Welfare deservingness opinions from heuristic to measurable concept: The CARIN deservingness principles scale

Bart Meuleman, Centre for Sociological Research, KU Leuven, Belgium

Femke Roosma, School of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Tilburg University, the Netherlands

Koen Abts, School of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Tilburg University, the Netherlands

*****Accepted for publication in *Social Science Research******

Abstract:

A steadily growing number of studies investigate how popular support for social policies targeting particular groups is rooted in citizens' deservingness opinions. According to theory, people fall back on five criteria – Control, Attitude, Reciprocity, Identity and Need (CARIN) – to distinguish the deserving from the undeserving. Deservingness opinions are assumed to be important predictors of support for particular welfare arrangements. A striking feature of this emerging research, however, is that there is no agreed-upon strategy to measure deservingness. Most previous studies rely on proxy-variables rather than measuring the actual deservingness criteria. Deservingness functions as a heuristic rather than as a measured concept, which leads to conceptual confusion. To remedy this shortcoming, this contribution proposes and validates a new instrument –the CARIN deservingness principles scale- that captures the five basic deservingness principles. We analyse data from the Belgian National Election Study by means of structural equation modelling (SEM) to (1) test the dimensionality, validity and reliability of the scale, and (2) verify to what extent the five deservingness principles predict specific policy preferences (as a test of construct validity). Our analyses confirm that the five deservingness principles are distinct dimensions that are differently related to social structural variables and have divergent consequences for policy preferences. The finding of theoretically meaningful patterns of differentiated effects illustrates that the CARIN criteria represent distinct logics of social justice, and corroborates that our measurement instrument is capable of tapping into the essence of these criteria.

Key words: deservingness; legitimacy of the welfare state; social policy support; public opinion; structural equation modelling; construct validity

Welfare deservingness opinions from heuristic to measurable concept: The CARIN deservingness principles scale

1. Introduction

In the wake of globalization, economic crisis and population ageing, the question *who should get what and why* is back on the agenda (Van Oorschot and Roosma, 2017: 3). Deservingness theory provides a very useful handle to understand the popular support for welfare programmes –or the lack thereof. The basic claim of deservingness theory is that individuals tend to target their solidarity towards groups that are considered as deserving, while others are excluded (Albrekt Larsen, 2008; Cook, 1979; De Swaan, 1988; Van Oorschot, 2000, 2006). To distinguish between people who are considered as entitled to the scarce resources of the welfare state and those who are not, individuals apply five basic *deservingness criteria*, namely Control, Attitude, Reciprocity, Identity and Need (hence CARIN, see Van Oorschot et al., 2017). These five deservingness criteria play a mediating role between social-structural characteristics and concrete policy preferences (Van Oorschot and Roosma, 2017).

Numerous contributions have attempted to test the central tenets of deservingness theory (Bang Petersen, Slothuus, Stubager and Togeby, 2011; Reeskens and van der Meer 2018; Van Oorschot, Roosma, Meuleman and Reeskens, 2017). However, a striking feature is that there exists considerable conceptual confusion on the character of deservingness opinions and, by consequence, an agreed-upon strategy to measure these opinions is lacking. Deservingness research often uses proxy-variables such as preferences for policies targeting specific groups (Jeene, Van Oorschot and Uunk, 2014; Laenen and Meuleman, 2017) or concerns for the living standards of these groups (Van Oorschot, 2006). Others have attempted to infer deservingness criteria by gauging stereotypes about target groups (Albrekt Larsen, 2008; Applebaum, 2001; Baumberg Geiger, 2017; Kallio and Kouvo, 2015) or setting up vignette experiments (De Wilde, 2017; Kootstra, 2016; Reeskens and Van der Meer, 2018). Rather

than actually measuring how important respondents think the various deservingness criteria should be, these studies employ deservingness as a heuristic to interpret findings regarding the support for targeting particular beneficiaries. The confusion about the conceptualization and operationalization of the deservingness criteria hampers direct empirical tests of deservingness theory (Meuleman, Roosma and Van Oorschot, 2017: 350) and makes it hard to draw conclusions about the (dis)similarities in deservingness opinions across temporal or geographical contexts.

This contribution proposes and validates an instrument that measures deservingness opinions in a more direct manner. Rather than using stereotypes or policy preferences, our CARIN deservingness scale focuses on the basic deservingness *principles* that underlie citizens' attitudes towards social welfare. Analysing survey data from the Belgian National Election Study 2014 (Abts, Swyngedouw, Meuleman, Baute and Galle, 2015) by means of Structural Equation Modelling (SEM), we (1) test the dimensionality, validity and reliability of our measurement instrument, and (2) verify to what extent the five deservingness principles play their ascribed pivotal role between social structure and policy preferences.

2. Theoretical background: Deservingness theory

2.1 The CARIN deservingness principles

The central claim of deservingness theory is that people's opinions about the deservingness of target groups are based on a limited number of basic *deservingness principles* that answer the question who should get what and why (Van Oorschot, 2000). These deservingness principles are rooted in the distinct logics of redistributive justice (Miller, 1999; Rothstein, 1998), namely equality, equity and need (Miller, 1999; Reeskens and Van Oorschot, 2013). While the equality principle states that everybody deserves the same, the other two redistributive principles provide a rationale for unequal distribution and targeting welfare to particular groups – only the truly needy in case of the need principle, and those who contribute in case of the principle of equity.

Deservingness theory takes the principles of redistributive justice as a point of departure, but adds two new angles. First, rather than formulating normative theories of justice, deservingness theory investigates how the general population uses justice principles to distinguish the deserving from the non-deserving. Second, deservingness theory provides a further elaboration of arguments that people may use to challenge the principle of equality and target solidarity towards specific groups (Clasen & Van Oorschot, 2002). Based on work by Cook (1979) and De Swaan (1988), Van Oorschot (2000) formulates an encompassing framework containing five basic deservingness criteria Control, Attitude, Reciprocity, Identity and Need (hence called CARIN criteria; Van Oorschot et al., 2017). Below, we explain the origins and underlying logic of the CARIN criteria.

According to the deservingness criterion of *need* (conceptually equivalent to the need principle in the redistributive justice literature), people are more willing to provide help if the intensity of the need is greater (Cook, 1979; Van Oorschot, 2000). The need principle refers to the right of necessity, that is, the right not to die of hunger and to be helped instead (Fleischacker, 2004). In terms of social policy, the need principle is often translated into making benefits conditional on means-testing (Marx, Salanauskaite and Verbist, 2016). De Swaan's (1988) concept of 'disability' adds that needy people are deserving of support if they also lack the control to improve their situation. Disability presupposes need, but in addition focuses on the ability of the person in need. Similarly, Cook's (1979) condition of 'locus of responsibility' stipulates people are perceived as more deserving when the need is caused by external situations beyond the victim's control. Van Oorschot (2000) summarized these ideas in the criterion of *control*, which can be traced back to the Lockean idea of justice that the people have a fundamental duty to provide for themselves (Fleischacker, 2004).

The conditions of 'docility' (De Swaan, 1988) or 'gratefulness' (Cook, 1979) imply that people who are grateful for being helped are seen as more deserving and are rooted in traditional Christian morality

that expects gratefulness and good behaviour of the poor (Fleischacker, 2004). Van Oorschot (2000) coined the criterion of *attitude* to denote that the public prefers beneficiaries who are compliant and thankful. A deeper conception of this idea is the principle that people should do something in return for their help, i.e. *reciprocity* (Cook, 1979; Van Oorschot, 2000). As some people do not have the resources to reciprocate, 'the smile of thanks' can function as a symbolic expression of gratefulness. Reciprocity can also be expressed in more direct forms, including helping others or making efforts to get out of the needy situation (Van Oorschot, 2000). Reciprocity as such echoes the concept of 'equity': contributing makes people entitled to receive. In social policy, reciprocity/equity underlies social insurance schemes that protect people from social risks as unemployment and sickness (Reeskens and Van Oorschot, 2013). Finally, the condition of proximity (De Swaan, 1988) states that we see those 'close to us' as more deserving. Proximity can take the form of kinship relations, place of residence or ingroup identification. Van Oorschot (2000) refers to this criterion as *identity*.

