

## POTENTIAL FOR DEGROWTH: ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOURS ACROSS 18 EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

**Abstract.** *Avoiding a whole-scale collapse of the civilisation-supporting ecosystems within this century will require a change in the social metabolism, as well as expectations, aspirations, behaviours and attitudes of the majority of the global population, especially in the Global North. In absence of the technological innovation to allow maintenance and expansion of the current energy utilisation by the global society, but without the collapse-inducing byproducts, the societies will require a transformation along the lines of a degrowth scenario. The main goal of this paper is to explore to what extent is environmentally motivated degrowth potential present among European populations on the level of attitudes and evaluation of behaviour. In order to do so we use the ISSP research module Environment survey data from 2011, analysing comparative findings for 18 European 'old' and 'new' democracies. Our findings indicate the prevalence of common awareness of environmental limits to growth among all participating European national populations, but a different potential to apply them in a degrowth scenario between 'richer' and 'poorer' states, as well as between younger and older European degrowthers.*

**Keywords:** *degrowth, environmental limits, sustainability, social transformation, Europe, ISSP*

### Introduction

“Indeed, these three fundamental questions of economic organization – *what, how, and for whom* – are as crucial today as they were at the dawn of human civilization.” (Samuelson & Nordhaus, 1998: 8)

---

\* Dr. Sc. Branko Ančić, postdoctoral fellow; dr. Mladen Domazet, research associate, Institute for Social Research in Zagreb, Croatia.

In the run-up to another global regulatory struggle concerned with climate-wrecking economic ‘side-effect’ at the Paris 2015 COP, the debate about the environmental consequences of international economic growth and associated material consumption have gained academic and policy prominence again. The global strategy response has so far been twofold. One strategy response is to call for a rapid and radical transition to a “green economy” intensely decoupled from material use and carbon emissions in energy production (UNEP, 2011). The other one is to completely change focus away from economic growth as the societal developmental goal with globally destructive consequences (Dietz & O’Neill, 2013; Jackson, 2009; Kallis, 2011).

Whilst the former strategy would also require a social transition traditionally associated with a major technological change (in energy production and distribution, for example) (Park, 1954; Polany, 1968; Pomeranz, 2009) it is currently primarily a problem of missing sufficiently implementable technological innovation (Steinberger, Krausmann, Getzner, Schandl & West, 2013; Tienhaara, 2009). But should it ever materialise, it promises to require a lesser upheaval to the social structures through which the embodied solar energy is distributed and the governance mechanisms altering their dynamics, than is the case with modification of social and governance structures to lessen the environmental impact of the current technology (Domazet et al., 2014). For much of the world population it is more akin to a business as usual scenario that requires no fundamental societal transformation.

The latter, the approach broadly characterised as degrowth (Schneider, 2008, 2010), involves a technological change as well. The current energy transformation technologies are clearly unsustainable given the sustenance-threatening consequences of dramatic climate change induced by the end of the century through the business-as-usual path of fossil fuel utilisation by a growing global population. A global population would have to dramatically reduce the use of existing fossil-fuel energy, increase the efficiency of those it cannot avoid utilising and replace them with renewable energy sources wherever possible (Jackson, 2009). Such a transition is associated with a much more radical social transformation for it decouples social and personal development and improvement aspirations from increase in economic production and consumption (material or ‘dematerialized’) within a given population. In simpler terms, it asks of the population to be prepared to do with less in terms of energy and material products.

Regarding social transformation it is significant how new concepts, ideas, paradigm shifts and social movements tackling these issues emerge in contemporary societies. For instance, in 2014 in Leipzig, Germany, Fourth International Conference on Degrowth for Ecological Sustainability and Social Equity has gathered various social actors (academicians and activists)

around the topic of degrowth and reflecting upon concrete steps towards sustainable societies beyond the imperative of growth<sup>1</sup>. Previously, activist and research communities have tackled the impact of degrowth and various degrowth scenarios at international conferences such as Paris in 2008, Barcelona in 2010 and Montreal and Venice in 2012, but also within the civil society organizations and initiatives in Canada, Spain, Greece or France (Baykan, 2007). We could say that in recent years a rising number of engaged social actors began to form a sort of social coalition dealing with implementation of degrowth transition, underlined by democratic processes calling for “downscaling the economy and bringing it within ecological limits” (Cattaneo, D’Alisa, Kallis & Zografos, 2012).

Contemporary societies, perceived either as industrial or post-industrial, are characterized with processes of marketization and economization of non-economic societal systems (i.e. welfare, healthcare, arts, education, civil society etc.). Economization became the main principle of societalization while at the heart of this principle lays the imperative of growth. Therefore, degrowth implies a change of the concept of the economy of growth but not only in terms of a GDP decline. It implies a change in nature of production and consumption, aiming at social and environmental sustainability (Demaria, Schneider, Sekulova & Martinez-Alier, 2013). Low or negative rates of GDP change in fact privilege inherited wealth worsening existing social inequalities in the long run, which in turn act as a barrier to democratic support for environmentally sustainable strategies (Piketty, 2014; Wilkinson & Pickett, 2010; Žitko, 2014). Degrowth should not be seen as a solely economic concept but more as a social concept with multi-contextual and multi-dimensional layers, since it incorporates activism and research in justice, critical analysis of development’s relation to utilitarianism, wellbeing, reformism and radical alternative practices. It encompasses topics of our past and our future in terms of our everyday life practices and potentials.

Social transformation and shift towards non-growth oriented societies assumes, as the degrowth theoreticians and activists underlay (Cattaneo et al., 2012), achievement of a degrowth scenario as the widening and deepening of the process of democratization, thus leading to social emancipation. Social changes unfolding in either more revolutionary or evolutionary social dynamics, but holding within the frames of widening and deepening of the process of democratization, depends on the existence and formation of specific value orientations. For restructuring social relations in order to make a shift towards degrowth orientation certain inter-dependent principles, as Latouche argues, are required. His “Rs” of degrowth include eight

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://leipzig.degrowth.org/en/>

inter-dependent principles. Re-evaluate what matters. Reconceptualize key notions such as wealth, poverty, value, scarcity and abundance. Restructure the productive apparatus and social relations to fit these new values. Redistribute wealth and access to natural resources between North and South and between classes, generations and individuals. Relocalize which means producing on local level thus descending all economic, political and cultural decisions at that level. Reduce production and consumption, especially for goods and services with little use value but high environmental impact. Re-use products and Recycle waste (Latouche, 2009).

