**FutureGEN: gendered attitudes towards providing care**

**Table 1: Descriptive statistics for the regression sample**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable**  | **Mean** | **Std.Dev** |
| Providing informal care | 6.0 | 23.8 |
| Male | 46.2 | 49.9 |
| Gender attitudes to care (ref=daughters should provide care) |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 22.2 | 41.6 |
| Strongly disagree | 63.6 | 48.1 |
| Male x gender attitudes to care |  |
| Male x Neither agree/disagree | 11.9 | 32.3 |
| Male x “egalitarian” | 28.1 | 45.0 |
|  Family support for informal care(ref = disagree that family should provide care) |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 18.0 | 38.4 |
| Strongly agree | 71.6 | 45.1 |
| Male x Family support |  |
| Male x neither agree/disagree | 8.2 | 27.4 |
| Male x strongly agree | 33.6 | 47.2 |
| Poor Self-reported health | 8.1 | 27.4 |
| Education |  |  |
| secondary | 59.5 | 49.1 |
| tertiary | 32.4 | 46.8 |
| employed | 71.7 | 45.1 |
| Parent’s health | 32.1 | 46.7 |
| Partner | 76.7 | 42.3 |
| N. of kids in household | 1,9 | 1,2 |
| Age | 49,0 | 6,4 |

**Figure 1: % of men providing care across countries**
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**Figure 2: % of women providing care across countries**
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**Figure 3: % of individuals with “unegalitarian”, “egalitarian” and inbetween views by gender and country**
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**Figure 4: probability of providing care by gender, country and gender care attitudes category**

****Note: 0 = “unegalitarian”/agree that daughters should provide care; 1 = “middle”/neither agree nor disagree; 2 = “egalitarian”/disagree that daughters should provide care

**Narrowing down model**

Model 1: Gender attitude to care variable (no interaction)
Model 2: Gender attitude to care variable x gender (interaction)
Model 3: Model 2 but with family support variable x gender
Model 4 (Full model): Model 3 with all controls (poor self-reported health, education, employment, parent’s health, partner, number of kids in household, age, wave of survey).

**Table 2: Multilevel logit model of impact of gender attitudes to care on provision of informal care (AMEs)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
|  |  | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men |
| Gender attitude to care (ref=“unegal”) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inbetween | -.013\*\* | -.029\*\*\* | .013\* | -.027\*\*\* | .005\*\* | -.022\*\* | .014\*\* |
| Egalitarian | -.012\*\* | -.028\*\*\* | .008† | -.0266\*\*\* | .004\* | -.019\*\* | .011\* |
| Variance country-level | .077 | .071 | .069 | .144 |

Note: †p < 0.10; \*p < 0.05; \*\*p < 0.01; \*\*\*p < 0.001. Weighted results. Average Marginal Effects. Level 2 of model are countries.

**Adding country-level variables**

Model 5: Full model + LTC expenditure
Model 6: Full model + LFP-rate for women
Model 7: Full model + % of women in national parliament
Model 8: Full model + % of egalitarians in our sample
Model 9: Full model + all 4 country-level variables

**Table 3: Multilevel logit model of impact of gender attitudes to care on provision of informal care (AMEs)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 5 | Model 6 | Model 7 | Model 8 | Model 9 |
|  | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men |
| Gender attitude to care (ref=“unegal”) |  |  |  |
| Inbetween | -.022\*\* | .013\*\* | -.022\*\* | .013\*\* | -.022\*\* | .014\*\* | -.022\*\* | .013\*\* | -.028\*\* | .014\* |
| Egalitarian | -.018\*\* | .011\* | -.018\*\* | .011\* | -.019\*\* | .011\* | -.018\*\* | .011\* | -.024\*\* | .010† |
| Country-level effects |  |  |  |
| LTC expenditure | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | -/\* |
| LFP rate women |  |  | -/† |  |  |  |  | -/ |
| % of women in nat. parliament |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | +/\*\*\* |
| % of “egalitarians” |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | + |
| Variance country-level | .121 | .119 | .171 | .113 | .041 |

Note: †p < 0.10; \*p < 0.05; \*\*p < 0.01; \*\*\*p < 0.001. Weighted results. Average Marginal Effects. Level 2 of model are countries.

**Table 4: Correlations between country variables**

High correlation between some variables; perhaps better to only use models 5 to 8 with 1 country-level variable each rather than all 4 country-level variables together in model 9?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| (1) LTC expenditure | 1.000 |  |  |
| (2) LFP rate women | 0.7926 | 1.000 |  |
| (3) % of women in nat. parliament | 0.735 | 0.562 | 1.000 |
| (4) % of “egalitarians” | 0.897 | 0.731 | 0.483 |