

Gender division of domestic labor in post-socialist Europe (1994-2012): test of class gradients hypothesis

Ukhova, Daria

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Ukhova, D. (2020). Gender division of domestic labor in post-socialist Europe (1994-2012): test of class gradients hypothesis. *Social Inclusion*, 8(4), 23-34. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v8i4.2972>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more information see:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

Online Supplement Table 1. Socio-economic trends in the selected CEE countries, 1990-2012

	Bulgaria				Czechia				Hungary				Poland				Russia				Slovenia			
	1990	1994	2002	2012	1990	1994	2002	2012	1990	1994	2002	2012	1990	1994	2002	2012	1990	1994	2002	2012	1990	1994	2002	2012
GDP per capita (thousands \$ per year) ^a	9.3	8.2	10.1	15.8	20.0	18.1	22.3	28.5	15.1	15.0	19.6	22.7	10.3	10.6	15.2	23.2	20.6	13.4	15.6	25.2	18.9	17.8	24.1	28.1
Female LFPR (%) ^b	55.0	51.9	46.3	47.8	51.7	52.6	51.2	50.1	46.2	42.5	41.3	44.7	55.3	52.4	48.1	48.8	59.5	52.7	52.9	57.0	47.8	51.8	51.1	52.3
Female-to-male LFPR (%) ^b	87.5	87.0	82.3	81.4	73.2	73.7	73.7	74.0	71.7	72.1	71.9	74.9	76.5	77.4	77.4	75.3	78.0	75.2	80.3	79.9	79.2	78.6	80.2	82.6
Gross enrolment ratio, pre-primary education (%) ^c	69.3	58.1	72.9	83.2	106.1	86.1	97.4	104.1 ^d	84.8	79.6	80.0	87.2	48.6	42.5	49.1	77.1	75.5	61.3	67.5	76.5	62.2	57.2	73.1	95.1
Family benefits public spending (% of GDP) ^e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.28	1.99	1.76	2.18	N/A	N/A	2.95	3.1	1.65	1.43	1.18	1.24	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.99	2.07
UNDP gender inequality index (GII) ^f	N/A	0.37	0.34	0.21	N/A	0.25	N/A	0.13	N/A	0.32	0.29	0.26	N/A	0.26	0.21	0.15	N/A	0.47	0.42	0.30	N/A	0.25	N/A	0.07
Gini index ^g	22.6	34.2	35.1	36.0	19.7	22.1	27.0	26.1	24.8	33.2	31.2	31.6	24.8	27.1	33.4	34.7	25.9	39.7	39.7	41.6	22.0	21.4	28.2	27.3

Note: Compiled by the author.

^a Constant 2011 PPP \$. Source: World Bank International Comparison Program Database. 1994 data for Slovenia is actually from 1995, as the data of GDP per capita in the country is not available for previous years. ^bSource: ILOSTAT ^cGross enrollment ratio, pre-primary, both sexes (%) – total enrollment in pre-primary education, regardless of age, expressed as a percentage of the total population of official pre-primary education age. Source: UNESCO Institute for Statistics. ^dGER can exceed 100% due to the inclusion of over-aged and under-aged students because of early or late school entrance and grade repetition. ^e Source: OECD (2017), Family benefits public spending (indicator). doi: 10.1787/8e8b3273-en ^fSource: UNDP HDR. Years for which GII is available are 1995, 2000 and 2012. ^gSource: All the ginis (ALG) data set 2016. 1989 gini index for Hungary is the average of 1989 and 1991 values.

Online Supplement Table 2. Countries and sample sizes

	n	1994	2002	2012
Bulgaria	1,680	635	572	473
Czechia	2,200	560	712	928
Hungary	1,569	660	457	452
Poland	1,868	860	598	410
Russia	2,712	1,277	851	584
Slovenia	1,701	607	596	498
N	11,730	4,599	3,786	3,345

Note: Non-weighted sample sizes.

