complained that the JB staff they had contacted appeared to insist on trying to apply generalised responses, rather than thinking of them as individuals with specific conditions (often a combination of conditions, of which depression was not uncommon) and sometimes with particular professional skills and experiences they would like to continue to use. Consequently, some respondents asserted that they felt '*insulted*' by the suggestions that were made to them. In these cases, the respondents sometimes made the decision to do something else, for example go back to college.

Some respondents reflected on situations through which they appeared not to have been given the opportunity to register; for example the respondent mentioned earlier who was refused an interview on the grounds that all the information she needed was contained in the pack that had been sent in the post. A self-employed respondent explained how she had sought specific information about how she could fund an unusual retraining course, but received no constructive advice despite being willing to contribute herself. Consequently, contrary to her GP's advice she returned to her existing employment, which she felt continued to present risks to her health.

To summarise, respondents' explanations for non-registration can broadly be categorised in two ways: those where the respondent made the decision not to continue contact, and those where that decision appeared to have been made by the JB, perhaps to the disappointment of the respondent. In addition, there were a small number of respondents who appeared to be in continuing contact with a JB at the time of interview but were not registered.

## 7.5 How non-registrants moved towards work

People in the sample who were not in contact with a JB at the time of the interview were asked about their current activity and their plans and aspirations. Most were still interested in working. Some had clear ideas about what they wanted to do and how they might achieve their aims; others were less clear though still committed to working. Some people had modest ambitions for relatively low-paid and low-skilled jobs; others described plans for new careers unconnected with their previous employment.

Only a minority, all were men in their 50s, had no plans for returning to work or had come to the assessment that they would be unable to re-enter employment. Two had been advised to give up job-hunting by the JBs they had contacted because of the long-term nature of their medical conditions. One was only interested in work of a particular level of pay and under conditions that would allow him to work without supervision. Another said that his condition, combined with his rural location and inability to drive, limited the work that he could do.

### 7.5.1 Moving towards work

A number of respondents indicated that they would like to pursue careers that would enable them to work from home. One woman explained that her condition meant that it took some time for her pain-relief to take effect in a morning and that it would be ideal if she could work from home at her own pace. Having been refused an interview with the JB organisation she had contacted for more information about employers who take on people with disabilities, she subsequently started a distance-learning bookkeeping course, paid for by her mother. This was something she pursued after a Learn Direct leaflet was posted through her door. Another respondent was on a fork-lift truck driving course and described contact with what sounded like a JB organisation, yet he was very unfamiliar with the concept of NDDP and 'Job Broker' language.

Other respondents presented a very clear idea of their needs. For example, one had very specific plans to set himself up as a freelance proofreader once he had had a diagnosis of his condition confirmed, and wanted information about how he would go about setting up his own business. While many respondents apparently viewed their conditions as a barrier to employment, this particular respondent planned to harness the '*particular talent*' linked with his suspected condition with a view to building a career around it, but had not registered with a JB because he did not feel well enough at the time. Another respondent did not accept the advice of a JB that the type of work she wanted was oversubscribed and who tried to dissuade her from pursuing her interest in a career in childcare. Instead she had registered to start a relevant course later in the year.

While many respondents appeared to be thinking about work and employment in terms of 'career', the aspirations of others were less ambitious. One respondent wanted only to work a few hours a week to supplement his income without any effect on his benefits and Carer's Allowance; he took on a paper round. Another described how long-term drug use had eroded his confidence to the point at which he found it difficult to leave the house. For him, his needs revolved around controlling his addiction with the support of his GP and drugs worker, before he could embark on the task of finding ways of increasing his self-confidence and identifying ways of setting up some kind of work experience, as it had been so long since he had worked.

### **7.5.2 Thinking about work in the future**

A number of respondents who had previously had quite physical or stressful jobs spoke of a desire to retrain. Some of this group of respondents had not registered with a JB when interviewed because of their health condition but would consider contacting them when they felt their health allowed. Information technology and business administration were a popular consideration, as it was understood that these areas could provide the option of both less physically intensive work and the possibility of working from home. In one case, the time spent out of work had caused the respondent to reflect on his situation and identify a skills and qualifications gap that he believed needed to be addressed in order to compete in the employment market. Although this respondent felt that he was not in a position to commit himself to a job or a course at this moment in time as he was still recovering from surgery, he was interested in the possibility of going into business with a friend or registering for a training course. For the time being, he regarded himself as considering his options.

### **7.5.3 Respondents who had found paid or voluntary work**

Although this was a small, non-representative sample, the experiences of people who had found paid or voluntary work can generate useful insights. As shown in Table 7.1, seven of the 30 people interviewed had found paid work by the time of the research interview. Two were working full-time hours of over 30 hours a week; the rest worked between four and 25 hours a week. In addition, three people were engaged in voluntary work.

Among the seven paid workers, two reported that they had been given advice about specific jobs by a JB. This appears to be an anomaly given that people in the qualitative sample were selected as non-registrants, but as mentioned earlier, they might have mistaken some other organisation, particularly Jobcentre Plus, for a JB. Alternatively, the JB might have given them advice before completing the formal registration process. Nevertheless, both respondents were critical of advice they were given because the jobs they started were unsatisfactory and they left soon afterwards. (One was required to do physical work that he did not expect; the other was told to work at weekends instead of weekdays only.)

Three of the other five paid workers and one of the voluntary workers were also critical of their contact with a JB but because they had not been registered had not received services from them. Critical comments included being treated with a lack of sensitivity by JB staff, or staff being unresponsive to their expressed needs.

All ten paid and voluntary workers were very committed to work, however, and had all continued their efforts to find work after ending contact with a JB organisation. Three people found jobs through word of mouth, two returned to old jobs, and two saw local advertisements (though not in local newspapers). These routes into work are interesting. It is possible that none of the jobs obtained would have come to the notice of a JB. The possible policy lessons of this observation are considered in Section 7.6.

