Version A

Situation 1:

(o) A small society has received a certain amount of money which can be used either to provide some help and assistance for a handicapped person or to further the education of an intelligent child. The child could receive a good education in languages and in natural sciences, let's say. Let the retarded person be person 1; if the sum of money were used for her support (alternative x), she would be able to learn some very basic things, so that at least in certain areas of daily life she would no longer be totally dependent on the assistance from other people. Let the intelligent child be person 2; the investment into its education represents alternative y. It is not possible to split up the given amount.

Which alternative should be realized in your view, x or y?

(a) Imagine that the sum of money which could be used to help the handicapped person, is so large that, on the other hand, this amount would suffice for the education of not only person 2 but also a second child (person 3) who is even somewhat more intelligent than person 2. Person 3 would, therefore, benefit even a bit more from the education than person 2. Let y be the investment into the education of the two children and let x again stand for the support of the handicapped person.

Would you choose x or y under these conditions?

(b) Imagine that if the money were used to finance alternative y it would be possible to educate still another child (person 4). The reason may simply be "economies of scale" or the fact that a talented teacher will be able to provide a good education for several children simultanously. Let us assume that all the other characteristics of the situation remain as before.

Which alternative should be picked in your view, x or y?

(c) Add another child to the situation (person 5), who could also receive an instruction in languages and the natural sciences out of the given budget. Everything else remains the same.

Would you want x or y to be realized?

(d_1) If up to this point you have always decided in favour of alternative x, could you imagine a situation, in which you would choose y after all (from the 5th, 6th, 7th, ... intelligent child onward? Or even later?), or would you always decide in favour of the handicapped person, i.e. alternative x?

(d_2) On which criteria did you base your decision? Please give a brief explanation.

Situation 2:

(o) Imagine that due to an unexpectedly large profit of the Federal Reserve (or an unexpectedly large budgetary surplus, if you prefer), Government has the possibility to spend several billion euros either on environmental protection within its own territory (alternative y) or to spend that amount of money to finance an aid program against hunger in various countries of Subsaharan Africa (alternative x). Given the available amount of money, the environmental program would aim at improving the current situation of the North Sea. This would primarily benefit the fishing industry and, perhaps to a somewhat lesser degree, the people who spend their vacation along the North Sea. Henceforth, these two groups are called "person 2". Those who suffer from famine in Subsaharan Africa are "person 1". Undoubtedly, both the fishermen and the vacationers in this country are, in terms of welfare, better off than the starving people in Africa, independent of whether alternative x or alternative y will be realized. We want to assume that either only x or only y can be realized, not both.

Which alternative should be chosen according to your view, x or y?

(a) Imagine now that the profit of the Federal Reserve (or the budgetary surplus) has turned out to be higher than anticipated originally. On the one hand, the fight against hunger could now be intensified, on the other the environmental program could be extended. The proposal is to improve the quality of the air in the neighbourhood of coal power plants. The group benefiting from this measure will be called "person 3". We shall assume that this group will always be better off than groups 2 and 1 with respect to alternative y, and be definitely better off than group 1 with respect to alternative x. Alternative y again stands for environmental protection and x stands for relief of hunger (both programs would, of course, now be larger due to the higher level of financial resources).

Which alternative should be realized according to your view, x or y?

(b) Assume that it has become clear that "economies of scale" would occur in the environmental program, once alternative y should be realized. We postulate that a program for cleaner water in rivers should also be feasible which would benefit

primarily those citizens of the country (group 4) who live close to the rivers (it seems obvious that cleaner water in rivers would, among other things, increase the stock of fish). In other words, not only would groups 2 and 3 benefit from the environmental program but also an additional group. Alternative y again stands for the environmental program and x stands for the aid program for Subsaharan Africa.

Which program should be chosen now, x or y?

(c) Imagine that, given the financial resources, a further enlargement of the environmental program appears realistic. It has, for example, been found out that an additional program aiming at a reduction of traffic noise along the highways would be financially feasible. Through this investment, still another group of people (group 5) would experience an increase in its living conditions. We assume that group 5 is better off than all the other groups under alternative y and that it is at least better off than group 1 under alternative x.

Which alternative should now be realized according to your view, x or y?

(d_1) If up to this point you have always made a decision in favour of alternative x, could you imagine a situation, in which you would choose y after all? And how should y look like in your view, or would you always take a decision in favour of the aid program against hunger?

(d_2) On which criteria did you base your decision? Please give a brief explanation.