In sum, the five deservingness criteria constitute refined logics of social justice that people employ to challenge the notion of equality, and to argue why some (groups of) people are more deserving of support than others. Of crucial importance is that the deservingness criteria are not characteristics of target groups or benefit systems. Instead, the CARIN criteria are abstract moral principles that individuals adhere to varying degrees.

2.2 The link between deservingness principles and support for specific policies

The CARIN criteria function as abstract, trans-situational ideological logics that people use as a benchmark to evaluate concrete objects, such as particular distributional arrangements. As such, the endorsement of particular deservingness criteria plays a pivotal role in generating or eroding the support for social policies. This argument is in line with the ideology hypothesis stating that support for social policies is embedded in a broader system of ideological preferences that serve as guiding

principles in the process of attitude formation (Feldman and Zaller, 1992; Jaeger, 2006; Hasenfeld and Rafferty, 1989).

Which deservingness principles exhort (or block) support for a particular policy ultimately depends on the particular groups targeted and their presumed characteristics. To illustrate how support for concrete policies is rooted in different deservingness logics, we elaborate the case of four target groups (and policies) with widely diverging characteristics, namely the unemployed (unemployment benefits), the sick (healthcare), the elderly (old age pensions) and ethnic minorities (anti-discrimination policies).

Unemployment benefit systems provide financial support to people who are in principle able to acquire an income on the labour market, but are involuntarily out of work. The Achilles heel of support for unemployment benefits is precisely the involuntary character of the needy situation. Previous research found consistently that there are strong and negative stereotypes about the unemployed, portraying them as people who lack the willingness to look for a job (Albrekt Larsen, 2002; Dwyer, 2004; Golding and Middleton, 1992; Van Oorschot and Meuleman, 2014) and abuse the benefit (Roosma, Van Oorschot and Gelissen, 2016). These stereotypes feed into the idea that the unemployed are responsible for their needy situation (Albrekt Larsen and Dejgaard, 2013; Golding and Middleton, 1992). Broadly supported activation policies expect the unemployed to take more responsibility and comply with increasing number of behavioural conditions (Clasen and Clegg, 2007; Immervoll and Scarpetta, 2012; Watts and Fitzpatrick, 2018). The unemployed are expected to do something in return for their benefit (e.g. increasing job-seeking efforts and enhancing employability), or to perform voluntary work to repay society (Buss, Ebbinghaus and Naumann, 2017; Gielens, Roosma and Achterberg, forthcoming). The call for activation is thus voiced as a mixture of control, reciprocity and attitude arguments. As a result, support for unemployment benefits will be lower among individuals who attach a lot of importance to the deservingness criteria of control, reciprocity and attitude.

As sickness is often perceived as a need that is randomly caused, people consider the sick and disabled as very deserving (Jensen and Petersen, 2016). This is reflected in the fact that support for healthcare policies is high across countries (Missinne, Meuleman and Bracke, 2013). Current healthcare policies are often universal in their coverage and usually provide medical care irrespective of the cause of the disease or the financial means of patients, with as only criteria medical need. Although this type of need should be distinguished from financial need, many European healthcare systems are currently under strain due to increased healthcare expenditure and demographic aging, which triggers debates about deservingness of healthcare beneficiaries (Van der Aa, Hiligsmann, Paulus and Evers, 2017). People become increasingly aware that certain health care risks are non-random but related to socioeconomic status and lifestyle. Risky behaviour – such as smoking, bad eating habits or performing dangerous sports - is increasingly put forward to exclude some persons from publicly-paid healthcare (Brown, 2013). Emphasizing individual control over health conditions, people with unhealthy lifestyles (Van der Aa et al., 2017) and people suffering from diseases related to obesity and smoking (Jensen and Petersen, 2016) are considered less deserving of help. Moreover, financial means may be another reason to exclude people from publicly-paid care: people who can afford private care do not have to rely on public healthcare. Previous research showed that -after medical need- financial need was the most important reason to regard people deserving of healthcare services (Van der Aa et al., 2017). We thus expect that persons stressing the criteria of control and need are less supportive of policy effort in favour of the sick.

Pension systems are universal in the sense that they provide for large shares of the elderly, because it is assumed that this group cannot acquire an income on the labour market anymore. Support for providing a decent standard of living for the old is very high (Roosma et al., 2014). Citizens do see the challenges of population aging, but across Europe people rather want to increase taxes or extend working life than lowering pension levels (Velladics, Henkens, and Van Dalen, 2006). However, similar as in the case of healthcare, the viewpoint that social policies should target the lowest incomes

(Kangas, 1995) –i.e. the need criterion – could undermine support for publicly financed pensions. The other four CARIN criteria are less relevant in this case because nobody can be blamed for getting old, the elderly have contributed to society over the course of their lives, and elderly are perceived as grateful and close to us (Huddy, Jones and Chard, 2001; Van Oorschot, 2006). For that reason, support for public pension systems is probably not directly affected by the logics of control, reciprocity, attitude or identity.

Finally, policies targeting ethnic minority groups (e.g. anti-discrimination policies) are predominantly criticized from an identity perspective, juxtaposing us vs. them (Strolovitch, 1998). The identity logic implies that the ingroup should have priority over outgroups in the distribution of welfare (Kootstra, 2017; Reeskens and Van der Meer, 2018). A strong emphasis on identity as a deservingness criterion may therefore erode the support base of policies benefiting ethnic minorities.

These arguments imply that individuals' preferences regarding the level of policy effort vis-à-vis particular target groups depend on the CARIN criteria they endorse. At the same time, deservingness opinions are informed by the structural positions of individuals (Jeene, Van Oorschot and Uunk, 2013). As such, deservingness principles function as an ideological hatch between social structural positions and policy preferences.

2.3 Social structural differences in deservingness opinions

The deservingness framework furthermore stipulates that the importance given to the different deservingness criteria varies across social-structural categories (Van Oorschot and Roosma, 2017). Previous research (Jeene et al., 2013) suggested two competing theoretical expectations regarding the relationship between structural characteristics and deservingness opinions. The first perspective suggests that people in a weaker socio-economic position consider their *group risk* of becoming dependent of welfare and therefore they would favour easier access to welfare arrangements and

relying less on deservingness criteria to exclude people. The second perspective -for which Jeene et al. (2013) find empirical support- suggests instead, that people with weaker socio-economic positions feel that they are in *competition* as they fear that those relying on benefits might waste scarce resources of the welfare state. This perspective aligns with previous findings showing that the lower educated perceive higher levels of welfare abuse (Golding and Middleton, 1982; Roosma et al., 2016). It can therefore be expected that people with lower education, in lower social classes and with lower incomes are putting more emphasis on deservingness criteria in general, to exclude undeserving groups from redistribution (Jeene et al., 2013).

Conversely, people who actually receive welfare benefits (or have received benefits) are assumed to place less emphasis on the deservingness criteria (Jeene et al., 2013) out of self-interest. The argument is that people relying on benefits have a direct self-interest in keeping benefits more accessible and lowering the emphasis on deservingness criteria. Also, it can be expected that (former) benefit recipients have a higher level of empathy for other beneficiaries as they can more easily relate to their situation and reject the stereotypes they are personally confronted with.