None of the people who were doing voluntary work appeared to have had the opportunity of discussing this with a JB. When voluntary work was also identified as another route back to work it was by people who considered themselves to be professionals and were seeking opportunities that would specifically harness their skills, qualifications and experience. For example, one woman continued to work in a school where she had previously been employed as a teacher of English as a Foreign Language. Despite the funding having ceased, she continued to work on a voluntary basis and used this contact with the school as a way of finding information about employment opportunities that might come up within the education system. For her, the priority was to combine her intellectual skills and experience with a need to work school-hours and holidays to accommodate her childcare commitments. A respondent with a nursing background had previously volunteered with a health and care organisation. Again, the implications of these findings for policy are explored in the following section.

Interestingly, there was little evidence within our sample of respondents returning to Jobcentre Plus for help. One woman said that she used Jobcentre Plus Online to look for jobs as she could not always make it to the office itself. Another respondent said that he planned to approach the service for advice regarding setting up his own business, while another described staff at his local Jobcentre Plus as being '*quite helpful*' and referred to their signposting of a JB service as an example of this. However, it does not appear that any of the people who eventually found some form of work were advised by JBs to contact Jobcentre Plus and certainly none had found paid work through this route.

## 7.6 Lessons for policy

As explained in the introduction to this chapter, it was hoped that depth interviews with 'knowledgeable non-registrants' would inform a number of policy and practice issues, including:

- whether JBs are providing the range of services needed by potential clients;
- whether people have misperceptions about JBs;
- whether access or location act as reasons for non-participation;
- the relevance and importance of how staff treat people when they contact a JB;
- what alternative sources of help people use in getting back to, and staying in, work.

Each of these will be considered below, but there are also a number of preliminary observations that can be made, which have emerged by reflecting on some of the assumptions and concerns that prompted the study initially.

The first assumption is that the high proportion of people who appear to fit a definition of 'knowledgeable non-registrant' is a problem and represents in some way a failure of the Job Broking programme to engage them. This perception that non-registration is a bad thing needs to be reassessed. For example, some people in this study indicated that they might return to a JB later when, for example, their health was better. The lesson for policy is therefore that there is a need to maintain contact with people committed to work at some time in the future so that, when they are thinking about work again, they approach a source of suitable help, which need not necessarily be a JB.

It must also be remembered that registration is not something entirely within the control of clients. JBs also act as 'gatekeepers', effectively ceasing contact or putting people off.

As mentioned in Section 7.2, the approach to sampling included an emphasis on people who contacted a JB voluntarily. The idea here was to avoid conducting too many interviews with people whose decision not to register was made simply because they learned that the scheme was voluntary. However, most of the people in the study who thought involvement was compulsory did not fit this picture. Most were committed to finding work and non-registration was due to a range of other reasons. Though the numbers of relevant respondents is small (by the very nature of a qualitative study) it is possible to infer that compulsory engagement can initiate a process that might not have happened if contact relied on claimants taking the first move, thus lending support to policy thinking underlying compulsory WFIs.

### 7.6.1 The range of Job Broker services

It is not possible from a qualitative study to identify the extent to which JB services meet the needs of potential clients. However, we can point to three areas that emerge from the study that might warrant further thought. First, it is apparent that some people who did not register would have welcomed greater help from a JB in thinking about what avenues to explore next. JBs could therefore review the information that is given to people who either chose not to register or whom a JB does not **want** to register. Secondly, there was little evidence that voluntary work was raised by JBs as a possible course of action for potential clients. More non-registrants might choose to register if they were aware that voluntary work was an option as part of a route back to paid employment. Finally, it was striking that the people who had found paid work had done so by routes that are perhaps not associated with JB services (i.e. word of mouth, a return to a previous job, advertisements in shop windows). Some thought might be given therefore about how to tap into sources of vacancies that JBs currently might not hear about, to complement any current practices that encourage clients to look for jobs that are not widely or conventionally advertised.

### 7.6.2 Potential clients' perceptions about Job Brokers

It is difficult to draw firm conclusions about whether people have misperceptions about JBs. Most of the respondents in the study made an initial contact (whether with a JB or someone else) because they understood that help was available to people with health problems or disabilities who wanted to work. However, there was a wide variation in what people seemed to understand about what services were available. The danger that this study identifies is that some potential clients do not proceed with a JB because they misunderstand how they can be helped. This is perhaps not surprising; JBs generally have a large number of ways in which they might respond to someone's needs and aspirations. What appears to be important in this context is the **first contact** between a person and a JB. It is at this point that some potential clients may be 'lost'. Hence, it might be constructive to review how such first contacts are handled, for example in terms of the type of information that is routinely given and, importantly, who is involved from the JB staff.

### 7.6.3 Access and location as reasons for non-registration

Access and location are clearly important issues. However, the qualitative study did not produce much evidence that this was a major problem for non-registrants. Only one respondent made critical comments about access, although for her it did contribute to her decision to cease contact with the JB. It was also seen in Section 5.3.1 that the majority of all respondents who had an interview or discussion with a JB were satisfied with the access to the building in which it took place.

#### **7.6.4 Staff treatment of people**

It is clear from the analysis of people's experiences of contact with JB's that the way in which they are treated by staff of JB organisations and Jobcentre Plus is important to them at a personal level and influential in whether they continue (or plan to continue) contact. This is not an unexpected finding, and reinforces similar findings from the two waves of qualitative research carried out as part of the NDDP evaluation (Corden *et al.* 2003; Lewis *et al.* 2004).

Perhaps the only additional lesson from this study of non-registrants is to emphasise the importance of personal treatment when people first make contact with a JB, as mentioned in Section 7.6.2. An initial bad experience can effectively drive people away and mean they are unlikely to make contact in the future.

#### **7.6.5 Use of alternative sources of help**

How people continue to move towards and into work was discussed in depth in Section 7.5. Again, any reflections here must be tentative given the small scale of the qualitative study. However, it does seem striking that alternative sources of help were seemingly used very little by people who did not register with a JB. Part of the explanation for this might be the lack of 'signposting' by JB's mentioned above. Most people remained committed to work but made progress mainly by their own efforts. Whether or not they would have fared even better with some form of help cannot be answered, but there does seem to be a case for greater signposting, for example to Jobcentre Plus services, to increase the chances that people's transition into work is supported by appropriate financial and other provisions.

