

# WiSE Working Paper

Series No.1 September 2015

Dr Caitlin McLean, Ailsa McKay Postdoctoral Fellow, Glasgow Caledonian University

## Beyond Care: Expanding the Feminist Debate on Universal Basic Income

### Abstract

International debate regarding universal basic income proposals has increased markedly in recent years. This has included a spirited feminist debate about the merits of basic income (BI) for contributing to gender equality. Advocates have pointed to the potential for BI to correct the paid work bias of contemporary social security systems and to increase women's economic autonomy and power within the household. Critics have argued that BI will do nothing to directly challenge the gendered division of labour and may well reinforce it. As such, the feminist debate about BI is in some ways a microcosm of wider feminist controversies regarding how the state can recognize the unpaid work women largely do without reinforcing existing inequalities. Nevertheless, this focus marginalizes other aspects of gender inequality, particularly intersections between gender and class and race, including the positions of women in the Global South and additional policy issues such as poverty. Using Nancy Fraser's 7 principles of gender equity, this paper demonstrates how a multi-dimensional perspective on gender equality strengthens the feminist case for BI proposals.

## Introduction

Basic income (BI) proposals have gained renewed interest cross-nationally in both academic and policy circles in recent decades. A BI can be defined as “an income paid by a political community to all its members on an individual basis, without means test or work requirement” (Van Parijs, 2004: 8). Specifically, it is an income floor which is:

- Universal – paid to everyone in the population
- Individual – paid to each adult rather than as a single household payment
- Unconditional – without means-test or conditions regarding family or employment status
- A cash benefit – delivered as a continual rather than one-off cash grant.

However, this leaves open to debate the particulars of any given basic income proposal including the extent of universality, the level of the payment and more (De Wispelaere & Stirton, 2004).

In the UK a basic income has been supported by the Green Party and the non-partisan Citizen’s Income Trust (a non-profit organisation). The Citizen’s Income Trust has recommended a basic income of £71 per week for working age adults, with a higher amount for older people and a lower amount for younger people and children, essentially replacing current benefits for these groups (child benefit/state pension) (Citizen’s Income Trust, 2013). They also see basic income as replacing personal tax allowances and many means-tested benefits, but recommend keeping some additional supports such as housing and disability benefits.

Internationally, BI has been advocated for a variety of reasons including but not limited to the promotion of gender equality (for an overview of key debates about BI see McLean, forthcoming). Nevertheless, the effects of a BI on gender equality are not straightforward and as such, a debate has arisen among feminists about the merits and demerits of a BI. Advocates have pointed to the potential for BI to correct the paid work bias of contemporary social security systems and to increase women’s economic autonomy and power within the household (Fitzpatrick, 1999; McKay, 2001; 2005; Zelleke, 2011). Critics have argued that BI will do nothing to directly challenge the gendered division of labour and may well reinforce it (Gheaus, 2008;

Robeyns, 2001). As such, the feminist debate about BI is in some ways a microcosm of wider feminist controversies regarding how the state can recognize the unpaid work women largely do without reinforcing existing inequalities, also known as Wollstonecraft’s Dilemma (Lister, 1995; Pateman, 1988).

A key consequence of this is that much of the debate has centred on the labour market-care dimension of gender inequality. While this is certainly a crucial topic for feminists, this focus marginalizes other aspects of gender inequality, particularly intersections between gender and class and race, including issues of poverty and the international nature of gender inequality, especially the particular challenges of life among women in the Global South. Attention to such issues is important for advancing a more inclusive feminism and for developing effective policy measures to combat gendered inequality beyond care. Using Nancy Fraser’s seven principles of gender equity, this paper demonstrates how a multi-dimensional perspective on gender equality strengthens the feminist case for BI proposals.

## Feminist debates about BI and gender equality: controversies of care

A fundamental and enduring conflict of feminist theory has been by what means women can be included as full members of society – either on the basis of a formal ‘gender-neutral’ equality as sameness with men (which privileges male norms and disadvantages women to the extent that they deviate from them) or on the basis of their difference from men (which risks entrenching gender essentialism), which Pateman (1988) summarized as ‘Wollstonecraft’s dilemma’, referring to the presence of this issue as far back as Mary Wollstonecraft’s advocacy of women’s rights in the late 18th century. The dilemma continues to be heavily reflected in public policy debates about gender equality. Lister (1995: 17) describes the ‘contemporary variant of Wollstonecraft’s dilemma’ as ‘how to provide this recognition [of the importance of care to society] without locking women further into a caring role which serves to exclude them from the power and influence which can derive from participation in the public sphere of the economy and the polis.’

