Universal Basic Income and Its Economic Effects: Insights from Experimental Studies

DR. GAJENDRA SAHU
Assistant Professor, Department of Economics
Banaras Hindu University (BHU), Varanasi, UP

Abstract:
This paper examines the economic impact of Universal Basic Income (UBI) through insights from global experimental studies. UBI, as an unconditional cash transfer, aims to enhance income security and promote inclusive development. Drawing on evidence from pilots in India, Finland, Kenya, and other countries, the paper analyzes its effects on labor supply, consumption, poverty reduction, entrepreneurship, and fiscal sustainability. While results highlight several positive outcomes, challenges such as financing, political feasibility, and integration with existing welfare systems remain. The study emphasizes the importance of context-specific design and gradual implementation for maximizing UBI's economic and social benefits.

Keywords: *UBI, Economic Impact, Experimental Studies, Poverty Reduction, Labour Market, Cash Transfers*

1. Introduction

UBI has emerged as one of the most debated and transformative policy ideas in recent years, particularly in the context of rising economic inequality, job insecurity due to automation, and inefficiencies in traditional welfare systems. Defined as a periodic, unconditional cash payment delivered to all citizens irrespective of employment status or income, UBI seeks to provide a financial floor that guarantees economic security and dignity (Standing, 2017). The core principle of UBI is universality- removing the need for means-testing or work requirements, which often create exclusion errors and administrative burdens in conventional welfare schemes.

The conceptual foundations of UBI date back to philosophical debates on justice and economic rights. Thinkers like Thomas Paine and later, John Stuart Mill, advocated for guaranteed income as a means to address structural poverty and enable individual freedom (Van Parijs & Vanderborght, 2017). In the 21st century, UBI has gained renewed traction as a policy response to challenges such as precarious employment, economic shocks, and gaps in social protection systems. Its appeal cuts across ideological lines from libertarians who see it as a simplification of welfare bureaucracy to progressives who view it as a tool for equity and empowerment.

While theoretical arguments for and against UBI are well established, the real momentum has come from experimental studies and pilot programs across different socio-economic contexts. Countries such as Finland, Kenya, the United States, Canada, and India have undertaken trials to test the feasibility, effectiveness, and consequences of basic income schemes. These experiments provide valuable insights into the economic effects of UBI, including changes in labor supply, consumption patterns, poverty levels, investment in health and education, and overall well-being (Banerjee et al., 2019; Kangas et al., 2020).

For example, the Madhya Pradesh pilot study conducted in India by SEWA and UNICEF (2011–2012) showed significant improvements in food security, health outcomes, school attendance, and small-scale investments when unconditional cash transfers were provided. Similarly, in Finland's national-level pilot (2017–2018), recipients reported lower stress, increased well-being, and no significant reduction in employment levels compared to the control group (Kangas et al., 2020). In Kenya, the large-scale ongoing UBI experiment by GiveDirectly is showing how long-term, predictable income affects household stability, entrepreneurship, and resilience to shocks (Haushofer & Shapiro, 2016).

Despite the promising evidence, UBI remains controversial. Critics argue that it may discourage work effort, strain public budgets, and divert funds from targeted welfare schemes. Questions also persist about its scalability, fiscal sustainability, and political acceptability in different governance settings. Hence, while experimental studies provide important micro-level insights, macroeconomic implications and context-specific challenges require careful consideration.

This paper aims to explore the economic effects of UBI by synthesizing insights from major experimental studies conducted around the world. It assesses UBI's impact on labor markets, consumption, poverty, inequality, and fiscal dynamics, with a focus on evidence-based understanding. By reviewing global empirical findings, this study contributes to the ongoing policy discourse on whether and how UBI can serve as a viable instrument for inclusive and sustainable economic development.

2. Economic Effects of Universal Basic Income: Evidence from Global Experiments

The economic effects of UBI have been a central concern in both theoretical debates and empirical studies. This section examines UBI's impact on key economic indicators, including labor supply, consumption, investment, poverty, inequality, entrepreneurship, and fiscal sustainability. Drawing from experimental studies across various countries and socio-economic contexts, it provides a detailed analysis of UBI's multidimensional implications for individuals, households, and national economies.

Labor Market Participation

One of the most persistent critiques of UBI is its potential to reduce labor market participation by weakening work incentives. Classical economic theory, particularly neoclassical labor-leisure trade-off models, suggests that an unconditional income might lower the marginal utility of additional income from labor, thereby reducing labor supply (Moffitt, 2003). However, evidence from experimental studies challenges this assumption.

