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Abstract

This study explores how the seemingly utopian and marginal idea of basic income has found a place on the policy agenda. It investigates the contexts, circumstances, actors and translating forces involved in basic income pilot projects in Finland, the Netherlands, Ontario and Scotland. The shift from radical idea to implementation is little explored in the literature, with no existing empirical analysis of the cases in the study. The study aims to address these deficiencies, and in doing so to construct an account of policy change in progress. The study takes an inductive, exploratory approach, using comparative case studies, incorporating semi-structured interviews and document analysis. The resulting data are analysed using grounded theory techniques. The study finds that all four cases demonstrate many common features: multiple factors coinciding temporally have reinforced each other, legitimising basic income as a solution to problems of policy failure, unemployment and poverty. Each case also has its own focus and form due to the translating effects of local circumstances. The study provides an insight for scholars and policy-makers into how a radical idea can manoeuvre around political, cultural, and bureaucratic barriers, and find a place in the policy mainstream.
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Introduction

How many policy ideas can claim support from as diverse a range of people as Richard Branson, John McDonnell, Milton Friedman and Mark Zuckerberg (Virgin, 2017; Cowburn, 2017; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017; Griffin, 2017)? Whether called a universal basic income, a basic income guarantee, or a citizen’s income, at its core basic income is a regular payment, transferred to everyone in society, with no obligations, means-testing or conditions attached (Widerquist and Lewis, 2005; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017). It promises a life free from poverty, where all citizens enjoy real freedom and an equal stake in society, where automation is no longer a cause of anxiety, and where no-one is forced into poor quality, low-paid work (Van Parijs, 1992; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017). Previously an idea very much at the margins of politics and policy debates, basic income has enjoyed a steep rise in popularity recently, attracting regular coverage in the mainstream media, and pilot projects are now underway or in planning in eight countries (McFarland, 2017).

This rise from utopian idea to experimental policy is, so far, little explored or understood. There is much debate about the merits of basic income, but little understanding of how such an idea, deeply challenging to many entrenched principles of developed welfare states, and of Western models of aid and development, has moved into the mainstream, and why it has happened simultaneously in multiple places (De Wispelaere, 2016c). Gaining a foothold on the policy agenda is challenging enough, graduating to actual implementation is yet more rare (Kingdon, 2011). Only a handful of authors have written about how basic income might be adopted as a legitimate policy, or the challenges to be addressed in doing so (see Groot and van der Veen, 2000; Mulvale, 2008; Jordan, 2011; 2012; De Wispelaere, 2016a; Koistinen and Perkiö, 2014). This literature is generally theoretical in nature, with empirical work mainly confined to quantitative studies on the effects of small-scale experiments (for example Forget, 2011). The literature often deals with basic income as a free-floating idea, not grounded in or influenced by any particular locality. That which is geographically specific tends to be historical surveys of the fate of basic income, providing only partial insight into the current shift in status (for example Mulvale and Frankel, 2016). There is no academic literature in print which empirically investigates the current pilot projects, or any linkages between them.

This study therefore sets out to understand the contexts, circumstances, and key actors involved in four of the pilot projects: Finland, the Netherlands, Ontario and Scotland. It will explore how basic income is legitimised as a policy solution, and to what problems, how the idea and implementation of basic income varies across the cases, and the key actors involved in the policy processes. Taking
an inductive, exploratory approach, comparative case studies are used, employing qualitative interviews with individuals involved in the pilot projects, and document analysis. Grounded theory techniques are used to analyse the data, to identify the key themes in the individual cases, and the commonalities and differences across all four.

Understanding how and why basic income has made progress in multiple locations will illuminate aspects of basic income as a policy idea, as well as complementing existing literature on policy change. It will also shed light on changing attitudes towards some of the established principles of Western social security systems. For those interested in studying basic income and/ or advancing it as a policy solution in their own locality, the study will provide insight into how this has occurred elsewhere.

The study is structured as follows:

A review of the existing literature surveys the theoretical propositions about how and why basic income might become an implemented policy, and positions this study as a valuable addition to the literature, particularly given its empirical basis.

The methods chapter describes and justifies the research design, explains how the research and analysis was carried out, and addresses ethical considerations, limitations of the study, and researcher reflexivity.

The findings and discussion are then presented together in one chapter, containing analytical descriptions of each case, and comparative discussion of the key themes which cut across the cases.

Finally, the conclusion reflects on the findings of the study in light of the original research questions, evaluates the relationship between the study and the literature, and makes suggestions as to further research that could enhance understanding of this topic.

Basic income (abbreviated to BI from hereon) is used in this study as a catch-all term for policies drawing on the core principles of BI: a universal, unconditional, regular cash payment (Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017). The ‘pure’ form of BI which adheres to all these core principles is termed paradigmatic. However, as will be seen, the forms of BI developed for actual implementation diverge from the paradigmatic in one or more ways. These practical and limited forms of BI are referred to as pragmatic (De Wispelaere and Stirton, 2011). ‘Social assistance’ is used to describe means-tested benefit programmes for the unemployed and low earners; ‘social security’ is defined more broadly as the wider system of means-tested and non means-tested benefits for individuals and households in need (Walker, 2005).
Literature Review

Introduction
This chapter surveys the literature on BI, principally focusing on that which addresses the contexts and circumstances in which BI might obtain a foothold on the policy agenda. It defines BI and its origins, and looks at some previous attempts at implementation. It synthesises the literature which addresses the policy and political conditions under which BI might be adopted, and the barriers and levers to doing so, moving on to provide an overview of the arguments for and against BI, and the alternatives. It shows that the literature exploring BI policy-making and implementation and the contexts in which these occur is limited in volume, lacks empirical evidence, and often theorises about BI in abstract, rather than specific, settings.

The majority of the BI literature explores the philosophical and moral arguments for and against (Van der Veen and Van Parijs, 1986; Van Parijs, 2013), economic modelling (Atkinson, 1995), and explorations of its potential effects (Robeyns, 2001; Hirsch, 2015; Torry, 2015; Reed and Lansley, 2016). The philosophical literature explores BI as a paradigmatic ideal, in contrast to the smaller amount of pragmatic literature which addresses issues of policy-making and implementation (De Wispelaere and Stirton, 2011). There is also an increasing volume of grey literature (see Painter and Thoung, 2015; Story, 2015; Reed and Lansley, 2016). The majority of the literature reviewed here addresses BI in the context of the Global North; there is also literature about BI as an anti-poverty measure in the Global South (see Herbert, 2015; Davala et al, 2016; Lacey, 2017). Literature which explores the local history and political standing of BI exists for all countries under investigation apart from Scotland. Literature was obtained through library searches, hand searching, online searches and databases (see appendix 1).

BI Definitions and Origins
As described in the introduction to this study, paradigmatic BI is a non-means-tested payment to everyone in society, with entitlements based on citizenship rather than behavioural or economic conditions (Offe, 1992; Widerquist and Lewis, 2005; Torry, 2015; Van Parijs and Vanderborgh, 2017). Although the basic conception is simple, in implementation it may take many forms, depending on what it is intended to do, what it replaces, and how it is funded (Van Parijs and Vanderborgh, 2017). Setting the level high enough to make a difference, but low enough to be affordable, is a fundamental challenge inherent in BI, and the basis of much debate (Van Parijs, 2004). Most advocates suggest BI would not be generous enough to live on comfortably, but should allow people to live with a manageable level of risk and the opportunity to make autonomous choices (Offe, 1992; Pateman, 2004).
With origins traceable back to Paine in the late 18th century (Paine, 1798), since the 1960s BI has increasingly been a subject of policy debate in Europe and North America, going through peaks and troughs in popularity. Experiments in BI-related policies, including negative income tax (NIT)\textsuperscript{1}, took place in the US in the 1960s and 70s, and BI rose in prominence in Europe in the 1980s (Walter, 1989; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017). In the 1990s, literature generally originated from political philosophers, gradually spreading to social scientists, advocates and public officials, with a growing interest in pragmatic questions (Mulvale, 2008). This broadening out reflects both a significant growth in the scope and magnitude of debate, and the lack of consideration of the practicalities of BI in the earlier philosophical literature. BI is now a credible and much-debated alternative to existing welfare policies, and, many believe, a genuine opportunity to address poverty and inequality (De Wispelaere, 2016a). However, there is very little in the literature about BI’s rise in the policy stakes (De Wispelaere, 2016c), and what there is is generally theoretical, with very little empirical research.

**Trials, Counterparts and False Starts**

In some countries, such as Finland and Canada, there is a long history of debate about BI (Koistinen and Perkiö, 2014; Mulvale and Frankel, 2016). In some Nordic countries, such as Finland, with longstanding commitments to universalism, BI resonates, and has had support since the 1970s not just from activists and academics but also politicians (Groot and van der Veen, 2000; Koistinen and Perkiö, 2014). However, in others such as Sweden, ostensibly with similar cultural and social values, the idea has never taken hold beyond a minority utopian vision (Andersson, 2000). A range of BI proposals have been made over the years in Finland, pitched as pragmatic improvements to the current system rather than a complete overhaul, to moderate the possibility of appearing overly radical (Andersson, 2000; Koistinen and Perkiö, 2014). Support for BI grew over time amongst political parties, both left and right-wing, and because Finnish governments have often been coalitions, smaller parties that support BI have been able to wield some power (Andersson, 2000). This support has not led to implementation until now, due to fractured political support, a mismatch with existing welfare systems, and ideological divergences with the country’s strong work ethic. Rapid growth in income inequality since 2000, and a more recent erosion of the fundamentals of sustainable employment, have given the idea more momentum (Koistinen and Perkiö, 2014).

In the Netherlands, BI gained political relevance during the late 1970s and 1980s, with support spreading from a single political party to include a range of other actors. Although the government has been resistant to the idea of uncoupling work and income, it has been recognised that labour

\textsuperscript{1} A tax repayment made to those earning below a specific threshold so as to guarantee a certain level of income (Walter, 1989)
market change in the future, for example the impact of technology, may make the idea more relevant and palatable (Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017).

BI has moved on and off the policy agenda in Canada over a period of at least 50 years, with interest now at a peak. The cost of poverty, ineffectiveness of existing strategies, and growing awareness of precarious work have all contributed to the increased interest. Previous attempts to introduce BI were thwarted by high costs, political criticism and concerns about reduced employment incentives (Mulvale and Frankel, 2016). The data from a small-scale NIT experiment in the 1970s, the Mincome experiment, was rediscovered in 2011, and showed positive outcomes in health and education (Forget, 2011). This, combined with Senate reports in the late 2000s which included recommendations relating to BI, sowed the seeds of Ontario’s current experiment. Conservative Senator Hugh Segal became a high profile advocate, focusing on the potential of BI to allow citizens to live with dignity. This long history has led to increased awareness and support for BI, and also more credible and sophisticated approaches to influencing the policy agenda and designing implementation plans (Mulvale and Frankel, 2016).

As well as the Mincome experiment, a number of other small-scale trials, cash-transfer schemes and stalled attempts to introduce BI provide some insight into its growing popularity. In Namibia all the inhabitants of a village were given a BI between 2008 and 2010, and in India, residents of eight villages have been given a monthly BI since 2011 (Muzzioli, 2013). Examples of stalled BI policies include a green paper in Ireland in 2002, US trials in the 1960s, and a Brazilian law enshrining a universal grant in legislation, which fell foul of financial constraints and competition with another programme (De Wispelaere, 2016a). Every citizen in Alaska receives an annual dividend from the profits of investments from the oil industry. In Iran, subsidies have been paid to citizens since 2010 to smooth the transition from heavily subsidised to market oil prices. The latter two policies were not designed to address the same problems as BI, but they are examples of widely popular universal and unconditional benefits. However, the similarity to BI is a by-product, and their circumstances are not readily replicable or particularly relevant to other jurisdictions (De Wispelaere, 2016a; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017).

Given the limited and sometimes tangential nature of the policies and experiments described above, and despite their extensive coverage in the literature, it seems unlikely they can fully account for the rise in interest in BI. BI has not tended to stay on political agendas for long, disappearing when conditions change, and not resulting in significant action. Initial interest in and advocacy for the policy has often come from those outside the political mainstream, and advocates and academics have had little power to force it onto the agenda (Groot and van der Veen, 2000). However, now the
idea is gaining traction and moving to experimental implementation in a growing number of countries (De Wispelaere, 2016a).

Precursors and Conditions for Adoption

The conditions for adoption of BI are likely to vary according to when and where adoption occurs. There will not be one single model of implementation, but as many as there are countries introducing it, tailored to fit with each country’s existing policies, the political climate, and the discourses around work, fairness and citizenship (Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017). Each model will involve a range of actors: visionaries to sell the idea, activists to resist policies which further marginalise the poor, and policy-makers who know how to navigate and influence policy processes and systems, dubbed ‘tinkerers’ by Van Parijs and Vanderborght (2017: 215).