Latouche's degrowth principles are broad social concepts needed for thinking in terms of social transformation towards sustainable and equitable societies, but one principle needs to be mentioned as a widening of Latouche's degrowth principles and that is social trust. For social emancipation through democratically based social transformation, social trust seems to be a necessary social prerequisite, especially in terms of relocalizing social practices and decision-making. Emancipatory potential of ('developed') societies to make a u-turn for reduction of economic production and consumption, thus leading to achievement of degrowth scenarios, can be explored through analyzing the prevalence of attitudes and practices connected with Latouche's degrowth inter-dependent principles. All of these inter-dependent principles as social concepts have an axiological notion immanent not only for philosophical dimension of degrowth concept, but also as socially existent ideas at individual level. The main goal of this paper is to explore to what extent are some of the Latouche's degrowth "Rs" present among European populations on the level of attitudes and evaluation of behavior. In order to do so we use the International Social Survey Programme research module Environment which focuses on environmental attitudes, beliefs and behavior.

## Methodology

For the purpose of exploring the degrowth potential in Europe we use the data for 18 countries (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom) participating in the ISSP module Environment, and fielded during 2009, 2010 and 2011<sup>2</sup>. As degrowth measures we have used several indicators assessing value orientation and intended behavior concerning degrowth concept, and in the analysis will be used as dependent variables.

<sup>2</sup> ISSP Research Group (2012): *International Social Survey Programme: Environment III – ISSP 2010. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA5500 Data file Version 2.0.0, doi:10.4232/1.11418*

### *Dependent variables*

As degrowth indicators we have used ISSP variables presenting personal willingness to make a material sacrifice in order to protect the environment, assessment of personal behaviour in line with mentioned degrowth principles and attitudes on economic growth-environment trade-off (table 1).

Composite measure *Attitudes of Material Sacrifice* (AMS) includes measures of willingness to: a) pay much higher prices in order to protect the environment; b) pay much higher taxes in order to protect the environment; c) to accept cuts in one's own standard of living in order to protect the environment<sup>3</sup>. It is thus a direct expression of the diffusion within a particular state's population of individuals willing to make sacrifices and support policies that demand greater material investments from individuals whilst providing smaller material benefits for them from resource extraction. The latter is what is required for reduction of the ecological footprint of individual societies, and the overall global population in the end, in order to bring them in line with the projected sustainable state.

*Degrowth-compliant pro-environmental behaviour (DCPEB)* is presented by a set of variables that, rather than measuring actual behaviour, measures respondents' intentions to take part in pro-environmental behaviour environment, such as recycling of glass, plastic and paper, buying 'green' products, saving water and choosing alternative means of transportation instead of travelling by car or saving energy. This indicator presents evaluation of personal behaviour and effort in line with degrowth orientation.

On top of indexes, composite measures of willingness for material sacrifice and personal efforts for environmental reasons, we also use single variable indicators of agreement/disagreement with general statements concerning economic growth-environment trade-off. These report on the prevalence within individual states of individuals who agree or disagree with statements whose affirmation or denial is a lemma of ecological and democratic strands of the degrowth conceptualisation. We divide these statements into those that express awareness of the immediate trade-off between growth as we know it and environmental protection, and those that express awareness of general ecological limits of growth, and name them Active Degrowth and Passive Degrowth respectively. The items were measured on a Likert-type acceptance scale ranging from 1 = "strongly agree"; 2="agree"; 3= "neither agree nor disagree"; 4="disagree"; 5 = "strongly disagree". Active Degrowth is represented by two single-variable (attitude) indicators (10a

---

<sup>3</sup> Reliability analysis on these three items for all of the ISSP countries indicates a good internal consistency (Cronbach's  $\alpha$  is 0.84). Therefore, we have constructed an additive index ranging from 3 to 15.

and 11a). The first, concurrent with *Environment-economy trade-off* indicator in Domazet et al. (2014a), exhibits the prevalence of individuals within states' populations who disagree with statement that concern for the future of the environment is exaggerated and unjustifiably prioritised over economic activities and progress. This is linked to considerations of efficacy on the individual and collective levels, perceptions of which are vital to one's willingness to make degrowth commitments concerning economic activity (Meyer, 2010; Ostrom, 2010). The second single-variable (attitude) indicator (11a) measures the normative side of economy-environment trade-off. It captures the prevalence within state's populations of individuals who disagree with a single item statement that their country *needs* economic growth in order to protect the environment. Whilst these variables do not in and of themselves indicate prevalence of support for full-blown economic and social degrowth transformations (Demaria et al., 2013; Kallis, 2011), they do indicate general conceptual support for a shift away from the developmental paradigm by which economic growth leads to remedying of individual scarcity and national environmental problems.

Passive Degrowth is represented by two single-variable (attitude) indicators (11b and 19c). The first captures the prevalence within national populations of individuals who agree with a single item statement that economic growth always harms the environment. Such agreement does not signal that in the growth-environment trade-off the environment should be favoured, but expresses an awareness that such a trade-off exists and thus might indicate abandonment of hope in 'green economies' that would successfully and rapidly decouple economic growth from environmental impact. Whilst less important to efficacy of action, this awareness nonetheless presents a fertile ethical foundation to consider future development strategies that would aim to balance ecological concerns with democratic material aspirations. The second is even more explicit in the expression of limits to growth awareness; it reports on percentage of individuals within national populations expressing agreement with a statement that economic *progress* in their country will slow down unless better environmental protection is enacted. This is an explicit expression of awareness that environmental limits of growth have been reached, and that further economic progress (though explicitly, term growth is not used in this variable) depends on protection rather than destruction of the environmental conditions. This awareness, again, can be perceived as a warning but not an expression of taking sides in environment-growth trade-off, as different environmental protection strategies may still be seen to be compatible with or resultant from focus on achieving economic growth.

Table 1: INDEXES AND INDICATORS OF DEGROWTH ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS

| INDEXES  |     | ITEMS  |
|--|-----|--|
| <b>Attitudes of material sacrifice index (AMS)</b>                       |     | <i>"How willing would you be to:"<sup>a</sup></i>  |
| the reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) for 18 countries is 0.853 |     | (a) "pay much higher prices in order to protect the environment"   |
| 0.56 - 0.80 inter-item correlation                                       |     | (b) "pay much higher taxes in order to protect the environment"  |
|  |     | (c) "to accept cuts in your standard of living in order to protect the environment"  |
| <b>Degrowth-compliant pro-environmental behaviour (DCPEB)</b>            |     | <i>"How often do you make a special effort to..."<sup>b</sup></i>  |
| the reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) for 18 countries is 0.765 |     | (a) "sort glass or tins or plastic or newspaper and so on for recycling"   |
| 0.21 - 0.54 inter-item correlation                                       |     | (b) "buy fruit and vegetables grown without pesticides or chemicals"   |
| range from 6 to 24   |     | (c) "cut back on driving a car for environmental reasons"  |
|  |     | (d) "reduce the energy or fuel you use at home for environmental reasons"  |
|  |     | (e) "choose to save or re-use water for environmental reasons"   |
|  |     | (f) "avoid buying certain products for environmental reasons"  |
| SINGLE-ITEM INDICATORS   |     | ITEMS  |
| <b>Active Degrowth indicators</b>  | 10a | <i>"And how much do you agree or disagree with each of these statements?"<sup>c</sup></i><br><i>"And how much do you agree or disagree with each of these statements?"</i> |
|  | 11a | <i>"How much do you agree or disagree with:"<sup>c</sup></i><br><i>"Our country needs economic growth in order to protect the environment"</i>                             |
|  |     | <i>"How much do you agree or disagree with:"<sup>c</sup></i>   |
| <b>Passive Degrowth indicators</b>                                       |     | <i>"How much do you agree or disagree with:"<sup>c</sup></i>   |
|  | 11b | "Economic growth always harms the environment"   |
|  | 19c | "Economic progress in [COUNTRY] will slow down unless we look after the environment better"  |

