

Past, Present, and Future Perspective as a Predictor for Basic Income: On the Relationship between Time Perspective on Basic Income

A mixed-method study

Lykle Maatje

s1585185

26-06-2017

Bachelor Psychology

University of Twente

Dr. Christina Bode

Dr. Anneke Sools

Index

Abstract	
Samenvatting	
Introduction	<i>p. 1</i>
Basic Income	<i>p. 1</i>
Futuring	<i>p. 4</i>
Time Perspective	<i>p. 5</i>
Goals and questions	<i>p. 6</i>
Method	<i>p. 8</i>
Design	<i>p. 8</i>
Procedure	<i>p. 8</i>
<i>Setting</i>	<i>p. 8</i>
Participants	<i>p. 9</i>
Materials	<i>p. 10</i>
<i>Letters From The Future</i>	<i>p. 10</i>
<i>ZTPI</i>	<i>p. 10</i>
Analysis	<i>p. 11</i>
<i>ZTPI</i>	<i>p. 11</i>
<i>Focus group discussions</i>	<i>p. 12</i>
Results	<i>p. 15</i>
Attitudes towards the Basic Income	<i>p. 15</i>
<i>Basic-Income Positive</i>	<i>p. 15</i>
<i>Basic-Income Conditional</i>	<i>p. 16</i>
<i>Basic-Income Negative</i>	<i>p. 16</i>
<i>Future</i>	<i>p. 17</i>
<u><i>Freedom to do other things</i></u>	<i>p. 17</i>
<i>Stress Relief</i>	<i>p. 18</i>
Time Perspective in relation to anticipated attitudes	<i>p. 19</i>
<i>Past Negative</i>	<i>p. 19</i>
<i>Past Positive</i>	<i>p. 20</i>
<i>Present Fatalistic</i>	<i>p. 21</i>
<i>Present Hedonistic</i>	<i>p. 21</i>
<i>Future</i>	<i>p. 23</i>
Discussion	<i>p. 24</i>
<u><i>Other Interesting Findings</i></u>	<i>p. 26</i>
Final Remark	<i>p. 29</i>
References	<i>p. 30</i>
Appendices	
A Participants	<i>p. 33</i>
B Informed Consent	<i>p. 34</i>
C Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory	<i>p. 35</i>

Abstract

The subject of a Basic Income (BI) has become increasingly discussed in the political debate. A BI is a monthly stipend paid to every adult citizen, regardless of what they decide to do with it. Research suggests a BI could grant more financial freedom and increased health amongst people. However, it could also work counterproductive, as it takes away a strong motivator to work: money. A few trials have been run in the past, knowledge on the psychological effects or attitudes of those living with a Basic Income is lacking. One way to study potential effects of BI, is called *futuring*. With *futuring*, people imagine a possible future for themselves and then respond to questions or assignments as though they are actually living that future. By imagining the future, researchers may be able to find some attitudes towards and psychological effects of a future event, like the Basic Income. This study aimed to add to the discussion and research in this subject, by using focus group discussions to study people's attitudes towards the BI and a questionnaire studying the Time Perspective. It will look at a relationship between a person's Time Perspective and their attitudes towards the Basic Income. To measure an individual's Time Perspective, Zimbardo and Boyd's (1999) Time Perspective Index (ZTPI) was used. Making use of both focus group discussions and questionnaires, this study used 14 participants to study people's general attitudes towards the BI. Two discussion groups consisting of seven participants each were held, during which the participants were asked to imagine a future in which they received a Basic Income, and then they were invited to elaborate on the BI. Afterwards, the ZTPI questionnaire was filled in. The ZTPI exists of 56 questions, that are divided among 5 sub-scales: (1) Past Negative (PN), (2) Past Positive (PP), (3) Present Fatalistic (PF), (4) Present Hedonistic (PH), and (5) Future (F). The focus group discussions were transcribed and coded with Atlas.ti, resulting in a code scheme of 6 codes. These codes were (1) Basic Income Positive, (2) Basic Income Negative, (3) Basic Income Conditional, (4) Future (F), (4.5) Freedom to do other things, and (5) Stress Relief. The results showed that most people were fairly positive about the BI. Some people were more sceptical and had more critical questions about the BI, such as those high in the Past and Present Positive orientation. However, everyone liked the idea of BI in some shape or form, in the end. Due to a small participant group, the results can be questioned. To ensure deeper and more meaningful results, an experimental trial of the BI is recommended, as it is very difficult to predict or draw conclusions from something that lies in the future.

Samenvatting

Het onderwerp van een Basisinkomen (BI) wordt steeds vaker besproken in het politieke (en privé) debat. Een BI is een maandelijks gift dat wordt betaald aan elke volwassen burger, onafhankelijk van wat zij besluiten ermee te doen. Onderzoek wijst uit dat een BI meer financiële vrijheden en verbeterde gezondheid onder de mensen kan bezorgen. Echter kan het ook contraproductief werken, omdat het een sterke motivatie voor werk wegneemt: geld. Er zijn al een paar experimentele onderzoeken gedaan in het verleden, maar er is nog niet veel bekend over psychologische effecten of attitudes van diegene die met een Basisinkomen leven. Één van de weinige manieren om mogelijke effecten te onderzoeken, wordt *futuring* genoemd. Bij *futuring* beelden mensen zich een mogelijke toekomst in voor zichzelf, en reageren daarna op vragen of opdrachten zoals zij denken dat hun toekomstige zelf dat zou doen. Door het inbeelden van de toekomst kunnen onderzoekers wellicht attitudes over en psychologische effecten van een toekomstige gebeurtenis, zoals een Basisinkomen, onderzoeken. Dit onderzoek zal proberen bij te dragen aan de discussie en het onderzoek naar dit onderwerp. Het zal kijken naar een mogelijke relatie tussen het Time Perspective van een persoon en hun attitudes over het Basisinkomen. Om het Time Perspective te meten, werd Zimbardo en Boyd's (1999) Time Perspective Index (ZTPI) gebruikt. Doormiddel van zowel focus groep discussies als vragenlijsten, werden bij 14 participanten het Time Perspective en hun attitudes over het Basisinkomen onderzocht. Twee discussiegroepen bestaande uit elk zeven participanten werden gehouden. Tijdens deze discussiemomenten werd aan de participanten gevraagd worden om zich een toekomst met een basisinkomen voor te stellen, en vervolgens konden ze vrij discussiëren over het BI. Daarna werd de ZTPI ingevuld. De ZTPI bestaat uit 56 vragen, die elk onderverdeeld worden in 5 sub-schalen: (1) Past Negative (PN), (2) Past Positive (PP), (3) Present Fatalistic (PF), (4) Present Hedonistic (PH), en (5) Future (F). De discussies werden getranscribeerd en vervolgens gecodeerd met Atlas.ti, wat resulteerde in een code schema van 6 codes. Deze codes waren (1) Basic Income Positive, (2) Basic Income Negative, (3) Basic Income Conditional, (4) Future (F), (4.5) Freedom to do other things, en (5) Stress Relief. De Future code kwam direct van de ZTPI sub-schalen, en was de enige van de vijf die genoeg quotes genereerde voor onderzoek. De resultaten lieten zien dat de meeste mensen redelijk positief waren over het BI. Sommige mensen waren wat sceptisch en hadden wat meer kritische vragen over het onderwerp, zoals degene die hoog in de Past en Present Positive perspectief zaten, maar uiteindelijk vond iedereen het aantrekkelijk om een BI te ontvangen. Om dieper en meer betekenisvolle resultaten te genereren, wordt een experimenteel onderzoek naar het BI aanbevolen, omdat het heel moeilijk is om dat wat in de toekomst ligt te voorspellen of conclusies te trekken uit iets wat nog niet gebeurt is.

Introduction

The subject of a Universal Basic Income is a dynamic one. It entails psychology, economy, sociology, and many other scientific fields. With our current economy the way it is, the Basic Income has been a subject of deep discussion in both the public and scientific domain, interested parties including everyone from researchers to students, working class and the unemployed. Because Basic Income is still an idea of the future, one of the few ways to research the psychological effects of it, or, for that matter, people's perspectives on the subject, is a relatively new research method, called futuring (imagining the future). In addition to the imagining of the future, Time Perspective research can help gain some concrete predictions about people's attitudes about the Basic Income.

