



POLSKA AKADEMIA NAUK
Instytut Badań Systemowych

**BADANIA OPERACYJNE I SYSTEMOWE:
ŚRODOWISKO NATURALNE,
PRZESTRZEŃ, OPTIMALIZACJA**

Olgierd Hryniewicz,
Andrzej Straszak,
Jan Studziński
red.



**BADANIA OPERACYJNE
I SYSTEMOWE:
ŚRODOWISKO NATURALNE, PRZE-
STRZEŃ, OPTYMALIZACJA**

INSTYTUT BADAŃ SYSTEMOWYCH • POLSKA AKADEMIA NAUK

Seria: BADANIA SYSTEMOWE
tom 63

Redaktor naukowy:

Prof. dr hab. inż. Jakub Gutenbaum

Warszawa 2008

Olgierd Hryniewicz, Andrzej Straszak, Jan Studziński

**BADANIA OPERACYJNE I SYSTEMOWE:
ŚRODOWISKO NATURALNE, PRZESTRZEŃ,
OPTYMALIZACJA**

Publikacja była opiniowana do druku przez zespół recenzentów, którego skład podano w treści tomu

Opinie, wyrażone przez autorów w pracach, zawartych w niniejszym tomie, nie są oficjalnymi opiniami Instytutu Badań Systemowych PAN, ani Polskiego Towarzystwa Badań Operacyjnych i Systemowych.

Copyright © by Instytut Badań Systemowych PAN & Polskie Towarzystwo Badań Operacyjnych i Systemowych
Warszawa 2008

ISBN 83-894-7519-7
EAN 9788389475190

Redakcja i opracowanie techniczne: Jan W. Owskiński, Aneta M. Pielak, Anna Gostyńska

**Lista recenzentów
artykułów, wchodzących w skład tomów serii „Badania Systemowe”
związanych z konferencją BOS 2008**

Dr Paweł Bartoszczuk
Dr inż. Lucyna Bogdan
Dr hab. inż. Zbigniew Buchalski
Mgr inż. Hanna Bury
Prof. dr hab. Marian Chudy
Dr Jan Gadomski
Mgr Grażyna Grabowska
Mgr inż. Andrzej Jakubowski
Dr hab. inż. Ignacy Kaliszewski
Dr Andrzej Kałuszko
Dr hab. Leszek Klukowski
Dr hab. inż. Wiesław Krajewski
Dr inż. Lech Kruś
Dr hab. inż. Marek Libura
Dr Barbara Mażbic-Kulma
Dr inż. Edward Michalewski
Dr inż. Jan W. Owiński
Dr inż. Grażyna Petriczek
Dr inż. Henryk Potrzebowski
Dr Maciej Romaniuk
Prof. dr hab. Piotr Sienkiewicz
Dr hab. Henryk Spustek
Prof. dr hab. Andrzej Straszak
Dr hab. inż. Jan Studziński
Prof. dr hab. Tomasz Szapiro
Mgr Anna Szediw
Dr inż. Grażyna Szkatuła
Dr hab. inż. Tadeusz Witkowski
Dr Irena Woroniecka-Leciejewicz
Dr hab. Sławomir Zadrozny
Dr inż. Andrzej Ziółkowski

**Komitet Konferencji
Badania Operacyjne i Systemowe 2008
Rembertów, Akademia Obrony Narodowej**

Patronat honorowy

Bogdan Klich, Minister Obrony Narodowej
Maciej Nowicki, Minister Środowiska i Zasobów Naturalnych

Komitet Sterujący

Janusz Kacprzyk, Prezes Polskiego Towarzystwa Badań Operacyjnych i Systemowych
Olgierd Hryniewicz, Dyrektor Instytutu Badań Systemowych
Janusz Kręcikij, Komendant Akademii Obrony Narodowej