Corresponding to Wollstonecraft’s dilemma, feminists have primarily taken one of three tacks with regard to policy advocacy. The first is the ‘sameness’ tack – emphasizing a removal of barriers to women participating in male-dominated spaces and patterns of life (e.g. positions of authority, full-time employment). Policies which fall under this category include anti-discrimination or equal opportunities legislation as well as childcare service provision in order to facilitate women’s capacity to participate in the public sphere on an equal basis with men. In contrast, others have taken the ‘difference’ tack – emphasizing an entitlement to time and financial support to engage in care work. Relevant policies include caregiver allowances as well as maternity leave policies and payments. More recently there has been an attempt to bypass or reconcile this dilemma by focusing on changes to men’s behaviour, particularly raising their time in care and household work to reduce the burden on women and divorce the association between women and care-giving. This is the aim of Nancy Fraser’s (1994) famous ‘universal caregiver’ model, which has come to be a widely used standard for assessing policy regimes in recent years. Fraser contrasted this model with the ‘universal breadwinner’

model, exemplified by the ‘sameness’ tack, and the ‘caregiver parity’ model, exemplified by the ‘difference’ tack. Policies which have been advocated as a means to to facilitate a shift toward a dual earner-carer or ‘universal caregiver model’ include a package of work-family policies such as family leave for men and women, childcare services and working time regulation (Gornick & Meyers, 2008).

Given that these models have been the focus of an entrenched and enduring controversy among gender equality advocates more broadly it is perhaps not surprising that this is also a primary demarcation of debate surrounding the relationship between gender equality and basic income. In particular advocates (and detractors) of BI as it pertains to gender equality have focused on three key areas of contention, each overlapping with the worker-carer dilemma and the promotion of the universal breadwinner, caregiver parity or universal caregiver policy models.

The first key issue (shared with the BI debate at large, see Pasma, 2010) is the question of incentives to engage in paid employment, which is representative of the universal breadwinner model. Both skeptics and advocates of a BI acknowledge that the provision of unconditional cash transfers is likely to encourage some reduction in labour market participation – the question is by whom and how much. For gender equality advocates a key concern is the extent to which women in particular have an incentive to reduce their labour market participation given their relatively weaker attachment to the labour force as a group vis a vis men as a group, and the central role this plays in broader economic and political inequalities (such as income gaps and poverty risks over the lifecourse) (Robeyns, 2001). In particular, cash benefits could encourage mothers, especially mothers with already weak attachment to the labour force (e.g. those who are low paid or with low education/qualifications) to exit in favour of personal childcare at home, thus reinforcing the gendered division of labour. In other words, a BI could ease the ability of men and women to engage in gender-differentiated lifestyles, particularly in the face of real and persistent cultural and normative ideas about what women and men can and should do, which BI would not actively challenge (Gheaus, 2008). Nevertheless, the effects of a BI on women’s labour force participation are by no means straightforward – while some women may scale back their participation

in employment, others may increase it, particularly those who already face disincentives to work due to receipt of means-tested income supports (Robeyns, 2001).

More fundamentally, and a key source of the critique of the universal breadwinner model of gender equality in general, focusing solely on paid employment maintains rather than challenges androcentric biases regarding what constitutes work and the value of paid versus unpaid work as well as care (McKay, 2001). There has been increasing acknowledgement of the limits to outsourcing care work either to the market or the state, and the question of how to support informal types of care work, including interpersonal love labour, has become imperative (Baker, 2008; Lynch, 2007). A basic income would provide income support unconditionally, including to those engaged in unpaid work in the home (still overwhelmingly women) and therefore would support this agenda while also potentially increasing the economic independence of those with limited time for paid employment and, by extension, acknowledging the value of such work on a personal and societal level (Pateman, 2004; Robeyns, 2001). Nevertheless, BI can be challenged from a caregiver parity perspective on the grounds that it is too neutral as a cash benefit and does not go far enough in explicitly valuing and rewarding care. For this reason, others have advocated cash benefits specifically for caregivers, such as Alstott's (2004) caretaker resource accounts which would entail a largely unconditional income support specifically for parents of young children.

However, most BI advocates have cited the policy's neutrality as a key benefit with regard to gender equality, arguing that this aspect of a BI avoids Wollstonecraft's dilemma and contributes to a reconciliation of the 'sameness' or 'difference' tacks via Nancy Fraser's famous 'universal caregiver' model (e.g. Bambrick, 2006; Birnbaum, 2012; Fitzpatrick, 1999; Zelleke, 2008). The unconditional nature of a basic income means no one has to specialize in being a worker or a caregiver in order to fit the citizenship mould or to receive income support. It provides an income and some basic economic security for everyone and is neutral regarding what activities they engage in. In this sense a BI avoids the drawbacks of a universal breadwinner model which maintains androcentric assumptions about the nature of work

(see McKay, 2001). But at the same time, and in contrast to caregiver allowances, BI provides a means of valuing the proportion of care work which cannot be provided via state or market without discriminating against employed women or other individuals who combine work with aspects of care rather than performing it as their sole activity (Baker, 2008; Robeyns, 2001) and without deterring greater sharing by designating a particular person responsible for such tasks (Birnbaum, 2012).