Offe (2009) and Van Parijs and Vanderborght (2017) suggest that BI is unlikely to be adopted quickly on a large scale, despite its appearance on the policy agenda as a fully formed idea, but rather by incremental steps. Other policies may set out on a relevant trajectory which, while not necessarily adhering to the paradigmatic model of BI, could open up space in which BI becomes more relevant and visible, and those in power are more open to new ideas and negotiation (Quilley, 2000; De Wispelaere and Fitzpatrick, 2011; De Wispelaere and Stirton, 2011; Jordan, 2012; De Wispelaere, 2016a). Conditional Cash Transfers (CCTs) and the UK’s Universal Credit (UC) are both suggested as possible precursors to BI. CCTs are seen by Standing (2008) to establish the importance of benefits paid in cash, although they are crucially different to BI in their use of conditionality<sup>2</sup> (De Wispelaere, 2016a). UC merges several benefits into one payment, designed to ensure that work always pays, and it is suggested that conditionality could be gradually stripped away from UC to move towards a BI model (Jordan, 2012; Hirsch, 2015).

However, both of these examples demonstrate the risks attached to this approach. Introducing programmes similar to BI may simply generate competition rather than smoothing the way, and may not address the same problems as BI (LoVuolo, 2012; Hirsch, 2015; De Wispelaere, 2016a). Completely removing conditionality from CCTs may be politically unacceptable, although it is worth noting that in implementation conditionality can be more, or less, enforced, making some CCT programmes essentially BI with a different name (Peck and Theodore, 2015). The current model of UC retains high levels of conditionality, sanctions and means-testing, and, minimal, if any, work incentives for many claimants (Story, 2015). Coupled with the strong influence in the UK of

---

<sup>2</sup> The requirements placed on claimants to qualify for payment of benefits
discourses of welfare dependency and the undeserving poor, it is hard to see how UC could morph into BI (De Wispelaere, 2016a).

Even if similar programmes are successfully introduced, this is no guarantee to further progress, with political disagreement and public resistance representing significant threats (Jordan, 2011). Whilst the current surge in interest seems to represent a major step forwards, and suggests the possibility that a policy window has opened up (Kingdon, 2011), it will count for little if the policy never progresses beyond pilot stage. In the ongoing context of austerity, moving from experimental policy to full implementation is no certainty (Mulvale, 2008; De Wispelaere, 2016a).

**Barriers and Levers to Adoption**

There is limited research, particularly empirical studies, into the conditions under which BI moves onto the policy agenda and is considered a viable policy option, or the barriers which might prevent it from doing so (De Wispelaere, 2016a).

The pragmatic literature highlights the distance between theoretical support of BI and a fully functioning programme (Groot and van der Veen, 2000). High level support may be needed to navigate complex political and bureaucratic processes (De Wispelaere, 2016a). Practical issues and costs are key, but also in some countries the extent to which public attitudes towards work, tax, fairness and reciprocity would need to be influenced may be insurmountable (De Wispelaere and Fitzpatrick, 2011; Piachaud, 2016; Jackson, 2017). As Offe (2009) notes, new policies need to be compatible with the context in which they are being introduced. Being open to compromise about the degree to which an implemented BI sticks to the paradigmatic model is one way to proceed, although this risks undermining the philosophical basis of the idea and potentially reducing the benefits (De Wispelaere and Stirton, 2011; Martinelli, 2016). Several commentators doubt there will ever be a fully implemented paradigmatic BI, and that the current trials might best be considered thought-experiments, allowing new aspects of welfare policy to be debated and tested (Gaffney, 2015; Raittila, 2017; Ravallion, 2017).

BI attracts support across the political spectrum, albeit in different forms and for different reasons (Reed and Lansley, 2016). For those on the left, BI would operate in addition to other forms of welfare as an egalitarian means of tackling poverty; for the right it would shrink the welfare state, reducing ‘social engineering’ and transferring responsibility onto individuals (Murray, 2008; Hirsch, 2015; Reed and Lansley, 2016; Jackson, 2017). Free-market think tank the Adam Smith Institute recognises, along with many left-wing commentators, that the current UK social security system is not working, and proposes a NIT as a pragmatic and fair alternative (Story, 2015). NIT was popularised by Milton Friedman in the 1970s, who saw it as a replacement for the majority of other
forms of welfare support, as do many right-wing advocates today (Atkinson, 1995; Offe, 2009; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017).

This cross-party appeal could be seen as supporting the development of BI schemes in the real world. The role of coalitions involving ‘powerful political agents’ (De Wispelaere, 2016b: 135) in securing meaningful support and progress towards implementation may be key. However, coalitions can be fragile and struggle to contain a multitude of opinions (Martinelli, 2016), as ideas about the purpose and form of schemes get pulled in opposing directions (Walter, 1989; De Wispelaere and Stirton, 2013). Beyond the basic principles, more detailed policy discussion quickly runs into differences, for example about taxation rates and universality; these are not merely administrative disagreements, but political and ideological, and may prove to be insurmountable (De Wispelaere and Stirton, 2011; Mulvale and Frankel, 2016; Chrisp, 2017). The contrast to cross-party appeal is cross-party opposition: critics from any political position can identify flaws (Martinelli, 2016). Those on the right can attack the bloating of the state; those on the left its withdrawal. The difficulty of securing sufficient political support for BI is noted by Offe (1992), particularly on the issue of linking the right to income to citizenship rather than to labour. Those suggesting that a single policy intervention could meet the objectives and expectations of such a broad range of positions are perhaps expecting too much (Atkinson, 1995).

Just because support for BI is vocalised, this does not necessarily translate into action, Ireland and Brazil being examples of this disconnect (Koistinen and Perkiö, 2014; De Wispelaere, 2016b). Historically, when vocal supporters of BI in Finland reached positions in which they might be able to implement it, their support often fell silent (Koistinen and Perkiö, 2014). De Wispelaere (2016b) calls this type of support ‘cheap’: easy to give, but does not add value to implementation efforts. Many BI advocates make the mistake of imagining that it will translate into real feasibility and sustained commitment. Without proper resources behind the support, particularly political capital, it amounts to very little. There is little risk or cost associated with supporting or promoting the idea of BI if one is unlikely ever to be in a position to act on it, compared to the high risks involved in actually implementing a BI scheme (De Wispelaere, 2016b).

**Arguments for BI**

Arguments in favour of BI found in the literature are hugely wide-ranging, incorporating ethical, economic, bureaucratic and social justice dimensions. The problems that BI might address are often complex, ‘wicked’ problems that have resisted myriad policy approaches over many years (Rittel and Webber, 1973). McKay suggests that BI is a ‘wicked solution’ which ‘opens up the debate to incorporate fresh and creative ideas’ (2013: 100). A brief review of the main arguments follows.
• **Dysfunctional social security systems**

Many Western social security systems are considered to perpetuate poverty, unemployment and helplessness, to be expensive, and punitive towards claimants (Jordan, 2011; Reed and Lansley, 2016). Means-tested benefits are characterised as a safety net in which people become trapped, in contrast to the stable floor of BI, below which no-one can fall (Torry, 2015; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017). Under many current systems, when a claimant starts work their benefits are withdrawn at very high marginal deduction rates, and very little, if any, additional income is disregarded in recalculation benefit entitlements, resulting in a poverty trap whereby work does not guarantee an increased income (Torry, 2015). The complexity of dealing with changing circumstances puts people in positions of uncertainty, debt and poverty. Not unreasonably, people try to avoid this situation and to remain on benefits, particularly if the employment on offer is low paid or insecure (Torry, 2015; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017).

McKay (2013) suggests adopting BI would constitute a fundamental rethinking of welfare policy, not a mere ‘tinkering’ around the edges of existing systems. It would signal a move away from the overwhelming onus on claimants to enter paid work, and the belief that work is the most effective way out of poverty. A universal system is hailed as simpler and less bureaucratic, with less administration and therefore lower costs (Walter, 1989; Standing, 2008; McKay, 2013). However, it seems naïve to think that implementation would be simple and need not be considered in policy debates (De Wispelaere and Stirton, 2017).

• **Precarity and low pay**

For an increasing number of households, poverty is not alleviated by being in work: in the UK 60% of people in poverty live in a household with at least one person in work (Hick and Lanau, 2017). New forms of work such as zero-hours contracts place workers in insecure and unpredictable positions, and income inequality is rising (Offe, 2009; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017).

BI could support workers to adapt to and benefit from new forms of work, without fear of falling into poverty, as everything earned would increase an individual’s income (Van Der Veen and Van Parijs, 1986; Standing, 1992; Healy et al, 2013; Koistinen and Perkiö, 2014). Lower paid workers would have the freedom to turn down the ‘worst’ jobs; market forces would compel employers to raise wages and improve working conditions; and workers would not face poverty if they lost or chose to leave their jobs, so could wield more power in negotiations (Standing, 1992; Pateman, 2004; Torry, 2015; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017).
• **Automation**

Predictions about the proportion of jobs at risk from technology and automation vary hugely, from 9% (Arntz et al, 2016) to 50% (Frey and Osborne, 2013), but it seems inevitable that technological change will continue to impact on the labour market. Allied to the effects of globalization, which have greater impact on those with low skills (OECD, 2017), ‘meaningful work’ is disappearing. BI could provide a means of moderating the negative impacts of these change (Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017).

• **Gender**

Many commentators note the amount of unpaid and un-noticed work, mainly done by women, which is essential to the functioning of society (Robeyns, 2001; McKay, 2007). BI, if paid on an individual basis, would provide financial compensation for this work, could allow more women to participate in the labour market, and even to leave unsatisfactory relationships (Standing, 1992; McKay, 2007; Torry, 2015; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017). However, the relatively low level at which BI is likely to be paid does nothing to increase the relative standing of this (women’s) work (McKay, 2007), and it may further entrench the idea that a woman’s place is in the home (Walter, 1989; Robeyns, 2001).

• **Environmental**

Current rates of growth and consumption are often deemed to be unsustainable, and BI is seen as one means of curbing these excesses. By enabling some people to leave the labour market, or work less, other forms of productive activity might be encouraged, other sources of fulfilment identified and the unthinking drive for growth reconsidered (Fitzpatrick, 1999; Reed and Lansley, 2016).

• **Freedom and Autonomy**

The potential of BI to enhance autonomy and support self-government is one of the most common ethical claims (Fitzpatrick, 1999; Pateman, 2004). BI could be part of a radical new society, in which ‘real’ freedom is fairly distributed; not just the freedom to choose, but the means to actually exercise those choices (Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017). BI is characterised not just as a means to alleviate poverty and associated suffering, but as a way to moderate power relations within society at a deep level, and to ‘liberate us all’ (Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017: 12).

• **Citizenship and Universality**

For Offe, citizenship is the basis on which people should be entitled to welfare support; it is not a reward for officially sanctioned or desired behaviour, but a ‘criterion of justice’ to meet basic needs (1992: 70). By right of its universality, BI has a levelling effect and avoids the intrusive and
stigmatising means-testing of many current systems, and the visible differences between the ‘hard working’ and the ‘idle’, which divide society into ‘them’ and ‘us’ (Van Parijs, 2004; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017). It is conceived as an inclusive policy which by its universality communicates that all citizens are ‘full members of society’ (Walter, 1989: 135), and that all have a right to a share of the common good (Healy et al, 2013).

**Arguments against and Alternatives to BI**

Most BI advocates acknowledge in the literature that it is not a universal panacea: it cannot solve all social problems; it wouldn’t be sufficient to meet all citizens’ needs, for example those of the disabled; it is not a cheap policy; and there are a great many unknowns as to the effects (Pateman, 2004; Torry, 2015).

The relationship between the right to an income and the responsibility to work is at the core of many arguments against BI. To suggest that citizens should be ‘rewarded’ for non-participation in the labour market, and not even forced to search for work, is often met with strong moral objections (Offe, 2009; Koistinen and Perkiö, 2014; Reed and Lansley, 2016). It is seen as unfair for some to choose to free-ride on the rest of society, and the idea of reciprocity as a fundamental societal norm is often brought into play (Pateman, 2004; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017). For Schroeder (2006), BI is not in itself a bad idea, but an unethical use of resources when so many people globally have so little, and cannot be justified when there are more pressing issues for study, activism and funding. The level of taxes required to fund even a moderate BI for an entire population may be prohibitive (Atkinson, 1995; Malul et al, 2009). To cover the basic costs of living for everyone, including those with additional needs, BI would need to be very generous, or some kind of means-testing would remain, undermining the key principle of universality (Reed and Lansley, 2016).