<sup>a</sup> Measured on Likert scale: 1 = "very willing"; 2 = "fairly willing"; 3 = "neither willing nor unwilling"; 4 = "fairly unwilling"; 5 = "strongly unwilling"

<sup>b</sup> Measured on scale: 1 = "never"; 2 = "sometimes"; 3 = "mostly", 4 = "always"

<sup>c</sup> Measured on Likert-type scale: 1 = "strongly agree"; 2 = "agree"; 3 = "neither agree nor disagree"; 4 = "disagree"; 5 = "strongly disagree"

Source: ISSP, 2010 - Environment III

### *Independent variables*

In order to explore socio-demographic characteristics of degrowth across Europe as independent variables we have used age and education. The educational level is a categorical variable with a distinction between no formal qualification, lowest formal qualification, secondary and tertiary educational attainment. Although Latouche emphasize redistribution as an inter-dependant degrowth principle and we added social trust to it, those measures in ISSP were not contextualized as part of sustainable and environmental awareness, and therefore are used as independent variables. Generalized trust is constructed as additive index based on the answers to the statements: a) "Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?"; b) "Generally speaking, do you think that most people would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance, or would they try to be fair?"<sup>4</sup>. As a measure of redistribution orientation we have used the question 2b - "It is the responsibility of the government to reduce the differences in income between people with high incomes and those with low incomes". The answers were recoded from five points (from "strongly agree" to "disagree strongly") to three points.

### *Data Analytic Strategies*

First we explored mean values and standard deviations of AMS and DCPEB for each of the 18 European countries along with percentages on each of the Active and Passive Degrowth indicators (table 2). The countries are ranked based on their GDP per capita (USD) data from 2011 (the same year as most of the countries were fielded with ISSP module Environment).

For the purpose of exploring the socio-demographic characteristics of degrowth supporters across Europe we conducted several logistic and OLS regression analyses. Predictors in the model are age and education as socio-demographic elements, and indices of generalized trust and redistribution orientation. Correlates of AMS and DCPEB indexes were explored by linear regression analysis (table 3), while correlates of Active and Passive Degrowth indicators were analysed using logistic regression models (table 4 and 5). Scale on Active and Passive Degrowth indicators was dichotomized in a way that degrowth orientation was assigned with value 1 (strongly agreeing or strongly disagreeing with one of the four statements indicating degrowth

<sup>4</sup> Reliability analysis on these two items for all of the ISSP countries indicates an acceptable internal consistency (Cronbach's  $\alpha$  is 0.75). Therefore, we have constructed an additive index ranging from 2 to 10.



orientation), while non-degrowth orientation was assigned with value 0. Analysis was done on all European national populations as a single sample (individuals as unit of analysis).

## Results

Whilst national development policies are still expressed within nation states and socio-cultural determinants of each of the analysed states influence personal value-orientations, attitudes and behavioural patterns, the eco-social effect of degrowth requires a transnational activation (Chatterton & Pickerill, 2010). However, before looking into degrowth characteristics of European population as a whole (based on the 18 analysed countries), results of “degrowth indicators” are presented for each of the respective countries which are sorted according to national GDP per capita at the time of survey fielding (table 2).

Results presented in table 2 imply a significant variability among European countries in terms of degrowth prevalence and potential among populations. Concerning material sacrifice or more precisely personal willingness to make material sacrifice (give more money and accept reductions of material standard of living) in order to protect the environment, most of the analysed countries have a prevalence of unsustainably oriented populations. Furthermore, their average score on AMS index correlates strongly with national GDP per capita (Kendall's tau\_b: .774,  $p < .01$ ). Transformation of material and social infrastructure into those more suitable to sustainability will also require willing sacrifices on individual level, in terms of greater costs of living or taxes for maintenance of public environmental services (Wapner, 2010). It expresses not just willingness to sacrifice but also a striving or commitment to purposeful action. There is of course an important obstacle, similar to general ‘willingness to pay’ problems, to the use of this in comparative indications of different countries’ commitments to a common cause. Given the differences in affluence between countries, especially among our lower income countries, this might be more of a measure of ‘ability to pay’ than ‘willingness’, and thus be more of an objective development indicator than a measure of population’s willingness for different development strategies (Haanpää, 2006). Previous analyses comparing perceptions of environmental risks with income and poverty risk in 18 European countries have confirmed this (Dolenec et al., 2014).

Concerning degrowth-compliant pro-environmental behaviour there are differences between countries, and differences between the components of the said index within individual countries also. For instance, in most of the countries sorting recyclables is by far the most frequent personal behaviour, while the least common effort is cutting back on driving

Table 2: INDEXES AND INDICATORS OF DEGROWTH ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS ACROSS 18 EUROPEAN COUNTRIES IN 2011  
 – MEAN VALUES, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND PERCENTAGES

