

AT A GLANCE

In Germany, younger, better educated persons, and lower income groups are more likely to be in favor of unconditional basic income

By Jule Adriaans, Stefan Liebig, and Juergen Schupp

- Representative surveys show that approval rates for an unconditional basic income vary between 45 and 52 percent in Germany
- Younger, better educated persons, and lower income groups are more likely to be in favor of unconditional basic income
- Justice attitudes also play a role: those who consider the needs of the weakest in society as not being met adequately are also more likely to favor unconditional basic income
- Between 2016/17 and 2018, about 30 percent of respondents changed their opinion regarding unconditional basic income: 15 percent became in favor of it, 15 percent moved to reject it

In a representative survey conducted in 2018 in Germany, about half the respondents expressed support for unconditional basic income



Source: SOEP-IS-BUS-Modul Soziale Ungleichheit, German-speaking population (n=2,031; weighted); own calculations.

© DIW Berlin 2019

FROM THE AUTHORS

“Obviously there is a strong interest among the population for exploring alternatives to the current social systems. Among other things, this has to do with the challenges posed by digitization and demographic change. Surely that is one reason why the idea of unconditional basic income is met favorably, not only in Germany”

— Juergen Schupp, author —

In Germany, younger, better educated persons, and lower income groups are more likely to be in favor of unconditional basic income

By Jule Adriaans, Stefan Liebig, and Juergen Schupp

ABSTRACT

Representative survey results have shown a stable approval rate for implementing unconditional basic income of between 45 and 52 percent in Germany since 2016/17. In European comparison, this approval rate is low. Younger, better educated persons, and those at risk of poverty support the concept of unconditional basic income in Germany. But these demographics are not the only factors that correlate with attitudes toward unconditional basic income: subjective justice attitudes do as well. The justice norm of equity and unconditional basic income appear to be contradictory. On the other hand, people who find that there are deficits in covering the needs of society's lower income groups tend to approve of unconditional basic income. Therefore, analyses show that attitudes toward unconditional basic income follow specific patterns and social regularities; and they were relatively stable between 2016 and 2018. As long as uncertainty predominates regarding the social costs and benefits of implementing such a basic income, the relatively high proportion of those in favor must be interpreted with care. It does not indicate that society is actually ready for reforms in this direction.

Since the summer of 2016 at the latest, when the Swiss rejected the implementation of unconditional basic income (UBI) by referendum, there has been a general public debate in Germany on whether or not paying a monthly sum of money to all citizens – no questions asked – is a good idea. At the end of January 2019, a book about the experiences of people who received basic income with the help of a Berlin crowdfunding initiative for one year¹ was on the bestseller list for several weeks. A two-year field experiment in Finland received extensive press coverage in Germany.² How unconditional basic income would change the behavior of its recipients and whether such a concept represents a more just alternative to our social state's existing subsidized and means-tested models are important related issues. This report presents empirical results on the degree of approval or rejection of the implementation of unconditional basic income based on several representative surveys (see Box 1). Unlike many simple online surveys,³ the surveys presented here ask the question about the possible implementation of unconditional basic income in a highly differentiated manner (see Box 2). Therefore, we were able to assume that all respondents shared the same understanding of the issue. However, the respondents did not receive information as to which tax reforms would finance UBI in Germany.

Surveys of attitudes toward unconditional basic income yield important findings, particularly if they are part of extensive, representative population surveys. Thanks to more detailed correlation analysis, we were able to identify the population groups that accept or reject unconditional basic income and pinpoint interrelations with other attitudes – perceived

¹ Michael Bohmeyer and Claudia Cornelsen, *Was würdest Du tun? Wie uns das Bedingungslose Grundeinkommen verändert*, (Berlin: Econ, 2019).