## Critique: intersectionality and heterogeneity among women

As demonstrated, much of the feminist debate on BI as it stands hinges on the worker-carer debate and whether women should be treated similarly to men (as wage labourers) or as differently to men (due to their caring responsibilities). However, in recent years feminist thought has increasingly shifted toward understanding and accounting for the heterogeneity of women's experiences and the difficulty of the feminist movement in being effectively inclusive of all types of women (Zack, 2007). A key issue is the role that divides among women play in gender inequality between men and women (Cooke, 2011).

Intersectionality, also known as 'complex inequality' (McCall, 2001), is a recognition of the presence of multiple, intersecting identities and social relations which prevent a straightforward universal understanding of the experience of being a woman or of articulating women's interests as a group (for a review of the concept of intersectionality in feminist theory, see Carastathis, 2014). In other words, the experience of any given woman is shaped not only by her gender but other systems of social stratification such as race or class, and in fact these dimensions are not simply an additional facet of her identity, but affect her gendered experience as well.

For example, Browne and Misra (2003) empirically examined how 'gender is racialized' in the context of labour markets, limiting employment opportunities for racial or ethnic minority women. The concept of intersectionality had been introduced by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) specifically as a means of demonstrating how both feminist and black movements served to exclude or downplay the particular experiences of women of colour, as they sit at the intersection between two systems of social stratification – race and gender. As Crenshaw (2004: 2) later noted: 'If you're standing in the path of multiple forms of exclusion, you are likely to get hit by both.'

Intersectionality has since been expanded to recognize a wide range of dimensions along which women may face disadvantage: race, but also class, disability, sexuality, national origin, age, religion etc., and is now a core concept in sociological theory (see, for example, Ritzer, 2007). This suggests that understanding the

relationship between a basic income and effects on gender equality necessitates including, but going beyond, a focus on the gendered division of labour in order to include the specific forms of disadvantage faced by different groups of women.

For debates about basic income in particular, intersections between gender and class are likely to be especially relevant. It is notable that basic income proposals have not been a core staple of feminist movements in general. Where they have surfaced as a feminist issue, working class women have been at the forefront. In Britain, for example, a resolution demanding a 'guaranteed minimum income' which was in practice a basic income proposal was passed at a National Women's Liberation Conference in 1977 (see Yamamori, 2014). This was spurred in large part by working class women and in particular by members of the Claimants Union (often single mothers) who wanted an end to patronizing and authoritarian dealings with the benefits bureaucracy (including investigating their homes to find evidence that they were living with men). Income without means-test was seen as a key way of tackling this issue as well as reducing dependence within patriarchal households. However, the proposal was not taken forward due to opposition within the movement. Specifically, there was a class divide between middle class women who did not see the benefit of a guaranteed income and working class women and benefits claimants for whom it was a more pertinent issue.

This is a stark example of what has been a much broader problem of the feminist movement: that it is by and large representative of white, middle-class women's interests (only) rather than inclusive of a wider range of women's experiences (Zack, 2007). This can be seen in the high degree of attention given to issues such as family policy with a relative lack of attention to issues which are gendered, but also classed, and in some contexts, racialized: risk of poverty, prostitution and risk of incarceration, risk of domestic violence and the authoritarian control over the lives of benefits claimants, to name only a few. Similarly, issues of class (as well as race, nationality or immigration status) have cast some doubt on core feminist policy proposals such as the provision of childcare services as an emancipatory step toward gender equality, with domestic service and the rise of global care chains pointing toward a redistribution

in care work among groups of women rather than a redistribution from women to men (Ehrenreich & Hochschild, 2002). Attention to intersectionality therefore demonstrates that interactions between gender and class create specific problems which are partly, but not solely, a function of the gendered division of labour and therefore cannot be entirely relieved by policy efforts to challenge it, such as the provision of childcare services or paid parental leave.

Nevertheless, while intersectionality has become an established concept in sociology and gender studies, it has only recently begun to filter into public policy studies (see Hankivsky & Cormier, 2011), which may help to explain its omission in most discussions of BI. The importance of intersectionality, especially gender-class divisions, as it pertains to debates about BI has been recently raised by Vollenweider (2013), who focused specifically on the role of domestic service in structuring class relations between women. While this is an important example of the issue, it does not provide an answer to a more general question, which is how to widen the BI debate to take greater account of intersectionality across a variety of specific areas, including but not limited to care and household labour.

## A multi-dimensional perspective on gender equality: Nancy Fraser's 7 principles of gender equity

A crucial question is what type of gender equality BI advocates are referring to when they claim that BI would be a positive policy for promoting it (O'Reilly, 2008). Some political philosophers have developed conceptualisations of gender justice in order to evaluate the merits of a BI (e.g. Gheaus, 2008; Zelleke, 2011). However, as noted in previous sections, it has been particularly common for BI advocates (e.g. Bambrick, 2006; Birnbaum, 2012; Fitzpatrick, 1999; Zelleke, 2008) to refer to Nancy Fraser's (1994) famous 'universal caregiver' model as the gender equality standard which a BI must meet.

