

Fairness Motivations and Tradeoffs Underlying
Public Support for Government Environmental Spending
in Nine Nations

Kenneth A. Rasinski and Tom W. Smith,

National Opinion Research Center

Sara Zuckerbraun

The University of Chicago

August 26, 1994

GSS Crossnational Report No. 15

Publication Notes: A revised version of this paper was published in *Journal of Social Issues*, 50 (1994), 179-197.

Running head: Support for Environmental Spending

Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Kenneth A. Rasinski, NORC, The University of Chicago, 1155 E. 60th Street, Chicago, IL 60637

Abstract

Public support for government spending on the environment in nine countries was assessed by examining responses to surveys conducted in each of these countries as part of the International Social Survey Program. Both absolute and relative levels of

support were assessed. Aggregate level analysis showed considerable variability across countries. Within countries, the young and more educated were more supportive of environmental spending, even at the expense of other social programs. Prosocialist values were associated with higher levels of support for environmental spending, while probusiness and government social responsibility values were associated with less support. However, those endorsing both prosocialist and government responsibility values were less likely to endorse spending on the environment at the expense of other social programs. The linkage of resource distributions tradeoffs to values supports a psychological model of public opinion about the environment based on distributive fairness considerations.

A number of recent events have helped to create worldwide public concern about the preservation, protection, and restoration of the environment. In the wake of the Chernobyl nuclear reactor crisis, the Exxon Valdez oil spill, the oil fires in Kuwait, and other events, local, national, and international environmental policies have been proposed. While one might hope that these policies would be generally accepted because of their potential to provide long-term benefits for everyone through a better environment, that has not been the case. As with other complex social problems, there are no simple solutions to the environmental challenges that face our world.

A review of the literature suggests three models of public support for public policy, models that can also be applied to support for the environment. The first model, issue saliency, is based on the idea that public sympathies can be evoked through the media. A second model, rational self-interest, is based on the common-sense notion that policy support is directly related to that which will directly benefit the individual. A third model suggests that one's policy support is consistent with one's values, that is, with one's sense of what government ought to be doing and what concerns ought to be addressed.

Traditionally, these three models of support for public policy have been tested by considering policies in isolation. However, our observation of environmental support suggests that it may be useful to consider the tradeoffs that people make in their support for different government policies. We have noticed that often opposition to environmentalism comes from those who believe that other interests may suffer. A self-interested example concerns policies that protect the spotted owl threaten the logging industry. These policies are opposed by those whose livelihoods depend on that industry. More generally however, it may be the case that those who support government funding of health, education, unemployment, and housing will oppose government-funded environmental policies if they believe that public funds will be diverted from these other programs to the environment. In the spirit of the theme for this special issue, some members of the public may think that such a tradeoff is just not fair.

Psychological Models of Support for the Environment

Past studies of support for the environment have explored a number of psychological determinants. As we mentioned, the literature suggests three models used by researchers to understand public support for spending on the environment; (1) a model based on issue salience, (2) a model based on rationality or self-interest, and (3) one based on values. We discuss a fourth model, heretofore not considered. The fourth model is based on fairness concerns.

Issue Salience

One model of public support for the environment suggests that environmental concerns rise and fall on the public agenda depending on the current salience of the topic (Iyengar & Kinder, 1987). This model is derived from a number of studies in psychology showing the importance of salience and memorability in determining judgments (Nisbett & Ross, 1980). The saliency model predicts that public opinion is responsive to publicity surrounding dramatic environmental events. For example, survey research from Britain suggests that environmental support was highest immediately after the Chernobyl and Exxon Valdez disasters (Norris, 1992). This result challenges other models that posit a more complex psychological approach to understanding public support of environmental policy.

Rationality/Self-Interest

A second model of public opinion about the environment posits that rationality, the economists' term for the pursuit of one's own interests, is a determinant of environmental support. Our earlier example, that suggests that opposition to policies to protect the environment are driven by a fear of personal loss, illustrates this view. Support for the rationality model is based mostly on aggregate analysis of public opinion data from the United States. Aggregate-level analysis of time-series data in the U.S. shows substantial, and in some cases increasing, support for environmental regulation (Gillroy & Shapiro, 1986; Page & Shapiro, 1992), presumably because of the recognition that environmental abuse has a direct and negative impact on one's health and quality of life (Page & Shapiro, 1992).