In Finland's two-year national-level UBI experiment (2017–2018), 2,000 unemployed individuals received a monthly payment of €560, unconditionally. The study found no significant reduction in employment among recipients compared to the control group (Kangas et al., 2020). In fact, some participants experienced improved mental health and were more willing to seek employment, suggesting that psychological security may positively affect labor market behavior.

Similarly, the UBI pilot conducted by SEWA and UNICEF in Madhya Pradesh, India, showed that recipients did not reduce their labor supply. Instead, many engaged more actively in small-scale farming and informal work (Davala et al., 2015). The pilot included over 6,000 individuals and revealed that the security of regular income allowed participants to take calculated risks, such as investing time in improving agricultural productivity or starting small businesses.

In contrast, the U.S.-based Negative Income Tax (NIT) experiments in the 1970s did observe modest reductions in labor hours, particularly among secondary earners and young adults (Widerquist, 2013). However, those reductions were not drastic and were often linked to increased time spent in education or caregiving, suggesting that reduced work hours may still yield socially beneficial outcomes.

3. Consumption and Aggregate Demand

UBI has a direct effect on increasing household consumption, particularly among low-income groups. Since the marginal propensity to consume is higher for the poor, UBI transfers tend to stimulate demand for essential goods and services. This was evident in Kenya's GiveDirectly project, where long-term cash transfers led to increased spending on food, housing, and health without creating inflationary pressure (Haushofer & Shapiro, 2016). The study also found that recipients used cash transfers prudently, with minimal spending on temptation goods like alcohol and tobacco.

In India, the Madhya Pradesh pilot saw an increase in expenditures on food, sanitation, and schooling. Notably, malnutrition indicators declined, and school enrollment improved, particularly for girls (Davala et al., 2015). This demonstrates UBI's capacity to generate a positive cycle of human capital development through better household resource allocation.

From a macroeconomic perspective, UBI can act as a stabilizer by supporting aggregate demand during economic downturns. This is especially relevant in the post-COVID-19 context, where job losses and income uncertainty have constrained consumption in many developing economies. As Gentilini et al. (2020) argue, UBI could serve as an automatic stabilizer that cushions households from economic shocks while sustaining overall demand.

4. Investment, Entrepreneurship, and Risk-Taking

By reducing income uncertainty, UBI can encourage entrepreneurship and long-term investment, especially among the poor who typically face liquidity constraints. In GiveDirectly's Kenya experiment, recipients of larger, lump-sum transfers were more likely to start small businesses and invest in productive assets like livestock and farm equipment (Haushofer & Shapiro, 2016). This challenges the stereotype that unconditional cash leads to passivity or wasteful spending.

In India's pilot as well, beneficiaries invested in improving agricultural land, purchasing tools, and diversifying crops (Davala et al., 2015). Incomes rose not simply because of consumption smoothing but due to increased productivity. Similar findings were echoed in the Namibia basic income grant pilot, where income security enabled recipients to engage in microenterprise and reduce reliance on exploitative informal credit (Haarmann et al., 2009).

These effects are consistent with behavioural economics theories. Mullainathan and Shafir (2013) argue that scarcity imposes a cognitive tax, reducing the mental bandwidth available for long-term planning. By alleviating financial stress, UBI may expand individuals' cognitive capacity to engage in goal-oriented behavior and risk-taking conducive to economic mobility.

5. Poverty and Inequality Reduction

One of UBI's strongest justifications is its potential to reduce poverty and inequality. UBI directly boosts the incomes of the poorest households, improving their consumption levels and quality of life. Simulations based on India's National Sample Survey data suggest that a modest UBI transfer (e.g., ₹3,000 per person per year) could significantly reduce the poverty headcount and poverty gap, even when financed through restructuring existing subsidies (Drèze & Khera, 2017).

The Madhya Pradesh pilot confirmed these predictions. Income inequality within villages declined, and the poorest households gained the most in terms of nutritional security, access to healthcare, and education (Davala et al., 2015). In Kenya, long-term UBI improved subjective well-being and reduced the severity of poverty even in remote, infrastructure-poor areas (Egger et al., 2022).

Moreover, UBI has the potential to reduce gender disparities. In many pilots, women reported greater autonomy in spending and increased participation in community decision-making. This supports the

argument that UBI, if distributed individually (not household-based), can be an effective tool for promoting gender equity (Standing, 2017).

