

Power2010 Deliberative Poll: Attitude Questions

	T1	T2	T3
1. Generally speaking how well or poorly would you say the system of democracy in Britain works these days?			
Significance of opinion change:		T1-T2: ns (p<0.302) ¹	T2-T3: ** (p<0.009) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.508	0.541	0.48
Extremely well - 1	3.20%	2.50%	1.60%
Fairly well - 2	42.40%	32.20%	49.20%
Neither well nor poorly - 3	9.60%	19.80%	14.30%
Fairly poorly - 4	37.60%	37.20%	25.40%
Extremely poorly - 5	7.20%	8.30%	9.50%
Total:	100%	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	1.6% (2/127)	4.7% (6/127)	0.8% (1/127)

	T1	T2	T3
2. How strongly would you agree or disagree with the following statement? I have opinions about politics that are worth listening to			
Significance of opinion change:		T1-T2: *** (p<0) ¹	T2-T3: *** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.196	0.795	0.879
Disagree strongly - 1	40.80%	1.60%	0%
Disagree somewhat - 2	44%	0.80%	0.80%
Neither agree nor disagree - 3	14.40%	9.80%	4%
Agree somewhat - 4	0%	53.70%	38.10%
Agree strongly - 5	0%	34.10%	57.10%
Total:	100%	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	1.6% (2/127)	3.1% (4/127)	0.8% (1/127)

	T1	T2	T3
3a. On a 0 to 10 scale where 0 is extremely undesirable 10 is extremely desirable and 5 is exactly in the middle how desirable or undesirable would you say are each of the following would be? Allowing a special referendum on whether to remove an MP from office if enough of his or her constituents request it AND holding a fresh election to choose a new MP			
Significance of opinion change:			T2-T3: + (p<0.094) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.691	0.658
Undesirable - 0-4		17.10%	22.80%
5		6.50%	7.90%
Desirable - 6-10		76.40%	69.30%
Total:		100%	100%
Don't know/missing:		3.1% (4/127)	0% (0/127)

	T1	T2	T3
3b. Using public consultation to compose a stronger Bill of Rights			
Significance of opinion change:			T2-T3: ns (p<0.46) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.658	0.667
Undesirable - 0-4		19.50%	16%
5		12.70%	16.80%
Desirable - 6-10		67.80%	67.20%
Total:		100%	100%
Don't know/missing:		7.1% (9/127)	1.6% (2/127)

	T1	T2	T3
3c. Allowing the public to initiate referendums on policy matters			
Significance of opinion change:			T2-T3:

		ns (p<0.149) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.576	0.531
Undesirable - 0-4	33.10%	41.70%
5	9.90%	11%
Desirable - 6-10	57%	47.20%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	4.7% (6/127)	0% (0/127)

3d. Redrawing parliamentary constituencies to equalise their populations		
		T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:		ns (p<0.162) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.577	0.535
Undesirable - 0-4	28.70%	33.90%
5	20%	21%
Desirable - 6-10	51.30%	45.20%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	9.4% (12/127)	2.4% (3/127)

3e. Electing a proportion of MPs each year		
		T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:		*** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.345	0.185
Undesirable - 0-4	62.50%	80.30%
5	12.50%	9.40%
Desirable - 6-10	25%	10.20%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	11.8% (15/127)	0% (0/127)

3f. Moving Parliament to a location nearer the geographical centre of the UK		
		T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:		*** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.218	0.094
Undesirable - 0-4	81.30%	95.20%
5	8.10%	1.60%
Desirable - 6-10	10.60%	3.20%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	3.1% (4/127)	1.6% (2/127)

3g. Expanding the scope of the Freedom of Information Act		
		T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:		ns (p<0.171) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.677	0.639
Undesirable - 0-4	17.90%	22.20%
5	13.40%	20.60%
Desirable - 6-10	68.80%	57.10%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	11.8% (15/127)	0.8% (1/127)

3h. Scrapping the plans for a National Identity card		
		T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:		* (p<0.018) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.696	0.754
Undesirable - 0-4	19.40%	16.70%
5	18.50%	11.10%

