

Social Dimensions of Sustainable Development in International Public Opinion

Spółeczne wymiary zrównoważonego rozwoju w międzynarodowej opinii publicznej

Paweł Rydzewski

*Institute of Sociology, Faculty of Philosophy and Sociology
Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, Poland
E-mail: p.rydzewski@umcs.pl*

Abstract

The article examines opinions on various elements of the social pillar of sustainable development. The analysis is based on the ISSP Role of Government V (2016). The research sample consisted of over 35,600 respondents from 28 different countries. It has been assumed that the most important indicator is the opinion that a given element requires much more government spending than it receives now. From the point of view of public opinion, health and education seem to constitute the crucial elements of the social pillar of sustainable development, whereas security and especially culture and the arts are much less important.

Key words: sustainable development, government, ISSP

Streszczenie

W artykule przedstawiono analizę opinii o elementach społecznego filaru zrównoważonego rozwoju w oparciu o badania ISSP Role of Government V (2016). Próba badawcza liczyła ponad 35 600 osób z 28 krajów. Za najważniejszy wskaźnik przyjęto opinię, iż dany element wymaga znacznie większego finansowania ze źródeł rządowych niż to ma miejsce obecnie. Zdrowie i edukacja – to elementy społecznego filaru zrównoważonego rozwoju, które wydają się być najważniejsze w opinii społecznej. Bezpieczeństwo a zwłaszcza kultura i sztuka – to elementy znacznie mniej istotne.

Słowa kluczowe: rozwój zrównoważony, rząd, ISSP

Introduction

Three pillars of sustainable development (environmental, economic, and social) are commonly distinguished in the literature. This article will focus on the social pillar, which will be examined from the perspective of public opinion only.

Social sustainability can be described as a state in which participants in social life enjoy a sufficiently high quality of life resulting from a combination of various specific factors. As Robert Prescott-Allen puts it, *human wellbeing is a condition in which all members of society are able to determine and meet their needs and have a large range of choices and opportunities to fulfil their potential* (Prescott-Allen, 2001, p.13). However, the question of what these

factors or their combinations are, is still being discussed (e.g. Kokić Arsić, 2016). One of the most interesting proposals in this area is the Human Wellbeing Index (HWI) developed by the World Conservation Union (IUCN). It is a set of indicators calculated for 180 countries. These indicators are aggregated into two sub-indexes: *human wellbeing* and *ecosystem wellbeing*. The first one (HWI), which is interesting for our purposes, is a collection of indicators concerning population, health, wealth, knowledge, culture and justice. The HWI is a realistic measure of socio-economic conditions and covers many aspects of human wellbeing. It incorporates five dimensions (health and population, wealth, knowledge and culture, community, and equity), which can be further subdivided into the following

10 elements: health, population, national wealth, knowledge, culture, freedom and governance, peace and order, household equity and gender equity (Prescott-Allen, 2001).

Some of these elements can be measured by means of objective indicators included in statistical data and official documents, while others are based on subjective indicators such as views and opinions. Sometimes we have a combination of objective and subjective indicators; for example, the state of health can be measured with statistical data on morbidity rates, hospitalization etc, but also by asking people how they assess their own health (self-assessment of health condition). Both these aspects are equally important. Consequently, public opinion surveys are essential for analysing the social pillar of sustainable development.

The purpose of the article is to answer the following research questions: (1) What are the opinions of inhabitants of different countries about government spending in such areas as health, education, police and law enforcement, and culture and the arts? (2) which of these areas is the most important from the point of view of public opinion?

Methodology

The data analysed in this article come from the ISSP Role of Government V module. The ISSP is a long-term international research program implemented annually in member states. It was initiated as the bilateral cooperation of the German ALLBUS program (Allgemeinen Bevölkerungsumfragen der Sozialwissenschaften) and the American GSS (General Social Survey). Later the program was joined by the British BSA (British Social Attitudes Survey) and the Australian National University, represented by the Research School of Social Sciences. Presently, the ISSP covers many countries around the world. In its current form, it has been operating since 1985. Since then, 32 surveys have been realised – some of them were repeated studies (e.g. five editions of *Role of Government*, four editions of *Social Inequality*, *Family and Changing Gender Roles*, and *Work Orientations*, three editions of *Environment*, *National Identity*, etc.). The ISSP research modules are usually attached to other major nationwide surveys (more information on the ISSP can be found at issp.org).