Specifically, Jeene et al. (2013) argued that that people in weaker socio-economic positions place more weight on the criteria they fulfil themselves, as it would give them a competitive advantage. This reasoning suggests that in general, more vulnerable groups give more emphasis to the identity criterion, as it excludes those without citizenship or who are seen as 'others'. In addition, the elderly would place high emphasis on the criteria of control and reciprocity, as they contributed to society and they cannot be blamed for getting old (Van Oorschot, 2006). People who are not relying on benefits but do experience financial strain, are therefore expected to place more emphasis on need and reciprocity, as they contribute but not receive support even though they are in a rough position (Jeene et al. 2013).

3. Operationalizing deservingness opinions

3.1 Four current approaches in measuring deservingness

Numerous studies have assessed the claims of deservingness theory but show quite a variety of ways to conceptualize and operationalize deservingness. Our argument is that the lack of an agreed-upon measurement instrument seriously hampers progress in the field, and that current operationalizations are, from a conceptual point of view, not satisfactory. This section identifies the current measurement practices and the associated conceptual problems.

A first approach attempts to capture deservingness opinions by gauging preferences regarding the policies the government should develop regarding particular target groups. This *policy effort approach* does not measure the various logics of deservingness, but rather focuses on the preferred effort to provide welfare for different target groups. Based on these preferences, scholars construct rankings that are assumed to reflect which deservingness criteria receive the widest acclaim among the general public. A clear example is the study by Laenen and Meuleman (2017), who analyse respondents' preferred role of government for providing healthcare for the sick and a decent standard of living for the elderly and unemployed. The elderly figure at the top of this ranking, which is then interpreted as popular support for reciprocity (see also Jeene et al., 2014). This policy effort approach operationalizes deservingness by means of a proxy variable, namely support for particular policies. Or, as Meuleman et al. (2017: 347) put it: “[D]eservingness functions as a heuristic to explain preferences for differential policy efforts vis-à-vis various targets, rather than as a measured concept.” This practice is unsatisfactory because it rests on the assumption that individuals' policy preferences are fully determined by deservingness arguments (rather than empirically testing the link between deservingness principles and policy preferences).

Another approach taps into deservingness opinions by directly assessing the perceived deservingness of primary target groups (without reference to policies). This approach asks people whether they

believe particular groups are deserving of welfare (Kootstra, 2017) or how concerned they are with the living conditions of these groups (Van Oorschot, 2006). This *primary target group approach* focuses on the perceived deservingness of groups rather than the underlying deservingness principles. Again, the deservingness criteria are used as a heuristic to explain observed differences: Between-group deservingness differences are assumed to reflect the preference for particular criteria, but these criteria are not measured as such.

The *secondary target group approach* measures group-based perceived deservingness as well. However, respondents are asked to evaluate particular target groups that are placed in various situations (secondary targeting). The situations are chosen in such a way to elicit the CARIN criteria. For example, Jeene et al. (2013) compare the deservingness of disabled people who are disabled due to illness or injury at work with people who are disabled due to their own irresponsible behaviour (referring to control). A refined application consists of vignette experiments in which the circumstances and characteristics of the target group are varied randomly across respondents (Kootstra, 2016; Reeskens and Van der Meer, 2018). Van der Aa et al. (2017), for example, operationalize control as the lifestyle of a health care seeker, while De Wilde (2017) operationalizes the same criterion in terms of the educational attainment of a social assistance claimant. The randomization of vignettes across respondents allows making causal claims about the relation between the characteristics and the deservingness status of the benefit claimant, as well as examining the trade-off respondents make between the different criteria. The advantage of the secondary target group approach is that it involves less indirect measures of deservingness criteria compared to the first two approaches (Meuleman et al., 2017). A disadvantage is that it is extremely difficult to translate the criteria in adequate characteristics of circumstances that are mutually exclusive. Too often characteristics and circumstances contain aspects of multiple CARIN criteria simultaneously.

Fourth, the *public images approach* measures deservingness using statements regarding target groups that reflect whether they meet deservingness criteria. Baumberg Geiger (2017) measures the control criterion by the statement that unemployed people do not really enough efforts to find a job. Other examples are measures of poverty attributions (that is, whether poverty is caused by people's own wrongdoing or by structural causes; Albrekt Larsen, 2008), statements that welfare recipients take more out the system than they contribute (Kootstra, 2017), or items refering to the needy status or degree of control of social assistance benefits (Kallio & Kouvo, 2015; Blomberg et al. 2017). A critique is that this approach leads to conceptual confusion between respondents' perceptions of whether target groups meet particular criteria on the one hand, and opinions regarding whether criteria should be important on the other hand. The public images approach measures beliefs regarding whether beneficiaries lack control or do not have the right attitude, but does not capture to what extent respondents think that it should matter for deservingness. As such, it operationalizes group-based stereotypes rather than attachment to the different deservingness logics.

3.2 The CARIN deservingness principles scale

The four current approaches have in common that they do not operationalize the deservingness logics directly but measure proxy variables, such as policy support, the deservingness status of particular groups, or stereotypes regarding welfare beneficiaries. These conceptual differences are extremely relevant. People can support certain principles of deservingness (that is, which criteria should matter for granting people social rights) but make a different judgement about whether groups meet those criteria (deservingness perceptions), and what this should mean in terms of policy (policy preferences). The current approaches provide indirect clues about how strictly and strongly people apply the principles and norms of deservingness (Van Oorschot, 2000: 35), but also suffer from conceptual vagueness: Under the label of deservingness, a plethora of measures is used, which makes it difficult to reconcile the findings of previous research or to make comparisons across policy contexts.

To resolve this conceptual confusion, we propose an operationalization that focuses directly on the core of deservingness theory, namely the five CARIN criteria. This *deservingness principles approach* directly measures which abstract deservingness logics people find important for beneficiaries to be deserving of support.¹ Our CARIN deservingness principles scale is a multi-item survey instrument tapping into the five deservingness principles. Below, we describe, validate and apply the scale using survey data collected in Belgium. As a first step, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) is performed to verify the dimensionality and discriminant validity of the instrument. Conform deservingness theory, we *hypothesize to find five distinct dimensions corresponding to the CARIN criteria* (H1). In a next step, we assess the construct validity (Cronbach and Meehl, 1955) of the instrument by relating our measurements of deservingness principles to social-structural characteristics of individuals (H2a-H2e) and support for policy efforts for four target groups (the elderly, sick, unemployed and ethnic minorities) (H3a-H3d). The test of construct validity is guided by the following hypotheses (see section 2.2 for the underlying argumentation):

H2a: Those with lower education, lower social classes and those experiencing more financial strain show higher support for all deservingness principles (resource competition argument).

H2b: People who rely or have relied on benefits show lower support for all deservingness principles (self-interest argument).

H2c: Those with lower educated, lower social classes and those experiencing financial strain show specifically higher support for the identity principle (competitive advantage argument).

H2d: Elderly show specifically higher support for the control and reciprocity principles (competitive advantage argument).

H2e: Those experiencing more financial strain show specifically higher support for the need and reciprocity principles (competitive advantage argument).

¹ Kallio & Kouvo (2015) use five items to measure deservingness-related attitudes towards social assistance beneficiaries (see also Blomberg et al. 2017), some of which contain a direct measurement of deservingness principles as well.

H3a: Support for unemployment benefits is influenced by the deservingness principles of control, reciprocity and attitude.

H3b: Support for healthcare policies is influenced by the deservingness principles of need and control.

H3c: Support for old age pensions is influenced by the deservingness principle of need.

H3d: Support for anti-discrimination policies is influenced by the deservingness principle of identity.

4. Data and methods

4.1 Dataset

We analyse data from the 2014 Belgian National Election Study (Abts et al., 2015), a post-electoral survey fielded among a register-based probability sample of Belgian adults entitled to vote. Respondents were interviewed by means of a CAPI (computer assisted personal interview) survey (response rate: 47%). After the CAPI survey respondents were asked to fill out a self-completion, drop-off questionnaire (returned by 74% of the initial respondents). Since the measurements of the deservingness principles are spread out over the face-to-face and drop-off questionnaire, our sample includes only respondents that completed both parts (N = 1400). To correct for differential non-response, all results are post-stratified for age, gender and education.

