Perception of Universal Basic Income and its Perceived Consequences

Khujan Singh [1]
Pooja Kataria [2]

Abstract

Purpose : The current study focused on understanding the perception of universal basic income (UBI) and its perceived consequences. We investigated this potential alternative program that would address the shortcomings and restrictions of the current welfare system.

Methodology : Five variables were used which addressed a diverse spectrum of dimensions related to the perception of universal basic income. Furthermore, how this perception varies across different demographic groups was examined. A total of 432 respondents from Haryana were included in this study. Statistical techniques like exploratory factor analysis, *t*-test, one-way ANOVA, and Welch test were used to analyze the data.

Findings : The findings of the study indicated that females and unemployed respondents were more inclined to support UBI and were less skeptical toward its moral consequences as compared to men and employed individuals. Furthermore, people with less income strongly supported the concept, but they were less optimistic about its moral consequences and believed that UBI might encourage people to be lazy and unproductive.

Practical Implications : It was proposed that carrying out a large-scale pilot project can yield relevant information regarding the viability of universal basic income. The government may have a greater knowledge of how UBI could aid in resolving societal challenges, including poverty, unemployment, and inequality, through a thorough evaluation.

Originality : The majority of previous research has been done on European countries. This study is the first to concentrate on how the UBI is viewed in the Indian setting.

Keywords : universal basic income (UBI), poverty, support, perceived consequences, temptation goods, essential goods

JEL Classification Codes : I31, I38, J68

Paper Submission Date : August 20, 2023 ; Paper sent back for Revision : March 16, 2024 ; Paper Acceptance Date : April 10, 2024 ; Paper Published Online : June 15, 2024

Global debate in the social and economic spheres has been sparked by worries about the increasing disparity between the rich and the poor, as well as the growth in global poverty. The need to find strategies and options that can be assessed and put into practice is urgent. In the past few decades, governments of developing nations all over the globe have significantly increased social security initiatives for the disadvantaged (Olken, 2019) to secure them financially and socially (Bordoloi, 2014). Certainly, aiding the underprivileged is not a novel idea in underdeveloped countries. However, there is still uncertainty about how to offer this assistance.

[1] *Professor,* Haryana School of Business, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology, Hisar - 125 001, Haryana. (Email : Kh_hsb@yahoo.co.in)
[2] *Research Scholar (Corresponding Author),* Haryana School of Business, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology , Hisar - 125 001, Haryana. (Email : Poojakataria5023@gmail.com)
ORCID iD : https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5919-0142

One crucial question to consider when creating welfare policies, according to Korpi and Palme (1998), is whether or not these programs should be offered to all citizens of the nation. Targeted transfer implementation, however, raises new concerns. Such issues include inefficient targeting methods due to which there are inclusion (including ineligible recipients) and exclusion errors (excluding eligible recipients), high cost of targeting (Hanna & Olken, 2018), and high non-takeup rates (van Oorschot, 1991). Due to these issues, there is low coverage of social assistance, especially in low-income countries, where only 17% of the poor population is covered (Grosh et al., 2022). However, in recent years, universal basic income (UBI) has been proposed as an answer to the existing scheme's shortcomings and limitations. According to Basic Income Earth Network (BIEN), a basic income is a periodic cash payment unconditionally delivered to all on an individual basis, without means-test or work requirement.

Basic income offers new reasons for hope that we might still succeed in achieving a free society and a rational economy in an era of rising poverty, unemployment, and inequality when outdated solutions to persistent social problems are insufficient. A UBI is the most straightforward and impartial kind of social welfare. The simplest type of equality is to provide every citizen the same amount at the same time, regardless of their existing financial situation. The simplicity of the program would greatly help in reducing the administrative cost involved in identifying and targeting the poor population in the country. Issues with inclusion and exclusion errors might be greatly decreased because of its universal character. This idea has been discussed for decades by intellectuals and public policy specialists as a means of ensuring social justice that prioritizes freedom and equality for all, even though it has not been implemented in any nation (van Parijs, 2004; van Parijs & Vanderborght, 2017). Contrarily, some researchers contend that implementing this concept may lead to morally questionable behaviors such as increased drinking and smoking, and it may also encourage individuals to be lazy and less efficient at work (Yi, 2018). Shah and Jani (2019) believed that it is not practical to implement UBI without any conditions applied. Despite the increased attention, public perceptions about UBI are not widely discussed. This is supposedly because opinion surveys on UBI have been dispersed across several nations, at different times, with inconsistent framing of questions. It is important to address this issue because public opinion plays a crucial role in converting a concept into public policy. The voluminous empirical research on the relationship between public policy and public opinion holds that public opinion affects policymaking (Burstein, 2003; Erikson, 1976; Hill & Hinton-Anderson, 1995). Thus, it is intriguing to explore public opinion toward UBI. Most of the studies on UBI have been carried out in European and Western countries. There has been little research done on the idea of UBI, and the debate over it is still in its early stages in India. Therefore, by examining people's perceptions of UBI and its perceived effects within the particular context of India, this study aims to close this gap. Policymakers could find their response to be quite helpful, and it could serve as a model for developing a full-scale national experiment.

