

Public Support for Governmental Benefits for the Elderly
Across Countries and Time

Tom W. Smith

National Opinion Research Center/
University of Chicago

December, 2000

This report was prepared for the Organisation for Economic
Co-operation and Development.

Introduction

This report examines two measures of public support for governmental programs to assist the elderly. The first asks about changes in government spending on "retirement benefits." The second inquires about whether it is the government's "responsibility" to "provide a decent standard of living for the old" (See Tables 1 and 2 for full wordings). These items are examined from four perspectives. First, how has support changed over time. Second, how does support differ across countries. Third, how does support for benefits for the elderly compare to support for other governmental spending programs and responsibilities. Fourth, how does support differ across sub-groups (within countries).

The data are drawn from the International Social Survey Program (ISSP). The ISSP has conducted nationally representative samples of adults in a large and growing number of countries annually since 1985. Details are presented in Appendix 1. The items on government benefits for the elderly have been asked as part of the ISSP studies on the Role of Government in 1985, 1990, and 1996. In 1985 six countries were covered (Australia, West Germany, Great Britain, the United States, Austria, and Italy). In 1990 11 countries (or divisions of countries) were included (Australia, East Germany, West Germany, Great Britain,

Northern Ireland, the United States, Hungary, Italy, Ireland, Norway, and Israel). In 1996 25 countries or sub-units were covered (Australia, East Germany, West Germany, Great Britain, the United States, Hungary, Italy, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Poland, Bulgaria, Russia, New Zealand, Canada, the Philippines, Israeli Arabs, Israeli Jews, Japan, Spain, Latvia, France, and Cyprus).

Changes Across Time, 1985-1996

Table 1 shows support for more governmental spending for retirement benefits by country and year. Five countries asked the item in all three years. Three countries showed a net loss of approval over the 11-year span. In Australia 55% backed more spending for retirement benefits in 1985 and 1990, then it fell to 50% in 1996 (for a net change in wanting more spending of -5.4 percentage points: $49.6 - 55.0 = -5.4$). In West Germany and Italy support rose from 1985 to 1990, but then dropped by an even larger margin from 1990 to 1996 for net declines of respectively -2.7 and -7.8 percentage points. Two countries showed net gains in approval of more spending. In Great Britain support rose from 75% in 1985 to 81% in 1990 then fell to 78% (for a net gain of 3.0 percentage points). In the United States support steadily rose from 42% in 1985 to 47% in 1990 to 49% in

1996 (+7.7). Another three countries have trends from 1990 to 1996. Support fell by -3.3 percentage points in Hungary and by -14.8 percentage points in Norway. Approval rose by 3.0 percentage points in Israel.

Table 2 shows that most countries have had declines in endorsing the idea that it was "definitely" the government's responsibility to provide the elderly with a decent standard of living. The sharpest drop was in Australia where support dropped from 62% in 1985 to 37% in 1990 and 1996 (percentage change from 1985 to 1996 of -25.0). The other declines between 1985 and 1996 were much more modest -8.4 in West Germany, -7.8 in Great Britain, -5.4 in Italy, and -4.1 in the United States. Hungary also showed a decline from 1990 to 1996 (-13.9 percentage points), but Norway showed no change and Israel had a small rise (1.0 percentage points).

The trends in the two measures have 1) mostly been small with the exception of three large drops (on spending in Australia from 1985 to 1990 and Norway from 1990 to 1996 and on responsibility in Hungary from 1990 to 1996) and 2) have shown more drops in support than gains. However, the pattern has not been uniform across countries or items with the magnitude and timing of the changes being quite varied.

Differences Across Countries

There is considerable variation in levels of support across countries for both spending and responsibilities (Tables 1-3). Among the six countries in 1985 support for more spending ranged from 75% in Great Britain to 42% in the United States for a range of 32.9 percentage points. For the nine countries in 1990 backing for more spending went from 90% in Northern Ireland to 47% in the United States (range = 43.5). Among the 25 countries in 1996 approval of more spending started at 91% in Latvia and ended at 27% in Canada (range = 64.1). The ranges increased because more countries were drawn into the studies. Among the five countries that asked the item in all three years (Australia, West Germany, Great Britain, Italy, and the United States) the range in support was 43.5 in 1985, 34.5 in 1990, and 34.6 in 1996.

Endorsement of the government having a "definite" responsibility towards providing the elderly with a decent standard of living in 1985 varied from 81% in Italy to 42% in the United States (range = 39.0). In 1990 it ran from 85% in Norway to 37% in Australia (range = 48.2). In 1996 supported ranged from 86% in Russia to 35% in Cyprus (range = 51.0). As with spending, the range grew mostly due to the addition of more countries. Among the five countries covered in each period the

range was 39.0 in 1985, 43.7 in 1990, and 38.2 in 1996.¹

Table 3 shows support for spending and responsibilities with countries ordered from high to low. For spending support is greatest in ex-Socialist countries. In 1996 they occupy the top five spending positions (Latvia, Russia, Hungary, Poland, and Bulgaria). The remaining three ex-Socialist countries (the Czech Republic, East Germany, and Slovenia) are in the middle third and no ex-Socialist country is in the bottom third. By in large the people of ex-Socialist states still favor a strong degree of collectivist welfare. Clustered near the bottom (four of the bottom six) are the colonial off-shoots of Europe in general and Great Britain in particular (New Zealand, Canada, the United States, and Australia). As previous research has indicated, these are pioneer and immigrant societies that place more emphasis on individualism and less on the collective security of the welfare state. Western European welfare democracies run from Great Britain just below the ex-Socialist block at the top, through Ireland, Italy, Spain, and Norway in the middle, to Sweden, West Germany, and France in the bottom third.

The responsibility measure shows a similar pattern, but

¹On responsibilities towards the care of the elderly the variation is mostly between the definite and probable responsible categories. In only the United States in all three years and in the Philippines, Japan, and Arab Israel in 1996 did more than 10% fail to say it was a government responsibility to at least some extent.

less strikingly. Three ex-Socialist countries are in the top third (Russia, Latvia, and Slovenia) and the remaining former Communist societies are in the middle (Bulgaria, Poland, East Germany, the Czech Republic, and Hungary). The immigrant/pioneer societies are either at the very bottom of the middle group (New Zealand) or in the bottom third (Canada, the United States, and Australia). Once again Western European welfare democracies run from Norway, Spain, Ireland, Italy, and Great Britain at the top to Sweden in the middle and France and West Germany in the bottom third (as with spending).

There is a general tendency for countries to consistently rank high, middle, or low on both measures, but there are some notable switches (e.g. Norway 17th on spending and 2nd on responsibilities and the Philippines 7th on spending and 24th on responsibilities). Also, the basic patterns (e.g. ex-Socialist states being high, immigrant/pioneer societies and West Germany being low, and considerable variation among other Western European democracies holds up for the shorter lists of countries in 1985 and 1990.

Support Across Programs

People were asked about government spending programs and responsibilities besides those relating to the elderly. In

addition to retirement benefits the public was asked about spending levels for the environment, health, the police and law enforcement, education, the military and defense, unemployment benefits, and culture and the arts. In 1985 two countries (Great Britain and Italy) placed spending for retirement benefits second among the eight areas, two countries (West Germany and Austria) ranked it third, and two countries (Australia and the United States) placed it fourth (Table 4). In 1990 a similar pattern emerged with retirement benefits being first in one country, second in three countries, third or fourth in three countries, and fifth in two countries. In 1996 retirement benefits were ranked first by one country, second by two countries, third by 12 countries, fourth by seven countries, and fifth by three countries. Thus, across 38 comparisons (i.e. 6 countries in 1985, 7 in 1990, and 25 in 1996) retirement benefits were selected as the most favored program for more spending only once (in Latvia in 1996) and never finished in the bottom three positions. It has been in the top half of spending priorities in 33 of 38 comparisons. The expanding list of countries covered over time showed somewhat less of a top priority for retirement benefits. It was among the top two places for 33% of the countries in 1985 and for 43% in 1990, but only 12% in 1996. Within the same countries the ranking of retirement benefits declined in only a few instances: from third

to fifth in West Germany from 1985 to 1996 and from second in 1985 and 1990 in Great Britain and Italy to third in 1996.