Questions that probe about choices between the high cost of environmental programs and regulation, high energy prices, high taxes, and unemployment suggest that environmental support in the U.S. is resistant to these other forces. Policies that would improve the economy and energy resources, yet be environmentally damaging (i.e. nuclear energy and coal) have not been supported (Rosenbaum, 1985). The implication from this aggregate-level analysis is that people do not see the personal and immediate gain they might enjoy from an improved environment as something they can trade off with more abstract concerns, such as high energy prices or tough economic conditions (Ladd, 1982; Mitchell, 1980; Keeter, 1984). However, investigations of individual-level public opinion data show much weaker evidence of rationality. This is the case in studies of public opinion on many issues,

including environmental support (Kinder & Sears, 1981; Sears, Tyler, Citrin, & Kinder 1978).

Values

Underlying the values model of understanding support for the environment is the notion that values reflect a shared cultural milieu. Investigations of the value perspective have found that political culture shapes individual values, which, in turn, affect public support for social policy. For example, Canadians are more supportive of state intervention and are less individualistic than Americans (Pross, 1975; Lipset, 1985; Steger, Pierce, Steel, & Lovrich, 1989). Public opinion in countries with a socialist or social democratic government favors a full gamut of social spending, directed to a comprehensive welfare state and income equalization. In contrast, liberal/capitalist countries are more likely to see the welfare state as a limited safety net, complain of high taxes, and favor equality of opportunity and education, as opposed to equality of income (Smith, 1990). By the same token, support for the environment has been shown to be related to liberal values of individual citizens within nations (Skrentny, 1994)

In general, socialist or social democratic societies favor a more comprehensive, government-initiated approach to environmental protection, while capitalist societies are less eager for government environmental protection. However, the Japanese are an exception. Despite having a capitalist culture similar to the U.S., Japan has long viewed the relationship between humans and nature as one of unity and harmonious coexistence (Steger, Pierce, Steel, & Lovrich, 1989, p. 236), and the Japanese public support government protection of the environment to a greater degree than is found in the U.S. (Lovrich, Pierce, Tsurutani, & Abe, T., 1986).

While values may vary from country to country, common value structures, or sets of related values, have been found across countries (Davidson & Thomson, 1980; Zavalloni, 1980). A theory positing a common value structure across countries is the materialist/post-materialist distinction developed by Inglehart (1977). This model has often been called a "cohort" model of public opinion because, according to this view, materialist values, emphasizing economic well-being and a strong military, emerge among age cohorts whose developmentally formative experiences occur during periods of economic hardship. Similarly, post-materialist values, emphasizing political participation, tolerance of minority opinions, quality of life issues, and environmental protection emerge among age-cohorts whose formative experiences occur during periods of economic prosperity (Boenau & Niuro, 1983).

According to the Inglehart model, environmental concern within nations will be higher among the young, who have grown up in times of relative prosperity and are likely to have inculcated postmaterialist values. This view has been supported by some studies (Buttel & Flinn, 1974, 1978b, Lowe & Pinhey, 1982;

Skrentny, 1994), while other studies have challenged or modified this view, finding that age was unrelated to environmental concern (Buttel & Flinn, 1976, 1978a; Van Liere & Dunlap, 1980; Samdahl & Robertson, 1989).

Fairness

A fourth model, that has not been considered in research on public opinion about environmental policies, is based on the notion that citizens are responsive to concerns about fairness when they consider public policy (Rasinski, 1987; Rasinski & Scott, 1990; Tyler, Rasinski, & McGraw, 1985; Tyler, Rasinski, & Griffin, 1986). We argue that a fairness-based model is particularly relevant to apply to understanding support for the environment in a tradeoff context.

Our review of other past research studying support for the environment indicates that it has not adequately examined public support for the environment compared to support for other concerns. For example, a recent study using some of the data reported in this research examined determinants of responses to a survey item asking respondents in five countries (including the U.S.) whether their government should spend more on the environment (Skrentny, 1994). Although, the respondent's general proclivity for supporting government spending was included in the analysis, the analysis did not take into account the respondent's support for the environment relative to their support for other social programs. To address relative support for the environment compared to support for other social concerns it seems natural to apply a fairness model.