Situation 3:

(o) Imagine a country that has a severe shortage of western currencies. The governing body of this country has the possibility to purchase on the world market either a certain number of badly needed dialysis machines (alternative x) that cannot be produced within the country, or a certain quantity of vitamin pills as well as tropical fruit (alternative y). This quantity would only be enough to satisfy the urgent needs of a relatively small group of persons. The realization of both alternatives together or a combination of both alternatives to some extent is assumed to be infeasible. The group of people suffering from kidney problems is group 1, the group of people benefiting from the import of vitamins and fruits is group 2. There is unanimous agreement in the country that all pregnant women should make up group 2. It is also unanimously agreed that the persons with kidney trouble are clearly worse off than the expectant mothers.

Which alternative should be realized in your view, x or y?

(a) Imagine now that the world market price for vitamin pills and tropical fruit has fallen. If alternative y were realized it would be possible to provide not only the

expectant mothers, but also all the country's babies and toddlers (group 3) with the needed vitamins. The price of dialysis machines is assumed to rest unchanged, however. The welfare levels of groups 2 and 3 are clearly higher than the level of group 1 both under y and under x.

Would you choose alternative x or alternative y?

(b) Let us imagine that there is a further decline in the world market price for vitamin pills and tropical fruit so that it turns out that under the given amount of western currencies the country's adolescents (group 4) could also be provided with vitamins if alternative y were chosen.

Which alternative should be chosen, x or y?

(c) The world market price of vitamin pills and tropical fruit declines once more so that under alternative y the given amount of western currencies would now suffice to provide those workers of the country who are engaged in physical labour (group 5) with the needed vitamins. Clearly, these workers are better off, no matter whether they receive the vitamins or not, than the group of persons who suffer from kidney problems.

Which of the two alternatives, x or y, should now be chosen?

(d_1) If up to this point you have always made a decision in favour of alternative x, could you imagine a situation, in which you would choose y after all? And how should y look like in your view, or would you always take a decision in favour of x?

(d_2) On which criteria did you base your decision? Please give a brief explanation.

Situation 4:

(o) Imagine a country which had been totally run down economically by a long-lasting dictatorship. Finally, the country could get rid of this dictatorship. Furthermore, imagine that an international bank group is offering a rather large loan (under very favourable conditions of repayment) to this country for economic reconstruction (alternative y). However, the consortium declares that the prerequisite for this loan should be that the employees in the country be granted neither a right to strike nor the free choice of occupation. This precondition would remain valid for the foreseeable future. If the new Government were unwilling to enforce this curtailment of individual rights, no loan would be offered, and, therefore, the country would have to pull itself up by its bootstraps (alternative x). In that case, the country would, of course, have the option to reinstall the right to strike and other basic rights, a measure which had been promised to the citizens of the country after the fall of the dictatorship. If the bank loan were granted, the large

enterprises (group 2) would be the first to experience an economic recovery. The workers and employees in the firms (group 1) would be hard hit by the restriction of basic rights. Also, their economic situation would be worse than that of the people in charge of the large enterprises.

What should the country do in your view, should it decide in favour of y or x?

(a) Imagine that the initial situation were to undergo the following modification: The loan which is offered would have such a large volume that an additional group of the population, the self-employed persons with a small or middle-sized business activity, let's say, would benefit from the financial aid (group 3). Let this alternative again be denoted by y. Alternative x remains as before.

Should the country choose x or y?

(b) Imagine again a change of the initial situation: The bank loan offered is so large that under alternative y still another group of the population, the civil servants, let's say, would realize larger economic benefits (group 4). Alternative x remains unchanged.

Which alternative should now be picked by the country?

(c) A further variation: we shall assume that still another group within the population, the retired members of society (group 5), would experience an improvement of their economic situation under alternative y. Alternative x remains unchanged.

Which alternative should now be chosen according to your view, x or y?

(d_1) If up to this point you have always made a decision in favour of alternative x, could you imagine a situation, in which you would choose y after all? And how should y look like in your view, or would you always take a decision in favour of x?

(d_2) If right from the beginning or "fairly quickly" you took a decision in favour of y, what kind of reasons or motives could have moved you to decide in favour of x? A further confinement of basic rights such as a law against founding political parties, the introduction of censorship of the press, TV etc. or a confinement of religious freedom? Or something else? Please give a brief explanation.