Some consider there to be alternatives equivalent to BI which do not demonstrate these drawbacks. These models come into play in discussions about implementable forms of BI, and are often subsumed into the BI ‘brand’ despite some significant differences (Chrisp, 2017). NIT is the most common alternative, which could deliver the same distributional outcomes as a cash-transfer model of BI, but lacks key tenets such as universality and the corresponding impacts on society (Walter, 1989; Chrisp, 2017; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017). A job guarantee is another oft-cited equivalent, in which government provides a top-up of jobs if the market fails to provide one for everyone able to work (Watts, 2002). Some argue this is more suitable than BI as it does not have the potential for work disincentives (Harvey, 2013), whilst others feel it does nothing to address poor quality work or the deeper philosophical roots of BI such as freedom from conditionality (Watts, 2002; Standing, 2013).
Links to Research

Theoretical, philosophical and ethical debates, whilst important to the development of the idea of BI and its core principles, tend not to address issues of implementation or feasibility and so do not necessarily move it forward on a practical basis (Pateman, 2004). The utopian tone of much of the theoretical literature fails to acknowledge the complexity and ambiguity of implementation, and assumes that once sufficient political support has been gained the way forward is smooth (Jordan, 2011).

As De Wispelaere and Morales (2016) point out, the majority of the research and theory relating to BI is specific to either the ethical or economic aspects, with little attention given to the political and policy context, the policy process by which BI might move from idea to implementation, or the barriers and enabling factors involved in making this happen. That which exists, which this chapter has surveyed, is broadly theoretical, with very limited empirical research. In addition, at the time of writing there was no academic literature exploring the pilot projects included in this study. Therefore, this study addresses a significant gap in the literature, and contributes up-to-date information and analysis to complement the existing body of knowledge.
Methodology

Introduction
This study sets out to discover and understand the contexts and circumstances which have led to BI moving from utopian idea to experimental policy in four localities, and addresses the following research questions:

- What are the contexts and circumstances in which basic income is identified as a policy solution, and to what policy problems?
  - Do these represent a ‘policy window’, where politics, problems and policies converge to enable action (Kingdon, 2011)?
  - To what extent is policy failure an enabling factor?
  - To what extent is policy transfer or policy learning an enabling factor?
- What causes the idea of basic income to change as it is implemented in different contexts?
  - To what extent is compromise a factor?
- What actors are involved in the process?
  - To what extent is coalition a factor?

Research Rationale
Qualitative methods were selected to explore these questions, to capture the views and experiences of those involved in the cases under investigation (Ormston et al, 2014). The study draws on the constructivist and interpretivist paradigms, viewing reality as actively constructed rather than existing independently of subjects, and data and findings as influenced by the context in which they are obtained (Ormston et al, 2014; Hantrais, 2009). The epistemological basis is transactional, whereby the interaction of subjects and the researcher creates knowledge (Creswell, 2014), therefore the research findings are mediated through the researcher’s values and opinions (Ormston et al, 2014). Qualitative research aims for rich and thick description, not fixed and singular explanations (Stake, 1995; Denscombe, 2014). The study is seeking new information through an inductive approach, rather than testing established theories (Denscombe, 2014).

Research Design
The study comprises comparative case studies, incorporating semi-structured interviews and document analysis, with data analysis carried out using grounded theory (GT) techniques.

i) Grounded theory
Having conducted the literature review, the scarcity of relevant literature and empirical research from which to develop a hypothesis became apparent. It was therefore decided to use GT as the...
method of analysis, which allows new information to emerge and new theories to be induced from close analysis of the data, rather than testing theories derived from the literature (Strauss and Corbin, 1990; Silverman, 2013; Urquhart, 2013; Denscombe, 2014). The appropriateness of using a theoretical framework in a GT study is debated (Charmaz, 2006), as it may force findings into a pre-existing model, rather than allowing something new to emerge (Glaser, 1998). This is not to say that the researcher should be unaware of relevant theories and concepts, as these can serve as a point of departure in the development of the research (Charmaz, 2006). However, as Glaser states, working with a preconceived theoretical framework can ‘contaminate’ the emerging theory (1998: 67). It was therefore decided to return to the BI literature only after data analysis, and to use it, and theories of policy change, to contextualise and situate the findings, and enrich the discussion (Urquhart, 2013).

Due to limitations of time and resources this study does not use a full GT methodology, but focuses on its data analysis and theory development techniques, which can be used independently (Urquhart, 2013; Flick, 2014).

ii) Comparative Case Studies

Case studies are useful to investigate a phenomenon involving complex relations, and the context in which it is occurring, particularly when the context appears to be an important explanatory factor (Yin, 1993; George and Bennett, 2004). Case studies are particularly suitable when theory is developed through an inductive process, such as a GT approach; in such cases, collective case studies are the most effective (De Vaus, 2001; George and Bennett, 2004). Within-case followed by cross-case analysis allows a rich description of lessons learned to be produced (Stake, 1995; Creswell, 1998). Case studies typically use multiple data sources; in this study semi-structured interviews and document analysis are used to gain multiple perspectives (Creswell, 1998).

The unit of analysis was defined as a BI pilot project. In order to develop focused research whilst also preserving the coherence of the cases (Silverman, 2013), the research is focused on the contexts and processes through which BI has been identified and adopted as a policy solution (Creswell, 1998).

Comparative methods apply the same research tools to compare similar phenomena in different settings (Hantrais, 2009). As knowledge in this study is considered to be constructed and context-specific, limits to the direct comparability of cases from different countries must be taken into consideration (Hantrais, 2009). However, standardising the research methods across all cases does allow for a level of ‘systematic comparison and cumulation of the findings’ (George and Bennett, 2004: 67).
iii) Interviews
Qualitative interviews produce contextual and linguistic knowledge through interaction between subject and researcher (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015). Semi-structured interviews use open-ended questions to elicit spontaneous information from subjects, to gain a narrative understanding and to access deeper meanings and themes (Gilbert and Stoneman, 2016).

iv) Document analysis
Documents are written with specific audiences in mind, and as with interviews, are context-specific; document analysis involves close reading to identify underlying themes (Bryman, 2016). Documents can be used to enrich and triangulate findings from other data (Seale, 2004).

Sampling
Purposive sampling was used to select cases, although this was limited by the number of pilot projects globally (8 live or in advanced planning). Comparability was striven for by selection on the basis of similarity: all cases are from the global north, and are led by central or local government (George and Bennett, 2004). They were relatively accessible, being in English-speaking countries or those with good levels of English as a second language. The cases are not presented as being typical of all cases, but are chosen to ‘maximise what we can learn’ (Stake, 1995: 6). The number of cases maximises the possibility of rich and meaningful comparisons, within the limited time available (De Vaus, 2001; George and Bennett, 2004).

Interview subjects were accessed either through gatekeepers, identified via a UK-based academic, or by internet research. Purposive sampling was used to approach a range of subjects, including civil servants, experts, politicians and advocates, in order to gain a rich and varied insight and improve generalizability (Denscombe, 2014). Invitations to participate in the research were sent by email, after ethical approval (see appendices 2 and 3). A sample of between 6-12 subjects was sought: 21 potential subjects were approached and 10 were interviewed, from four different countries (see appendix 4). Several of the subjects could be considered elites. They were approached through a trusted gatekeeper where possible, and communication was highly organised and professional to maximise potential access (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015).

Data Collection
An interview schedule was prepared, drawing directly on the research questions, and was piloted with other students. It contained a range of introductory, direct, follow-up, probing, structuring and interpreting questions, which were used as necessary (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015) (see appendix 5). Clear, non-academic language was used, and questions were open-ended and neutral to avoid
influencing subjects’ responses (Gilbert and Stoneman, 2016). The order and exact wording of questions was varied in response to subjects’ replies, to maintain the flow of the interviews, and to prompt subjects to provide full and detailed responses (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015). Interviews were carried out using Skype due to the locations of the subjects, either using voice-only or video calling depending on subjects’ preferences. Interviews were recorded (with consent) and then transcribed.

Policy documents were selected from government websites or provided by interview subjects (Kangas, 2016; Segal, 2016; Kerr, 2017). These documents detail the rationale behind the experiments and what they hope to achieve, and although publicly available, are relatively technical policy documents, aimed at an informed audience.

Analysis

Through line-by-line reading, interview and documentary data were assigned descriptive open codes. Links and similarities between open codes were identified, and codes grouped together into bigger and broader categories through focused coding, to arrive at concepts (Charmaz, 2006). The connections and dynamics between these concepts were explored, in the stage of theoretical coding (Urquhart, 2013; Denscombe, 2014). New emerging codes and categories were compared with existing ones to aid refinement and to stay grounded in the data (Silverman, 2013; Denscombe, 2014). Theoretical memos were taken during coding to note emerging themes and ideas (Urquhart, 2013). Interview questions and research questions were adapted during the process as data were analysed and more was discovered about the cases (Stake, 1995).

Reflections and Considerations

i) Ethics

Subjects were provided with detailed information about the study, how the information they provided would be used, and their rights to withdraw and to anonymity. Informed consent was obtained prior to interview (see appendices 7 and 8) (Creswell, 2014). Nine subjects returned their signed form via email, one gave verbal consent at the beginning of the interview. Interview data (recordings and transcripts) were stored electronically in password-protected areas, and subjects’ identities stored separately to preserve anonymity. Identifying information was removed from transcripts (Bryman, 2016). During the analysis it became clear that anyone with knowledge of current BI experiments would be able to identify the localities under discussion. Subjects’ consent

3 Documents from Dutch municipalities are not referenced in order to preserve subjects’ anonymity
was therefore obtained to name each locality in the reporting, for the sake of clarity and simplicity. All other aspects of anonymity remained in place.

   ii)  Reliability, validity and generalizability

Small-scale qualitative studies have inherent limits to their reliability, validity and generalizability. Reliability is difficult to achieve due to the contextual and transactional nature of the knowledge produced (Bryman, 2016). The strong roots of GT findings in the data improve internal validity, demonstrating correspondence between data and the resulting analysis (De Vaus, 2001; Bryman 2016). Triangulation using documentary data was used to improve validity (Seale, 2004; Denscombe, 2014). A reflexive approach was taken to the research, taking account of potential biases and aiming to take a neutral stance as far as possible (Ormston et al, 2014).

The small sample size limits generalizability, however the study primarily set out to understand the features of the studied cases rather than develop a generalizable theory (De Vaus, 2001; Bryman 2016). If certain responses and themes come up repeatedly it is possible to make some tentative generalizations (Stake, 1995). The small scale of the project also risks bias in the selection of subjects; for example, in the Netherlands only subjects working at municipal, not national, level were interviewed, therefore a fully balanced view may not have been obtained (Seale, 2004).

   iii)  Reflexivity

As discussed earlier in this chapter, qualitative research cannot avoid being shaped by the researchers’ own opinions and experiences (Blaxter et al, 2010). I avoided sharing my own opinions during interviews, as they could have influenced subjects’ responses (Yeo et al, 2014). Using Skype could have made it difficult to build rapport, compared to face-to-face interviews, however I did not experience this as a significant problem, and the richness of the information obtained suggests that this was not a problem for subjects either (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015). The structure of each interview was kept flexible and responsive to the subject and the direction in which it was unfolding, whilst also ensuring that each subject was asked about the same topics in broadly similar ways. This required quick thinking and active listening to keep track of the discussion (Yeo et al, 2014).

Some subjects had English as a second language, so it was important to be alert to possible limitations in their self-expression, the potential differences in concepts and meanings in different languages, and the cultural dominance of English (Lendvai and Bainton, 2013). These subjects did occasionally struggle to express their thoughts; in such cases I attempted to interpret their meaning, without making assumptions as to what they were trying to say.
The position of the Global North and South in BI debates is also important to consider. Much of the BI literature assumes BI would operate within a Western welfare state paradigm, thereby ignoring different forms of state support and intervention operating in the South and East (Walker and Wong, 2013). In parallel, CCTs, seen by some as a precursor to BI, operate almost entirely in the South and East and are rarely discussed in the context of the North (Peck and Theodore, 2015). Differences between North and South and the dominance of Northern paradigms are therefore, at least partially, reinforced.
Findings and Discussion

This chapter presents the research findings, analysis and discussion in an integrated form. First, the within-case analysis presents narrative explanations of the processes, dynamics and contexts of each case, drawn from the GT analysis. Individual cases are illuminated by the dominant themes identified through the analysis. Additional information about each experiment and locality is in appendices 9 and 10. The chapter then draws together and analyses similarities and differences and high-level themes in cross-case analysis. In accordance with a GT approach the discussion is led by the data, and relationships to the literature are noted to enrich the findings (Urquhart, 2013). Concepts relating to policy change, transfer and translation are also introduced to extend the analysis and expand on themes. Selected quotations are used to illustrate key aspects.

The themes identified in the analysis provide insight into the original research questions: what are the contexts and circumstances in which basic income is identified as a policy solution, and to what policy problems; what causes the idea of basic income to change as it is implemented; what actors are involved in the process? The questions are addressed directly in the concluding chapter.