6. Fiscal Sustainability and Public Finance

Despite its positive economic impacts, UBI's affordability and fiscal sustainability remain contentious. Large-scale implementation requires substantial financial resources, particularly in countries with limited tax bases. According to IMF estimates, a universal UBI equivalent to 25% of median income would cost between 6% and 12% of GDP, depending on the country (IMF, 2017).

In India, Drèze and Khera (2017) propose a phased rollout targeting the poorest 75% of the population, financed by rationalizing non-merit subsidies and improving tax compliance. This would amount to roughly 4–5% of GDP, a figure that, while significant, could be feasible with political will and administrative efficiency.

Alternative financing models include progressive taxation, wealth taxes, and environmental levies. Some countries have considered replacing inefficient welfare programs with UBI to reduce administrative costs and leakage. However, replacing all welfare schemes with a flat UBI may undermine targeted protections for vulnerable groups, especially those needing in-kind services like healthcare and education (Ghatak & Mani, 2019).

The fiscal debate also intersects with long-term growth. If UBI leads to improved human capital and higher productivity, it could expand the tax base and reduce future welfare dependency. Yet, the short-term costs are likely to pose political and economic challenges, especially in low-income economies.

7. Effects on Human Capital and Well-being

A less discussed but increasingly relevant effect of UBI is its impact on human capital formation and psychological well-being. By providing income stability, UBI allows individuals to invest more in education, skills development, and health. The Namibia pilot reported improvements in school attendance and access to healthcare, leading to long-term benefits for community development (Haarmann et al., 2009).

Behavioral studies show that financial insecurity increases stress and reduces cognitive function, which in turn impairs decision-making (Haushofer & Fehr, 2014). UBI helps mitigate this "scarcity mindset," allowing individuals to focus on future-oriented goals. In Finland's experiment, participants reported higher levels of happiness, trust in institutions, and mental well-being even if employment rates did not significantly change (Kangas et al., 2020).

Thus, UBI's benefits extend beyond income metrics. Its psychological and social effects may yield long-term gains in productivity, civic participation, and resilience key drivers of sustainable development.

8. Challenges and Criticisms

Despite its promising economic effects, UBI faces several challenges and criticisms that complicate its implementation and acceptance as a mainstream policy. One of the most prominent concerns is **fiscal sustainability.** Critics argue that implementing a universal and unconditional transfer scheme at scale would require substantial public expenditure, potentially leading to increased deficits or the reallocation of funds from essential public services (IMF, 2017). In developing countries with constrained fiscal capacity, this trade-off could be particularly detrimental to sectors like education and health.

Another major criticism is the **potential disincentive to work,** rooted in classical economic theory. Although experimental evidence suggests minimal negative impact on labor supply (Kangas et al., 2020; Davala et al., 2015), the perception persists that unconditional income may erode the motivation to work, especially among youth and able-bodied individuals (Moffitt, 2003). Relatedly, UBI may create **political**

opposition, especially if it is perceived as a replacement for existing targeted schemes that serve specific vulnerable groups.

Targeting versus universality is another point of contention. While UBI aims to avoid exclusion errors common in targeted welfare programs, it risks allocating resources to the wealthy, thereby raising equity concerns (Ghatak & Mani, 2019). Moreover, **administrative feasibility and political resistance** pose real obstacles in contexts where governance capacity is weak and welfare reforms are politically sensitive.

Lastly, critics argue that UBI is a **simplistic solution to complex socio-economic problems.** Addressing poverty, unemployment, and inequality may require a combination of income support, skill development, and institutional reforms, rather than a one-size-fits-all approach (Standing, 2017).

These criticisms highlight the need for careful **design, piloting, and evaluation** before large-scale implementation, with due consideration to economic, political, and institutional realities.

9. Conclusion

UBI represents a bold reimagining of social protection, aiming to provide financial security, reduce poverty, and promote inclusive economic participation. Experimental studies across diverse contexts such as India, Finland, and Kenya reveal that UBI can positively influence labor participation, consumption, investment, and well-being, with minimal negative effects on work incentives. However, the policy is not without challenges. Concerns about fiscal sustainability, political feasibility, and the trade-offs with existing welfare programs require serious consideration. While UBI is not a panacea, it offers a strong foundation for rethinking welfare in the 21st century, particularly in the face of automation, informality, and economic vulnerability. Policymakers must approach its adoption with rigorous evidence, context-specific strategies, and phased implementation. If designed and financed carefully, UBI has the potential to support not only individual dignity and resilience but also broader goals of equity and sustainable economic development.