Demographic Characteristics:

(1) sex: (1 = female, 2 = male)

(2) age:

(3) Which of the following categories describes best the professional status of the family in which you grew up?

(1 = unskilled worker, 2 = skilled worker, 3 = craftsman,
4 = employee or civil servant in the public sector,
5 = employee in the private sector,
6 = self–employed)

(4) subject of study: (1 = business administration, 2 = mathematics,
3 = economics, 4 = other)

(5) Were you employed before starting with your studies?

(1 = yes, 2 = no)

(6) How many percent of the citizens of your country do you expect to have, in the year 2010, a net–income lower than your own?

(1 = 5%, 2 = 25%, 3 = 50%, 4 = 75%, 5 = 95%)

Version B

Situation 1:

(o) A small society has received a certain amount of money which can be used either to provide some help and assistance for a handicapped person or to further the education of an intelligent child. The child could receive a good education in languages and in natural sciences, let's say. The retarded person (person 1) is severely handicapped from birth. If the sum of money were used for her support (alternative x), she would be able to learn some very basic things, so that at least in certain areas of daily life she would no longer be totally dependent on the assistance from other people. Let the intelligent child be person 2; the investment into its education represents alternative y. It is not possible to split up the given amount.

Which alternative should be realized in your view, x or y?

(a) Imagine that the sum of money which could be used to help the handicapped person, is so large that, on the other hand, this amount would suffice for the education of not only person 2 but also a second child (person 3) who is even somewhat more intelligent than person 2. Person 3 would, therefore, benefit even a bit more from the education than person 2. Let y be the investment into the education of the two children and let x again stand for the support of the handicapped person.

Would you choose x or y under these conditions?

(b) Imagine that if the money were used to finance alternative y it would be possible to educate still another child (person 4). The reason may simply be "economies of scale" or the fact that a talented teacher will be able to provide a good education for several children simultanously. Let us assume that all the other characteristics of the situation remain as before.

Which alternative should be picked in your view, x or y?

(c) Add another child to the situation (person 5), who could also receive an instruction in languages and the natural sciences out of the given budget. Everything else remains the same.

Would you want x or y to be realized?

(d_1) If up to this point you have always decided in favour of alternative x, could you imagine a situation, in which you would choose y after all (from the 5th, 6th, 7th, ... intelligent child onward? Or even later?), or would you always decide in favour of the handicapped person, i.e. alternative x?

(d_2) On which criteria did you base your decision? Please give a brief explanation.

Situation 2:

(o) Imagine that due to an unexpectedly large profit of the Federal Reserve (or an unexpectedly large budgetary surplus, if you prefer), Government has the possibility to spend several billion euros either on environmental protection within its own territory (alternative y) or to spend that amount of money to finance an aid program against hunger in various countries of Subsaharan Africa (alternative x), which was caused by several wars between these states. Given the available amount of money, the environmental program would aim at improving the current situation of the North Sea. This would primarily benefit the fishing industry and, perhaps to a somewhat lesser degree, the people who spend their vacation along the North Sea. Henceforth, these two groups are called "person 2". Those who suffer from famine in Subsaharan Africa are "person 1". Undoubtedly, both the fishermen and the vacationers in this country are, in terms of welfare, better off than the starving people in Africa, independent of whether alternative x or alternative y will be realized. We want to assume that either only x or only y can be realized, not both.

Which alternative should be chosen according to your view, x or y?

(a) Imagine now that the profit of the Federal Reserve (or the budgetary surplus) has turned out to be higher than anticipated originally. On the one hand, the fight against hunger could now be intensified, on the other the environmental program could be extended. The proposal is to improve the quality of the air in the neighbourhood of coal power plants. The group benefiting from this measure will be called "person 3". We shall assume that this group will always be better off than groups 2 and 1 with respect to alternative y, and be definitely better off than group 1 with respect to alternative x. Alternative y again stands for environmental protection and x stands for relief of hunger (both programs would, of course, now be larger due to the higher level of financial resources).

Which alternative should be realized according to your view, x or y?

(b) Assume that it has become clear that "economies of scale" would occur in the environmental program, once alternative y should be realized. We postulate that

a program for cleaner water in rivers should also be feasible which would benefit primarily those citizens of the country (group 4) who live close to the rivers (it seems obvious that cleaner water in rivers would, among other things, increase the stock of fish). In other words, not only would groups 2 and 3 benefit from the environmental program but also an additional group. Alternative y again stands for the environmental program and x stands for the aid program for Subsaharan Africa.