In conclusion, this qualitative follow-up of a sample of 'knowledgeable non-registrants' has raised a number of areas where further policy thinking could usefully be directed, and has challenged some of the possible negative assumptions about 'non-registration'.



## 8 Conclusion

What emerges predominantly from this third wave of analysis is the importance of recognising the diversity of the Eligible Population in terms of their work experience, expectations and health. Indeed these three factors play a part in respondents' awareness of New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP) (as shown in Chapter 4), participation in the programme (as shown in Chapter 5) and demand for the programme (as shown in Chapter 6). The diversity of the population is crucial to understanding the varied levels of interest. After three waves of fieldwork spanning two years, there had been little change in the low levels of registration with, and the overall awareness levels of, NDDP (although awareness of Job Brokers (JBs) and the New Deals in general has increased slightly). Thereafter, actual NDDP registrations did increase markedly from 34,490 in the year to March 2004 to 61,580 in the subsequent 12 months (Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) various). Nevertheless, substantially larger proportions of the Eligible Population remain interested in work – so what more can be done to increase participation in NDDP?

### 8.1 The diversity of the Eligible Population

Between and within sample types, it has been shown that health, work experience and work expectations are extremely varied. Comparing sample groups, there were vast differences between the longer-term claimants (Stock) and the more recent claimants (Flow Voluntary and Mandatory), as would be expected. Longer-term claimants were in poorer health, had had their health condition for longer, were less likely to be in work currently or recently, to have looked for work recently or to expect to work in the future. This is not to say that they were not interested in work. Indeed, 38 per cent of the longer-term claimants were in work, looking for work or expected to work in the future.

There were also less substantial and sometimes less predictable differences between the two Flow groups. In terms of health and work experience, the Flow groups were very similar. Differences did occur with less Flow Mandatory currently in work, more looking for work, more having positive attitudes to NDDP, and a greater demand for the programme than Flow Voluntary respondents. This may be providing some evidence that work-focused interviews (WFIs) are increasing awareness of and registration with NDDP.

## 8.2 Similarities over time

As well as allowing comparisons between and within waves and sample groups, not seen at earlier stages of the study, this final and largest wave confirms previous findings. The first is that there had been no significant changes in the modest levels of overall awareness of NDDP since the start of the evaluation. The opposite may have been expected given that the NDDP mailshot was updated to a colour leaflet and letter, and that the public and media profile of New Deals has grown. Another related finding that has been confirmed is that awareness of JB's has increased since Wave One, although there was no significant increase between Waves Two and Three. This implies that the profile and marketing of local JB's has been more effective at reaching the target audience than national NDDP marketing.

Wave Three also saw the continuation of low registration rates, along with persistent confusion around the NDDP vocabulary and process. Respondents did not identify with the terms 'registration' and 'non-registration,' indeed many who said they were registered were not, and many who were registered did not realise they were. A number of other respondents reported contact with JB's, although whether this actually took place is sometimes difficult to determine. Among these slightly negative findings, more encouraging findings were also confirmed, such as the substantial proportions of the Eligible Population who aspire to paid work.

## 8.3 Continued interest in work

As identified in Chapter 6, seven per cent of all Stock respondents, 12 per cent of Flow Voluntary respondents and 14 per cent of Flow Mandatory respondents were identified as belonging to an 'Interested Target Group'. This consisted of those who were either aware of NDDP and planned to contact a JB, or were not aware of NDDP, but had looked for work in the last four weeks and were definitely interested in the type of service it offered. There were no significant changes in the size of this group across waves; it remained much larger than current take-up of the programme.

Another 13 per cent of all Stock respondents and as many as 26 and 22 per cent of all Flow Voluntary and Mandatory respondents were identified as being in the 'Non-interested Target Group'. This was made up of people who were interested in work, but not NDDP (where an interest in work was defined as either having looked for work or expecting to work). Given that the characteristics of both groups were very similar, it may be that it would not take much to move many of these respondents from being 'non-interested' to 'interested' in NDDP. The greater proportions of both groups were what may be called 'easier to support into work': those who are younger, with qualifications and have less severe health conditions. Others displayed a commitment to work despite seeming to face greater obstacles to securing a job. What can be done to make members of the targets groups more likely to register with the programme?

## 8.4 Recommendations for marketing strategy

Evidently, the existing marketing approach had not resonated among the Eligible Population. Nevertheless, this study provides evidence that variations in the **form, branding, and frequency and timing** of NDDP marketing may assist in raising awareness levels and participation in the programme. The main **form** of NDDP marketing for the Stock and Flow Voluntary groups was the NDDP mailshot. For the Flow Mandatory group at Wave Two, it was the WFI, and at Wave Three, this group had both a WFI and a mailshot. Receiving information on NDDP from two sources instead of one did not seem to have an effect on awareness among this group. At both waves, there was little difference in awareness levels of all three groups. However, of all those aware, the Flow Mandatory displayed the most positive reactions to the programme, were the least likely to reject it and the most likely to be in the Interested Target Group. This implies that personal contact goes some way in moving respondents towards participation.

Clear evidence has been gathered from this and other parts of the NDDP Evaluation that the **branding** of the programme has had limited success. Positive steps have been taken to rectify this including the localisation of the New Deals (DWP, 2004). In terms of marketing the NDDP brand, this study also supports a more personalised approach to potential clients. The apparent success (in terms of increased awareness) of the local marketing required of JB's over national NDDP marketing should be embraced. This more localised approach could be more attractive to the 13 per cent of Stock, 26 per cent of Flow Voluntary and 22 per cent of Flow Mandatory respondents who were looking or expecting to work but expressed lack of interest in NDDP or a similar service.