² See Kai Strittmacher, "Ein Grundeinkommen macht nicht produktiver, aber glücklicher," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, February 8, 2019 (in German; available online, accessed March 12, 2019; this applies to all other online sources in this report unless stated otherwise). In Finland, a randomly selected group of 2,000 persons was granted basic income benefits for a period of two years without conditions. Initial preliminary results show that overall, recipients reported a higher level of satisfaction than the control group. They also suffered fewer health problems and stress. See Olli Kangas et al., *The Basic Income Experiment 2017–2018 in Finland. Preliminary results (2019)* (available online, accessed February 9, 2019).

³ See the results of an online survey commissioned by the newspaper *Die Welt*, for example. The question was: "Are you in favor of the idea of unconditional basic income for all citizens?". Respondents could answer with "Yes, absolutely," "Yes, more or less," "No, more or less," or "No, absolutely not." As of March 12, 2019, around 41 percent of respondents were in favor of UBI ("Yes, absolutely" and "Yes, more or less") and 39 percent categorically rejected one ("No, absolutely not"). (In German; available online).

Figure 1

Approval of the introduction of an unconditional basic income in several European countries

Approval rate in percent



Source: European Social Survey (ESS); wave 8 (n=44,387; weighted)

© DIW Berlin 2019

The approval rate for an unconditional basic income is lower in Germany than in many other European countries.

norms of justice, in particular. We also present analyses on the stability of and change in preferences for or against such a basic income.

In European comparison, approval of unconditional basic income is below average in Germany

The idea of unconditional basic income has been met with interest in many European countries.⁴ In most, support for such a proposal is even higher than in Germany. In Germany, around 45 percent of respondents in the eighth wave of the ESS (see Box 1) are in favor of implementing unconditional basic income (see Figure 1). The survey only yielded significantly lower approval rates in Sweden, Norway, and Switzerland, where just under two thirds of all respondents rejected basic income. The approval rate in Austria, France, and the Netherlands was similar to that of Germany. Approval is particularly high in Lithuania, Russia, Hungary, Israel, and Slovenia. In those countries, around one third of respondents rejected unconditional basic income. A close analysis of the patterns explaining the national differences showed that approval rates were lower in countries with far-reaching, strong welfare-state benefits and institutions.⁵

Supporters tend to be young, well-educated, and in a lower income group

On average, the findings on the acceptance of UBI in Germany have been fairly stable since 2016/17.

A follow-up survey of participants in the German sample of the ESS conducted in fall and winter 2018 showed a slight increase between 2016/17 and 2018 (from 45 to 48 percent) (see Figure 2). And between fall 2017 and fall 2018, the proportion of supporters rose by several percentage points to 52 percent in two representative surveys of the SOEP-IS. In both data sources, the approval rate in eastern Germany was higher than the rate in western Germany.

Differentiating approval based on socio-demographic characteristics showed that those who approved tended to be in younger age groups, to have completed higher levels of education, and had lower household incomes (see Table 1). Women approve implementing UBI somewhat more frequently, but multivariate statistical tests indicate that the gender difference is not significant. The same applies to the differences between eastern and western Germany. They are not significant after statistically controlling for socio-demographic characteristics. Eastern Germans do not generally have a higher UBI approval rate than western Germans.⁶

⁴ An Unconditional Basic Income Europe (UBIE) initiative that has been existing for several years is currently working on a European citizen's initiative. It plans to use the European election in May for mobilization. See the UBIE website for more information. In Germany, the "Bündnis Grundeinkommen", whose only campaigning topic is unconditional basic income, is presenting candidates in the forthcoming European election

⁵ Soomi Lee, "Attitudes Toward Universal Basic Income and Welfare State in Europe: A Research Note," *Basic Income Studies*, 13 (1) (2018): 1-9.

⁶ The results represented refer to 2018 and those respondents who were surveyed as part of the ESS in 2016/17. Examining the responses from these persons from 2016/17 showed a slightly different pattern of approval. It seems as though education became more important for attitude toward UBI in 2018. And the east-west differences appeared to have decreased in importance between 2016/17 and 2018.