| European countries | GDP per capita (USD 2011) | Material sacrifice (AMS) index* |             |             | Degrowth-compliant pro-environmental behaviour index (DCPEB)** |             |            | Active Degrowth indicators                                   |   | Passive Degrowth indicators                           |  |
|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|--|-------------|------------|--|---|---|--|
|                    |                           | M                               | SD          | z-values    | M  | SD          | z-values   | Q10a Worry too much about environment over jobs (% disagree) | Q11a Environment: protect by economic growth (% disagree) | Q11b Economic growth: harms the environment (% agree) | Q19c Economic progress will slow down without environmental protection (% agree) |
| Norway             | 98564                     | 8.44                            | 2.88        | ,18         | 13.21  | 3.14        | -,23       | 50.3%  | 38.4%   | 14.6%   | 35.1%  |
| Switzerland        | 85794                     | 9.75                            | 2.58        | ,60         | 16.25  | 3.30        | ,54        | 50.0%  | 50.5%   | 38.6%   | 43.2%  |
| Denmark            | 59580                     | 9.31                            | 2.69        | ,46         | 14.93  | 3.28        | ,21        | 54.3%  | 29.0%   | 23.3%   | 49.8%  |
| Sweden             | 57133                     | 8.40                            | 2.81        | ,17         | 13.90  | 3.10        | -,05       | 49.1%  | 20.0%   | 14.1%   | 42.3%  |
| Austria            | 49686                     | 7.99                            | 2.78        | ,04         | 15.79  | 3.90        | ,43        | 46.8%  | 31.9%   | 35.7%   | 39.5%  |
| Finland            | 48887                     | 8.12                            | 2.81        | ,08         | 14.62  | 3.45        | ,13        | 37.9%  | 51.9%   | 35.6%   | 38.9%  |
| Belgium            | 47807                     | 7.98                            | 2.90        | ,03         | 15.51  | 2.77        | ,36        | 32.8%  | 24.9%   | 23.1%   | 23.8%  |
| Germany            | 43865                     | 8.51                            | 2.83        | ,20         | 16.26  | 3.26        | ,55        | 49.5%  | 27.1%   | 28.9%   | 51.2%  |
| France             | 42641                     | 7.66                            | 3.06        | -,07        | 16.53  | 3.14        | ,61        | 32.7%  | 28.3%   | 31.3%   | 34.6%  |
| Great Britain      | 38918                     | 7.56                            | 3.11        | -,10        | 14.31  | 3.79        | ,05        | 35.1%  | 19.2%   | 15.1%   | 34.6%  |
| Spain              | 31820                     | 7.79                            | 2.97        | -,03        | 13.73  | 3.70        | -,10       | 36.9%  | 27.9%   | 25.6%   | 54.7%  |
| Slovenia           | 24709                     | 7.91                            | 2.99        | ,01         | 14.56  | 3.22        | ,11        | 29.6%  | 19.3%   | 35.3%   | 52.5%  |
| Czech R.           | 20606                     | 6.60                            | 2.93        | -,41        | 13.58  | 3.83        | -,13       | 34.3%  | 14.0%   | 28.5%   | 35.5%  |
| Slovakia           | 17545                     | 7.28                            | 2.94        | -,19        | 12.98  | 3.73        | -,29       | 32.2%  | 13.6%   | 31.8%   | 39.9%  |
| Croatia            | 14217                     | 6.31                            | 2.88        | -,50        | 12.99  | 4.24        | -,28       | 31.7%  | 18.5%   | 19.6%   | 42.7%  |
| Lithuania          | 12962                     | 6.36                            | 2.79        | -,48        | 12.50  | 3.85        | -,41       | 32.6%  | 12.8%   | 32.0%   | 46.5%  |
| Latvia             | 12696                     | 5.70                            | 2.60        | -,69        | 12.09  | 3.53        | -,51       | 30.3%  | 15.0%   | 26.0%   | 41.4%  |
| Bulgaria           | 7186                      | 6.36                            | 3.31        | -,48        | 11.46  | 3.75        | -,67       | 40.0%  | 10.2%   | 37.8%   | 59.4%  |
| <b>Average</b>     | <b>39701</b>              | <b>7.72</b>                     | <b>3.06</b> | <b>-,05</b> | <b>14.53</b>   | <b>3.73</b> | <b>,11</b> | <b>39.1%</b>   | <b>25.8%</b>  | <b>27.6%</b>  | <b>42.8%</b>   |

\*Range is from 3 to 15

\*\* Range is from 6 to 24

Source: ISSP, 2010 – Environment III

car for environmental reasons (more in Brajdić Vuković, 2014). But on this measure the correlation with GDP pc weakens (Kendall's tau\_b: .556,  $p < .01$ ), calling for further analysis of social paradigms and material infrastructure for relevant behavioural practices. Personal degrowth-compliant behaviour can be perceived as a personal pro-environmental aspiration and therefore degrowth orientation, however it depends on the available infrastructure suitable for practicing degrowth-compliant behaviour. Based on the results from the composite measure, European population as a whole presents average level of degrowth-compliant behaviour.

Active and passive degrowth indicators, on the other hand, are not indices of individuals' *personal* values and behaviour, but are a collection of comments on the general societal development trends in the trade-offs between environmental conservation and economic activity. Moreover, differences in proportions within and between countries are visible, however in all countries "degrowth critique" of current economic model and its impact on the environment is present.

Although differences among countries suggest socio-structural and socio-cultural conditions which have an impact on dimensions of degrowth concept among respective populations, the concept itself transgresses national boundaries and fundamental societal shifts it requires are not a task for individual states in the contemporary globalized society. It therefore makes sense to analyse all European national populations as a single 'continental' sample. It is thus interesting to see the characteristics of the overall population of European ISSP respondents concerning AMS and DCPEB and expressing support for the measures of Active or Passive Degrowth orientation. For that purpose, we have conducted a linear regression analysis for AMS and DCPEB, while for Active and Passive degrowth indicators we have used logistic regression analysis (table 3).

Concerning AMS predictors in the model education and trust are statistically significant in a way that those with higher educational attainment and those who have more trust in others express more willingness to make material sacrifice in order to protect the environment. Similar is with degrowth-compliant behaviour but with addition of age and redistribution orientation as also significant predictors. It seems that degrowth-compliant pro-environmental behaviour is more prevalent as people became older and within those who are more supportive of governments' redistributive role between citizens with high incomes and those with low incomes (tables 4, 5).

Active and Passive Degrowth orientation tend to differ in the age of the population, with younger population expressing support for Active Degrowth and older population for Passive Degrowth. Level of educational attainment, on the other hand, returns mixed results on support for Active and Passive Degrowth. Higher educational attainment is related with

expressions of disagreement that we worry too much about the future of the environment and not enough about current prices and jobs (variable 10a; part of Active Degrowth) and agreement with statement that country needs economic growth in order to protect the environment (variable 11a; part of Active Degrowth). Educational attainment is also a predictor of agreement with a statement that economic growth always harms the environment (variable 11b; part of Passive Degrowth), but significance of educational stratification is lower. On most our degrowth indicators individuals expressing degrowth-orientation are also individuals supporting redistributive role of the national governments. They are also those expressing higher levels of trust within a society, except on the indicator marking disagreement that their country needs to achieve economic growth in order to successfully protect the environment (variable 11a).

## **Conclusion**

The above analysis detects traces of the correlation between prosperity and environmentally-motivated-degrowth explored in detail elsewhere (Dolenec, Domazet & Ančić, 2014; Domazet, Ančić et al., 2014). This correlation is related to the prosperity thesis (Diekmann & Franzen, 1999), which claims that populations with higher average wealth express higher levels of environmental concern out of greater readiness to pay for environmental resilience as a scarce good. Such a thesis remains highly problematic for social transformation required for degrowth in the absence of the (seemingly miraculous) wealth generation decoupled from local and global environmental impact (Steinberger et al., 2013). National populations, and especially highly developed ones such as the European populations surveyed here are, must find democratic motivation for transformation of social practices in line with environmental sustainability, which will include some form of degrowth strategies (in the sense of degrowth broader than simple economic reading, as outlined in the Introduction), even amongst the comparatively poorer populations, given that the growth space is severely limited from an ecological perspective.