What these arguments have generally not done is engage with the fundamentals of Fraser's framework: the seven principles of gender equity on which she bases her claim that a universal caregiver model would better satisfy the aim of gender equality than competing models (universal breadwinner or caregiver parity).<sup>1</sup> These principles are: anti-poverty, anti-exploitation, income equality, leisure time equality, equality of respect, anti-marginalization and anti-androcentrism.

This omission is a problem because it limits the debate to the question of care and downplays other aspects relevant for achieving gender equality. A focus just on the employment-care dichotomy, inherent in the emphasis on a universal caregiver model, misses in particular the presence of intersectionality and related gendered issues of class and power. Crucially, such issues are included in Fraser's underlying framework, particularly with regard to principles such as anti-poverty and anti-exploitation, even if they are not explicit in shorthand references to the universal caregiver model. In the sections to follow, I provide an overview of Fraser's seven principles and demonstrate their applicability to the BI debate and its capacity to promote gender equality. These examples are also summarized in Table 1.

The first principle of gender equity is **anti-poverty**. Fraser argues that preventing poverty is a key aspect of gender equality given that women in general are at

<sup>1</sup>Zelleke (2011) is a key exception, summarizing Fraser's argument with reference to the principles in a discussion of feminist conceptions of citizenship.

higher risk than men. Indeed, the phrase 'feminization of poverty' (Pearce, 1978) was coined in recognition of the fact that women tend to be economically disadvantaged in the labour market for a variety of reasons, including responsibilities for children and domestic tasks as well as outright discrimination, which leads to lower market income, and that this economic risk is further compounded by systems of social security which tie income supports to labour market participation.

While poverty may be 'feminized', certain groups of women are more vulnerable to poverty than others. This is especially the case for single mothers, although the level of risk varies by country and is associated with variation in systems of social security, with universal systems less strongly associated with poverty among single mothers compared to targeted systems (Brady & Burroway, 2012). Further, ethnic minority women, disabled women, refugees and migrant women also face a higher degree of economic disadvantage, such that they might be especially likely to benefit from an income floor relative to more privileged women. Incorporating the anti-poverty agenda also recognises gender inequalities as a global or inter- rather than intra-national issue. A high proportion of the world's poor are women, with women in many developing countries facing a greater array of social, political and economic disadvantages which raise their risk of poverty as well as related problems such as poor health.

Thus the potential for a BI to reduce poverty is a crucial component of its contribution to decreasing gender inequality. BI can contribute to the reduction of poverty in the straightforward sense of securing a certain level of financial welfare via cash transfers. This has been one of the key rationales for piloting BI proposals in countries in the Global South, such as Namibia (Haarman & Haarman, 2012) and India (Davala et al., 2015) where the anti-poverty effects of cash transfers are most stark given low standards of living.

Additionally, the universal aspect of a BI is likely to increase its effectiveness in preventing, rather than simply alleviating poverty. First, it avoids the unemployment traps of targeted cash transfers, making it easier for recipients to combine paid employment with receipt of the benefit while not facing the risk of entering employment or increasing hours worked

and in the process losing a steady income stream. This is especially relevant for women. Single women are particularly likely to be recipients of targeted cash transfers which they risk losing by increasing their labour market participation. Coupled women are also disadvantaged given that targeted cash transfers are usually reduced as household income levels rise and women's income contributions, on average lower than men's, thus face higher reduction penalties.

A BI also reduces inequalities which result from income support penalties for those performing activities outside the paid labour market (care work, volunteer work etc.) which continue to be marginalized in most social security systems. Reforming social security systems to include a basic income reduces the paid work bias of most welfare systems by shifting importance away from income supports based on labour market participation such as unemployment insurance, tax credits and allowances and occupational benefits (McKay, 2005; Parker, 1993). By doing so it avoids compounding the economic disadvantage women face due to their heterogeneous attachment to the labour market relative to men.

The core role of BI in providing economic security also contributes to the second principle of gender equity: **anti-exploitation**. Fraser characterises this as the prevention of exploitation of vulnerable people, including in the household, the market and the state. Crucially, Fraser argues that this principle requires that welfare benefits not be linked to dependency relationships (e.g. benefits through a husband or through employment). The question is whether BI as an alternative form of social security can contribute to reducing the power of 'bosses, boyfriends and bureaucrats' over women's lives (Levine, 2013).