A theoretical basis for expecting fairness concerns to affect relative support for environmental policy comes from the social psychological literature on distributive justice (Deutsch, 1975; Rasinski, 1987; Rasinski & Scott, 1990). Theory presented by Deutsch (1975) points out the importance of social goals in defining distributive justice. Further research has shown that social goals are internalized by individual citizens' as social values, and that these values determine public response to distributive policy (Rasinski, 1987). While fairness-related social values vary across countries, they have been found to determine citizens' responses to government allocation policies within countries (Rasinski & Scott, 1990).

In this research we focus on the impact of distributive fairness concerns by examining tradeoffs citizens are willing to make for or against government spending on the environment and by examining determinants of those tradeoffs. We emphasize distributive fairness because the questions in our data examine support for government spending on the environment along with support for government spending for a number of other social concerns. This allows us to examine environmental support relative to support for other social programs.

While direct measures of distributive fairness are not available, the surveys contain measures that allow us to assess

support for the environment relative to support for other social issues. Based on prior research (Rasinski, 1987; Rasinski & Scott, 1990) we address the fairness issue by examining whether citizens make principled tradeoffs in their support for government spending on the environment compared to their support for spending for other social concerns. Consistent with the literature on the psychology of fairness judgments, we define principled tradeoffs as those consistent with personal value orientations.

Testability of the Models

In an ideal study we would be able to test critical aspects of each of the theoretical models reviewed in order to decide which is most likely to offer the best explanation of the data on public support of environmental spending. However, we are limited by the existing measures in this unique crossnational public opinion database. Our situation is limited further by the fact that the four models we have presented are not mutually exclusive. That is, evidence for one model does not preclude the operation of factors posited by the others. In fact, it could be that citizens are responsive to factors from each of the hypothesized models -- issue salience, self-interest, shared value structure, and fairness. In light of this, and the absence of measures to test all of the critical components of each of the models, we use the following logic to help us in determining the relative usefulness of each of the models in explaining public support for environmental policy.

First, we will rule out the issue salience model as sufficient to explain public support for environmental policy if values or key demographics, such as age, gender, income or education, are shown to be related to support. Second, we will rule out self-interest as sufficient to explain support if individual values are shown to be related to support independent of demographics. Third, if we find a significant relationship between environmental support and age within a number of the countries, we will take this as evidence for the common value structure model. Fourth, if we find individual values are related to tradeoffs between supporting environmental policies and supporting government spending for other social concerns we will take this as evidence for the fairness-based model.

Method

We examine data from the 1990 International Social Survey Program (ISSP). The ISSP is an international consortium of social scientists who conduct annual probability surveys in their respective nations. The nine nations represented in this research -- Australia, West Germany, Great Britain Northern Ireland, the United States, Hungary, Italy, Norway, and Israel -- were ISSP members when the 1990 data were collected. Since that time, the ISSP has grown to twenty-one nations. Table 1 shows the sample sizes and age ranges of the samples from the nine nations studied in this research.

Insert Table 1 about here

ISSP members work together to develop modules dealing with social issues of mutual concern, include the modules as 15-minute supplements to their regular national surveys, include an extensive common core of background variables, and make the data available to the social science community as soon as possible. Further information about the ISSP can be found in Davis and Smith (1993).

The 1990 ISSP survey contains questions about government spending for a variety of social concerns, including the environment, and also contains a number of questions about the role of government in economic and social affairs. Three categories of survey questions from the 1990 ISSP are used in this research. First, the questions measuring support for government spending on the eight different social policies are used to assess support for government spending on the environment versus support for spending on other issues. Items were scaled such that a high number indicates more support. Second, questions measuring conservative (probusiness) and liberal (prosocialist) values, and questions about the role of government as an agent of social welfare (government social responsibility) are used to assess different value positions. The composite value measures were named PROBUS, PROSOC, and GOVRSP, respectively. The composite variables PROBUS, PROSOC, and GOVRSP were created such that a high score indicates endorsement of the value. For example, high scorers on PROBUS expressed agreement with the probusiness value items and high scorers on PROSOC expressed agreement with the prosocialist value items. Third, questions measuring background and demographic characteristics, to the extent that they have been measured comparably across the countries, are included. Question wordings and response categories are presented in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

A measure of relative support for spending on the environment was created for each respondent by subtracting support for the environment from support for each of the other issues and summing across the differences. A low value on this measure indicates less support for environmental spending than for spending on other concerns. A high value indicates more support for environmental spending than for spending on other concerns.