The ISSP Role of Government V 2016 was selected for the analysis because it is the latest survey carried out worldwide that contains variables relating to the social pillar of sustainable development. The questionnaire included the following question: *Listed below are various areas of government spending. Please show whether you would like to see more or less government spending in each area. Remember that if you say 'much more', it might require a tax increase to pay for it.* This question concerned, among others, the following issues: environment,

Table 1. Selected elements of the Human Wellbeing Index and corresponding indicators in the ISSP Role of Government V database (Prescott-Allen, modified in 2001)

HWI elements	HWI content	ISSP Role of Government V indicators
Health	People enjoy long lives in good health	Government should spend money on health
Knowledge	People have the knowledge to innovate and cope with change, live well and sustainably, and fulfil their potential	Government should spend money on education
Culture	with avenues for spiritual growth, creativity; and self-expression	Government should spend money on culture and the arts
Peace and order	Communities coexist peacefully and protect their members from crime and violence.	Government should spend money on police and law enforcement

Table 2. Sample structure by country

	Frequency	Percent
Chile	1416	3.9
Croatia	1966	5.4
Czech Republic	1026	2.8
Denmark	1400	3.8
Finland	1138	3.1
France	1186	3.2
Georgia	1501	4.1
Germany	1487	4.1
Great Britain	1689	4.6
Hungary	1000	2.7
Iceland	1322	3.6
Israel	1248	3.4
Japan	1611	4.4
Korea	1051	2.9
Latvia	1002	2.7
Lithuania	1006	2.8
New Zealand	1350	3.7
Norway	1260	3.4
Philippines	1200	3.3
Slovakia	1150	3.1
Slovenia	1024	2.8
Spain	1834	5.0
Sweden	1140	3.1
Switzerland	1066	2.9
Taiwan	1475	4.0
Thailand	1563	4.3
United States	1390	3.8
Venezuela	1045	2.9
Total	36546	100.0

health, police and law enforcement, education, and culture and the arts. The respondents could choose from the following answers: spend much more, spend more, spend the same as now, spend less, spend much less. The table below shows the relations between the Human Wellbeing Index and the

Table 3. Opinions *Government should spend money on health* by country

		Government should spend money on health				
		Spend much more	Spend more	Spend the same as now	Spend less	Spend much less
Chile	Count	688	558	87	31	9
	%	50.1%	40.6%	6.3%	2.3%	0.7%
Croatia	Count	323	846	489	195	35
	%	17.1%	44.8%	25.9%	10.3%	1.9%
Czech Republic	Count	405	471	113	25	7
	%	39.7%	46.1%	11.1%	2.4%	0.7%
Denmark	Count	306	660	366	43	7
	%	22.1%	47.8%	26.5%	3.1%	0.5%
Finland	Count	279	533	263	22	6
	%	25.3%	48.3%	23.8%	2.0%	0.5%
France	Count	236	512	380	31	6
	%	20.3%	43.9%	32.6%	2.7%	0.5%
Georgia	Count	304	574	480	85	9
	%	20.9%	39.5%	33.1%	5.9%	0.6%
Germany	Count	845	497	92	7	0
	%	58.6%	34.5%	6.4%	0.5%	0.0%
Great Britain	Count	490	754	377	24	7
	%	29.7%	45.6%	22.8%	1.5%	0.4%
Hungary	Count	682	265	38	4	2
	%	68.8%	26.7%	3.8%	0.4%	0.2%
Iceland	Count	644	576	80	6	3
	%	49.2%	44.0%	6.1%	0.5%	0.2%
Israel	Count	599	437	171	18	1
	%	48.9%	35.6%	13.9%	1.5%	0.1%
Japan	Count	333	467	520	92	45
	%	22.9%	32.1%	35.7%	6.3%	3.1%
Korea	Count	197	500	312	26	7
	%	18.9%	48.0%	29.9%	2.5%	0.7%
Latvia	Count	340	549	76	9	6
	%	34.7%	56.0%	7.8%	0.9%	0.6%
Lithuania	Count	311	491	179	13	3
	%	31.2%	49.2%	18.0%	1.3%	0.3%
New Zealand	Count	399	718	211	5	2
	%	29.9%	53.8%	15.8%	0.4%	0.1%
Norway	Count	247	678	292	22	4
	%	19.9%	54.5%	23.5%	1.8%	0.3%
Philippines	Count	525	599	53	20	2
	%	43.8%	50.0%	4.4%	1.7%	0.2%
Slovakia	Count	448	498	152	35	4
	%	39.4%	43.8%	13.4%	3.1%	0.4%
Slovenia	Count	302	492	195	17	5
	%	29.9%	48.7%	19.3%	1.7%	0.5%
Spain	Count	717	891	174	16	6
	%	39.7%	49.4%	9.6%	0.9%	0.3%
Sweden	Count	379	569	162	4	3
	%	33.9%	50.9%	14.5%	0.4%	0.3%
Switzerland	Count	118	358	461	81	13
	%	11.4%	34.7%	44.7%	7.9%	1.3%
Taiwan	Count	687	522	172	23	15
	%	48.4%	36.8%	12.1%	1.6%	1.1%
Thailand	Count	486	816	201	9	0
	%	32.1%	54.0%	13.3%	0.6%	0.0%
United States	Count	240	681	309	112	26
	%	17.5%	49.8%	22.6%	8.2%	1.9%
Venezuela	Count	566	384	74	19	2
	%	54.2%	36.7%	7.1%	1.8%	0.2%
Total	Count	12096	15896	6479	994	235
	%	33.9%	44.5%	18.1%	2.8%	0.7%