Review of Literature

Support for UBI

There have been few studies that have asked individuals regarding their support for UBI, and they are dispersed across nations and time intervals. In terms of level of support, available research reveals that European countries are quite supportive. In Sweden, 46% of the population considered UBI a good idea, while 63% of the population in Finland supported the idea (Andersson & Kangas, 2002). In the United Kingdom, 48% of the population was found to be in favor of UBI (Roosma & van Oorschot, 2020). At the same time, voters in Switzerland rejected UBI in a 2016 national referendum (Parolin & Siöland, 2020). The eighth round of the European Social Survey (ESS) was carried out in 23 European nations in 2016, and the support for UBI ranged from the greatest in Lithuania (80%) to the lowest in Norway and Switzerland, which was less than 35%. (Vlandas, 2019). Likewise, a poll

conducted in America indicated that 52% of American adults were in favor of the idea (Hamilton et al., 2022). So, throughout time, UBI seems to have gained popularity in different nations.

Furthermore, for a better understanding of public support, it is crucial to know what factors influence individuals to be for or against a proposal. There is a wealth of research on the elements influencing people's attitudes about the welfare systems of today, but less is known about UBI. However, the findings from recent studies on support for UBI are consistent with several predictions from the extant literature on existing welfare policies; for instance, self-interest plays a significant role in forming attitudes towards both UBI and welfare state programs (Choi, 2021; Vlandas, 2021). Self-interest indicates that those who are more inclined to gain from welfare measures seem to be more likely to hold a favorable attitude toward these policies (Blekesaune & Quadagno, 2003). This made it logical to believe that a range of people would be quite supportive of the social programs, including the elderly getting pensions, the jobless, students, and other people who would probably receive the transfer (Jæger, 2006). Vlandas (2021) confirmed this assumption and found that economically vulnerable people are more likely to support UBI, like the younger population, unemployed, and people with low income.

Additionally, Roosma and van Oorschot (2020) stated that older adults, those with lower educational attainment, and those with small children at home are likely to be less supportive of universal basic income. Achterberg et al. (2013) stated that socioeconomic vulnerabilities heavily influence support for the welfare state. These vulnerabilities can be measured by educational attainment, employment status, likelihood of becoming unemployed in the upcoming year, and the income of the respondent (Achterberg et al., 2013). Therefore, the demographic parameters are considered in this study which may influence support for UBI. These characteristics are gender, occupational status, and the monthly income of the respondent.

Perceived Social Consequences

The argument for universal basic income is that it has the power to end poverty. Resolving the shortcomings in the current welfare systems serves as a safety net to keep people from slipping back into it (Arcarons et al., 2014). It also motivates people to plan and save (Arcarons et al., 2014). In Namibia, for example, with the implementation of basic income payments, food poverty decreased from 76% to 37% (Haarmann et al., 2024). The recipient's average debt also decreased, and they have begun to invest in assets such as livestock and engage in certain self-employment activities (Haarmann et al., 2024).

Furthermore, van Parijs and Vanderborght (2017), in their book *Basic Income: A Radical Proposal for a Free Society and Sane Economy,* considered it a source of freedom and justice. In addition to providing justice to people who perform unpaid labor, such as women and those who are unable to work because of physical or mental disabilities, they thought it might improve employees' negotiating position in the labor market. Similarly, basic income has been viewed as a useful instrument for addressing the issue of gender inequality (McKay, 2001). The authors believe that basic income encourages women's financial independence by respecting and acknowledging their unpaid labor (Baker, 2008; Katada, 2012; Zelleke, 2008). Moreover, basic income can liberate those women who are trapped in dysfunctional and toxic relationships because they are financially reliant on men (Katada, 2012). Advocates of UBI also argue that in addition to the financial advantages, it also has psychological advantages (Ministry of Finance, Government of India, 2017). People may focus on their future and are freed from the strain of earning for their basic needs (Banerjee et al., 2019). According to Haushofer and Shapiro (2016), there was a notable improvement in the mental health of receivers of unconditional payments in Kenya.

Perceived Moral Consequences

Despite its widespread popularity, basic income is still seen as an outlandish concept. It is expected that recipients would refuse to work if the government offers them enough money to meet their necessities (Yi, 2018); even if the basic income is set at low levels, some groups could stop working, like married women (Browne & Immervoll, 2017). However, the current literature contradicts this claim. Gilbert et al. (2018) examined labor responses in 16 trial programs throughout the world and observed no substantial shift in the total number of hours worked or labor participation rate. Similarly, Gamel et al. (2006) investigated how young people's attitudes toward employment changed with the adoption of UBI. Most respondents answered that they do not intend to alter or quit their employment after the implementation of UBI. Many officials and opponents of basic income have also voiced concern about recipients using cash transfers for additional drugs, alcohol, and cigarettes (Banerjee et al., 2019).