Results

Aggregate-Level Support for the Environment

Table 3 shows the level of public support for increased government spending on the environment for each of nine nations. Support for increased spending on the environment is compared to spending on health, law enforcement, education, defense, retirement, unemployment benefits, and the arts.

Insert Table 3 about here

Relative to spending for other social concerns increased spending on the environment is high on the public agenda. Across nations, only increased spending for health received more support. However, support for increased spending for education and for retirement were a close third and fourth.

Support for government spending on the environment varies somewhat by country. Compared to the other nations, support for increased spending on the environment was highest in West Germany, Hungary, Italy, and Norway. Support in West Germany was substantially greater than support in the other nations. The four nations highest in support for the environment were also more likely to support government spending for other social concerns.

Tradeoffs

Next we examine the tradeoffs citizens are willing to make for spending on the environment. Table 4 shows the correlations between support for government spending for the environment, on the one hand, and support for government spending on health, education, defense, pensions, unemployment benefits, and the arts, on the other, for each of the nine nations. The results indicate that support for increased spending on the environment is moderately associated with support for increased spending for other social causes, especially health and education. The exception is defense. In every country except Hungary and Israel, citizens are willing to accept decreased spending on defense for increased spending on the environment.

Insert Table 4 about here

The next analysis examines mean level responses to the tradeoffs measure. As we mentioned, a high score on the tradeoffs measure indicates support for government spending on the environment at the expense of other social issues, while a low score indicates support for other issues at the support of the environment.

Insert Table 5 about here

Means for the tradeoff measure across the nine nations are shown in Table 5. 95% confidence intervals are provided to give a rough idea of which countries differ significantly in their willingness to trade off other programs for environmental spending. The results indicate that West Germans are most likely to trade off spending on the environment with spending for other social concerns while the Israelis are least likely to make this tradeoff. Norwegians are second most likely to desire tradeoffs for the environment. The other nations overlap in their preference for the tradeoff, but it appears that the tradeoff is least preferred among the Northern Irish, followed by Great Britain, the United States, Italy, Australia, and Hungary.

Determinants of Support and Tradeoffs

The final analysis examines individual-level determinants of support for government spending on the environment. Both absolute and relative support are considered. Table 6 shows the results of multiple regression analyses of the single item measuring support for spending on the environment in the left column, and of the tradeoff or relatively support measure in the right column. The independent variables included demographic factors and values.

Insert Table 6 about here

For the single support item, age, education and income are each significantly related to support for increased government spending on the environment. Across the nine countries younger respondents, those with more education, and those with higher incomes are more likely to support increased environmental spending. When tradeoffs are the dependent variable, younger respondents, those with more education, and those with higher incomes are also more likely to support environmental spending at the expense of other social programs. For tradeoffs, the gender variable is significant. Men are more likely to support government spending for the environment at the expense of the other social programs while women are more likely to support spending on the other social programs at the expense of the environment.

Respondents expressing probusiness attitudes, in the form of rejecting government control over two very environmentally-related industries (electric and steel), were significantly less likely to endorse increased government spending for the environment. However, the relationship between probusiness attitudes and the tradeoffs measure was not significant, indicating that those with probusiness attitudes were not necessarily rejecting government environmental spending because they believed that resources should be applied toward solutions for the other social problems.

Respondents promoting prosocialist values, primarily concerning the government's role in income equalization, were more likely to support increased government spending on the environment, but were more willing to trade off the environment for other social programs. Respondents who endorsed government responsibility for a number of non-environmental social concerns were less supportive of spending on the environment and were not willing to trade off support for the environment with support for their other concerns.

The analyses reported above included terms (not shown) controlling for mean differences among countries and for the interaction between countries and the three value items. Many of the interaction terms were significant, suggesting substantial differences in support for tradeoffs across countries, and suggesting that the relationship between values and tradeoffs differed from country to country. These differences justify an examination of determinants of tradeoffs within countries.

