

Using the Theory of Protected Needs to conceptualize sustainability as 'caring for human well-being': An empirical confirmation of the theory's potential

Antonietta Di Giulio, Rico Defila, Corinne Ruesch Schweizer

Front. Sustain. Sec. Sustainable Consumption Volume 4 - 2023 | doi: 10.3389/frsus.2023.1036666

Appendix B: The sample of the Swiss study about Protected Needs and consumption corridors conducted in 2016

Antonietta Di Giulio & Rico Defila

cite as:

Di Giulio, Antonietta; Defila, Rico (2023): The sample of the Swiss study about Protected Needs and consumption corridors conducted in 2016. Appendix B to: Using the Theory of Protected Needs to conceptualize sustainability as 'caring for human well-being': An empirical confirmation of the theory's potential. Front. Sustain. Sec. Sustainable Consumption Volume 4 - 2023.

Table B1 Sample by age, gender, and linguistic region

<i>Linguistic region</i>			<i>Gender</i>		<i>Total</i>
			<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	
German-speaking part	Age	18–30	70	72	142
		31–40	62	63	125
		41–50	65	69	134
		51–60	64	65	129
		61 and older	108	91	199
	Subtotal		369	360	729
French-speaking part	Age	18–30	34	35	69
		31–40	29	29	58
		41–50	32	32	64
		51–60	28	28	56
		61 and older	46	37	83
	Subtotal		169	161	330
Total	Age	18–30	104	107	211
		31–40	91	92	183
		41–50	97	101	198
		51–60	92	93	185
		61 and older	154	128	282
	Total		538	521	1059

Note: Composition of the sample resulting from applying the combined criteria of age (aged 18 and older), gender, and linguistic region (German-speaking part of Switzerland, French-speaking part of Switzerland) in quota sampling (crossed quota). Compared to the Swiss population, respondents from the French-speaking part of Switzerland were slightly overrepresented in the sample. This was considered in the data analysis by weighting the answers.

Table B2 Sample by size of household

<i>Size of household (persons per household)</i>	<i>Sample (in %)</i>	<i>Swiss population (in %)</i>
1–2 persons	66.6	67.8
3–4 persons	28.4	26.1
5 persons and more	5	6.1
Total	100	100

Note: The household sizes represented in the sample in comparison to the Swiss population in 2015 (Source: Swiss Federal Statistical Office, November 24, 2016). At the time the survey was fielded, most respondents lived in households consisting of one or two persons, and the same applied to the Swiss population.

Table B3 Sample by political attitude

<i>Political attitude (1 = far left; 11 = far right)</i>	<i>Sample (in %)</i>	<i>Swiss population (in %)</i>
1–4	17	15.4
5–7	43.8	50.5
8–11	28.9	19.7
Missing or no answer	10.3	14.4
Total	100	100

Note: The political attitudes represented in the sample in comparison to the Swiss population in 2015 (Source: <http://forscenter.ch/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/SILC-2010-COMPASS-Codebook-D.pdf>). To capture political attitudes (Question 12), we asked "Sometimes one talks about political left or right. Where would you personally classify yourself if 0 means far left and 10 means far right?" with the additional option "I don't know". This question was used in the Swiss questionnaire of the European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions in 2015 (EU-SILC CH). For data analysis, 0 was coded as 1 and 10 was coded as 11 (N = 950, "I don't know" was coded as missing; minimum = 1, maximum = 11; M = 6.41, SD = 2.19). Although the general picture with regard to the political attitude of the respondents in the sample reflects the general picture in Switzerland, it is remarkable that the percentage of individuals with a right-wing attitude in the sample is slightly higher than in the Swiss population since the survey's topic would have led one to expect the contrary.

Table B4 Sample by education

<i>Education (highest level achieved)</i>	<i>Sample (in %)</i>	<i>Swiss population (in %)</i>
Compulsory school	3.2	24.5
Secondary school II, vocational training	45.9	34.6
Secondary school II, general education	15.2	11.6
Higher vocational training	21.9	12.5
Higher education (e.g., university)	13.7	16.9
Total	100	100

Note: The educational levels represented in the sample in comparison to the Swiss population in 2015 (source: Swiss Federal Statistical Office, January 31, 2017). A strict comparison of the numbers is not possible since the percentages provided by the Swiss Federal Statistical Office include the population from the age of 15 while the sample does not cover the age span 15–17 (compulsory school ends at the age of 16, and vocational training is not yet completed at the age of 17, so compulsory school was the highest level of education already achieved by respondents who were in vocational training at the time).

Table B5 Sample by income

<i>Income (net income of household per month)</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
</= 3,000 CHF	133	12.5
3,001 to 5,000 CHF	193	18.3
5,001 to 7,000 CHF	201	19.0
7,001 to 11,000 CHF	240	22.6
=/> 11,001 CHF	106	10.0
I don't know or no answer	187	17.6
Total	1059	100

Note: The income distribution in the sample (the scale is taken from the Swiss Vox Analysis). For comparison with the Swiss population: The median gross salary for a full-time position in 2016 was CHF 6,502 per month; the 10% of employees with the lowest wages earned less than CHF 4,313 per month; the 10% with the highest salaries earned more than CHF 11,406 per month (Source: Swiss Federal Statistical Office, May 14, 2018).

Altruism Scale

In order to capture the potentially different effects of political attitude and personality, we asked respondents questions capturing altruism (Question 13) by using five positively keyed items chosen from the "International Personality Item Pool" IPIP (<http://ipip.ori.org>) and the German "Typentest" by Lars Lorber (<http://www.typentest.de>). These five items were: (1) I perceive/anticipate the needs of others; (2) My own advantage is not so important to me; (3) The wellbeing of others is important to me; (4) I help others even when this causes disadvantages for me; (5) I like to be generous without expecting anything in return. The respondents were asked about their level of agreement with each of these items on a 7-point scale (not labelled) with "I don't know" as an additional option. The altruism scale we used in data analysis was the mean across all five items ($N = 1051$, "I don't know" was coded as missing; minimum = 1.00, maximum = 7.00; $M = 5.00$, $SD = 1.08$; Cronbach's Alpha = .84).