Figure 2

Opinion on unconditional basic income in Germany since 2016/2017

Approval rate to each answer proposition in percent



Question: "Overall, would you be against or in favor of having this scheme in Germany?" (see Box 2 for the exact wording of the question)

Source: European Social Survey (ESS), wave 8, German sample (n=2,852, of which western Germany n=1,915, eastern Germany n=937), adults aged 15 and over (weighted); sample of the ESS 2018 follow-up survey (n=1,096, of which western Germany n=761, eastern Germany n=335), adults aged 17 and over (not weighted); for 2017: SOEP-IS-BUS-Modul BGE, German-speaking population (n=2,031, of which western Germany n=1,692, eastern Germany n=229), adults aged 14 and over (weighted); for 2018: SOEP-IS-BUS-Modul Soziale Ungleichheit, German-speaking population (n=2,031, of which western Germany n=1,700, eastern Germany n=331), adults aged 14 and over (weighted).

© DIW Berlin 2019

Opinions on the unconditional basic income have not varied much since 2016/17, approval is higher in eastern Germany.

Supporters tend to be politically left wing and skeptical of the equity principle

An estimate model that additionally takes into account attitudes and opinions showed that persons who classified their political orientation as left wing approved of unconditional basic income with a significantly higher frequency. The same applied to persons who believe that in Germany, low incomes are unfairly too low; people who thought the standard of living of unemployed persons is extremely bad also tended to be in favor of unconditional basic income. Therefore, attitudes toward basic income appear to be related to the perception of social (in)justice. Persons who identify deficits in how the needs of specific social groups are covered – low-earners, unemployed persons – tend to have more positive attitudes towards unconditional basic income.

Attitudes on the question of how benefits and burdens should be distributed in a fair society also play a role.⁷ A preference for needs-based distribution often goes hand in hand with approval of an unconditional basic income. On the other hand, preference for the equity principle is hardly compatible with the unconditionality of UBI.⁸ Consequently, those

⁷ Social justice research differentiates among basic principles according to which benefits and burdens are distributed: *The equity and need principle* receive the most approval in Germany. The *equity principle* requires more to be given to those who have delivered higher performance. According to the *need principle* rewards and burdens should be allocated based on individual need. See Sebastian Hülle, Stefan Liebig and Meike May (2018), *Measuring Attitudes Toward Distributive Justice: The Basic Social Justice Orientations Scale*, Social Indicators Research, 136; 663-692, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-017-1580-x> and Philipp Eisnecker, Jule Adriaans, and Stefan Liebig, "Was macht Gerechtigkeit aus? Deutsche WählerInnen befürworten über Parteigrenzen hinweg das Leistungs- und das Bedarfsprinzip," *DIW aktuell*, no. 17 (2018) (in German; available online, accessed March 20, 2019).

⁸ See Dominik H. Enste, "Grundeinkommen: Geschenk ist viel zu teuer," *iwd*, 2019 (in German; available online).

who are more in favor of equity-based distribution in society are less likely to support UBI.

High approval of unconditional basic income does not necessarily mean high willingness to embrace reform

There is a wide range of ideas with regard to how much money basic income should be and how it should be financed.⁹ Depending on the model discussed, the implementation of UBI would lead to a substantial redistribution of income: some would be much better off financially, and others would be worse off as the result of their higher tax burden. Since this aspect was ignored in the surveys used for the present analysis, the approval rates for basic income are meaningful only to a limited extent with regard to willingness to embrace reform in this direction.¹⁰

For this reason, it seemed appropriate to look at the trend in attitudes toward UBI over time.