Desirable - 6-10	62.10%	72.20%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	2.4% (3/127)	0.8% (1/127)

3i. Limiting or doing away with state databases that violate individual citizens privacy		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: * (p<0.03) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.67	0.717
Undesirable - 0-4	19.10%	13.50%
5	18.30%	16.70%
Desirable - 6-10	62.60%	69.80%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	9.4% (12/127)	0.8% (1/127)

3j. Restricting the use of CCTV and other intrusive surveillance by public and private sector bodies		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ns (p<0.761) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.52	0.521
Undesirable - 0-4	37.30%	35.70%
5	16.90%	15.90%
Desirable - 6-10	45.80%	48.40%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	7.1% (9/127)	0.8% (1/127)

3k. Having compulsory politics lessons in school		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ns (p<0.703) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.62	0.623
Undesirable - 0-4	22.30%	23.60%
5	19%	11%
Desirable - 6-10	58.70%	65.40%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	4.7% (6/127)	0% (0/127)

3l. Having a stronger Bill of Rights		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: * (p<0.016) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.691	0.644
Undesirable - 0-4	11.30%	15.10%
5	17.40%	17.50%
Desirable - 6-10	71.30%	67.50%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	9.4% (12/127)	0.8% (1/127)

3m. Having a written constitution			
Significance of opinion change:		T1-T2: * (p<0.013) ¹	T2-T3: ** (p<0.004) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.698	0.616	0.564
Undesirable - 0-4	12.80%	25.50%	34.10%
5	18.80%	15.50%	13.80%
Desirable - 6-10	68.40%	59.10%	52%
Total:	100%	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	7.9% (10/127)	13.4% (17/127)	3.1% (4/127)

3n. Electing the Prime Minister directly			
		T1-T2:	T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:		*** (p<0) ¹	*** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.659	0.55	0.359
Undesirable - 0-4	27.60%	35.30%	59.70%
5	8.13%	14.70%	15.30%
Desirable - 6-10	64.20%	50%	25%
Total:	100%	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	3.1% (4/127)	8.7% (11/127)	2.4% (3/127)

3o. Having a limit on the length of time a Prime Minister can serve			
		T1-T2:	T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:		ns (p<0.483) ¹	* (p<0.026) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.632	0.626	0.572
Undesirable - 0-4	28.20%	31.30%	28.30%
5	15.32%	9.60%	21.30%
Desirable - 6-10	56.50%	59.10%	50.40%
Total:	100%	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	2.4% (3/127)	9.4% (12/127)	0% (0/127)

4a. Selecting the Upper Chamber by lot from the population			
			T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:			* (p<0.019) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.402	0.331
Undesirable - 0-4		52%	65.60%
5		15%	7.40%
Desirable - 6-10		33%	27%
Total:		100%	100%
Don't know/missing:		21.3% (27/127)	3.9% (5/127)

4b. Banning members of the House of Lords from becoming government ministers			
			T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:			ns (p<0.182) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.588	0.62
Undesirable - 0-4		27%	27%
5		24.30%	15.10%
Desirable - 6-10		48.70%	57.90%
Total:		100%	100%
Don't know/missing:		9.4% (12/127)	0.8% (1/127)

4c. Creating an Upper Chamber that represents different sectors like education transport and financial services			
			T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:			ns (p<0.449) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.574	0.557
Undesirable - 0-4		24.80%	28.30%
5		17.10%	15%
Desirable - 6-10		58.10%	56.70%
Total:		100%	100%
Don't know/missing:		7.9% (10/127)	0% (0/127)

4d. Barring the appointment of former MPs to the House of Lords.			
			T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:			ns (p<0.909) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.565	0.57

Undesirable - 0-4	33.30%	33.10%
5	22.20%	15%
Desirable - 6-10	44.40%	52%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	7.9% (10/127)	0% (0/127)

4e. Reducing the governments use of statutory instruments to bypass parliamentary scrutiny

Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: + (p<0.069) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.706	0.662
Undesirable - 0-4	14.20%	19.70%
5	10.60%	14.80%
Desirable - 6-10	75.20%	65.60%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	11% (14/127)	3.9% (5/127)