Which program should be chosen now, x or y?

(c) Imagine that, given the financial resources, a further enlargement of the environmental program appears realistic. It has, for example, been found out that an additional program aiming at a reduction of traffic noise along the highways would be financially feasible. Through this investment, still another group of people (group 5) would experience an increase in its living conditions. We assume that group 5 is better off than all the other groups under alternative y and that it is at least better off than group 1 under alternative x.

Which alternative should now be realized according to your view, x or y?

(d_1) If up to this point you have always made a decision in favour of alternative x, could you imagine a situation, in which you would choose y after all? And how should y look like in your view, or would you always take a decision in favour of the aid program against hunger?

(d_2) On which criteria did you base your decision? Please give a brief explanation.

Situation 3:

(o) Imagine a country that has a severe shortage of western currencies. The governing body of this country has the possibility to purchase on the world market either a certain number of badly needed dialysis machines (alternative x) that cannot be produced within the country, or a certain quantity of vitamin pills as well as tropical fruit (alternative y). The realization of both alternatives together or a combination of both alternatives to some extent is assumed to be infeasible. The group of people suffering from kidney problems is group 1. Because of the low world market price for vitamin pills and tropical fruit it is possible to provide several groups with the needed vitamins, namely all pregnant women of the country (group 2), the country's babies and toddlers (group 3), the adolescents (group 4), and those workers of the country who are engaged in physical labour (group 5). It is also unanimously agreed that the persons with kidney trouble are clearly worse off than the mentioned groups 2–5. There is also unanimous agreement that the need for vitamins is declining among the groups 2–5, i.e. greatest for group 2 and lowest for group 5.

Which alternative should be realized in your view, x or y?

(a) Imagine now that the world market price for vitamin pills and tropical fruit has risen. If alternative y were realized it would be impossible to provide the workers who are engaged in physical labour (group 5) with the needed vitamins anymore.

Would you choose alternative x or alternative y?

(b) Let us imagine that there is a further increase in the world market price for vitamin pills and tropical fruit so that it turns out that under the given amount of western currencies the country's adolescents (group 4) could no longer be provided with vitamins if alternative y were chosen.

Which alternative should be chosen, x or y?

(c) The world market price of vitamin pills and tropical fruit rises once more so that under alternative y the given amount of western currencies would not suffice to provide the country's babies and toddlers (group 3) with the needed vitamins, so that only the pregnant women (group 2) benefit from alternative y.

Which of the two alternatives, x or y, should now be chosen?

(d_1) If you have always made a decision in favour of alternative x, could you imagine a situation, in which you would choose y after all? And how should y look like in your view, or would you always take a decision in favour of x?

(d_2) On which criteria did you base your decision? Please give a brief explanation.

Situation 4:

(o) Imagine a country which had been totally run down economically by the governance of a party for several years. This party came into power by free elections which they won with the program "Protect our Economy". Furthermore, imagine that an international bank group is offering a rather large loan (under very favourable conditions of repayment) to this country for economic reconstruction (alternative y). However, the consortium declares that the prerequisite for this loan should be that the employees in the country be granted neither a right to strike nor the free choice of occupation. This precondition would remain valid for the foreseeable future. If the new Government were unwilling to enforce this curtailment of individual rights, no loan would be offered, and, therefore, the country would have to pull itself up by its bootstraps (alternative x). In that case, the country would, of course, have the option to reinstall the right to strike and other basic rights, a measure which had been promised to the citizens of the country after the fall of the dictatorship. If the bank loan were granted, the large enterprises (group 2) would be the first to experience an economic recovery. The workers and employees in the firms (group 1) would be hard hit by the restriction

of basic rights. Also, their economic situation would be worse than that of the people in charge of the large enterprises.

What should the country do in your view, should it decide in favour of y or x?

(a) Imagine that the initial situation were to undergo the following modification: The loan which is offered would have such a large volume that an additional group of the population, the self-employed persons with a small or middle-sized business activity, let's say, would benefit from the financial aid (group 3). Let this alternative again be denoted by y. Alternative x remains as before.

Should the country choose x or y?

(b) Imagine again a change of the initial situation: The bank loan offered is so large that under alternative y still another group of the population, the civil servants, let's say, would realize larger economic benefits (group 4). Alternative x remains unchanged.

Which alternative should now be picked by the country?

(c) A further variation: we shall assume that still another group within the population, the retired members of society (group 5), would experience an improvement of their economic situation under alternative y. Alternative x remains unchanged.