Finland: Pragmatism and Experimentation

A basic income experiment launched in Finland in summer 2017, focusing on unemployed individuals and testing reduced conditionality. A strong pragmatic thread runs through the Finnish project, and an over-riding emphasis on the project as an experiment. Experts seeking evidence as to the effectiveness of BI have been key to the experiment’s instigation; this is particularly clear in the policy documentation (Kangas, 2016), reflecting a wider interest in evidence-based policy. Experimentation appears to be the central motivation for the project, rather than anything ideological; this is not to say there is no concern for citizens’ wellbeing, however it is contained within the context of experimentation:

“...we’ve been fascinated by... randomised control trials... and the core idea... is to bring more evidence to policy making... and then we pick out BI as a very debated topic, so let’s marry these two things” Participant B, expert

Implementation has been driven by a focused and urgent need to get things done, necessitating compromise in experimental design and bureaucratic processes, as well as an acknowledgement that the implemented model diverges from a paradigmatic BI and is not one that could be directly rolled out to the whole population. There is seen to be a limited political window in which to deliver the project (Kingdon, 2011), so there is a focus on how to deliver the best possible experiment within the practical and temporal constraints:
“... they didn’t want this to be one of those ideas that will be postponed... they wanted to get it done during their [parliamentary] time” Participant B, expert

“... we had to make compromises, we were in a big hurry... the implementation was much more fluent and rapid” Participant A, civil servant

The project is clearly framed as a boundaried event, an experiment almost for its own sake, and by no means a guaranteed pre-cursor to a wider rollout of BI, echoing Mulvale (2008) and De Wispelaere (2016a). The experiment is part of a broader policy focus on addressing the changing nature of work and problems with the social security system, but government is also running a parallel experiment testing the effects of increased conditionality, which is directly contrary to the BI experiment. The experiment does not appear to be a signal of deep cultural or political change:

“... we just happen to be able to put together this experiment... the other policy ideas coming from the government, they [are] not supporting the idea [of BI]” Participant B, expert

Prime minister Juha Sipilä was the primary instigator of the experiment. A relative newcomer to politics, he committed to experimenting with BI in his governmental programme. The reasons for this commitment are unclear; it may have been influenced by an expert report about BI (Forss and Kanninen, 2014), as well as a response to the gathering pace and volume of public and media interest. It appears that his interest in BI is pragmatic rather than values-driven, and combined with the focus on experimentation, this seems to have shaped the overall nature of the pilot:

“... his business background makes him also quite pragmatic... [the experiment aims to] reform existing social security... he felt that BI could be handy for this purpose, so let’s try it out” Participant B, expert

As well as being key to the project’s instigation, experts were also highly influential in implementation. Government commissioned a research consortium to scope and design the experiment, and the experts’ role spilled over from advisory to implementation, emphasising their centrality in the process:

“... it was quite a strange situation... we were hired to do something and we ended up driving it” Participant B, expert

In adopting BI as a pilot policy, the practical goal of delivering the experiment re-made some relationships: old political alliances were tested, particularly with trade unions, which are broadly opposed to BI. Political opinion is divided on whether BI is a suitable solution, however interestingly this has led both sides to support experimentation, in order to resolve the debate:

“... those who say this is a bad idea, they say, let’s start the experiment, we want to see that this is a bad idea... and these people who say this is a good thing, we should try it and see if this is a good mechanism” Participant A, civil servant
Long-standing BI advocates have also adopted pragmatic approaches, rather than campaigning for a politically unlikely paradigmatic BI. Policy changes over many years have, often unintentionally, acted as test-beds for aspects of BI, for example bigger income disregards for those in low-paid work, which were originally introduced for rural volunteer firefighters. These incremental changes have opened up policy space for BI to colonise, and allowed policy to deviate from well-worn paths (Béland, 2010; De Wispelaere and Fitzpatrick, 2011):

“... [the] social system of nowadays is gradually being moved... you can earn 300 euros a month without any loss of unemployment benefits. And this is a very big step towards basic income... one day we can see that the system looks so much [like] basic income, that it is more easy to change the system towards a basic income” Participant C, advocate

Although seemingly at odds with its limited nature, the experiment may yet prove to be one more incremental step towards a paradigmatic BI in the future, as suggested by Jordan (2012) and Van Parijs and Vanderborght (2017).

Netherlands: Conflict and Compromise

Several municipalities in the Netherlands are in the process of launching experiments into the effects of reduced conditionality on recipients of social assistance. Under municipalities’ original plans, they were identified as ‘basic income’ experiments, however, as is characteristic of much of the process, political disagreement between local and national government led to significant compromise of their scope and purpose. The term ‘basic income’ was removed; the experiments are now framed as tests of reduced conditionality on employment outcomes only. This recalls De Wispelaere and Stirton’s (2011) assertion that political consensus on introducing a paradigmatic BI is unlikely to be reached, and that variations will need to be accepted.

Municipalities embraced the opportunity for change which BI represents, whilst national government strongly resisted anything resembling it:

“... there was... not any intention to allow anything resembling experiments at all, let alone something with a basic income... as soon as it started to resemble anything like basic income they wouldn’t allow it” Participant H, civil servant

In 2015 the Participation Act was introduced, a new legal framework for employment support and social assistance, delivery of which is devolved to municipalities. The Act intensifies conditionality and rules, and is unpopular with municipalities who do not believe this approach is effective:

“... this further tightening [of the rules] made many municipalities very unhappy... we are now confronted with a scheme that... we believe to be ineffective because [of] its large bureaucratic burden, it only creates distrust” Participant E, expert
Contained in the Act is an Innovation Clause, which allows for experimentation within the legal framework. This clause proved to be instrumental: municipalities seized the chance to test less conditionality and improved work incentives. This appears to be an unintended consequence of the clause; the space in which municipalities have been able to act was created accidentally, and they embraced it:

“... we... found that there was an article in there that allowed for these experiments... I don’t really think when it was drafted up that people thought it would bring these kind of really innovative experiments” Participant I, advocate

This recalls Van Parijs and Vanderborght’s (2017) ‘tinkerers’: actors who seek out and exploit accidents to further their cause.

The experiments are primarily driven by municipalities, often working in close partnership with local universities. A small number of key individuals at national level also contributed to a surge in interest in basic income, enhancing the supportive environment and building on a long history of interest in BI. These include author Rutger Bregman, whose book (‘Free Money for Everyone’ in Dutch) has been hugely popular (Bregman, 2017). Strong local coalitions of actors involving advocates, activists and citizens have been key to building broad-based support and legitimising the experiments:

“... there’ve been many, many people involved in the many initiatives, which have strengthened each other... it’s really been in general a very bottom up thing” Participant I, advocate

There is considerable evidence of collaboration and proactive networking between municipalities and universities across the country, in contrast to the tensions between local and national government. Organised networks have been facilitated, spreading the momentum nationwide:

“... there was a close exchange between municipalities and universities... [making] use of the momentum that had been created” Participant E

Each municipality is testing something slightly different, shaped by local politics and concerns. Political support for the experiments ranges across many parties at a local level, and whilst there is an underpinning dissatisfaction with the Participation Act, local motivations vary:

“... each municipality has been slightly different, sometimes radically different, because it has also been different political parties proposing to do these experiments... really across the political spectrum” Participant I, advocate

The division between nationally-devised laws and regulations and local implementation lies behind some of the political conflict. Empowered and emboldened by devolution, municipalities were driven to make a difference for their citizens, and demonstrate innovation. This resulted in a power struggle, with the bottom-up desire to experiment pushing against top-down control and resistance to change:
“... local governments said...we are decentralised, we have lots of policy freedom” Participant H, civil servant

“... there was this... promise of decentralisation... but then... the government was blocking them rather than facilitating them” Participant I, advocate

The basis of this struggle is two fundamentally opposed policy positions: nationally, a move to intensify conditionality, and locally, a judgement that this approach has broadly failed. The difference of opinion has led to considerable compromise as to the purpose and form of the experiments:

“... you have two contrary movements, on the national and local levels, and that’s where it’s clashing” Participant E, expert

“... the conflict of course is between what they aspire [to] in these experiments compared to what the national government wants” Participant H, civil servant

Whilst this national policy context has proved a barrier to progress, locally there is often a complementary policy environment and a strong cultural fit.

Political disagreements and negotiations have led to significant delays and frustration for municipalities. Motivated by an interest in evidence-based policy, municipalities have concerns about the scope, quality and ethical validity of the experiments. Uncertainty about the speed and direction of travel has led to implementation challenges:

“... the vagueness of the entire project... created a lot of mess and that leads to practical problems” Participant H, civil servant

“... all kinds of restrictions were put in that were not coming from municipalities but from national government” Participant I, advocate

Municipalities wish to measure a broad range of holistic outcomes, whereas national government has enforced a strong focus on employment incentives. This polarisation is echoed in public opinion, which is divided between those supporting the principles of basic income, and those concerned about its implications:

“... when you say free money for everybody, there is a part of the population who screams that it’s scandalous” Participant H, civil servant

“public opinion has shifted in a major way, so three years ago people would laugh at basic income” Participant I, advocate

Ontario: Poverty and Holism

The BI experiment in Ontario, Canada, focuses on low-income individuals, and guarantees a minimum income to those on the programme. Its over-riding focus and motivation is the relief of poverty, which is defined broadly and includes a wide range of associated problems including food
security, health, mental health and homelessness. Delivered by the Ontario provincial government, the pilot seeks to mitigate personal hardship as well as the financial costs of poverty.

Awareness of the scale and severity of poverty and its impacts is seen to have grown amongst politicians and the general public, and this has been key to a parallel growth in awareness and support for the principles of BI:

“... more and more people are coming to the basic income side due to their own sense of vulnerability... and being aware of some of the forces and trends that are impacting the labour market” Participant G, advocate

“... people are starting to see that it costs a lot and it makes people sick to live in poverty... there has to be a different way to actually approach this problem” Participant D, civil servant

Concerns are not limited to the ruling Liberal Party but occur across party lines, partly through politicians’ awareness of their constituents’ experiences:

“[My local representative] sees an awful lot of destitution... he’s well aware of those issues and that social assistance... is not leading to good outcomes” Participant G, advocate

The provincial government has a high-profile commitment to tackle poverty and a significant programme of activity, of which the BI experiment is one part. This complementary policy context appears to be one enabler of the experiment, as theorised in the literature (Offe, 2009; Koistinen and Perkiö, 2014):

“...you can’t have a conversation just about...social assistance... without talking about health... education... employment, and all of these things are part of one bundle. It’s all about our income security” Participant D, civil servant

Two political actors have been critical in the instigation of the experiment, Ontario Premier Kathleen Wynne and former Conservative senator and academic Hugh Segal. Segal, a long-standing advocate of BI, was commissioned by the provincial government to write a report and series of recommendations for the experiment (Segal, 2016). His report is an impassioned exploration of the hardship caused by poverty and the possibility of dignity offered by BI, which combines the paradigmatic and pragmatic approaches to BI. His position as a powerful political actor lent significant legitimacy to the project, and appears to have assisted in gaining cross-party support for the experiment:

“... he’s just so well-known and so well respected... he did spend time with all parties” Participant D, civil servant

The political and expert power lent by these two key actors appears to have been critical in enabling the experiment to proceed, echoing De Wispelaere’s (2016b) assertion of the need for powerful political agents. It built on a long history not only of advocacy but also political support for BI:
“[basic income] has surfaced from time to time... quite prominently in the early 1970s... as the number one recommendation of a report of our federal senate... Another one was in the mid-1980s when... a federal royal commission... had a recommendation around guaranteed income” Participant G, advocate

As well as the importance of these individuals, significant levels of well-organised lobbying, from professional groups such as doctors as well as advocates and activists, have fed into the broader context of public and political opinion. It is suggested that the professional status of many of these advocates lent greater legitimacy to BI as a potential solution. Focused on the effects of poverty, lobbying was directed at both local and provincial politicians, and is seen as directly influencing the decision to proceed with the experiment:

“... the Ontario government was hearing more and more from various interests... physicians...mayors...social workers...public health units... the Canadian Medical Association... I think the Ontario government was reading the landscape” Participant G, advocate

The broad range of advocates reflects the broad range of positive outcomes that BI is deemed to offer:

“...it’s not a uni-dimensional thing... basic income can help solve more than one problem... the diversity of voices coming into this is helping to keep basic income very much alive” Participant G, advocate

The experiment is not a stand-alone trial, but part of a move for deep, systemic change in the social security system, with significant changes proposed to address poverty. This has led to implementation challenges, with institutional resistance and in some cases a lack of understanding about the significance of the changes:

“... this is different, this is not social assistance ... this is about a whole new way of treating people” Participant D, civil servant

It has however also been a collaborative implementation process, cutting across institutional boundaries and engaging with external advocates. Extensive public consultation was carried out during the development of the pilot, the results of which amplified the sense that existing systems were not delivering satisfactory outcomes.