Health tops retirement benefits in 37 of 38 comparisons and has the best average rank across all countries and all years. Education is higher in 23 of 38 comparisons. No other spending program on average ranks ahead of retirement benefits. The environment bests retirement benefits in 13 of 38 comparisons. The police and law enforcement is ranked higher in 12 of 38 comparisons. Unemployment benefits and culture and the arts are never more popular and the military and defense bests retirement benefits only in Cyprus in 1996. Education always is ranked higher than retirement benefits in the immigrant/pioneer societies, appears to gain ground in Western European democracies (Great Britain, West Germany, and Italy) over time, and is more popular in ex-Socialist countries outside of the former Soviet Union. Environment is consistently ranked higher than retirement benefits in West Germany, bests retirement benefits in a smattering of other Western European countries, but rarely tops retirement benefits in ex-Socialist states. Support for police/law enforcement spending exceeds that for retirement benefits mainly among immigrant/pioneer societies (in 8 of 8 comparisons) and does so in only one ex-Socialist state (East Germany in 1996).

Regarding government responsibilities, in 1985 in addition

to asking about the government providing a decent standard of living for the elderly people were asked if they should "provide a job for everyone who wants one," "provide health care for the sick," and "provide a decent standard of living for the unemployed." In 1990 and 1996 people were also asked if the government should "provide financial assistance to college students from low-income families" and "provide decent housing for those who can't afford it." Providing for the elderly was the top listed priority in three countries in 1985 and in second place in three countries, first in four countries in 1990 and the second choice in the remaining seven countries, and first in three countries in 1996, second in 17.5,² third in 3.5 countries, and fifth in one country (Table 5). In each of the 27.5 times that providing for the elderly was ranked second, it was outranked by (or tied with) health care. The small differences across countries in the rankings of providing for the elderly does not clearly relate to any of the major groupings of countries (i.e. immigrant/pioneer, ex-Socialist, Western Europe, etc.).

While remaining high, the relative rank of providing for the elderly slipped over time. First place finishes fell from 50% in 1985, to 36% in 1990, and to just 12% in 1996. Within the same countries caring for the elderly slipped a position for

²Reference to half countries (i.e. 0.5) represent ties.

Australia, West Germany, and the United States from 1985 to 1990 and dropped a rung for East Germany, Hungary, Norway, and Israel from 1990 to 1996. The only gains were moving up a rung for the United States and Ireland from 1990 to 1996. However, the levels of support for health and elder care are quite high in most countries and usually very close. In only 12 of 42 comparisons were the differences greater than five percentage points.

Spending for retirement benefits and providing a decent standard of living for the elderly are relatively popular policies in virtually all countries. Only health consistently does better than programs for the elderly. Educational spending does top retirement benefits in most comparisons, but providing for the elderly almost always does better than giving assistance to those with low incomes to attend college. Others proposals usually are less favored than those for the retired and/or elderly. However, the relative popularity of programs for the elderly appears to have slipped a bit. The shift is small however and more evident on providing for the elderly than regarding spending for retirement benefits.

Differences Across Socio-Demographic Groups

Some systematic differences exist in support for government spending for retirement benefits and for providing for the

elderly across genders, age groups, and labor force statuses. As Table 6 shows in 1996 in 22 of 25 countries women are more in favor of high spending than men are. The differences are generally quite modest however with only 11 exceeding 5.0 percentage points. The three largest gender gaps are in Slovenia (+11.1), East Germany (+15.8), and Sweden (+16.8). On government responsibilities towards the elderly women were more supportive than men were in all 25 countries in 1996 and the differences were 5.0 or higher in 16 cases (Table 7). The only two difference over 10 percentage points were in Hungary (+11.7) and Canada (+13.8).

Across age groups the predominate pattern was for support for governmental spending for retirement benefits to rise with age (Table 8). This occurred in 19 of 25 countries. The generational differences were often quite large. Support for more spending among those 65+ exceeded support among those under 30 by 20 percentage points or more in East Germany, Great Britain, Sweden, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Poland, France, and Cyprus. But rising support as one nears retirement age did not appear in all countries. In Latvia there was little variation by age, in the Philippines and West Germany there were non-linear patterns with spending most endorsed by the middle-aged in the Philippines and least backed by the middle-aged in West Germany, and in Canada and the United States the

predominate pattern reversed with support generally declining with age.³

On whether providing for the elderly is a governmental responsibility, the association with age is even stronger. In all countries those 65+ are more likely to say it is the government's duty compared to those under 30 and in 18 of 25 comparison those over 65 are more supportive than any other age group (Table 9). As with spending, many generational differences are large, exceeding 20 percentage points in East Germany, Great Britain, Sweden, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, New Zealand, and Canada. The smallest generations gaps are in Australia (+3.0) and the United States (+3.1).

Labor force status does not show as consistent a pattern with support for government programs for the elderly as gender and age do. On spending measures the retired are the most in favor of more spending in 11 countries, followed by those keeping house in six countries, the unemployed in three countries, part-time workers in two countries, those in other circumstances (e.g. students, disabled, unknown) in two countries, and full-time workers in one country (Table 10). To assess potential conflict between the retired and current workers who in most countries are paying for the benefits of the

³Among Israeli Arabs there were too few respondents 65+ to determine fully the age relationship.

retired through their payroll taxes, the position of the retired and full-time workers were compared. In five countries (the Philippines: -1.4; Latvia: -1.6; Canada: -1.7; the United States: -7.3; and Arab Israel: -14.2) workers are more in favor of increased spending than the retired are. In the remaining 20 countries retirees are supportive of higher benefits. In many countries the differences are modest, but in nine countries the differences are 15 percentage points or more (Cyprus: +15.7; Norway: +16.2; France: +16.7; Poland: +19.5; Bulgaria: +20.0; Sweden: +21.9; Slovenia: +22.9; the Czech Republic: +25.4; and East Germany: +25.9). In general, in immigrant/pioneer societies differences are small and as likely to be negative (Canada and the United States) as positive (Australia and New Zealand). In ex-Socialist countries the gaps are usually substantial with the exception of Latvia and Russia where support for more spending is very high among both workers and retirees. In Western Europe differences are moderate-to-large (from +9.8 in Italy to +21.9 in Sweden) in all countries except Spain (+2.0).

A similar pattern emerges for government responsibilities. In 12 countries retirees are most likely to see the government as having a definite responsibility to provide a decent standard of living for the elderly, those keeping house are first in 5.5 countries, the unemployed in 4 countries, part-time workers in 1.5 countries, and others in 2 countries. Comparing full-time

employees and retirees shows that retirees are more in favor of government providing for the elderly than workers are in 24 of 25 cases (Israeli Arabs at -8.1 being the only exception). Unlike in many previous comparisons the immigrant/pioneer societies do not cluster together. Differences run from +5.6 in Australia to +7.9 in the United States, +16.3 in Canada, and +24.2 in New Zealand. There is also considerable variation among the ex-Socialist countries where differences range from +1.4 in Latvia to +24.0 in the Czech Republic. Similarly, in Western Europe differences go from +6.4 in West Germany to +21.5 in Sweden.