4f. Abolishing the Monarchy and introducing an elected a Head of State

Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: * (p<0.038) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.25	0.218
Undesirable - 0-4	75%	80.30%
5	5.60%	3.90%
Desirable - 6-10	19.40%	15.70%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	2.4% (3/127)	0% (0/127)

4g. Having a fully elected House of Lords

Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ** (p<0.003) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.633	0.557
Undesirable - 0-4	28.30%	35.40%
5	10%	12.60%
Desirable - 6-10	61.70%	52%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	5.5% (7/127)	0% (0/127)

4h. Abolishing the Royal Prerogative Powers

Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: + (p<0.079) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.457	0.419
Undesirable - 0-4	43.40%	48.80%
5	19.50%	20%
Desirable - 6-10	37.20%	31.20%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	11% (14/127)	1.6% (2/127)

5a. Allowing felons to vote while serving their prison terms

Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ns (p<0.607) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.287	0.279
Undesirable - 0-4	64.80%	68.30%
5	11.50%	12.70%
Desirable - 6-10	23.80%	19%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	3.9% (5/127)	0.8% (1/127)

5b. Having a referendum to decide whether to devolve England		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: *** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.57	0.398
Undesirable - 0-4	33.10%	55.60%
5	15.30%	18.30%
Desirable - 6-10	51.70%	26.20%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	7.1% (9/127)	0.8% (1/127)

5c. Allowing voters to vote by telephone text message or online		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: *** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.501	0.33
Undesirable - 0-4	39.80%	65.60%
5	10.60%	8%
Desirable - 6-10	49.60%	26.40%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	3.1% (4/127)	1.6% (2/127)

5d. Allowing voters to vote for none of the above on ballot papers		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: * (p<0.02) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.689	0.75
Undesirable - 0-4	16.90%	14.20%
5	13.70%	7.10%
Desirable - 6-10	69.40%	78.70%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	2.4% (3/127)	0% (0/127)

5e. Allowing voters to rate the governments performance of in multiple policy areas on ballot papers		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: *** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.515	0.404
Undesirable - 0-4	36.60%	53.20%
5	11.60%	14.50%
Desirable - 6-10	51.80%	32.30%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	11.8% (15/127)	2.4% (3/127)

5f. Making voting compulsory		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ns (p<0.231) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.463	0.422
Undesirable - 0-4	45.40%	56.30%
5	14.30%	2.40%
Desirable - 6-10	40.30%	41.30%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	6.3% (8/127)	0.8% (1/127)

5g. Holding a referendum on replacing the pound with the euro		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ns (p<0.795) ¹

Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.647	0.625
Undesirable - 0-4	23.90%	27%
5	12.80%	14.30%
Desirable - 6-10	63.20%	58.70%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	7.9% (10/127)	0.8% (1/127)

5h. Holding a referendum on whether Britain should withdraw its membership to the EU		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: *** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.628	0.509
Undesirable - 0-4	31.10%	46.50%
5	9%	8.70%
Desirable - 6-10	59.80%	44.90%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	3.9% (5/127)	0% (0/127)

5i. Replacing the pound with the euro		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ns (p<0.596) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.341	0.353
Undesirable - 0-4	58.10%	57.50%
5	15.30%	12.60%
Desirable - 6-10	26.60%	29.90%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	2.4% (3/127)	0% (0/127)

5j. Scheduling Election Day on a weekend			
Significance of opinion change:		T1-T2: ns (p<0.61) ¹	T2-T3: ns (p<0.155) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.701	0.653	0.686
Undesirable - 0-4	19.70%	11.90%	13.70%
5	28.21%	29.70%	23.40%
Desirable - 6-10	51.30%	58.50%	62.90%
Total:	100%	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	7.9% (10/127)	7.1% (9/127)	2.4% (3/127)

5k. Allowing felons to vote after they have served their sentences			
Significance of opinion change:		T1-T2: ns (p<0.609) ¹	T2-T3: * (p<0.027) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.702	0.73	0.786
Undesirable - 0-4	18.30%	9.40%	5.60%
5	16.67%	13.70%	11.20%
Desirable - 6-10	64.20%	76.90%	83.20%
Total:	100%	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	5.5% (7/127)	7.9% (10/127)	1.6% (2/127)