4.2 Deservingness principles scale

To measure the *deservingness principles*, we developed multi-item batteries capturing the importance people attach to the various logics of deservingness, namely control, attitude, reciprocity, attitude and need. The items are five-point Likert-type statements (1 = disagree completely to 5 = agree completely). To capture the principles of deservingness, the statements gauge respondents' views on requirement that could be imposed for having access to social benefits and services. Note that this is a crucially different approach compared to measuring respondents' perceptions regarding the

characteristics of target groups. Because we are interested in the underlying logics, the statements are formulated as much as possible in abstract terms. However, to reduce question difficulty for the respondent, some reference to concrete policy schemes or target groups cannot be avoided. The question wording is included in Table 1. The *control* principle is measured by means of two statements referring to the question whether individuals who are personally responsible for their needy situation should be entitled to social welfare (D8_2 & D8_3). *Attitude* is operationalized via two statements mentioning that benefit recipients should be grateful (D9_1) and have no right to complain (D9_3), as opposed to welfare being a social right. The importance of *reciprocity* is measured by statements mentioning that access to welfare should depend on past contributions (Q102_1 & Q102_4) and that it is unfair when non-contributors make use of benefits (Q102_2). The principle of *identity* refers to the idea that the scarce resources of the welfare state should be directed primarily to members of the ingroup. Although in principle numerous characteristics could be used to delineate group boundaries, welfare-related identity discussions in contemporary Western societies focus on immigrants. Therefore, we operationalized identity by means of three indicators tapping into the argument that newcomers should (or should not) be given the same access to social welfare as natives (Q122_2, Q122_4 & Q122_5). Finally, we measure the *need* criterion by means of three items stating that the resources of the welfare state should be reserved for those living in poverty (Q101_1 & Q101_3) and that those with personal financial reserves should be excluded (Q101_2).

4.3 Testing construct validity: Measures of policy effort and social-structural positions

We operationalize the preferred *policy effort* by four items that ask respondents whether the government should be responsible for the wellbeing of particular vulnerable target groups (Roller, 1995), namely the elderly (Q53: '*Making sure the elderly have a reasonable pension.*'), the sick (Q54: '*Making sure there is affordable health care for all.*'), the unemployed (Q55: '*Making sure that the unemployed have a reasonable standard of living.*') and ethnic minorities (Q56: '*Making sure that ethnic minorities are not discriminated against.*'). 11-point scales are used to register preferences for

government intervention (0 - no responsibility to 10 - full responsibility). In order to make visible how deservingness logics are differentially applied to various target groups, we analyse these items as single indicators rather than creating a scale. The correlations between the policy efforts range from 0.230 (elderly and ethnic minorities) to 0.534 (elderly and sick), which guarantees that they contain sufficient unique variance.

To capture respondents' *social-structural position*, we use a variety of indicators, such as gender, age (in three categories: 18-34, 35-64 and over 65 years), and the educational level (none or primary; lower secondary; higher secondary; tertiary). Employment status is based on the Erikson-Goldthorpe-Portocarero (EGP) class scheme, and distinguishes between (1) executive professionals; (2) white-collar workers; (3) self-employed; (4) skilled manual workers; (5) unskilled manual workers; and (6) the economically inactive. A dummy is included to indicate whether someone in the household of the respondent received social security benefits (social assistance or unemployment benefit; pensions not included) over the past two years. Finally, perceptions of financial strain are measured by means of four indicators. One item is a subjective evaluation of the present income (Q97) while three others refer to future financial insecurity.

Descriptive statistics of all variables and a CFA analysis for financial insecurity can be found in Appendix.

4.4 Statistical modelling

We make use of Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) in various steps. First, we validate our newly-developed measurement instrument for deservingness principles using CFA. Subsequently, the mediating role of deservingness principles between social structure and policy preferences is investigated – Figure 1 represents the tested model.

All models are estimated using *Mplus* 7.11. The ordered-categorical nature of certain indicators is taken into account by using the robust weighted least squares estimator (WLSMV). To deal with the limited amount of item non-response, pairwise deletion is used to calculate the covariance structure (as a result, the full information available in the dataset is retained). The reported parameters are standardized, apart from the effects of the dummy variables, which are semi-standardized. As a result, the effects of dummy variables refer to the difference with the reference category in terms of standard deviations on the dependent variable.

5. Results

5.1 Validating the CARIN deservingness principles scale

The first step in this analysis consists of testing the reliability and validity of the CARIN deservingness principles scale. To assess the dimensionality and measurement quality, we formulated a CFA model with five factors (one per deservingness principles) - see Table 1. We specify correlations between the factors (meaning that the deservingness logics are distinct but connected) but do not include cross-loadings or error correlations (representing that the various items should be clear-cut indicators of the factor they are intended to measure). The resulting model has a very good fit, as the Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA; 0.044) is lower than cut-off criterion 0.06, while the Comparative Fit Index (CFI; 0.982) and Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI; 0.974) are sufficiently close to 1. Clearly, the five-dimensional structure provides an appropriate description of the correlations between the indicators. All factor loadings are quite strong (all $>.60$; most $>.70$), which implies that the indicators can be considered as sufficiently valid and reliable indicators of the deservingness principles they are intended to measure.

All correlations between the five factors are positive. Persons emphasizing one particular criterion are thus also more likely to endorse the other principles. Yet, the size of the correlations shows remarkable differences. The strongest correlation is found between the control and attitude principles (0.594).

Stressing the role of individual responsibility easily leads to questioning the grateful and submissive attitude of welfare beneficiaries. After all, a ‘correct attitude’ implies maximal effort to get out of the needy situation. An almost equally strong correlation is found for reciprocity and identity (0.577). The exclusion of outgroup members (in this case: immigrants) from the solidarity circle goes hand in hand with a strong emphasis on the need to reciprocate. Apparently, perceptions that immigrants do not contribute to welfare feed into exclusionary attitudes towards this group. The need criterion shows least overlap with the other deservingness principles (correlations $<.20$). Notwithstanding the correlations between the factors, the CFA model confirms that the five deservingness principles constitute empirically distinct logics of redistributive justice (thus supporting H1).

TABLE 1 SOMEWHERE HERE

5.2 Deservingness principles as mediator between social structure and policy preferences

In this section, we test if the five deservingness factors fulfil their expected mediating role between social structure and policy preferences (see the model depicted in Figure 1). In doing so, we not only test the construct validity of the CARIN measurement scale, but also provide insight in the antecedents and consequences of deservingness opinions. To reduce model complexity, we decided to trim the model (i.e., the insignificant paths were removed;² Brown, 2014). The resulting model has an excellent fit (RMSEA = 0.024; CFI = 0.973; TLI = 0.965).

FIGURE 1 SOMEWHERE HERE

Table 2 shows how various demographic and socio-economic indicators are related to support for the deservingness principles. The strongest effects are found for educational attainment. With exception

² In case of categorical variables, trimming is only applied if all dummies yield insignificant effects.

of the need criterion, all deservingness principles exhibit a clear educational gradient. The lower educated are more strongly convinced that access to social welfare should depend on personal responsibility, a docile attitude, previous contribution and ingroup status. Especially for the reciprocity, attitude and identity principles, educational differences are outspoken. The lowest educational category scores respectively 0.630, 0.501 and 0.425 standard deviations lower than those with a tertiary degree. This shows that our hypothesis H2a is specifically accepted for the lower educated, who in general favour deservingness-related conditionality. People in lower classes and with lower incomes rather display support for specific deservingness principles. When a more clear-cut indicator of rational interests in welfare is considered –namely benefit reciprocity- effects are in line with self-interest theory (partly supporting H2b): in households that have experience with benefit reciprocity, the logics of attitude and reciprocity are significantly less popular (Jeene et al., 2013). Regarding social class, a complex pattern of differences is retrieved. Support for the identity criterion is most clearly structured along class lines, which (partly) supports the competitive advantage argument (H2c). Manual workers and the self-employed are most supportive of restricting social welfare to the ingroup of native citizens, while executive professionals attach least importance to the identity criterion. Regarding the other deservingness principles, it is mostly the self-employed who occupy a distinct position: The self-employed not only score high on the identity criterion, but also tend to emphasize the logics of control, attitude and need. Also those reporting more financial strain put more emphasis on the identity principle (H2c), and in addition endorse the reciprocity principle, which partly supports the competitive advantage argument (H2e).