Overall, a potential for conflict between current workers and retirees exists in a number of countries. On both spending for retirement benefits and providing for the elderly large differences appear in Poland, Sweden, the Czech Republic, and East Germany and moderate-to-large differences appear on both measures in most countries.

Conclusion

Programs for the elderly are popular in most countries. Only health policies typically garner more support. In addition, educational spending is rated more highly than spending for retirement benefits in most comparisons, but this educational advantage does not prevail when caring for the elderly is compared to helping those with low-incomes go to college.

Support is not uniform across countries. The immigrant/pioneer societies, West Germany, and Japan are least supportive of these policies to aid the retired and elderly and ex-Socialist countries are usually the most supportive. Other Western European countries show considerable variation, but tend to be between these two polar groups.

There has been some decline in both absolute levels of support and the relative rank across competing programs. However, these changes are modest in magnitude and do not occur in all countries.

Women are consistently more supportive of programs for the elderly, but the differences are usually quite small. Support tends to increase with age and in a fair number of countries there are large generation gaps, but a few countries (e.g. the United States and Canada on spending) show a contrary relationship. Differences by labor force status are less consistent than either the gender or age patterns, but support is most often highest among the retired. Differences between retirees and full-time workers are usually moderate in size, but large and consistent differences appear in about a quarter of the countries.

Table 1

Support for Government Spending on Retirement Benefits
by Country and Year

Year	Much More	More	Same	Less	Much Less	Can't Choose	N
1985							
Australia	17.3	37.7	40.9	3.3	0.8	0.0	1471
German (West)	10.4	35.3	48.9	3.3	0.6	1.5	1037
Great Britain	25.3	49.3	23.4	1.0	0.1	1.0	1474
United States	12.4	29.3	41.1	10.3	2.7	4.2	655
Austria	11.5	36.6	45.9	1.6	0.4	4.1	987
Italy	22.3	51.9	19.8	3.1	0.6	2.3	1500
1990							
Australia	11.7	42.9	40.1	4.3	0.6	0.3	2382
Germany (West)	15.4	38.4	41.9	1.7	0.6	1.9	3028
Great Britain	28.4	52.8	17.1	0.4	0.3	1.1	1148
No. Ireland	40.3	49.9	8.8	0.2	0.0	0.8	766
United States	12.1	34.6	40.0	7.2	2.2	3.9	1178
Hungary	40.3	46.5	10.2	1.6	0.2	1.2	972
Italy	25.2	55.3	16.0	1.9	0.5	1.1	999
Norway	15.7	54.9	27.1	0.7	0.3	1.4	1467
Israel	27.3	43.6	23.7	3.0	0.4	2.0	989
1996							
Australia	11.7	37.9	46.7	2.9	0.5	0.2	2111
Germany	13.5	32.1	47.1	3.9	0.4	2.9	3450
West	12.5	30.5	49.2	4.3	0.5	3.2	2855
East	18.6	39.8	37.5	2.3	0.0	1.9	595
Great Britain	26.5	51.1	20.9	0.8	0.3	0.4	978
United States	12.8	36.6	38.3	7.7	2.0	2.6	1294
Hungary	33.0	50.5	13.2	1.3	0.1	1.9	1495
Italy	17.8	48.6	23.5	4.8	2.0	3.2	1100
Ireland	28.5	45.1	24.8	0.6	0.0	1.1	992
Norway	12.6	43.2	40.7	1.4	0.2	2.0	1323
Sweden	14.6	39.4	39.5	2.3	0.1	4.1	1336
Czech Rep.	18.2	46.7	29.6	1.8	1.0	2.7	1096
Slovenia	22.5	34.6	33.5	4.5	1.9	3.0	1003
Poland	35.3	43.9	15.4	1.9	0.5	3.0	1168
Bulgaria	31.9	46.5	16.9	1.5	0.5	2.8	998
Russia	55.5	33.8	6.4	0.6	0.2	3.5	1691
New Zealand	11.8	33.8	47.8	4.2	0.8	1.6	1153

Canada	6.7	20.5	61.3	8.2	1.4	1.8	1205
The Philippines	12.2	64.8	18.5	3.2	0.1	1.2	3947
Israel							
Jews	40.7	34.2	21.0	1.9	0.3	1.9	1040
Arabs	46.4	27.3	19.6	2.8	1.6	2.2	494

Table 1 (continued)

1996	Much More	More	Same	Less	Much Less	Can't Choose	N
Japan	25.2	30.3	33.7	2.7	1.4	6.8	1244
Spain	15.7	48.3	28.6	1.9	0.3	5.2	2484
Latvia	52.3	39.0	5.5	0.3	0.1	2.8	1495
France	13.0	23.4	53.4	5.2	2.0	3.0	1278
Cyprus	10.6	46.1	39.2	3.7	0.3	0.1	996

Source: ISSP ROG I,II,III

Wording:

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/Spend More/Spend the Same Amount/Spend Less/Spend Much Less/Can't Choose

f. Retirement Benefits

Table 2

Government's Responsibility for Providing for the Elderly
by Country and Year

Year	Definitely	Probably	Probably Not	Definitely Not	Can't Choose	N
1985						
Australia	62.4	33.7	3.3	0.6	0.0	1452
Germany (West)	55.4	40.5	2.9	0.4	0.8	1036
Great Britain	78.2	19.6	1.1	0.5	0.6	1483
United States	42.0	44.8	9.1	2.5	1.7	658
Austria	63.2	33.8	1.3	0.1	1.6	993
Italy	81.0	17.4	0.4	0.1	1.0	1500
1990						
Australia	37.2	56.6	5.4	0.4	0.5	2389
Germany	59.7	35.2	3.9	0.4	0.7	3769
West	53.7	40.3	4.8	0.5	0.8	3021
East	84.3	14.4	0.6	0.2	0.5	748
Great Britain	77.6	20.2	0.9	0.3	0.9	1157
No. Ireland	80.5	17.9	0.9	0.3	0.3	767
United States	39.0	46.2	10.1	2.0	2.7	1180
Hungary	76.6	22.1	0.9	0.0	0.4	975
Italy	80.9	18.1	0.6	0.3	0.1	1000
Ireland	77.6	20.3	1.7	0.2	0.2	1003
Norway	85.4	13.2	1.0	0.1	0.3	1502
Israel	64.8	27.6	5.6	1.3	0.7	986
1996						
Australia	37.4	56.6	5.5	0.4	0.2	2107
Germany	49.9	44.5	3.1	0.4	1.8	3444
West	47.0	47.2	3.5	0.4	2.0	2853
East	63.8	33.8	1.3	0.4	0.8	591
Great Britain	70.4	26.0	2.2	0.4	1.0	983
United States	37.9	47.6	9.8	3.3	1.5	1278
Hungary	62.7	34.4	1.7	0.1	1.1	1500
Italy	75.6	21.7	1.8	0.3	0.7	1100
Ireland	76.3	22.6	0.5	0.3	0.3	994
Norway	85.4	13.2	0.5	0.4	0.5	1329
Sweden	67.0	27.6	1.5	0.7	3.2	1347
Czech Rep.	63.1	32.8	2.1	1.3	0.7	1097
Slovenia	73.8	21.8	2.7	0.9	0.9	1002
Poland	64.4	32.2	1.2	0.2	1.9	1174

Bulgaria	66.3	30.8	1.5	0.4	1.1	1000
Russia	85.6	12.3	1.1	0.2	0.8	1691
New Zealand	58.0	35.5	5.1	0.6	0.9	1163
Canada	49.1	41.5	7.0	1.7	0.8	1229
The Philippines	37.7	52.0	7.2	2.1	1.0	3947

Table 2 (continued)