Komitet Programowy

Piotr Sienkiewicz, *Przewodniczący*
Jacek Mercik, *Wiceprzewodniczący*

<i>Tomasz Ambroziak</i>	<i>Ryszard Budziński</i>	<i>Wojciech Cellary</i>
<i>Marian Chudy</i>	<i>Ludostaw Drelichowski</i>	<i>Jerzy Hołubiec</i>
<i>Olgierd Hryniewicz</i>	<i>Adam A. Janiak</i>	<i>Jerzy Józefczyk</i>
<i>Ignacy Kaliszewski</i>	<i>Józef Korbicz</i>	<i>Maciej Krawczak</i>
<i>Piotr Kulczycki</i>	<i>Małgorzata Łatuszyńska</i>	<i>Marek J. Malarski</i>
<i>Barbara Mażbic-Kulma</i>	<i>Zbigniew Nahorski</i>	<i>Andrzej Najgebauer</i>
<i>Włodzimierz Ogryczak</i>	<i>Wojciech Olejniczak</i>	<i>Jan W. Owsiański</i>
<i>Andrzej Piegat</i>	<i>Krzysztof Santarek</i>	<i>Roman Słowiński</i>
<i>Honorata Sosnowska</i>	<i>Henryk Spustek</i>	<i>Jan Stachowicz</i>
<i>Andrzej Straszak</i>	<i>Tomasz Szapiro</i>	<i>Andrzej Szymonik</i>
<i>Ryszard Tadeusiewicz</i>	<i>Eugeniusz Toczyłowski</i>	<i>Tadeusz Trzaskalik</i>
<i>Jan Węglarz</i>	<i>Tadeusz Witkowski</i>	<i>Stanisław Zajas</i>
	<i>Bogdan Zdrodowski</i>	

Komitet Organizacyjny

Jan W. Owsiański, Andrzej Kałużko, Mieczysław Pelc, Zbigniew Piątek

Sekretariat

Krystyna Warzywoda, Monika Majkut, Aneta M. Pielak, Krzysztof Sep,
Anna Stachowiak, Halina Świeboda, Tadeusz Winiarski

Redakcja wydawnictw

Janusz Kacprzyk, Piotr Sienkiewicz, Andrzej Najgebauer,
Olgierd Hryniewicz, Andrzej Straszak, Jan Studziński,
Jan W. Owsiański, Zbigniew Nahorski, Tomasz Szapiro

Przestrzeń i transport

ON MEASUREMENT OF SUSTAINABILITY AND LIFE QUALITY IN POLISH MUNICIPALITIES

Jan W. Owiński

Systems Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences
Newelska 6, 01-447 Warszawa

In the research on sustainable development at the municipal level in Poland and its indicators, conducted within the project ANAGMIS, one of the themes concerns life quality, as perceived through the municipality-level data. The paper, first, refers to the broadly conceived “economic” and “civilisation-al” aspects of the statistical description of municipalities. After having shown some of the extreme cases for Poland, we look at the proxy for the subjective evaluation of life quality, directly based on migration and migration balance (“voting with the legs”). This proxy is confronted with other descriptive variables in the first stage of an attempt of building the model of migration-based life quality assessment model. The conclusions from this stage of work, meant to direct the further study, close the paper.

1. Introduction

The present paper reports from the work on the Project ANAGMIS¹⁴, dealing with the evaluation of the sustainability of development of Polish self-governmental units. The project aims at the following objectives: (i) elaboration of the methodology of assessing the level and the dynamics of the sustainability of development of the municipality-level units, (ii) analysis of the municipality-level data to support the methodology proposed; (iii) establishment of the website presenting the evaluation results (see Gadomski, Sobczak, Owiński, 2006; Owiński, 2007; Owiński, Więclaw, 2007; Sobczak, Bielak, 2006; Sobczak, 2007a,b).

The present paper belongs to the stream of work on objective (ii). One of the essential aspects of sustainable development, especially when it is broadly conceived, encompassing the environmental, resource-related, social and economic variables, is the (perceived) life quality. This is true in two meanings, equivalent to directions of reasoning and course of actual processes: higher life quality is the effect of a more sustainable development, in quite “theoretical terms”, but also similar indicators may be used to identify the levels of both life quality and sustainability, under definite conditions.