As the qualitative work with knowledgeable non-registrants showed, it is also vital that potential clients' first contact with JB's is positive. Many of those who got as far as JB contact, but did not register were motivated enough to look for work independently. Although this implies that non-registration is not necessarily a bad thing, had these clients registered, they may have benefited from JB's knowledge of local labour markets, and sustained in-work support. There was also evidence that JB's acted as 'gatekeepers' to the programme deciding, sometimes without consultation, not to register potential clients. If people show the willingness to work by approaching a JB it is important that this is supported – if NDDP is not the right programme for them it is crucial that JB's signpost them to Jobcentre Plus with the aim of finding something which is. However, this concern relates only to a small minority of those approaching JB's, given that for all those who had contact with a Broker, around nine in ten felt that they had been listened to and understood.

In terms of **frequency and timing**, the national NDDP marketing of around one mailing a year (depending on claim start date and National Insurance number) does not seem frequent enough to reach effectively its target audience. Given that the qualitative work revealed that many knowledgeable non-registrants had intentions of recontacting NDDP in the future, often when their health had recovered, a more

regular approach to marketing may be suitable, though whether this should comprise more mailshots or local marketing is debatable. The identification of the Interested Target Group indicates that large numbers within the Eligible Population are or could be quite close to NDDP participation. However, even if these people were aware of NDDP (and many were not), they may well have had no follow-up on NDDP since an initial mailshot or WFI. There is a definite need for sustained contact so as to 'grasp' these potential clients, especially given the variability of their health status. There was also a proportion of respondents who had moved onto Jobseeker's Allowance by the time of interview – evidently, they were assessed as capable of work and may be more 'work ready' – this is another group who may have benefited from NDDP if caught at the right time.

The Pathways to Work pilots are acknowledging those who may not be ready to move immediately to NDDP with the introduction of regular WFIs for some claimants and the introduction of a job preparation premium (H.M. Treasury, 2004). This study supports such a move in that it helps incapacity-related benefit claimants move closer to the labour market by keeping them up-to-date with the options available for moving into employment in the future. However, this is not a guarantee that the NDDP message still reaches those who, if not in need of it now, may be at a later stage. This could be done via more regular mailouts and greater recommendation of NDDP within WFIs (though making it compulsory to mention NDDP is probably not practical). The NDDP mailshot could also suggest to potential clients to contact the programme **when** they feel ready or sometime in the future, acknowledging that claimants' circumstances change.

In conclusion, awareness and take-up of NDDP was low in all three waves of this study, but the consistent evidence for interest in the service among the Eligible Population shows that changes in the current marketing, informed by the above recommendations, could potentially change this trend.

# Appendix A

## Sample details: all waves

**Table A.1 Sample details: all waves**

|                   | Benefit claim period    | Whether had a WFI | Whether sent NDDP mailshot | When sent NDDP mailshot | When sent opt-out letter | When interviewed           | Number of interviews | Telephone number coverage <sup>1</sup> % | Response rate <sup>2</sup> % |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--|------------------------------|
| <b>Wave One</b>   |                         |                   |                            |                         |                          |                            |                      |  |                              |
| Stock             | Before 24 Sept 2001     | N                 | Y                          | c. 25 April 2002        |                          |                            | 630                  | 56                                       | 61                           |
| Flow Vol          | 10 March – 6 April 2002 | N                 | Y                          |                         | 29 July 02               | 12 Aug – 25 Oct 02         | 451                  | 63                                       |                              |
| Flow Mand         |                         | Y                 | N                          | N/A                     |                          |                            | 87                   | 78                                       |                              |
| <b>Wave Two</b>   |                         |                   |                            |                         |                          |                            |                      |  |                              |
| Stock             | Before 24 Sept 2001     | N                 | Y                          | c. 15 January 2003      |                          |                            | 424                  | 49                                       | 55                           |
| Flow Vol          | 17 Nov – 14 Dec 2002    | N                 | Y                          |                         | 22 April 2003            | 8 May – 29 June 2003       | 470                  | 60                                       |                              |
| Flow Mand         |                         | Y                 | N                          | N/A                     |                          |                            | 409                  | 99                                       |                              |
| <b>Wave Three</b> |                         |                   |                            |                         |                          |                            |                      |  |                              |
| Stock             | Before 28 July 2003     | N                 | Y                          | c. 21 September 2003    | 7 January 2004           | 22 January – 21 April 2004 | 658                  | 69                                       | 55                           |
| Flow Vol          | 28 July – 23 Aug 2003   | N                 | Y                          |                         |                          |                            | 657                  | 83                                       |                              |
| Flow Mand         |                         | Y                 | N                          |                         |                          |                            | 969                  | 94                                       |                              |

<sup>1</sup> For the Stock and Flow Voluntary, subsequent manual look-up was conducted which increased number coverage to 61 per cent for Wave One Stock; 67 per cent for Wave One Flow Voluntary; 53 per cent for Wave Two Stock; and 64 per cent for Wave Two Flow Voluntary. This was not done at Wave Three.

<sup>2</sup> At each wave around one-third of telephone numbers obtained were unusable (defined as disconnected, sample member unknown at number, or moved away). These are not included in the response rate calculations.

# Appendix B

## Weighting strategy

### B.1 Stock sample

There were three stages to the weighting for the stock sample:

- the availability of a telephone number;
- whether an interview was achieved from those issued;
- post-stratification by benefit type.

#### **B.1.1 Availability of a telephone number**

Of the 19,954 people initially extracted for the survey, a telephone number was available for 13,859<sup>29</sup>. Factors that were potentially related to whether a telephone number was available were identified and logistic regression used to model the associations. As the factors that were associated with whether a telephone number was available were more likely to vary for the three benefit types (Incapacity Benefit, Income Support and Severe Disablement Allowance), separate models were fitted for each benefit type.

The following factors were associated with whether a telephone number was available:

- IB: age and the number of previous claims made;
- IS: the number of previous claims made;
- SDA: age.

From the models fitted, the predicted probabilities of a telephone number being available were obtained and the weights calculated as the reciprocal of these.

---

<sup>29</sup> Note that for some of these cases this telephone number was later found to be invalid.