1996	Defin- itely	Prob- ably	Prob- ably Not	Defin- itely Not	Can't Choose	N
Israel						
Jews	65.8	28.8	3.7	1.1	0.8	1040
Arabs	63.3	24.5	4.6	6.4	1.2	498
Japan	45.2	38.3	6.1	2.3	8.1	1240
Spain	78.7	19.2	0.8	0.2	1.1	2490
Latvia	79.9	19.0	0.3	0.1	0.7	1492
France	54.1	39.0	4.7	1.6	0.6	1283
Cyprus	34.6	58.5	6.2	0.1	0.5	993

Source: ISSP ROG 1985, 1990, 1996

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

Definitely Should Be/Probably Should Be/Probably Should Not Be/Definitely Should Not Be/Can't Choose

d. Provide a decent standard of living for the old

Table 3

Support for More Spending and Definite Responsibility by
Level of Support by Year

Year	Spending	Responsibility
1985	Great Britain: 74.6	Italy: 81.0
	Italy: 74.2	Great Britain: 78.2
	Australia: 48.1	Australia: 63.2
	West Germany: 45.7	West Germany: 55.4
	United States: 41.7	United States: 42.0
1990	No. Ireland: 90.2	Norway: 85.4
	Hungary: 86.8	East Germany: 84.3
	Great Britain: 81.2	Italy: 80.9
	Italy: 80.5	No. Ireland: 80.5
	Israel: 70.9	Ireland: 77.6
	Norway: 70.6	Great Britain: 77.6
	Australia: 54.6	Hungary: 76.6
	West Germany: 53.8	Israel: 64.8
	United States: 46.7	West Germany: 53.7
	United States: 39.0	
	Australia: 37.2	
1996	Latvia: 91.3	Russia: 85.6
	Russia: 89.3	Norway: 85.4
	Hungary: 83.5	Latvia: 79.9
	Poland: 79.2	Spain: 78.7
	Bulgaria: 79.2	Ireland: 76.3
	Great Britain: 77.6	Italy: 75.6
	The Philippines: 77.0	Slovenia: 73.8
	Israeli Jews: 74.9	Great Britain: 70.4
	Israeli Arabs: 73.7	Sweden: 67.0
	Ireland: 73.6	Bulgaria: 66.3
	Italy: 66.4	Israeli Jews: 65.8
	Czech Rep.: 64.9	Poland: 64.4
	Spain: 64.0	Israeli Arabs: 63.3
	East Germany: 58.4	East Germany: 63.8
	Slovenia: 57.1	Czech Rep.: 63.1
	Cyprus: 56.7	Hungary: 62.7
	Norway: 55.8	New Zealand: 58.0
	Japan: 55.5	France: 54.1
	Sweden: 54.0	Canada: 49.1
	Australia: 49.6	West Germany: 47.0
United States: 49.4	Japan: 45.2	
New Zealand: 45.6	United States: 37.9	

37.7
West Germany: 43.0
France: 36.4
Canada: 27.2

Australia: 37.4
The Philippines:
Cyprus: 34.6

Source: ISSP ROG 1985, 1990, 1996

Table 4

Support for Government Spending by
Program, Country, and Year

(% for More Spending)

1985	ENV	HLTH	POL	EDUC	ARMS	RET	UNEM
ARTS							
Australia	31.9	62.5	67.4	64.0	45.8	55.0	12.6
9.6							
Germany (West)	81.1	51.4	29.0	39.4	5.9	45.7	33.6
13.0							
Great Britain	35.4	87.8	38.8	73.8	17.1	74.6	40.3
9.2							
United States	41.5	58.6	49.9	64.5	19.6	41.7	24.2
14.6							
Austria	69.9	59.3	21.4	35.5	12.3	48.1	15.1
10.6							
Italy	58.4	79.4	46.0	60.5	11.3	74.2	54.5
31.4							
1990							
Australia	63.5	67.7	67.7	69.7	25.1	54.6	10.1
13.0							
Germany (West)	89.5	72.4	42.1	57.7	4.3	53.8	35.8
21.0							
Great Britain	61.8	89.5	49.3	78.9	8.5	81.2	35.5
12.0							
No. Ireland	56.1	89.2	35.2	73.2	14.3	90.2	53.1
13.0							
United States	58.5	70.4	54.3	72.6	13.4	46.7	26.2
12.7							
Hungary	85.5	94.8	53.1	86.7	13.6	86.8	46.5
63.0							
Italy	73.1	84.7	56.7	65.0	11.5	80.5	52.3
44.5							
Norway	73.2	82.7	61.3	54.6	3.5	70.6	18.4
9.4							
Israel	53.0	79.2	57.6	80.5	53.6	70.9	29.2
34.8							
1996							

Australia	47.9	79.8	67.1	70.4	26.7	49.6	12.3
12.5							
Germany	57.0	55.8	58.2	51.2	7.4	45.7	32.5
15.5							
West	57.2	52.8	55.4	49.8	7.8	43.0	27.9
13.5							
East	55.8	70.2	71.2	58.1	5.5	58.4	55.0
25.5							
Great Britain	42.9	91.2	72.1	83.9	17.6	77.6	34.5
5.9							
United States	48.4	66.4	57.2	76.4	21.0	49.4	27.6
15.1							
Hungary	62.8	91.9	63.5	80.5	31.8	83.5	34.0
46.9							
Italy	57.6	76.5	31.4	70.0	7.4	66.4	47.3
41.6							
Ireland	51.2	83.4	75.0	62.2	23.0	73.6	46.7
21.8							
Norway	41.8	84.5	61.4	50.1	10.2	55.8	19.0
7.9							
Sweden	52.6	76.0	46.6	57.8	13.0	54.0	41.3
14.3							
Czech Rep.	66.1	81.0	41.5	65.6	11.2	64.9	18.6
26.5							
Slovenia	70.5	78.4	36.9	82.7	24.1	57.1	47.3
47.8							
Poland	73.2	91.4	69.7	80.9	51.3	79.2	41.0
47.7							
Bulgaria	59.6	92.2	69.6	78.9	67.5	78.4	65.3
49.8							
Russia	75.1	93.4	34.5	86.4	67.4	89.3	60.4
59.4							
New Zealand	36.5	87.3	83.3	82.6	16.8	45.6	10.1
13.0							
Canada	49.0	53.8	31.8	62.4	8.0	27.2	15.6
25.3							
The Philippines	57.3	83.4	48.1	83.0	52.3	77.0	----
54.9							
Israel							
Jews	62.5	83.1	59.2	88.6	65.6	74.9	32.6
41.1							

Table 4 (continued)

	ENV	HLTH	POL	EDUC	ARMS	RET	UNEM
ARTS							
Arabs	75.0	86.3	49.3	81.6	34.6	73.7	70.0

69.5								
Japan	65.5	65.6	22.2	47.2	8.8	55.5	31.0	
31.3								
Spain	58.6	75.7	60.4	69.9	14.1	64.0	49.0	
41.8								
Latvia	45.5	89.8	39.4	85.8	37.8	91.3	58.2	
54.0								
France	42.2	51.7	39.7	62.3	7.9	36.4	23.8	
14.9								
Cyprus	61.7	78.9	51.3	83.4	79.6	56.7	44.9	
44.0								

Source: ISSP ROG I,II,III

Wording:

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/Spend More/Spend the Same Amount/Spend Less/Spend Much Less/Can't Choose

- a. The environment
- b. Health
- c. The police and law enforcement
- d. Education
- e. The military and defense
- f. Retirement benefits
- g. Unemployment benefits
- h. Culture and the arts

Table 5

Support Government Social Welfare Programs
by Program, Country, and Year

(% Definitely Should Provide For)