Scotland: Collaboration and Resonance

Four local authorities in Scotland, Glasgow, Fife, Edinburgh and North Ayrshire, are working towards implementing BI pilots, potentially as a collaborative experiment across all four areas. Political agreement is being negotiated, and detailed design may commence in autumn 2017.

The BI activity in Scotland has a strong emphasis on networks, collaboration, sharing and facilitation, with experts and advocates amongst the key actors. Think tanks and academics have been instrumental in raising the profile of BI amongst the public and politicians, lending it legitimacy, and
leading on policy and project development (Kerr, 2017). In addition, a wide range of voices, many from the grassroots, have increased public and political engagement with BI; Mulvale and Frankel (2016) suggest that civil society will play an important role in boosting political support. Together, these actors have contributed to an upsurge of interest in the last 12 months:

“... we’ve just suddenly found a huge amount of momentum” Participant F, expert

“... it’s taken us... quite by surprise... things seem to have snowballed” Participant J, advocate

There is broad agreement that current systems and policies for dealing with long-entrenched problems in Scotland such as unemployment, poverty, inequality and poor social mobility are ineffective. There is growing awareness of the scale and impact of such problems and agreement on the need for action to find solutions:

“... actually these problems are incredibly entrenched... how are [government] going to have an impact?” Participant F, expert

The interest in BI is driven by both a pragmatic desire to address these problems, and by hopes for deeper, holistic change, reflecting paradigmatic BI values such as social justice and equality. Scotland was found to be the country with the furthest-reaching ambitions relating to BI, which is seen as having the potential to unlock wider debate. Although the current priority is to test the effects of BI, it is framed as the basis for fundamental, perhaps paradigmatic, social change (Hall, 1993):

“I see it as a foundation stone for a new social contract... this could start to open up a space where we could then move into addressing some of the other [challenges]” Participant F, expert

Whilst local politicians are driving the experiments, there is a supportive national political environment, with Scottish national government encouraging and now funding experimentation (McCafferty, 2017):

“... they’re certainly very open to the concept of what experimentation could look like, and... it’s allowed a politically neutral space to move from” Participant F, expert

The Scottish Independence Referendum in 2014 galvanised political engagement and a common desire for a better country, albeit with different perspectives on the best way to achieve it. Aspects of BI such as innovation resonate with the Scottish cultural identity. The wider policy environment provides a fertile and complementary context, with a good level of cross-party consensus on key issues, reflecting suggestions by Offe (2009), Koistinen and Perkiö (2014) and Mulvale and Frankel (2016) of the need for such a setting:

“... we had this huge upsurge in civic and national involvement in the political process... people were generally unified by the idea of a better Scotland” Participant F, expert
“... [the] broad brush strokes of where the main parties and the policymakers want Scotland to go are very similar... the broad focus of a fairer Scotland, a more inclusive Scotland... all of these tie very nicely into the basic income model” Participant F, expert

BI in Scotland is characterised as a social movement, not just a policy proposal, as it is felt to resonate with a wider change in public attitudes:

“... a real sense of a movement, rather than simply a policy concept... at another point it wouldn’t have had as much resonance” Participant F, expert

The key actors are proactive, engaged and collaborative, with a variety of roles, such as influencing public opinion. Democratic power is identified as one key factor in pushing the BI agenda forwards, perhaps reflecting the level of political engagement in the country. Non-political actors are consciously positioned in cross-party or politically neutral spaces, enhancing their ability to engage with a cross-section of society; a common theme in the literature (De Wispelaere, 2016b; Martinelli, 2016; Mulvale and Frankel, 2016):

“I don’t join any [political parties] ... because it’s easier for me to talk to different people if I don’t come with the baggage of a particular party” Participant J, advocate

Scotland is the most engaged of the cases in international activity, taking more cues from other pilots, and proactively seeking to contribute to the global debate. The global interest in BI is shining a spotlight on Scotland as an innovator, and the attention provides political currency to BI’s supporters, thereby strengthening the position of BI as a viable policy option:

“... [global activity] provides the reassurance to people that we’re not just crazy... it plays to the Scottish political context of trying to see Scotland in a more global position” Participant F, expert

Devolution has provided a certain amount of policy space within which to act, although Scotland is still governed by UK institutions and processes to a significant degree, and the UK government is currently not interested in BI, being committed to Universal Credit. The complexity of governance, involving UK, Scottish national and Scottish local governments, is a cause of uncertainty about the future prospects of the planned experiments. Although still in the early stages, there is already awareness of the need for compromise and the level of complexity that good quality experiments will encounter.

Cross-case Comparison

A number of themes cut across all or most of the cases, and appear to be the most influential and important in generating the conditions for the experiments to take place, shaping their contexts and also their content. The key themes fall into two broad categories, Enablers and Modifiers, with two themes straddling both and mediating between them (see figure 1). These themes interact and influence each other, strengthening in some cases, modifying and translating in others.
In the studied cases multiple factors have converged to become a whole: an enabling policy space in which localities have been able to act. Some have occurred by accident and some by design, some are a consequence of the passing of time. Some, such as the income disregards in Finland and innovation clause in the Netherlands, appear small and relatively inconsequential, but in combination contribute to much wider impacts (Pierson, 2004). All have in some way contributed to BI being legitimised as a policy option and to key actors being open to explore it. They crucially have all occurred together within a temporal window, and appear to reinforce each other:

“I think some of it’s just serendipity... at another point it could perhaps slipped into just being a policy debate” Participant F, expert, Scotland

“... it’s a bit of a perfect storm to do something very different” Participant D, civil servant, Ontario

The interplay of these factors has created fertile ground in each case and seems to have led to a critical mass of interest and support which has moved the idea of BI from the abstract into action (Johnson and Hagström, 2005). Importantly, the opportunity to act has been recognised by key actors who have seized their chances to pursue BI as a policy solution (Kingdon, 2011):

“... the ground was just very fertile, there was enough convergence of external interest... and internal interest and support being expressed” Participant G, advocate, Ontario
“... a book called Free Money for Everyone... heated up the discussion... about the same time that the new law had been introduced, and suddenly there was room for experiments... [municipalities] have been given the room... they have grabbed their chance” Participant E, expert, Netherlands

Van Parijs and Vanderborght’s tinkerers (2017) seem to be at work in all cases, within a range of roles and institutions.

The temporality of the experiments appears to be a pivotal enabling factor. That the Enablers have coincided and therefore interacted appears to have had a significant effect (Pierson, 2004). Anxiety about the future is coupled with long-standing interest in BI and advocacy in all cases, although the historical roots are less strong in Scotland. This has allowed public and political opinion, and norms and values, to develop over time, which appears to have led to increased familiarity and comfort with the concept of BI:

“... the trend is upwards... in the 80s it was very difficult to talk about [basic income] and many people thought that you were totally crazy... the brand of basic income is very good now” Participant C, advocate, Finland

“I call it the old idea that’s become new again” Participant D, civil servant, Ontario

Koistinen and Perkiö (2014) and Mulvale and Frankel (2016) suggest that this familiarity is an important enabler of the adoption of an idea, coupled with cultural compatibility. The level of familiarity and support seems to have reached a threshold, at which point change has been triggered. Ontario and Finland in particular demonstrate a combination of slow, incremental change, such as in public opinion, and rapid decision-making and implementation (Pierson, 2004).

The problems that BI is hoped to address have not diminished over time, despite societal and economic change and concerted policy attention. However, awareness and understanding of these problems has grown. Policy has not kept up with change or found new ways to tackle problems, leading to a re-examination, and sometimes an active positioning, of BI as a possible solution (Kingdon, 2011):

“... [the] unemployment benefit system is made in the 1960s and 70s, it’s based on the idea of the world at that time... it sees that you are either fully employed or fully unemployed” Participant A, civil servant, Finland

The emphasis in each case on experimentation is another important Enabler. Each case is framed as an investigation into whether BI might really deliver what it promises, in a wider context of growing interest and legitimacy in evidence-based policy:

“... the bigger trend is that evidence-based policy and experimenting in general are getting more popular” Participant I, advocate, Netherlands
Interpretations about what BI represents and what level of policy or societal change it signals vary across cases; it conveys multiple meanings to multiple actors (Yanow, 1996). Support for experimentation does not necessarily equate to generalised support for BI, as observed in the Finnish case. Equally, interest in BI does not necessarily signal deep political or societal change. In Scotland and Ontario the potential for BI to precipitate deeper change appears strongest; less so in the Netherlands and Finland given the wider policy contexts:

“... this is just an experiment with some aspects of basic income, this is not a model that could be implemented at all” Participant B, expert, Finland

This disparity is reflected in the relative satisfaction of experts and advocates with the experiments in several cases. Expert actors tend to assign the experiments a relatively limited meaning: they are an opportunity to learn about the effects of BI, perhaps almost only a thought-experiment (Gaffney, 2015), and experts appear to be content with this. However, to many advocates, BI is potentially the conveyor of radical societal change, but has been compromised and undermined in these experiments due to their limited scope. For them, the experiments are disappointing, and an opportunity missed; the messiness of implementation has undermined the paradigmatic ideal (Jordan, 2011).

BI is a policy laden with meaning, and a strong signifier, framed in all cases as radical, innovative and different:

“... it’s time to actually try something big and bold” Participant D, Ontario

It is seen as multidimensional, speaking to a broad range of different actors, and intersectional, providing solutions to many problems. It taps into many different motivations, and critically, is different to existing policy options which are failing to deliver. There appears to be a kudos attached to testing BI, which is embraced by those involved. Particularly in Scotland and the Netherlands, BI takes on a symbolic role and is a signifier of particular positive qualities which actors wish to project; innovation, influence, leadership, progressiveness:

“... there’s also a symbolic component to it in a way, that local government bodies want to show how active they are” Participant E, expert, Netherlands

This signifying plays out through international activity, where piloting BI positions a locality as a global innovator. In all cases the international context lends legitimacy and importance to the local experiments:

“[we are] hoping that our government would take this seriously because other countries are following what we are doing” Participant B, expert, Finland
The extent to which international activity directly influences policy and implementation varies in each case. Finland, the Netherlands and Ontario are all well aware of the international activity, and see their work as part of a global conversation, but their own local circumstances are the primary influencers of the shape and scope of their experiments; there is no strong evidence of policy transfer between the current experiments. The dissemination of historical BI activity appears to be more influential, in particular the Mincome experiment of the 1970s (Forget, 2011):

“... it’s mostly been historical experiments that have had an influence here, less so the experiments going on in other countries now” Participant I, advocate, Netherlands

Scotland appears more influenced by the other cases, and international activity is a more powerful legitimiser there. There may be a relationship between Scotland’s weaker historical roots and the stronger interest in learning from the other experiments: drawing on existing, high-profile experiments may provide a short-cut to legitimacy and help to build a critical mass of support (Evans, 2009; Peck and Theodore, 2010). In all cases, regardless of whether policy transfer is occurring, there is an exchange of ideas and experiences between countries at a global level, creating a space in which policy can move and translate (Stone, 2012), and which may prove to be more influential in future.

Mediators

As well as acting strongly as an Enabler, the purpose of the experiments has also acted to modify and shape their design and implementation. Common to all four cases is the belief in the failure of existing social assistance systems; this is also one of the most commonly cited problems in the literature (Offe, 2009; Torry, 2015; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017). Although each country’s system is delivered differently, the basic problems are common to all: performance in addressing long-term unemployment falls short; systems are too complex and bureaucratic; they contain structural flaws that disincentivise the outcomes they seek to deliver; and they stigmatise those in poverty:

“...our system is not encouraging people to take on part-time work [or]... self-employment, and also we have the incentive trap... you might end up with less money in your hands” Participant A, civil servant, Finland

“... the current social security system is very inadequate and doesn’t actually help people, it tends to hinder them” Participant J, advocate, Scotland

This represents a significant reframing of the problems of unemployment and poverty, shifting the narrative away from ‘benefit dependency’ and the undeserving poor, to acknowledging the importance of structural and systemic issues (Bacchi, 2009; Patrick, 2014), as suggested by McKay (2013). The conception of the policy problem appears to have changed over time, with the dominant
discourses relating to work and poverty being undermined by policy failure (Hall, 1993; Béland and Petersen, 2017). Whilst not yet constituting third order, paradigm shift (Hall, 1993), it may be a precursor to such a change, particularly in Ontario and Scotland. As well as system failure there is a strong feeling that other policies have had only partial success at best, recalling Mulvale and Frankel’s (2016) suggestion that this would be a key factor in BI adoption. Therefore BI’s characterisation as different to other policies is another enabling aspect:

“... we’ve tried the same things over and over, so if we try them again they’re going to have the same impact” Participant F, expert, Scotland

Some of the problems mentioned in the literature, in particular the environmental and gender-based, were hardly mentioned in the cases, if at all. However, every case is hoping for a range of different positive outcomes, both economic and social, pragmatic and ethical, and all are motivated by concern for citizens’ welfare. Each case, but particularly Ontario, acknowledges the interconnectedness of these problems, and views BI as a holistic and intersectional policy solution:

“... all of these things are part of one bundle... we start to see it as a whole system” Participant D, civil servant, Ontario

Changes to the labour market, particularly precarious work and growing automation, are the cause of significant anxiety about the future. BI is seen to have the potential to allow this new future to be negotiated:

“... the laws and the way we work at the moment, they don’t work and they are not future proof” Participant H, civil servant, Netherlands

These problems and desired outcomes modified the experiments’ design and implementation, for example incentivising work by setting deduction rates at a level to make work pay, or working across bureaucratic boundaries to ensure a holistic approach.