### **B.1.2 Interview achieved**

Of the 1,912 people issued for the survey, an interview was achieved with 658. A model (weighted by the weight for whether they had a telephone or not) for whether an interview was achieved was fitted and the following factors found to be related to response: age and the source of the telephone number. (Source of the telephone number was generated to mimic that used in wave one, although the procedures for obtaining telephone numbers changed somewhat. This may have impacted on the model produced.)

The weights were calculated as the reciprocal of the predicted probabilities of response.

### **B.1.3 Post-stratification**

Composite weights were calculated as the sum of the weights in Section B.1.1 and Section B.1.2. The distribution of the weighted sample was then adjusted to that of the sampling frame (at wave one) using post-stratification weights.

## **B.2 Flow Voluntary sample**

There were three stages to the weighting for the Flow Voluntary sample:

- the availability of a telephone number;
- whether an interview was achieved from those issued;
- post-stratification by benefit type.

### **B.2.1 Availability of a telephone number**

Of the 19,974 people initially extracted, a telephone number was available for 16,667<sup>30</sup>. Factors that were potentially related to whether a telephone number was available were identified and logistic regression used to model the associations.

The following factors were associated with whether a telephone number was available: benefit type and age.

From the models fitted, the predicted probabilities of a telephone number being available were obtained and the weights calculated as the reciprocal of these.

### **B.2.2 Interview achieved**

Of the 1,757 people issued for the survey, an interview was achieved with 657. A model (weighted by the weight for whether they had a telephone or not) for whether an interview was achieved was fitted and the following factors found to be related to response: age and the source of the telephone number (see previous comment).

---

<sup>30</sup> Note that for some of these cases this telephone number was later found to be invalid.

The weights were calculated as the reciprocal of the predicted probabilities of response.

### **B.2.3 Post-stratification**

Composite weights were calculated as the sum of the weights in Section B.2.1 and Section B.2.2. The distribution of the weighted sample was then adjusted to match that of the sampling frame using post-stratification weights.

## **B.3 Flow Mandatory sample**

There were three stages to the weighting for the Flow Mandatory sample:

- the availability of a telephone number;
- whether an interview was achieved from those issued;
- post-stratification by benefit type.

### **B.3.1 Availability of a telephone number**

Of the 3,697 people initially extracted, a telephone number was available for 3,457<sup>31</sup>. Factors that were potentially related to whether a phone number was available were identified and logistic regression used to model the associations.

The only factor that was associated with whether a phone number was available was age.

From the models fitted, the predicted probabilities of a phone number being available were obtained and the weights calculated as the reciprocal of these.

### **B.3.2 Interview achieved**

Of the 2,229 people issued for the survey, an interview was achieved with 969. A model for whether an interview was achieved (weighted by the weight for whether they had a telephone or not) was fitted. The following factors were found to be related to response: age and the source of the telephone number (see previous comment).

The weights were calculated as the reciprocal of the predicted probabilities of response.

### **B.3.3 Post-stratification**

Composite weights were calculated as the sum of the weights in Section B.3.1 and Section B.3.2. The distribution of the weighted sample was then adjusted to match that of the sampling frame using post-stratification weights.

---

<sup>31</sup> Note that for some of these cases this telephone number was later found to be invalid.



# Appendix C

## Characteristics across waves

**Table C.1 Gender – Wave One**

|                              | <b>Stock %</b> | <b>Flow %</b> |
|------------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Male                         | 51             | 60            |
| Female                       | 49             | 40            |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i> |                |               |
| <i>Weighted base</i>         | 630            | 538           |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>       | 630            | 538           |

**Table C.2 Gender – Wave Two**

|                              | <b>Stock %</b> | <b>Voluntary %</b> | <b>Mandatory %</b> |
|------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Men                          | 52             | 62                 | 62                 |
| Women                        | 48             | 39                 | 38                 |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i> |                |                    |                    |
| <i>Weighted base</i>         | 424            | 470                | 409                |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>       | 424            | 470                | 409                |

**Table C.3 Gender - Wave Three**

|                              | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|------------------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|
| Men                          | 53      | 57          | 62          |
| Women                        | 47      | 43          | 38          |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i> |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>         | 658     | 657         | 969         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>       | 658     | 657         | 969         |

**Table C.4 Age – Wave One**

|                              | Stock % | Flow % |
|------------------------------|---------|--------|
| 18 to 34                     | 22      | 33     |
| 35 to 49                     | 36      | 37     |
| 50+                          | 41      | 30     |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i> |         |        |
| <i>Weighted base</i>         | 630     | 538    |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>       | 630     | 538    |

**Table C.5 Age – Wave Two**

|                              | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|------------------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|
| 18 to 34                     | 22      | 33          | 35          |
| 35 to 49                     | 32      | 37          | 37          |
| 50+                          | 45      | 30          | 28          |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i> |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>         | 423     | 467         | 409         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>       | 424     | 468         | 409         |

**Table C.6 Age – Wave Three**

|                              | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|------------------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|
| 18 to 34                     | 19      | 28          | 37          |
| 35 to 49                     | 35      | 41          | 37          |
| 50+                          | 47      | 32          | 26          |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i> |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>         | 658     | 657         | 968         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>       | 658     | 657         | 968         |

**Table C.7 Ethnicity – Wave One**

|                              | Stock % | Flow % |
|------------------------------|---------|--------|
| White                        | 92      | 91     |
| White Irish                  | 2       | 2      |
| Black                        | 2       | 1      |
| Black African                | 1       | *      |
| Black Caribbean              | 1       | 1      |
| Other Black                  | *       | *      |
| Asian                        | 2       | 4      |
| Bangladeshi                  | *       | 1      |
| Indian                       | 2       | 1      |
| Pakistani                    | *       | 2      |
| Other                        | 2       | 1      |
| None of the above            | 1       | *      |
| Prefer not to say            | –       | 1      |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i> |         |        |
| <i>Weighted base</i>         | 630     | 538    |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>       | 630     | 538    |

