

Table 4

Across all categories of how people view the welfare state (from protecting vulnerable through to stepping out of the way), more people support than oppose basic income in principle. The highest margin is those who see the welfare state's purpose as supporting the vulnerable (48% to 16%), followed by intervening in individual behaviour (43% to 18%), the contributory principle (37% to 20%), and stepping out of the way (37% to 21%), while the lowest margin is those who believe in prioritising common ways of life, e.g. marriage (39% to 31%),

Table 7 - *It would do a better job than the current system at providing a guaranteed basic level of security*

Not much that's surprising. Across all categories of welfare state responses there's significant agreement that BI would better provide better security than status quo. Libertarians (getting out the way) are the least likely to see basic income as more secure than the status quo.

49% of those who oppose basic income in principle disagree that it'd be a better way of providing security than the current system. Perhaps making that argument could sway some anti-BI folks?

Interestingly, of those who say they neither support nor oppose the idea there's a significant leaning towards seeing BI as better for providing security (31% to 11%).

Table 9 - *The current system is working in the main so there is no reason to consider alternatives*

Notable takeaway is that the only people that thinks (in net terms) that the status quo is working in the main is the sub-group who oppose basic income in principle (43% think it's working, 32% don't). Weirdly 12% of those who support basic income in principle agree that the current system's working so there's no need to consider alternatives (?) although the majority of them only agree slightly.

Only 19% of both those who believe in protecting the vulnerable and the contributory principle think the current system is working, while it's 21-32% for all the other welfare sub-groups.

Table 11 - *It could give people the freedom to make the right decisions for themselves and their families to a greater extent than the current system allows*

Perhaps surprisingly, those most likely to agree with this from amongst the welfare respondent sub-groups are those who think the state should prioritise common ways of life, e.g. marriage (62%). There seems to be a good agency argument here, is a popular opinion in general, garnering support across the spectrum.

Table 13 - *If everyone received the payments it would create a disincentive to work, a risk that is too great compared with the current system*

29% of those who support basic income in principle think it would disincentivise work, while 52% of those who neither support nor oppose think the same. 72% of those who oppose basic income think it'll stop people working – making it one of the biggest sticking points.

The *majority* of every welfare sub-group (except those who see the government's role as protecting the needy and vulnerable) see basic income as disincentivising work. There's a lot of work to do here to present the other side of the story. 62% of those who want to prioritise common ways of life (marriage) see basic income as a disincentive while only 6% disagree with the statement.

Table 15 - *The payments would provide more of an incentive to work because people wouldn't lose money if they got a job (as with many current benefits)*

Despite the above, every welfare subgroup (except those who think the government should step out of the way, and only just) think that basic income could incentivise work. I'm guessing that once it's put up against UC, as the survey did, people understand the marginal deduction dynamic (even if it's not put in those terms).

Surprisingly, 35% of those who oppose basic income in principle think that it could incentivise work, whilst 41% disagree.

Table 17 - *It would decrease crime by reducing destitution and extreme need*

There's an outlier here. Whilst most of the welfare subgroups seem fairly balanced on this question (vulnerable slightly pro, contributory slightly against), those who prioritise common ways of life overwhelmingly see the crime reduction point as a benefit of basic income. 52% believe it could reduce crime while only 17% disagree.

Table 19 - *It would increase educational attainment*

Pretty much identical results to the above – suggests link between crime and education. It should be noted, however, that the sample size for the common life subgroup is very small (~50). Can give insights nonetheless, more as focus than national survey, though.

Those who oppose the idea of basic income disagree with this statement overwhelmingly – (10% pro to 52% anti). Seems to be strong feelings here, worth pushing the education angle (e.g. Dauphin) if we want to up support.

Table 21 - *It would improve mental and physical health*

As with the above, there's surprisingly low support for this. There's no subgroup (except those who support basic income in principle – 60%) for which there's a majority agreeing. This is perhaps an area for development and strong messaging as there's lots of evidence connecting BI with positive health outcomes. 49% of those opposing basic income in principle disagree that it'll lead to good health.

Table 23 - *It would reduce the stigma associated with receiving benefits*

Quite strong support for this across the welfare subgroups (43-56%), but 43% of those who oppose basic income disagree that BI would reduce stigma. 25% *strongly* disagree.

Table 25 - *It would cause inflation*

Of those who support BI in principle, 20% think it would lead to inflation. 44% who oppose the idea think the same – quite a large subsection – while only 6% disagree with the statement. Addressing the inflation question could swing some people.

The other subset of note is those who believe that welfare's role is to intervene in people's behaviour. 34% think it would lead to inflation, 7% don't.

Table 27 - *It is unaffordable*

All welfare subgroups on balance think that it's unaffordable. The highest 'strongly disagree' value is only 9% (for those who think the state's role is to protect the vulnerable). 35% of that sub-group think that it's unaffordable. We already know this but the affordability question is key. 40% or more of the other welfare subgroups think its unaffordable, most extremely for the group who believe in intervening in individual behaviour (58% to 8%), followed by the contributory principle set (46% to 10%).