	Jobs for All	Care of Sick	Elder- ly	Job- less	Stu- dents	Hous- ing
1985						
Australia	20.2	60.3	62.4	15.1	----	----
Germany (West)	34.9	53.4	55.4	23.2	----	----
Great Britain	36.7	85.6	78.2	42.8	----	----
United States	12.8	35.4	42.0	14.7	----	----
Austria	44.7	63.7	63.2	14.8	----	----
Italy	51.2	86.0	81.0	38.7	----	----
1990						
Australia	11.2	37.5	37.2	5.5	21.6	12.8
Germany	35.4	61.5	59.7	24.9	35.6	28.2
West	28.9	56.4	53.7	18.5	30.2	23.4
East	61.8	82.0	84.3	50.9	57.5	47.7
Great Britain	22.9	84.2	77.6	30.5	47.8	45.2
No. Ireland	31.9	82.3	80.5	43.5	54.2	53.4
United States	15.2	39.4	39.0	13.1	29.5	20.0
Hungary	50.7	74.2	76.6	20.5	37.9	33.5
Italy	38.2	87.7	80.9	32.1	53.8	44.5
Ireland	37.0	80.0	77.6	48.0	62.8	55.6
Norway	51.2	83.2	85.4	41.1	36.3	25.1
Israel	55.2	64.5	64.8	30.6	50.8	44.6
1996						
Australia	10.9	42.3	37.4	8.7	24.5	10.5
Germany	31.9	52.5	49.9	19.5	28.1	21.5
West	26.9	49.8	47.0	15.9	25.2	18.4
East	56.1	65.6	63.8	37.0	41.7	36.0
Great Britain	27.1	81.5	70.4	27.0	35.8	34.5
United States	13.1	37.5	37.9	12.0	33.5	18.8
Hungary	46.5	69.6	62.7	15.6	36.0	21.5
Italy	41.2	80.6	75.6	29.2	58.6	44.7
Ireland	28.9	74.1	76.3	39.3	57.8	46.3
Norway	47.1	87.0	85.4	39.9	32.2	20.3
Sweden	32.6	68.5	67.0	36.6	33.3	24.9

Czech Rep.	48.3	71.7	63.1	9.5	48.4	27.5
Slovenia	57.3	79.3	73.8	41.8	74.3	50.2
Poland	54.7	66.3	64.4	26.6	44.4	35.8
Bulgaria	52.0	70.2	66.3	48.0	49.8	37.3
Russia	70.9	79.7	85.6	37.6	61.3	48.6

Table 5 (continued)

	Jobs for All	Care of Sick	Elder- ly	Job- less	Stu- dents	Hous- ing
New Zealand	18.0	71.1	58.0	14.7	33.3	22.7
Canada	10.9	63.0	49.1	15.9	34.3	20.3
The Philippines	44.3	44.7	37.7	27.6	37.6	27.7
Israel						
Jews	40.5	70.1	65.8	28.2	60.6	52.9
Arabs	75.3	66.5	63.3	53.8	65.0	65.5
Japan	22.1	45.4	45.2	21.4	20.8	16.3
Spain	59.7	80.0	78.7	57.1	74.1	68.3
Latvia	67.2	83.4	79.9	38.4	63.2	37.9
France	44.0	54.1	54.1	35.0	60.7	46.3
Cyprus	20.5	43.1	34.6	20.2	36.1	25.5

Source: ISSP ROG 1985, 1990, 1996

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

Definitely Should Be/Probably Should Be/Probably Should Not Be/Definitely Should Not Be/Can't Choose

a. Provide a job for everyone who wants one

c. Provide health care for the sick

d. Provide a decent standard of living for the old

f. Provide a decent standard of living for the unemployed

g. Give financial assistance to college students from low-income families

h. Provide decent housing for those who can't afford it

Table 6

Support for More Spending for Retirement Benefits
by Gender and Country in 1996

(% for More Spending)

	Men	Women
Australia	45.7	52.8
Germany	41.7	49.6
West	40.0	46.0
East	50.1	65.9
Great Britain	76.9	78.2
United States	46.3	52.0
Hungary	80.5	86.2
Italy	63.5	69.2
Ireland	73.7	73.5
Norway	51.9	60.0
Sweden	45.7	62.5
Czech Rep.	62.6	67.0
Slovenia	51.1	62.2
Poland	77.3	80.8
Bulgaria	76.4	80.2
Russia	87.8	90.5
New Zealand	44.4	46.9
Canada	24.2	30.0
The Philippines	77.4	76.5
Israel		
Jews	71.7	77.6
Arabs	73.4	74.1
Japan	55.2	55.8
Spain	64.3	63.6
Latvia	90.6	92.0
France	36.0	36.5
Cyprus	54.2	59.2

Source: ISSP ROG 1996

Table 7

Supporting for Providing for the Elderly
by Country and Gender in 1996

(% Definitely Should)

	Men	Women
Australia	34.3	39.8
Germany	46.3	53.3
West	43.7	50.3
East	60.0	67.1
Great Britain	66.6	73.1
United States	32.8	42.0
Hungary	56.5	68.2
Italy	73.5	77.5
Ireland	75.4	77.3
Norway	82.5	88.5
Sweden	64.2	69.8
Czech Rep.	58.5	67.6
Slovenia	71.1	75.8
Poland	59.4	69.0
Bulgaria	62.7	69.7
Russia	84.1	86.8
New Zealand	53.0	62.3
Canada	42.0	55.8
The Philippines	36.7	38.7
Israel		
Jews	64.9	66.5
Arabs	61.6	65.6
Japan	44.6	45.7
Spain	78.1	79.2
Latvia	78.2	81.4
France	50.9	57.0
Cyprus	30.3	38.9

Source: ISSP ROG 1996

Table 8

Support for More Spending for Retirement Benefits
by Age and Country in 1996

(% for More Spending)

	LT30	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+
Australia	38.1	46.3	50.9	56.4	46.2
Germany	45.5	41.6	41.6	48.4	51.7
West	44.7	40.3	38.6	44.7	47.1
East	50.9	48.2	56.1	63.6	71.0
Great Britain	63.3	79.2	79.7	79.8	87.1
United States	55.0	51.0	45.7	48.9	45.2
Hungary	72.5	80.6	85.5	90.2	89.9
Italy	55.8	60.4	65.8	65.8	75.6
Ireland	64.2	70.8	74.2	79.3	81.9
Norway	51.9	51.4	52.2	61.5	66.3
Sweden	41.7	51.3	51.9	59.8	66.8
Czech Rep.	47.5	53.3	61.9	72.0	80.0
Slovenia	43.5	48.2	55.2	69.8	73.5
Poland	70.0	71.0	79.7	89.0	91.5
Bulgaria	71.6	67.6	68.7	87.3	90.1
Russia	84.9	89.2	92.7	89.8	92.0
New Zealand	41.4	38.1	43.2	54.7	49.5
Canada	34.8	23.4	24.6	30.5	20.5
The Philippines	74.3	78.2	81.9	76.8	71.4
Israel					
Jews	67.0	73.7	82.0	81.8	78.1
Arabs	76.8	70.2	71.4	80.0	----
Japan	54.6	48.0	53.9	57.9	60.9
Spain	58.1	63.0	68.8	66.1	66.5
Latvia	90.0	93.2	92.2	91.2	90.4
France	26.8	31.4	33.0	42.6	47.8
Cyprus	48.5	57.1	65.4	64.6	75.5

Source: ISSP ROG 1996

Table 9

Supporting for Providing for the Elderly
by Country and Age in 1996

(% Definitely Should)