**Table C.8 Ethnicity – Wave Two**

|                              | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|------------------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|
| White                        | 92      | 92          | 89          |
| White Irish                  | 1       | 1           | 2           |
| Black                        | 1       | 2           | 2           |
| Black African                | *       | *           | 1           |
| Black Caribbean              | 1       | 1           | 1           |
| Other Black                  | –       | *           | –           |
| Asian                        | 3       | 2           | 5           |
| Bangladeshi                  | 1       | –           | –           |
| Chinese                      | –       | –           | –           |
| Indian                       | 1       | 2           | 3           |
| Pakistani                    | 1       | 1           | 3           |
| Other                        | 1       | 2           | 2           |
| None of the above            | *       | 1           | 1           |
| Prefer not to say            | 1       | *           | 1           |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i> |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>         | 422     | 470         | 409         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>       | 423     | 469         | 409         |

**Table C.9 Ethnicity – Wave Three**

|                              | Stock % | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|------------------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|
| White                        | 88      | 87          | 86          |
| White Irish                  | 2       | 2           | 2           |
| Black                        | 2       | 4           | 4           |
| Black African                | *       | 1           | 3           |
| Black Caribbean              | 2       | 1           | 1           |
| Other Black                  | 1       | 1           | 1           |
| Asian                        | 4       | 3           | 4           |
| Bangladeshi                  | 1       | 1           | *           |
| Chinese                      | *       | –           | *           |
| Indian                       | 1       | *           | 2           |
| Pakistani                    | 2       | 2           | 2           |
| Other                        | 3       | 2           | 3           |
| Prefer not to say            | 1       | 1           | 1           |
| <i>Base: All respondents</i> |         |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>         | 658     | 656         | 968         |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>       | 658     | 657         | 969         |

**Table C.10 Nature of main health condition – Wave One**

|   | Stock % | Flow % |
|---|---------|--------|
| Problems with your arms or hands                              | 20      | 15     |
| Problems with your legs or feet                               | 29      | 24     |
| Problems with your neck or back                               | 33      | 27     |
| Difficulty in seeing  | 2       | 2      |
| Difficulty in hearing   | 1       | 1      |
| Speech impediment   | –       | –      |
| Skin conditions or allergies                                  | 1       | 1      |
| Chest or breathing problems                                   | 6       | 5      |
| Heart problems or blood pressure                              | 8       | 7      |
| Problems relating to stomach, liver, kidney or digestion      | 5       | 6      |
| Diabetes  | 3       | 4      |
| Mental health condition                                       | 23      | 23     |
| Epilepsy  | 3       | 1      |
| Learning difficulties   | 1       | 1      |
| Progressive illness not covered above                         | 6       | 3      |
| Other disability  | 11      | 7      |
| <i>Base: All respondents with a disability now or in past</i> |         |        |
| <i>Weighted base</i>  | 603     | 461    |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>  | 606     | 467    |

**Table C.11 Nature of main health condition – Wave Two**

|   | Stock %    | Voluntary % | Mandatory % |
|---|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Problems with your arms or hands                              | 17         | 14          | 16          |
| Problems with your legs or feet                               | 20         | 22          | 20          |
| Problems with your neck or back                               | 27         | 29          | 30          |
| Difficulty in seeing  | 1          | 2           | 1           |
| Difficulty in hearing   | 1          | 1           | *           |
| Speech impediment   | *          | *           | -           |
| Skin conditions or allergies                                  | 1          | 2           | *           |
| Chest or breathing problems                                   | 5          | 8           | 5           |
| Heart problems or blood pressure                              | 8          | 6           | 7           |
| Problems relating to stomach, liver, kidney or digestion      | 6          | 4           | 5           |
| Diabetes  | 3          | 3           | 1           |
| Mental health condition                                       | 27         | 22          | 23          |
| Epilepsy  | 2          | 1           | 2           |
| Learning difficulties   | 1          | 1           | -           |
| Progressive illness not covered above                         | 6          | 3           | 2           |
| Other disability  | 9          | 8           | 10          |
| <i>Base: All respondents with a disability now or in past</i> |            |             |             |
| <i>Weighted base</i>  | <i>407</i> | <i>417</i>  | <i>379</i>  |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>  | <i>407</i> | <i>417</i>  | <i>379</i>  |

**Table C.12 Nature of main health condition – Wave Three**

|   | <b>Stock %</b> | <b>Voluntary %</b> | <b>Mandatory %</b> |
|---|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Problems with your arms or hands                              | 14             | 10                 | 13                 |
| Problems with your legs or feet                               | 27             | 22                 | 22                 |
| Problems with your neck or back                               | 33             | 25                 | 26                 |
| Difficulty in seeing  | 2              | 2                  | 2                  |
| Difficulty in hearing   | 1              | 1                  | *                  |
| Speech impediment   | *              | *                  | –                  |
| Skin conditions or allergies                                  | *              | 1                  | 1                  |
| Chest or breathing problems                                   | 6              | 5                  | 6                  |
| Heart problems or blood pressure                              | 7              | 7                  | 5                  |
| Problems relating to stomach, liver, kidney or digestion      | 4              | 6                  | 6                  |
| Diabetes  | 3              | 2                  | 3                  |
| Mental health condition                                       | 18             | 26                 | 30                 |
| Epilepsy  | 3              | 3                  | 1                  |
| Learning difficulties   | 1              | *                  | *                  |
| Progressive illness not covered above                         | 4              | 2                  | 2                  |
| Other disability  | 14             | 11                 | 7                  |
| <i>Base: All respondents with a disability now or in past</i> |                |                    |                    |
| <i>Weighted base</i>  | 643            | 593                | 899                |
| <i>Unweighted base</i>  | 642            | 596                | 902                |

# Appendix D

## Supporting logistic regressions

Logistic regression for the dependent variable 'Awareness of NDDP' for Stock

**Table D.1 Omnibus tests of model coefficients**

|        | Chi-square | df | Sig. |
|--------|------------|----|------|
| Step 4 | 4.104      | 1  | .043 |
| Block  | 30.979     | 4  | .000 |
| Model  | 30.979     | 4  | .000 |