Just under one third of respondents changed their opinion regarding unconditional basic income in 2018

Until now, the results of surveys on UBI were examined case by case. Considering a range of data sources showed a quite constant approval rate on average. In view of the heated public debates¹¹ and a plethora of suggested models, we searched for an answer to the question of whether attitudes for or against UBI are just as stable on the level of individual persons. The same persons that participated in the recurring ESS survey in 2016/17 responded in 2018. Despite the relatively short study period, we were able to derive initial findings on individual stability and changes in attitude. Around two thirds of respondents did not change the opinion on UBI they expressed in 2016/17. Almost one third of respondents changed their opinion in 2018; whereby the proportion of persons who change in one direction or the other was approximately equal at around 15 percent. Therefore,

Table 1

Relation between socio-demographic characteristics, opinions and the support for an unconditional basic income

	Support for unconditional basic income	
<i>Age</i>		
Under 25 years old	0.238***	(0.062)
26 to 45 years old	0.171**	(0.056)
46 to 65 years old	0.098*	(0.048)
Over 65 years old	Ref.	Ref.
<i>Male (1=yes)</i>		
Male (1=yes)	0.001	(0.031)
<i>Education (CASMINI)¹</i>		
Education (CASMINI) ¹	0.017*	(0.009)
<i>At risk of poverty (1=yes)²</i>		
At risk of poverty (1=yes) ²	0.139*	(0.055)
<i>Living alone (1=yes)</i>		
Living alone (1=yes)	0.043	(0.044)
<i>Eastern Germany (1=yes)</i>		
Eastern Germany (1=yes)	-0.008	(0.033)
<i>Occupational status</i>		
Not working	Ref.	Ref.
Working	-0.026	(0.043)
<i>Opinions and values</i>		
Political orientation (left/right)	-0.029***	(0.009)
Fairness of high incomes ³	0.028**	(0.011)
Fairness of low incomes ³	-0.037***	(0.009)
Estimated unemployment rate	0.014*	(0.007)
Standard of living of unemployed ⁴	-0.030***	(0.008)
Equity principle ⁵	-0.082***	(0.017)
Pseudo-R ² (in percent)	14.43	
Observations	894	

Remark: logistic regression (logit). Shown are average marginal effects (AME). Standard error in brackets. + p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

- 1 Information on education and household income as provided by the first survey round ESS 8 (2016/17).
- 2 A person is considered "at risk of poverty" if his/her household income is among the lowest 20 percent of household incomes. At the time the survey was conducted, this corresponded to a household net income of 1,440 euros or less. Whether the person surveyed lives on his/her own was included in the model to control for household size.
- 3 The subjective appreciation of income justice in Germany was surveyed with an 11-point scale ranging from "unjustly too low" (-5) to "unjustly too high" (+5), where (0) represents "just". Context information was provided when asking the questions. For more information see Jule Adriaans and Stefan Liebig, "Inequality of Earnings in Germany Generally Accepted but Low Incomes Considered Unfair", DIW Weekly Report, no 27 (2018) (available online).
- 4 Measured by the answer to the question "What do you think overall about the standard of living of people who are unemployed?" on an 11-point scale ranging from "extremely bad" (0) to "extremely good" (10).
- 5 The position with regard to the principle of equity is assessed based on the affirmation: "Large differences in people's incomes are acceptable to properly reward differences in talents and efforts." Respondents could position themselves on following scale: (1) "disagree strongly", (2) "disagree", (3) "neither agree nor disagree", (4) "agree", (5) "agree strongly".

Source: authors own calculations based on follow-up survey ESS 2018. Adults aged 17 and over.

Reading aid: Persons at risk of poverty have a 13.9 percentage point higher probability than persons who are not at risk of poverty to embrace the introduction of unconditional basic income.

⁹ For example, see Rigmar Osterkamp, "Ist ein bedingungsloses Grundeinkommen in Deutschland finanzierbar?" in *Auf dem Prüfstand: Ein bedingungsloses Grundeinkommen für Deutschland*, ed. Rigmar Osterkamp (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2014): 225-80. Depending on the model and amount of basic income per month, previous social security benefits would cease but higher income tax rates would lead to substantial redistribution effects. Also see the international study by Hilary W. Hoynes and Jesse Rothstein, "Universal Basic Income in the US and Advanced Countries," *NBER Working Paper*, 25538 (2019) (available online).