	LT30	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+
Australia	35.6	34.8	34.9	39.9	38.6
Germany	45.6	47.0	46.2	53.7	56.7
West	45.1	44.6	43.6	49.7	52.2
East	48.8	59.4	58.7	71.0	74.9
Great Britain	57.9	70.0	71.6	71.7	80.3
United States	38.7	36.0	35.3	39.3	41.8
Hungary	57.7	59.9	61.7	65.9	68.7
Italy	69.3	77.9	73.4	78.1	80.4
Ireland	70.5	74.0	79.1	75.6	84.4
Norway	75.7	85.5	85.4	91.1	95.6
Sweden	59.1	57.4	69.7	68.3	80.9
Czech Rep.	51.8	48.4	65.8	62.2	80.8
Slovenia	62.2	71.2	71.0	84.7	82.4
Poland	50.8	66.9	64.1	71.1	75.4
Bulgaria	65.9	65.0	62.4	64.7	71.9
Russia	82.2	83.3	89.0	84.8	92.6
New Zealand	50.5	46.5	53.4	65.4	73.8
Canada	38.4	47.2	51.0	54.0	62.7
The Philippines	31.1	42.2	40.1	37.8	38.0
Israel					
Jews	57.1	66.7	71.1	70.9	74.0
Arabs	60.9	64.5	62.5	78.0	----
Japan	40.5	42.9	45.9	47.3	48.5
Spain	74.7	79.9	83.2	77.1	80.9
Latvia	75.2	82.1	78.8	83.8	80.8
France	46.7	51.5	57.3	58.1	57.1
Cyprus	29.1	30.6	38.3	51.0	46.7

Source: ISSP ROG 1996

Table 10

Supporting for More Spending for Retirement Benefits
by Country and Labor Force Status in 1996

(% Spend More)

	Full Time	Part Time	Un- emp	Re- tired	Keep House	Other	Retired - Full
Australia	47.4	44.8	48.9	49.4	52.9	----	+2.0
Germany	40.2	41.8	61.1	56.3	48.4	42.0	+16.1
West	38.5	39.8	56.0	51.0	48.1	41.1	+12.5
East	48.6	60.4	69.0	74.5	----	47.3	+25.9
Great Britain	73.6	71.9	76.9	86.9	82.5	78.6	+13.3
United States	49.9	45.7	----	42.6	52.6	57.4	-7.3
Hungary	80.8	76.5	70.7	90.4	----	81.0	+9.6
Italy	63.0	65.6	70.3	72.8	68.7	62.9	+9.8
Ireland	67.9	73.1	81.7	82.5	78.1	76.0	+14.6
Norway	50.5	63.3	71.1	66.7	75.9	53.6	+16.2
Sweden	46.3	60.7	59.5	68.2	----	55.1	+21.9
Czech Rep.	55.6	62.1	----	81.0	61.9	69.7	+25.4
Slovenia	50.2	----	60.0	73.1	73.4	40.3	+22.9
Poland	73.2	77.0	77.8	92.7	70.8	69.7	+19.5
Bulgaria	71.3	59.8	70.2	91.3	----	81.7	+20.0
Russia	87.8	88.4	95.0	91.9	95.4	83.4	+4.1
New Zealand	41.7	48.2	53.4	50.5	50.0	42.2	+8.8
Canada	24.6	28.6	41.3	22.9	25.7	41.4	-1.7
The Philippines	78.5	77.5	70.9	77.1	77.8	69.4	-1.4
Israel							
Jews	75.5	69.4	82.8	79.5	88.9	64.3	+4.0
Arabs	69.1	86.9	----	54.9	76.3	82.1	-14.2
Japan	53.7	62.9	----	56.7	57.9	53.2	+3.0
Spain	64.9	----	67.2	66.9	61.6	52.9	+2.0
Latvia	93.1	88.6	87.7	91.5	94.1	89.5	-1.6
France	29.1	32.7	41.4	45.8	41.8	35.5	+16.7
Cyprus	54.5	----	----	70.2	68.5	44.1	+15.7

Source: ISSP ROG 1996

Table 11

Supporting for Providing for the Elderly
by Country and Labor Force Status in 1996

(% Definitely Should)

	Full Time	Part Time	Un- emp	Re- tired	Keep House	Other	Retired - Full
Australia	34.4	37.3	45.5	40.0	35.4	----	+5.6
Germany	47.2	48.0	57.3	57.0	53.0	40.3	+9.8
West	44.7	46.8	51.1	51.1	53.1	40.5	+6.4
East	59.1	59.6	66.9	77.1	----	----	+18.0
Great Britain	63.7	68.5	92.4	78.2	71.3	76.2	+14.5
United States	34.2	36.0	----	42.1	46.5	51.6	+7.9
Hungary	58.8	64.5	59.1	68.6	----	55.5	+9.8
Italy	74.8	74.1	73.2	81.7	75.4	70.4	+6.9
Ireland	73.6	86.4	66.0	80.8	81.4	69.6	+7.2
Norway	85.6	87.7	89.5	95.8	86.8	75.7	+10.2
Sweden	60.1	65.6	74.1	81.6	----	70.5	+21.5
Czech Rep.	54.0	----	----	78.0	57.1	77.3	+24.0
Slovenia	69.9	----	67.7	84.6	80.0	57.9	+14.7
Poland	59.5	50.2	75.5	75.1	66.5	40.8	+15.6
Bulgaria	63.4	67.2	63.8	69.6	----	73.7	+6.2
Russia	84.9	82.5	87.6	89.6	87.3	80.1	+4.7
New Zealand	48.7	59.9	75.7	72.9	62.7	51.5	+24.2
Canada	45.4	46.4	35.9	61.7	45.6	52.9	+16.3
The Philippines	37.2	41.0	37.4	42.5	36.7	31.7	+5.3
Israel							
Jews	63.1	61.9	68.6	74.8	82.2	60.6	+11.7
Arabs	62.9	68.4	----	54.8	68.4	64.6	-8.1
Japan	43.5	47.4	----	51.5	51.8	37.1	+8.0
Spain	78.3	----	77.7	80.9	80.1	74.5	+2.6
Latvia	81.0	80.7	77.7	82.4	81.2	72.1	+1.4
France	48.7	61.6	61.4	57.0	56.2	56.3	+8.3
Cyprus	30.8	44.0	----	43.9	44.2	33.6	+13.1

Source: ISSP ROG 1996

Appendix 1: International Social Survey Program

The International Social Survey Program (ISSP) is a continuing, annual program of crossnational collaboration. It brings together pre-existing, social science projects and coordinates research goals, thereby adding a crossnational perspective to the individual, national studies.

ISSP evolved from a bilateral collaboration between the Allgemeinen Bevölkerungsumfragen der Sozialwissenschaften (ALLBUS) of the Zentrum fuer Umfragen, Methoden, und Analysen (ZUMA) in Mannheim, West Germany and the General Social Survey (GSS) of the National Opinion Research Center (NORC), University of Chicago. Both the ALLBUS and the GSS are replicating, time series studies. The ALLBUS has been conducted biennially since 1980 and the GSS nearly annually since 1972. In 1982 ZUMA and the NORC devoted a small segment of the ALLBUS and GSS to a common set of questions on job values, important areas of life, abortion, and feminism. (A merged data set is available from the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), University of Michigan.) Again in 1984 collaboration was carried out, this time on class differences, equality, and the welfare state.

Meanwhile, in late 1983 the National Centre for Social Research (NCSR) (then known as Social and Community Planning Research), London, which was starting a social indicators series called the British Social Attitudes Survey (BSA) similar to the ALLBUS and GSS, secured funds from the Nuffield Foundation to hold meetings to further international collaboration. Representatives from ZUMA, NORC, NCSR, and the Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University organized ISSP in 1984 and agreed to 1) jointly develop topical modules dealing with important areas of social science, 2) field the modules as a fifteen-minute supplement to the regular national surveys (or a special survey if necessary), 3) include an extensive common core of background variables, and 4) make the data available to the social science community as soon as possible.