Those who support basic income in principle are evenly split agree/disagree (27% for each) and those who oppose BI are *heavily* skewed toward 'unaffordable' (73% to 6%). This is the largest margin I can see for any question 3 option.

Table 29 - *The money spent giving everyone a basic income could be better targeted e.g. towards the very poorest alone*

This is an interesting one. The group most likely to support a basic income in principle (supporting the vulnerable) is the second most likely to think the money would be better spent in a targeted fashion (50% to 18%). The welfare subgroup most likely to think money should be targeted is the common ways of life group (55% to 8%), while the least likely is the contributory group, which is strange (40% to 18%).

Of those who support basic income in principle, 40% believe money would be better spent if it were targeted. Only 23% disagree. It's worth trying to unpack this one. I would say it's important to emphasise the other end of the basic income dynamic – progressive taxation, sovereign wealth funds, wealth taxes etc. – so that people get that the policy is balanced out at the funding end (i.e. the rich pay more into the scheme than they get out). Also important to emphasise the retention of disability/housing benefit etc.

Table 31 - *I would be more inclined to support a Universal Basic Income if it were not funded by a rise in income tax/national insurance*

There's (unsurprisingly) widespread agreement with this statement. Notable points: the 'vulnerable' welfare group has significantly a lower 'agree' and higher 'disagree' than the others (>10%), which I would guess is because they'd support the policy already (the question implies a change in position).

Of those who disagree with basic income in principle, 30% say they wouldn't be any more likely to support if it didn't mean raising income tax/NI. 35% of the group agree with the statement. I'd guess this means that a) there's a considerable portion of the 'oppose' group

who don't care about how its funded (so are ideologically against) but also that b) there's a similar sized chunk that could be swayed if BI weren't funded by raised income taxes/NI.

As with the above (Table 29), it's worth hitting home that progressive taxation, sovereign wealth funds, wealth taxes etc. are preferable funding options. Could increase support significantly.

Table 33 - *It would benefit me and my family*

Two points here (remembering that there's net disagreement with this statement): those who care about family (n=~50) disproportionately agree that it would benefit them and their families (42% to 28%). They're the only welfare subgroup who think this, by a considerable margin.

Second, those who are against basic income overwhelmingly think it wouldn't benefit them personally (60% to 14%). There's a split between those who support the idea: 36% think it would benefit them, 33% don't.

Table 35 - *Rather than cash, the state should provide citizens with basic food supplies and social housing to meet their needs*

Again, there seems to be a somewhat contradictory consensus here. Every welfare group thinks money would be better spent on services. The 'vulnerable' subgroup thinks so by the slimmest margin (39% to 34%), for all other subgroups the 'agree' percentage is 55% or over.

When we split it by support for basic income, in principle, there's an odd pattern. Many more people who 'don't know' if they support basic income think money would be better spent on services (49% to 19%), while the 'support' and 'oppose' groups are more evenly split. The 'support' group think services are better by 45% to 31%, while the 'oppose' group – weirdly – are *less likely* to agree that services are better than cash – 45% to 41%. Worth thinking about.

Table 35 - *Experiments*

No real surprises here. All welfare subgroups, on balance, open to experiments in their area. Those who support the idea of basic income would welcome experiments, by 74% to 2%, while those who neither support nor oppose feel similarly (20% to 11%), although the 'neither welcome nor oppose' experiments segment is large (52%). Those who oppose the idea of basic income, in principle, are dead against experiments in their area. 61% oppose whilst only 11% would welcome. 22% are indifferent.

Table 39 - *Which, if any, of the following funding options would you like to see used to fund a Universal Basic Income?*

Interesting table. The most popular funding strategy, overall, is the raising of progressive income taxes 'so the rich pay more into the scheme that they get out' (39% overall). However, when you look at the subgroups there are several distinct patterns. The 'vulnerable' welfare group likes progressive income tax (47%) and the creation of new funding streams – wealth taxes, etc. – (39%). For all other welfare subgroups support for raising progressive

taxes is a third or lower, and the highest support for all (except 'common ways of life') is reducing the amount spent on other benefits. 19% of the 'stepping out of the way' group support shrinking the welfare state, though this isn't popular amongst other groups.

Amongst those who support basic income in principle, there's 51%, 47%, and 40% support for progressive income tax, new funding mechanisms, and reducing spending on other benefits, respectively. 25% support raising income tax rates for ordinary taxpayers – the highest for any subgroup. For 'neither support nor oppose' the most popular option is raising progressive income tax (36%), and for 'oppose' it's cutting other benefits (31%), although this is tied for the latter with 'none of these'. Still, 29% of those opposing basic income would support raising progressive income taxes.

It seems that there's at least scope for talking about alternative funding mechanisms, and that considerable sections of the population would listen (across the spectrum of pro- and anti-basic income, and welfare groupings). The least popular option after shrinking the welfare state is increasing income taxes for all (even if ordinary tax payers gained overall), meaning that more inventive schemes are considerably more popular.