¹⁰ There exist complex survey methods in the social sciences that make it possible to study preferences for and acceptance of various financing and design options for individual basic income models in more detail. For example, see Katrin Auspurg et al., "The factorial survey as a method for measuring sensitive issues," in *Improving Survey Methods: Lessons from Recent Research*, ed. Uwe Engel et al., (New York: Routledge, 2014). Empirical studies have also been made on benefits to cover subsistence costs. See Katharina Hörstermann and Hans-Jürgen Andreß, "Wer nicht arbeitet, soll auch nichts essen! Eine Vignettenanalyse zur Bestimmung eines Einkommensmindestbedarfs," *Zeitschrift für Sozialreform*, 61 (2015): 171-198.

¹¹ For example, searching for "bedingungsloses Grundeinkommen" (unconditional basic income) in the Factiva media database for 2018 yields over 4,900 hits: an increase of over 50 percent in comparison to 2016 and six times the media articles in 2015. Several talk shows provide good examples of how heated the debates sometimes become, for example, the Phoenix debate on June 27, 2017 titled "1000 Euro für jeden – Wie sinnvoll ist das Grundeinkommen?" (1,000 euros for everyone – how much sense does basic income make?). (In German; video available online, accessed March 20, 2019) or in the Phoenix Unter den Linden show on April 30, 2018 titled "Arbeitsmarktpolitik 4.0 – Brauchen wir ein Grundeinkommen für alle?" (Smart labor market policy – do we need basic income for everyone?). (In German; video available online, accessed March 20, 2019).

Box 1

Database

The analyses presented here are based on survey data from four sources.

The **European Social Survey (ESS)** is an international, cross-sectional survey that has been conducted in personal interview format every other year since 2001. The ESS collects data on attitudes and behavior patterns of the population in more than 20 European countries. In the eighth round (field period from **fall 2016 until spring 2017**), Israel and Russia also participated in the survey. One of the aims of the ESS is to produce useful indicators related to citizens' perceptions and evaluations of social issues. Very high methodological standards are applied to survey construction, the sampling procedure, and data collection in the ESS. Upon request, the data are provided to science and academia for secondary analysis.¹

In Germany as part of the 2016/17 survey, participants in the eighth wave of the ESS were asked whether they were willing to participate in a new survey. Of the 2,852 respondents in the German sample, 2,211 gave their informed consent. The previously announced postal follow-up survey was conducted by Bielefeld University between **August and December 2018**. Overall, 1,096 persons were successfully interviewed in the follow-up. This is equal to around 38 percent

¹ For example, see Christian Schnaudt, et al., "The European Social Survey: Contents, Design, and Research Potential," *Schmollers Jahrbuch*, 134 (2014): 487-506. Upon prior registration, the data are available online.

of all participants in the first survey. To exclude possible distortion of the results on the stability of and changes in attitudes toward unconditional basic income, it was examined whether or not those in favor of or against in the 2016/17 survey had significantly different probabilities of participating in the follow-up survey in fall and winter 2018. Selectivity analyses showed that there was no selective distortion related to attitude toward unconditional basic income.

As part of the Socio-Economic Panel at the German Institute for Economic Research's **SOEP Innovation sample**,² 2,031 persons in the German-speaking population 14 and older participated in a computer-assisted survey on several themes conducted by trained interviewers from the Kantar Public survey institute between **August and September 2017**. In that representative test survey, the same question as in the ESS 2016/17 was asked on the possible implementation of unconditional basic income (see Box 2). It was a random selection with an average error tolerance of 1.4 percentage points (at a proportional value of five percent) to 31 percentage points (at a proportional value of 50 percent). From **August to September 2018**, Kantar Public conducted a new wave of a multi-theme survey in which there were also 2,031 respondents.