Each research organization funds all of its own costs. There are no central funds. The merging of the data into a crossnational data set is performed by the Zentralarchiv fuer Empirische Sozialforschung, University of Cologne in collaboration with the Analisis Sociologicos, Economicos y Politicos in Spain.

Since 1984, ISSP has grown to 37 nations, the founding four--Germany, the United States, Great Britain, and Australia--plus Austria, Italy, Ireland, Hungary, the Netherlands, Israel, Norway, the Philippines, New Zealand, Russia, Japan, Bulgaria,

Canada, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Poland, Sweden, Spain, Cyprus, France, Portugal, Slovakia, Latvia, Chile, Bangladesh, Denmark, South Africa, Switzerland, Venezuela, Brazil, Flanders, Finland, and Mexico. In addition, East Germany was added to the German sample upon reunification. The affiliated organizations are listed in Table 1. Other nations have replicated particular modules without being ISSP members (e.g. Poland, in 1987, and Switzerland, in 1987 and 1993).

The annual topics for ISSP are developed over several years by a sub-committee and pretested in various countries. The annual plenary meeting of ISSP then adopts the final questionnaire. The ISSP researchers especially concentrate on developing the questions that are 1) meaningful and relevant to all countries and 2) can be expressed in an equivalent manner in all relevant languages. The questionnaire is originally drafted in British English and then translated to other languages using standard back translation procedures.

The themes covered in the ISSP module and the nations collecting data are listed in Table 1. The first theme on the role of government covered attitudes towards a) civil liberties, b) education and parenting, c) welfare and social equality, and d) the economy. The second theme was on social networks and support system. It contained detailed behavioral reports on contacts with various friends and relatives and then a series of questions about where one would turn for help when faced with various situations such as financial need, minor illness, career advice, and emotional distress. The third module, on social equality, concerned beliefs about what factors effect one's chances for social mobility (e.g. parental status, education, contacts, race, etc.), explanations for inequality, assessments of social conflicts, and related questions. It also asked people to estimate the average earnings of various occupations (e.g. farm laborer and doctor) and what the average earnings of these occupations should be.

The fourth module covered the impact on the family of the changing labor force participation of women. It included attitudes on marriage and cohabitation, divorce, children, and child care and special demographics on labor force status, child care, and earnings of husband and wife. The fifth module on orientations towards work dealt with motivations to work, desired characteristics of a job, problems relating to unemployment, satisfaction with one's own job (if employed), and working conditions (if employed).

The sixth module in 1990 repeats the role of government theme. By replicating substantial parts of earlier modules (approximately two-thirds), ISSP not only has a crossnational perspective, but also an over time perspective. One is not only

be able to compare nations and test whether similar social science models operate across societies, but is also able to see if there are similar international trends and whether parallel models of social change operate across nations.

The seventh module covers the impact of religious beliefs and behaviors on social, political, and moral attitudes. It includes questions on religious upbringing, current religious activities, traditional Christian beliefs, and existential beliefs. The non-religious items concern such topics as personal morality, sex roles, crime and punishment, and abortion. The eighth module in 1992 replicates and extends the 1987 social equality module. The ninth module in 1993 is on the environment. It includes an environmental knowledge scale along with attitudinal and behavioral measures.

The tenth module in 1994 repeats the 1988 module on gender, family, and work. It also adds items on household division of labor, sexual harassment, and public policy regarding the family. The 11th module in 1995 was on national identity. It assess nationalism and patriotism, localism and globalism, and diversity and immigration. The 12th module in 1996 was the second replication of role of government. The 13th module in 1997 was the first replication of the 1989 module on work orientations. The 14th module in 1998 was the first replication of the 1991 religion module. The 15th module in 1999 is the second replication of the social inequality module fielded in 1987 and 1992.

These will be followed in 2000 by the first replication of the 1993 environment module, in 2001 by the first replication of the 1986 social relations and social support module, in 2002 by the third replication of the gender, family, and work module, and in 2003 by the first replication of the 1995 national identity module.

ISSP marks several new departures in the area of crossnational research. First, the collaboration between organizations is not special or intermittent, but routine and continual. Second, while necessarily more circumscribed than collaboration dedicated solely to crossnational research on a single topic, ISSP makes crossnational research a basic part of the national research agenda of each participating country. Third, by combining a cross time with a crossnational perspective, two powerful research designs are being used to study societal processes.

Data from the first 14 modules on role of government, social networks and support systems, social equality, the family, work orientation, role of government II, religion, social equality II, the environment, the family II, national identity, role of government III, work orientation II, and

religion II are presently available from the Zentralarchiv and various national archives such as Essex in Britain and ICPSR in the United States. The 1999 social inequality module will be available shortly and the other modules will be released periodically as soon as the data can be processed.

Publications based on the ISSP are listed in a bibliography available from the ISSP Secretariat (see below). It currently lists nearly 900 publications.

There are seven collections of ISSP research 1) Roger Jowell, Sharon Witherspoon, and Lindsay Brook, eds., British Social Attitudes: Special International Report. (Aldershot: Gower, 1989); 2) J.W. Becker, James A. Davis, Peter Ester, and Peter P. Mohler, eds., Attitudes to Inequality and the Role of Government. (Rijswijk, The Netherlands: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, 1990); 3) Roger Jowell, Lindsay Brook, and Lizanne Dowds, eds., International Social Attitudes: The 10th BSA Report. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing, 1993; 4) Alan Frizzell and Jon H. Pammett, eds., Social Inequality in Canada. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1996; 5) Alan Frizzell and Jon H. Pammett, eds., Shades of Green. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1997; 6) Roger Jowell, John Curtice, Alison Park, Lindsay Brook, Katrina Thomson, and Caroline Bryson, eds., British - and European - Social Attitudes: The 15th Report. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998; and 7) Niko Tos, Peter Ph. Mohler, and Brina Malnar, eds., Modern Society and Values: A Comparative Analysis Based on ISSP Project. Ljubljana: University of Lubljana and ZUMA, 2000.

For further information there are two Web sites that one can contact:

- 1) Zentralarchiv fuer Empirische Sozialforschung, University of Cologne: <http://www.za.uni-koeln.de/en/issp/>
- 2) ISSP Secretariat: <http://www.issp.org/>

For further details contact the ISSP secretariat, Tom W. Smith, NORC 1155 East 60th St. Chicago, IL 60637. Phone: 773-256-6288 Fax: 773-753-7866 Email: smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu

Table 1: ISSP

Enviro- II	Family/ ment Gender II	ISSP Members Countries	ISSP Modules							
			Role of Govt	Social Support	Social Equality	Family/ Gender	Work	Role of Govt II	Religion	Social Equal.
RSSS D93	D94	Australia	D86	D87	D88	D90	--	D90	D93	D93
IS D95	D95	Austria	D86	D86	D88	D88	D89	--	D93	D93
BUP --	--	Bangladesh	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
IUPERJ --	--	Brazil	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ASA D94	D95	Bulgaria	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	D93
SC D93	D94	Canada	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	D92
CES --	--	Chile	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
CAR --	--	Cyprus	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ISCAS D93	D94	Czech Republic ^a	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	D92
DEPPA --	--	Denmark	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
FSD --	--	Finland	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
CDA --	--	Flanders	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
France-ISSP --	--	France	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ZUMA D93	D94	Germany ^b	D85	D86	D87	D88	D89	D90	D91	D92
NCSR D93	D94	Grt Britain ^c	D85	D86	D87	D88	D89	D90	D91	D92
Tarkai D93	D94	Hungary	--	D86	D87	D88	D89	D90	D91	D92
SSRC D93	D94	Ireland	--	D89	D89	D89	D89	D91	D91	--
TAU D93	D94	Israel	--	--	--	--	D89	D91	D91	--
Eurisko D92	D93	Italy D94	--	D85	D87	D87	D88	D89	D91	D91
BCRI D93	D94	Japan	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
LAS/LSRC		Latvia	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