In contrast, Evans and Popova (2017) observed some unexpected results: rather than increasing the consumption of alcohol and other tempting items, people reduced their expenditure on such goods. Similarly, in the Indian and Kenyan basic income pilot experiments, the expenditure on alcohol and tobacco was found to be negative or insignificant (Davala et al., 2015; Haushofer & Shapiro, 2013). However, there was no improvement in alcohol abuse in Namibia (Haarmann et al., 2024).

Consumption of Temptation Goods

One of the worries of policymakers is that individuals may use the UBI payments to buy tempting goods. Temptation goods are those that fulfill one's immediate needs without providing for their future self (Banerjee & Mullainathan, 2010). In simple terms, temptation consumption is described as funds "wasted" by people with low incomes on items that policymakers wish they did not buy (Brune et al., 2022). Cash transfer programs are frequently criticized because recipients may waste money or use it in a manner that lowers their welfare (White & Basu, 2016). A growing corpus of studies suggests that impoverished individuals struggle with self-control and favor products that solely meet their immediate requirements (Bruns & Mußhoff, 2022). This impulsive behavior may affect their ability to save and invest (Bruns & Mußhoff, 2022). Brune et al. (2022) studied that 40% of the respondents in their study believed that temptation expenses, for instance, alcohol, tobacco, and sweets, are a major barrier to saving. Banerjee and Mullainathan (2010) suggested that spending on tempting items has the potential to create a poverty trap. Economically disadvantaged individuals are more significantly impacted by temptation goods in comparison to the rich (Bruns & Mußhoff, 2022). Even the most destitute waste a large portion of their earnings on things that are not necessary for survival (Banerjee & Duflo, 2007; Banerjee & Mullainathan, 2010).

Nevertheless, research by Evans and Popova (2017) and Brune et al. (2022) did not discover any rise in expenditure on temptation goods with a rise in financial resources. The most important problem, however, is which products should be categorized as temptation goods. Evans and Popova (2017), Handa et al. (2018), and Jumrani and Birthal (2017) considered alcohol and tobacco as temptation goods; Aker (2013) included doughnuts and beer; Dasso and Fernandez (2014) regarded food from restaurants; and Brune et al. (2022) took salty snacks, gifts, and clothing as temptation goods. The purchase of branded apparel and meals from restaurants are viewed as enticing commodities in this study, which took into account two studies: Brune et al. (2022) and Dasso and Fernandez (2014).

Consumption of Essential Goods

Cash transfers are generally seen as a useful strategy for increasing and sustaining household spending in addition

to encouraging the investment of human capital (Bazzi et al., 2015). For effective policymaking, it is essential to understand how household consumption reacts to transfers of money. The UBI pilot experiment results refute the claim that recipients will squander their additional funds on pointless goods. In Kenya, for instance, cash transfers have led to a significant increase in consumption, food security, and asset holding (Haushofer & Shapiro, 2013). Additionally, the basic income pilot in Madhya Pradesh (India) also revealed a favorable impact on consumption. The basic income beneficiaries upgraded their standard of living by increasing access to food, improving their homes' roofs and walls, arranging toilets, improving their cooking and lighting facilities, and increasing their ownership of assets, including scooters, furniture, televisions, and mobile phones (Davala et al., 2015).

Research Methodology

Descriptive analysis using primary data was selected for the study based on the body of literature already in the field. The data were gathered using a self-structured questionnaire that included both nominal and interval items. The online survey approach was selected because it provided greater advantages in the sense of contacting the sample group, speed, money, and convenience. Multiple online platforms, such as LinkedIn, WhatsApp, and also E-mail were used to collect data by sending the link. The non-probability convenience sampling method was used. The period of the study was from November 2022 to April 2023. The data were collected from six administrative divisions of Haryana. A total of 480 respondents were asked to take part in the survey. In total, 450 responses were received. Out of 450 responses, 18 were discarded due to incomplete and poor responses. The final sample of 432 responses was included in the analysis. To examine the stated hypotheses, one-way ANOVA, Welch test, Games - Howell post hoc test, and independent sample t-tests have been performed using IBM SPSS version 21.

To conduct this study, the following hypotheses have been put forth:

✎ **H_{01} :** There is no significant difference in support for UBI (H_{01a}), perceived social consequences (H_{01b}), perceived moral consequences (H_{01c}), consumption of temptation goods (H_{01d}), and consumption of essential goods (H_{01e}) across gender.

✎ **H_{02} :** There is no significant difference in support for UBI (H_{02a}), perceived social consequences (H_{02b}), perceived moral consequences (H_{02c}), consumption of temptation goods (H_{02d}), and consumption of essential goods (H_{02e}) across occupations.