5l. Fining people who dont vote			
Significance of opinion change:		T1-T2: ns (p<0.131) ¹	T2-T3: ns (p<0.921) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.316	0.273	0.274
Undesirable - 0-4	63.70%	71.90%	68.50%
5	10.48%	7.40%	10.20%
Desirable - 6-10	25.80%	20.70%	21.30%
Total:	100%	100%	100%

Don't know/missing:	2.4% (3/127)	4.7% (6/127)	0% (0/127)
---------------------	--------------	--------------	------------

5m. Lowering the voting age to 16			
		T1-T2:	T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:		* (p<0.026) ¹	** (p<0.008) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.404	0.469	0.538
Undesirable - 0-4	54.80%	46.70%	37.80%
5	10.32%	13.10%	11%
Desirable - 6-10	34.90%	40.20%	51.20%
Total:	100%	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	0.8% (1/127)	3.9% (5/127)	0% (0/127)

5n. Having devolution for England			
		T1-T2:	T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:		ns (p<0.36) ¹	*** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.449	0.476	0.352
Undesirable - 0-4	43.10%	35.40%	62.70%
5	26.61%	34.50%	14.30%
Desirable - 6-10	30.30%	30.10%	23%
Total:	100%	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	14.2% (18/127)	11% (14/127)	0.8% (1/127)

6a. Changing electoral system to allow for the Alternative Vote			
			T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:			* (p<0.017) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.55	0.48
Undesirable - 0-4		26.20%	39.80%
5		30.80%	23.60%
Desirable - 6-10		43%	36.60%
Total:		100%	100%
Don't know/missing:		15.7% (20/127)	3.1% (4/127)

6b. Changing the electoral system to allow for Proportional Representation			
			T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:			ns (p<0.488) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.563	0.578
Undesirable - 0-4		26.70%	26.20%
5		25%	20.60%
Desirable - 6-10		48.30%	53.20%
Total:		100%	100%
Don't know/missing:		8.7% (11/127)	0.8% (1/127)

6c. Having open primaries to select each parties candidate for parliament			
			T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:			*** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.533	0.421
Undesirable - 0-4		29.80%	51.20%
5		19.30%	20.80%
Desirable - 6-10		50.90%	28%
Total:		100%	100%
Don't know/missing:		10.2% (13/127)	1.6% (2/127)

6d. Changing the electoral system so that your second or third choice can count			
---	--	--	--

		T1-T2:	T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:		ns (p<0.315) ¹	*** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.715	0.611	0.52
Undesirable - 0-4	29%	22.70%	36.20%
5	16.13%	16%	14.20%
Desirable - 6-10	53.20%	61.30%	49.60%
Total:	100%	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	2.4% (3/127)	6.3% (8/127)	0% (0/127)

6e. Changing the electoral system to give each party the same proportion of seats as the proportion of votes it receives nationally

		T1-T2:	T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:		ns (p<0.855) ¹	ns (p<0.736) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.607	0.615	0.605
Undesirable - 0-4	27.70%	26.50%	24.40%
5	14.29%	9.40%	15%
Desirable - 6-10	58%	64.10%	60.60%
Total:	100%	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	6.3% (8/127)	7.9% (10/127)	0% (0/127)

7a. Limiting the amount of money that individuals can donate to parties and candidates

			T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:			* (p<0.023) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.665	0.609
Undesirable - 0-4		19.70%	27.60%
5		18.80%	11.80%
Desirable - 6-10		61.50%	60.60%
Total:		100%	100%
Don't know/missing:		7.9% (10/127)	0% (0/127)

7b. Increasing public funding for parties and candidates

			T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:			ns (p<0.167) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.41	0.444
Undesirable - 0-4		54.20%	51.60%
5		15%	15.90%
Desirable - 6-10		30.80%	32.50%
Total:		100%	100%
Don't know/missing:		5.5% (7/127)	0.8% (1/127)