The idea to grow first, attain greater average wealth, and then deal with environmental issues later has been empirically delegitimised as a strategy (Simmons, 1993; Steinberger et al., 2013). In that sense the spread of national scores on measures of acceptance of material sacrifice (AMS), behavioural sacrifice of comfort (DCPEB) and Active Degrowth indicators is not encouraging. It shows wealthier countries' populations lead the way in degrowth-compliant orientation, but even those remain at levels insufficient for democratic mobilisation despite the history of highest material consumption and environmental impact per capita in the world (Schaffartzik et al.,

Table 3: ORDINARY LEAST SQUARES REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF AMS AND DCPEB INDEXES ACROSS 18 EUROPEAN COUNTRIES IN 2011.

|                            | Material sacrifice (AMS) index |      | Degrowth-compliant pro-environmental behaviour (DCPEB) |      |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|------|--|------|
|                            | Beta Coeff.                    | Sig. | Beta Coeff.  | Sig. |
| Age                        | -.003                          | .642 | .170   | .000 |
| Education                  | .135                           | .000 | .052   | .000 |
| Trust                      | .225                           | .000 | .079   | .000 |
| Redistribution orientation | -.009                          | .170 | .071   | .000 |
| F-ratio                    | 450.318                        |      | 179.722  |      |
| F-Sig.                     | .000                           |      | .000   |      |
| R-squared                  | .284                           |      | .206   |      |
| Adjusted R-squared         | .080                           |      | .042   |      |
| Number of countries        | 18                             |      | 18   |      |
| Number of observations     | 20573                          |      | 16263  |      |

Source: ISSP, 2010 - Environment III

Table 4: LOGISTIC REGRESSION OF ACTIVE DEGROWTH INDICATORS ACROSS 18 EUROPEAN COUNTRIES IN 2011.

| European Countries         | Q10a Worry about future environment* |      |         |      |       | Q11a Environment: protect by economic growth* |      |         |      |       |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|---------|------|-------|---|------|---------|------|-------|
|                            | β                                    | s.e. | Wald    | Sig. | Exp   | β   | s.e. | Wald    | Sig. | Exp   |
| Age                        | -.011                                | .001 | 133,753 | .000 | .989  | -.005   | .001 | 28,249  | .000 | .995  |
| Education                  | .527                                 | .024 | 492,156 | .000 | 1,693 | .199  | .025 | 65,087  | .000 | 1,220 |
| Trust                      | .166                                 | .008 | 456,354 | .000 | 1,181 | .106  | .008 | 172,645 | .000 | 1,112 |
| Redistribution orientation | .214                                 | .022 | 93,200  | .000 | .807  | -.032   | .022 | 2,055   | .152 | .969  |
| Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup>  | .129                                 |      |         |      |       | .030  |      |         |      |       |
| Number of countries        | 18                                   |      |         |      |       | 18  |      |         |      |       |
| Number of observations     | 16297                                |      |         |      |       | 15666   |      |         |      |       |

\* Answers "4" and "5" coded as 1, answers "1-3" coded as 0.

Source: ISSP, 2010 - Environment III

2014). Previous analyses have shown a reversal of the prosperity trend on awareness of ecological limits of growth within the sample of 18 European countries, as well as wider global ISSP sample (Domazet, Ančić et al., 2014; Domazet & Ančić, n.d.). Passive Degrowth indicators do not distinguish between wealthier and poorer European societies, showing that awareness of environmental limits of growth is not limited to national wealth, but the readiness to act on it is.

As with the distinction between individual 'willingness to pay' and 'ability to pay' presented above, this may be another example of infrastructural

Table 5: LOGISTIC REGRESSION OF PASSIVE DEGROWTH INDICATORS ACROSS 18 EUROPEAN COUNTRIES IN 2011.

| European Countries         | Q11b Economic growth: harms the environment** |      |         |      |       | Q19c Economic progress in [COUNTRY] will slow down** |      |         |      |       |
|----------------------------|---|------|---------|------|-------|--|------|---------|------|-------|
|                            | β   | s.e. | Wald    | Sig. | Exp   | β  | s.e. | Wald    | Sig. | Exp   |
| Age                        | ,004  | ,001 | 18,531  | ,000 | 1,004 | ,008   | ,001 | 56,246  | ,000 | 1,008 |
| Education                  | -,238   | ,024 | 94,732  | ,000 | ,788  | -,059  | ,026 | 5,047   | ,025 | ,943  |
| Trust                      | -,109   | ,008 | 179,631 | ,000 | ,897  | ,013   | ,009 | 2,177   | ,140 | 1,013 |
| Redistribution orientation | ,321  | ,024 | 181,345 | ,000 | 1,379 | ,337   | ,024 | 202,167 | ,000 | 1,400 |
| Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup>  | ,059  |      |         |      |       | ,030   |      |         |      |       |
| Number of countries        | 18  |      |         |      |       | 18   |      |         |      |       |
| Number of observations     | 14533   |      |         |      |       | 13044  |      |         |      |       |

\*\*Answers “1” and “2” coded as 1, answers “3–5” coded as 0.

Source: ISSP, 2010 – Environment III

insufficiencies, in this case socio-economic rather than material, for degrowth-compliant strategies among poorer European populations. Even on normative grounds, it can be considered unfair to expect those with less resources in contemporary globalised economy to lead the contribution to the common endeavour, or as Shue says “if the wealthy have no general obligation to help the poor, the poor certainly have not general obligation to help the wealthy” (Shue, 1999: 543). But as the degrowth movement, introduced above, is trans-national, so the environmental constrictions and strategies required to address them are. National populations are political subjects in contemporary Europe, but a global transition along the lines of degrowth movements’ invocations requires a transnational mobilisation, especially in a wealthy and highly interconnected region such as Europe is. In this sense we aimed to examine the overall European degrowth-oriented population as a democratic actor in its own right.

Our results indicate that there is a significant difference between Active Degrowth and Passive Degrowth supporting populations within the overall European sample, on top of and in combination with the differences exhibited by national populations.<sup>5</sup> Whilst ‘European degrowth supporters’ are

<sup>5</sup> Whilst the collection of individual respondents reported on here is not a representative sample of the overall European population, but a collection of different size representative samples of national populations of 18 participating countries, based on previous and above analyses there is no reason to assume that nationality influences the profile of degrowth-orientation individuals. More explicitly there is no reason to assume as a starting hypothesis that odds of age group or redistribution orientation are affected by the values of the degrowth-compliant answers to Active and Passive Degrowth variables (predictors) and nationality of the respondent. Nonetheless, these results should be used as first indication of trends among European population to be followed by further analysis on a representative European sample scaling the national participation in accordance with the distribution of national population sizes in Europe.

invariably those already expressing individual concern for the environment and individually committed to material sacrifice, they are also people who support the redistributive role of the government and tend to have greater level of social trust. Educational attainment also plays a part in degrowth-support according to our measures, but its role is much less clear and requires further analysis and elucidation. This is not unexpected given the theoretical expectations of the social degrowth transition, including greater social cohesion and redistribution of outputs of production in lieu of shifts in social metabolism.