✎ **H_{03} :** There is no significant difference in support for UBI (H_{03a}), perceived social consequences (H_{03b}), perceived moral consequences (H_{03c}), consumption of temptation goods (H_{03d}), and consumption of essential goods (H_{03e}) across income.

The questionnaire was divided into two sections. The first section of the survey asked for demographic information about the sample, such as gender, age, educational level, marital and occupational status. Table 1 reveals that 47% of the respondents were women, and 53% of the respondents were men. The majority of the data (94.5%) were collected from respondents who were between the ages of 18 and 35. Of these, 42.4% reported being employed, and 57.6% claimed they were unemployed but actively looked for work. In the sample, the income levels that makeup nearly half of the sample are as follows: 16.7% fell between 10 and 25K, 20.8% fell between 25 and 40K, and the remaining percentage fell over 40K. Moreover, 23.8% of the respondents were married, and 76.2% of the respondents were single. Table 1 provides an overview of the data pertaining to the respondents' educational backgrounds.

The second part of the survey covered 21 items addressing the perception of UBI. Out of 21 items, five items related to support for UBI and eight items about the perceived social consequences of UBI were obtained from a

Table 1. *Demographic Profile of the Respondents*

Demographics	Categories	Number of Respondents	%
Gender	Male	229	53
	Female	203	47
Age	18 – 26	272	63
	27 – 35	136	31.5
	36 – 44	18	4.2
	Above 45	6	1.4
Education	Metric	67	15.5
	Graduation	192	44.4
	Post-Graduation	125	28.9
	Professional Diploma	48	11
Occupational Status	Employed	183	42.4
	Unemployed (Looking for a job)	249	57.6
Income (per month)	0 – 10K	228	52.8
K-Thousand	10K – 25K	72	16.7
	25K – 40K	90	20.8
	Above 40K	42	9.7
Marital Status	Single	329	76.2
	Married	103	23.8

study conducted in July 2018 by Populus, a UK research firm owned by Younder Consulting. The statements were modified according to the needs of the study. The Cronbach's Alpha was recorded as 0.928 and 0.892, respectively.

Furthermore, two items of perceived moral consequences, two items of consumption of temptation goods, and four items of consumption of essential goods were self-framed. The Cronbach's alpha was recorded as 0.842, 0.916, and 0.755, respectively. Each item was measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "*strongly disagree*" (1) to "*strongly agree*" (5). All 21 items were subjected to exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and principal component analysis using varimax rotation. Table 2 shows that the loadings for every item were recorded as greater than the limit recommended by Hair Jr. et al. (2014).

Table 2. *Results of Factor Analysis and Reliability*

Factors and Measured Items	EFA Loadings	Cronbach's Alpha
Support for UBI		
I support the idea of universal basic income.	0.895	0.928
It would be better than the current system.	0.875	
There is a need to implement UBI.	0.780	
It would be beneficial for my family and me.	0.815	
I would welcome such experiments in my local area to test how it works.	0.846	
Perceived Social Consequences		
It would give more freedom to women and promote gender equality.	0.594	0.892
It would reduce poverty.	0.772	

	0.782	
It would decrease crime by reducing poverty.	0.782	
It would give people the freedom to make their own decisions independently.	0.625	
It would reduce the financial burden on the primary earner of the family.	0.695	
It would improve the mental and physical health of the beneficiaries.	0.780	
It would increase educational attainment among the beneficiaries.	0.736	
It would reduce the stigma associated with receiving benefits (the embarrassment of claiming the benefit).	0.623	
Perceived Moral Consequences		
People become lazy to work.	0.897	0.842
Poor people may use this money for drinking and smoking.	0.924	
What would you do if you received UBI payments without any conditions?		
Consumption of Temptation Goods		
I would eat in a 5-star or 7-star restaurant.	0.947	0.916
I would buy branded clothes.	0.947	
Consumption of Essential Goods		
I would ensure food, shelter, and clothing for my family.	0.717	0.755
I would continue with my education.	0.703	
I would get training to enhance my job skills.	0.777	
I would start my own business.	0.556	

Note. EFA stands for exploratory factor analysis.