Demographic indicators, finally, have only very limited impact on deservingness opinions. The oldest age group (65 years and older) is more convinced of the importance of control and identity (which partly supports the competitive advantage argument, H2d), while females are less supportive of the identity principle.

This analysis shows that social-structural characteristics have a rather limited but differentiated impact: The structural support base of the distinct deservingness logics only overlaps partly. The contrast between the identity and need criterion is exemplary. The idea that social welfare should in the first place be directed at the native population is socially highly structured, and most prevalent among the lower educated and manual workers. That these groups score high on anti-immigrant sentiments is also known from the literature on ethnic group conflict (Kunovich, 2004). The social-structural characteristics explain almost 20% of the variation in the identity criterion but only 4.5% of the variation in support for the need principle. The idea of a residual welfare state, in which social benefits and services are reserved for the poorest only, is almost evenly distributed across social categories.

****TABLE 2 SOMEWHERE HERE****

Table 3 displays the significant direct effects on support for policies targeting four vulnerable groups, namely the elderly, sick, unemployed and ethnic minorities. Most importantly, we find that the deservingness principles influence support for specific target groups in theoretically meaningful and distinct ways. Support for the unemployed depends primarily of the importance one attaches to the criteria of reciprocity ($b = -0.135$) and attitude ($b = -0.232$) (partly confirming hypothesis H3b). Individuals stressing that welfare should be reserved for those who have contributed and display a compliant attitude are less likely to back policies favouring the unemployed. This is not surprising, since public discourses often blame the unemployed for not reciprocating and being not-compliant (Dwyer, 2004). Based on popular imagery of the unemployed as being lazy and not trying to find a job, we would have expected to find an effect of control as well. Yet this expectation is not confirmed.

Not surprisingly, support for policies benefiting ethnic minorities are primarily structured by the logic of identity (hypothesis H3d). Endorsement of the identity criterion strongly decreases support for anti-

discrimination policies ($b = -0.264$). Also, the attitude principle is found to undermine support for policies benefiting minorities ($b = -0.141$). The effect of attitude (and identity) on anti-discrimination policy may be related to the fact that in public discourses ethnic minorities are, similarly to the unemployed, often blamed for the abuse and overuse of collective welfare. The so-called guests are not acting according to the logic of hospitality and not obeying the rules of docile compliance, gratitude and loyalty towards the hosting welfare state.

Although hypotheses H3a and H3b are confirmed, effects of deservingness criteria on support for policies favouring the elderly and sick are considerably smaller. In popular opinion, deservingness logics are less often applied to question the social rights of the elderly and the sick, which is consistent with the popularity of policies benefiting these groups (Missinne et al., 2013; Roosma et al., 2014; Velladics, Henkens and Van Dalen, 2006). In the case of the sick, a relatively small effect of control is found: Persons convinced that welfare provision should factor in personal responsibility are slightly less supportive of the idea that government is responsible for healthcare ($b = -0.064$). This control effect resonates public discussions on whether unhealthy behaviour –such as smoking, drinking or harmful nutritional patterns- should limit one's right to publicly funded healthcare (Brown, 2013). The need criterion has a negative effect on preferred policy efforts in favour of the elderly and the sick. Favouring a welfare system targeted at the poorest segments only undercuts support for the elderly ($b = -0.133$) and the sick ($b = -0.144$). This is hardly surprising, provided that pension and health care systems are *par excellence* universal branches of the welfare state of which also the more well-off make use. Interestingly, for policies that are beneficial to ethnic minorities we find a positive effect of need ($b = 0.066$). Favouring need-based welfare provision becomes an argument to support ethnic minorities, who are strongly overrepresented in the lower socio-economic strata.

Only few direct effects of social-structural characteristics on policy preferences are significant. Controlling for deservingness principles, persons over 65 years of age are (not surprisingly) more

supportive of policies favouring the elderly and the sick, but also of unemployment benefits. Furthermore, benefit recipients have a stronger preference for government intervention in favour of the unemployed. Finally, those reporting more financial strain are more likely to support policies favouring the elderly and the unemployed.

****TABLE 3 SOMEWHERE HERE****

5. Discussion and conclusion

Remarkably, most recent deservingness studies do not try to measure the support for deservingness principles directly, but rather use proxy-variables or employ deservingness as a heuristic to interpret findings regarding the support for targeting particular beneficiaries. The lack of an agreed-upon strategy to operationalize deservingness opinions is highly problematic: The diversity of measurement approaches impedes the accumulation of knowledge across studies and forms a serious obstacle to comparisons of findings across temporal, geographical or policy contexts. This article has the purpose to stimulate the debate on the operationalization of deservingness opinions by (1) clarifying conceptual differences between the current measurement approaches; (2) proposing a new multi-item instrument -the CARIN deservingness principles scale– that operationalizes the five deservingness principles; and (3) validating this scale using data from the BNES 2014.

Our analysis confirms that the five deservingness principles are distinct dimensions that are differently rooted in social structural characteristics and have divergent consequences for policy preferences. The finding of differentiated patterns that are theoretically meaningful illustrates that the CARIN criteria represent theoretically distinct logics of social justice, and corroborates that our measurement instrument is capable of tapping into the essence of these criteria. Our direct measurement of deservingness principles has the advantage of conceptual clarity and offers a good vantage point to

bring together the scattered findings in current deservingness research and to substantiate more fine-grained interpretations of the origins of welfare support.

In this respect, our analysis yields important insights into the role of deservingness as a mediator between social structural positions and policy preferences. The results demonstrate that some groups are more prone to support particular logics of deservingness. Especially the lower educated favour applying deservingness-related restrictions to social rights, based on the control, reciprocity, attitude and identity principles. Among individuals having (indirect) experiences with benefit dependency, the principles of attitude and reciprocity are significantly less popular, following a self-interest logic. Support for the identity principle is clearly patterned along social-structural lines. People with lower socioeconomic statuses are more willing to exclude 'others' from welfare benefits, as it would provide themselves with a competitive advantage. Some deservingness principles seem to partially overlap, where others operate independently. Support for applying the need criterion in targeting benefits is hardly related to support for other deservingness principles. This confirms previous studies that have suggested that 'need' follows an independent logic as principle of distributive justice (Fleischacker, 2004; Jensen and Bang Petersen, 2017) and precedes other deservingness criteria as control and identity (De Swaan, 1988). Contrary to other deservingness principles, need does not show a clear educational gradient. The other deservingness principles are distinct as well, but overlap to a certain extent in their structural basis and policy consequences. This explains why other operationalisations of deservingness criteria often fail to make clear-cut distinctions between criteria (as control and attitude; or reciprocity and identity) and to interpret the findings unambiguously.

By introducing the deservingness principles as mediating factors between structural position and support for various welfare policies we can better understand the underlying mechanisms why some policies (old age pensions and health care) can rely on very high levels of support, while the legitimacy of unemployment benefits is constantly questioned, even among people with a potential high interest

in these benefits. The inclusion of measurements of the deservingness principles has been one of the missing links in research into the counterintuitive relationship between social structural positions to policy support.