Gender Division of Domestic Labor in Post-socialist Europe, 1994-2012: Test of Class Gradients Hypothesis (Online Supplement)

Online Supplement Table 3. Descriptive statistics, CEE region (N=11,730 respondents)

			1994		2002		2012	
	Min	Max	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Index of GDDL	-6	6	-3.25 ^a [-3.30, -3.19]	1.83	-3.17 [-3.24, -3.10]	2.14	-3.07 [-3.14, -3.00]	2.16
- low educated	-6	6	-3.42 [-3.50, -3.34]	1.90	-3.52 [-3.63, -3.41]	2.14	-3.41 [-3.55, -3.27]	2.18
- highly educated	-6	6	-2.91 [-3.05, -2.77]	1.70	-2.62 [-2.79, -2.44]	2.19	-2.60 [-2.74, -2.46]	2.13
- poor/bottom income quintile	-6	6	-3.39 [-3.51, -3.27]	1.86	-3.61 [-3.76, -3.46]	2.06	-3.33 [-3.49, -3.17]	2.13
- rich/top income quintile	-6	6	-3.08 [-3.19, -2.96]	1.73	-2.80 [-2.95, -2.65]	2.10	-2.87 [-3.03, -2.71]	2.10
Gender of respondent (0 = male, 1 = female)	0	1	0.50	--	0.51	--	0.51	--
Age of respondent	18	65	42.42	11.76	43.55	11.94	43.62	11.55
Household size	2	6	3.62	1.11	3.48	1.14	3.29	1.11
Rich/Top income quintile (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.20	--	0.20	--	0.20	--
Medium income (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.60	--	0.60	--	0.60	--
Poor/Bottom income quintile (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.20	--	0.20	--	0.20	--
Higher education (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.13	--	0.16	--	0.25	--
Medium education (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.42	--	0.45	--	0.47	--
Low education (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.45	--	0.39	--	0.28	--
Man working full-time (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.73	--	0.69	--	0.80	--
Man working part-time (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.03	--	0.03	--	0.02	--
Man not employed (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.24	--	0.28	--	0.18	--
Woman working full-time (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.59	--	0.53	--	0.60	--
Woman working part-time (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.06	--	0.05	--	0.06	--
Woman not employed (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.35	--	0.42	--	0.34	--
Woman's income share bigger (0 = man earning more, 1 = woman earning equally or more)	0	1	0.34	--	0.38	--	0.36	--
Gender role attitudes (higher values = more gender-egalitarian attitudes)	5	25	12.06	4.00	13.35	3.91	14.32	4.16

Note: All values are weighted using a combination of external weights and post-stratification weights provided by the ISSP.

^a95% confidence intervals for dependent variable in brackets.

Gender Division of Domestic Labor in Post-socialist Europe, 1994-2012: Test of Class Gradients Hypothesis (Online Supplement)

Online Supplement Table 4. Descriptive statistics by country and year (N=11,730 respondents)