corresponding indicators in the ISSP Role of Government V database. As already mentioned, the HWI contains 10 components while the ISSP Role of Government V only 5, including the *environment* indicator, which is not a variable of the social pillar, but rather belongs to the environmental pillar of sustainable development. It seems, however, that it cannot be ignored in the analyses.

How should we interpret these indicators? The opinion that government should finance a given area in one way or another, reflects the respondents' attitude towards this area. So if respondents express the view that a given aspect should receive more financing, this shows their positive attitude towards it. In particular, the declaration *spend much more* is of great importance, as the respondents must be aware that increased expenditure may require a tax increase, and so affect them directly.

The ISSP Role of Government V survey was conducted on a sample of 36,546 people from 28 countries across the world. The sample structure by country is shown in the table 2.

Results

The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (1992) in Principle I states that: *Human beings are at the center of concerns for sustainable development. They are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature.* The essence of this element is the length of a (healthy) life, and this in turn requires expenditure.

The view that government spending on health should be substantially increased was most often expressed by inhabitants of Hungary (68.8%), Germany (58.6%), Venezuela (54.2%), Chile (50.1%), Iceland (49.2%), Israel (48.9%) and Taiwan (48.4%). On the other hand, residents of Switzerland (11.4%), the USA (17.5%), Croatia (17.1%), and Korea (18.9%) were the least likely to express this opinion. Surprisingly enough, rich countries can be found both in the group that favours higher spending on health and in the group that believes that such spending is not necessary (e.g. Germany, Taiwan, Israel vs. Switzerland, the USA, Korea). Hence, economic development is not a factor that accounts for the observed relationships. These could perhaps be explained by the nature of the health care system in those countries.

A subjective indicator of the HWI component that has been called *peace and order* is the opinion about government spending on police and law enforcement. This opinion can also be interpreted as the belief that it is necessary to provide more protection against violence and crime. Residents of Great Britain (27.9%), Venezuela (27.2%), Germany (24.2%), Sweden (25.7%), Iceland (25.3%), and Korea (23.2%) would like to see a significant increase in spending on police and law enforcement. This can be

explained by the complicated international or internal situation in those countries (Korea and Venezuela), but most of all by the problems connected with large numbers of unwanted immigrants or refugees. Not so long ago, countries such as Great Britain, Germany, Sweden, or Iceland seemed to be oases of security. This sense of security has now significantly decreased, as the data show. By contrast, in the US, a country with a very liberal policy on gun possession, the discussed indicator stands at only approx. 10.9%. The lowest percentage of the indicator which shows lack of security is noted in Japan and Switzerland (4.5% and 4.8% respectively), where the problem of unwanted immigrants or refugees practically does not exist.

As R. Presscott-Allen states, *knowledge helps people to lead more fulfilling and satisfying lives, deepening their understanding and enjoyment of the world and equipping them with the information and skills required to live well and sustainably* (Prescott-Allen, 2001, p. 36). In the absence of better empirically available tools, education (most often, the length and availability of education) usually serves as an indicator of *knowledge*.