**Table D.2 Variables in the equation**

|  | B      | S.E.  | Wald   | df    | Sig.  | Exp(B) |
|--|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|
| IB recipient                                 | -0.425 | 0.181 | 5.552  | 1.000 | 0.018 | 0.653  |
| Has qualifications                           | -0.658 | 0.180 | 13.366 | 1.000 | 0.000 | 0.518  |
| If could return to original benefit (bridge) | -0.571 | 0.184 | 9.635  | 1.000 | 0.002 | 0.565  |
| Not sure could work regularly (barrier)      | 0.366  | 0.181 | 4.097  | 1.000 | 0.043 | 1.441  |
| Constant                                     | -1.001 | 0.355 | 7.949  | 1.000 | 0.005 | 0.368  |

Logistic regression for the dependent variable 'Awareness of NDDP' for Flow Voluntary group

**Table D.3 Omnibus tests of model coefficients**

|        | Chi-square | df | Sig. |
|--------|------------|----|------|
| Step 1 | 7.552      | 1  | .006 |
| Block  | 7.552      | 1  | .006 |
| Model  | 7.552      | 1  | .006 |

**Table D.4 Variables in the equation**

|                         | B      | S.E.  | Wald  | df    | Sig.  | Exp(B) |
|-------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| Something else (bridge) | -0.677 | 0.243 | 7.782 | 1.000 | 0.005 | 0.508  |
| Constant                | -0.479 | 0.209 | 5.257 | 1.000 | 0.022 | 0.619  |

Logistic regression for the dependent variable 'Awareness of NDDP' for Flow Mandatory group

**Table D.5 Omnibus tests of model coefficients**

|        | Chi-square | df | Sig. |
|--------|------------|----|------|
| Step 5 | 5.902      | 1  | .015 |
| Block  | 41.514     | 5  | .000 |
| Model  | 41.514     | 5  | .000 |

**Table D.6 Variables in the equation**

|  | B      | S.E.  | Wald  | df    | Sig.  | Exp(B) |
|--|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| IB recipient                                 | -0.391 | 0.163 | 5.773 | 1.000 | 0.016 | 0.676  |
| Looking or expecting to work                 | -0.558 | 0.184 | 9.176 | 1.000 | 0.002 | 0.572  |
| Has qualifications                           | -0.463 | 0.154 | 9.012 | 1.000 | 0.003 | 0.630  |
| Childcare responsibility (barrier)           | 1.136  | 0.366 | 9.636 | 1.000 | 0.002 | 3.115  |
| Not sure if better off on benefits (barrier) | -0.504 | 0.177 | 8.083 | 1.000 | 0.004 | 0.604  |
| Constant                                     | -1.141 | 0.374 | 9.284 | 1.000 | 0.002 | 0.320  |

Logistic regression for the dependent variable 'Awareness of Job Broker' for Stock

**Table D.7 Omnibus tests of model coefficients**

|        | Chi-square | df | Sig. |
|--------|------------|----|------|
| Step 5 | 5.631      | 1  | .018 |
| Block  | 36.528     | 5  | .000 |
| Model  | 36.528     | 5  | .000 |

**Table D.8 Variables in the equation**

|  | B      | S.E.  | Wald   | df    | Sig.  | Exp(B) |
|--|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|
| Looking or expecting to work                 | -0.583 | 0.176 | 10.980 | 1.000 | 0.001 | 0.558  |
| No mental health condition                   | 0.638  | 0.194 | 10.773 | 1.000 | 0.001 | 1.893  |
| Something else (bridge)                      | -0.625 | 0.237 | 6.931  | 1.000 | 0.008 | 0.535  |
| Age (barrier)                                | -0.407 | 0.172 | 5.615  | 1.000 | 0.018 | 0.666  |
| Not sure if better off on benefits (barrier) | -0.506 | 0.204 | 6.127  | 1.000 | 0.013 | 0.603  |
| Constant                                     | 0.762  | 0.296 | 6.606  | 1.000 | 0.010 | 2.142  |

Logistic regression for the dependent variable 'Awareness of Job Broker' for Flow Voluntary group

**Table D.9 Omnibus tests of model coefficients**

|        | Chi-square | df | Sig. |
|--------|------------|----|------|
| Step 4 | 5.596      | 1  | .018 |
| Block  | 40.641     | 6  | .000 |
| Model  | 40.641     | 6  | .000 |

**Table D.10 Variables in the equation**

|  | B      | S.E.  | Wald   | df    | Sig.  | Exp(B) |
|--|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|
| Last worked 10+ years or never worked        | 0.961  | 0.334 | 8.281  | 1.000 | 0.004 | 2.614  |
| Last worked 4 to 9 years ago                 | 0.669  | 0.245 | 7.444  | 1.000 | 0.006 | 1.953  |
| Currently in work/last 3 years               | 1.315  | 0.295 | 19.910 | 1.000 | 0.000 | 3.723  |
| Being able to work from home (bridge)        | 0.545  | 0.201 | 7.379  | 1.000 | 0.007 | 1.725  |
| If could return to original benefit (bridge) | -0.471 | 0.200 | 5.530  | 1.000 | 0.019 | 0.624  |
| Something else (bridge)                      | -0.644 | 0.233 | 7.618  | 1.000 | 0.006 | 0.525  |
| Constant                                     | -0.452 | 0.313 | 2.094  | 1.000 | 0.148 | 0.636  |

Logistic regression for the dependent variable 'Awareness of Job Broker' for Flow Mandatory group

**Table D.11 Omnibus tests of model coefficients**

|        | Chi-square | df | Sig. |
|--------|------------|----|------|
| Step 5 | 4.569      | 1  | .033 |
| Block  | 32.396     | 7  | .000 |
| Model  | 32.396     | 7  | .000 |