This is a key strength of BI proposals compared to other forms of social security, as it reduces the potential for exploitative relationships in each of the social spheres. With regard to the market, among BI advocates more generally a core argument is that an unconditional source of income will increase the bargaining power of the worker in relation to the employer, as the threat of destitution is removed (Van Parijs, 2004). This is a core argument for social security proposals in general, but a BI is arguably more beneficial due to its universality and unconditionality, which makes the income floor more reliable. The

anti-exploitative potential of a BI with regard to the market sphere is, additionally, especially relevant for women given that on average they tend to be lower paid, in lower authority positions and are less likely to be employers.

Second, as an individual level benefit, BI helps to redress or at the very least avoid exacerbating intra-household inequalities between men and women in couple relationships. A core feminist critique of tax-benefit systems has been their use of household rather than individual level assessments. This system relies on assumptions about equal sharing and pooling of household income and other resources, which does not always hold in practice, usually to the disadvantage of women and children who bring lower amounts of independent income into the household. Economic inequalities within the household also underpin and reinforce power differentials between men and women and between children and adults. Individual, unconditional payments paid to everyone have the potential to offset some of these inequalities (Robeyns, 2001). Especially for women making less money than their partner, or who would otherwise have no income of their own, a BI could increase bargaining power within the household - voice in decision-making processes or the ability to exit if required (Okin, 1989).

Less commonly acknowledged but nevertheless a key avenue for exploitative power relationships is the interaction between women and the state. Paternalistic, intrusive and/or coercive interactions between welfare workers and claimants is especially relevant given increased use of sanctions in some countries, such as the UK and the US, to control the behaviour of those claiming benefits. Not only are such measures ineffective, as they often target those most in need of assistance (e.g. with transportation, childcare, or health care) and further exacerbate conditions leading to poverty by reducing income and increasing stress levels, but, additionally, they are experienced as humiliating situations bordering on abuse (Laakso & Drevdahl, 2006; Rainford, 2004; Wu et al., 2006). In contrast to means-tested and/or conditional cash benefits, a BI would be both universal and unconditional, thus removing the need for eligibility enforcement and reducing the power and oversight of state officials and caseworkers over benefit claimants' personal lives, an issue which is especially pertinent for women, who are more likely to

be claimants and are more likely to receive scrutiny of their coupled relationships based on household-level means-testing (Fitzpatrick, 1999).

The third principle of gender equity also places economic issues at the forefront: **income equality**. Fraser takes care to note that she is not referring to a perfectly equal split between men and women in general but rather changes to current systems such that women are not systematically disadvantaged in the way that they are currently due to the gendered division of labour (e.g. lower income and inequality within households). BI has the potential to address this issue via redistribution between households, but it is also redistributive within households, due to its individual nature. As noted previously, this helps to avoid assumptions about sharing of household resources and to reduce any existing income inequalities in the home by ensuring that, regardless of labour market participation, each individual has access to independent means.

However, income inequalities are not the only relevant intra-household inequality. Disparities between husbands and wives are even more pronounced when considering inequalities of time, especially leisure time, as women are held responsible for ongoing care and household activities even in their 'free time', leading to higher 'time poverty' among women (Bittman & Wajcman, 2000; Mattingly & Bianchi, 2003). Thus Fraser adds **leisure-time equality** as an additional principle of gender equity.

The unconditional nature of BI proposals could theoretically contribute to the reduction of time inequalities by relieving financial pressures and creating space to engage in unremunerated activities. Combined with normative change from a social recognition of the importance of such activities, it is possible that this would facilitate renegotiations of labour in the household and reduce gender inequalities (Bambrick, 2006). However, it cannot be assumed that men with increased time will necessarily take up household work rather than increasing leisure. Available evidence suggests that increases in women's employment leads to increases in men's household work over time (Gershuny et al., 2005). It is less clear that income in particular prompts change; instead it may lead to a reduction or outsourcing of household work rather than a redistribution within the household

(Bittman et al., 2003). While this would increase leisure-time equality within the household, it would not fundamentally change gendered responsibility for such work, instead redistributing labour among classes of women, rather than between women and men. Here, too, a BI could have interesting effects. Vollenweider (2013) argues that the supply of domestic services may well fall (or prices may rise) in the presence of financial security for currently low-income workers providing such services. Under those circumstances, household redistribution may be more likely.

The fifth principle is **equality of respect**. This is in some ways the most fundamental yet is the most difficult to touch with policy measures. Fraser defines it as the 'recognition of women's personhood and recognition of women's work'. BI, like most policy proposals, is probably best characterized as being compatible with the aim of equality of respect, rather than actively driving it, at least as it pertains to individuals. It is more effective with regard to reflecting or promoting equality of respect at an institutional level. For example, the lack of conditionality attached to cash transfers under a BI decreases institutional signals of disrespect for the types of work (care work, volunteer work etc.) that women have historically done and continue to do in greater numbers.