The view that government spending on education should be significantly increased was most often expressed by residents of Germany (61%), Taiwan (57.6%), Venezuela (54.9%), Israel (54.6%), and the Philippines (50.4%); whereas residents of France (13.6%), Denmark (15%), Finland (16.6%), Sweden (18.1%) and Switzerland (18.4%) were the least likely to express this view. The presence of countries such as Venezuela or the Philippines in the first group can be easily explained, but it is much harder to understand why inhabitants of Germany or Taiwan would like to see more government spending on education. On the other hand, the make-up of the second group is not surprising, as it includes countries where much money is spent on education and education level is generally high.

Several important organizations (e.g. UNESCO and the Council of Europe) have recently recognized culture as an important aspect of sustainable development. However, there is an ongoing debate on what indicators should be used for culture treated as an element of the social aspect of sustainable development (Dessein et al., 2015).

The need to increase government spending on culture and the arts is most often noticed by Germans (30%), as well as the Taiwanese (21.6%) and Venezuelans (22.4%) while Danes (2.4%), Finns (2.9%), the French (2.1%), inhabitants of New Zealand (2.7%), Norway (2.7%) and Sweden (3%) rarely express this need. Just as it was the case with spending on education, it is not surprising that those living in rich countries, where culture and the arts are generously financed, do not see the need to significantly raise government spending for this purpose. What is interesting, however, is a high percentage of Ger-

Table 4. Opinions *Government should spend money on police and law enforcement* by country

		Government should spend money on police and law enforcement					
		Spend much more	Spend more	Spend the same as now	Spend less	Spend much less	
Country	Chile	Count	156	486	489	173	46
		%	11.6%	36.0%	36.2%	12.8%	3.4%
	Croatia	Count	286	861	555	147	26
		%	15.3%	45.9%	29.6%	7.8%	1.4%
	Czech Republic	Count	100	350	386	132	50
		%	9.8%	34.4%	37.9%	13.0%	4.9%
	Denmark	Count	143	456	655	103	17
		%	10.4%	33.2%	47.7%	7.5%	1.2%
	Finland	Count	163	441	440	38	14
		%	14.9%	40.2%	40.1%	3.5%	1.3%
	France	Count	174	540	406	30	8
		%	15.0%	46.6%	35.1%	2.6%	0.7%
	Georgia	Count	166	454	692	94	23
		%	11.6%	31.8%	48.4%	6.6%	1.6%
	Germany	Count	335	412	515	96	26
		%	24.2%	29.8%	37.2%	6.9%	1.9%
	Great Britain	Count	460	802	347	36	5
		%	27.9%	48.6%	21.0%	2.2%	0.3%
	Hungary	Count	136	287	395	92	52
		%	14.1%	29.8%	41.1%	9.6%	5.4%
	Iceland	Count	327	707	242	13	6
		%	25.3%	54.6%	18.7%	1.0%	0.5%
	Israel	Count	254	443	406	83	26
		%	21.0%	36.6%	33.5%	6.8%	2.1%
	Japan	Count	61	165	902	159	60
		%	4.5%	12.2%	67.0%	11.8%	4.5%
	Korea	Count	242	453	323	20	4
		%	23.2%	43.5%	31.0%	1.9%	0.4%
	Latvia	Count	71	423	369	80	16
		%	7.4%	44.1%	38.5%	8.3%	1.7%
	Lithuania	Count	116	391	412	48	15
		%	11.8%	39.8%	42.0%	4.9%	1.5%
	New Zealand	Count	219	595	458	27	10
		%	16.7%	45.5%	35.0%	2.1%	0.8%
	Norway	Count	151	574	472	34	7
		%	12.2%	46.4%	38.1%	2.7%	0.6%
	Philippines	Count	255	648	211	68	11
		%	21.4%	54.3%	17.7%	5.7%	0.9%
	Slovakia	Count	71	270	551	188	37
		%	6.4%	24.2%	49.3%	16.8%	3.3%
	Slovenia	Count	161	518	281	24	10
		%	16.2%	52.1%	28.3%	2.4%	1.0%
	Spain	Count	223	695	718	103	21
		%	12.7%	39.5%	40.8%	5.9%	1.2%
	Sweden	Count	285	551	255	15	5
		%	25.7%	49.6%	23.0%	1.4%	0.5%
	Switzerland	Count	50	291	606	81	7
		%	4.8%	28.1%	58.6%	7.8%	0.7%
	Taiwan	Count	138	257	620	230	75
		%	10.5%	19.5%	47.0%	17.4%	5.7%
	Thailand	Count	218	692	552	32	7
		%	14.5%	46.1%	36.8%	2.1%	0.5%
	United States	Count	150	545	537	117	21
		%	10.9%	39.8%	39.2%	8.5%	1.5%
	Venezuela	Count	283	351	255	124	29
		%	27.2%	33.7%	24.5%	11.9%	2.8%
Total		Count	5394	13658	13050	2387	634
		%	15.4%	38.9%	37.2%	6.8%	1.8%