	Bulgaria				Czechia				Hungary				Poland				Russia				Slovenia																	
	1994		2012		1994		2012		1994		2012		1994		2012		1994		2012		1994		2012															
	Min	Max	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD														
Index of GDDL	-6	6	-3.32	1.83	-3.42	2.37	-2.86	2.10	-3.35	1.77	-3.40	1.90	-3.23	2.06	-3.00	1.95	-3.45	1.95	-3.03	2.52	-3.38	1.97	-3.14	1.96	-3.17	1.89	-3.42	1.62	-2.74	2.40	-3.29	2.30	-3.03	1.75	-2.86	2.13	-2.82	1.97
Gender of respondent (0 = male, 1 = female)	0	1	0.53	--	0.50	--	0.52	--	0.49	--	0.53	--	0.51	--	0.49	--	0.51	--	0.49	--	0.49	--	0.53	--	0.49	--	0.51	--	0.48	--	0.51	--	0.52	--	0.52	--	0.53	--
Age	18	65	43.45	12.11	45.40	12.00	43.59	12.26	41.43	11.72	43.97	11.99	43.19	11.64	42.01	12.02	41.7	12.31	44.00	11.36	43.49	11.25	43.83	11.09	41.32	10.39	42.48	12.10	40.62	12.60	42.17	11.82	41.70	11.24	45.95	10.64	47.80	10.68
Household size	2	6	3.65	1.13	3.41	1.11	3.19	1.08	3.38	1.01	3.14	1.03	3.05	0.99	3.53	1.11	3.41	1.17	3.25	1.16	3.97	1.26	3.93	1.22	3.76	1.14	3.53	0.96	3.39	1.06	3.12	1.04	3.65	1.09	3.58	1.07	3.34	1.09
Rich/Top quintile (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.19	--	0.20	--	0.21	--	0.20	--	0.22	--	0.19	--	0.18	--	0.18	--	0.19	--	0.21	--	0.20	--	0.20	--	0.20	--	0.18	--	0.21	--	0.20	--	0.20	--	0.20	--
Medium income (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.60	--	0.60	--	0.59	--	0.60	--	0.59	--	0.59	--	0.61	--	0.60	--	0.59	--	0.60	--	0.61	--	0.60	--	0.60	--	0.59	--	0.59	--	0.60	--	0.60	--	0.60	--
Poor/Bottom quintile (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.21	--	0.20	--	0.20	--	0.20	--	0.19	--	0.22	--	0.21	--	0.22	--	0.22	--	0.19	--	0.19	--	0.20	--	0.20	--	0.23	--	0.20	--	0.20	--	0.20	--	0.20	--
Higher education (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.13	--	0.25	--	0.28	--	0.14	--	0.15	--	0.16	--	0.11	--	0.14	--	0.15	--	0.11	--	0.11	--	0.33	--	0.17	--	0.13	--	0.30	--	0.13	--	0.18	--	0.30	--
Medium education (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.50	--	0.49	--	0.53	--	0.38	--	0.30	--	0.42	--	0.26	--	0.30	--	0.29	--	0.30	--	0.40	--	0.36	--	0.56	--	0.61	--	0.66	--	0.55	--	0.59	--	0.54	--
Low education (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.37	--	0.26	--	0.19	--	0.48	--	0.55	--	0.42	--	0.63	--	0.56	--	0.56	--	0.59	--	0.49	--	0.31	--	0.27	--	0.26	--	0.04	--	0.32	--	0.23	--	0.16	--
Man working full-time (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.65	--	0.52	--	0.79	--	0.89	--	0.80	--	0.86	--	0.73	--	0.72	--	0.74	--	0.64	--	0.64	--	0.87	--	0.73	--	0.79	--	0.83	--	0.72	--	0.66	--	0.69	--
Man working part-time (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.04	--	0.05	--	0.01	--	0.01	--	0.02	--	0.02	--	0.01	--	0.04	--	0.02	--	0.04	--	0.02	--	0.06	--	0.10	--	0.04	--	0.03	--	0.01	--	0.02	--	0.01	--
Man not employed (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.31	--	0.43	--	0.20	--	0.10	--	0.18	--	0.12	--	0.26	--	0.24	--	0.24	--	0.32	--	0.34	--	0.07	--	0.17	--	0.17	--	0.14	--	0.27	--	0.32	--	0.30	--
Woman working full-time (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.52	--	0.47	--	0.61	--	0.82	--	0.59	--	0.64	--	0.54	--	0.54	--	0.54	--	0.48	--	0.47	--	0.63	--	0.54	--	0.51	--	0.55	--	0.65	--	0.59	--	0.59	--
Woman working part-time (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.04	--	0.04	--	0.03	--	0.05	--	0.03	--	0.06	--	0.02	--	0.04	--	0.04	--	0.06	--	0.06	--	0.14	--	0.13	--	0.13	--	0.07	--	0.03	--	0.03	--	0.03	--
Woman not employed (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.44	--	0.49	--	0.36	--	0.13	--	0.38	--	0.30	--	0.44	--	0.41	--	0.42	--	0.46	--	0.47	--	0.23	--	0.33	--	0.36	--	0.38	--	0.32	--	0.38	--	0.38	--
Woman's income share bigger (0 = man earning more; 1 = woman earning equally or more)	0	1	0.45	--	0.36	--	0.34	--	0.24	--	0.32	--	0.35	--	0.29	--	0.36	--	0.32	--	0.45	--	0.36	--	0.33	--	0.25	--	0.40	--	0.34	--	0.40	--	0.48	--	0.48	--
Gender role attitudes (higher values = more gender egalitarian views)	5	25	11.12	4.40	12.94	3.78	13.78	3.55	13.80	3.83	13.65	4.07	15.03	4.22	11.17	3.89	12.67	3.95	13.02	4.10	12.35	3.84	14.00	3.95	15.25	3.86	10.60	3.19	12.43	3.50	12.54	3.76	13.30	3.78	14.46	3.77	16.49	4.12

Note: All values are weighted using post-stratification weights provided by ISSP.