Data Analysis and Results

Table 3 summarizes the results of the *t*-test across genders of the respondents. The findings suggest that the mean scores of males and females are significantly different for support for UBI and the perceived moral consequences of UBI. The mean values of males and females are recorded as 3.33 and 3.59, respectively, for support for UBI. It indicates that female respondents are more inclined to support UBI than male respondents. Furthermore, the mean

Table 3. *t-test Results Across Gender*

Factor	Gender	Mean	*t*-test		Null Hypotheses
			t-Statistics	Sign.	
Support for UBI	Female	3.59	–2.50	0.013**	**Rejected**
	Male	3.33			
Perceived Social Consequences	Female	3.75	–1.31	0.190	Not Rejected
	Male	3.65			
Perceived Moral Consequences	Female	3.38	2.011	0.045**	**Rejected**
	Male	3.61			
Consumption of Temptation Goods	Female	1.84	0.320	0.752	Not Rejected
	Male	1.87			
Consumption of Essential Goods	Female	3.80	1.087	0.278	Not Rejected
	Male	3.87			

Note. ** indicates $p < 0.05$; the mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

value for the moral consequences of UBI is recorded as 3.38 for females and 3.61 for males. It suggests that women are not convinced that UBI payments would lead to a decrease in work participation and an increase in alcohol intake. Thus, H_{01a} and H_{01c} are rejected. At the same time, both males and females are found to be indifferent toward the perceived social consequences of UBI, the consumption of essential goods, and temptation goods. Therefore, H_{01b}, H_{01d}, and H_{01e} are not rejected.

The results of the *t*-test across the occupational status of the respondents are summarized in Table 4. The results reveal that the mean difference between unemployed (looking for a job) and employed for support for UBI and perceived moral consequences are statistically significant, which means $p < 0.05$. The mean value of the unemployed is 3.57, and the employed is 3.28 for support for UBI and perceived moral consequences, 3.40 and 3.65, respectively. The results indicate that unemployed people are more likely to support the idea of UBI than employed people. Also, unemployed people are less skeptical about the moral consequences of UBI. Therefore, H_{02a} and H_{02c} are rejected. Nevertheless, the respondents are indifferent toward social consequences and consumption of essential and tempting goods. Hence, H_{02b}, H_{02d}, and H_{02e} are not rejected.

The results of one-way ANOVA based on income can be seen in Table 5. The Levene's values for all the variables are less than 0.05, which means the assumption of homogeneity of variance is not fulfilled. So, to know the significant difference among different groups, the Welch test has been performed. The *p*-value of support for

Table 4. *t-test Results Across Occupational Status*

Factor	Occupation	Mean	*t*-test		Null Hypotheses
			t-Statistics	Sign.	
Support for UBI	Unemployed	3.57	2.74	0.006**	**Rejected**
	Employed	3.28			
Perceived Social Consequences	Unemployed	3.74	1.33	0.184	Not Rejected
	Employed	3.64			
Perceived Moral Consequences	Unemployed	3.40	–2.23	0.26**	**Rejected**
	Employed	3.65			
Consumption of Temptation Goods	Unemployed	1.78	–1.86	0.063	Not Rejected
	Employed	1.95			
Consumption of Essential Goods	Unemployed	3.84	–0.155	0.877	Not Rejected
	Employed	3.85			

Note. ** ** indicates $p < 0.05$; the mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 5. *ANOVA Statistics Across Income*

Factors	Levene's Sign.	ANOVA Sign.	Welch Test		Null Hypothesis
			Statistics	Sign.	
Support for UBI	0.000*	-------	7.796	0.000**	**Rejected**
Perceived Social Consequences	0.024*	-------	0.298	0.827	Not Rejected
Perceived Moral Consequences	0.001*	-------	3.713	0.013**	**Rejected**
Consumption of Temptation Goods	0.003*	------	1.003	0.394	Not Rejected
Consumption of Essential Goods	0.289	0.927	------	-------	Not Rejected

Note. *Indicates $p < 0.05$, no homogeneity in group variance, and ** indicates $p < 0.05$, the mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 6. *Games–Howell Test Across Income*

Factor	Income (*I*)	Income (*J*)	*I–J*	Standard Error	Sign.
Support for UBI	Below 10K	25K – 40K	0.50877	0.14144	0.002*
		Above 40K	0.62982	0.19174	0.010*
Support for UBI	10K – 25K	25K – 40K	0.58611	0.17405	0.005*
		Above 40K	0.70716	0.21691	0.009*
Perceived Moral Consequences	Below 10K	Above 40K	–0.48904	0.18049	0.043*

UBI and perceived moral consequences is significant, which means less than 0.05. It indicates that there is a significant difference between the mean values across income for support for UBI and perceived moral consequences. So, H_{03a} and H_{03c} are rejected. However, the *p*-values of the remaining variables are not significant. Hence, H_{03b}, H_{03d}, and H_{03e} are not rejected. In Table 6, the post hoc comparison using the Games–Howell test shows that for support for UBI, the mean score of respondents whose income is less than 10K and between 10K and 25K is significantly different from the mean score of respondents whose income is between 25K and 40K and above 40K. It reveals that respondents with lower incomes are more inclined to favor the concept of UBI than those with higher incomes. However, the respondents whose income is less than 10K are more skeptical about the perceived moral consequences than respondents whose income is more than 40K.