Basic income

In the past couple of years, the subject of a Basic Income (BI) has become increasingly discussed in the political debate (Bregman, 2016; De Wispelaere & Morales, 2015; Franssen, 2017; Gradus, Westerveld, Ranshuijsen, & de Lange, 2015; Klein, 2015; Witteman, 2017). The concept of a Basic Income is that every adult person receives a certain amount of money from the government, regardless of employment, study, income, or what they are going to do with it (Bregman, 2014; De Wispelaere & Morales, 2015). Whilst there do exist variations between several conceptions of the Basic Income, De Wispelaere and Morales posit three core features that makes this 'gift' from the government decidedly different from, say, childcare benefits. The first is that the gift is not calculated per household, but per individual. Where childcare benefits are calculated by the amount of money the *household* brings in, the Basic Income is focussed on the individual. It does not matter how much they or their partner earn – every individual has a right to the Basic Income. Secondly, the Basic Income is universal. Unemployment benefits is only for the unemployed, childcare benefits only for those with children – the Basic Income, however, is for everyone. Some discussion exists here on whether or not to include long-term residents (rather than just legal citizens), or children, or prisoners. These kinds of discussions are interesting to have, but at this point, not relevant to this study. For the purposes of this study, Basic Income is only for every legal adult. The third and final feature is arguably its most controversial; whereas benefits as they exist today

require the filling in of many forms and the fulfilling of many requirements, a Basic Income requires no such thing (De Wispelaere & Morales, 2015; Torry, 2014). As said before, no matter what you decide to do with the BI, if you want to squander it on expensive clothes or change the world, you will receive it.

Basic Income has several merits working in its favour. One of these is that with a Basic Income, one can strive to improve his or her life (Painter, 2016b). With an unconditional grant that would enable everyone to provide for themselves, people would be able to pursue something that would make them happy; whether this is work-related, or simply involves the development of a talent or a hobby, does not matter. Another merit is the link between income and health. There has been a clear negative relation between poverty and health issues (Painter, 2016a; Standing, 2015). The poorer people are, the less healthy they become.

In the mid-1970s, a trial with a Universal Basic Income in Dauphin, Canada was conducted. Every adult with an annual income less than €13.000 (\$13.800) was eligible for a grant of \$4800 a year (Bregman, 2014; Painter, 2016a). The experiment was terminated by a more conservative government before any analysis could be conducted, but in the 2000s, a team of the University of Manitoba re-examined the data, and the results suggest a link between health issues and poverty. Hospital visits dropped by 8,5% (Bregman, 2014). Furthermore, other effects of the trial were the fact that the youth studied better and faster, the birth rate dropped, and people were getting married at an older age. Even though most counter-arguments were that people were working less, the results proved the opposite. The work-hours hardly dropped at all. Where they did drop, they were replaced by other activities, like studying for a higher degree, searching for a better job, or staying home with the children more often. When a statistical error made the American population believe that the number of divorces had risen by 50%, the enthusiasm for the Basic Income waned, and the entire idea was put to rest.

The erroneous divorce rate notwithstanding, there are also several counter-arguments that have been raised. The first of which is – most understandably – how such a Basic Income would be financed (Van Parijs, 2003). It is true that the entire current economic system would have to undergo some rigorous changes. With a Basic Income, one would have to ask

questions such as ‘do we still need unemployment benefits/child benefits/etc. with a Basic Income?’. This is a very difficult question to answer, as Torry (2014) showed. For example, in England, people have a right to Housing Benefits so that they can live in a house that suits their family’s size and needs, since the housing prices are too high for most people. If a Basic Income were to replace all existing benefits, the Income itself would have to be so monumentally high that it would become unaffordable for the state. Thus, in England, a thing like Housing Benefits would have to stay. But if all existing benefits remained in effect, the cost of both the Basic Income and the benefits would become unmanageable as well. So a middle road would need to be found. And what happens to the tax system? A substantial amount of the government’s income comes from taxes (61% in 2016 (Miljoenennota, 2016)), and especially income taxes generate a substantial amount of money (56.2 billion Euros in 2016). This is problematic, and leads to the next argument: when people receive a monthly stipend, enough to live on, they will stop working (Atkinson, 1996; Birnbaum, 2011) and be lazy, costing the state a lot of income from income taxes. The lack of faith in humankind aside, this counter-argument does have a point. *If* people stop working, a substantial amount of tax-income disappears – which is needed to pay the Basic Income in the first place. It is obvious that the idea of Basic Income has several moral and legal issues – for countries such as the Netherlands, it is even legally impossible to institute a Basic Income at this point (Franssen, 2017), as our Participation Law requires every able adult to either be working or be looking for work, and a Basic Income as it is understood here, does not require such contribution. Finally, the BI is predicted to be a very expensive venture (Birnbaum & De Wispelaere, 2016).

Despite all the criticisms and legal obstacles, the Basic Income has been regaining its former popularity over the past few decades. An attraction of such an unconditional Basic Income is that it grants freedom to the employees on the labour market (Birnbaum & De Wispelaere, 2016). Employees are no longer forced to work at a job that makes them unhappy or sick, because they can take care of themselves with the Basic Income granted to them on a monthly basis. They can continue studying for a better-suited job, or work part-time to devote the rest of their time to hobbies. In the words of Van Parijs, it gives people “the power to decide what sort of life one wants to live...the power to say no to the dictates of a boss,

bureaucrat or a spouse” (2013; as cited in Major, 2016). It would certainly give a lot of women the independence from their husband that they would need, should they ever divorce. At this point in time, the division of labour is still unequally gendered – with women taking up much more of the unpaid care for the children than do men – which makes women economically vulnerable (Regehr, 2014). A universal Basic Income would surely put an end to that.

To sum up, the Basic Income is a monthly stipend people would receive without any obligations attached. There are several pros and cons attached to it; pros include more freedom for the citizens and increased health among the people. Cons include the possibility of people becoming lazy and not contributing to society. Research into the Basic Income and psychological effects of the same is scarce, for there have not been many trials, which makes studying its effects quite difficult. One of the only ways to study possible effects, is called *futuring* (A. Sools & Mooren, 2012).

Futuring

Sools, Tromp, and Mooren (2015) state that *futuring*, or imagining the future, is a capacity of the mind, and that this capacity has been the subject of many interested psychologists and researchers over the past few centuries (e.g. William James and Abraham Maslow).

Furthermore, imagining is something undeniably connected to the future, as one can imagine beyond the realm of the possible or the existing. So how then is it possible to research something that has not yet happened? Something that may never even happen? Imagining the future has proved reasonably effective of at least studying people’s hopes and dreams for the future (Sools, Mooren, & Tromp, 2013), as many studies have shown the psychological effects of imagining the future. These effects include, but are not limited to, increased optimism, improved mental health, and increased happiness.

There are two authors who posited two different ways to imagine the future; Bandura (1986) on the one hand, and Melges (1982) on the other. Bandura (1986; as cited in Sools et al, 2013) was based in *expectations* of the future. He extrapolated possible future outcomes based on experiences of the past. Melges (1982; as cited in Sools et al, 2013), on the other hand, assumed a more complex, non-linear conception of time. His conception of imagining

the future involved emotions, because *emotions* determine the nature of people's images of the future. Hopes, dreams, and fears influence how people see their future. Melges extrapolated possible future outcomes based on experiences *and* created new possible outcomes, by *anticipating* them. The latter is a far more creative process, as it does not rely on past experiences, and creates a new sensation, behaviour, or thought. And the latter is therefore more important to the current study, as people cannot just *expect* the Basic Income from past experiences.

Futuring is a creative and handy tool for research into events that have not happened yet, and by imagining the future, researchers may be able to find some attitudes towards and psychological effects of a future event, like the Basic Income.

Time Perspective

An interesting part of research into future events, is Time Perspective. According to Webster (2011), Time Perspective is something that every individual has. It is a difference dimension, in which people are either past-, present-, or future-oriented. In this dimension, people “express attitudinal and behavioural preferences” (p. 111) for one of the three orientations. These attitudes and behaviours concern every kind of event and stimuli – including a Basic Income. In 1951, Lewin already defined Time Perspective. According to him, Time Perspective is “the totality of the individual's views of psychological future and psychological past existing at a given time” (cited in Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999, p. 1271). In this view, the past experiences and future expectations have an influence on present behaviour. Therefore, as people usually are more focussed on one or the other, Time Perspective may have some predictive value in psychological research. A way to measure people's perspective towards time has been accomplished by Zimbardo & Boyd (1999). They developed the *Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory*, which characterizes and categorizes people according to their relation to time. When taking this Inventory, people are subcategorized into five categories. Past Negative (PN) people have a “generally negative, aversive view of the past” (p. 1274, Zimbardo & Boyd). Past Positive (PP) people have a warm and sentimental view towards the past, in contrast to PN people. People who are Present Fatalistic (PF) have a hopeless, fatalistic view towards the future and life in general, and do not think they can influence the

course of their life. People who are Present Hedonistic (PH) are not opposed to risk-taking and have a “devil may care” attitude towards time and life itself. These people have little care for the future, and care more for “quick fixes” concerning pleasure in the present. They would rather be content in the present than think about the future. Future (F) oriented people are people who are – unsurprisingly – oriented towards the future. When oriented towards the Future, people are striving for future goals and for reward. The future time perspective has not been split into positive and negative like the past and present have. Zimbardo and Boyd do not give an explanation for this, except that a factor analysis revealed the items loaded onto five factors, not six.

In short, Time Perspective reflects people’s attitudes and behaviours towards a certain time, whether that be Past, Present, or Future. The Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory (ZTPI) is a useful questionnaire to measure this Time Perspective. For this study, it will be used to help to try and categorize attitudes towards a Basic Income.