There also remain open questions regarding the impact of social-structural factors on deservingness opinions. One is the question how we should interpret the strong educational gradient in endorsement for deservingness principles. Do lower educated feel in competition with those relying benefits (as the theory suggest) or - does the strong educational gradient suggests that lower educated have a particular normative worldview that includes distaste for deservingness-based targeting in welfare provision? The same goes for the self-employed, who strongly support for selective targeting based on deservingness criteria. Future research is needed to further explore the role of structural characteristics of individuals, and in addition to investigate how support for the deservingness principles is linked to dimensions of (cultural) values and ideological preferences.

Our study contends with several limitations and leaves much to explore. Although the measurement validity of the CARIN scale is demonstrated, certain decisions in regard to the substantive formulation of some items can be criticized. To facilitate understanding of the items by the respondent, the deservingness principles were not formulated in completely abstract terms but instead to policies and target groups. Although the items clearly refer to the principles that should underlie redistribution according to the respondent, the reference to target groups and policies might contaminate the items and establish unwanted links with measurements of public images and/or policy preferences. Furthermore, our decision to graft the identity criterion fully on the question of migration background risks missing other important dimensions of identity. Efforts to include a broader conceptualization of the identity principle in the scale are welcomed. Finally, it remains to be investigated systematically

whether the body of knowledge that was accumulated by previous studies using proxy measures can be confirmed if deservingness principles are measured directly.

References

- Abts K, Swyngedouw M, Meuleman B., Baute S and Galle, J (2015) *Belgian National Election Study 2014: Codebook: Questions and Frequency tables*.
- Albrekt Larsen C (2002) Unemployment and stigmatization: the dilemma of the welfare state. In: Goul Andersen J and Halvorsen K (eds) *Unemployment and citizenship: marginalization and integration in the Nordic countries*. Bristol: Policy Press, 55-72.
- Albrekt Larsen C (2008) The institutional logic of welfare attitudes: How welfare regimes influence public support. *Comparative Political Studies* 41(2): 145-168. doi: 10.1177/0010414006295234
- Albrekt Larsen C and Dejgaard TE (2013) The institutional logic of images of the poor and welfare recipients: A comparative study of British, Swedish and Danish newspapers. *Journal of European Social Policy* 23(3): 287-299.
- Applebaum LD (2001) The influence of perceived deservingness on policy decisions regarding aid to the poor. *Political Psychology* 22(3): 419-442. doi: 10.1111/0162-895X.00248
- Bang Petersen M, Slothuus R, Stubager R and Togeby L (2011) Deservingness versus values in public opinion on welfare: The automaticity of the deservingness heuristic. *European Journal of Political Research* 50(1): 24-52. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6765.2010.01923.x
- Baumberg Geiger B (2017). False beliefs and the perceived deservingness of social security benefit claimants. In: Van Oorschot W, Roosma F, Meuleman B and Reeskens T. (Eds) *The social legitimacy of targeted welfare: Attitudes to welfare deservingness*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp 73-92.
- Blomberg H, Kallio J, Kangas O, Kroll C and Niemelä M (2017) Social assistance deservingness and policy measures: Attitudes of Finnish politicians, administrators and citizens. In: Van Oorschot W, Roosma F, Meuleman B and Reeskens T. (Eds) *The social legitimacy of targeted welfare: Attitudes to welfare deservingness*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp 209-224.
- Brown RCH (2013) Moral responsibility for (un)healthy behaviour. *Journal of Medical Ethics*. doi: 10.1136/medethics-2012-100774
- Brown TA (2014) *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York: Guilford Publications.
- Buss C, Ebbinghaus B and Naumann E (2017) Support for the conditionality of unemployment benefits in 23 European countries, 1990-2008. In: Van Oorschot W, Roosma F, Meuleman B and Reeskens T. (Eds) *The social legitimacy of targeted welfare: Attitudes to welfare deservingness*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp 167-188.
- Clasen J and Clegg D (2007) Levels and levers of conditionality: Measuring change within welfare states. In: Clasen J and Siegel NA (eds) *Investigating welfare state change. The 'dependent variable problem' in comparative analysis*. Cheltenham/Northampton: Edward Elgar, 166-197.

- Clasen J and Van Oorschot W (2002) Changing Principles in European Social Security. *European Journal of Social Security* 4(2): 89-115. doi: 10.1023/a:1020520321533
- Cook FL (1979) *Who should be helped? Public support for social services*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Coughlin R (1980) *Ideology, public opinion and welfare policy; attitudes towards taxes and spending in industrial societies*. Berkely: University of California Press.
- Cronbach LJ and Meehl PE (1955) Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological bulletin* 52(4): 281. doi: 10.1037/h0040957
- De Koster W, Achterberg P and Van der Waal J (2013) The new right and the welfare state: The electoral relevance of welfare chauvinism and welfare populism in the Netherlands. *International Political Science Review* 34(1): 3-20. doi: 10.1177/0192512112455443
- De Swaan A (1988) *In care of the state: Health care, education, and welfare in Europe and the USA in the modern era*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Wilde M (2017) Deservingness in social assistance administrative practice: A factorial survey approach. In: Van Oorschot W, Roosma F, Meuleman B and Reeskens T. (Eds) *The social legitimacy of targeted welfare: Attitudes to welfare deservingness*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp 225-240.
- Dwyer P (2004) Creeping conditionality in the UK: from welfare rights to conditional entitlements? *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 29(2): 265-287. doi: 10.1353/cjs.2004.0022
- Feldman S and Zaller J (1992) The political culture of ambivalence: Ideological responses to the welfare state. *American Journal of Political Science* 36: 268-307.
- Fleischacker S (2004) *A short history of distributive justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gielens, E, Roosma, F and Achterberg, P (forthcoming) Deservingness in the eye of the beholder: A vignette study on the moderating role of cultural profiles in supporting activation policies. *International Journal of Social Welfare*. doi: 10.1111/ijsw.12392
- Golding P and Middleton S. (1982) *Images of welfare: Press and public attitudes to poverty*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hasenfeld Y and Rafferty JA (1989) The determinants of public attitudes toward the welfare state. *Social Forces*, 67(4): 1027-1048.
- Huddy L, Jones JM and Chard RE (2001) Compassionate politics: Support for old-age programs among the non elderly. *Political Psychology* 22(3): 443-471. doi: 10.1111/0162-895X.00249
- Jaeger MM (2006) What Makes People Support Public Responsibility for Welfare Provision: Self-interest or Political Ideology? *Acta Sociologica* 49(3): 321-338.

- Jeene M, Van Oorschot W and Uunk W (2013) Popular criteria for the welfare deservingness of disability pensioners: The influence of structural and cultural factors. *Social Indicators Research* 110(3): 1103-1117. doi: 10.1007/s11205-011-9974-7
- Jeene M, Van Oorschot W and Uunk W (2014) The dynamics of welfare opinions in changing economic, institutional and political contexts: An empirical analysis of Dutch Deservingness opinions, 1975–2006. *Social Indicators Research* 115(2): 731-749. doi: 10.1007/s11205-012-0230-6
- Jensen C and Bang Petersen M (2017) The Deservingness Heuristic and the Politics of Health Care. *American Journal of Political Science* 61(1): 68-83. doi: doi:10.1111/ajps.12251
- Kangas OE. (1995) Attitudes on means-tested social benefits in Finland. *Acta Sociologica* 38(4): 299-310.
- Kootstra A (2016) Deserving and undeserving welfare claimants in Britain and the Netherlands: Examining the role of ethnicity and migration status using a vignette experiment. *European Sociological Review* 32(3): 325-338. doi: 10.1093/esr/jcw010
- Kootstra A (2017) Us versus them: Examining the perceived deservingness of minority groups in the British welfare state using a survey experiment. In: Van Oorschot W, Roosma F, Meuleman B and Reeskens T. (Eds) *The social legitimacy of targeted welfare: Attitudes to welfare deservingness*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp 263-280.
- Kallio J and Kouvo A (2015) Street-level bureaucrats' and general public's deservingness perceptions of the social assistance recipients in Finland. *Social Policy & Administration* 49(3): 316–334.
- Kunovich RM (2004) Social structural position and prejudice: An exploration of cross-national differences in regression slopes. *Social Science Research* 33(1): 20-44. doi: 10.1016/S0049-089X(03)00037-1
- Laenen T and Meuleman B (2017) A universal rank order of deservingness? Geographical, temporal and social-structural comparisons. In: Van Oorschot W, Roosma F, Meuleman B and Reeskens T. (Eds) *The social legitimacy of targeted welfare: Attitudes to welfare deservingness*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp 37-54.
- Marx I, Salanauskaite L and Verbist G (2016) For the poor, but not only the poor: On optimal pro-poorness in redistributive policies. *Social Forces* 95(1): 1-24. doi: 10.1093/sf/sow058
- Mau S (2003) *The moral economy of welfare states: Britain and Germany compared*. London: Routledge.
- Meuleman B, Roosma F and Van Oorschot W (2017) Evaluating the fruitfulness of deservingness theory. In: Van Oorschot W, Roosma F, Meuleman B and Reeskens T. (Eds) *The social legitimacy of targeted welfare: Attitudes to welfare deservingness*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp 335-351.
- Miller D (1999) *Principles of social justice*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