Conclusion

Considering the demographic profile of the respondents, this study gives a clear knowledge of the variations in support of the proposal of UBI. The significance of concerns relating to social policy, especially in the light of difficulties faced by the Indian welfare system, like leakages of benefits to elites and lack of coverage for poor populations, shows how critical it is to find the best strategies for overcoming problematic modes of action. Basic income is viewed as a potential cure to the problems of poverty and inequality (Arcarons et al., 2014; Haarmann et al., 2024), a tool to ensure "real freedom to all" (van Parijs, 2004; van Parijs & Vanderborght, 2017) and requirement of the changing labor market (Baranowski, 2021). The findings demonstrate a considerable difference in the level of support for UBI based on the demographic features of the respondents. To begin with, the findings suggest that unemployed, low-income individuals and females are more likely to support UBI. These findings are consistent with the literature on attitudes toward existing welfare programs. Previous literature suggests that self-interest plays a significant role in forming opinions toward welfare policies. According to Hasenfeld and Rafferty (1989) and Huber and Form (1973), women are more inclined to accept universal programs than males since they are socially and economically more disadvantaged. Considering the fact that women require welfare benefits more frequently than men (Blekesaune & Quadagno, 2003), women have a larger self-interest. Likewise, low-income individuals and the unemployed are socioeconomically vulnerable (Blekesaune & Quadagno, 2003; Hasenfeld & Rafferty, 1989) and hence more inclined towards supporting UBI.

Moreover, females and unemployed individuals were less pessimistic about the moral consequences of UBI. They were not convinced that UBI would lead to a reduction in work participation and an increase in consumption of alcohol and tobacco. At the same time, people with low incomes thought the opposite and agreed that UBI payments would make people lazy and unproductive. Furthermore, this study clearly shows that the perceived social consequences of UBI and consumption of temptation and essential goods are consistent across gender, occupation, and income size of the sample.

Policy Implications

The study offers a substantial direction to the policymakers to understand the perception of the public for UBI. The findings of the study suggest that the government needs to design a national-level experiment to understand the financial and administrative feasibility of UBI in India. In addition to this, the government needs to evaluate the different welfare programs that currently exist and how the substitution of these programs with UBI impacts poverty, inequality, and unemployment in India. Moreover, the shortcomings in the existing welfare programs suggest that the government needs to have a proper mechanism to identify the eligible and ineligible beneficiaries of the welfare programs. Furthermore, the government needs to conduct randomized controlled trials to evaluate how the results vary by providing different amounts of benefits to different groups so that welfare programs can be framed accordingly.

Limitations of the Study and Scope for Future Research

Similar to any research study, this study also encompasses certain limitations. The first drawback is that this study focused only on five variables and overlooked other aspects of UBI. Therefore, if UBI is to be adopted in the future, future research might look into other factors as well, like respondents' propensity to work and how their work attitude affects their support for UBI. Another drawback of the study is the small sample size; thus, larger sample sizes could be considered in future research to enhance the generalizability of the results. Future studies can also examine the respondents' expectations of what other people would do with a similar sum of money and what they would do if the UBI were implemented.

Additionally, because this study only examined demographic aspects, future research may look into other variables, such as respondents' ideologies, that may influence support for universal basic income. The highlighted limits are a valuable input to future empirical studies. In light of the numerous potential negative effects, we think the study's conclusions would significantly advance the current discussion surrounding the concept of basic income.

Authors' Contribution

Prof. Khujan Singh developed the notion that was presented and assisted in the questionnaire's development. After conferring with Prof. Khujan Singh, Pooja Kataria examined the existing literature, gathered the necessary information, and took the lead in composing the text. Each author contributed to every facet of the study and offered helpful criticism.

Conflict of Interest

Funding Acknowledgement

References

Achterberg, P., Raven, J., & van der Veen, R. (2013). Individualization: A double-edged sword: Welfare, the experience of social risks and the need for social insurance in the Netherlands. *Current Sociology, 61*(7), 949–965. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392113499738

Aker, J. C. (2013). *Cash or coupons? Testing the impacts of cash versus vouchers in the democratic republic of Congo*. Available at SSRN. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2241237

Andersson, J. O., & Kangas, O. (2002). Popular support for basic income in Sweden and Finland. In *9th International Congress of the Basic Income European Network (BIEN)* (pp. 1–15). https://basicincome.org/bien/pdf/2002AnderssonKangas.pdf

Arcarons, J., Pañella, R. D., & Mèlich, L. T. (2014). Feasibility of financing a basic income. *Basic Income Studies, 9*(1–2), 79–93. https://doi.org/10.1515/bis-2014-0005

Baker, J. (2008). All things considered, should feminists embrace basic income? *Basic Income Studies, 3*(3). https://doi.org/10.2202/1932-0183.1129

Banerjee, A. V., & Duflo, E. (2007). The economic lives of the poor. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 21*(1), 141–168. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.21.1.141