The diversity of actors has both enabled the experiments and shaped their implementation. The motivations, interests and power of the interlinked mix of actors have had significant effects on how the idea of BI has been translated into implementation in all cases (Lendvai and Stubbs, 2007).

Coalitions exist at different levels and in different forms in the cases. Informal and collaborative groupings of advocates, experts and political actors appear to be an important enabling factor; however formal government coalitions in Finland and the Netherlands have complicated decision-making. Particularly in the Netherlands and Scotland there is a strategy of proactive network development, which serves to shore up support, and consolidate BI as a legitimate policy:

“... a broad movement of organisations and initiatives has been involved, this has really led to broad support among the local population” Participant E, expert, Netherlands
Martinelli (2016) anticipated the importance, and also fragility, of coalitions in implementing BI. Evidence from the cases suggests a coalescence of actors, if not organised coalitions, is key to making progress, and that they have so far managed to contain or manoeuvre around internal disagreements.

There is broadly a left-right political split in terms of support and opposition across the cases. However, this obscures more nuanced positions, including opposition from trade unions in Finland, and conservative support in Ontario for a smaller, simpler welfare state. This appeal to different political orientations is partly a quality of BI itself, and partly a conscious tactic to position it in a multi-dimensional space. This has been both an Enabler and a source of conflict and translation, with multiple actors all pursuing supremacy for their version of BI (Walter, 1989; Johnson and Hagström, 2005; De Wispelaere and Stirton, 2013).

There is a distinction between those actors making up the broader context of debate, support and awareness, and those directly involved in decision-making, although their multiple interpretations of BI all contribute to its translation into a locally-specific form (Yanow, 1996; Lendvai and Stubbs, 2007; Freeman, 2009). In general, politicians and experts wield most power, with expert power being particularly important in Finland and Scotland. In all cases political actors are driving experiments, and all are at sub-national level, except in Finland. This combination of vocal support and political capital is noted by De Wispelaere (2016b) as crucial. Political actors also modify and shut down action: in the Netherlands political conflict is the primary force modifying the experiments.

Modifiers

Although all cases demonstrate significant similarities, it is at the level of detailed design and implementation that divergences emerge. Translation of the paradigmatic idea of BI has occurred through local circumstances; political, cultural and structural (Johnson and Hagström, 2005; Lendvai and Stubbs, 2007; Stone, 2012). These circumstances have shaped the focus, scope and delivery of each experiment, as hypothesised by Van Parijs and Vanderborght (2017). As described above, the diversity of actors in each case is one of the main translators:

“... these experiments [in the Netherlands] all differ slightly because each experiment is influenced by what the local parties are... what their specific interests are, what they think is the most interesting research question” Participant E, expert, Netherlands

There is little evidence of policy transfer occurring between the current experiments, however it is possible to speculate that transfer may have occurred several decades ago: Canada, Finland and the Netherlands all have a documented history of BI stretching back to the 1960s or 70s. Since then
there may have been a long process of translation and synthesis, with local forces shaping and mutating paradigmatic BI into a form that is appropriate to the locality (Stone, 2017), followed by a second, more recent translation, in the development from policy to implementation (Lendvai and Bainton, 2013).

One of the key drivers of translation is the need for compromise. All three cases with fully developed experiments (Finland, Netherlands, Ontario) have made compromises to a significant degree, recalling Martinelli’s (2016) suggestion that it is inevitable in the move from abstract idea to implementation. None of the implementation processes have been linear and uncomplicated, they have adapted and morphed according to a variety of local forces and their complex interactions, including public opinion, political disagreement, bureaucracy, and experimentation. Each process is specific to its context (Yanow, 1996; Freeman, 2009; Béland and Petersen, 2017). None of the experiments is testing anything like a paradigmatic BI. Van Parijs and Vanderborght predict that a ‘cautious introduction’ of a partial BI will be the most common path (2017: 215), and the evidence from the cases reflects this. There is a strong sense of ambitions being scaled down, particularly in the Netherlands:

“... the big changes have been due to political negotiations, and political considerations”
Participant E, expert, Netherlands

“... there was... so many limitations posed by national government... it’s not as ambitious as we wanted” Participant I, advocate

Each case has been forced to make compromises in order to make the experiments politically and experimentally acceptable. De Wispelaere and Stirton (2011) theorise such an outcome, precipitated by the influence of politics and bureaucracy. In all three cases with fully developed experiments the process of implementation has also been out of the ordinary, perhaps much faster than usual, or bypassing normal procedures. This seems to be a consequence of BI requiring new bureaucratic processes but also the special status of the experiments and the meanings attached to them by their high profiles, their champions and the status of BI as different:

“We had to make it some other way than we normally do... we had to compromise all the time” Participant A, civil servant, Finland

“... I was working in a different way to get it done” Participant D, civil servant, Ontario

There is much commonality between cases at a high level, relating to the circumstances leading to BI being implemented, the policy problems and the intended outcomes, and there is divergence at the detailed implementation level. Some themes have emerged strongly as important factors in all cases, and it is clear that local circumstances have played a key role in the translation of the
paradigmatic BI into pragmatic, implementable models. The implications of the findings for the research questions are addressed in the following chapter.
Conclusion
This concluding chapter begins by revisiting the research problem and questions and summarising the key findings. It situates this study in relation to the wider BI literature, and suggests avenues for further research.

Responses to the Research Questions
This study began by identifying a lack of exploration or understanding of the reasons why and how the utopian idea of BI has progressed into the policy mainstream and experimental implementation. It set out to contribute towards addressing this gap by producing four case studies using qualitative interviewing and document analysis and grounded theory techniques, ensuring findings strongly rooted in the data. The following insights into the research questions were constructed.

- What are the contexts and circumstances in which basic income is identified as a policy solution, and to what policy problems?

In their specificities, all of the contexts and circumstances in this study are different, and each case has its own character, however there are several common themes that occur in all. No one single factor has brought about the implementation of BI, but it has required a cluster of enabling factors occurring within a temporal window, which interact and strengthen each other (Kingdon, 2011). Some factors have been gestating for many years, others have entered the frame recently and trigged rapid progress (Pierson, 2004). The cases show strong adherence to Kingdon’s model of policy change, with the convergence of problems, policy and politics opening up a window of change (2011). Broad agreement amongst diverse actors on policy problems has occurred at the same time as BI has risen in prominence and credibility, and powerful actors have found the idea politically acceptable.

The explicit framing of the pilots as experiments, and the status of BI as different and innovative, combined with the kudos lent by the international attention on the pilots, lend BI an important legitimacy. Those with the power to implement BI have identified multiple policy problems which are significant enough to require action, and are seeking radical solutions. A critical mass of public awareness and debate has helped to push BI up the policy agenda, and a resonance with cultural and political values has given it an unusually strong following and momentum. A complementary policy context helps, but even in its absence actors have carved out space to act.

The failure of existing social assistance policies is a key driver in these cases, and the central problem that experiments are attempting to tackle. Tried and tested policies to tackle unemployment and poverty deliver limited success at best. A broad range of associated problems including labour
market change, poor health and inequality also come into play. BI offers a radical alternative to existing policy, and is seen by some as a precursor to paradigm change. BI is viewed as a multi-dimensional and intersectional policy, capable of addressing multiple policy problems.

The cases show little evidence of contemporaneous policy transfer, although there is an awareness in all that they are part of a global conversation. A great deal of information about the cases is circulating globally, perhaps generating the conditions for policy transfer, learning and translation for a second wave of experiments.

- What causes the idea of basic income to change as it is implemented in different contexts?

There is clear evidence of policy translation in all cases, precipitated by a range of factors. Not only does BI undergo translation from paradigmatic idea to pragmatic implementation, the initial implementation models have also been translated by political, bureaucratic and scientific concerns. Chief amongst these has been the need for compromise, very often to make the experiments politically viable.

- What actors are involved in the process?

As Kingdon (2011) suggests, a small number of key individuals are important in each case to the transition from idea to implementation. These key actors tend to be political, with academics and expert commentators also proving powerful. However, each case also shows the importance of a broad base of many different actors including advocates, activists, academics, professionals such as doctors, and engaged citizens. These actors have legitimised policy problems and BI as a solution, and developed a critical mass of public interest and support. They have not necessarily worked in formal coalition, but their interests coalesce around BI as a cause.

**Relationship to the literature**

Whilst this study was exploratory and not testing any specific theory, there are some clear congruencies between the findings of this study and theories advanced in the literature. The likelihood of an incremental approach, riddled with compromise (De Wispelaere and Stirton, 2011; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017); the need for strong political leadership (De Wispelaere, 2016a); the benefits and risks of cross-party appeal (Reed and Lansley, 2016; Chrisp, 2017); and the importance of a broad range of actors (Van Parijs and Vanderborght, 2017) have all been borne out in these cases. The study represents a valuable addition to the literature on the basis of its empirical approach and findings about the current, live pilots. It builds on the theoretical literature but also contributes new, complementary knowledge.
Further research

The extent to which these findings are generalizable beyond these cases is of course limited by the small scale of the study and the constructivist and interpretivist approach. Undertaking a longer and more wide-ranging study would improve validity and the potential for findings to be applicable in other cases. The lack of evidence of policy transfer in these cases does not preclude further study to investigate whether it occurred historically in the 1960s and 70s, whether it is occurring now in the development of new pilots in other countries, or to understand the dynamics in the dissemination of information about BI through global epistemic networks. A more detailed study of the forces causing policy translation and their outcomes would shed light on how an abstract idea like BI becomes something very different when spatially and temporally grounded. Finally, the extent to which BI challenges the dominant discourse of welfare dependency could be an enlightening case study of how paradigm shift occurs.
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Appendix 1: Literature review searches

Search terms:

- Basic income
- Citizens’ income
- Basic income + implementation

Search locations:

- University of Bristol library search
- IBSS
- Web of Science
- Scopus
- Google Scholar
Appendix 2: Invitation to participate email

Dear,

I am writing to invite you to participate in a research project I am conducting into basic income, as part of my postgraduate degree at the University of Bristol.

This project is designed to understand the political and policy context in which experiments related to basic income have been set up, and to compare these between different countries.

You have been asked to participate in this study because you have been involved in the decision-making process in the Netherlands. Your expertise and opinions about basic income, and the wider context in which the experiment is taking place, will be crucial to meeting the research aims.

If you agree to participate, your involvement will consist of a one-to-one interview in late June, at a time convenient to you. It will take around 60 minutes, either via telephone or skype. With your consent, this interview will be recorded. The interview will be conducted in English.

Your name, your organisation, and the location of the basic income experiment you are involved in, will be kept confidential and stored securely at all times, according to University of Bristol ethics procedures.

In the final research report, and any other publications, all data will be anonymised to minimise the possibility of you, your organisation, or your location being identified.

I would be very pleased if you would be able to take part. If you cannot, I would be extremely grateful if you could suggest another person involved in the experiment that might be suitable.

If you have any questions at all about the research or the interview please do let me know.

I would be happy to share my key findings with you when the research is complete.

With many thanks
Appendix 3: SPS Student Ethics Form

This form must be completed for each piece of research carried out by all undergraduate and taught postgraduate students in the School for Policy Studies.

Doctoral (PhD/DSocSci/DedPsy) students should complete the staff and doctoral students form which is submitted to the School Research Ethics Committee.

Students should discuss their proposed research with their supervisors who will then approve and sign this form before forwarding to the relevant dissertation convenor, unit convenor or programme director. Failure to get approval prior to conducting any fieldwork may result in the University taking action for research misconduct – the outcome of such action may be that your degree is not awarded and/or that you are unable to submit your fieldwork findings for assessment.