When researching the Basic Income, it became apparent that it can be interesting to know whether Time Perspective can have any sort of association with attitudes towards a Basic Income. A question that came to mind was, for example, do Future oriented people care more for a Basic Income, because with money, they can achieve a goal? Or, are Present Hedonistic people indifferent towards the BI, because they like where they are now, and therefore do not need the money? It will be attempted to answer these questions and others during the course of this study.

Goals and questions

In conclusion, some research has been done on a Basic Income and its direct health influences (Canada, India etc.), but the psychological effects or attitudes have received very little attention, for it is difficult to study; a field study would require drastic changes in the monetary system. To be able to grant even a select group a Basic Income, governments need to be convinced of its usefulness, and as the idea is very expensive, this will not be happening any time soon. With the current study, the aim is to add to the psychological side of the Basic Income conversation. It will do so by making use of the research tool *Futuring*, where people will imagine a future with a BI. Time Perspective is a second tool that can help with research

into events that have not happened yet. Past, Present and Future orientations all include attitudinal and behavioural portions, which can help discover people's attitudes towards the Basic Income. This study will make use of a focus group discussion, and everything the participants discussed during them.

The two main questions of this study were: (1) *What are people's anticipated attitudes as imagined in a future with a Basic Income?* and (2) *Is there a relationship between people's Time Perspective and their attitudes?*

Several predictions can be made based on these questions.

Logically, one would say that people who are focussed on the future, have thought more about Basic Income, but they can be both negative and positive about it, depending on what they want their goals to be. Past Negative people are predicted to have a more positive view on Basic Income than Past Positive people – as PN people view the past in a negative light, and Basic Income could change this negative past into a positive future. Present Hedonistic people are predicted to have slightly less interest in Basic Income than the others, as they enjoy the present and are not very concerned with the future. Present Fatalistic, in turn, are predicted to have a more positive view of the Basic Income, as they view the present as bleak and would not mind a change towards a brighter future.

Method

Design

A mix of two designs was used in this study; a qualitative one and a quantitative one. For the quantitative part, participants were asked to participate in a focus group discussion. To avoid overcrowding, the group was split in two – the somewhat older and mostly employed participants in group 1, the students in group 2. These conditions were almost completely the same in terms of coach, setting and questions asked.

Simultaneously, the participants were asked to fill out several questionnaires. A questionnaire survey design was therefore also used.

Procedure

Before any interviews could take place, permission to conduct this research was given by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Behavioural, Management and Social Social at the University of Twente (case no. 17103).

The participants were recruited from the researchers' direct environment. They were invited to the University of Twente Campus, where they participated in a focus group discussion led by Anneke Sools, who is experienced in leading discussion groups of this nature. Beforehand, they received an envelope with several forms they had to fill out prior to the focus group sessions.

The first group discussion took place on Monday, April 3rd 2017. This group consisted of 6 working people, and one retiree. The second group discussion took place on Friday, April 7th 2017, which consisted of seven students, 6 of which were from the University of Twente. During these discussion groups, participants were first guided through a meditation by the coach, and they wrote another Letter from the Future. Afterwards, the group read their letters aloud and they discussed their experiences and ideas about the Basic Income. Following the discussion, they filled out another questionnaire.

Setting. On both occasions, the group discussions took place in a large room (C124) in the Cubicus building on the University of Twente campus. The room held one large oval table, at which the participants could sit so that they could see and hear everybody properly. The coach was situated at the head of the table. Snacks and drinks were made available to all

participants. During the first group discussion, it became clear that the room was too hot after a while, so a door was opened, allowing for outside noises to possibly disturb the participants. To avoid any environmental biases, it was decided to hold the second group discussion in the same room despite this. Other than this snag, the room was very well equipped for the current research purposes; there was enough space and the cameras, with which the discussions were recorded, had enough of an angle to record everyone. The participants were made aware of the fact that the discussions were being recorded, and had all agreed to it by signing the Informed Consent form.

Participants

The participant group consisted of 14 individuals (50% female), between the ages of 18 and 64 (\bar{x} = 34.50, SD=16.24). The participants were equally divided over the two groups. Every person was approached personally by one of the six researchers, and thus came from the researchers' own environment. The participants, therefore, formed a convenience sample. The only restriction was that the participants be legally adults (18 years or older), as Basic Income is most likely for adults only. The researchers tried to find people who differed in background, education, and age. The age criteria was quite evenly divided; almost every age group had a representative. However, the background and education criteria were more difficult to fulfil. Almost all participants were University schooled, or still studying at HBO level or higher, and almost all participants were white and Dutch or German.

To gain insight into these demographics, a descriptive statistics analysis was conducted on gender, age, nationality, and education. The results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. *Socio-demographic variables*

Gender, n (%), female	7 (50)
Age, mean (SD), years	34.50 (16.24)
Completed education, n (%)	
VWO	5 (35.7)
MBO	1 (7.1)
HBO	6 (42.9)
Missing	2 (14.3)
Current education, n (%)	
University	6 (42.9)
Not currently studying	6 (42.9)
Missing	2 (14.3)

Materials

Before the actual group discussion took place, all the participants received an envelope with several forms that they were asked to fill in. This package contained (1) an Informed Consent form for them to sign, (2) a demographics survey, asking for age, gender, educational level, and income, (3) a well-being questionnaire (Mental Health Continuum-Short Form (MHCSF), and (4) a blank Letter From The Future with instructions, on which they could write their own Letter From The Future where they imagined a future *without* Basic Income.

Letters from the Future. Letters from the Future are not a new concept. They have been used before in a study by Sools et al. (2013). The letters come from the Lifestory lab at the University of Twente. For the participants, this study used almost identical instructions to the original Letter instructions, with one notable difference. Whereas the original letter (as used by Sools et al.) gave the freedom to imagine any future the participants wanted, the first Letter should be written about a future *without* a Basic Income, and the second letter – written during the focus group discussions – should be written specifically *with* a Basic Income in mind.

Both the MHCSF and the Letters from the Future were not used for this study, as they were for one of the other researchers. It was decided not to use the Letters from the Future to focus purely on what the participants said in the company of others and in response to the others and after being led through the meditation by the coach.

During the group discussion, the coach first guided the participants through a meditation, during which the participants were free to imagine any future where they had a Basic Income. In that spirit, the participants were asked to write the second Letter From The Future, this time *with* a Basic Income.

ZTPI. To examine the participants' Time Perspective, the *Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory (ZTPI)* (Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999) was used. The questionnaire consisted of 56 items, which are divided over 5 sub-scales; Past Negative, Past Positive, Present Fatalistic, Present Hedonistic and Future. Zimbardo and Boyd themselves conducted a confirmatory factor analysis on the constructs, using a sample of 361 San Francisco state University students. They found that all the items had a significant relationship with the expected factor (Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999). They found that item 9 and item 30 were the only two items who

had a standardized loading below .30. These were -.26 and .29 respectively. The rest of their results can be found in table 2.

Table 2. *Zimbardo & Boyd's (1999) confirmatory analysis results of the respective sub-scales, including current study's Cronbach's Alpha*

Sub-scales	Cronbrach's Alpha	Current Cronbach's Alpha	Eigenvalue	% of variance explained	N	\bar{x}	SD
<i>Past-Negative</i>	.82	.79	6.86	12.3	10	2.98	.72
<i>Past-Positive</i>	.80	.80	2.50	4.5	9	3.71	.64
<i>Present-Fatalistic</i>	.79	-.52	5.01	8.9	15	3.44	.51
<i>Present-Hedonistic</i>	.74	.67	2.21	3.9	9	2.37	.60
<i>Future</i>	.77	.74	3.54	6.3	13	3.47	.54

Analysis

First, a descriptive statistics analysis was performed on the variables age, gender, and education to gain insight into the participants, using IBM SPSS Statistics 22 (IBM, 2013). Afterwards, several ZTPI items were recoded into their reverse. Following this, the five sub-scales Past Negative, Past Positive, Present Hedonistic, Present Fatalistic and Future were calculated for every participant. Then, the interviews were transcribed *verbatim*, and using Atlas.ti, they were coded into a code scheme. This was then repeated by a second researcher. Both the scores per sub-scale and the coded interviews were used to answer the research question.

ZTPI. After entering all the filled out questionnaires into SPSS, several items had to be reversed: items 9 (“*Ik maak me geen zorgen als dingen niet op tijd gebeuren*”), 24 (“*Ik neem de dag zoals die komt, in plaats van die te plannen*”), 25 (“*Het verleden heeft te veel onplezierige herinneringen waaraan ik liever niet denk*”), 41 (“*Ik merk dat ik afhaak wanneer familieleden praten over hoe de dingen vroeger waren*”), and 56 (“*Er is altijd tijd om mijn werk alsnog af te krijgen*”). This meant that when a participant answered ‘1’ (“*helemaal mee oneens*”), it became ‘5’ (“*helemaal mee eens*”) and vice versa. ‘2’ (“*mee oneens*”) became ‘4’ (“*mee eens*”), and only ‘3’ (“*neutral*”) remained the same.