Which alternative should now be chosen according to your view, x or y?

(d_1) If up to this point you have always made a decision in favour of alternative x, could you imagine a situation, in which you would choose y after all? And how should y look like in your view, or would you always take a decision in favour of x?

(d_2) If right from the beginning or "fairly quickly" you took a decision in favour of y, what kind of reasons or motives could have moved you to decide in favour of x? A further confinement of basic rights such as a law against founding political parties, the introduction of censorship of the press, TV etc. or a confinement of religious freedom? Or something else? Please give a brief explanation.

Demographic Characteristics:

(1) sex: (1 = female, 2 = male)

(2) age:

(3) Which of the following categories describes best the professional status of the family in which you grew up?

(1 = unskilled worker, 2 = skilled worker, 3 = craftsman,
4 = employee or civil servant in the public sector,
5 = employee in the private sector,
6 = self–employed)

(4) subject of study: (1 = business administration, 2 = mathematics,
3 = economics, 4 = other)

(5) Were you employed before starting with your studies?

(1 = yes, 2 = no)

(6) How many percent of the citizens of your country do you expect to have, in the year 2010, a net–income lower than your own?

(1 = 5%, 2 = 25%, 3 = 50%, 4 = 75%, 5 = 95%)

Version C

Situation 1:

(o) A small society has received a certain amount of money which can be used either to provide some help and assistance for a handicapped person or to further the education of an intelligent child. The child could receive a good education in languages and in natural sciences, let's say. The handicap of the retarded person (person 1) is due to an accident from participating in a dangerous sport (paragliding, let's say). If the sum of money were used for her support (alternative x), she would be able to learn some very basic things, so that at least in certain areas of daily life she would no longer be totally dependent on the assistance from other people. Let the intelligent child be person 2; the investment into its education represents alternative y. It is not possible to split up the given amount.

Which alternative should be realized in your view, x or y?

(a) Imagine that the sum of money which could be used to help the handicapped person, is so large that, on the other hand, this amount would suffice for the education of not only person 2 but also a second child (person 3) who is even somewhat more intelligent than person 2. Person 3 would, therefore, benefit even a bit more from the education than person 2. Let y be the investment into the education of the two children and let x again stand for the support of the handicapped person.

Would you choose x or y under these conditions?

(b) Imagine that if the money were used to finance alternative y it would be possible to educate still another child (person 4). The reason may simply be "economies of scale" or the fact that a talented teacher will be able to provide a good education for several children simultanously. Let us assume that all the other characteristics of the situation remain as before.

Which alternative should be picked in your view, x or y?

(c) Add another child to the situation (person 5), who could also receive an instruction in languages and the natural sciences out of the given budget. Everything else remains the same.

Would you want x or y to be realized?

(d_1) If up to this point you have always decided in favour of alternative x, could you imagine a situation, in which you would choose y after all (from the 5th, 6th, 7th, ... intelligent child onward? Or even later?), or would you always decide in favour of the handicapped person, i.e. alternative x?

(d_2) On which criteria did you base your decision? Please give a brief explanation.

Situation 2:

(o) Imagine that due to an unexpectedly large profit of the Federal Reserve (or an unexpectedly large budgetary surplus, if you prefer), Government has the possibility to spend several billion euros either on environmental protection within its own territory (alternative y) or to spend that amount of money to finance an aid program against hunger in various countries of Subsaharan Africa (alternative x) which was caused by serious mistakes in agriculture. Given the available amount of money, the environmental program would aim at improving the current situation of the North Sea. This would primarily benefit the fishing industry and, perhaps to a somewhat lesser degree, the people who spend their vacation along the North Sea. Henceforth, these two groups are called "person 2". Those who suffer from famine in Subsaharan Africa are "person 1". Undoubtedly, both the fishermen and the vacationers in this country are, in terms of welfare, better off than the starving people in Africa, independent of whether alternative x or alternative y will be realized. We want to assume that either only x or only y can be realized, not both.

Which alternative should be chosen according to your view, x or y?

(a) Imagine now that the profit of the Federal Reserve (or the budgetary surplus) has turned out to be higher than anticipated originally. On the one hand, the fight against hunger could now be intensified, on the other the environmental program could be extended. The proposal is to improve the quality of the air in the neighbourhood of coal power plants. The group benefiting from this measure will be called "person 3". We shall assume that this group will always be better off than groups 2 and 1 with respect to alternative y, and be definitely better off than group 1 with respect to alternative x. Alternative y again stands for environmental protection and x stands for relief of hunger (both programs would, of course, now be larger due to the higher level of financial resources).