Such generally true, if not trivial, statements, when confronted with the reality of human behaviour, call for a rectification and complementing. Thus, the paper focuses on, first, an assessment of the hypothetical life quality differences in the population of Polish municipality-level units. This assessment is made mainly

¹⁴ ANAGMIS Project: contract with the Ministry of Science and Higher Education No 9008/H03/2006/31, project N11400/31/1404.

through the “economic” and “civilisational” indicators, characterizing the municipalities. Special emphasis is placed on the extreme values of the respective indicators. Then, attention shifts to migration flows, into and out of the municipalities, as the proxy indicator of the actual perception of life quality in particular municipalities. It is considered both in general terms, through the first-glance statistics, and in relation to the two aspects, mentioned before, and especially the extreme cases.

It can be easily concluded that the thus perceived life quality is far less closely, if at all, related to sustainability, understood as in the hypothetical quasi-model, discussed before, or perhaps more generally. The final conclusions of the paper deal with the further work on the model of life quality, as perceived through the migration hypothesis.

2. An assessment of sustainable development

2.1. The indicators selected

Within the framework of the ANAGMIS project data were used for all municipalities in Poland (around 2,500 units) concerning some 20 variables. The essential theme of the project is sustainable development of these units. One of the approaches, used to assess sustainability, developed and applied within the project, consisted in the joint use of two indicators: “economic” and “civilisational”. Each of them was based on a set of (relative) variables, namely:

“*economic indicator*”:

- investment outlays per capita from the municipal budget,
- share in % of the investment outlays in total budgetary expenditures of the municipality,
- share of outlays into transport and communication in expenditures from the budgetary budget,
- number of persons employed outside of agriculture per 1000 inhabitants,
- number of jobless per 1000 inhabitants (times -10),
- number of businesses registered per 1000 inhabitants,
- population inflow per 1000 inhabitants,
- population outflow per 1000 inhabitants (negative).

The “*civilisational indicator*” was composed of the following variables:

- number of publicly available computers with Internet access per 1000 inhabitants,
- number of graduates of higher than middle secondary schools per 1000 inhabitants,
- percentage share of persons served by the water supply system,
- percentage share of persons served by the sewage system,
- percentage share of persons served by a wastewater treatment plant.

In the basic version of the analysis the *overall development indicator* was a simple sum of the two above (i.e. of all the 13 variables). Further, all the data quoted in the paper, are an illustration for the year 2005. It must be emphasised, though,

that this illustration is adequate for representing the phenomena here considered. All the data originate from one, reliable statistical source (the regional database, so-called BDR of the Central Statistical Office, GUS), and are recorded year-to-year, and are thus verifiable. It should be remembered, though, that for many communes the data on computers were until quite recently not available, and that in virtually all the rural communes there no schools other primary ones. In addition, employment is registered according to the seat of the company, not the place of residence, nor even of the actual place of work. The fact that the data source used does not account for the employment on family farms is partly “offset” by the low jobless registration in rural areas. Hence, a statistical artefact can arise of having joblessness positively correlated with employment rate.

Variables were selected on the basis of several criteria, including relative balance of the two indicators, as illustrated in Table 1 below. It should be noted that while, indeed, the averages of the two indicators are relatively well balanced, the spreads are quite different (differing by more than factor of two). This brings us to the issue of the overall characterisation of the population of Polish communes.

Table 1. The economic and civilisational indicators across all Polish municipalities

<i>Indicators:</i>	<i>Economic</i>	<i>Civilisational</i>
Averages	172.06	153.84
Standard deviations	183.91	78.22

2.2. A characterisation of the population of Polish communes

Municipalities are formally classified in Poland into urban, rural and urban-rural. There are some 300 urban communes, being “true-to-life” towns, even if small ones. Some of them are, of course, big towns and large agglomerations. Most of communes, close to 1600, are rural ones, the rest (close to 600) are urban-rural, meaning that a (really) small town is treated together with the respective surrounding rural commune. Even though care was taken not to define “too small” communes, the resulting diversification is formidable, as shown in Table 2. Attention ought to be paid to the enormous differentiation in terms of municipal budgets.