² David Richter and Jürgen Schupp, "SOEP Innovation Panel (SOEP-IS)," *Schmollers Jahrbuch*, 135 (3) (2015): 389-399.

we were not able to detect a clear trend toward stronger approval or rejection.

Approval rate of younger and politically left-wing persons increased

Searching for common factors among the approximately 15 percent of the population who changed from the "reject group" to the "approve group" again showed the significant effect of young age (see Table 2, Model 1). A left-wing political stance apparently also goes hand in hand with changing from disapproval to approval of UBI.

Persons who consider low incomes as unjustly too low in general, or who are of the opinion that the standard of living of unemployed persons is extremely bad, were more likely to change their stance from rejection to approval. On the other hand, for those who approve of the equity principle, the probability of changing their stance to approval fell significantly.

The elderly, persons with lower educational levels, and high earners more often change to rejection

Among the approximately 15 percent of the population whose attitude toward UBI changed to negative, the over-65 age group showed a significant effect (see Table 2, Model 2).

Persons with lower levels of education as well as persons who are not at risk of poverty changed their previously favorable attitude.

The respondents' notion of justice also played a role in this type of change in attitude. Those who did not consider low incomes unjust or believe that unemployed persons' standard of living is too high were more likely to change their stance from approval to rejection of unconditional basic income.

Overall, attitudes to the UBI remained relatively stable across the study period from 2016 to 2018. Those who changed their opinion followed patterns similar to those that became obvious in the cross-sectional analysis. In addition to age and education, norms of justice played a key role. This supports the assumption that debates on implementing UBI absolutely must address its perceived justice.

Conclusion: to generate acceptance, basic income models must harmonize with principles of justice

In Germany, the model of unconditional basic income has received more and more public attention in recent years. Around half of the population has a favorable opinion of unconditional basic income. Overall, attitudes towards UBI remained relatively stable across the study period (2016 to

Box 2

Survey of attitudes toward unconditional basic income

Regardless of which of the four surveys generated them, the results on the acceptance of unconditional basic income presented here were based on the following question:

"Some countries are currently talking about introducing a basic income scheme. In a moment, I will ask you to tell me whether you are against or in favor of this scheme. First, I will give you some more details. A basic income includes all of the following:

- The state pays everyone a monthly income that cover essential living costs.
- It replaces many other social benefits.
- The purpose is to guarantee everyone a minimum standard of living.
- Everyone receives the same amount regardless of whether or not they are working.
- People also keep the money they earn from work or other sources.
- This scheme is paid for by taxes.

Overall, would you be against or in favor of having this scheme in Germany?"

The respondents were next asked to indicate their degree of approval or rejection on a four-point scale: "strongly against," "against," "in favor," "strongly in favor." For the correlation analyses the responses "strongly in favor" and "in favor" were coded as "approval" and the responses "strongly against" and "against" were coded as "rejection".

The Europe-wide share of those who did not or could not answer the questions was between one percent and 19 percent of respondents. For all surveys conducted in Germany, at one to six percent, the proportion of missing answers was among the lowest.

2018). In particular, younger persons and those with higher educational levels embrace the concept. However, the approval rates for unconditional basic income reported here cannot be translated into a willingness to support reforms in this direction. They do not mean that citizens would welcome such a plan even if its financing and consequences were made transparent. The answer to this issue can only be found by conducting further surveys that use more differentiated methods of empirical social research and reveal various scenarios – along with the associated financing scenarios, for example. In addition to the issue of financial viability, the debate on implementing unconditional basic income is connected to the issue of the justice of a change in the social state principle. While critics primarily view unconditional basic income as a threat to an equity-based distribution,¹² the analyses presented here show that the widely accepted justice principle of need harmonizes with the implementation of