GDDL—Country-Specific Patterns and Trends, 1994–2012

In Online Supplement Table 5, I provide estimations of time- and class-related effects on the level of equality in GDDL from country-specific regressions. I also include estimations of the other theoretically-relevant variables and controls. With minor exceptions, the effects of the latter were comparable across all the considered countries.

By breaking down the sample, I lose some statistical power, which should be taken into account when interpreting the statistical significance of the effects. To compensate for this and to simplify the interpretation of the country-specific effects, I include coefficients from the pooled regional model.

Online Supplement Table 6 includes information on net societal change in inequality in GDDL and on change among three major classes at the regional level and in each of the analyzed countries.

Gender Division of Domestic Labor in Post-socialist Europe, 1994-2012: Test of Class Gradients Hypothesis (Online Supplement)

Online Supplement Table 5. Determinants of gender division of domestic labor, CEE countries, 1994-2012 (OLS)

	CEE		Bulgaria		Czechia		Hungary		Poland		Russia		Slovenia	
	Model 1 <i>β</i> (SE)	Model 2 <i>β</i> (SE)	Model 1 <i>β</i> (SE)	Model 2 <i>β</i> (SE)	Model 1 <i>β</i> (SE)	Model 2 <i>β</i> (SE)	Model 1 <i>β</i> (SE)	Model 2 <i>β</i> (SE)	Model 1 <i>β</i> (SE)	Model 2 <i>β</i> (SE)	Model 1 <i>β</i> (SE)	Model 2 <i>β</i> (SE)	Model 1 <i>β</i> (SE)	Model 2 <i>β</i> (SE)
<i>Year (ref. category: 1994)</i>														
2002	0.02 (0.04)	-0.36** (0.11)	-0.22* (0.12)	-0.82** (0.31)	0.04 (0.11)	-0.25 (0.28)	-0.57*** (0.13)	-0.92** (0.32)	0.24* (0.10)	-0.14 (0.23)	0.48*** (0.10)	0.87** (0.29)	0.21* (0.11)	0.09 (0.31)
2012	0.03 (0.05)	-0.02 (0.12)	0.22* (0.13)	0.01 (0.32)	0.05 (0.11)	0.15 (0.26)	-0.02 (0.13)	-0.22 (0.36)	-0.14 (0.13)	-0.09 (0.29)	-0.10 (0.11)	-0.02 (0.43)	0.18 (0.13)	0.65* (0.35)
<i>Education (ref. category: Low)</i>														
Medium Education	0.21*** (0.04)	0.14* (0.07)	0.12 (0.13)	0.01 (0.20)	0.14 (0.09)	-0.05 (0.17)	0.32* (0.13)	0.22 (0.20)	0.20* (0.10)	0.08 (0.15)	0.24* (0.13)	0.62*** (0.16)	0.09 (0.12)	0.07 (0.18)
Higher Education	0.53*** (0.06)	0.34*** (0.10)	0.66*** (0.16)	0.32 (0.26)	0.32* (0.14)	-0.09 (0.25)	0.60*** (0.17)	0.78** (0.26)	0.58*** (0.15)	0.30 (0.26)	0.59*** (0.15)	0.73*** (0.21)	0.17 (0.17)	-0.09 (0.28)
Medium Education*2002		0.20* (0.10)		0.16 (0.28)		0.16 (0.24)		0.24 (0.30)		0.21 (0.23)		-0.95*** (0.26)		0.24 (0.27)
Higher Education*2002		0.27* (0.14)		0.55 (0.36)		0.65* (0.35)		-0.78* (0.39)		0.13 (0.38)		-0.52 (0.32)		0.66* (0.39)
Medium Education*2012		0.02 (0.11)		0.21 (0.33)		0.33 (0.26)		0.09 (0.32)		0.19 (0.28)		-0.69* (0.42)		-0.30 (0.32)