Table 2 conceals the obviously expected various ranges of differentiation of the three classes of municipalities. That is why, in Table 3, the characteristics are shown for selected variables, entering the two indicators previously defined, and for the total value of the development indicator, broken down into all communes, urban, rural and urban-rural ones, and respective minima, averages and maxima. Note that the values here quoted are those that enter already the indicators, not just the raw values of the respective variables.

It can be easily seen from Table 3 that the largest differentiation (in terms of the relative variables) exists, as anyway expected, among rural communes. This is, in particular, expressed through the fact that the biggest number of the extreme values occurs in just these communes.

Table 2. The scale of differentiation of Polish municipalities

	Area in km ²	Population	Own revenues of communal budgets, in PLN (Polish zlotys)	Revenues from personal income tax, in PLN
<i>Minima</i>	3.32	1 321	520 400	99 000
<i>Maxima</i>	634.80	1 692 854	4 855 300 000	2 086 895 000
<i>Ratio of max to min</i>	Min x 200	Min x 1 000	Min x 10 000	Min x 20 000

Table 3. Some characteristics of the values entering the indicators for various commune types

Communes:	Employed outside farming per 1,000 inhabitants	Unemployed per 1,000 inhabitants	Businesses per 1,000 inhabitants	% of inhabitants served by water supply	Summary indicator value
All					
- <i>min</i>	0	-366	18	0	-32
- <i>average</i>	115	-89	66	76	311
- <i>max</i>	4439	0	336	132	5861
Urban					
- <i>min</i>	16	-366	40	22	189
- <i>average</i>	232	-87	109	92	593
- <i>max</i>	549	-24	336	99.70	1032
Rural					
- <i>min</i>	16	-215	18	0	-32
- <i>average</i>	83	-87	55	71	240
- <i>max</i>	4439	0	324	104	5861
Urban-rural					
- <i>min</i>	0	-205	30	0	63
- <i>average</i>	140	-95	74	81	358
- <i>max</i>	800	0	268	132	1272

The “strange” values, which occur in Table 3, like 0 persons employed outside of family farming or 0 of unemployed are either statistical artefacts, or errors, or, ultimately, the reflection of the true, but extreme situation (this is, most probably, the case of 0 unemployed, since there may be communes, in which no jobless person is formally registered).

Two particularities should, though, be explicitly explained. One is related to the maximum total indicator value, closely related to the maximum score for the number of employed, recorded for a rural commune! This is effect of the data collection system, based on location of company seats. The exceptional commune (4439 persons employed per 1000 inhabitants!) is Kleszczów in central Poland, where

large-scale lignite mining and power generation centre developed. The other is more than 100% of inhabitants served in maximum cases by water supply (104% for a rural commune and 132% for a rural-urban one). This is a statistical artefact, resulting from the way the water supply companies report the extent of the respective systems. Luckily, these cases are very rare indeed, and do not spoil the entire image.

The conclusions that can be drawn from this table are straightforward. First, the biggest differentiation can be observed among the rural communes (the shading outside of the averages indicating the extreme values). It should be noted that even for the number of registered businesses per 1,000 inhabitants the maximum for rural communes is almost identical to the maximum for towns (324 vs. 336). It appears that the ranges of values taken are in a way related to the numbers of municipalities in respective types, a rather strange statistical phenomenon.

The summary indices, being simple sums of “scores” of all the variables listed, were also represented by the yet simplified linear regression models, making them dependent upon the selected, most important variables. The results of such models are presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Coefficients of summary indicator models for particular types of communes

Model elements:	Constant	Employed per 1000	Jobless per 1000	% water supply availability	% sewage availability	% water treatment availability	R ²
Models for communes:							
- all	129.25	1.25	1.24	0.96	1.24	1.15	0.94
- urban	203.51	1.19	1.15	0.06	1.52	1.08	0.85
- rural	124.31	1.25	1.27	1.05	1.58	0.97	0.92
- urban-rural	140.09	1.22	1.20	0.68	1.03	1.41	0.90

Two aspects of Table 4, attract attention: **1.** lack of dependence upon water supply availability in towns, obvious in view of virtually complete availability of water supply in towns (92% on the average, see Table 3), and **2.** high degree of similarity of models, with the one exception mentioned. It is also interesting to compare the constant coefficients of these models with the average scores (Table 5).