7c. Removing the 500 deposit for candidates to stand in the general election

			T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:			ns (p<0.55) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.463	0.446
Undesirable - 0-4		40.30%	46%
5		26.90%	11.10%
Desirable - 6-10		32.80%	42.90%
Total:		100%	100%
Don't know/missing:		6.3% (8/127)	0.8% (1/127)

7d. Requiring full disclosure of MPs and civil servants communications with lobbyists

			T2-T3:
Significance of opinion change:			*** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.814	0.616
Undesirable - 0-4		5.70%	25.40%
5		4.90%	15.90%

Desirable - 6-10	89.40%	58.70%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	3.1% (4/127)	0.8% (1/127)

7e. Making party manifesto promises legally binding		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: *** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.618	0.258
Undesirable - 0-4	27.60%	73.80%
5	13%	7.90%
Desirable - 6-10	59.30%	18.30%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	3.1% (4/127)	0.8% (1/127)

7f. Incentivising the parties to choose candidates to reflect the gender and ethnic makeup of the population more closely		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ns (p<0.123) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.432	0.401
Undesirable - 0-4	46.50%	51.20%
5	21.10%	22.40%
Desirable - 6-10	32.50%	26.40%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	10.2% (13/127)	1.6% (2/127)

7g. Requiring political parties to practice more internal democracy		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: * (p<0.011) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.686	0.624
Undesirable - 0-4	9.50%	12.90%
5	21.90%	26.60%
Desirable - 6-10	68.60%	60.50%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	17.3% (22/127)	2.4% (3/127)

8a. Electing senior judges		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: *** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.424	0.226
Undesirable - 0-4	45.50%	75%
5	25%	13.70%
Desirable - 6-10	29.50%	11.30%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	11.8% (15/127)	2.4% (3/127)

8b. Consulting the public on the wages expenses and working conditions of MPs		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ** (p<0.002) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.706	0.629
Undesirable - 0-4	18.20%	29.40%
5	9.90%	8.70%
Desirable - 6-10	71.90%	61.90%
Total:	100%	100%

Don't know/missing:	4.7% (6/127)	0.8% (1/127)
---------------------	--------------	--------------

8c. Increasing the number of issues decided by free votes		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ns ($p < 0.198$) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.761	0.728
Undesirable - 0-4	5.30%	7.20%
5	11.50%	12%
Desirable - 6-10	83.20%	80.80%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	11% (14/127)	1.6% (2/127)

8d. Giving MPs control of the parliamentary timetable		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ns ($p < 0.217$) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.618	0.624
Undesirable - 0-4	12.30%	15.60%
5	33%	26.20%
Desirable - 6-10	54.70%	58.20%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	16.5% (21/127)	3.9% (5/127)

8f. Banning retired MPs from working in private sector jobs associated with their former positions for a period of years		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ns ($p < 0.112$) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.61	0.588
Undesirable - 0-4	29.60%	31.50%
5	13.90%	12.10%
Desirable - 6-10	56.50%	56.50%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	9.4% (12/127)	2.4% (3/127)

8g. Strengthening select committees		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: *** ($p < 0$) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.745	0.808
Undesirable - 0-4	1.80%	1.60%
5	13.60%	10.60%
Desirable - 6-10	84.50%	87.80%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	13.4% (17/127)	3.1% (4/127)

8h. Having a parliament sit for a fixed term			
Significance of opinion change:		T1-T2: *** ($p < 0.001$) ¹	T2-T3: ** ($p < 0.004$) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.745	0.642	0.595
Undesirable - 0-4	15.70%	20.40%	27.80%
5	7.44%	19.50%	19%
Desirable - 6-10	76.90%	60.20%	53.20%
Total:	100%	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	4.7% (6/127)	11% (14/127)	0.8% (1/127)

9a. Allowing only English MPs to vote on matters affecting only England and only			
--	--	--	--

English and Welsh MPs to vote on matters affecting only England and Wales		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ** (p<0.001) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.718	0.621
Undesirable - 0-4	16.90%	28.50%
5	14.40%	13.80%
Desirable - 6-10	68.60%	57.70%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	7.1% (9/127)	3.1% (4/127)