Depending on the nature of the research you wish to conduct, it may be necessary for you to get additional approvals and checks. This may involve submitting a full application to an NHS Research Ethics Committee (NRES) or submitting your SPS application for review by the SPS Research Ethics Committee. You should discuss this with your supervisor. It is your responsibility to ensure that you have enough time to obtain these approvals prior to conducting any fieldwork.

This signed form or a copy must be submitted as an appendix to your dissertation. If appropriate, a copy of approval from the SPS REC or other REC committee should also be in the appendix to your dissertation.
SECTION ONE: GOVERNANCE

1. NHS Research Ethics approval

**Who needs to provide Ethics approval for your project?**

The School will only consider those projects which do not require ethical approval from elsewhere. As such, you should make sure that your proposed research does not fall within the jurisdiction of the NRES system: [http://www.nres.nhs.uk/applications/approval-requirements/ethical-review-requirements/](http://www.nres.nhs.uk/applications/approval-requirements/ethical-review-requirements/)

If you are not sure where you should apply please discuss it with your supervisor.

Currently NRES are not expected to consider applications in respect of activities that are not research: i.e. clinical audit, service evaluation and public health surveillance. In addition REC review is not normally required for research involving NHS or social care staff recruited as research participants by virtue of their professional role. Social care research projects which are funded by the Department of Health, must always be reviewed by a REC within the Research Ethics Service for England. Similarly research which accesses un-anonymised patient records must be reviewed by a REC and NIGB.

2. Local Governance

If your project involves access to patients, clients, staff or carers of an NHS Trust or Social Care Organisation, it falls within the scope of the Research Governance Framework for Health and Social. You will also need to get written approval from the Research Management Office or equivalent of each NHS Trust or Social Care Organisation.

3. Disclosure and Barring Service check

**Do you need a Disclosure and Barring Service check?**

The Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) replaces the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) and Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA). Criteria for deciding whether you require a DBS check are available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/disclosure-and-barring-service/about](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/disclosure-and-barring-service/about)

You should specifically look at the frequency, nature, and duration of your contact with potentially vulnerable adults and or children. If your contact is a one-off research interaction, or infrequent contact (e.g.: 3 contacts over a period of time) you are unlikely to require a check.

If you think you need a DBS check then you should consult the University of Bristol web-page. [http://www.bris.ac.uk/secretary/legal/disclosure/crbhome](http://www.bris.ac.uk/secretary/legal/disclosure/crbhome)
If 'yes' then please discuss with your supervisor and check the university guidance to determine whether you will need to apply for DBS clearance PRIOR to conducting your research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you require such clearance?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you received clearance?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 2: STUDENT, ADVISOR/SUPERVISOR AND PROJECT DETAILS

1. Student’s name:

2. Programme:

   MSc Public Policy

3. Year of Study:

   2016-17

4. Project advisor/supervisor:

   Noemi Lendvai

5. Date dissertation is to be submitted:

   15 Sept 2017

6. Project title:

   [Draft] A Comparative Policy Transfer Analysis of Universal Basic Income

*If your research involves secondary analysis of data, please go to question 11.*
SECTION THREE: THE RESEARCH

1. For those intending to carry out primary research:

Who are your participants and how are you contacting them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a)</th>
<th>Describe your research participants. What populations form the basis of your sample? (e.g. general population, lone parents, mature students etc). Identify if your participants come from a vulnerable group (e.g. homeless, victims of crime etc). How many people do you expect to recruit?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants will be public sector employees, politicians, think-tank employees and possibly third sector/ advocacy group representatives. They are not from a vulnerable group. Aiming to recruit between 6-10 participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b)</th>
<th>Describe the source(s) of your participants and the selection criteria. Specifically, how will you find potential participants, and how will you contact them? Bear in mind that in most cases it is not appropriate for researchers to contact individual potential participants directly (e.g. service users should be informed of any research by the service and not by the researcher).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants have been identified through a mix of suggestions made by gatekeepers and also through internet research to identify relevant people. All participants are professionals who are involved in pilots of universal basic income. They will be contacted via email, either directly or via a gatekeeper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c)</th>
<th>Are you advertising for participants or posting a notice for volunteers? If yes, attach a copy of the advertisement, notice, email or web post.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d)</th>
<th>Are you using a questionnaire, interview, focus group as part of your procedure? If yes, attach a copy of the questionnaire(s), topic guide and/or interview questions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e)</th>
<th>Will you be asking questions that might disturb your participants emotionally or produce stress and anxiety? If Yes, what plans do you have to deal with this? For example, what support can be provided to them? If you intend to give participants a list of support services, please provide a copy with your application.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not anticipated that any questions would disturb participants or induce stress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f) Do you consider any of your participants to be especially vulnerable and/or especially at risk of harm? If yes, what risks do you anticipate and how are you planning to deal with them? For example, a survivor of abuse may be at further risk from the perpetrator if they take an information sheet away with them. Please note that in most circumstances, professionals who are being asked about their professional role and being offered anonymity would not be considered at risk of harm.

No

Informed consent and researcher safety:

g) Information for participants: what information will you be giving to participants? (E.g. letter of introduction, outline of project’s aims, participant information sheet etc). Please attach copies of any such information to this form.

Participant information sheet – as attached

h) Informed consent: what procedures will you follow to ensure all of your participants give informed consent (i.e. that participants know exactly what they are agreeing to and what you will do with the information they provide)? You should consider whether participants have the capacity to give informed consent, provide enough information so that consent is informed, and provide copies of any consent forms with your application. Participants should be asked to put their initials to show they give consent for the specific points on the form. Where written consent is not possible, you should explain your consent process in detail (i.e., will consent be audio recorded?):

Participants will receive an information sheet and will be encouraged to ask any questions they might have before agreeing to take part in the research. Each participant will be asked to complete a consent form (as attached) to confirm their consent to taking part – this will be sent via email as interviews will be via Skype or phone. Participants’ rights will also be reiterated at the start of each interview.

i) Confidentiality and anonymity: how are you going to anonymise the data you collect? How will you keep it confidential?

All data will be stored securely (password-protected computer and files). Real names and organisations will not be used in documents containing original data, information about participants will be stored separately to data in password-protected files. No participants, organisations or countries will be referred to by their real name in the dissertation.
**Researcher safety:** are there any potential risks to you in undertaking this research and how will you deal with them? Where will the fieldwork take place? Who will you notify with details of where and when you are doing the fieldwork? Will you take your mobile phone with you? Please explain your plan for ensuring your safety and explain who will be notified about where you will be and when you are due to return. Note that you should not conduct research in someone’s home if you do not know them and are alone. You may need to have a research safety protocol which should be discussed with your supervisor.

None anticipated. Interviews will be conducted via skype or telephone, and personal phone number will be blocked so that it is not available to the participants. Only university email address will be used.

1. **For those intending to carry out secondary analysis of data:**

**What data will you use?:** give a brief description of the data. Please also explain:

1. Where did you get these data from (e.g. ESRC Data Archive)?
2. How did you obtain permission to use these data? (e.g. by signing an end user licence)
3. Where will you store the secondary datasets?
SECTION FOUR – DATA MANAGEMENT

1. Where is your survey data stored?

If you intend to use an on-line survey (for example Survey Monkey) you need to ensure that the
computers they use are based in an EU country (or Iceland & Norway) and not in the USA. Please
confirm that no data will be sent outside of Europe.

n/a

2. How will you manage your data?

How will the data you collect be stored? All identifiable electronic data should be stored on
the university password protected server. If this is not possible you should ensure that your
home computer or laptop is password controlled and secure. Data should be anonymised as
soon as possible and identifying files kept securely away from anonymised data.
Unanonymised data should never be stored on a memory stick or digital recorder (obviously it
may be necessary on your return journey from an interview). Any physical data such as
cassette tape, minidisc, or paper files should be locked away in a secure draw or cabinet.
Please tell us where this physical data will be stored and whether you have any concerns
about security at this location.

Data containing identifiable information about participants will be stored in password-protected
files, either on the password-protected server of UoB, and/or on my own password-protected
laptop. Data will be anonymised as soon as it is transcribed from interview recordings and
records of the people and organisations involved will be kept separately from data, and in
password-protected files.

3. Will your data be available to others?

What are your plans for the long-term preservation of the data? Will the data storage be
stored in a way that will enabled it to be accessed by other researchers? Will the data be
destroyed/deleted at any point? If so, how and when will this be done? For example,
reformatting tapes or discs, confidential shredding of paper waste etc).

The School may require you to produce your data. If there is no long term data
sharing plan, please confirm that you will not destroy your data until after your degree
has been awarded.

Once the dissertation has been marked and degree awarded all data will be destroyed.
SECTION FIVE – OTHER DOCUMENTS

1. What documents are you submitting with this form?

**Additional Material** - please identify which of the following additional materials you have attached to this application and attach in the order listed? (helpful for reviewing lots at same time!) Please collate the form and attachments into one document before submitting to your supervisor/unit convener

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Material</th>
<th>Number of Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants information sheet (s)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent form (s)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality protocol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher safety protocol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment letters/posters/leaflets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo method information sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo method consent form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk assessment form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support information for participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd party confidentiality agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other information (draft interview questions)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION SIX: CONFIRMATIONS AND SIGNATURES

A: Student:

I certify that the statements made in this request are accurate and complete, and if I receive approval for this project from my supervisor/unit convener I will conduct my research as stated.

I agree to inform my advisor/supervisor/unit convener in writing of any emergent problems or proposed procedural changes and that I will not proceed with the research until any proposed changes have been reviewed and approved.

I have attached all of the relevant documentation necessary to carry out this research.

I am aware that this form and, if necessary, REC approval from the SPS REC or NHS must be included in an appendix in my dissertation.

B: Student advisor/supervisor: Please tick the first box and one of the subsequent boxes:

I have reviewed this form.

I approve the information in this form and do not think higher level approval is necessary.

I have sought advice from the SPS REC, this advice has been headed and approval has been given.

This form should be examined by the SPS REC.

This project has been submitted for ethical approval from an NHS REC.

C: The dissertation convenor, unit convener or programme director, on behalf of SPS REC:

Please tick the appropriate box:

Approval is granted to this project

This form is being referred to the appropriate SPS/NHS REC.

Signature: …………… Date: …… 17.05.17 ……………………
Appendix 4: Participant List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Participant Reference</th>
<th>Participant Role</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Civil Servant – national government</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Civil Servant – municipal government</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Civil Servant – provincial government</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Expert’ includes academics and think tank employees
‘Advocate’ includes campaigners, activists and others seeking to raise the profile of BI
Appendix 5: Interview Schedule

Introduction / Participant professional background and role in the basic income project

- Introductions, explanation of the research and how the interview will proceed, questions from participants
  - Check read the info sheet
  - Check have an hour
  - Check understand re confidentiality
  - Check ok with recording
  - Ask if any questions before start
  - Stress no right and wrong answers but want to hear your opinions and experiences

- Can you briefly describe your professional background and your involvement with the basic income project?
- Can you briefly outline the basic income project that you are involved in?

Project origins and purpose

What are the origins of the idea of basic income in your country or region? Historically and in this present experiment

- Where did you first hear about basic income as an idea?
- Who first proposed it as a solution?
- Have any other countries been used as inspiration?

What is the political, social and economic context in which the project has come about?

- For example levels of unemployment, recession, inequality, change of administration

What problems is it designed to address?

- Have other policies tried to address these problems and failed?
- Are there other benefits that you also think might occur as well?

How does the project integrate or interact with other related policies? E.g. simplifying systems, responding to new ways of living – relate back to response from previous question – is that problem part of wider policy programme?

How does it relate to national culture e.g. ideas of citizenship, reciprocity, work ethic, universality?

- for example policies regarding welfare, bureaucracy, or employment?
- What are the strongest ideas in your country about work, poverty, equality and welfare? Do you think these ideas have shaped the debate about basic income?

Project development

Can you talk me through the development of this project, from the initial idea until now?

Why has it been prioritised by government in the legislative programme?

- What are the main factors that influenced the decision to test basic income?
- What are the main factors that have affected the way in which the project has been set up?
What do you think the most important factors have been that have secured support for the basic income project [e.g. quality of the idea, feasibility, importance of the problem(s), favourable political environment and values of your country]

Why do you think that this project is happening at this particular time?

How and why has the idea moved into the mainstream and onto the agenda at this particular time?

- Does BI build on other attempts to address [x policy problem]?
- What other solutions were considered?
- How was BI selected above other possible solutions?

Have there been any challenges in developing the project?

- Have you had to make any compromises to the initial idea in order to get to this point? (follow up on reasons why – administrative, political, public opinion)

Key people and organisations

Who are the people and organisations involved in debates and discussion about basic income?

Who are the people and organisations directly involved in the project?