Thus, the variable part of the model plays the most important role in the case of urban communes, which is closely linked to the fact that the variability of scores is the lowest in this type.

Table 5. Comparison of average summary scores and model constants

Communes:	Average summary score:	Constant model coefficient
All	311	129
Urban	593	204
Rural	240	124
Urban-rural	358	140

2.3. A look at the extremes

The definition of the two indicators, “economic” and “civilisational” was meant to highlight two sides of the sustainable development, which, by a proposition inherent to the study, ought to remain in equilibrium if the development is to be sustainable. Thus, the question arises of the extremes, the communes, in which the two indicators are most “disequilibrated”. Given the content of Table 1, a distribution should be expected, centred at the averages, flatter for the economic indicator and more pronounced for the civilisational one. Hence, first, Table 6 shows the numbers of communes, featuring extreme values. Let us add that these statistics do not account for the really “outlying” observations, like the one of the commune of Kleszczów, mentioned before, and the extremes represent, in a way, the borders of the mass of communes in a multidimensional space.

Table 6. Numbers of communes featuring extreme values of the “economic” and “civilisational” indicators

Numbers of communes featuring the values of the indicators:			
Economic		Civilisational	
< -10	52	< +30	56
< 0	79	< +40	87
< +10	106	< +50	125
< +20	145	< +60	177
< +30	193	< +70	257
< +40	256	< +80	363
< +50	332	< +90	549
...		...	
> 300	363	> 230	444
> 310	338	> 240	391
> 320	311	> 250	342
> 330	298	> 260	305

Now, let us see the numbers of the most “disequilibrated” communes in terms of the two indicators, first, in Table 7, with an exceptional domination of the economic indicator, and then, in Table 8, with an exceptional domination of the civilisational indicator. Even though this may seem strange, there are such communes, and they are not so few as one might expect.

Now, at the real far bottom of the scoring there are communes with very low values of both indicators. Their numbers are shown in Table 9.

Table 7. Numbers of communes with extreme domination of the economic indicator

Civilisational indicator:	Economic indicator			
	> 200	> 210	> 220	> 230
< 50	10	9	8	8
< 40	9	8	8	8
< 30	6	5	5	5

Table 8. Numbers of communes with extreme domination of the civilisational indicator

Civilisational indicator:	Economic indicator			
	< 0	< 10	< 20	< 30
> 180	5	9	11	14
> 190	3	7	8	11
> 200	3	5	6	9

Table 9. Numbers of communes with extremely low values of both indicators

Civilisational indicator:	Economic indicator				
	<-10	< 0	< 10	< 20	< 30
< 30	2	2	2	6	7
< 40	2	2	2	9	11
< 50	3	3	4	11	17
< 60	3	3	4	12	19

Table 10. Top 20 communes featuring the biggest difference of the two indicators

Commune (area in Poland)	Type	Economic	Civilisational	Absolute difference
Józefów (near Warsaw)	1	537.22	62.73	474.49
Łomianki (near Warsaw)	3	547.05	83.49	463.56
Raszyn (near Warsaw)	2	588.08	158.83	429.25
Michałowice (near Warsaw)	2	563.22	179.85	383.37
Stryków (near Cracow)	2	361.44	13.38	348.06
Siewierz (Silesia)	3	432.91	102.71	330.20
Radziejowice (not far from Warsaw)	2	338.54	33.19	305.35
Jabłonna (near Warsaw)	2	311.01	39.81	271.20
Marki (near Warsaw)	1	373.17	105.78	267.39
<i>Pelczyce (Western Pomerania)</i>	3	-3.76	261.22	264.98
Puszczykowo (near Poznań)	1	428.25	168.29	259.96
Bełżec (region of Lublin)	2	272.60	20.19	252.41
<i>Karnice (Western Pomerania)</i>	2	-57.98	192.54	250.52
Podkowa Leśna (near Warsaw)	1	397.35	147.04	250.31
<i>Grzmiąca (Western Pomerania)</i>	2	-36.72	208.12	244.84
Ślemień (Beskid Mts., near Silesia)	2	254.03	11.67	242.36
<i>Dobra (Western Pomerania)</i>	3	-18.56	215.55	234.11
Trzciana (not far from Cracow)	2	242.67	12.81	229.86
Radzymin (near Warsaw)	3	301.89	75.77	226.12
Dębe Wielkie (region of Warsaw)	2	238.43	16.39	222.04