9b. Giving more decision making and taxation powers to local government		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ** (p<0.004) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.548	0.619
Undesirable - 0-4	29.60%	20.60%
5	17.60%	12.70%
Desirable - 6-10	52.80%	66.70%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	1.6% (2/127)	0.8% (1/127)

9c. Adopting a region-based federalist system		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ns (p<0.217) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.418	0.374
Undesirable - 0-4	47.10%	52.80%
5	21.20%	18.40%
Desirable - 6-10	31.70%	28.80%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	18.1% (23/127)	1.6% (2/127)

9d. Letting Scotland Wales and Northern Ireland hold a referendum about giving them further powers		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: *** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.634	0.506
Undesirable - 0-4	19%	38.70%
5	19%	16.90%
Desirable - 6-10	62.10%	44.40%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	8.7% (11/127)	2.4% (3/127)

9e. Holding a referendum on establishing an English Parliament		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: *** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.579	0.394
Undesirable - 0-4	33.30%	59.50%
5	12.80%	9.50%
Desirable - 6-10	53.80%	31%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	7.9% (10/127)	0.8% (1/127)

9f. Choosing the Mayors of population centres by direct election		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: * (p<0.044) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.639	0.573

Undesirable - 0-4	21.40%	24%
5	15.20%	25.60%
Desirable - 6-10	63.40%	50.40%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	11.8% (15/127)	1.6% (2/127)

9g. Increasing the salaries of local councillors		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: + (p<0.065) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.397	0.439
Undesirable - 0-4	50%	44.40%
5	22%	25%
Desirable - 6-10	28%	30.60%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	7.1% (9/127)	2.4% (3/127)

9h. Selecting some councillors by lot from the local population		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: *** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.455	0.348
Undesirable - 0-4	43.70%	58.70%
5	15.10%	9.50%
Desirable - 6-10	41.20%	31.70%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	6.3% (8/127)	0.8% (1/127)

9i. Allowing local people to elect the heads of key services like the police		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: *** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.406	0.213
Undesirable - 0-4	54.20%	80.30%
5	18.30%	8.70%
Desirable - 6-10	27.50%	11%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	5.5% (7/127)	0% (0/127)

9j. Establishing a duty of public consultation on controversial matters		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: + (p<0.092) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.688	0.72
Undesirable - 0-4	10.20%	9.40%
5	16.90%	15.70%
Desirable - 6-10	72.90%	74.80%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	7.1% (9/127)	0% (0/127)

9k. Establishing a duty of public consultation on controversial matters through a deliberative process		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: *** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.687	0.806
Undesirable - 0-4	9.10%	4%
5	19.10%	8.10%
Desirable - 6-10	71.80%	87.90%
Total:	100%	100%

Don't know/missing:	13.4% (17/127)	2.4% (3/127)
---------------------	-------------------	--------------

9l. Establishing a duty of public consultation on controversial matters through direct democracy		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ns ($p < 0.933$) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.64	0.627
Undesirable - 0-4	12.50%	16.10%
5	26.90%	22.60%
Desirable - 6-10	60.60%	61.30%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	18.1% (23/127)	2.4% (3/127)

9m. Holding separate referendums on membership of the Union in England Scotland and Wales		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: *** ($p < 0$) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.531	0.402
Undesirable - 0-4	38.60%	52.40%
5	14.90%	20.20%
Desirable - 6-10	46.50%	27.40%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	20.5% (26/127)	2.4% (3/127)

9n. Holding a referendum on the strongest form of devolution amongst the nations		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: *** ($p < 0$) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.55	0.428
Undesirable - 0-4	32.70%	48.40%
5	20.80%	21.80%
Desirable - 6-10	46.50%	29.80%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	20.5% (26/127)	2.4% (3/127)

9o. Giving local government more local control			
Significance of opinion change:		T1-T2: ns ($p < 0.201$) ¹	T2-T3: ** ($p < 0.004$) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.697	0.666	0.726
Undesirable - 0-4	13.50%	17.40%	11.20%
5	15.87%	10.40%	7.20%
Desirable - 6-10	70.60%	72.20%	81.60%
Total:	100%	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	0.8% (1/127)	9.4% (12/127)	1.6% (2/127)