After the recoding, the five separate sub-scales were computed. These consisted of the

mean scores of every item belonging to that sub-scale. For the sub-scale Past Negative, items 4, 5, 16, 22, 27, 33, 34, 36, 50, and 54 were added up and divided by 10. To the Past Positive sub-scale, the items 2, 7, 11, 15, 20, 25 (reverse coded), 29, 41 (reverse coded), and 49 belonged, and their sum was divided by 8. For the Present Fatalistic variable, the items 3, 14, 35, 37, 38, 39, 47, 52, and 53 were added up and divided by 9. For the sub-scale Present Hedonistic, items 1, 8, 12, 17, 19, 23, 26, 28, 31, 32, 42, 44, 46, 48, and 55 were added up and divided by 15. And finally, items 6, 9 (reverse coded), 10, 13, 18, 21, 24 (reverse coded), 30, 40, 43, 45, 51, and 56 (reverse coded) were added up and divided by 13 for the Future sub-scale. (“The Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory (ZTPI) Psychometrics and Scoring Key,” n.d.). Every participant received a score on all the subscales based on their answers, and the Time Perspective on which they scored the highest, was assigned as their personal Time Perspective.

For every sub-scale, a cut-off point was devised. In SPSS, the medians were computed for every subscale, and these respective medians were used as cut-off points. The cut-off point for the Past Negative was 2.45. For Past Positive, this was 3.76. For Present Fatalistic, the cut-off point was 2.78. For Present Hedonistic, the cut-off was at 3.33. And finally, for the Future sub-scale, it was 3.38. Anyone scoring higher than these cut-off points, were considered to be high scorers.

Focus group discussions. After transcribing the discussion parts of the focus group meetings, they were carefully read and a code schema was put together, using Atlas.ti 8.0 (1999). This schema consisted of several important themes discussed during the two sessions, and after coding the transcriptions of both meetings, 6 main themes were found over all. These codes were mainly created in a bottom-up way, with the codes being created during the reading of the interviews. However, some themes were consistent with the variables of Time Perspective (PN, PP, PF, PH & F). Therefore, these were used as well. However, during the coding it became clear that it was very difficult to find statements in the interviews that actually matched most of the sub-scales. Only the ‘Future’-theme reoccurred often enough to have something significant to say.

As the research question mainly concerns people’s attitudes towards a Basic Income, that is what was focussed on during the coding of the discussions. This included positive

attitudes, negative attitudes, and sceptical attitudes towards the Basic Income. It also included people's attitudes towards the future with that Basic Income, and even the attitudes towards how it is in the present, without the BI. All the relevant codes – those that appeared 3 times or more – and short explanations of them, are shown in Table 3.

To increase the reliability, a second, independent researcher was brought in to code the transcribed interviews as well. Overall, the codes matched, but they deviated in a few places. The following statement “*Dan zouden de plannen die we dan hebben, met zo'n huis, om zo'n huis te kopen, om daar gewoon wat vaker heen te gaan, dat zou wel wat relaxter dan zijn... als er een basisinkomen zou zijn*”, for example, was coded by the first researcher as Basic-Income Positive, but by the second research as Future. After a short discussion, the researchers agreed to code it under Basic-Income Positive. Other codes that sometimes overlapped between the two researchers were Future and Freedom to do Other Things. This problem was encountered by the first researcher as well, and had been resolved by making Freedom to do Other Things a sub-code. After discussing the problem, the second researcher agreed that this was the best option to resolve the issue.

Tabel 3. *Codes and their meanings*

1 st level Codes	2 nd level Codes	Meaning	Example Quote
Basic-Income Positive		Positive statements about the basic income	<i>“Ik denk dat het basisinkomen echt wat kan bieden voor iemand.”</i>
Basic-Income Negative		Sceptical or negative statements about the basic income	<i>“Ik denk dat op het moment dat je die duizend euro iedere maand krijgt, in mijn geval, dat je dan echt zoiets hebt van ‘oh ik heb heel veel geld, ik kan heel veel uitgeven’ en dat je dan ook teveel gaat uitgeven omdat je niet uitkijkt.”</i>
Basic-Income Conditional		When someone is positive about the BI, but wants certain conditions to be set for who deserves to receive a BI.	<i>“Mensen die een basisinkomen zouden willen hebben of een gedeelte daarvan, die zouden dan positief moeten bijdragen aan de maatschappij en niet dan 24 uur per dag achter de computer zitten en computer spelletjes spelen.”</i>
Future	General	Statements about the future, i.e. what to do with the BI, how the future looks without the BI.	<i>“Ik denk dat dan het teruggeven aan de maatschappij en vrijwilligerswerk... Dan denk ik dat in ieder geval dat deel in de toekomst goed komt.”</i>
	Freedom to Do Other Things	Statements about the ability that the BI provides to do other things than work.	<i>“Ik zou dan ook minder gaan werken en de dingen waar ik, die mijn hart hebben, waar mijn hart ligt, zou ik dan gaan oppakken in de zin van vrijwilligers werk, dat zou me wel aanspreken.”</i>
Stress Relief		Statements about the amount of pressure experienced	<i>“Wat mij nog opviel was dat eigenlijk iedereen heeft geschreven dat zij zich minder zorgen maken in het leven.”</i>

Results

To gain insight into the general Time Perspective of the participants, a descriptive statistics analysis was conducted on the Time Perspective scores. The results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. *Time Perspective Data, mean (SD)*

Sub-scales

Past-Negative	2.55 (.64)
Past-Positive	3.56 (.73)
Present-Fatalistic	2.73 (.30)
Present-Hedonistic	3.33 (.44)
Future	3.29 (.52)

Except for the Present Fatalistic sub-scale, all the means fell only slightly beneath the means found by Zimbardo and Boyd (1999). The PF sub-scale fell slightly above the mean found by Zimbardo and Boyd, which would suggest a more Present Fatalistic subject pool in the current study than the

one used in their study.

Attitudes towards the Basic Income

To understand what the participants were saying and in search for an answer to the first research question, the codes are explained further below. Afterwards, the statements will be looked at through a Time Perspective lens. Appendix A contains a table with all demographic data available about the participants.

Basic-Income Positive

The respondents were overall very positive about the idea of a Basic Income. They were especially positive about the changes a Basic Income can bring about in their lives.

[With a Basic Income] “Nou dan zou dat wel een mogelijkheid zijn om je een beetje meer om je omheen te kunnen kijken, oh daar heb ik misschien meer zin in, oh daar moet ik misschien iets anders gaan doen.” (12)

Many of the other respondents also spoke of this broadening of options when money was no longer a worry (more on this later).

“Natuurlijk heb je minder geldzorgen, en je kunt wat makkelijker overleven en dat is absoluut belangrijk.” (27)

Part of this code also was the positive influence the Basic Income could have first on the individual's life, but also on the lives of his descendants. With a Basic Income, it was said, people could make a positive choice that would secure a happy, good future, which in turn would positively influence the futures of their families and children (15).

In sum, people who were positive about the Basic Income usually spoke of the positive changes it would bring about in all areas of their lives.

Basic-Income Conditional

However, most of the people who were positive about the Basic Income, also thought there should be some conditions to who could receive such a grant. To them, not everybody deserves it. The opinions varied on *what* those conditions were.

To participant #15, it is people who wanted to counter climate change who should be the first that receive a Basic Income. They can then use this money to actually affect change. Another participant spoke of people who did nothing all day,

“...mensen die een basisinkomen zouden willen hebben of een gedeelte daarvan, die zouden dan positief willen [moeten] bijdragen aan de maatschappij en niet dan 24 uur per dag achter de computer zitten en computer spelletjes spelen” (11)

Those who receive a Basic Income should *do* something with it, not sit around all day doing nothing.

Basic-Income Negative

Some participants wondered whether or not they would be able to appreciate a Basic Income on the long term – students receive Student Financing in the Netherlands, and after a while, it becomes a ‘normal’ thing, no longer a special grant. Some also suggested that, with a Basic Income, they would lose valuable experience in the work fields, as it would not be necessary to do as many jobs as it is now;

“‘En als ik dan denk ‘oké’ ja als ik dan zo ‘n basisinkomen heb en dan niet moet werken, ja dan heb ik ook die ervaring niet.’ (23)

[...] ‘Ja, een soort verlieservaring’ (Coach)

‘Ja’.(23)”

One of the participants summarized the point when he said,

[when receiving a Basic Income every month] “dan weet je het ook niet meer te waarderen, en dan is het essentieel qua gevoel minder belangrijk” (27)

In general, people were more positive than negative of the Basic Income. People often were sceptical – they saw a great many problems that could arise with a Basic Income, but almost no one was vehemently against the concept.

Future

With a Basic Income, it would enable people to implement their plans for the future with more ease;

“Als ik nou dat basisinkomen zou hebben, dan zouden de plannen die we dan hebben, met zo’n huis, om zo’n huis te kopen.” (12)

Another participant (25) became a little emotional when she said “*kon het maar!*” about having a little more money and implement her future dreams. In her situation, this is very understandable. She and her family have a lot of money problems, and she has to work really hard just to be able to buy herself a new pair of trousers when she needs it.