Beyond doubt, life quality in at least majority of communes, counted in tables 7, 8 and 9, is to a definite extent impaired. This appears, of course, to be especially true for those from Table 9. Yet, those from Table 9 mostly turn out to be deeply peripheral communes (e.g. in Beskidy Mts.), for which the idea of balancing the two indicators, and these indicators in general, seems applicable in a highly particular manner (in deeply peripheral, thinly populated communes economic development is obviously not pronounced, and the needs for civilisational achievements are not pronounced, either, but to only a little detriment). Yet, some of the communes entering the right-bottom corner of Table 9 are located in otherwise well-developed regions (e.g. province of Masovia), and constitute the “black holes” of such regions. Hence, Table 10 presents the top 20 communes with the biggest differences between the values of the two indicators.

This is, indeed, a striking image. Of the twenty communes – ten are either within the suburbs of Warsaw, or close to them, all featuring high domination of the economic indicator over the civilisational one. Then, four are from the region of Western Pomerania, with quite an opposite image. Thus, on the one hand, we deal with communes of suburban type of development, while, on the other hand, with those of the formerly German (Prussian) territories, where large-scale state farms dominated in the post-war period, which collapsed, leaving economic black holes.

3. Voting for the life quality?

3.1. The first glance

In this modest exercise we do not try to build another (“comprehensive” or “systemic”) theory of measuring quality of life (see, e.g., Sienkiewicz and Świeboda, 2006), nor do we try to check some of the existing methodologies, often widely publicised (e.g. Czapiński, Panek, 2007; *Human Development Report*, 2007/2008; *World Development Report*, 2007; *First European...*, 2007; *European Cities Monitor*, 2008; International Living, 2008). We treat “quality of life” as an underlying phenomenon, which can only be measured indirectly, not necessarily through complex methodologies, but rather through tangible intermediaries. It is one of the aspects of development, the main subject of the study. We chose the simple intermediary of migratory flows, and compared them to the other indicators we use.

So, let us now look at the top twenty communes, shown in Table 11, from the point of view of migrations. The reasoning behind is, of course, very simple, if not trivial: what stands behind the differentiation in migratory flows and net migration balances? That is, we try to look at the same time at the overall migration intensity (“location-wise mobility”), being the sum of the inflow and outflow indicators, and the net migration balance, the latter especially in terms of distinction of positive-versus-negative.

Table 11. Migratory movements in and out of the communes from Table 10

Commune	Economic	Civilisational	Inflow*	Outflow*	Balance*
Józefów	537.22	62.73	25	11	14
Łomianki	547.05	83.49	35	10	25
Raszyn	588.08	158.83	18	11	7
Michałowice	563.22	179.85	31	11	20
Stryków	361.44	13.38	8	8	0
Siewierz	432.91	102.71	12	8	4
Radziejowice	338.54	33.19	30	11	19
Jabłonna	311.01	39.81	75	12	63
Marki	373.17	105.78	36	16	20
<i>Pelczyce</i>	<i>-3.76</i>	<i>261.22</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>-2</i>
Puszczykowo	428.25	168.29	24	15	9
Bełżec	272.60	20.19	10	11	-1
<i>Karnice</i>	<i>-57.98</i>	<i>192.54</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>-9</i>
Podkowa Leśna	397.35	147.04	19	22	-3
<i>Grzmiąca</i>	<i>-36.72</i>	<i>208.12</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>-3</i>
Ślemień	254.03	11.67	8	9	-1
<i>Dobra</i>	<i>-18.56</i>	<i>215.55</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>-5</i>
Trzciana	242.67	12.81	7	9	-2
Radzymin	301.89	75.77	20	8	12
Dębe Wielkie	238.43	16.39	19	8	11