10. Thinking about the Monarchy in Britain do you think it should be...?			
Significance of opinion change:		T1-T2: *** ($p < 0$) ²	T2-T3: ns ($p < 0.25$) ²
Kept as is - 1	59.30%	54.90%	63.80%
Reformed - 2	27.60%	31.10%	22%
Abolished - 3	12.20%	13.90%	14.20%
Total:	100%	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	3.1% (4/127)	3.9% (5/127)	0% (0/127)

11. And what would be your second choice - should the monarchy in Britain be...?

Significance of opinion change:		T1-T2: *** (p<0) ²	T2-T3: ns (p<0.66) ²
Kept as is - 1	21.30%	37.90%	40.80%
Reformed - 2	63%	54.30%	54.20%
Abolished - 3	11.10%	7.80%	5%
Total:	100%	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	15% (19/127)	8.7% (11/127)	5.5% (7/127)

12. Some people think that we should continue to have appointed life peers in the House of Lords. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale at point 1. Other people think all members of the House of Lords should be democratically elected. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4 and of course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7. Where would you place your views on this scale or haven't you thought much about this?

Significance of opinion change:		T1-T2: ns (p<0.226) ¹	T2-T3: ns (p<0.237) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.684	0.658	0.611
Continue appointed life peers - 1	14.50%	9.10%	8.90%
2	10.30%	7.40%	12.20%
3	4.30%	9.10%	6.50%
Exactly in the middle - 4	3.40%	13.20%	17.90%
5	7.70%	13.20%	11.40%
6	11.10%	10.70%	16.30%
Democratically elect all members - 7	47.90%	37.20%	26.80%
Total:	100%	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	7.9% (10/127)	4.7% (6/127)	3.1% (4/127)

13. Some people think that Britain should withdraw completely from the EU. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale at point 1. Other people think that Britain should stay in the EU and work toward the formation of a single European government. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4 and of course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7. Where would you place your views on this scale or haven't you thought much about this?

Significance of opinion change:		T1-T2: ns (p<0.41) ¹	T2-T3: *** (p<0) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.451	0.447	0.558
Withdraw completely from the EU - 1	19.80%	20%	10.20%
2	13.50%	11.20%	10.20%
3	16.70%	16.80%	11.80%
Exactly in the middle - 4	13.50%	16%	19.70%
5	11.10%	14.40%	15%
6	13.50%	12%	16.50%
Stay in the EU and work toward a single European government - 7	11.90%	9.60%	16.50%
Total:	100%	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	0.8% (1/127)	1.6% (2/127)	0% (0/127)

14a. Here are some things that people find more or less important for themselves or

society to have. On a 0 to 10 scale where 0 is extremely unimportant 10 is completely important and 5 is exactly in the middle how important would you say each of the following is to you? Seeing to it that everyone has equal opportunities

		T2-T3:	
Significance of opinion change:		ns ($p < 0.285$) ¹	
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.855	0.866
Extremely unimportant - 0-4		3.30%	3.20%
5		7.40%	4.80%
Extremely important - 6-10		89.30%	92.10%
Total:		100%	100%
Don't know/missing:		3.9% (5/127)	0.8% (1/127)

14b. Making sure that nobody goes hungry or lacks medical care

		T2-T3:	
Significance of opinion change:		ns ($p < 0.842$) ¹	
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.926	0.93
Extremely unimportant - 0-4		1.70%	0.80%
5		0.80%	0.80%
Extremely important - 6-10		97.50%	98.40%
Total:		100%	100%
Don't know/missing:		4.7% (6/127)	0% (0/127)

14c. Minimizing the gap between rich and poor

		T2-T3:	
Significance of opinion change:		ns ($p < 0.508$) ¹	
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.74	0.748
Extremely unimportant - 0-4		12.10%	8.70%
5		13.70%	13.40%
Extremely important - 6-10		74.20%	78%
Total:		100%	100%
Don't know/missing:		2.4% (3/127)	0% (0/127)