Banerjee, A., & Mullainathan, S. (2010). *The shape of temptation: Implications for the economic lives of the poor* (NBER Working Paper No. 15973). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w15973

Banerjee, A., Niehaus, P., & Suri, T. (2019). Universal basic income in the developing world. *Annual Review of Economics, 11,* 959–983. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080218-030229

Baranowski, M. (2021). The sharing economy: Social welfare in a technologically networked economy. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society, 41*(1), 20–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/02704676211010723

Bazzi, S., Sumarto, S., & Suryahadi, A. (2015). It's all in the timing: Cash transfers and consumption smoothing in a developing country. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 119*, 267–288. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2015.08.010

Blekesaune, M., & Quadagno, J. (2003). Public attitudes toward welfare state Policies: A comparative analysis of 24 nations. *European Sociological Review, 19*(5), 415–427. https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/19.5.415

Bordoloi, R. (2014). Formulation and implementation of government policies and programmes with reference to Assam. *Arthshastra Indian Journal of Economics & Research, 3*(1), 40–47. https://doi.org/10.17010/aijer/2014/v3i1/55963

Browne, J., & Immervoll, H. (2017). Mechanics of replacing benefit systems with a basic income: Comparative results from a microsimulation approach. *The Journal of Economic Inequality, 15,* 325–344. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10888-017-9366-6

Brune, L., Kerwin, J. T., & Li, Q. (2022). How important is temptation spending? Maybe less than we thought. *The World Bank Economic Review, 36*(2), 433–454. https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/lhab027

Bruns, S., & Mußhoff, O. (2022). An empirical identification of temptation goods: Perceptions of Cambodian smallholder farmers. *Applied Economics, 54*(17), 1999–2012. https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2021.1983147

Burstein, P. (2003). The impact of public opinion on public policy: A review and an agenda. *Political Research Quarterly, 56*(1), 29–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/106591290305600103

Choi, G. (2021). Basic human values and attitudes towards a universal basic income in Europe. *Basic Income Studies, 16*(2), 101–123. https://doi.org/10.1515/bis-2021-0010

Dasso, R., & Fernandez, F. (2014). *Temptation goods and conditional cash transfers in Peru* (pp. 1–27). International Food and Policy Research Institute. http://www-2.iies.su.se/papers/ASWEDE_C1_Fernandez.pdf

Davala, S., Jhabvala, R., Mehta, S. K., & Standing, G. (2015). *Basic income: A transformative policy for India* (1st ed.). Bloomsbury Academic. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781472593061

Erikson, R. S. (1976). The relationship between public opinion and state policy: A new look based on some forgotten data. *American Journal of Political Science, 20*(1), 25–36. https://doi.org/10.2307/2110507

Evans, D. K., & Popova, A. (2017). Cash transfers and temptation goods. *Economic Development and Cultural Change, 65*(2), 189–221. https://doi.org/10.1086/689575

Gamel, C., Balsan, D., & Vero, J. (2006). The impact of basic income on the propensity to work: Theoretical issues and micro-econometric results. *The Journal of Socio-Economics, 35*(3), 476–497. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2005.11.025

Gilbert, R., Murphy, N. A., Stepka, A., Barrett, M., & Worku, D. (2018). Would a basic income guarantee reduce the motivation to work? An analysis of labor responses in 16 trial programs. *Basic Income Studies, 13*(2), 20180011. https://doi.org/10.1515/bis-2018-0011

Grosh, M., Leite, P., Wai-Poi, M., & Tesliuc, E. (2022). *Revisiting targeting in social assistance: A new look at old dilemmas. Human development perspectives.* World Bank Publications. http://hdl.handle.net/10986/37228

Haarmann, C., Haarmann, D., Jauch, H., Shindondola-Mote, H., Nattrass, N., van Niekerk, I., & Samson, M. (2024). *Making the difference! The Basic Income Grant in Namibia* (Namibia Digital Repository). https://www.namibiadigitalrepository.com/items/show/456

Hair Jr., J. F., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & Kuppelwieser, V. G. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM): An emerging tool in business research. *European Business Review, 26*(2), 106–121. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-10-2013-0128

Hamilton, L., Yorgun, M., & Wright, A. (2022). "People nowadays will take everything they can get": American perceptions of basic income usage. *Journal of Policy Practice & Research, 3,* 77–95. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42972-021-00035-0

Handa, S., Daidone, S., Peterman, A., Davis, B., Pereira, A., Palermo, T., & Yablonski, J. (2018). Myth-busting? Confronting six common perceptions about unconditional cash transfers as a poverty reduction strategy in Africa. *The World Bank Research Observer, 33*(2), 259–298. https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lky003

Hanna, R., & Olken, B. A. (2018). Universal basic incomes versus targeted transfers: Anti-poverty programs in developing countries. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 32*(4), 201–226. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.32.4.201