With regard to the second aspect of Fraser's principle of equality of respect, a BI is also compatible with the promotion of women's personhood. Fraser refers specifically to the issue of women being sexually objectified. In this narrow sense, a BI could contribute via the mechanism of anti-exploitation: basic financial security for all could be expected to reduce, if not eliminate, women's participation in sex work out of necessity or desperation. However, BI also contributes to a broader sense of women's personhood as full, independent citizens entitled to an income in their own right, rather than as dependants within a household (Pateman, 2004). In this sense it is a symbolic and discursive benefit rather than a material one - whether a BI would in practice reduce economic dependence depends on the level of funds actually provided.

Last are the twin principles of **anti-marginalisation** and **anti-androcentrism**. Fraser's inclusion of these principles was an explicit attempt to avoid Wollstonecraft's dilemma and are the keystones of her argument for a universal caregiver model over the caregiver parity

or universal breadwinner models. She argued that the caregiver parity model would lead to marginalisation, secluding women in the private sphere and perpetuating gender essentialism; while the universal breadwinner model would uphold the idea that masculine life patterns are best and that women, to be equal, must conform to men's standards. Fraser argued that the only way to avoid these two issues would be to prioritize what she called the universal caregiver model, in which both men and women are encouraged and supported to participate in the labour market as well as the care and work of the household. As noted previously this has been the crux of many advocates' arguments for BI as a feminist proposal, who have pointed out that BI moves toward this type of policy model because the lack of conditionality means that it neither goes down the labourist path nor the care path of citizenship (Bambrick, 2006; Birnbaum, 2012; Fitzpatrick, 1999; Zelleke, 2008).

*Table 1: Fraser's 7 Principles of Gender Equity & Basic Income*

Principle of gender equity	Theoretical contribution of Basic Income
Anti-poverty	Security of an income floor without work disincentives from means-tested benefits
Anti-exploitation	Reducing the power of 'bosses, boyfriends and bureaucrats' (Levine, 2013)
Income equality	Redistribution of income between but also within households
Leisure-time equality	Reduced economic pressure on men as breadwinners may facilitate more equal sharing of unpaid work in the household
Equality of respect	Lack of conditionality respects the value of activities beyond paid employment
Anti-marginalisation	Income not tied specifically to caregiving making it more difficult to discriminate against women
Anti-androcentrism	Income not tied to labour market participation

## Conclusion: A renewed feminist case for BI?

The BI debate as it currently stands reflects a fundamental feminist disagreement, namely what do about the unpaid work of the household: how to value it (and avoid perpetuating androcentric biases) without reinforcing the gendered division of labour and women's resultant socio-economic disadvantage. Nevertheless, the worker vs. mother dichotomy does not encapsulate the sum total of the female experience or of gendered disadvantage.

A key missing component is attention to intersectionality, especially differences of class but also race and other social categories. Crucially, while many of these issues are related to questions of care, they cannot be reduced to questions of care. Fraser's 7 principles of gender equity can be inclusive of such issues, particularly with regard to poverty and exploitation, whereas an emphasis simply on the universal caregiver model downplays these aspects, to its detriment. While this is relevant for broader discussions about policies to facilitate gender equality more generally, it is especially relevant to the feminist debate about basic income.

Feminists debating the merits of a BI have downplayed the anti-poverty and anti-exploitation aspects (which Fraser argues are core principles of gender equity) and which affect wide swathes of women, albeit in different ways. Yet these are core benefits of a BI compared to other policies such as childcare provision or parental leave policies which have taken centre stage in recent years. Basic income proposals are in essence an attempt to provide economic security and raise the welfare floor of the least well-off, without encouraging stigmatization or further increasing the hardships they face via complex eligibility and administrative rules. Thus there is a case to be made that to the extent that a basic income addresses these particular issues, it does not only reduce or alleviate the suffering associated with poverty and income gaps but it also helps further gender equality goals, particularly if our concept of gender equality includes attention to intersectionality and heterogeneity among women as well as differences between women and men as a group.

This is not to say that none of these issues have been brought up by basic income scholars. Rather, they have not served as a main area of focus or systematic analysis within the debate at large. While advocates have argued that BI could contribute to achieving gender equality via its compatibility with a universal caregiver model, they have for the most part not engaged with the fundamental principles of gender equity. Doing so provides an opportunity to widen the feminist debate about BI beyond care and to better incorporate insights about intersectionality and the diversity of women's experience. Arguably, this also strengthens the case for a BI with respect to the goal of gender equality. Not only does it mediate one of the core polarizing issues among feminists (whether to prioritize support for labour market participation or care work in the home) but it also addresses issues which are sometimes side-lined within the feminist movement, but are especially important for the most vulnerable groups of women - issues such as poverty and exploitation of unequal power relationships with employers, family and state caseworkers.