* per 1,000 inhabitants, rounded to full persons

The content of Table 11 is at the same time trivial and surprising. It is trivial in that we appear to know well that it is the “development bee-hives” that are the (net) sinks of migrations, while the “development peripheries” are the migration (net) sources. It is, however, surprising in that conditions existing in these places must not necessarily correspond to what is usually perceived as high quality of life:

- low quality and availability of technical infrastructure (not just water, sewage and wastewater treatment, but also roads, phone lines etc.);
- low quality and availability of social infrastructure (education and health care, first of all);
- low or no spatial order (petty industries amongst family housing areas, aesthetical disruption, high degree of uncertainty as to the value of the estate, etc.); and, last not least,
- very frequently observed high crime rates (especially in the transforming suburban municipalities).

There are exceptions, or apparent exceptions, to the general, though approximate, rule. A notable one is constituted by the commune of Podkowa Leśna, near Warsaw, listed in Table 11. At a first glance it is very similar to, say, the commune of Marki, or Puszczykowo near Poznań. Yet, its migration balance in the year observed was negative! And generally, it is close to zero. This is the effect of the fact that Podkowa Leśna is one of the richest municipalities in Poland (personal income tax paid per capita). And the rich ones do not wish to have congestion, nor any (or most) of the phenomena listed above. This is secured by local regulations on, for instance, minimum size of building plots and policy of issuing construction permits.

Let us add that the difference, appearing in the last column of Table 10, dwindles down to 130 points at the end of the next 20 communes (i.e. for, roughly, the 40th commune). Thus, we observe here the border of the respective distribution.

3.2. The first attempts of modelling

Simple models were tried out to gain an insight into the mechanism of migration in relation to other variables considered. Some results are shown in Table 12.

Table 12. Linear models of net migration in rural communes in years 2003-2006

Model element	Scale of magnitude	2003	2004	2005	2006
Constant	-	-11.4	-10.9	-8.5	-8.9
Population density	10 ⁰	2.8	1.6	1.8	1.7
Own revenues of commune per capita	10 ²	-0.001	-0.002	-0.001	-0.0001
Employed per 1000 inhabitants	10 ¹ -10 ²	0.013	0.012	0.011	0.006
Jobless per 1000 inhabitants	10 ¹	-0.013	-0.015	-0.030	-0.004
Businesses per 1000 inhabitants	10 ¹ -10 ²	0.097	0.118	0.104	0.079
% of population with sewage	10 ¹	-0.01	-0.01	0.002	-0.02
Financial independence	10 ⁻¹	16.42	18.38	12.74	20.22
<i>R</i> ²	-	<i>0.34</i>	<i>0.33</i>	<i>0.32</i>	<i>0.36</i>

This table confirms what has been said before, with some reservations. Thus, the base (constant) is negative, reflecting the conditions in truly peripheral, depopulating areas. Then, people move to where there are already more people than on the average. And they move towards areas, which are rich, and economically active, rather than environmentally friendly...

The models shown display reasonable stability from year to year, additionally supporting the conclusions drawn. Given that these models are based on data for around 1500 units, their validity for these conclusions appears to be ascertained.

4. Some preliminary observations and conclusions

What is life quality? We are trying to shed light on an aspect related to the perception through the intermediary of migrations. A lot of counterarguments can be voiced against this proxy, but it must be also remembered that all the existing and published methodologies provide nothing but proxies or substitutes. The results here cited are indeed telling in their clarity. If one feels that there is something wrong about them, it is primarily in view of the “theoretical” conviction as to “how life quality should look”. Thus, we shall pursue this study, by slightly developing on the “theoretical” side, and enriching the empirical investigation.