Higher Education*2012		0.29* (0.14)		0.50 (0.42)		0.59* (0.36)		0.20 (0.43)		0.58* (0.35)		-0.42 (0.46)		-0.01 (0.40)
<i>Income (ref. category: Low)</i>														
Medium Household Income	0.14* (0.06)	0.04 (0.10)	0.27* (0.14)	0.05 (0.21)	0.03 (0.13)	0.12 (0.23)	0.03 (0.20)	-0.13 (0.24)	0.23* (0.17)	0.15 (0.17)	0.23* (0.11)	-0.03 (0.15)	-0.10 (0.15)	0.04 (0.24)
High Household Income	0.16* (0.07)	0.07 (0.11)	0.52*** (0.19)	0.47* (0.28)	-0.02 (0.18)	0.11 (0.30)	-0.28 (0.26)	-0.66* (0.32)	0.28 (0.17)	0.34 (0.24)	0.26* (0.15)	-0.08 (0.20)	-0.03 (0.20)	0.14 (0.31)
Medium Household Income*2002		0.27* (0.12)		0.60* (0.31)		0.15 (0.32)		0.33 (0.38)		0.37 (0.27)		0.39 (0.24)		-0.20 (0.35)
High Household Income*2002		0.38* (0.16)		0.16 (0.41)		0.32 (0.41)		1.04* (0.49)		0.35 (0.37)		0.56* (0.32)		-0.08 (0.47)
Medium Household Income*2012		0.02 (0.14)		0.01 (0.35)		-0.35 (0.29)		0.16 (0.48)		-0.29 (0.33)		0.57* (0.28)		-0.27 (0.37)
High Household Income*2012		-0.10 (0.18)		-0.10 (0.49)		-0.61 (0.43)		0.18 (0.78)		-0.55 (0.45)		0.70* (0.38)		-0.54 (0.47)
<i>Man's employment status (ref. category: Full-time)</i>														
Man employed part-time	0.25* (0.11)	0.25* (0.11)	0.07 (0.29)	0.03 (0.29)	0.47 (0.32)	0.46 (0.32)	-0.14 (0.39)	-0.14 (0.39)	0.87*** (0.24)	0.87*** (0.24)	0.20 (0.17)	0.20 (0.17)	0.75* (0.40)	0.79* (0.40)
Man not employed	0.18** (0.06)	0.19*** (0.06)	0.13 (0.15)	0.14 (0.15)	0.22 (0.18)	0.22 (0.18)	0.21 (0.17)	0.17 (0.17)	0.35** (0.13)	-0.49*** (0.11)	0.06 (0.15)	0.05 (0.16)	0.14 (0.14)	0.13 (0.31)
<i>Woman's employment status (ref. category: full-time)</i>														
Woman employed part-time	0.03 (0.08)	0.03 (0.08)	-0.14 (0.25)	-0.16 (0.25)	0.10 (0.19)	0.09 (0.19)	-0.42 (0.31)	-0.45 (0.31)	0.06 (0.17)	0.05 (0.17)	0.29* (0.13)	0.31* (0.13)	0.10 (0.28)	0.11 (0.28)
Woman not employed	-0.31*** (0.05)	-0.31*** (0.05)	-0.38** (0.13)	-0.37** (0.13)	-0.23* (0.12)	-0.25* (0.12)	-0.47*** (0.14)	-0.45*** (0.14)	-0.50*** (0.11)	-0.49*** (0.11)	0.08 (0.10)	0.09 (0.10)	-0.49*** (0.13)	-0.49*** (0.13)
Woman's income share bigger	0.34*** (0.05)	0.34*** (0.05)	0.45*** (0.11)	0.44*** (0.12)	0.62*** (0.10)	0.64*** (0.10)	0.23* (0.12)	0.25* (0.13)	0.12 (0.11)	0.13 (0.11)	0.27 (0.19)	0.29 (0.19)	0.26** (0.10)	0.25* (0.10)
Egalitarian gender role attitudes ^a	0.03*** (0.01)	0.03*** (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.04*** (0.01)	0.04*** (0.01)	0.02 (0.01)	0.02 (0.01)	0.05*** (0.01)	0.05*** (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.04** (0.01)	0.04** (0.01)
Female respondent	-0.63*** (0.04)	-0.63*** (0.04)	-0.89*** (0.10)	-0.89*** (0.10)	-0.59*** (0.08)	-0.59*** (0.08)	-0.62*** (0.11)	-0.62*** (0.11)	-0.49*** (0.09)	-0.49*** (0.09)	-0.48*** (0.10)	-0.49*** (0.08)	-0.69*** (0.10)	-0.69*** (0.10)