Table 2

Relation between socio-demographic characteristics, opinions and the change of opinion regarding an unconditional basic income

	Model 1: From rejection to approval of UBI		Model 2: From approval to rejection of UBI	
Age				
Under 25 years old	0.251**	(0.087)	-0.208**	(0.080)
26 to 45 years old	0.159*	(0.071)	-0.151+	(0.081)
46 to 65 years old	0.103+	(0.058)	-0.122+	(0.072)
Over 65 years old	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Male (1=yes)	-0.022	(0.041)	0.004	(0.042)
Education (CASMIN) ³	-0.002	(0.012)	-0.030**	(0.011)
At risk of poverty (1=yes) ^{3,4}	0.106	(0.074)	-0.127+	(0.073)
Living alone (1=yes)	-0.025	(0.059)	-0.070	(0.062)
Eastern Germany (1=yes)	0.004	(0.046)	0.047	(0.043)
Occupational status				
Not working	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Working	-0.028	(0.056)	-0.006	(0.059)
Opinions and values				
Political orientation (left/right)	-0.023+	(0.012)	0.013	(0.012)
Fairness of high incomes ⁵	0.015	(0.014)	-0.029*	(0.015)
Fairness of low incomes ⁵	-0.027*	(0.012)	0.043***	(0.012)
Estimated unemployment rate	0.021*	(0.009)	0.001	(0.010)
Standard of living of unemployed ⁶	-0.025*	(0.011)	0.030**	(0.010)
Equity principle ⁷	-0.077***	(0.023)	0.033	(0.023)
Pseudo-R ² (in percent)	13.00		12.86	
Observations	462		432	

Remark: logistic regression (logit). Shown are average marginal effects (AME). Standard error in brackets. + p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

- 1 Model 1 compares all respondents who rejected unconditional basic income at first and later supported it with those who continued rejecting it.
- 2 Model 2 compared all respondents who supported an unconditional basic income at first and later rejected it with those who continued supporting it.
- 3 Information on education and household income as provided by the first survey round ESS 8 (2016/17).
- 4 A person is considered "at risk of poverty" if his/her household income is among the lowest 20 percent of household incomes. At the time the survey was conducted, this corresponded to a household net income of 1,440 euros or less. Whether the person surveyed lives on his/her own was included in the model to control for household size.
- 5 The subjective appreciation of income justice in Germany was surveyed with an 11-point scale ranging from "unjustly too low" (-5) to "unjustly too high" (+5), where (0) represents "just". Context information was provided when asking the questions. For more information see Jule Adriaans and Stefan Liebig, "Inequality of Earnings in Germany Generally Accepted."
- 6 Measured by the answer to the question "What do you think overall about the standard of living of people who are unemployed?" on an 11-point scale ranging from "extremely bad" (0) to "extremely good" (10).
- 7 The position with regard to the principle of equity is assessed based on the affirmation: "Large differences in people's incomes are acceptable to properly reward differences in talents and efforts." Respondents could position themselves on following scale: (1) "disagree strongly", (2) "disagree", (3) "neither agree nor disagree", (4) "agree", (5) "agree strongly".

Source: authors own calculations based on follow-up survey ESS 2018. Adults aged 17 and over.

Reading aid: under 25 year-olds who rejected unconditional basic income in 2016/17 have a 25.1 percentage points higher probability of supporting it in 2018 than over 65 year-olds who also rejected it in 2016/17.

12 See Enste, "Grundeinkommen."

UBI. Precisely those who support needs-based distribution and see unsatisfied needs at the lower end of society tend to be in favor of an unconditional basic income. Among these respondents, the approval rate is on an upswing.