- Has the pilot come about through the work of one particular organisation, or has there been a range involved? (follow up – has it changed over time)
- Could the project have happened without all of these different organisations?
- Who decided that (xx policy problem) is important and should be addressed?
- Who was most influential in the decision to set up the project? (Prompts: activists, political parties, academics, think tanks, other)
- Has it been hard or easy to get support for the project?
- Have you taken into account how people might react when designing and communicating the project?

That’s the end of my questions, - is there anything you would like to add or that you think I should know

Any questions for me

Interested in receiving key findings in autumn?
Appendix 6: Participant information form

Basic Income Research: Participant Information

This project is designed to understand the political and policy context in which basic income pilots have been set up, and to compare these between different countries. It aims to understand how and why the idea of basic income has been picked up in a range of different countries, and will explore the different problems which basic income is designed to address, and the process through which basic income was selected as a policy solution.

You have been asked to participate in this study because you have been involved in the discussions about basic income in your country / region. Your expertise and opinions about basic income, and the wider context in which the project is taking place, will be crucial to meeting the research aims as described above.

If you agree to participate, your involvement will consist of a one-to-one interview for a maximum of 60 minutes, either via telephone or skype. With your consent, this interview will be recorded. The data from the interview will then be transcribed and analysed and will form part of the final research report. Some anonymised direct quotes may be used in the final report, and in other circumstances, if you agree.

You are under no obligation to take part in this research project, and you may withdraw your consent at any time before the interview, during the interview, and for 7 days after the interview has taken place. You may also choose not to answer one of more of the questions during the interview. You do not need to give reasons if you decide to withdraw or not to answer specific questions.

All information you provide, your name, your organisation, and the location of the basic income pilot you are involved in, will be kept confidential, and stored securely at all times, according to University of Bristol ethics procedures. In the final research report, and any other publications, all data will be anonymised to minimise the possibility of you, your organisation, or your location being identified. However, it cannot be guaranteed that someone with extensive knowledge of basic income projects could not identify specific projects or locations from the final research report.

If you agree to participate in this research, please provide your formal consent by completing the form, below, to indicate that you have received and understand the information provided and the aims of the research.

If you have any questions at any time before, during or after the interview please contact me (ad16189@my.bristol.ac.uk) or my academic supervisor (noemi.lendvai@bristol.ac.uk).

Thank you for your involvement.

Anna Dent
MSc Public Policy
University of Bristol
June 2017
Appendix 7: Participant Consent Forms

### Interview Consent Form

Please complete this form to confirm that you consent to take part in this research and return to [Redacted].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please tick the appropriate box to record your response to each statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have read the participant information sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had sufficient opportunity to ask questions about this research project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received sufficient information about the research project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I am free to withdraw from the research before or during the interview, or at any point up to 7 days after the interview, without giving reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to my interview being recorded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to anonymised quotes from my interview being used in the research reporting, and in other publications if relevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that my personal information and data from the interview will be kept secure and confidential, in line with University of Bristol ethics procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to take part in this research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Name:** [Redacted]

**Date:** 20-06-2017
**Interview Consent Form**

Please complete this form to confirm that you consent to take part in this research and return to [redacted]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please tick the appropriate box to record your response to each statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have read the participant information sheet</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had sufficient opportunity to ask questions about this research project</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received sufficient information about the research project</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I am free to withdraw from the research before or during the interview, or at any point up to 7 days after the interview, without giving reasons</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to my interview being recorded</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to anonymised quotes from my interview being used in the research reporting, and in other publications if relevant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that my personal information and data from the interview will be kept secure and confidential, in line with University of Bristol ethics procedures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to take part in this research</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Name:** …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………… **Date:** JUNE 22\(^{nd}\), 2017
**Interview Consent Form**

Please complete this form to confirm that you consent to take part in this research and return to [insert location].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please tick the appropriate box to record your response to each statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have read the participant information sheet</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had sufficient opportunity to ask questions about this research project</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received sufficient information about the research project</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I am free to withdraw from the research before or during the interview, or at any point up to 7 days after the interview, without giving reasons</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to my interview being recorded</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to anonymised quotes from my interview being used in the research reporting, and in other publications if relevant</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that my personal information and data from the interview will be kept secure and confidential, in line with University of Bristol ethics procedures</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to take part in this research</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name: [redacted]  
Date: June 21, 2017
### Interview Consent Form

Please complete this form to confirm that you consent to take part in this research and return to

Please tick the appropriate box to record your response to each statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have read the participant information sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had sufficient opportunity to ask questions about this research project</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received sufficient information about the research project</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I am free to withdraw from the research before or during the interview, or at any point up to 7 days after the interview, without giving reasons</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to my interview being recorded</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to anonymised quotes from my interview being used in the research reporting, and in other publications if relevant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that my personal information and data from the interview will be kept secure and confidential, in line with University of Bristol ethics procedures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to take part in this research</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.......................................................... Date: ..........................................................
**Interview Consent Form**

Please complete this form to confirm that you consent to take part in this research and return to

Anna Dent: ad16189@my.bristol.ac.uk

Please tick the appropriate box to record your response to each statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have read the participant information sheet</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had sufficient opportunity to ask questions about this research</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received sufficient information about the research project</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I am free to withdraw from the research before or</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during the interview, or at any point up to 7 days after the interview,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without giving reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to my interview being recorded</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to anonymised quotes from my interview being used in the</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research reporting, and in other publications if relevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that my personal information and data from the interview</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be kept secure and confidential, in line with University of Bristol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethics procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to take part in this research</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name: .............................................. Date: ...27 JUNE 2017...............
**Interview Consent Form**

Please complete this form to confirm that you consent to take part in this research and return to Anna Dent: ad16189@my.bristol.ac.uk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please tick the appropriate box to record your response to each statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have read the participant information sheet</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had sufficient opportunity to ask questions about this research project</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received sufficient information about the research project</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I am free to withdraw from the research before or during the interview, or at any point up to 7 days after the interview, without giving reasons</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to my interview being recorded</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to anonymised quotes from my interview being used in the research reporting, and in other publications if relevant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that my personal information and data from the interview will be kept secure and confidential, in line with University of Bristol ethics procedures</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to take part in this research</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name: ………………………………………………… Date: …27-06-2017……………………
# Interview Consent Form

Please complete this form to confirm that you consent to take part in this research and return to

Anna Dent:
ad16189@my.bristol.ac.uk

Please tick the appropriate box to record your response to each statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have read the participant information sheet</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have had sufficient opportunity to ask questions about this research project</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received sufficient information about the research project</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I am free to withdraw from the research before or during the interview, or at any point up to 7 days after the interview, without giving reasons</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to my interview being recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to anonymised quotes from my interview being used in the research reporting, and in other publications if relevant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that my personal information and data from the interview will be kept secure and confidential, in line with University of Bristol ethics procedures</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to take part in this research</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name: Jamie Cooke
Date: 22/06/2017...
## Interview Consent Form

Please complete this form to confirm that you consent to take part in this research and return to

Anna Dent:
ad16189@my.bristol.ac.uk

Please tick the appropriate box to record your response to each statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have read the participant information sheet</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had sufficient opportunity to ask questions about this research project</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received sufficient information about the research project</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I am free to withdraw from the research before or during the interview, or at any point up to 7 days after the interview, without giving reasons</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to my interview being recorded</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to anonymised quotes from my interview being used in the research reporting, and in other publications if relevant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that my personal information and data from the interview will be kept secure and confidential, in line with University of Bristol ethics procedures</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to take part in this research</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name: Marjukka Turunen ………………………………………………………   Date: 14.6.2017……………….
# Interview Consent Form

Please complete this form to confirm that you consent to take part in this research and return to Anna Dent:

ad16189@my.bristol.ac.uk

Please tick the appropriate box to record your response to each statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have read the participant information sheet</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had sufficient opportunity to ask questions about this research</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received sufficient information about the research project</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I am free to withdraw from the research before or</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during the interview, or at any point up to 7 days after the interview,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without giving reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to my interview being recorded</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to anonymised quotes from my interview being used in the</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research reporting, and in other publications if relevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that my personal information and data from the interview</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be kept secure and confidential, in line with University of Bristol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethics procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to take part in this research</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name: Rob Rainer Date: June 29, 2017
Appendix 8: Experiments Further Information

Finland

- Launched early 2017
- 2 year long experiment
- 2000 people in treatment group
- Randomly selected group of working age people on unemployment benefits
- €560 payment per month
- No employment conditions attached, not withdrawn if participant earns any income
- Focus on labour market participation

Ontario

- Provincial government led programme
- 3 year long experiment
- 4000 people in treatment group
- Randomly selected group of working age people on a low income
- Experiment guarantees a minimum $16,989 annual income, with 50% marginal deduction rate for any earnings above this
- No employment conditions attached

Netherlands

- Several municipalities planning to experiment with unconditional payments
- First experiments to launch autumn 2017
- 2 year long experiments
- Randomly selected treatment group of participants receiving social assistance benefits
- Testing a range of interventions including no employment conditions, a more intensive programme of employment support, and ability to earn additional income and retain 50%

Scotland

- Early stages of planning up to 4 experiments in Glasgow, Edinburgh, North Ayrshire and Fife
- Potential for all 4 regions to run one coordinated programme
## Appendix 9: Country Contextual Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>Ontario</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>5.5m</td>
<td>16.8m</td>
<td>14m</td>
<td>5.4m&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td>National Coalition: Centre Party (Centrist, liberal), New Alternative (Nationalist) and National Coalition Party (liberal conservatism)</td>
<td>National Coalition: caretaker government while coalition negotiations continue: previous coalition of VVD (conservative-liberal) and PvdA (social-democratic)</td>
<td>Provincial government: Liberal party (Centre-left)</td>
<td>Scottish Government: SNP (Centre-left, pro-independence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance structure</strong></td>
<td>National, provincial and municipal governance</td>
<td>National, provincial and municipal governance</td>
<td>Federal, provincial and municipal governance</td>
<td>Certain functions devolved from UK to Scottish government. Scottish national and local governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Rate (% of working age population)</strong></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>60%&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labour force participation rate (% of working age population)</strong></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>77% (Economic activity rate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-time employment (% of all employment)</strong></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporary Employment (% of all)</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16% (Canada)&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


<sup>5</sup> [http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/labr69a-eng.htm](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/labr69a-eng.htm)

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/l01106-eng.htm](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/l01106-eng.htm)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>May 2017</th>
<th>May 2016</th>
<th>May 2015</th>
<th>May 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unemployment Rate (% of labour force)</strong></td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term Unemployment Rate (% of all unemployed)</strong></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Wages</strong></td>
<td>USD 42,217</td>
<td>USD 52,833</td>
<td>USD 41,139</td>
<td>USD 30,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty Rate</strong></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.13 (Canada) (OECD)</td>
<td>0.11 (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GDP</strong></td>
<td>USD 43,363 per capita</td>
<td>USD 51,285 per capita</td>
<td>USD 44,374 per capita</td>
<td>USD 43,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income tax basic rate</strong></td>
<td>6.5 - 31.75%¹³</td>
<td>8.4 - 52%¹⁴</td>
<td>15 - 33%¹⁵</td>
<td>0 - 45%¹⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Inequality (Gini coefficient)</strong></td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.31¹⁷</td>
<td>0.34¹⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social spending (% of GDP)</strong></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17% (Canada)¹⁹</td>
<td>16% [2011-12]²⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public unemployment spend (benefits, incl.)</strong></td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.6% (Canada)²¹</td>
<td>0.3% (UK) Spending not devolved²²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 [http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/170727/dq170727a-eng.htm](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/170727/dq170727a-eng.htm) (Converted from Can dollars)
10 [https://data.oecd.org/](https://data.oecd.org/)
14 [https://www.expatax.nl/tax-rates-2016](https://www.expatax.nl/tax-rates-2016)
16 [https://www.gov.uk/scottish-rate-income-tax/how-it-works](https://www.gov.uk/scottish-rate-income-tax/how-it-works)
17 [https://data.oecd.org/](https://data.oecd.org/)
19 [https://data.oecd.org/](https://data.oecd.org/)
21 [https://data.oecd.org/](https://data.oecd.org/)
22 [https://data.oecd.org/](https://data.oecd.org/)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of GDP</th>
<th>% of GDP</th>
<th>% of GDP</th>
<th>% of GDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public spend on labour markets (Benefits, support services, training) (% of GDP)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.86% (Canada)</td>
<td>0.7% [different services]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET Rate (% of 15-24 year olds)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>11% (15-29 years old)</td>
<td>8.4% (16-19 years old)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All details correct at time of writing (August 2017)
All % over 10% rounded to nearest whole number
NB: data from different sources not directly comparable
All data are the most recent available, unless otherwise stated
Where regional data is not available national data has been used, and noted

23 [https://data.oecd.org/](https://data.oecd.org/)
26 [http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Labour-Market/LANEET/Table1](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Labour-Market/LANEET/Table1)