Table 7 shows the results of the regression analysis of support separately for each country. Results indicate that the effect of age, education, and income on support is consistent across most countries. Either youth or increasing levels of education, or both, significantly predict environmental support in each of the countries. Israel is an exception. In most other countries, greater income means more support for government spending on the environment. In Israel, income is negatively related to environmental support.

Insert Table 7 about here

When values are considered, consistent and fairly widespread effects are found for normative expectations about the government's role in addressing social problems. In seven out of the nine countries (Italy and Israel excepted), those who held the government responsible for contributing to the solution of social problems also thought government should spend more on the environment. This consistency was not found for probusiness and prosocialist values. In two countries (Australia and the United States) those who endorsed probusiness values endorsed greater government spending on the environment. In two other countries, (Germany and Great Britain) the reverse effect was found. Those who endorsed probusiness values endorsed less support for government spending on the environment.

Table 8 shows the results of the regression analysis of tradeoffs separately for each country. An effect of probusiness values on the tradeoff measure was found only in West Germany and Israel. In each of these two countries, probusiness values were associated with a willingness to support government spending on the environment at the expense of other social programs. Prosocialists in Great Britain, the United States, and Israel were not willing to see spending on the environment sacrificed in favor of other social programs, while in Norway prosocialist were willing to sacrifice their concerns about other social programs for their concerns about the environment.

Insert Table 8 about here

The relationship between government responsibility and supporting tradeoffs for the environment was less consistent than the relationship between government responsibility and the single environment items. Government responsibility was associated with tradeoffs only in Hungary, Italy, and Norway. In each of these countries, those who held government responsible for solving other social problems were more likely to accept tradeoffs in terms of support for the environment.

Discussion

While the issue salience and self-interest models were not tested directly, our results suggest that neither is sufficient to explain support for the environment. Both background characteristics and values were significantly related to support

in ways predicted by value-based theories of political attitudes. Second, our results show that it is useful to consider support for environmental policy within the context of tradeoffs with other social issues. Nations differ substantially in the priority they give to the environment relative to other social concerns, and this pattern is different from the pattern of overall support for the environment.

Other research has documented the consistent influence of liberal values and post-materialist values on policy support. This research shows that post-materialist concerns, to the extent that they are reflected by the respondent's age, extend not only to the environment but to supporting the environment at the expense of other social programs. For liberal values the findings were somewhat different depending on whether support or tradeoffs were considered. Government responsibility and prosocialist values were related to support differently, but proponents of both these liberal values were not willing to trade off environmental support for spending on other social programs. Thus, tradeoffs show more ideological consistency than support for environmental spending. Publics are apparently willing to make hard choices consistent with their values.

Our aggregate level results could be interpreted as evidence for the "something for nothing" phenomena documented by Sears and Citrin (1982) who showed evidence of a public that wanted increased government benefits but rejected tax increases. Nations with high levels of support for other social services were also high in support of government spending on the environment. At one level, the individual-level results suggest the same thing. Respondents with liberal government responsibility and prosocialist values, and those likely to be postmaterialist, were most supportive of government spending on the environment. However, the modeling of the tradeoff between the environment and other social programs showed that publics are willing to make the trade consistent with their values. This suggests that, for at least a portion of the world's people, sophisticated and principled fairness-related decisions about the environment are being made.

The notion of fairness-based tradeoffs may help explain debates between those who are supportive of government spending on the environment and those who are not. It is possible that the latter group are not unconcerned about the quality of the environment but that they see other pressing needs and, out of a sense of fairness consistent with their value leanings, support the allocation of scarce resources to the other needs.

References

- Boenau, A. B., & Niuro, K. (1983). *Post-industrial society*. New York: University Press of America.
- Buttel, F.H. & Flinn, W.L. (1974). The structure of support for the environmental movement, 1968-1970. *Rural Sociology*, 39, 1.