Nevertheless, it is still not clear to what extent BI would satisfy these principles in practice. While, there are good reasons to suspect that BI would facilitate, or at the very least be compatible with each of the seven principles, it is less likely to actively drive progress on some of these dimensions than others. For example, arguments for a BI are stronger with regard to anti-poverty and anti-exploitation compared to increasing leisure-time equality. However, it would be unreasonable to expect any single policy proposal to drive change along each of these dimensions. Even a 'universal caregiver' model refers to a broad policy regime and would therefore include a variety of individual policies, one of which could be a BI. For this reason many feminists argue that a BI should be coupled with additional policy measures to further reduce gender inequality, such as funding for childcare services and education to fight gender stereotypes from an early age (Elgarte, 2008; Gheaus, 2008; O'Reilly, 2008; Robeyns, 2001).

## References

- Alstott, A. (2004) *No Exit: What Parents Owe their Children and What Society Owes Parents*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, J. (2008). All Things Considered, Should Feminists Embrace Basic Income? *Basic Income Studies*, 3(3), 1-8.
- Bambrick, L. (2006). Wollstonecraft's Dilemma: Is a Citizen's Income the Answer? *Citizen's Income Newsletter*, (2), 3-10.
- Birnbaum, S. (2012). *Basic Income Reconsidered: Social justice, liberalism, and the demands of equality*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bittman, M. & Wajcman, J. (2000). The Rush Hour: The Character of Leisure Time and Gender Equity. *Social Forces* 79(1), 165-189.
- Bittman, M., England, P., Sayer, L., Folbre, N., & Matheson, G. (2003). When Does Gender Trump Money? Bargaining and Time in Household Work. *American Journal of Sociology*, 109(1), 186-214.
- Brady, D. and Burroway, R. (2012) Targeting, Universalism, and Single-Mother Poverty: A Multilevel Analysis across 18 Affluent Democracies. *Demography* 49(2): 719-46.
- Browne, I. and Misra, J. (2003) The Intersection of Gender and Race in the Labor Market. *Annual Review of Sociology* 29, 487-513.
- Carastathis, A. (2014). The Concept of Intersectionality in Feminist Theory. *Philosophy Compass* 9(5), 304-314.
- Citizen's Income Trust. (2013). *Citizen's Income: A Brief Introduction*. London: Citizen's Income Trust.
- Cooke, L. P. (2011). *Gender-class Equality in Political Economies*. New York: Routledge.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139-168.
- Crenshaw, K. (2004). 'Intersectionality: the Double Bind of Race and Gender', interview with Kimberlé Crenshaw. *Perspectives*, Spring 2004. American Bar Association. Available at: [www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/publishing/perspectives\\_magazine/women\\_perspectives\\_Spring2004CrenshawPSP.authcheckdam.pdf](http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/publishing/perspectives_magazine/women_perspectives_Spring2004CrenshawPSP.authcheckdam.pdf)
- Davala, S., Jhabvala, R., Standing, G. and Kapoor Mehta, S. (2015). *Basic Income: A Transformative Policy for India*. London: Bloomsbury.
- De Wispelaere, J., & Stirton, L. (2004). The Many Faces of Universal Basic Income. *The Political Quarterly*, 75(3), 266-274.
- Ehrenreich, B. & Hochschild, A. (Eds.) (2002). *Global woman: Nannies, Maids and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Elgarte, J. M. (2008). Basic Income and the Gendered Division of Labour. *Basic Income Studies*, 3(3), 1-7.
- Fitzpatrick, T. (1999). *Freedom and Security: An Introduction to the Basic Income Debate*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, Ltd.
- Fraser, N. (1994). After the Family Wage: Gender Equity and the Welfare State. *Political Theory*, 22(4), 591-618.
- Gershuny, J., Bittman, M., and Brice, J. (2005). Exit, Voice and Suffering: Do Couples Adapt to Changing Employment Patterns? *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67(3), 66-665.
- Gheaus, A. (2008). Basic Income, Gender Justice and the Costs of Gender-Symmetrical Lifestyles. *Basic Income Studies*, 3(3), 1-8.
- Gornick, J. C., & Meyers, M. K. (2008). Creating Gender Egalitarian Societies: An Agenda for Reform. *Politics & Society*, 36(3), 313-349.
- Haarman, C. & Haarman, D. (2012). 'Namibia: Seeing the Sun Rise - The Realities and Hopes of the Basic Income Grant Pilot Project' in Murray & Pateman (Eds.) *Basic Income Worldwide: Horizons of Reform*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 33-58.
- Hankivsky, O., & Cormier, R. (2011). Intersectionality and Public Policy: Some Lessons from Existing Models. *Political Research Quarterly*, 64(1), 217-229.
- Laakso, J. & Drevdahl, D. (2006). Women, Abuse and the Welfare Bureaucracy. *Affilia* 21(1), 84-96.
- Levine, J. (2013). *Ain't No Trust How Bosses, Boyfriends, and Bureaucrats Fail Low-Income Mothers and Why It Matters*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lister, R. (1995). Dilemmas in Engendering Citizenship. *Economy and Society*, 24 (1), 35-40.
- Lynch, K. (2007). Love Labour as a Distinct and Non-commodifiable Form of Care Labour. *The Sociological Review* 55(3), 550-570.
- Mattingly, M. and Bianchi, S. (2003). Gender Differences in the Quantity and Quality of Free Time: The U.S. Experience. *Social Forces* 81(3), 999-1030.
- McCall, L. (2001). *Complex Inequality: Gender, Class, and Race in the New Economy*. New York: Routledge.
- McKay, A. (2005). *The Future of Social Security Policy: Women, Work and a Citizens' Basic Income*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- McKay, A. (2001). Rethinking Work and Income Maintenance Policy: Promoting Gender Equality through a Citizens' Basic Income. *Feminist Economics*, 7(1), 97-118.
- McLean, C. (forthcoming) 'Debating a Citizen's Basic Income: An International and Cross-Disciplinary Perspective' In J. Campbell and M. Gillespie (eds.) *Feminist Economics and Public Policy: Reflections on the Work and Impact of Ailsa McKay*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Okin, Susan Moller. (1989). *Justice, Gender and the Family*. New York: Basic Books.
- O'Reilly, J. (2008). Can a Basic Income Lead to a More Gender Equal Society? *Basic Income Studies*, 3(3), 1-7.
- Parker, H. (1993). *Citizen's Income and Women*. London: Citizen's Income.
- Pasma, C. (2010). Working Through the Work Disincentive. *Basic Income Studies*, 5(2), 1-20.
- Pateman, C. (2004). Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. *Politics & Society*, 32(1), 89-105.
- Pateman, C. (1988). 'The Patriarchal Welfare State' In A. Gutman (Ed.), *Democracy and the Welfare State*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 231-260.