It appears here that three important features ought to be taken into account in the future course of this study:

- the differentiation of the migration models between the three types of communes and within these types (e.g. the already mentioned internal differentiation of the urban commune type), i.e. identification of different kinds of models, which may reflect either different modes of the same process, or perhaps different kinds of processes;
- verification of the hypothesis of a relative character of quality-of-life-through-migration assessment, meaning that life quality, as expressed through migrations, is different for definite conditions, including the ones identified as above, but primarily referring to the population groups (see the case of Podkowa Leśna, indicated before), i.e. quality of life is different for different groups of people;
- most difficult – verification of the incremental hypothesis, meaning that the differentiation, mentioned above, can be organised, or ordered, into a regular process, in which some variable or variables define the direction of change (e.g. level of income).

References

- Czapiński J., Panek T (2007) *Diagnoza społeczna 2007. Warunki i jakości życia Polaków*. Rada Monitoringu Społecznego, Warszawa.
- European Cities Monitor* (2007) Cushman & Wakefield www.cushmanwakefield.com
- First European Quality of Life Survey* (2007) European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.
- Gadomski, J., Sobczak E., Owiński J.W. (2006) Zrównoważony rozwój JST w świetle polityki spójności UE. Working Paper, IBS PAN, Warszawa, WP-2-2006, 39s.
- Human Development Report 2007/2008* (2008) *Fighting climate change: Human solidarity in a divided world*. United Nations Development Programme, UNDP.
- International Living (2008) 2008 Quality of Life Index. www.internationalliving.com
- Owiński J. W. (2007) Niektóre cechy charakterystyczne gmin polskich z punktu widzenia rozwoju zrównoważonego. Raport ANAGMIS R4/2007, Warszawa.
- Owiński J.W., Więclaw A. (2007) Finding the odd-man-out in development scoring and classifications. W: O. Hryniewicz, J. Studziński, A. Szediw, red., *Environmental Informatics and Systems Research*. Volume 2: *Workshop and application papers*. Shaker Verlag, Aachen 2007, str. 195-199, ISBN 978-3-8322-6397-3.
- Sienkiewicz P., Świeboda H. (2006) Analiza systemowa jakości życia w społeczeństwie informacyjnym. *BOS'06*. Polskie Towarzystwo Badań Operacyjnych i Systemowych, Warszawa.
- Sobczak E., Bielański J. (2006) Rozwój społeczno-ekonomiczny regionów w świetle polityki spójności UE. Kolegium Nauk Społecznych i Administracji-KNSiA PW, Zeszyt 24, 2006, 123-136s.
- Sobczak E. (2007a) Zróżnicowanie poziomu rozwoju gmin województwa wielkopolskiego. KNSiA-PW, Zeszyt 25, 2007, ss. 5-32.
- Sobczak E. (2007b) Zróżnicowanie poziomu rozwoju gmin województwa mazowieckiego. KNSiA-PW, Zeszyt 26, 2007, ss.41-68.
- World Development Report 2007* (2007) *Development and the Next Generation*. The World Bank, Washington, DC.

IBS PAN *Konf.*

46003

Bibl. podręczna

**Olgierd Hryniewicz, Andrzej Straszak, Jan Studziński
red.**

**BADANIA OPERACYJNE I SYSTEMOWE:
ŚRODOWISKO NATURALNE, PRZESTRZEŃ,
OPTYMALIZACJA**

Książka składa się z artykułów przedstawiających wyniki prac z dziedziny badań operacyjnych i systemowych, poświęconych środowisku naturalnemu i zarządzaniu nim, zwłaszcza w zakresie ochrony atmosfery, globalnego ocieplenia i walki z nim, jakości i zaopatrzenia w wodę. Tematyka ta jest rozszerzona o aspekty przestrzenne, regionalne i samorządowe, a także planowanie i funkcjonowanie infrastruktury. Tom zamykają prace metodyczne, dostarczające technik, będących podstawą prezentowanych zastosowań.

**ISBN 83-894-7519-7
EAN 9788389475190**

Instytut Badań Systemowych PAN
tel. (4822) 3810241 / 3810273 e-mail: biblioteka@ibspan.waw.pl