--	--									
CEO	--	Mexico	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
--	--									
SCP	--	The Netherlands	--	--	D87	D89	D89	--	D91	--
D93	D94									
MU	--	New Zealand	--	--	--	--	--	--	D91	D92
D93	D94									
NSD	--	Norway	--	--	--	--	D89	D90	D91	D92
D93	D94									
SWS	--	The Philippines	--	--	--	--	--	--	D91	D92
D93	D94									
ISS	--	Poland	--	--	--	--	--	--	D91	D92
D93	D94									
ICS	--	Portugal	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
--	--									
VCIOM	--	Russia	--	--	--	--	--	--	D91	D92
D93	D94									
IS-SAS	--	Slovakia	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
--	--									
POMCRC	--	Slovenia ^d	--	--	--	--	--	--	D91	D92
D93	D93									
CIS/ASEP	--	Spain	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	D93
D94	D94									
UU	--	Sweden	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	D91
--	D94									
SIDOS	--	Switzerland	--	--	D87	--	--	--	--	--
D93	--									
NORC	--	United States	D85	D86	D87	D88	D89	D90	D91	D92
D93	D94									
LACSO	--	Venezuela	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
--	--									
Others:										
IFS	--	Poland	--	--	D87	--	--	--	--	--
--	--									
BS	--	Lithuania	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
--	D94									
D=Done		P=Planned								

Table 1 (continued)

ISSP Members	Countries	National Identity	Role of Government III	Work II	Religion II	Social Equal. III	Environment II		
RSSS	Australia	D96	P98	P98	P98	P99	P00		
IS	Austria	D95	--	--	P99	P99	P00		
BUP	Bangladesh	--	P98	D98	--	P99	P00		
IUPERJ	Brazil	--	--	--	--	--	P00		
ASA	Bulgaria	D95	D96	D97	P99	P99	P00		
SC	Canada	D95	D96	P99	P99	P99	P00		
CEP	Chile	--	--	--	--	D98	P99	P00	P00
CAR	Cyprus	--	D96	D97	P99	P99	P00		
ISCAS	Czech Republic ^a	D95	D96	D97	P99	P99	P00		
DEPPA	Denmark	--	--	--	P99	P99	P00		
FSD	Finland	--	--	--	--	--	P00		
CDA	Flanders	--	--	--	--	--	P00		
FRANCE-ISSP	France	--	D97	D98	D98	P99	P00		
ZUMA	Germany	D95	D96	D97	D98	P00	P00		
NCSR	Grt Britain ^b		D95	D96	D97	D98	P99	P00	P00
Tarkai	Hungary	D95	D96	D97	D99	P99	P00		
SSRC	Ireland	D95	D96	--	D99	P99	P00		
TAU	Israel	--	D96	D97	P99	P99	P00		
Eurisko	Italy		D95	D96	D97	D99	P99	P00	P00
BCRI	Japan		D95	D97	D97	D99	P00	P00	
LAS/LSRC	Latvia	D95	D96	D97	P99	P99	P00		
CEO	Mexico	--	--	--	--	--	P00		
SCP	The Netherlands	D96	--	D98	D98	P99	P00		
MU	New Zealand	D96	D97	D97	D98	P99	P00		
NSD	Norway	D95	D96	D97	D98	P99	P00		
SWS	The Philippines	D95	D96	D97	D98	P99	P00		
ISS	Poland	D95	D97	D97	P99	P99	P00		
ICS	Portugal	--	--	D97	D98	P99	P00		
VCIOM	Russia	D96	D97	P98	P98	P99	P00		
IS-SAS	Slovakia	D96	--	--	P98	P99	P00		
POMCRC	Slovenia	D95	D96	D97	D98	D99	P00		
CIS/ASEP	Spain		D95	D96	D97	D98	P99	P00	P00
UU	Sweden	D95	D96	D97	D98	P99	P00		
SIDOS	Switzerland	--	--	--	P99	P99	P00		
NORC	United States	D96	D96	D98	D98	P00	D00		
LACSO	Venezuela	--	--	--	--	P00	P00		

^aIncludes Slovakia in 1992.

^bIncludes East Germany starting in 1990.

^cIncludes Northern Ireland 1989-1991, 1993, and 1994.

^dPartial version of 1986 Social Support module.

Table 1 (continued)

ASA=Agency for Social Analyses (Sofia)
 BCRI=Broadcasting Culture Research Institute, NHK (Tokyo)
 BS=Baltic Surveys, Lithuania
 BUP=Bangladesh Unnayan Parishad (Dhaka)
 CAR=Center for Applied Research, Cyprus College (Nicosia)
 CEO=Centro de Estudios Opinion, University of Guadalajara
 CDA=Centrum voor Dataverzameling en -Analyse, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
 CES=Centro de Estudios Publicos (Santiago)
 CIS/ASEP=Centro de Investigaciones Sociologicas and Analisis Sociologicos, Economicos y Politicos (Madrid)
 Eurisko, in collaboration with the University of Milan (Milan)
 FSD=Finnish Social Science Data Archive, University of Tampere
 FRANCE-ISSP=consortium of Centre de Recherche en Economie et Statistique, Centre d' Informatisation des Donnees Socio-Politiques, Observatoire Francais des Conjonctures Economiques, and Laboratoire d' Analyse Secondaire et de Methodes Appliquees en Sociologie (Paris)
 ICS=Instituto de Ciencias Sociais, University of Lisbon (Lisbon)
 IFS=Instytut Fiozofuu i Socjologii, University of Warsaw (Warsaw)
 IS=Institut fuer Soziologie, University of Graz (Graz)
 ISCAS=Institute of Sociology, Czech Academy of Sciences (Prague)
 ISS=Institute of Social Studies, University of Warsaw (Warsaw)
 IS-SAS=Institute of Sociology, Slovak Academy of Sciences (Bratislava)
 IUPERJ=Instituto Universitario de Pesquisas do Rio de Janerio
 LACSO=Laboratorio de Ciencias Sociales (Caracas)
 LAS/LSRC=Latvian Academy of Science and Latvia Social Research Centre (Riga)
 NCSR=National Center for Social Research; formerly Social and Community Planning Research (London)
 NORC=National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago (Chicago)
 NSD=Norsk Samfunnsvitenskapelig Datajeneste, University of Bergen (Bergen)
 MU=Masseey University (Palmerston)
 POMCRC=Public Opinion and Mass Communication Research Center, University of Ljubljana (Ljubljana)
 RSSH=Research School of the Social Sciences, Australian National University (Canberra)
 SC=Survey Center, Carleton University (Ottawa)
 SCP=Social en Cultureel Planbureau (Rijkswijk)
 SI=Soziologisches Institut, University of Zuerich (Zurich)
 SIDOS=Swiss Information and Data Archive Service for the Social Sciences (Neuchatel)
 SSRC=Social Science Research Center, University College (Dublin)
 SWS=Social Weather Stations (Quezon City)
 Tarki=Tarsadalomkutatasi Informatika Tarsula (Budapest)
 TAU=Tel Aviv University (Tel Aviv)
 UU=University of Umea (Umea)
 VCIOM=Soviet Center for Public Opinion and Market Research (Moscow)
 ZUMA=Zentrum fuer Umfragen Methoden und Analysen (Mannheim)