Which alternative should be realized according to your view, x or y?

(b) Assume that it has become clear that "economies of scale" would occur in the environmental program, once alternative y should be realized. We postulate that

a program for cleaner water in rivers should also be feasible which would benefit primarily those citizens of the country (group 4) who live close to the rivers (it seems obvious that cleaner water in rivers would, among other things, increase the stock of fish). In other words, not only would groups 2 and 3 benefit from the environmental program but also an additional group. Alternative y again stands for the environmental program and x stands for the aid program for Subsaharan Africa.

Which program should be chosen now, x or y?

(c) Imagine that, given the financial resources, a further enlargement of the environmental program appears realistic. It has, for example, been found out that an additional program aiming at a reduction of traffic noise along the highways would be financially feasible. Through this investment, still another group of people (group 5) would experience an increase in its living conditions. We assume that group 5 is better off than all the other groups under alternative y and that it is at least better off than group 1 under alternative x.

Which alternative should now be realized according to your view, x or y?

(d_1) If up to this point you have always made a decision in favour of alternative x, could you imagine a situation, in which you would choose y after all? And how should y look like in your view, or would you always take a decision in favour of the aid program against hunger?

(d_2) On which criteria did you base your decision? Please give a brief explanation.

Situation 4:

(o) Imagine a country which had been totally run down economically by belonging to an international economic organisation for a longer period. Now the country has left this organisation. Furthermore, imagine that an international bank group is offering a rather large loan (under very favourable conditions of repayment) to this country for economic reconstruction (alternative y). However, the consortium declares that the prerequisite for this loan should be that the employees in the country be granted neither a right to strike nor the free choice of occupation. This precondition would remain valid for the foreseeable future. If the new Government were unwilling to enforce this curtailment of individual rights, no loan would be offered, and, therefore, the country would have to pull itself up by its bootstraps (alternative x). In that case, the country would, of course, have the option to reinstall the right to strike and other basic rights, a measure which had been promised to the citizens of the country after the fall of the dictatorship. If the bank loan were granted, the large enterprises (group 2) would be the first to experience an economic recovery. The workers and employees in the firms (group 1) would

be hard hit by the restriction of basic rights. Also, their economic situation would be worse than that of the people in charge of the large enterprises.

What should the country do in your view, should it decide in favour of y or x?

(a) Imagine that the initial situation were to undergo the following modification: The loan which is offered would have such a large volume that an additional group of the population, the self-employed persons with a small or middle-sized business activity, let's say, would benefit from the financial aid (group 3). Let this alternative again be denoted by y. Alternative x remains as before.

Should the country choose x or y?

(b) Imagine again a change of the initial situation: The bank loan offered is so large that under alternative y still another group of the population, the civil servants, let's say, would realize larger economic benefits (group 4). Alternative x remains unchanged.

Which alternative should now be picked by the country?

(c) A further variation: we shall assume that still another group within the population, the retired members of society (group 5), would experience an improvement of their economic situation under alternative y. Alternative x remains unchanged.

Which alternative should now be chosen according to your view, x or y?

(d_1) If up to this point you have always made a decision in favour of alternative x, could you imagine a situation, in which you would choose y after all? And how should y look like in your view, or would you always take a decision in favour of x?

(d_2) If right from the beginning or "fairly quickly" you took a decision in favour of y, what kind of reasons or motives could have moved you to decide in favour of x? A further confinement of basic rights such as a law against founding political parties, the introduction of censorship of the press, TV etc. or a confinement of religious freedom? Or something else? Please give a brief explanation.

Demographic Characteristics:

(1) sex: (1 = female, 2 = male)

(2) age:

(3) Which of the following categories describes best the professional status of the family in which you grew up?

(1 = unskilled worker, 2 = skilled worker, 3 = craftsman,
4 = employee or civil servant in the public sector,
5 = employee in the private sector,
6 = self–employed)

(4) subject of study: (1 = business administration, 2 = mathematics,
3 = economics, 4 = other)

(5) Were you employed before starting with your studies?

(1 = yes, 2 = no)

(6) How many percent of the citizens of your country do you expect to have, in the year 2010, a net–income lower than your own?

(1 = 5%, 2 = 25%, 3 = 50%, 4 = 75%, 5 = 95%)