Table 5. Opinions *Government should spend money on education* by country

	Country		Government should spend money on education				
			Spend much more	Spend more	Spend the same as now	Spend less	Spend much less
	Chile	Count	547	635	136	40	7
		%	40.1%	46.5%	10.0%	2.9%	0.5%
	Croatia	Count	429	843	427	148	30
		%	22.9%	44.9%	22.7%	7.9%	1.6%
	Czech Republic	Count	427	485	89	17	4
		%	41.8%	47.5%	8.7%	1.7%	0.4%
	Denmark	Count	207	516	576	70	9
		%	15.0%	37.4%	41.8%	5.1%	0.7%
	Finland	Count	183	415	456	42	4
		%	16.6%	37.7%	41.5%	3.8%	0.4%
	France	Count	157	477	485	34	3
		%	13.6%	41.3%	42.0%	2.9%	0.3%
	Georgia	Count	300	496	541	91	10
		%	20.9%	34.5%	37.6%	6.3%	0.7%
	Germany	Count	880	449	104	9	0
		%	61.0%	31.1%	7.2%	0.6%	0.0%
	Great Britain	Count	763	682	185	10	6
		%	46.4%	41.4%	11.2%	0.6%	0.4%
	Hungary	Count	372	430	170	7	3
		%	37.9%	43.8%	17.3%	0.7%	0.3%
	Iceland	Count	334	623	297	26	7
		%	26.0%	48.4%	23.1%	2.0%	0.5%
	Israel	Count	666	387	153	13	1
		%	54.6%	31.7%	12.5%	1.1%	0.1%
	Japan	Count	355	487	545	40	18
		%	24.6%	33.7%	37.7%	2.8%	1.2%
	Korea	Count	185	406	371	65	11
		%	17.8%	39.1%	35.7%	6.3%	1.1%
	Latvia	Count	253	557	152	16	3
		%	25.8%	56.8%	15.5%	1.6%	0.3%
	Lithuania	Count	195	431	314	37	7
		%	19.8%	43.8%	31.9%	3.8%	0.7%
	New Zealand	Count	362	651	301	12	2
		%	27.3%	49.0%	22.7%	0.9%	0.2%
	Norway	Count	130	556	518	27	4
		%	10.5%	45.0%	41.9%	2.2%	0.3%
	Philippines	Count	604	522	57	15	0
		%	50.4%	43.6%	4.8%	1.3%	0.0%
	Slovakia	Count	287	502	301	39	3
		%	25.4%	44.3%	26.6%	3.4%	0.3%
	Slovenia	Count	229	444	306	20	4
		%	22.8%	44.3%	30.5%	2.0%	0.4%
	Spain	Count	762	843	169	12	7
		%	42.5%	47.0%	9.4%	0.7%	0.4%
	Sweden	Count	200	536	351	13	5
		%	18.1%	48.5%	31.8%	1.2%	0.5%
	Switzerland	Count	192	483	350	17	1
		%	18.4%	46.3%	33.6%	1.6%	0.1%
	Taiwan	Count	819	445	126	19	14
		%	57.6%	31.3%	8.9%	1.3%	1.0%
	Thailand	Count	329	748	402	22	3
		%	21.9%	49.7%	26.7%	1.5%	0.2%
	United States	Count	427	650	243	39	14
		%	31.1%	47.3%	17.7%	2.8%	1.0%
	Venezuela	Count	574	350	93	25	3
		%	54.9%	33.5%	8.9%	2.4%	0.3%
Total		Count	12096	11168	15049	8218	925
		%	33.9%	31.4%	42.3%	23.1%	2.6%

Table 6. Opinions Government should spend money on culture and the arts by country