- Buttel, F.H. & Flinn, W.L. (1976). Environmental politics: the structuring of partisan and ideological cleavages in mass environmental attitudes. *Sociological Quarterly*, 17, 477-490.
- Buttel, F.H. & Flinn, W.L. (1978a). The politics of environmental concern: the impacts of party identification and political ideology on environmental attitudes. *Environment and Behavior* 10,1.
- Buttel, F.H. & Flinn, W.L. (1978b). Social class and mass environmental beliefs: a reconsideration. *Environment and Behavior* 10,1.
- Davidson, A.R. & Thomson, E. (1980). Cross cultural studies of attitudes and beliefs. In H. C. Triandis & R. W. Brislin. *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology Vol. 5*, Boston: Allyn & Bacon Inc, pp 25-71.
- Davis, J. A. & Smith, T. W. (1993). A proposal to support the International Social Survey Program. Unpublished manuscript. National Opinion Research Center, Chicago.
- Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality, and need: What determines which value will be used as a basis of distributive justice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 31, 137-150.
- Gillroy, J. M. & Shapiro, R. Y. (1986). The polls: Environmental protection. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 50.
- Inglehart, R. (1977). *The silent revolution: Changing values and political styles among western publics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Iyengar, S. & Kinder, D. R. (1987). *News that matters*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Keeter, S. (1984). Problematic pollution polls: validity in the measurement of public opinion on environmental issues. *Political Methodology*, 10.
- Kinder, D. R. & Sears, D.O. (1981). Prejudice and Politics: symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 414-31.
- Ladd, E.C. (1982). Cleaning the air: public opinion and public policy on the environment. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Winter.
- Lipset, S. M. (1985). Canada and the United States: The cultural dimension, in Charles Doran and John Sigler (eds.) *Canada and the United States: Enduring Friendship, Persistent Stress*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lovrich, N. P., Pierce, J. C., Tsurutani, T., & Abe, T. (1986). Gender differences in policy-relevant knowledge holding: A cross national analysis of environmental information levels in the United States and Japan. In Gwen Moore and Glenna Spitze (eds.), *Research in Politics and Society*. Vol 2, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press (pp. 147-180).
- Lowe, G.D. & Pinhey, T.K. (1982). Rural-urban differences in support for environmental protection. *Rural Sociology*, 47,1.
- Mitchell, R. C. (1980). *Public opinion on environmental issues: Results of a national public opinion survey*. Washington, D.C.: Resources for the Future.
- Nisbett, R. E. & Ross. L. (1980). *Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgement*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Norris, P. (1992, September 3-6). Are we all green now? Public opinion towards environmentalism in Britain. Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association.

Page, B. I. & Shapiro, R. Y. (1992). The rational public: 50 years of public opinion research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pross, A. (1975). Pressure groups: Adaptive instruments of political communication. In A.P. Pross (Ed.) Pressure group behaviour in Canadian politics. Canada: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited.

Rasinski, K.A. (1987). What's fair is fair -- or is it: Value differences underlying public views about social justice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 201-211.

Rasinski, K. A., & Scott, L. A. (1990). Culture, values, and beliefs about economic justice. *Social Justice Research*, 4(4).

Rosenbaum, W. A. (1985). Environmental politics and policy. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.

Samdahl, D. M. & Robertson, R. (1989). Social determinants of environmental concern: specification and test of the model. *Environment and Behavior*, 21,1.

Skrentny, J. D. (1994). Concern for the environment: A cross-national perspective. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 5, 335-352.

Sears, D.O., Tyler, T.R., Citrin, T., & Kinder, D.R. (1978). Political system support and public response to the energy crisis. *American Journal of Political Science* 22: 56-82.

Smith, T. W. (1990). Social inequality in cross-national perspective in Becker. In J.W. (Ed.) Attitudes to Inequality and the Role of Government. *International Social Survey Programme*.

Steger, M. E., Pierce, J. C., Steel, B. S. & Lovrich, N. P. (1989). Political culture, postmaterial values, and the new environmental paradigm: A comparative analysis of Canada and the United States. *Political Behavior* 11, 3.

Tyler, T. R., Rasinski, K. A., & Griffin, E. (1986). Alternative images of the citizen: Implications for public policy. *American Psychologist*, 41, 970-978.

Tyler, T. R., Rasinski, K. A., & McGraw, K. (1985). The influence of perceived injustice on the endorsement of political leaders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 700-725.

Van Liere, K.D. & Dunlap, R.E. (1980). The social bases of environmental concern: A review of hypotheses, explanations and empirical evidence. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 44.

Zavalloni, M. (1980). Values. In H. C. Triandis & R. W. Brislin (eds.), *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology Vol.5*. 1980. Boston: Allyn & Bacon Inc, pp. 73-120.