References

1. Banerjee, A. V., & Duflo, E. (2019). Good economics for hard times. Penguin Books.
2. Banerjee, A., Niehaus, P., & Suri, T. (2019). Universal basic income in the developing world. Annual Review of Economics, 11(1), 959–983. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080218-030243
3. Bastagli, F., Hagen-Zanker, J., Harman, L., Barca, V., Sturge, G., Schmidt, T., & Pellerano, L. (2016). Cash transfers: What does the evidence say? Overseas Development Institute.
4. Davala, S., Jhabvala, R., Mehta, S. K., & Standing, G. (2015). Basic income: A transformative policy for India. Bloomsbury India.
5. Drèze, J., & Khera, R. (2017). Recent social security initiatives in India. World Development, 98, 555–572. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.05.035
6. Egger, D., Haushofer, J., Miguel, E., Niehaus, P., & Walker, M. W. (2022). General equilibrium effects of cash transfers: Experimental evidence from Kenya. Econometrica, 90(1), 1–39. https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA17960
7. Friedman, M. (1962). Capitalism and freedom. University of Chicago Press.
8. Gentilini, U., Grosh, M., Rigolini, J., & Yemtsov, R. (2020). Exploring universal basic income: A guide to navigating concepts, evidence, and practices. World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1458-0
9. Ghatak, M., & Mani, A. (2019). Universal Basic Income: Some theoretical aspects. In R. Kanbur, P. Shaffer, & R. R. Venugopal (Eds.), Immiserizing growth: When growth fails the poor (pp. 221–242). Oxford University Press.
10. Government of India. (2017). Economic Survey 2016–17: Volume I. Ministry of Finance, Government of India.

11. Haarmann, C., Haarmann, D., Jauch, H., Shindondola-Mote, H., Nattrass, N., Samson, M., & Standing, G. (2009). Towards a basic income grant for all: Basic income grant pilot project assessment report. Basic Income Grant Coalition.
12. Haushofer, J., & Fehr, E. (2014). On the psychology of poverty. Science, 344(6186), 862–867. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1232491
13. Haushofer, J., & Shapiro, J. (2016). The short-term impact of unconditional cash transfers to the poor: Experimental evidence from Kenya. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 131(4), 1973–2042. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjw025
14. Hoynes, H., & Rothstein, J. (2019). Universal basic income in the US and advanced countries. Annual Review of Economics, 11, 929–958. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080218-030237
15. ILO. (2021). World Social Protection Report 2020–22: Social protection at the crossroads. International Labour Organization.
16. IMF. (2017). Fiscal monitor: Tackling inequality. International Monetary Fund.
17. Kangas, O., Jauhiainen, S., Simanainen, M., & Ylikännö, M. (2020). The basic income experiment 2017–2018 in Finland: Preliminary results. Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Finland.
18. Moffitt, R. A. (2003). The negative income tax and the evolution of U.S. welfare policy. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 17(3), 119–140. https://doi.org/10.1257/089533003769204362
19. Mullainathan, S., & Shafir, E. (2013). Scarcity: Why having too little means so much. Times Books.
20. OECD. (2017). Basic income as a policy option: Can it add up?. OECD Publishing.
21. Ravallion, M. (2018). Guaranteed employment or guaranteed income? World Development, 112, 106–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.08.020
22. Standing, G. (2011). The precariat: The new dangerous class. Bloomsbury Academic.
23. Standing, G. (2017). Basic income: And how we can make it happen. Penguin.
24. Standing, G. (2020). Battling eight giants: Basic income now. Bloomsbury Academic.
25. Stern, N. (2022). Why are we waiting? The logic, urgency, and promise of tackling climate change. MIT Press.
26. UNDP. (2021). Temporary Basic Income: Protecting poor and vulnerable people in developing countries. United Nations Development Programme.
27. Van Parijs, P., & Vanderborght, Y. (2017). Basic income: A radical proposal for a free society and a sane economy. Harvard University Press.
28. Widerquist, K. (2013). Independence, propertylessness, and basic income: A theory of freedom as the power to say no. Palgrave Macmillan.
29. Widerquist, K., & Howard, M. W. (Eds.). (2012). Exporting the Alaska model: Adapting the Permanent Fund Dividend for reform around the world. Palgrave Macmillan.
30. World Bank. (2019). The changing nature of work: World Development Report 2019. World Bank Publications.
31. Zelleke, A. (2011). Feminist political theory and the argument for an unconditional basic income. Policy and Politics, 39(1), 27–42. https://doi.org/10.1332/030557310X550305