What is clear, though, is the age difference, with younger 'European degrowthers' being more supportive of the Active Degrowth measures and older 'European degrowthers' more supportive of the Passive Degrowth measures. Interestingly, this 'passive' awareness of normative environmental limits of economic growth, combines with self-reporting of individual sacrificial behaviour, as degrowth-compliant pro-environmental behaviour is also more prevalent as people became older. This need not be surprising, as we might be seeing an influence of aspiration-dampening (some might say wisdom) with age, a certain transformational defeatism along the lines of more-conservative-as-you-age. There is also a hang-up of the twentieth-century ecological modernisation approach at play here, affecting older more than younger populations (Cifrić, Čaldarović, Kalanj & Kufrin, 1998). As the Active and Passive Degrowth statements test the overall societal strategies and not personal 'devil-may-care' attitudes the age-dependent difference should not be ascribed to the different life-prospects of the age groups. A natural follow-up to these indicative findings would be testing the relationship between contextual socio-demographic characteristics of degrowth supporters across Europe and viable and positive degrowth-oriented mid-term policies and long-term development strategies on a representative sample of entire European population. It would also be interesting to see whether there is overlap in these characteristics and support between European and global populations, especially those already expressing high proportion of support for some of our degrowth-orientation measures.

What is clear is that on the whole the European degrowth-compliant population motivated from environmental perspective is neither negligent nor of irrelevant size, whilst still presenting a minority in both 'rich' and 'poor' European states. It is a population of individuals with value-sets overlapping with Latouche's (2009) R's, in for example calls for redistribution, community cohesion and localisation through social trust. It is also a population with marked willingness to commit individual sacrifices from the perspective of material self-interest, and crucially its younger segment is more dedicated to possible proactive measures than the older one is. And whilst there is no difference between citizens of 'richer' and 'poorer' European states in the awareness of environmental limits of growth, with generally 'older

environmentalist degrowthers' opting for this normative approach, wealth and economic output of individual states is a reliable predictor of their overall population's willingness to support proactive degrowth transformation, practice pro-environmental behaviour and commit to individual material sacrifice. This would indicate a possible cleavage between 'richer' and 'poorer' Europeans in aspirational choice between technologically induced 'green economy' and socially induced degrowth, which calls for a better targeted and more nuanced comparative research than the survey employed here permitted. Its findings could help inform the widening and deepening trans-national pan-European process of democratization, aiming at eventual social emancipation for a just degrowth scenario implementation.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baykan, G. B. (2007): From limits to growth to degrowth within French green politics. *Environmental Politics*, 16(3), 513–517. doi:10.1080/09644010701251730
- Brajdić Vuković, M. (2014): The sustainability potential of the knowledge society: Empirical study. In M. Domazet & D. Marinović Jerolimov (Eds.), *Sustainability Perspectives from the European Semi- periphery*. Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja u Zagrebu; Heinrich Böll Stiftung-Hrvatska.
- Cattaneo, C., G. D'Alisa, G. Kallis & C. Zografos (2012): Degrowth futures and democracy. *Futures*, 44, 515–523. Retrieved from <http://scholar.google.com/cholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:Degrowth+futures+and+democracy#0>
- Chatterton, P. & J. Pickerill (2010): Everyday activism and transitions towards post-capitalist worlds. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 35(4), 475–490.
- Cifrić, I., O. Čaldarović, R. Kalanj & K. Kufrin (1998): *Društveni razvoj i ekološka modernizacija – prilozi sociologiji tranzicije*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko sociološko društvo.
- Demaria, F., F. Schneider, F. Sekulova & J. Martinez-Alier (2013): What is Degrowth? From an Activist Slogan to a Social Movement. *Environmental Values*, 22(2), 191–215. doi:10.3197/096327113X13581561725194
- Diekmann, A. & A. Franzen (1999): The Wealth of Nations and Environmental Concern. *Environment and Behaviour*, 28, 302–339.
- Dietz, R. & D. O'Neill (2013): *Enough is enough: Building a sustainable economy in a world of finite resources*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Dolenec, D., M. Domazet & B. Ančić (2014): Why power is not a peripheral concern: Exploring the relationship between inequality and sustainability. In M. Domazet & D. Marinović Jerolimov (Eds.), *Sustainability Perspectives from the European Semi- periphery* (pp. 173–194). Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja u Zagrebu; Heinrich Böll Stiftung-Hrvatska.
- Domazet, M. & B. Ančić (n.d.): How far for the money?: prosperity and democratic degrowth potential in Europe. Forthcoming in A. Telešienė (ed.), *Green European. Environmental Behaviour and Attitudes in Europe in a Historical and Cross-Cultural Comparative Perspective*.



- Domazet, M., B. Ančić & M. Brajdić Vuković (2014): Prosperity and environmental sacrifice in Europe: Importance of income for sustainability-orientation. In M. Domazet & D. Marinović Jerolimov (Eds.), *Sustainability Perspectives from the European Semi- periphery* (pp. 145–172). Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja u Zagrebu; Heinrich Böll Stiftung-Hrvatska.
- Domazet, M., D. Dolenc, V. Cvijanović, T. Tomašević, J. F. Walton, K. Doolan & M. Žitko (2014): We Need to Change. Ideas of Growth and Development in a Time of Crisis of Fossil Energy and Capitalism. *Etnološka Tribina*, 44(37), 37–71. doi: 10.15378/1848-9540.2014.37.01
- Haanpää, L. (2006): *Environmental Concern Worldwide: An Examination of Two-way Thesis of Environmentalism and National Variation*. In T. A. Wilska & L. Haanpää (Eds.), *Lifestyles and Social Change. Essays in Economic Sociology* (pp. 179–204). Tampere: Esa Print.
- Jackson, T. (2009): Prosperity Without Growth: Economics for a Finite Planet. *Eastern Economic Journal* (Vol. 40). London: Earthscan. doi:10.1057/eej.2013.22
- Kallis, G. (2011): In defense of degrowth. *Ecological Economics*, 70, 873–880.
- Latouche, S. (2009): *Farewell to Growth* (p. 124). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Meyer, J. M. (2010): A Democratic Politics of Sacrifice? In M. Maniates & J. M. Meyer (Eds.), *The Environmental Politics of Sacrifice* (pp. 13–32). Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Ostrom, E. (2010): Polycentric systems for coping with collective action and global environmental change. *Global Environmental Change*, 20, 550–557.
- Park, R. E. (1954): *Human Ecology*. In A. W. Lind & R. E. Park (Eds.), *Human Communities. The City and Human Ecology* (pp. 145–164). Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Piketty, T. (2014): *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Polanyi, K. (1968): *Primitive, archaic, and modern economies; essays of Karl Polanyi*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Pomeranz, K. (2009): Introduction. *World History and Environmental History*. In E. I. Burke & K. Pomeranz (Eds.), *Environment and World History* (pp. 3–32). London: University of California Press.
- Samuelson, P. A. & W. D. Nordhaus (1998): *Economics* (16th ed.). London: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Schaffartzik, A., A. Mayer, S. Gingrich, N. Eisenmenger, C. Loy & F. Krausmann (2014): The global metabolic transition: Regional patterns and trends of global material flows, 1950–2010. *Global Environmental Change*, 26, 87–97. doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.03.013
- Schneider, F. (2008): Macroscopic rebound effects as argument for economic degrowth. In *Proceedings of degrowth conference*. Paris 18–19 April 2008. Barcelona: Research and Degrowth.
- Schneider, F. (2010): Degrowth of production and consumption capacities for social justice, well-being and ecological sustainability. In *Proceedings of the second conference on economic degrowth for ecological sustainability and social equity*. Barcelona: University of Barcelona.