- Missinne S, Meuleman B and Bracke P (2013) The popular legitimacy of European healthcare systems: a multilevel analysis of 24 countries. *Journal of European Social Policy* 23(3): 231-247. doi: 10.1177/0958928713480065
- Reeskens T and van der Meer T (2018) The inevitable deservingness gap: A study into the insurmountable immigrant penalty in perceived welfare deservingness. *Journal of European Social Policy*. doi: 10.1177/0958928718768335
- Reeskens T and Van Oorschot W (2013) Equity, equality, or need? A study of popular preferences for welfare redistribution principles across 24 European countries. *Journal of European Public Policy* 20(8): 1174-1195. doi: 10.1080/13501763.2012.752064
- Roller E (1995). The welfare state: The equality dimension. In: Borre O and Scarbrough E (eds.) *The scope of government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roosma F, Van Oorschot W and Gelissen J (2014) The preferred role and perceived performance of the welfare state: European welfare attitudes from a multidimensional perspective. *Social Science Research* 44: 200-210. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2013.12.005
- Roosma F, Van Oorschot W and Gelissen J (2016) The Achilles' heel of welfare state legitimacy: perceptions of overuse and underuse of social benefits in Europe. *Journal of European Public Policy* 23(2): 177-196. doi: 10.1080/13501763.2015.1031157
- Rothstein B (1998) *Just institutions matter: The moral and political logic of the universal welfare state*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Strolovitch DZ. (1998) Playing favorites: public attitudes toward race-and gender-targeted anti-discrimination policy. *NWSA Journal* 10(3): 27-53.
- Van der Aa M, Hilgsmann M, Paulus A and Evers S (2017) Healthcare deservingness opinions of the general public and policymakers compared: A discrete choice experiment. In: Van Oorschot W, Roosma F, Meuleman B and Reeskens T. (Eds) *The social legitimacy of targeted welfare: Attitudes to welfare deservingness*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp.241-262.
- Van der Waal J, Achterberg P and Houtman D (2007) Class is not dead—it has been buried alive: class voting and cultural voting in postwar western societies (1956–1990). *Politics & Society* 35(3): 403-426. doi: 10.1177/0032329207304314
- Van Oorschot W (2000) Who should get what, and why? On deservingness criteria and the conditionality of solidarity among the public. *Policy & Politics* 28(1): 33-48. doi: 10.1332/0305573002500811
- Van Oorschot W (2006) Making the difference in social Europe: deservingness perceptions among citizens of European welfare states. *Journal of European Social Policy* 16(1): 23-42. doi: 10.1177/0958928706059829

- Van Oorschot W and Meuleman B. (2014) Popular deservingness of the unemployed in the context of welfare state policies, economic conditions and cultural climate. In: Kumlin S and Stadelmann-Steffen I (eds) *How welfare states shape the democratic public: Policy feedback, participation, voting, and attitudes*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 244-268.
- Van Oorschot W and Roosma F (2017) The social legitimacy of targeted welfare and welfare deservingness. In: Van Oorschot W, Roosma F, Meuleman B and Reeskens T. (Eds) *The social legitimacy of targeted welfare: Attitudes to welfare deservingness*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 3-36.
- Van Oorschot W, Roosma F, Meuleman B and Reeskens T (2017) *The social legitimacy of targeted welfare: Attitudes on welfare deservingness*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Velladics K, Henkens K and Van Dalen HP (2006) Do different welfare states engender different policy preferences? Opinions on pension reforms in Eastern and Western Europe. *Ageing & Society* 26(3): 475-495. doi: doi:10.1017/S0144686X05004551
- Watts B and Fitzpatrick S. (2018) *Welfare Conditionality*, London: Routledge.

Table 1. Parameter estimates of the CFA model for 5 deservingness principles (N = 1400)

Factor loadings		<i>Control</i>	<i>Attitude</i>	<i>Reciprocity</i>	<i>Identity</i>	<i>Need</i>
d8_2	People who fall into poverty because of their own mistakes should be entitled to a living wage of the OCMW.	-0.747				
d8_3	People who are themselves to blame for their problems do not deserve any social security.	0.630				
d9_1	People on benefits should show more gratitude.		0.697			
d9_3	People who receive a living wage should be pleased about this and do not have any right to complain.		0.756			
q102_1	Social security should be reserved for those who have contributed to collective prosperity.			0.795		
q102_2	It is not fair that people receive social benefits to which they have not contributed.			0.820		
q102_4	People who have worked and contributed in the past deserve better social services than people who have contributed little or nothing.			0.632		
q122_2	Only people whose parents are Belgians are entitled to social services and benefits.				0.812	
q122_4	When granting social benefits, people who have been born here should get priority over people who have not been born here.				0.768	
q122_5	Migrants should be allowed to enjoy the same social services as Belgians.				-0.668	
q101_1	Social security should only be available to those who truly live in poverty.					0.661
q101_2	People with sufficient financial reserves should not receive social benefits.					0.678
q101_3	Only people in dire need may receive social benefits.					0.937
Correlations between latent factors		<i>Control</i>	<i>Attitude</i>	<i>Reciprocity</i>	<i>Identity</i>	<i>Need</i>
	<i>Control</i>	1.000				
	<i>Attitude</i>	0.598	1.000			
	<i>Reciprocity</i>	0.493	0.431	1.000		
	<i>Identity</i>	0.510	0.408	0.577	1.000	
	<i>Need</i>	0.063	0.161	0.333	0.249	1.000
Model fit: Chi2 = 206.55 Df = 55 RMSEA = 0.044 CFI = 0.982 TLI = 0.974						

Results are weighted for age, gender and education.