Hasenfeld, Y., & Rafferty, J. A. (1989). The determinants of public attitudes toward the welfare state. *Social Forces, 67*(4), 1027–1048. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/67.4.1027

Haushofer, J., & Shapiro, J. (2013, November 15). *Household response to income changes: Evidence from an unconditional cash transfer program in Kenya.* https://files.givewell.org/files/DWDA%202009/Interventions/Cash%20Transfers/haushofer_shapiro_uct_2013.11.16.pdf

Haushofer, J., & Shapiro, J. (2016). The short-term impact of unconditional cash transfers to the poor: Experimental evidence from Kenya. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 131*(4), 1973–2042. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjw025

Hill, K. Q., & Hinton-Anderson, A. (1995). Pathways of representation: A causal analysis of public opinion-policy linkages. *American Journal of Political Science, 39*(4), 924–935. https://doi.org/10.2307/2111663

Huber, J., & Form, W. H. (1973). *Income and ideology: An analysis of the American political formula.* Free Press.

Jæger, M. M. (2006). What makes people support public responsibility for welfare provision: Self-interest or political ideology?: A longitudinal approach. *Acta Sociologica, 49*(3), 321–338. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001699306067718

Jumrani, J., & Birthal, P. S. (2017). Does consumption of tobacco and alcohol affect household food security? Evidence from rural India. *Food Security, 9,* 255–279. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-017-0660-8

Katada, K. (2012). Basic income and feminism: In terms of "the gender division of labor". In *14th International Congress of the Basic Income Earth Network* (pp. 14–16). https://basicincome.org/bien/pdf/munich2012/katada.pdf

Korpi, W., & Palme, J. (1998). The paradox of redistribution and strategies of equality: Welfare state institutions, inequality, and poverty in the Western countries. *American Sociological Review, 63*(5), 661–687. https://doi.org/10.2307/2657333

McKay, A. (2001). Rethinking work and income maintenance policy: Promoting gender equality through a citizens' basic income. *Feminist Economics, 7*(1), 97–118. https://doi.org/10.1080/13545700010022721

Ministry of Finance, Government of India. (2017). *Universal basic income: A conversation with and within the Mahatma, Economic Survey 2016–17.* https://www.indiabudget.gov.in/budget2017-2018/es2016-17/echapter.pdf

Olken, B. A. (2019). Designing anti-poverty programs in emerging economies in the 21st century: Lessons from Indonesia for the world. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies, 55*(3), 319–339. https://doi.org/10.1080/00074918.2019.1690411

Parolin, Z., & Siöland, L. (2020). Support for a universal basic income: A demand–capacity paradox? *Journal of European Social Policy, 30*(1), 5–19. https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928719886525

Roosma, F., & van Oorschot, W. (2020). Public opinion on basic income: Mapping European support for a radical alternative for welfare provision. *Journal of European Social Policy, 30*(2), 190–205. https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928719882827

Shah, K. K., & Jani, D. G. (2019). A preliminary survey of the theoretical and practical aspects of UBI and assessing its feasibility in the context of the Indian economy. *Arthshastra Indian Journal of Economics & Research, 8*(4), 47–55. https://doi.org/10.17010/aijer/2019/v8i4/148071

van Oorschot, W. (1991). Non-take-up of social security benefits in Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy, 1*(1), 15–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/095892879100100103

van Parijs, P. (2004). Basic income: A simple and powerful idea for the twenty-first century. *Politics & Society, 32*(1), 7–39. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032329203261095

van Parijs, P., & Vanderborght, Y. (2017*). Basic income: A radical proposal for a free society and a sane economy.* Harvard University Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv253f7wq

Vlandas, T. (2019). The politics of the basic income guarantee: Analysing individual support in Europe. *Basic Income Studies, 14*(1), 20180021. https://doi.org/10.1515/bis-2018-0021

Vlandas, T. (2021). The political economy of individual-level support for the basic income in Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy, 31*(1), 62–77. https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928720923596

White, J. S., & Basu, S. (2016). Does the benefits schedule of cash assistance programs affect the purchase of temptation goods? Evidence from Peru. *Journal of Health Economics, 46,* 70–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2016.01.005

Yi, G. (2018). The effects of Basic Income on labour supply. *Korean Social Security Studies, 34*(1), 193–218.

Younder Counsulting. (2018). *Universal basic income survey*. https://yonderconsulting.com/poll/universal-basic-income-survey/

Zelleke, A. (2008). Institutionalizing the universal caretaker through a basic income? *Basic Income Studies, 3*(3). https://doi.org/10.2202/1932-0183.1133

About the Authors

Dr. Khujan Singh is a Professor at the Haryana School of Business, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology, Hisar, Haryana. Specializing in business economics, he has authored two textbooks and numerous research papers published in esteemed journals.

Pooja Kataria is currently pursuing her research as a Scholar at the Haryana School of Business, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology, Hisar, Haryana.