Country		Government should spend money on culture and the arts					
		Count	Spend much more	Spend more	Spend the same as now	Spend less	Spend much less
		%					
Chile	Count	155	475	513	168	26	
	%	11.6%	35.5%	38.4%	12.6%	1.9%	
Croatia	Count	172	636	683	263	57	
	%	9.5%	35.1%	37.7%	14.5%	3.1%	
Czech Republic	Count	125	353	398	103	39	
	%	12.3%	34.7%	39.1%	10.1%	3.8%	
Denmark	Count	33	219	759	255	86	
	%	2.4%	16.2%	56.1%	18.9%	6.4%	
Finland	Count	32	107	364	339	244	
	%	2.9%	9.9%	33.5%	31.2%	22.5%	
France	Count	24	101	440	359	207	
	%	2.1%	8.9%	38.9%	31.7%	18.3%	
Georgia	Count	67	152	611	392	196	
	%	4.7%	10.7%	43.1%	27.6%	13.8%	
Germany	Count	425	454	415	90	34	
	%	30.0%	32.0%	29.3%	6.3%	2.4%	
Great Britain	Count	108	365	766	315	78	
	%	6.6%	22.4%	46.9%	19.3%	4.8%	
Hungary	Count	82	231	469	131	57	
	%	8.5%	23.8%	48.4%	13.5%	5.9%	
Iceland	Count	63	198	502	304	203	
	%	5.0%	15.6%	39.5%	23.9%	16.0%	
Israel	Count	177	299	547	135	33	
	%	14.9%	25.1%	45.9%	11.3%	2.8%	
Japan	Count	96	188	784	165	97	
	%	7.2%	14.1%	58.9%	12.4%	7.3%	
Korea	Count	55	224	619	113	24	
	%	5.3%	21.6%	59.8%	10.9%	2.3%	
Latvia	Count	65	325	459	77	22	
	%	6.9%	34.3%	48.4%	8.1%	2.3%	
Lithuania	Count	67	251	495	97	46	
	%	7.0%	26.3%	51.8%	10.1%	4.8%	
New Zealand	Count	35	146	674	343	115	
	%	2.7%	11.1%	51.3%	26.1%	8.8%	
Norway	Count	33	125	529	367	171	
	%	2.7%	10.2%	43.2%	30.0%	14.0%	
Philippines	Count	194	657	290	52	4	
	%	16.2%	54.9%	24.2%	4.3%	0.3%	
Slovakia	Count	72	318	569	138	27	
	%	6.4%	28.3%	50.6%	12.3%	2.4%	
Slovenia	Count	42	283	514	131	23	
	%	4.2%	28.5%	51.8%	13.2%	2.3%	
Spain	Count	165	547	775	194	39	
	%	9.6%	31.8%	45.1%	11.3%	2.3%	
Sweden	Count	32	129	545	257	119	
	%	3.0%	11.9%	50.4%	23.8%	11.0%	
Switzerland	Count	38	153	568	226	37	
	%	3.7%	15.0%	55.6%	22.1%	3.6%	
Taiwan	Count	296	470	536	49	17	
	%	21.6%	34.4%	39.2%	3.6%	1.2%	
Thailand	Count	30	159	588	455	236	
	%	2.0%	10.8%	40.1%	31.0%	16.1%	
United States	Count	39	254	653	328	84	
	%	2.9%	18.7%	48.1%	24.2%	6.2%	
Venezuela	Count	232	319	405	74	7	
	%	22.4%	30.8%	39.1%	7.1%	0.7%	
Total	Count	2954	8138	15470	5920	2328	
	%	8.5%	23.4%	44.4%	17.0%	6.7%	