All in all, people expressed a positive view of the future with a Basic Income. There were, of course, some doubts and questions that worry everyone because those could only be answered by a real implementation of the Basic Income, but overall people were enthusiastic. These worries and questions were addressed under the Basic Income Negative and Basic Income Conditional headers.

Freedom to do other things. During the discussion, it soon became clear that people felt they could do other, more enjoyable things with their time if they were to receive a monthly Basic Income. This can be both judged as a Basic Income Positive sub-code, and a Future sub-code. Because most people were talking about what they would do with it in the future, it was decided to make it a sub-code of the Future code.

Whereas many of the opponents to the BI idea will say that most people would just sit back and do nothing all day, that is not what the participants planned to do with their time.

“Ik zou dan ook minder gaan werken en de dingen waar ik, die mijn hart hebben, waar mijn hart ligt, zou ik dan gaan oppakken in de zin van vrijwilligers werk, dat zou me wel aanspreken.”(13)

Many others said, too, that they wanted to do some volunteers work instead of having to work hard to maintain themselves and their families (*“Ja, ik denk dat dan het teruggeven aan de maatschappij en vrijwilligerswerk.”*(26)). The participants really saw their options expanding if they were ever to receive a BI, and reminisced about the freedom it would bring:

“Ik zou daar op zich wel blij mee zijn. Het hoeft niet voor mij doorgevoerd worden, maar wat ik zeg, dat ik dan wel iets meer vrijheid heb en ik dan misschien drie maandjes kan laten vallen. Gewoon iets meer mijn tijd meer kan indelen zoals ik in mijn brief zeg met het toekomstplan dat ik had tien jaar geleden bijna. Dus, ja dat ik in ieder geval iets meer kan investeren in de plannen die ik zelf heb en niet de plannen die de hele wereld voor mij heeft.”

(16)

It gave the participants an option to do things they would not normally be able to do. They would be able to do something that would actually make them happy, instead of something that would give them enough money to survive (22).

A Basic Income, in short, would provide people with the freedom to do things they enjoy, which would make them happy, instead of doing something they may not enjoy.

Stress Relief

Especially the student participants wrote and spoke about a relieve of pressure or stress. While money is not everything, according to them, it is helpful to be able to live a comfortable life in the current economy. In the words of participant #26: *“Los van het feit dat ik geloof in de uitspraak ‘geld maakt niet gelukkig’, geloof ik wel dat het comfortabeler is om iets meer geld te hebben”*. Not worrying about money causes less stress.

“Wat mij nog opviel was dat eigenlijk iedereen heeft geschreven dat zij zich minder zorgen maken in het leven.” (21)

The student group touched the stress-subject a lot, and not only their own money problems and stress was addressed, but they also thought of other groups of people:

“Want heel veel mensen van 50+ die hebben ook zoiets van ‘ja ik wordt niet meer aangenomen’ of dat wordt moeilijker. En dan heb je tenminste iets minder zorgen daarbij en heb je echt zoiets van ‘ik kan goed uitzoeken wat voor werk ik nu ga doen’.” (27)

The two groups both mentioned the pressure of having not enough money, which makes their lives more stressful. With their current circumstances, pressure to pay their bills, pay for a good education, even pay for their food, can sometimes be overwhelming, and a BI would alleviate some of that pressure.

Time Perspective in relation to anticipated attitudes

The participants' Time Perspectives were used to further understand their attitudes and to attempt to answer the second research question.

Past Negative. Persons with a high score on the Past Negative variable usually had a gloomy view of the past. In this case this was participants 22 (3.10), 24 (3.40), and 25 (3.90). In the interviews, there was no clear mention of the past – as the subject was focussed towards the future. However, what those high in Past Negative *did* mention consistently was a decrease of stress and worry about their financial situation. They also talked about how not only they themselves could benefit, but thought of other groups, too.

“Ja ik denk dat het vooral een verschil in drukte is die ik dan ervaar. Dus het is vooral om de zekerheid te krijgen en dan het geld te hebben” (24)

“Ik denk dat het voor zeker de bevolkingsgroepen in Nederland die onder de armoedegrens leeft dat het heel fijn is.” (25)

*“ ‘ En zou het dan vooral voor jongere mensen het meest interessant zijn?’ (Coach)
‘Oudere mensen misschien ook wel.’ ” (22)*

What is interesting is that those who scored high were mostly students, whilst those scoring lower on the scale were the working participants, who were significantly older. These lower scoring participants were generally more sceptical about the Basic Income – not necessarily negative, but worried about the side effects it would bring on society. The lowest scoring participant (17) was flat-out against a Basic Income, because he believes people should make

their own way in life, but also recognized that it could be a nice little extra to gain even more from life. For him, however, those grants citizens already receive – student financing, pensions, etc. – are more than enough to support everyone equally.

There was only one participant that actually was negatively oriented towards the past; participant 25. She was mostly positive about the BI, because it would bring her out of her financial trouble she was in at present.

So, in general, those scoring high on the PN-scale were positive about the BI, whilst those scoring low were more negative about it.

Past Positive. What was surprising was the fact that more people were high scorers on Past Positive, than there were low scorers on Past Negative. The only consistent participant appeared to be participant 25, who scored very low on Past Positive (1.78), just as she scored very high on Past Negative. The three highest scorers were 27 (4.22), 23 (4.44), and 11 (4.56). Participant 27 was the most talkative of them all, and had obviously thought long and hard about the subject. He was, in general, positive about the Basic Income, but also felt that there were issues that had to be overcome before it could be implemented.

“Zo eenzijdig is het hele verhaal voor mij niet. Ik bedoel, natuurlijk krijg je heel veel meer mogelijkheden, maar gemak is in vele wegen ook niet altijd goed geweest voor mensen.” (27)

Participant 23 was a little more sceptical, because she wondered if she would be able to appreciate the Basic Income after a while of receiving it because she did not feel she had earned it, but also recognized that it would open up quite a few doors that would otherwise have been unavailable to her.

Participant 11 was in favour of the Basic Income, but felt that certain conditions should be set for those who were to receive it.

“Daar zou eigenlijk zo een soort criterium aankomen, gemotiveerde mensen, bijvoorbeeld, die echt iets nuttigs doen voor de maatschappij, die zouden van mij een basisinkomen kunnen krijgen.” (11)

To sum up, participants who scored higher on the Past Positive variable, generally were a little more sceptical of the Basic Income, in one way or another. The lower scorers

were a bit more positive on the whole, but especially the working group had a mentality that can be described as ‘I managed back then, so people can manage now’. They felt that because they had succeeded in life without a Basic Income, so can the next generation.

There were quite a few people in this participant sample that were positively oriented towards the past. Nine out of fourteen, to be exact. Their statements did indeed reflect a more sceptical attitude towards the BI.

Present Fatalistic. There did not exist any real outliers in this category. The lowest scorer had a score of 2.00 (16) and the highest scorer one of 3.11 (13). The rest were pretty evenly divided between those two scores. Like most of his peers in the Monday group, participant 13 was initially very sceptical about the entire idea of a BI. However, when the coach asked everyone to add a final thought, he said:

“Ik denk dat het een heel mooi iets zou kunnen zijn, maar ik denk dat het heel moeilijk is om te realiseren. Ik denk dat een basisinkomen echt wat kan bieden voor iemand.”

So he remains sceptical, but does see the benefits for many people, and if it all works out, it would do a lot of good. Participant 16 would rather something else was done with the money than give everyone a Basic Income, like make education free for all. However, in the end, he too admitted it would be nice to have the extra money to do things he would normally not be able to do.

It seems telling that no one scored very low on this scale. The present may hold many displeasures for people, and perhaps that is why the Basic Income is such an appealing option for many. There were no Present Fatalistic focussed participants in this participant pool, which reflects well in the results. Nobody has a truly negative outlook on the present, which results in a slightly more sceptical attitude towards the BI.

Present Hedonistic. Those who scored highly on this variable are expected to have a positive view of the present. It is very surprising, in view of the scores on the Present Fatalistic scale, to find two outliers in the high scorers. Participants 11 and 27 both had a score of 4.07, whilst they scored 2.56 and 2.78 on the PF scale, respectively. Both these high scorers were sceptical about the Basic Income. They would not protest if it was enacted, but

especially participant 11 feels that there should be criteria set, as discussed before. Participant 27 is slightly more positive than 11, but still has some reservations.

“Ik vraag me dus erg af of je de hele bevolking kunt zeggen dat dat wel zo past. Want als je studeert kunt je ook net zo goed zeggen de overheid moet de studie betalen. [...] Dat is de vraag hoe kun je effectief daar naar toe pakken wat je wilt bereiken door het basis inkomen en kun je daarop vertrouwen dat iedereen of dat de mensen gewoon iedereen zijn eigen passie echt gaan naleven of kun je op een andere manier met hetzelfde geld een structuur geven die hetzelfde mogelijk maakt.” (27)

He sees other options as well, like the government paying for your education, instead of paying a Basic Income. He also wonders if it is prudent to generalise, if the BI will be a good fit for everyone – some people may just never do anything again, which he finds a waste. Interestingly, Participant 16 seems more inclined towards other options than a BI, as well. His scores would suggest otherwise, as his score is the second lowest.