Table 1

Number of cases and age range in each sample

Country	n	Age range in sample
---------	---	------------------------

Australia	2398	18 - 89
West Germany	2812	18 - 92
Great Britain	1163	18 - 83
Northern Ireland	783	18 - 90
United States	1217	18 - 89
Hungary	977	20 - 89
Italy	1000	18 - 75
Norway	1516	16 - 79
Israel	991	20 - 87

Table 2

ISSP items measuring support for government spending, probusiness, prosocialist, and government social responsibility values, and background characteristics

Government Spending Items

Listed below are various areas of government spending. Please indicate 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. (Spend much more (1), Spend the same as now (3) Spend much less (5)).

V33	The environment
V34	Health
V35	The police and law enforcement
V36	Education
V37	The military and defense
V38	Retirement benefits
V39	Unemployment benefits
V40	Culture and the arts

Probusiness Values

What do you think the government's role in each of these industries should be? (1, Own it; 2, Control prices and profits but not own it; 3, Neither own it nor control its prices and profits)

V46	Electric power
V47	The steel industry

Prosocialist Values

V23 Some people think those with high incomes should pay a larger proportion (percentage) of their earnings in taxes than those who earn low incomes. Other people think that those with high incomes and those with low incomes should pay the same proportion (percentage) of their earning in taxes. Do you think those with high incomes should pay a much larger proportion (1), pay a larger proportion (2), pay the same proportion as those who earn low incomes (3), pay a smaller proportion (4), or pay a much smaller proportion

(5)?

V24 What is your opinion of the following statement? It is the responsibility of the government to reduce the differences in income between people with high incomes and those with low incomes (Agree strongly (1), Neither agree or disagree (3), Disagree strongly (5)).

On the whole, do you think it should or should not be the government's responsibility to ...

V55 Reduce income differences between the rich and poor?

V49 Provide a job for everyone who wants one?
(Definitely should be (1), Can't choose (3), Definitely should not be (5))

Government Social Responsibility Values

On the whole, do you think it should or should not be the Government's responsibility to ...

V51 Provide health care for the sick?

V52 Provide a decent standard of living for the old?

V53 Provide industry with the help it needs to grow?

V54 Provide a decent standard of living for the unemployed?

V56 Give financial assistance to college students from low-income families?

V57 Provide decent housing for those who can't afford it?
(Definitely should be (1), Can't choose (3), Definitely should not be (5))

Background Characteristics

V59 Gender
V60 Age
V80 Education
INCOME Income

Table 3

Percent of citizens supporting increased government spending for the environment, health, law enforcement, education, defense, retirement, unemployment benefits, and the arts.

	WEST AUSTRALIA	GREAT GERMANY	NORTHERN BRITAIN	UNITED IRELAND	UNITED STATES	HUNGARY	ITALY	NORWAY
ISRAEL Avg.								
Environment	62.7	88.4	59.2	54.0	56.5	85.2	73.0	70.5
53.0 66.3								
Education	69.2	56.9	77.3	71.1	70.4	86.4	65.0	52.4
80.3 62.9								
Culture/arts	13.0	20.7	11.8	12.6	12.2	62.7	44.4	9.1
34.7 22.1								
Unemployment Benefits	10.1	35.4	34.7	51.4	25.3	46.1	52.2	17.8
29.1 30.2								
Retirement	54.3	53.2	80.1	88.3	45.2	86.4	80.4	68.2
70.7 62.7								

Defense	24.9	4.3	8.2	13.9	12.9	13.6	11.4	3.4
53.5	14.6							
Law								
Enforcement	67.1	41.4	48.3	34.1	52.6	52.9	56.7	59.4
57.4	47.0							
Health	67.1	71.6	88.3	87.8	68.0	94.5	84.4	80.2
79.1	72.1							
Avg.	46.1	46.5	51.0	51.7	42.9	66.0	58.4	45.1
57.2								

Table 4

Correlations between government spending for the environment and government spending for other social concerns in nine nations.