The models for providing basic income under discussion must meet the challenge of reconciling the two widely accepted, seemingly opposite principles of just distribution – covering individual needs and honoring performance – and their proponents.¹³ It is important to design the model such that incentives for taking up gainful employment still exist

13 To be mentioned here are: reform plans for basic benefits for children, the guaranteed social benefits to the unemployed without certain current conditions (*Garantiesicherung ohne Zwang*) proposed by the Green Party, and the SPD's most recent plans for a basic pension.

despite receiving unconditional basic income.¹⁴ In order to address this aspect, other basic income models are on the table: for example, one in which basic income is reserved for specific groups and/or is paid to persons who take up work in the social labor market.¹⁵

14 For example, the change in eligibility requirements for the guaranteed income (*Garantieeinkommen*). See Maximilian Blömer and Andreas Peichl, "Ein 'Garantieeinkommen für Alle.' Studie in Zusammenarbeit mit der Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft Wirtschaft und Finanzen von Bündnis 90/Die Grünen," *ifo Forschungsberichte* 97 (2018).

15 For example, the state of Berlin will kick off a trial project for a "blanket basic income" in July 2019. See Senatskanzlei Berlin, "Das Solidarische Grundeinkommen: eine Win-Win-Situation für Arbeitslose und die Gesellschaft," press release, February 20, 2019 (in German; available online, accessed March 21, 2019). Also see Jürgen Schupp, "Solidarisches Grundeinkommen: Für einen sozialen Arbeitsmarkt," *Wirtschaftsdienst*, 98(4) (2018): 226 (in German; available online, accessed March 21, 2019); and Stefan Bach and Jürgen Schupp, "Solidarisches Grundeinkommen: alternatives Instrument für mehr Teilhabe," *DIW aktuell*, no. 8 (2018) (in German; available online, accessed March 21, 2019).

Jule Adriaans is Research Associate in the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) infrastructure unit at DIW Berlin | jadriaans@diw.de

Stefan Liebig is Director of the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) infrastructure unit and member of the board of DIW Berlin | sliebig@diw.de

Juergen Schupp is Vice Director of the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) infrastructure unit at DIW Berlin | jschupp@diw.de

JEL: D63, I38, H23

Keywords: Basic Income- Preferences, Survey

LEGAL AND EDITORIAL DETAILS



DIW Berlin — Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung e.V.

Mohrenstraße 58, 10117 Berlin

www.diw.de

Phone: +49 30 897 89-0 Fax: -200

Volume 9 April 10, 2019

Publishers

Prof. Dr. Tomaso Duso; Prof. Marcel Fratzscher, Ph.D.; Prof. Dr. Peter Haan;
Prof. Dr. Claudia Kemfert; Prof. Dr. Alexander Kriwoluzky; Prof. Dr. Stefan Liebig;
Prof. Dr. Lukas Menkhoff; Dr. Claus Michelsen; Prof. Karsten Neuhoff, Ph.D.;
Prof. Dr. Jürgen Schupp; Prof. Dr. C. Katharina Spieß

Editors-in-chief

Dr. Gritje Hartmann; Mathilde Richter; Dr. Wolf-Peter Schill

Reviewer

Dr. Stefan Bach

Editorial staff

Renate Bogdanovic; Dr. Franziska Bremus; Rebecca Buhner;
Claudia Cohnen-Beck; Dr. Daniel Kemptner; Sebastian Kollmann;
Matthias Laugwitz; Dr. Alexander Zerrahn

Sale and distribution

DIW Berlin Leserservice, Postfach 74, 77649 Offenburg

leserservice@diw.de

Phone: +49 1806 14 00 50 25 (20 cents per phone call)

Layout

Roman Wilhelm, DIW Berlin

Cover design

© imageBROKER / Steffen Diemer

Composition

Satz-Rechen-Zentrum Hartmann + Heenemann GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin

ISSN 2568-7697

Reprint and further distribution—including excerpts—with complete
reference and consignment of a specimen copy to DIW Berlin's
Customer Service (kundenservice@diw.de) only.

Subscribe to our DIW and/or Weekly Report Newsletter at

www.diw.de/newsletter_en