- Pearce, D. (1978) The Feminization of Poverty: Women, Work, and Welfare. *The Urban & Social Change Review* 11(1-2), 28-36.
- Rainford, W. (2004). Paternalistic Regulation of Women: Exploring Punitive Sanctions in Temporary Assistance to Needy Families. *Affilia* 19(3), 289-304.
- Ritzer, G. (2007). *Contemporary Sociological Theory and Its Classical Roots: The Basics*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Robeyns, I. (2001). Will a Basic Income do Justice to Women? *Analyse*, 23(1), 88-105.
- Van Parijs, P. (2004). Basic Income: A Simple and Powerful Idea for the Twenty-First Century. *Politics & Society*, 32(1), 7-39.
- Vollenweider, C. (2013). Domestic Service and Gender Equality: An Unavoidable Problem for the Feminist Debate on Basic Income. *Basic Income Studies*, 8(1), 19-41.
- Wu, C-F., Cancian, M., Meyer, D., and Wallace, G. (2006). How Do Welfare Sanctions Work? *Social Work Research* 30(1), 33-50.
- Yamamori, T. (2014). A Feminist Way to Unconditional Basic Income: Claimants Unions and Women's Liberation Movements in 1970s Britain. *Basic Income Studies*, 9(1-2), 1-24.
- Zack, N. (2007). 'Can Third Wave Feminism be Inclusive? Intersectionality, its problems and new directions' In Linda Alcoff and Eva Feder Kittay (eds.) *The Blackwell Guide to Feminist Philosophy*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., pp. 193-207.
- Zelleke, A. (2011). Feminist Political Theory and the Argument for an Unconditional Basic Income. *Policy and Politics*, 39(1), 27-42.
- Zelleke, A. (2008). Institutionalizing the Universal Caretaker through a Basic Income? *Basic Income Studies*, 3(3), 1-9.

ISBN: 9781905866755

## WiSE

The WiSE Research Centre within the Glasgow School for Business and Society aims to promote and make visible women's economic contribution through high quality research, consultancy and knowledge transfer activities. Our work is of interest to everyone with an interest in women's position in, and contribution to, the national and global economy, including academics, policy makers, equality practitioners, the business community and gender equality activists.

### WiSE Policy Briefings:

1. Child Poverty and Mothers' Employment Patterns: Exploring Trends (September 2012)
2. Where are women in Scotland's labour market? (January 2013)
3. How Modern is the Modern Apprenticeship in Scotland? (May 2013)
4. Scotland and the Great Recession: An Analysis of the Gender Impact (October 2013)
5. The Economic Case for Investing in High-Quality Childcare and Early Years Education (November 2013)
6. Underemployment in Scotland: A Gender Analysis (June 2014)



University for the Common Good

### For further information contact:

Alison Lockhart  
Senior Administrator (Research)  
WiSE Research Centre  
Glasgow Caledonian University  
Cowcaddens Road, Glasgow G4 0BA

T: 0141 331 8644 E: [wise@gcu.ac.uk](mailto:wise@gcu.ac.uk)

[www.gcu.ac.uk/wise](http://www.gcu.ac.uk/wise)