Gender Division of Domestic Labor in Post-socialist Europe, 1994-2012: Test of Class Gradients Hypothesis (Online Supplement)

Age ^a	-0.08*** (0.01)	-0.08*** (0.01)	-0.07* (0.03)	-0.07* (0.03)	-0.14*** (0.03)	-0.15*** (0.03)	-0.09* (0.04)	-0.09* (0.04)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.03)	0.00 (0.03)	-0.14*** (0.04)	-0.14*** (0.04)
Age squared	0.07*** (0.01)	0.07*** (0.02)	0.07 (0.03)	0.07 (0.04)	0.14*** (0.03)	0.15*** (0.04)	0.09* (0.05)	0.09* (0.05)	0.02 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.00 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.03)	0.14 (0.04)	0.14*** (0.04)
Household size ^a	-0.07*** (0.02)	-0.08*** (0.02)	-0.014** (0.05)	-0.14** (0.05)	-0.07 (0.05)	-0.07 (0.05)	-0.12* (0.06)	-0.12* (0.06)	-0.09* (0.04)	-0.09* (0.04)	0.06 (0.04)	0.07+ (0.04)	-0.06 (0.05)	-0.07 (0.05)
Intercept	-3.20***	-3.06***	-3.17***	-2.99***	-3.42***	-3.37***	-2.90***	-2.53***	-3.41***	-3.08***	-3.54***	-3.72***	-2.70***	-2.76***
Adjusted R ²	0.063	0.065	0.108	0.114	0.070	0.077	0.058	0.063	0.093	0.095	0.050	0.057	0.076	0.078
N	11,710	11,710	1,680	1,680	2,200	2,200	1,569	1,569	1,868	1,868	2,712	2,712	1,701	1,701

Notes: Models 1 and 2 have the same specifications as pooled Models 3 and 4 respectively. ^aAge centred at 40, household size centred at 3, gender role attitudes centred at 15. ⁺p ≤ 0.1 *p ≤ 0.05, ** p ≤ 0.01, *** p ≤ 0.001.

Gender Division of Domestic Labor in Post-socialist Europe, 1994-2012: Test of Class Gradients Hypothesis (Online Supplement)

Online Supplement Table 6. Net and class-specific change in GDDL, 1994-2012

	Net societal change		Low educated, low-income (bottom 20%) households		Medium educated, middle-income (middle 60%) households		Highly educated, high-income (top 20%) households	
	1994-2002 ^a	2002-2012 ^b	1994-2002 ^c	2002-2012 ^d	1994-2002 ^c	2002-2012 ^d	1994-2002 ^c	2002-2012 ^d
CEE Region	0.02	0.01	-0.36***	0.34**	0.12	-0.10	0.29*	-0.12
Bulgaria ^e	-0.22 ⁺	0.45***	-0.82**	0.83**	-0.06	0.29	-0.11	0.53 ⁺
Czechia ^e	0.04	0.01	-0.25	0.40 ⁺	0.05	0.08	0.72 ⁺	-0.59 ⁺
Hungary ^e	-0.57***	0.55***	-0.92**	0.69 ⁺	-0.34	0.37	-0.66 ⁺	0.80 ⁺
Poland ^e	0.24*	-0.38**	-0.14	0.05	0.44*	-0.55*	0.34	-0.41
Russia ^e	0.48***	-0.57***	0.87**	-0.88 ⁺	0.30*	-0.44**	0.90***	-0.63*
Slovenia ^e	0.21 ⁺	-0.03	0.09	0.56	0.13	-0.05	0.67*	-0.57 ⁺

Notes: ^a Change=[Year 2002] from a full model without education*year and income*year interaction terms and with 1994 as omitted year reference category. ^b Change=[Year 2012] from a full model without education*year and income*year interaction terms with 2002 as omitted year reference category (model not shown). ^c Change=[Year 2002 + educational level*2002 + income level*2002] from a full model with education*year and income*year interaction terms and with 1994 as omitted year reference category. ^d Change=[Year 2012 + educational level*2012 + income level*2012] from a full model with education*year and income*year interaction terms and with 2012 as omitted year reference category.

⁺p ≤ 0.1 *p ≤ 0.05, ** p ≤ 0.01, *** p ≤ 0.001