“En dan zou ik zeggen liever goedkoop studeren dan dat, dan een basisinkomen vind ik.”

The one who scored lowest on the Present Hedonistic scale was participant 24 (2.40), was very positive about the Basic Income. Her few words during the discussion reflected her current stress and worry about money and education.

“Ja ik denk dat het vooral een verschil in drukte is die ik dan ervaar. Dus het is vooral om de zekerheid te krijgen en dan het geld te hebben.” (24)

Participant 15, who, with a score of 3.03, fell below the cut-off point of 3.33, also felt exceedingly positive about the BI, predicting that it would help restore the environment and it would help those in need (e.g. disabled and/or poor people) get a better grip on life.

Once again, only one participant was actually Present Hedonistically oriented. And in line with the results, participant 14 did seem very sceptical about the Basic Income, because in his eyes, it would bring about more problems than solutions. He was willing to admit that it would give more freedom to do other things, and it would relieve some of the constant pressure resting on his shoulders. But overall, he was sceptical bordering on outright negative,

and did not see many good things coming from the idea.

All in all, it seems prudent to conclude that, in this participant pool, those who are more positively oriented towards the present, are slightly more sceptical towards the BI. They are not necessarily against the concept, but they are not particularly eager to have the BI implemented either. Lower scorers, on the other hand, seem much more inclined to immediately accept the idea of a BI.

Future. It is not surprising to find participant 27 on the lowest end of the Future scale. He is very Past and Present Positive, and seems therefore not so worried about what the future may hold, and is much more focused on living life in the present than he is on what may come in the future. It is also not surprising to find participant 24 on the highest end. Her scores on the PN and the PH scale were such that it is natural that she is striving towards a goal somewhere in the future, because she is both very Past Negative and not very Present Hedonistic.

However, most participants scored high on this scale. Only three participants scored more than a standard deviation (.52) below the cut-off point. This may indicate a certain inclination of all participants to orient towards the future. All participants seemed to want to do something in their future with a BI that would be impossible without it, whether that is a house in France, or travelling the world.

There were three participants who had a Future orientation. Participants 12, 16 and 24 all were fairly positive about the Basic Income, and the fact that it would remove many barriers in life. Participant 16 also felt, however, that it could be employed for education rather than a BI.

In general, high scorers were positive about the Basic Income. The working group were a bit more sceptical than the student group, which comes into fruition when looking at participant 16.

Discussion

There has been little to no research done on the possible links between Time Perspective and views on Basic Income, which leaves plenty of room for speculation. The questions at the start of this paper were (1) *What are people's anticipated attitudes as imagined in a future with a Basic Income?* and (2) *Is there a relationship between people's Time Perspective and their attitudes?* We had several expectations based on these questions, concerning what Time Perspective should best fit a positive or negative attitude towards the BI. The first expectation was that people with a Future-oriented Time Perspective had thought a lot about the BI, but this would not predict whether they were positive or negative. Surprisingly, the findings showed the exact opposite. Those who were less Future-oriented had thought more about the BI, than those who were actually Future-oriented. Moreover, 'Futurers' were decidedly more positive about the Basic Income than the non-'Futurers', who were far more sceptical. Those who thought more about the BI, obviously came across the same doubts and counter-arguments discussed before (Atkinson, 1996; Birnbaum, 2011; Torry, 2014), whilst those who did not think as much about it, saw only the obvious pros – having more money, more freedom, and so on. As to why a Future-oriented person thinks less about a Basic Income, one can only guess. Perhaps people think the Basic Income is not a goal to be achieved – as future oriented people are always focused upon achieving a certain goal in the future. Or perhaps they do not care much for extra financial aid in achieving their goals. Or perhaps the participant pool in this study was just too small to draw any sort of conclusion. Further research should be able to generate more obvious answers. An attractive (but expensive) option for this is a large-scale experiment with considerably more participants, and perhaps even a trial with a BI.

The second expectation was that PN-oriented people are more positive about the BI than PP-oriented people. Our data supported this expectation. The students, most of whom were Past Negatively oriented in some degree, were quite a bit more positive about the Basic Income, whilst the Past Positively oriented participants were either sceptical or flat-out against the entire concept. There may be two reasons why this is so. First is that the students were quite a bit younger than the working participants. So for the students, the past is still

very alive and is often dwelled upon. This may be because of a principle called “negativity bias” (Rozin & Royzman, 2001). This principle states that “in most situations, negative events are more salient, potent, dominant in combinations, and generally efficacious than positive events” (p. 297). Add to that the findings of recent research that older people (until roughly 60 years) tend to attend more to positive events than they do negative events (Carstensen, Pasupathi, Mayr, & Nesselrode, 2000; Mello & Worrell, 2004; Wood & Kisley, 2006) and the younger adults are more inclined to attend to negative events (~18-34), and it would explain why younger adults are more Past Negative than older adults. The second reason is the fact that people who have negative feelings towards the past, want a more positive future. A Basic Income would certainly improve that future, because it would decrease people’s daily stress and give people the opportunity to fill in their free time with things that induce happiness. Thus, the second prediction seems to be confirmed. It would, of course, be more prudent if an actual trial was conducted so as to confirm this prediction more firmly. A trial would lend credibility to any and all results that may come from it.

The third prediction was that Present Hedonistic oriented people have less interest in the BI than the others. The result show this to a certain degree. Present Hedonistic oriented participants liked the idea of the BI well enough, but were sceptical and did not see it happening any time soon. Those who were Present Hedonistic to a lesser degree, on the other hand were far more inclined towards a positive attitude, and they often mentioned the benefits found by the analysis of the Dauphin trial (Painter, 2016a, 2016b), like being able to undertake things that make them happy, or better health care, and better study results. Furthermore, Tseferidi, Griva, and Anagnostopoulos' (2017) study suggests that people who are satisfied with life, are more likely to have a Present Hedonistic attitude towards life. This may then suggest that Present Hedonistic oriented people are happy with how their lives are, and do not need the BI for life satisfaction.

The fourth and final prediction was the people who have a gloomy outlook on the present, have a more positive view on the Basic Income. It is difficult to draw clear conclusions from the data for this prediction. Nobody appeared to be very Present Fatalistic, and neither did they appear to be on the other side of that spectrum, and on both sides of the spectrum, people were generally positive about the BI. This may be because, as may be

derived from the discussions, the present holds many displeasures for people – stress, money problems and worries, an uncertain future – and a Basic Income would take the edge off of many of those displeasures. Furthermore, a PF Time Perspective is associated with depressive symptoms (Tseferidi et al., 2017), and it can therefore be assumed that the current participants were not depressed, as the results had no outliers. The participants did appear to be more Present Fatalistic than those in Zimbardo and Boyd's study, which may suggest that people have a more Present Fatalistic Time Perspective now, than they had 18 years ago.

Literature does not seem to have an explanation why people are so negative towards the present. One look at the news may suggest an answer, with wars, climate change, and other nasty business, but this can hardly be supported by what the participants have said. It is not that these participants are particularly depressed; many have a positive outlook on both the past and the present in our participant group. But it seems like people are generally pessimistic about the present – not enough for a depression, but just enough to be *present* in people's minds. Further research, such as an interview study in which participants are asked about how they feel about the present, what is good and what is bad, may be prudent for a satisfying answer.

Other Interesting Findings. There were several other interesting findings, which cannot be covered by the research question and predictions, but are worth mentioning. For example, a surprising theme that was discussed mainly among the student group, was the fact that they feared they would no longer appreciate the money they would receive, should a BI become reality. This is not a new concept; it has been called the "IKEA-effect" (Norton, Mochon, & Ariely, 2012). According to this concept, doing the actual labour will increase the value of the end-result. When you receive a Basic Income, you have done nothing to earn it, and so, psychologically, you will not appreciate it like you appreciate the pay check you receive after a hard month's work. This may be an obstacle for an eventual implementation of the Basic Income, and something that should be considered when setting up the first possible trials.

It would be very interesting to do some further research into this particular phenomenon. Would something like the IKEA-effect really have an impact on whether or not

people will accept a Basic Income? Again, in a trial, this can be very interesting to research, as it may make a difference between success and failure of the trial.

From these conclusions, it can be inferred that the type of Time Perspective a person, does indeed have a predictive quality for attitudes towards the Basic Income. From the intuitive expectations, only our first expectations did not seem to ring true for this participant group. It can therefore be stated that people who are Past Positively oriented are more sceptical or even against the Basic Income. Past Negatively oriented people are far more positive about the BI, and are less inclined to be sceptical. Future oriented people, surprisingly, seemed to have thought less about the BI in general, but did have a more positive outlook on the entire subject. Present Hedonistic people were far more inclined to be sceptical than Present Fatalistic people, and even though it was difficult to draw any sort of conclusions from the data, people who were Present Fatalistic oriented did seem to be more positive towards the BI, if only by a small amount.