14d. Making ones own choices

		T2-T3:	
Significance of opinion change:		ns ($p < 0.408$) ¹	
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.875	0.885
Extremely unimportant - 0-4		1.60%	1.60%
5		3.20%	2.40%
Extremely important - 6-10		95.20%	96%
Total:		100%	100%
Don't know/missing:		1.6% (2/127)	0.8% (1/127)

14e. Preserving traditions and customs

		T2-T3:	
Significance of opinion change:		ns ($p < 0.856$) ¹	
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.718	0.718
Extremely unimportant - 0-4		15.10%	15.10%
5		13.50%	15.90%
Extremely important - 6-10		71.40%	69%
Total:		100%	100%
Don't know/missing:		0.8% (1/127)	0.8% (1/127)

14f. Earning as much money as possible

		T2-T3:	
Significance of opinion change:		ns ($p < 0.398$) ¹	
Mean (rescaled 0-1):		0.548	0.535

Extremely unimportant - 0-4	27.70%	29.60%
5	27.70%	26.40%
Extremely important - 6-10	44.50%	44%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	6.3% (8/127)	1.6% (2/127)

14g. Being able to retire comfortably		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ns ($p < 0.419$) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.866	0.857
Extremely unimportant - 0-4	4%	2.40%
5	1.60%	2.40%
Extremely important - 6-10	94.40%	95.30%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	1.6% (2/127)	0% (0/127)

15a. How strongly would you agree or disagree with the following statements? People with views very different from mine often have good reasons for their views even when they are wrong.		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: *** ($p < 0.001$) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.835	0.885
Agree strongly - 1	0.80%	0.80%
Agree somewhat - 2	1.60%	0.80%
Neither agree nor disagree - 3	9.70%	4.80%
Disagree somewhat - 4	38.70%	31%
Disagree strongly - 5	49.20%	62.70%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	2.4% (3/127)	0.8% (1/127)

15b. Public officials care a lot about what people like me think.		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ** ($p < 0.009$) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.318	0.396
Agree strongly - 1	29.50%	16.50%
Agree somewhat - 2	38.50%	41.70%
Neither agree nor disagree - 3	12.30%	10.20%
Disagree somewhat - 4	14.80%	29.90%
Disagree strongly - 5	4.90%	1.60%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	3.9% (5/127)	0% (0/127)

15c. Most public policy issues are so complicated that a person like me cant really understand whats going on.		
Significance of opinion change:		T2-T3: ** ($p < 0.007$) ¹
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.476	0.387
Agree strongly - 1	21%	28.60%
Agree somewhat - 2	21.80%	29.40%
Neither agree nor disagree - 3	12.10%	6.30%
Disagree somewhat - 4	36.30%	30.20%
Disagree strongly - 5	8.90%	5.60%
Total:	100%	100%
Don't know/missing:	2.4% (3/127)	0.8% (1/127)

15d. People like me don't have any say about what the government does.

		T2-T3:	
Significance of opinion change:		*** (p<0) ¹	
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.732	0.559	
Agree strongly - 1	4%	7.40%	
Agree somewhat - 2	16.90%	32%	
Neither agree nor disagree - 3	6.50%	7.40%	
Disagree somewhat - 4	27.40%	36.10%	
Disagree strongly - 5	45.20%	17.20%	
Total:	100%	100%	
Don't know/missing:	2.4% (3/127)	3.9% (5/127)	

16. On a 0 to 10 scale where 0 is distrust completely 10 is trust completely and 5 is exactly in the middle how much in general do you trust the UK government to do what is right?

		T2-T3:	
Significance of opinion change:		** (p<0.001) ¹	
Mean (rescaled 0-1):	0.398	0.448	
Distrust completely - 0-4	58.70%	48%	
5	14.30%	13.40%	
Trust completely - 6-10	27%	38.60%	
Total:	100%	100%	
Don't know/missing:	0.8% (1/127)	0% (0/127)	

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

¹ Two-tailed t-test

² Chi2 test

³ One-tailed t-test

⁴ Fisher's exact test