Figure 1. Structural equation model with deservingness principles as mediating factor between social background and policy preferences

Table 2. Direct effects of social-structural variables on deservingness principles (N=1400)

		Control		Attitude		Reciprocity		Identity		Need
Gender										
	Male (ref.cat.)									
	Female							-0.240 ***		
Age										
	18-34	0.002						-0.109		
	35-65(ref.cat.)									
	65+	0.398 ***						0.242 **		
Education										
	None / lower secondary	0.353 *		0.501 **		0.630 ***		0.450 **		0.310 *
	Lower secondary	0.279 *		0.312 **		0.434 ***		0.551 ***		0.328 **
	Higher secondary	0.296 **		0.242 **		0.352 ***		0.372 ***		0.044
	Tertiary (ref.cat.)									
Employment status										
	Service class (ref.cat.)									
	Routine non-manual	0.150		-0.015				0.193 *		0.163
	Self-employed	0.328 *		0.542 ***				0.467 ***		0.306 *
	Skilled manual	0.294		0.255				0.422 **		0.275
	Unskilled manual	0.110		0.122				0.414 ***		0.178
	Retired & non-active	-0.004		-0.058				0.229		0.351 **
Benefit reciprocity										
	Yes			-0.240 **		-0.236 **				
	No (ref.cat.)									
Financial strain						0.107 **		0.113 **		
Explained variance		8.2%		7.9%		6.8%		19.5%		4.5%
Model fit		Chi-square: 633.46; Df: 350; RMSEA: 0.024; CFI: 0.973; TLI: 0.965								

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Note: The parameters displayed are semi-standardized when the independent variable is a dummy (thus representing the difference with the reference category in terms of standard deviations of the dependent variable) and fully standardized in all other cases. The analysis is weighted for gender, age and education.

Table 3. Direct effects of social-structural variables and deservingness principles on preferred policy effort in favour of the elderly, sick, unemployed and ethnic minorities (N=1400)

		<i>Policy effort: elderly</i>	<i>Policy effort: healthcare</i>	<i>Policy effort: unemployed</i>	<i>Policy effort: ethnic minorities</i>
Gender					
	<i>Male (ref.cat.)</i>				
	<i>Female</i>				
Age					
	<i>18-34</i>	-0.195 *	-0.128	-0.228 **	
	<i>35-65(ref.cat.)</i>				
	<i>65+</i>	0.177 *	0.240 **	0.179 *	
Education					
	<i>None / lower secondary</i>				
	<i>Lower secondary</i>				
	<i>Higher secondary</i>				
	<i>Tertiary (ref.cat.)</i>				
Employment status					
	<i>Service class (ref.cat.)</i>				
	<i>Routine non-manual</i>			-0.139	
	<i>Self-employed</i>			-0.175	
	<i>Skilled manual</i>			-0.076	
	<i>Unskilled manual</i>			-0.053	
	<i>Retired & non-active</i>			0.206	
Benefit reciprocity					
	<i>Yes</i>			0.219 **	
	<i>No (ref.cat.)</i>				
Financial strain		0.138 ***	0.046	0.099 **	
Control			-0.064 *		
Attitude				-0.232 ***	-0.141 ***
Reciprocity				-0.135 ***	
Identity					-0.264 ***
Need		-0.133 ***	-0.144 ***		0.066 *
Explained variance		4.7%	3.7%	13.2%	11.2%
Model fit	Chi-square: 633.46; Df: 350; RMSEA: 0.024; CFI: 0.973; TLI: 0.965				

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Note: The parameters displayed are semi-standardized when the independent variable is a dummy (thus representing the difference with the reference category in terms of standard deviations of the dependent variable) and fully standardized in all other cases. The analysis is weighted for gender, age and education.

Appendix 1. Descriptive statistics

	N	%
Gender		
<i>male</i>	713	50.82
<i>female (ref.cat.)</i>	690	49.18
<i>Total</i>	1403	100.00
Age		
<i>18-34 years</i>	275	19.60
<i>35-64 years (ref.cat.)</i>	786	56.02
<i>Over 65 years</i>	342	24.38
<i>Total</i>	1403	100.00
Education		
<i>None / lower secondary</i>	128	9.12
<i>Lower secondary</i>	256	18.25
<i>Higher secondary</i>	452	32.22
<i>Tertiary (ref.cat.)</i>	567	40.41
<i>Total</i>	1403	100.00
Employment status		
<i>Service class (ref.cat.)</i>	430	30.67
<i>Routine non-manual</i>	306	21.83
<i>Self-employed</i>	129	9.20
<i>Skilled manual</i>	124	8.84
<i>Unskilled manual</i>	271	19.33
<i>Retired & non-active</i>	142	10.13
<i>Total</i>	1402	100.00
Benefit reciprocity		
<i>Yes</i>	337	24.05
<i>No (ref.cat.)</i>	1064	75.95
<i>Total</i>	1401	100.00

		<i>Completely disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Completely Agree</i>	<i>N</i>
d8_2	People who fall into poverty because of their own mistakes should be entitled to a living wage of the OCMW.	4.5	17.9	29.4	42.6	5.8	1389
d8_3	People who are themselves to blame for their problems do not deserve any social security.	5.8	31.9	35.6	22.0	4.7	1381
d9_1	People on benefits should show more gratitude.	3.0	14.0	33.2	40.6	9.2	1388
d9_3	People who receive a living wage should be pleased about this and do not have any right to complain.	3.0	18.7	33.2	35.4	9.8	1387
q102_1	Social security should be reserved for those who have contributed to collective prosperity.	4.3	36.6	24.5	29.9	4.8	1400
q102_2	It is not fair that people receive social benefits to which they have not contributed.	3.4	29.6	24.5	34.8	7.7	1397
q102_4	People who have worked and contributed in the past deserve better social services than people who have contributed little or nothing.	2.3	26.4	24.5	38.7	8.2	1398
q122_2	Only people whose parents are Belgians are entitled to social services and benefits.	10.3	51.5	18.8	16.5	2.8	1393
q122_4	When granting social benefits, people who have been born here should get priority over people who have not been born here.	8.5	39.1	21.7	26.4	4.3	1392
q122_5	Migrants should be allowed to enjoy the same social services as Belgians.	2.2	15.0	31.0	44.1	7.7	1395
q101_1	Social security should only be available to those who truly live in poverty.	13.1	63.4	10.8	11.0	1.6	1403
q101_2	People with sufficient financial reserves should not receive social benefits.	8.8	46.4	22.2	19.3	3.4	1399
q101_3	Only people in dire need may receive social benefits.	10.9	54.3	15.8	15.8	3.2	1400
To what extent do you think the government should be responsible for the following tasks? (0 = Government has no responsibility - 10 = Government has full responsibility)			<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std</i>	<i>N</i>
q53	Making sure the elderly have a reasonable pension.		0	10	8.37	1.61	1402
q54	Making sure there is affordable health care for all.		0	10	8.78	1.38	1402
q55	Making sure that the unemployed have a reasonable standard of living.		0	10	6.59	2.22	1401
q65	Making sure that ethnic minorities are not discriminated against.		0	10	6.75	2.30	1394

Q97. Which of the following statements best describes your current situation, taking into account the total income that you currently have?	<i>N</i>		<i>%</i>			
1 - <i>We have more than enough, we can easily save money</i>	189		13.5			
2 - <i>We have enough to get along without difficulties</i>	718		51.3			
3 - <i>We have just enough to get along</i>	406		29.0			
4 - <i>We do not have enough and often have difficulties to get along</i>	87		6.2			
<i>Total</i>	1400		100			
How do you see your future? Are you sometimes worried about one of the following things? Are you worried that...	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Some-times</i>	<i>Regu-larly</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>N</i>
Q98_1... that your financial worries will increase in the coming years?	14.8	24.8	35.2	16.9	8.4	1396
Q98_2.... that you will have difficulties to keep your socio-economic position?	22.4	29.5	29.7	13.2	5.3	1384
Q98_3.... that your children and the coming generation will have it much more difficult?	4.8	9.4	25.5	33.5	26.8	1394

Appendix 2. CFA for the concept financial strain

		<i>Factor loading</i>
q97	Which of the following statements best describes your current situation, taking into account the total income that you currently have?	0.478
q98_1	... that your financial worries will increase in the coming years?	0.865
q98_2	 that you will have difficulties to keep your socio-economic position?	0.833
q98_3	 that your children and the coming generation will have it much more difficult?	0.524

Model fit: $\chi^2 = 1.16$ Df = 2 RMSEA = 0.000 CFI = 1.000 TLI = 1.001

Note: the parameters reported here are standardized factor loadings, obtained by means of the WLSMV estimator.