Table 7. Opinions *Government should spend money on environment* by country

Country			Government should spend money on environment					Variable of highest beta (p< 0.05)
			Spend much more	Spend more	Spend the same as now	Spend less	Spend much less	
			Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	
Chile	Count	216	639	391	97	9		
	%	16.0%	47.3%	28.9%	7.2%	0.7%	Place of living (+)	
Croatia	Count	355	971	360	160	16		
	%	19.1%	52.1%	19.3%	8.6%	0.9%	Education (-)	
Czech Republic	Count	202	478	279	43	18		
	%	19.8%	46.9%	27.4%	4.2%	1.8%	Place of living (+)	
Denmark	Count	96	397	743	100	26		
	%	7.0%	29.1%	54.6%	7.3%	1.9%	Job status (+)	
Finland	Count	193	309	481	83	27		
	%	17.7%	28.3%	44.0%	7.6%	2.5%	Education (-)	
France	Count	94	327	576	110	25		
	%	8.3%	28.9%	50.9%	9.7%	2.2%	Job status (+)	
Georgia	Count	177	405	619	185	39		
	%	12.4%	28.4%	43.4%	13.0%	2.7%	Education (-)	
Germany	Count	525	497	281	82	13		
	%	37.6%	35.6%	20.1%	5.9%	0.9%	Place of living (+)	
Great Britain	Count	337	643	562	86	15		
	%	20.5%	39.1%	34.2%	5.2%	0.9%	Job status (+)	
Hungary	Count	188	393	368	20	7		
	%	19.3%	40.3%	37.7%	2.0%	0.7%	Place of living (+)	
Iceland	Count	192	528	460	70	18		
	%	15.1%	41.6%	36.3%	5.5%	1.4%	Job status (+)	
Israel	Count	220	466	416	71	16		
	%	18.5%	39.2%	35.0%	6.0%	1.3%	Age (-)	
Japan	Count	234	417	647	52	28		
	%	17.0%	30.3%	47.0%	3.8%	2.0%	Education (-)	
Korea	Count	148	509	334	36	11		
	%	14.3%	49.0%	32.2%	3.5%	1.1%	Education (-)	
Latvia	Count	42	245	512	95	29		
	%	4.6%	26.5%	55.5%	10.3%	3.1%	Place of living (+)	
Lithuania	Count	69	237	520	120	14		
	%	7.2%	24.7%	54.2%	12.5%	1.5%	Place of living (+)	
New Zealand	Count	184	446	604	59	6		
	%	14.2%	34.3%	46.5%	4.5%	0.5%	Education (-)	
Norway	Count	123	376	554	125	43		
	%	10.1%	30.8%	45.4%	10.2%	3.5%	Education (-)	
Philippines	Count	230	676	171	97	19		
	%	19.3%	56.7%	14.3%	8.1%	1.6%	Job status (+)	
Slovakia	Count	172	476	425	43	10		
	%	15.3%	42.3%	37.7%	3.8%	0.9%	Place of living (+)	
Slovenia	Count	111	500	355	27	6		
	%	11.1%	50.1%	35.5%	2.7%	0.6%	Job status (+)	
Spain	Count	238	709	597	144	13		
	%	14.0%	41.7%	35.1%	8.5%	0.8%	Job status (+)	
Sweden	Count	179	331	496	72	23		
	%	16.3%	30.1%	45.0%	6.5%	2.1%	Education (-)	
Switzerland	Count	143	392	424	56	11		
	%	13.9%	38.2%	41.3%	5.5%	1.1%	Place of living (+)	
Taiwan	Count	337	537	358	112	20		
	%	24.7%	39.4%	26.2%	8.2%	1.5%	Place of living (+)	
Thailand	Count	118	490	737	103	13		
	%	8.1%	33.5%	50.4%	7.0%	0.9%	Education (-)	
United States	Count	146	508	510	172	32		
	%	10.7%	37.1%	37.3%	12.6%	2.3%	Age (+)	
Venezuela	Count	200	391	309	102	28		
	%	19.4%	38.0%	30.0%	9.9%	2.7%	Job status (+)	
Total	Count	5469	13293	13089	2522	535		
	%	15.7%	38.1%	37.5%	7.2%	1.5%		

Table 8. Opinions *Government should spend much more money on...*

	Responses	
	N	Percent
Government should spend money on environment	5469	14.7%
Government should spend money on health	12096	32.6%
Government should spend money on police and law enforcement	5394	14.5%
Government should spend money on education	11168	30.1%
Government should spend money on culture and arts	2954	8.0%
Total	37081	100.0%

mans and the Taiwanese who would like to see a substantial increase in expenditure on culture and the arts.

When analysing the data from the ISSP Role of Government V module, we cannot ignore opinions regarding government spending on environment. In this case, the table analysis is supplemented with the categorical regression (CATREG), where the dependent variable is the opinion on how much government should spend on environmental protection, while the independent variables include sex, age, size of the place of living, job status, education and subjective assessment of one's own social status. The table also includes columns with regression adjusted R square and the dependent variable of highest beta (unstandardised coefficient). This last column shows the names of independent variables that have the strongest influence (variable of highest beta)¹.