These conclusions cannot be drawn unequivocally, for there are several weaknesses that cast doubt upon this study. The first, and most obvious one, is the number of participants. Fourteen did not prove sufficient enough to draw any sound conclusions, as the negative Cronbach's Alpha on one of the variables of the questionnaire proved. Generally, an Alpha below .7 is considered weak (Nunnally, 1978; cited in Peterson, 1994), so a negative Cronbach's Alpha is unacceptable for valid conclusions. Churchill & Peter (1984; cited in Peterson, 1994) found a negative relation between sample size and the Alpha; the smaller the sample size, the smaller the Alpha. From this follows that the current sample size was too small to at least draw any conclusions about the Present Fatalistic scale. The other scales all seemed adequate, as they all scored above the aforementioned .7 cut-off Nunnally provided.

Another weakness was the lack of diversity with regard to education. Most of the participants were at least HBO-schooled or higher, with just one exception, which means that the gross of the participants were from the upper-middle class of society. This prevented the compilation of a fully representational subject pool, and leaves us wondering whether lower-educated citizens have different views on the BI than the higher-educated subject pool. Another problem was the lack of diverse ethnicities. Only one of the participants was non-

Western and non-White. The rest was either Dutch or German, and were all white. For a study to be able to make accurate predictions about the general population, its participants have to represent the population more accurately. With only 1 out of 14, this participant group did not fairly reflect the population, and it is therefore difficult to say whether these findings can be generalized over a wider population.

Furthermore, whilst it is perfectly acceptable to have fourteen participants for a qualitative study, those fourteen are decisively not enough to be able to make any kind of predictions for the quantitative part. Whilst there is no reason a sample would not yield proper results, the risk of “non-convergent or improper solutions” is significantly higher (MacCallum, Widaman, Zhang, & Hong, 1999). Thus, these results may be reliable, but they also may not. In general, MacCallum et al. showed that a sample below 100 is not worth even mentioning. Thus, for the qualitative portion of this research, it is difficult to draw sound conclusions. One can infer, of course, but it may very well be possible that these results are not reflective of the entire population.

This study is the first step towards gaining more knowledge of the psychological effects of a Basic Income. The results showed that people are overall sure they would become more relaxed and happy with a Basic Income. By interacting directly with the participants, the researchers not only saw their reactions to the discussions, but they could also react to the responses. This is a valuable addition to qualitative research, which makes this study more predictive about what people really think. But of course, this concerns imagined behaviour and attitudes, which makes it difficult to be unequivocally sure. People always say that they would have joined the resistance in World War II, but it is easy to say after the fact, or before something happens. Likewise, it is easy to say that you will do something productive with the BI, but that is an easy statement to make when you do not have a BI. The interesting thing is what happens when people actually receive a Basic Income.

The participants were very motivated, which makes us believe they were honest about their thoughts about the subject. Everyone was very enthusiastic during and after the discussion group, and most participated well. Concerning the quantitative part, a well-documented and well-used questionnaire was used, which further suggest a certain reliability in this study.

Final remark

In conclusion, despite its several points for improvement, this study has taken a first step in the psychological research on the Basic Income. It showed that there is a difference between people with regards to their attitude towards the Basic Income, and that this difference can be, in part, explained by people's Time Perspective. People are generally either positive or sceptical about the Basic Income, but nobody seems flat-out against the concept. Especially people who do not have positive feelings towards the past are excited for a future with a Basic Income.

This subject requires more and extensive research. Because of the difficulty of measuring psychological effects of having a Basic Income *before* it is implemented, it may be prudent to conduct an experimental trial – perhaps in cooperation with economic studies – where participants receive some form of Basic Income and live with it for an extended period of time.

Basic Income is an interesting and dynamic subject, and it will supply the academic world with interesting research subjects for years to come.

References

- Atkinson, A. B. (1996). The case for a participation income. *Political Quarterly*, 67(1), 67.
<http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-923X.1996.tb01568.x>
- Birnbaum, S. (2011). Should surfers be ostracized? Basic income, liberal neutrality, and the work ethos. *Politics, Philosophy & Economics*, 10(4), 396–419.
<http://doi.org/10.1177/1470594X10386569>
- Birnbaum, S., & De Wispelaere, J. (2016). Basic Income in the Capitalist Economy: The Mirage of “Exit” from Employment. *Basic Income Studies*, 11(1), 61–74. <http://doi.org/10.1515/bis-2016-0013>
- Bregman, R. (2014). *Gratis Geld Voor Iedereen*. Zuthpen: Druk Koninklijke Wöhrmann.
- Bregman, R. (2016, May). Deze filosoof weerlegt het belangrijkste argument tegen het basisinkomen. *De Correspondent*. Retrieved from <https://decorrespondent.nl/4525/deze-filosoof-weerlegt-het-belangrijkste-argument-tegen-het-basisinkomen/173963625-64af0609>
- Carstensen, L. L., Pasupathi, M., Mayr, U., & Nesselroade, J. R. (2000). Emotional experience in everyday life across the adult life span. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(4), 644–655. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.4.644>
- De Wispelaere, J., & Morales, L. (2015). The stability of basic income: a constitutional solution for a political problem? *Journal of Public Policy*, 36(4), 1–25.
<http://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X15000264>
- Franssen, A. G. (2017, January 17). Basisinkomen: vangnet in Finland, fata morgana in Nederland. *Trouw*. Retrieved from <https://www.trouw.nl/home/basisinkomen-vangnet-in-finland-fata-morgana-in-nederland~ac93a440/>
- Gradus, R., Westerveld, L., Ranshuijsen, A., & de Lange, A. (2015, May 22). Basisinkomen: de na- en voordelen van gratis geld. *Volkskrant*. Retrieved from <http://www.volkskrant.nl/ opinie/basisinkomen-de-na-en-voordelen-van-gratis-geld~a4037179/>
- Klein, N. (2015, June 25). De tijd is rijp voor het basisinkomen. *Trouw*. Retrieved from <https://www.trouw.nl/home/de-tijd-is-rijp-voor-het-basisinkomen~aa5f297d/>
- MacCallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Zhang, S., & Hong, S. (1999). Sample Size in Factor Analysis, 4(1), 84–99.

- Major, A. (2016). Affording Utopia: The Economic Viability of “A Capitalist Road to Communism.” *Basic Income Studies*, 11(2). <http://doi.org/10.1515/bis-2015-0023>
- Mello, Z. R., & Worrell, F. C. (2004). The Relationship of Time Perspective to Age , Gender , and Academic Achievement Among Academically Talented Adolescents. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 29(3), 271–289.
- Norton, M. I., Mochon, D., & Ariely, D. (2012). The IKEA effect: When labor leads to love. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 22(3), 453–460. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2011.08.002>
- Painter, A. (2016a). A universal basic income: the answer to poverty, insecurity, and health inequality? *The BMJ*, 355(December), 1–2. <http://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i6473>
- Painter, A. (2016b). Pragmatism, idealism and basic income: A transformative investment in human potential. *Juncture*, 22(4), 289–292. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.2050-5876.2016.00876.x>
- Peterson, R. A. (1994). A Meta-Analysis of Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21(2), 381. <http://doi.org/10.1086/209405>
- Regehr, S. (2014). Basic Income and Gender Equality: Reflections on the Potential for Good Policy in Canada. *Basic Income Studies*, 1–17.
- Rozin, P., & Royzman, E. B. (2001). Negativity Bias, Negativity Dominance, and Contagion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5(4), 296–320. http://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0504_2
- Sools, A. M., Tromp, T., & Mooren, J. H. (2015). Mapping letters from the future: Exploring narrative processes of imagining the future. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 20(3), 350–364. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1359105314566607>
- Sools, A., & Mooren, J. H. (2012). Towards Narrative Futuring in Psychology: Becoming Resilient by Imagining the Future. *Graduate Journal of Social Science*, 9(2), 203–226. Retrieved from <https://login.ezproxy.net.ucf.edu/login?auth=shibb&url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edo&AN=89513081&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Sools, A., Mooren, J. H., & Tromp, T. (2013). Positieve gezondheid versterken via narratieve toekomstverbeelding Anneke. In E. T. Bohlmeijer, L. Bolier, G. Westerhof, & J. A. Walburg (Eds.), *Handboek positieve psychologie. Theorie, onderzoek en toepassingen*. (pp. 91–130). Amsterdam: Boom.
- Standing, G. (2015). Why Basic Income’s Emancipatory Value exceeds its Monetary Value. *Basic Income Studies*, 10(2), 193–223. Retrieved from Browning, R. (2015). Why Basic Income’s

Emancipatory Value exceeds its Monetary Value Guy Standing. *Basic Income Studies*, 10(2), 193–223.

The Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory (ZTPI) Psychometrics and Scoring Key. (n.d.). Universiteit Gent. Retrieved from www.ekgp.ugent.be/pages/nl/vragenlijsten/ZTPI-NL-info.doc

Torry, M. (2014). A Basic Income is feasible: but what do we mean by “feasible”? *BIEN Congress*, (June), 12.

Tseferidi, S.-I., Griva, F., & Anagnostopoulos, F. (2017). Time to get happy: associations of time perspective with indicators of well-being. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, 22(5), 618–624. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2016.1226508>

Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal. (2016). Miljoenennota 2017.

Van Parijs, P. (2003). Basic Income: A Simple and Powerful Idea for the Twenty-First Century. In *Redesigning Distribution: basic income and stakeholder grants as alternative cornerstones for a more egalitarian capitalism* (Vol. 32, pp. 7–39). <http://doi.org/10.1177/0032329203261095>

Webster, J. D. (2011). A new measure of time perspective: Initial psychometric findings for the balanced time perspective scale (BTPS). *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 43(2), 111–118. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0022801>

Witteaman, J. (2017, January 23). Eerste experiment basisinkomen mogelijk in Terneuzen. *Volkskrant*. Retrieved from <http://www.volkskrant.nl/economie/eerste-experiment-basisinkomen-mogelijk-in-terneuzen~a4452204/>

Wood, S., & Kisley, M. A. (2006). The negativity bias is eliminated in older adults: Age-related reduction in event-related brain potentials associated with evaluative categorization. *Psychology and Aging*, 21(4), 815–820. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.21.4.815>

Zimbardo, P. G., & Boyd, J. N. (1999). Putting Time in perspective: a valid, reliable individual differences metric. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 6(77), 1271–1288. <http://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.77.6.1271>

Appendix A Participants

Table A. Participant information

Participant no.	Workshop	Gender	Age	Studying y/n	If y, what kind	Completed Study	TP*
11	1	M	31	n	.	n.a.	PP
12	1	F	55	n	.	HBO	F
13	1	F	58	n	.	HBO	PP
14	1	M	55	n	.	HBO	PH
15	1	M	64	n	.	HBO	PP
16	1	M	28	n	.	HBO	F
17	1	M	36	n	.	MBO	PP (?)
21	2	M	22	y	University	.	PP
22	2	F	21	y	University	.	PP
23	2	F	28	y	University	.	PP
24	2	F	21	y	University	.	F
25	2	F	18	y	MBO	.	PN
26	2	F	25	y	University	.	PP
27	2	M	21	y	University	.	PP

* The individual Time Perspective of each participant based on their ZTPI scores. PP=Past Positive, PN=Past Negative, PH=Present hedonistic, PF=Present fatalistic, F=Future

Appendix B Informed Consent

Hierbij verklaar ik dat op een manier die voor mij duidelijk is geïnformeerd ben over de methode en “natuur” van dit onderzoek. Mijn vragen zijn naar tevredenheid beantwoord. Ik stem toe tot deelname aan dit onderzoek uit vrije wil. Ik behoud het recht om op ieder moment gedurende dit onderzoek deze toestemming kan terugtrekken zonder hiervoor een reden te moeten opgeven en ik ben mij er van bewust dat ik op ieder moment mag stoppen met de workshop. Als resultaten verkregen vanuit dit onderzoek op enige manier publiek worden gemaakt zullen deze compleet anoniem worden gemaakt. Mijn persoonlijke data zal niet bekend gemaakt worden aan derden zonder mijn toestemming. Ik begrijp dat film- en toonmateriaal of bewerking daarvan uitsluitend voor analyse en/of wetenschappelijke presentaties zal worden gebruikt. Als ik meer informatie opvraag over het onderzoek, nu of in de toekomst, kan ik dat doen door contact op te nemen met (...). Mocht u klachten hebben over dit onderzoek dan kunt u contact opnemen met de begeleider van deze onderzoek.

A.M. Sools, Universiteit Twente, BMS (Cubicus), 7500 AE Enschede, telefoon: +31 53 489 6314, e-mail: a.m.sools@utwente.nl

Getekend in tweevoud:

.....
Naam deelnemer

.....
Handtekening

.....
Naam onderzoeker

.....
Handtekening

Appendix C **Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory (Dutch version)**

1. Ik vind feestvieren met vrienden één van de belangrijke plezierige dingen is in het leven.
2. Gebouwen, geluiden of geuren uit mijn kindertijd zorgen vaak dat heerlijke herinneringen terugkomen.
3. Het lot bepaalt veel in het leven.
4. Ik denk vaak aan wat ik anders had moeten doen in mijn leven.
5. Mijn beslissingen worden vaak beïnvloed door anderen en zaken om me heen.
6. Ik ben van mening dat iemand's dag elke ochtend van te voren moet worden gepland.
7. Het doet me een plezier om aan mijn verleden te denken.
8. Ik doe dingen impulsief.
9. Ik maak me geen zorgen als dingen niet op tijd gebeuren.
10. Als ik iets wil bereiken, stel ik doelen en bepaal ik welke middelen ik nodig heb om dat doel te bereiken.
11. Als ik de balans opmaak is er veel meer goeds dan slechts te herinneren over mijn verleden.
12. Wanneer ik naar mijn favoriete muziek luister ben ik vaak helemaal de tijd kwijt.
13. Het noodzakelijke werk vóór een geplande einddatum doen is belangrijker dan de plezierige dingen van vandaag doen.
14. Omdat 'het komt zoals het gaat', doet het er niet zo toe wat ik doe.
15. Ik houd van verhalen over hoe het was in 'die goede oude tijd'.
16. Pijnlijke ervaringen uit het verleden blijven zich herhalen in mijn hoofd.
17. Ik probeer alles uit mijn leven te halen, dag voor dag.
18. Het maakt me van streek als ik te laat ben op mijn afspraken.
19. Ideaal gezien zou ik elke dag leven alsof het mijn laatste was.
20. Blijde herinneringen over goede periodes komen makkelijk in mijn gedachten.
21. Ik kom mijn verplichtingen naar vrienden en autoriteiten op tijd na.
22. Ik heb mijn deel van mishandeling en afwijzing wel gehad in mijn leven.
23. Ik beslis op het moment zelf.
24. Ik neem de dag zoals die komt, in plaats van die te plannen.
25. Het verleden heeft te veel onplezierige herinneringen waaraan ik liever niet denk.
26. Het is belangrijk om spanning in mijn leven te brengen.
27. Ik heb fouten gemaakt in het verleden die ik graag ongedaan zou maken.
28. Ik heb het idee dat het belangrijker is plezier te hebben in wat je doet, dan het werk op tijd te doen.
29. Ik word nostalgisch als ik over mijn jeugd denk.
30. Voor een besluit te nemen, weeg ik de kosten tegen de baten af.
31. Risico's nemen zorgt er voor dat het leven niet saai wordt.
32. Het is belangrijker om me te richten op hoe het leven verloopt, dan op waar het naar toe gaat.
33. Dingen komen haast nooit uit zoals ik verwacht had.
34. Het is moeilijk voor me om onplezierige beelden uit mijn jeugd te vergeten.
35. Als ik aan doelen en uitkomsten moet gaan denken, haalt dat het plezier en de gang uit wat ik aan het doen ben.
36. Zelfs wanneer ik plezier beleef aan het hier-en-nu word ik teruggeworpen tot vergelijken met soortgelijke ervaringen uit het verleden.
37. Je kunt niet echt plannen voor de toekomst, omdat er zoveel verandert.
38. Mijn levenspad wordt gecontroleerd door zaken die ik niet kan beïnvloeden.
39. Het helpt niet om je zorgen te maken over de toekomst, omdat je daar toch niets aan kunt veranderen.
40. Ik maak taken op tijd af door stapje voor stapje vooruitgang te boeken.
41. Ik merk dat ik afhaak wanneer familieleden praten over hoe de dingen vroeger waren.
42. Ik neem risico's om spanning in mijn leven te brengen.
43. Ik maak lijsten van dingen die ik nog moet doen.
44. Ik volg vaak meer mijn hart, dan mijn hoofd.
45. Ik ben in staat verleidingen te weerstaan, wanneer ik weet dat er nog werk is te doen.
46. Ik merk dat ik helemaal in beslag genomen wordt door de opwindendheid van het moment.
47. Het leven van vandaag is te ingewikkeld, ik zou liever het eenvoudigere leven uit het verleden leven.
48. Ik verkies spontane vrienden boven voorspelbare vrienden.
49. Ik houd van familie rituelen en tradities die regelmatig herhaald worden.
50. Ik denk over de slechte dingen die gebeurd zijn met me in het verleden.
51. Ik blijf werken aan moeilijke of oninteressante taken, als die me helpen vooruit te komen.
52. Geld besteden aan de pleziertjes van vandaag is beter dan sparen voor de veiligheid van morgen.
53. Vaak helpt geluk meer dan hard werken.
54. Ik denk over de gemiste kansen op goede dingen in mijn leven.
55. Ik vind het fijn als mijn intieme relaties gepassioneerd zijn.
56. Er is altijd tijd om mijn werk alsnog af te krijgen.