**Table D.12 Variables in the equation**

|  | B      | S.E.  | Wald   | df    | Sig.  | Exp(B) |
|--|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|
| Looking after the home and family            | -0.282 | 0.132 | 4.552  | 1.000 | 0.033 | 0.754  |
| In work now                                  | -0.091 | 0.237 | 0.146  | 1.000 | 0.702 | 0.913  |
| Has looked for work in past 12 months        | -0.481 | 0.258 | 3.476  | 1.000 | 0.062 | 0.618  |
| Expects to work in the future                | -0.583 | 0.259 | 5.064  | 1.000 | 0.024 | 0.558  |
| Has qualifications                           | -0.275 | 0.138 | 3.956  | 1.000 | 0.047 | 0.760  |
| Age (barrier)                                | -0.377 | 0.157 | 5.799  | 1.000 | 0.016 | 0.686  |
| Not sure if better off on benefits (barrier) | -0.515 | 0.159 | 10.519 | 1.000 | 0.001 | 0.598  |
| Constant                                     | 0.795  | 0.304 | 6.810  | 1.000 | 0.009 | 2.214  |

Logistic regression for the dependent variable 'Awareness of Job Broker' for Flow Mandatory group

**Table D.13 Omnibus tests of model coefficients**

|        | Chi-square | df | Sig. |
|--------|------------|----|------|
| Step 5 | 4.569      | 1  | .033 |
| Block  | 32.396     | 7  | .000 |
| Model  | 32.396     | 7  | .000 |

**Table D.14** Variables in the equation

|  | <b>B</b> | <b>S.E.</b> | <b>Wald</b> | <b>df</b> | <b>Sig.</b> | <b>Exp(B)</b> |
|--|----------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|
| Looking after the home and family            | -0.282   | 0.132       | 4.552       | 1.000     | 0.033       | 0.754         |
| In work now                                  | -0.091   | 0.237       | 0.146       | 1.000     | 0.702       | 0.913         |
| Has looked for work in past 12 months        | -0.481   | 0.258       | 3.476       | 1.000     | 0.062       | 0.618         |
| Expects to work in the future                | -0.583   | 0.259       | 5.064       | 1.000     | 0.024       | 0.558         |
| Has qualifications                           | -0.275   | 0.138       | 3.956       | 1.000     | 0.047       | 0.760         |
| Age (barrier)                                | -0.377   | 0.157       | 5.799       | 1.000     | 0.016       | 0.686         |
| Not sure if better off on benefits (barrier) | -0.515   | 0.159       | 10.519      | 1.000     | 0.001       | 0.598         |
| Constant                                     | 0.795    | 0.304       | 6.810       | 1.000     | 0.009       | 2.214         |



# References

Ashworth, K., Hartfree, Y., Kazimirski, A., Legge, K., Pires, C., Reyes De-Beaman, S., Shaw, A. and Stafford, B., (2003) *New Deal for Disabled People National Extension First Wave of the First Cohort of the Survey of Registrants*, DWP Research Report 180 (Sheffield: Department for Work and Pensions).

Aston, J., Atkinson, J., Evans, C., Davis, S. and O'Regan, S., (2003), *Employers and the New Deal for Disabled People: Qualitative Research First Wave*, DWP Research Report 145 (Sheffield: Department for Work and Pensions).

Aston, J., Barkworth, R., Davis S., and Willison, R., (2005) *Employers and the New Deal for Disabled People, Qualitative Research Wave 2*, DWP Research Report 180 (Sheffield: Department for Work and Pensions).

Corden, A., Harries, T., Hill, K., Kellard, K., Lewis, J., Sainsbury, R. and Thornton, T., (2003) *New Deal for Disabled People National Extension: Findings from the First Wave of Qualitative Research with Clients, Job Brokers and Jobcentre Plus Staff*, DWP Research Report 169 (Sheffield: Department for Work and Pensions).

DWP (2002) *Pathways to Work: helping people into employment*, Cm. 5690 (London: TSO).

DWP (2004) *Building on New Deal: Local solutions meeting individual needs* (London: TSO).

DWP (various) *Statistical Release - New Deal for Disabled People* <http://www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/nddp.asp>

Employment Service (2000) *New Deal for Disabled People Extension*, Sheffield, ES, 27 November.

Evans, M., Eyre, J., Millar, J. and Sarre, S. (2003) *New Deal for Lone Parents: Second Synthesis Report of the National Evaluation* (Sheffield: Department for Work and Pensions).

H.M. Treasury (2004) *Budget 2004 - Prudence for a Purpose: a Britain of Stability and Strength* (London: TSO).

Kazimirski, A., Adelman, L., Arch, J., Keenan, L., Legge K., Shaw, A., Stafford, B., Taylor, R. and Tipping, S., *New Deal for Disabled People evaluation: Registrants' Survey – Merged Cohorts (Cohorts one and two, Waves one and two)*, DWP Research Report 260 (Sheffield: Department for Work and Pensions).

Lewis, J., Corden A., Dillon, L., Hill, K., Kellard, K., Sainsbury, R. and Thornton, P., (2005) *New Deal for Disabled People: An In-Depth Study of Job Broker Service Delivery*, DWP Research Report 246 (Sheffield: Department for Work and Pensions).

Loumides, J., Stafford, B., Youngs, R., Green, A., Arthur, S., Legard, R., Lessof, C., Lewis, J., Walker, R., Corden, A., Thornton, P. and Sainsbury, R., (2001) *Evaluation of the New Deal for Disabled People Personal Adviser Service Pilot*, DWP Research Report 144 (Sheffield: Department for Work and Pensions).

National Statistics, 'Labour Market Spotlight', *Labour Market Trends*, May 2003.

Stanley, K. and Regan, S., (2003) *The Missing Million: supporting disabled people into work* (London: Institute for Public Policy Research).

Walker, R., (2003) 'The needs of disabled people: Balancing Employment, Support and Security', *New Economy* 10.1, (Oxford: Blackwell).

Woodward, C., Kazimirski, A., Shaw, A. and Pires, C., (2003) *New Deal for Disabled People Evaluation Eligible Population Survey Wave One Interim Report*, DWP Research Report 170 (Sheffield: Department for Work and Pensions).