- Shue, H. (1999): Global environment and international inequality. *International Affairs*, 75(3), 531-545. Retrieved from <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/1468-2346.00092>\n<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2346.00092/full>
- Simmons, I. G. (1993): *Environmental history: a concise introduction* (p. 206). Oxford: Blackwell Pub.
- Steinberger, J. K., F. Krausmann, M. Getzner, H. Schandl & J. West (2013): Development and Dematerialization: An International Study. *PLoS "ONE,"* 8(10), e70385. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0070385
- Tienhaara, K. (2009): A Tale of Two Crises. What the Global Financial Crisis Means for the Global Environmental Crisis. In *Global Governance Working Paper Global Governance Working Paper* (p. 37). Amsterdam.
- UNEP (2011): *Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication*.
- Wapner, P. (2010): Sacrifice in an Age of Comfort. In M. Maniates & J. W. Meyer (Eds.), *The Environmental Politics of Sacrifice* (pp. 33-60). Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Wilkinson, R. & K. Pickett (2010): *The Spirit Level - Why Equality is Better for Everyone*. London: Penguin Books.
- Žitko, M. (2014): Global environmental crisis and limits to growth: A Marxian perspective. In M. Domazet & D. Marinović Jerolimov (Eds.), *Sustainability Perspectives from the European Semi- periphery* (pp. 93-116). Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja u Zagrebu; Heinrich Böll Stiftung-Hrvatska.

Appendix 1: AGE, EDUCATION, TRUST AND REDISTRIBUTION ORIENTATION ACROSS 18 EUROPEAN COUNTRIES IN 2011-  
MEAN VALUES, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND PERCENTAGES

|               | N     | Age   |       | Education               |                             |                 |                | Trust |      | Redistribution orientation |             |                  |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------|------|----------------------------|-------------|------------------|
|               |       | M     | SD    | no formal qualification | lowest formal qualification | secondary level | tertiary level | M     | SD   | disagree (strongly)        | neither nor | agree (strongly) |
| Austria       | 1019  | 46.16 | 17.60 | 1.6                     | 17.9                        | 68.2            | 12.4           | 6.28  | 1.94 | 13.5                       | 17.8        | 68.7             |
| Belgium       | 1142  | 49.74 | 18.47 | 3.9                     | 15.3                        | 52.6            | 28.1           | 6.17  | 2.31 | 11.6                       | 13.6        | 74.9             |
| Bulgaria      | 1003  | 48.12 | 18.15 | 1.3                     | 5.1                         | 40.6            | 53.0           | 4.30  | 1.97 | 7.2                        | 12.7        | 80.1             |
| Croatia       | 1210  | 45.60 | 16.65 | 2.3                     | 11.5                        | 65.5            | 20.7           | 5.31  | 2.03 | 9.1                        | 19.0        | 71.9             |
| Czech R.      | 1428  | 47.28 | 17.41 | 0.1                     | 9.6                         | 75.0            | 15.3           | 5.36  | 1.96 | 20.8                       | 22.1        | 57.1             |
| Denmark       | 1305  | 49.12 | 16.83 | 5.7                     | 3.1                         | 36.9            | 54.4           | 7.43  | 1.99 | 27.1                       | 12.7        | 60.2             |
| Finland       | 1211  | 44.29 | 16.46 | 6.5                     | 6.7                         | 37.3            | 49.5           | 6.61  | 2.18 | 15.5                       | 12.9        | 71.6             |
| France        | 2255  | 48.39 | 17.88 | 1.2                     | 14.4                        | 43.1            | 41.3           | 5.36  | 1.96 | 15.3                       | 10.5        | 74.2             |
| Germany       | 1407  | 49.57 | 17.56 | 2.0                     | 34.7                        | 43.6            | 19.7           | 6.11  | 2.03 | 22.9                       | 15.6        | 61.5             |
| Latvia        | 1000  | 44.90 | 17.25 | 2.2                     | 10.6                        | 59.3            | 27.9           | 5.38  | 1.95 | 8.8                        | 12.6        | 78.6             |
| Lithuania     | 1023  | 45.08 | 18.47 | 1.1                     | 6.3                         | 48.9            | 43.7           | 5.31  | 1.71 | 4.0                        | 13.9        | 82.2             |
| Norway        | 1382  | 48.43 | 16.02 | 0.4                     | 5.1                         | 45.9            | 48.6           | 7.71  | 1.94 | 24.3                       | 19.9        | 55.8             |
| Slovak R.     | 1159  | 44.20 | 17.04 | 0.7                     | 22.0                        | 65.0            | 12.3           | 4.97  | 1.89 | 7.9                        | 15.1        | 77.0             |
| Slovenia      | 1082  | 48.64 | 18.49 | 3.7                     | 16.5                        | 57.4            | 22.3           | 4.99  | 1.96 | 7.1                        | 7.5         | 85.3             |
| Spain         | 2560  | 48.41 | 17.67 | 9.2                     | 20.1                        | 49.4            | 21.4           | 5.45  | 1.89 | 12.1                       | 9.4         | 78.5             |
| Sweden        | 1181  | 49.04 | 16.47 | 0.8                     | 17.7                        | 43.0            | 38.5           | 7.22  | 2.03 | 17.3                       | 23.6        | 59.1             |
| Switzerland   | 1212  | 48.92 | 17.76 | 0.6                     | 15.9                        | 54.9            | 28.6           | 6.61  | 1.81 | 27.1                       | 16.2        | 56.7             |
| Great Britain | 934   | 47.31 | 17.63 | 21.3                    | 6.3                         | 34.4            | 38.1           | 6.25  | 2.23 | 23.2                       | 23.9        | 52.9             |
| Total         | 23514 | 47.57 | 17.53 | 3.6                     | 13.9                        | 50.9            | 31.7           | 5.92  | 2.17 | 15.5                       | 15.0        | 69.6             |