	AUSTRALIA	WEST GERMANY	GREAT BRITAIN	NORTHERN IRELAND	UNITED STATES	HUNGARY	ITALY	NORWAY	
ISRAEL									
Health	.19b	.33b	.24b	.30b	.32b	.44b	.34b	.21b	.30b
Law									
Enforcement	.01	.00	.17b	.17b	.19b	.18b	.15b	.01	.33b
Education	.22b	.30b	.28b	.25b	.30b	.36b	.28b	.24b	.23b
Defense	-.17b	-.25b	-.14b	-.17b	-.16b	-.070	-.09*		
-.22b	.08								
Pensions	.05	.10b	.16b	.17b	.05	.17b	.13b	.09b	.29b
Unemployment									
Benefits	.11b	.22b	.12b	.16b					
-.00	.19b	.13b	.08b	.23b					
Culture/									
arts	.25b	.19b	.19b	.21b	.19b	.29b	.37b	.17b	.41b

*p<.05, bp<.01

Table 5

Support for increased government spending on the environment at the expense of other concerns in nine countries

Country	95% Confidence Bounds			
	Mean	S.D.	Lower	Upper
Australia	3.13	6.58	2.86	3.40
West Germany	8.57	5.17	8.38	8.77
Great Britain	1.75	5.22	1.44	2.05
Northern Ireland	0.78	5.41	0.39	1.16
United States	2.23	6.37	1.86	2.59
Hungary	3.38	5.10	3.05	3.70
Italy	2.65	5.76	2.28	3.01
Norway	4.81	5.54	4.52	5.09
Israel	-0.80	5.67	-1.16	-0.44

Table 6

Regression analysis: Support for government spending on the environment across nine nations

Variable	Support	Tradeoff
GENDER	-.01	-.04**
AGE	-.14**	-.17**
EDUCATION	.06**	.05**
INCOME	.04*	.06**
PROBUS	-.06*	.02
PROSOC	.10**	-.15**
GOVRSP	-.10**	-.07**
R-squared	.26**	.26**

*p<.05, **p<.01

Note: Tabled values are unstandardized partial regression coefficients (beta weights) except where indicated

Table 7

Regression analysis: Support for increased government spending on the environment, separately for nine nations

Variable	AUSTRALIA	WEST GERMANY	GREAT BRITAIN	NORTHERN IRELAND	UNITED STATES	HUNGARY	ITALY	NORWAY	ISRAEL
GENDER	.03	-.02	.02	-.09*	-.08**	.04	-.06	.08**	-.03
AGE	-.30**	-.18**	.04	-.10*	-.14**	.07	-.16**	-.22**	-.01
EDUCATION	.10**	.04	.12**	.09*	.24**	.20**	.04	.14**	-.13**
INCOME	.03	.05*	.17**	.07	-.00	.08*	.08*	.06*	-.29**
PROBUS	.04*	-.05*	-.10**	-.06	.08**	-.04	.05	-.01	-.02
PROSOC	.09**	.12**	-.17**	-.02	-.07*				-.06
GOVRSP	.15**	.20**	.15**	.16**	.14**	.14**	.08	.04*	.02
R-squared	.16**	.12**	.11**	.07**	.10**	.07**	.06**	.11**	.11**

*p<.05, **p<.01

Note: Tabled values are unstandardized partial regression coefficients (beta weights) except where indicated

Table 8

Regression analysis: Tradeoff of support for government spending on the environment with other social problems, separately for nine nations

Variable	AUSTRALIA	WEST GERMANY	GREAT BRITAIN	NORTHERN IRELAND	UNITED STATES	HUNGARY	ITALY	NORWAY	
ISRAEL									
GENDER	-.01	-.04	-.05*	-.14**	-.08**	-.00			
-.11**	.06*	-.06**							
AGE	-.31**	-.23**	-.02	-.14**	-.14**	-.03	-.17**		
-.20**	-.00								
EDUCATION	.13**	.04*	.09**	.08*	.22**	.13**	.02	.13**	.01
INCOME	.07**	.04	.17**	.14**	.03	.08*	.10**	.06*	.01
PROBUS	.03	-.08**	-.03	-.04	.03	-.01	.05		
-.01	-.07**								
PROSOC	.04	.04	-.13**	-.04	-.10**	-.01			
-.03	.13**	-.06*							
GOVRSP	-.03	.02	.02	.01	-.06	-.10**	-.11**		
-.07*	-.04								
R-squared	.15**	.08**	.09**	.10**	.12**	.05**	.09**	.09**	.02**

*p<.05, **p<.01

Note: Tabled values are unstandardized partial regression coefficients (beta weights) except where indicated