It turns out that pro-ecological attitude towards the natural environment is mostly dependent on size of the place of living, education and job status (8-9 indications each). Respondents who live in large urban centres, are well-educated and professionally active display stronger pro-ecological attitudes.

Strong pro-ecological attitude (reflected in the opinion that government spending on the environment should be significantly increased even if it involves raising taxes) was most often expressed by Germans (37.6%), the Taiwanese (24.7%), and the British (20.5%). This indicator was also high in Croatia, the Czech Republic, Finland, Hungary, Israel, the Philippines and Venezuela (approx. 19%). The lowest values were recorded in Latvia (4.6%), Lithuania (7.2%), and Denmark (7%).

Conclusions

The table 8 shows the frequency of responses *government should spend much more money on* for each

analysed element of the social pillar of sustainable development. What conclusions can be drawn from this? Health and education seem to be the most important elements of this pillar (30-33% on average). Security (police and law enforcement) is less important (approx. 15% on average), but still more important than culture and the arts (the average of 8%). The natural environment belongs to a different pillar of sustainable development, yet it is believed to be as important as security (the average of approx. 15%). Generally speaking, those elements of sustainable development that seem to be more closely related to the lives of most people (health, education) are more important for them than the ones that are as if further away from their life experiences (security, environment, and above all culture and the arts). These conclusions refer to the entire population surveyed and could illustrate some *general trend*. However, as shown in the tables, there are many differences (up to several dozen percent) between individual countries.

The article focuses on the analysis of the indicator represented by the *spend much more money* responses. The same dataset could be used to carry out an equally interesting analysis based on the *spend less* and *spend much less* responses (combined together, given a small number of answers in this category). It would also be worthwhile to compare the results of analyses based on indicators of opinions about government spending with the corresponding indicators based on other data.

References

1. ASH N. (ed.), 2005, *Ecosystems and human well-being: current state and trends*, Island Press, Washington D.C.
2. BORYS T., 2005, *Wskaźniki zrównoważonego rozwoju*, Wydawnictwo Ekonomia i Środowisko, Warszawa-Białystok.

¹ The plus or minus sign next to the variable indicates its direction, e.g. education (-) should be interpreted in the following way: the higher the level of education, the more respondents express the view that spending on environment should be increased. We must bear in mind the increasing rank of *negative* responses: '1' means that government should spend much more on the environment, while '5' signifies that government should spend much less on the environment. It may be justifiable to ask

whether the variable describing job status can be assigned direction, as in fact it does not have one. However, the value of this variable ranked as 1 means *in paid work* (over 50% of indications), while the remaining (higher) ranks refer to different ways of functioning outside the labour market. This makes it possible to determine the direction of this variable that by default is dichotomous (*in paid work vs. other occupational status*).

3. CARPENTER S.R., PINGALI P.L., BENNETT E.M., ZUREK M.B. (eds.), 2005, *Ecosystems and human well-being scenarios*, Island Press, Washington, D.C.
4. DESSEIN J., SOINI K., FAIRCLOUGH G., HORLINGS L. (eds.), 2015, *Culture in, for and as Sustainable Development*, Conclusions from the COST Action IS1007 Investigating Cultural Sustainability, University of Jyväskylä, Finland.
5. HARRIS J.M., WISE T.A. GALLA-GHER K.P., GOODWIN N.R. (eds.), 2001, *A Survey of Sustainable Development, Social and Economic Dimensions*, Island Press, Washington, Covelo, London.
6. HOLMBERG J., 1992, *Making Development Sustainable: Redefining Institutions*, Policy and Economics, Island Press, Washington.
7. KOKIĆ ARSIĆ A., M. MIŠIĆ, M. RADOJKOVIĆ, B. PRLINČEVIĆ, 2016, *Social Aspects of Sustainable Development of Enterprises*, International Conference on Quality of Life, Center for Quality, Faculty of Engineering, University of Kragujevac, p. 85.
8. LEHTONEN M., 2004, The environmental-social interface of sustainable development: capabilities, social capital, institutions, in: *Ecol. Economics*, 49(2).
9. PRESCOTT-ALLEN R., 2001, *The Wellbeing of Nations. A Country-by-Country Index of Quality of Life and the Environment*, Island Press, Washington, Covelo, London, p. 13-14.
10. REED D. (ed.), 1997, *Structural Adjustment, The Environment and Sustainable Development*, Earthscan, London.