Source: ISSP, 2010 - Environment III

Appendix 2: CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR DEPENDANT AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

|                               |                     | Correlations |        |         |         |         |         |         |                |         |                               |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------------|---------|-------------------------------|
|                               |                     | AMS          | DCPEB  | 10a     | 11a     | 11b     | 19c     | Age     | Educa-<br>tion | Trust   | Redistribution<br>orientation |
| AMS                           | Pearson Correlation | 1            | ,336** | ,314**  | ,148**  | ,028**  | ,148**  | -.025** | ,178**         | ,248**  | -,051**                       |
|                               | Sig.                |              | ,000   | ,000    | ,000    | ,001    | ,000    | ,000    | ,000           | ,000    | ,000                          |
| DCPEB                         | Pearson Correlation | 22074        | 16605  | 16636   | 15955   | 14840   | 13197   | 21994   | 21914          | 21459   | 21323                         |
|                               | Sig.                | ,336**       | 1      | ,142**  | ,102**  | ,081**  | ,164**  | ,170**  | ,031**         | ,095**  | ,063**                        |
| 10a                           | Pearson Correlation | 16605        | 17398  | 13144   | 12642   | 11831   | 10463   | 17356   | 17272          | 16918   | 16819                         |
|                               | Sig.                | ,314**       | ,142** | 1       | ,239**  | -,081** | ,023*   | -,131** | ,237**         | ,206**  | -,120**                       |
| 11a                           | Pearson Correlation | 16636        | 13144  | 17532   | 13088   | 12207   | 10964   | 17473   | 17388          | 16991   | 16958                         |
|                               | Sig.                | ,148**       | ,102** | ,239**  | 1       | ,172**  | -,166** | -,053** | ,092**         | ,116**  | -,031**                       |
| 11b                           | Pearson Correlation | 15955        | 12642  | 13088   | 16760   | 12353   | 10908   | 16706   | 16643          | 16294   | 16240                         |
|                               | Sig.                | ,028**       | ,081** | -,081** | ,172**  | 1       | ,115**  | ,054**  | -,119**        | -,140** | -,139**                       |
| 19c                           | Pearson Correlation | 14840        | 11831  | 12207   | 12353   | 15574   | 10093   | 15526   | 15471          | 15158   | 15121                         |
|                               | Sig.                | ,148**       | ,164** | ,023*   | -,166** | ,115**  | 1       | ,079**  | -,045**        | -,005   | ,130**                        |
| Age                           | Pearson Correlation | 13197        | 10463  | 10964   | 10908   | 10093   | 13860   | 13829   | 13764          | 13499   | 13474                         |
|                               | Sig.                | -,025**      | ,170** | -,131** | -,053** | ,054**  | ,079**  | 1       | -,214**        | ,032**  | -,055**                       |
| Education                     | Pearson Correlation | 21994        | 17356  | 17473   | 16706   | 15526   | 13829   | 23399   | 23212          | 22586   | 22450                         |
|                               | Sig.                | ,178**       | ,031** | ,237**  | ,092**  | -,119** | -,045** | -,214** | 1              | ,169**  | -,117**                       |
| Trust                         | Pearson Correlation | 21914        | 17272  | 17388   | 16643   | 15471   | 13764   | 23212   | 23321          | 22507   | 22376                         |
|                               | Sig.                | ,248**       | ,095** | ,206**  | ,116**  | -,140** | -,005   | ,032**  | ,169**         | 1       | -,107**                       |
| Redistribution<br>orientation | Pearson Correlation | 21459        | 16918  | 16991   | 16294   | 15158   | 13499   | 22586   | 22507          | 22683   | 21862                         |
|                               | Sig.                | -,051**      | ,063** | -,120** | -,031** | ,139**  | ,130**  | ,055**  | -,117**        | -,107** | 1                             |
|                               |                     | 21323        | 16819  | 16958   | 16240   | 15121   | 13474   | 22450   | 22376          | 21862   | 22547                         |

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: ISSP, 2010 - Environment III

---

of religious belief, but of the specific socioeconomic characteristics of religious Slovenians.

**Keywords:** economy and religion, religiosity, neoliberalism, socialist syndrome

UDK: 502.131.1:316.42(4)

Branko ANČIĆ, Mladen DOMAZET: POTENCIAL ZA USTAVLJANJE RASTI: STALIŠČA IN OBNAŠANJA V 18 EVROPSKIH DRŽAVAH  
Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana 2015, letnik LII, št. 3. str. 456–475

V tem stoletju bo izogibanje vseobsegajočem propadu ekosistemov, ki so osnova civilizacije, zahtevalo spremembo v socialnem metabolizmu, pa tudi spremembe pričakovanj, aspiracij, obnašanj in stališč večjega dela globalnega prebivalstva, posebej globalnega Severa. Brez tehnoloških inovacij, ki bi omogočile vzdrževanje in rast trenutne uporabe energije v globalni družbi brez stranskih produktov, ki povzročajo splošni propad, bodo družbe potrebovale spremembo, utemeljeno na scenariju ustavljanja rasti ("degrowth" scenarij). Glavni cilj tega članka je razkriti, koliko je okoljevarstveno motiviran potencial za ustavljanje rasti prisoten med evropsko populacijo na ravni stališč in ocene obnašanj. V ta namen uporabljamo ISSP raziskovalni modul Okoljski anketni podatki iz leta 2011 in analiziramo primerljive podatke za 18 evropskih "starih" in "novih" demokracij. Naši rezultati kažejo, da pri vseh evropskih prebivalcih, ki so bili zastopani v raziskovalnem modulu, prevladuje splošno zavedanje o okoljskih omejitvah razvoja, vendar se glede pripravljenosti za uporabo t. i. "degrowth" scenarija kažejo razlike med "bogatejšimi" in "revnejšimi" državami tako kot med mlajšimi in starejšimi podporniki scenarija.

**Ključni pojmi:** ustavljanje rasti, okoljske omejitve, trajnostni razvoj, družbena sprememba, Evropa, ISSP

UDC: 330.831.8:711.4

Klemen PLOŠTAJNER: NEOLIBERALISM AND ITS MANIFESTATIONS IN THE CITY  
Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana 2015, letnik LII, št. 3. str. 476–493

The main aim of the article is to concretise analyses of neoliberalism by theorising its spatial manifestations in the city. Neoliberalism is a special kind of state regulation which through use of market mechanisms of