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**Variable coding**

Data on household income is coded in various ways in the ISSP. Sometimes exact values are given, whereas in other cases there are only some broad income categories. I coded this data into income quintiles based on the distribution of respondents, accounting for survey weights. Due to the empirical distribution, in some cases it is only possible to approximate real quintiles capturing twenty percent of respondents. To make sure that different sizes of the income categories do not bias the results, I tested for the influence of the actual size of the empirical income quintiles and added this as a control variable. The results are unaffected by the size of the income quintiles. Data on *educational degrees* is coded into three categories. These are (1) below upper secondary education, (2) upper secondary-below tertiary education, and (3) tertiary education. Respondents in *paid work* are distinguished by whether they work full-time (more than 30 hours a week) or part-time (below 30 hours a week). The variable *partner in paid work* is constructed out of two variables indicating whether respondents are married or are living together in the same household with their partner (coded as 1 to 3) or whether this is not the case (0). Similar to the *respondent in paid work vaiable*, it is further distinguished whether partners are not in paid work (1), work part-time (2) or full-time (3). I also control for *partner´s educational degree* which is coded in the same way as respondent´s educational degree (see above); and I control for *relative income* between the respondent and his/her partner. The categorical variable *relative income* is based on the respondent´s assessment of who has the higher income. I distinguish respondents without own income (1), with less income than their partner (2), with the same income (3), with more income (4), and those who are the only ones who have an income (5). I control for *toddlers* and *children* living in the same household. *Toddlers* include children below school-age, *children* include non-adult children with the beginning of school-age. A final control variable related to exposure to traditional norms is *religious practice*. This variable is coded as 1 if respondents attend religious services more than once a year, and 0 otherwise.

In separate models, I control for long-term average levels and period-specific deviations of the female labor force participation ratio (as a % of women aged between 15 and 64) and unemployment rates (as a % of the total labor force; both indicators are taken from the OECD Labor Force Survey 2014). This allows me to disentangle the effects of expanding childcare provision from broader trends of rising female employment and in the labor market context. These additional model specifications are presented in Table A.2 in this appendix.

**Tables and Figures**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table A.1: Public childcare spending, inequality in childcare enrolment, and attitudes towards maternal employment; as average levels and changes over time | | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Country | Public childcare spending (% of GDP; average 2002-2012) | Public childcare spending (change 2002-2012) | Inequality in childcare enrolment (average level 2006-2012) | Inequality in childcare enrolment (change 2006-2012) | Attitudes towards maternal employment (average level 2002-2012) | Attitudes towards maternal employment (change 2002-2012) |
| DE | 0.44 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.04 | 0.69 | 0.17 |
| GB | 0.78 | 0.01 | 0.45 | 0.15 | 0.53 | 0.13 |
| AT | 0.38 | 0.21 | 0.14 | -0.13 | 0.48 | -0.03 |
| HU | 0.62 | 0.02 | 0.25 | -0.18 | 0.59 | 0.12 |
| IE | 0.37 | 0.25 | 0.60 | 0.03 | 0.64 | 0.07 |
| NL | 0.56 | 0.36 | 0.27 | -0.04 | 0.70 | -0.02 |
| NO | 0.92 | 0.59 | 0.15 | 0.02 | 0.78 | 0.19 |
| SE | 1.36 | 0.45 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.84 | 0.07 |
| CZ | 0.38 | 0.12 | 0.28 | 0.04 | 0.61 | 0.00 |
| SI | 0.55 | -0.05 | 0.07 | -0.07 | 0.76 | 0.11 |
| PL | 0.33 | 0.24 | 0.51 | -0.03 | 0.43 | -0.02 |
| ES | 0.48 | 0.17 | 0.23 | 0.05 | 0.68 | 0.11 |
| SK | 0.45 | -0.02 | 0.19 | -0.04 | 0.56 | 0.18 |
| FR | 1.20 | 0.08 | 0.33 | -0.11 | 0.65 | 0.17 |
| PT | 0.35 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.68 | 0.25 |
| DK | 1.39 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.85 | 0.18 |
| BE | 0.67 | 0.13 | 0.20 | 0.05 | 0.76 | 0.09 |
| FI | 1.00 | 0.21 | 0.24 | -0.03 | 0.72 | 0.23 |
| Mean | 0.68 | 0.17 | 0.23 | -0.01 | 0.66 | 0.11 |
| Standard deviation | 0.35 | 0.17 | 0.16 | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.09 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Note: Average values for attitudes towards maternal employment account for sampling weights. For country labels and full definitions of the variables, see main text. | | | | | | |
|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table A.2: Multilevel random intercept logistic regressions: Attitudes towards maternal employment; controlling for female labor force participation ratio and unemployment rate; maximum likelihood estimates | | | | | | |
|  | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 |
| VARIABLES | Attitudes towards maternal employment | | | | | |
| Household income: Q1 | -0.183\*\*\* | -0.184\*\*\* | -0.183\*\*\* | -0.183\*\*\* | -0.183\*\*\* | -0.183\*\*\* |
| (ref: Q3) | (0.041) | (0.041) | (0.041) | (0.041) | (0.041) | (0.041) |
| Q2 | -0.059 | -0.059 | -0.059 | -0.059 | -0.059 | -0.059 |
|  | (0.039) | (0.039) | (0.039) | (0.039) | (0.039) | (0.039) |
| Q4 | 0.133\*\*\* | 0.134\*\*\* | 0.133\*\*\* | 0.133\*\*\* | 0.134\*\*\* | 0.133\*\*\* |
|  | (0.040) | (0.040) | (0.040) | (0.040) | (0.040) | (0.040) |
| Q5 | 0.201\*\*\* | 0.201\*\*\* | 0.201\*\*\* | 0.201\*\*\* | 0.201\*\*\* | 0.201\*\*\* |
|  | (0.043) | (0.043) | (0.043) | (0.043) | (0.043) | (0.043) |
| Below upper secondary education | -0.637\*\*\* | -0.637\*\*\* | -0.639\*\*\* | -0.639\*\*\* | -0.638\*\*\* | -0.640\*\*\* |
| (ref: Tertiary education) | (0.043) | (0.043) | (0.043) | (0.043) | (0.043) | (0.043) |
| Upper secondary education | -0.391\*\*\* | -0.391\*\*\* | -0.392\*\*\* | -0.392\*\*\* | -0.391\*\*\* | -0.391\*\*\* |
|  | (0.041) | (0.041) | (0.041) | (0.041) | (0.041) | (0.041) |
| Paid work (part-time) | 0.133\*\*\* | 0.133\*\*\* | 0.134\*\*\* | 0.135\*\*\* | 0.134\*\*\* | 0.135\*\*\* |
| (ref: not in paid work) | (0.049) | (0.049) | (0.049) | (0.049) | (0.049) | (0.049) |
| Paid work (full-time) | 0.195\*\*\* | 0.195\*\*\* | 0.195\*\*\* | 0.196\*\*\* | 0.195\*\*\* | 0.195\*\*\* |
|  | (0.033) | (0.033) | (0.033) | (0.033) | (0.033) | (0.033) |
| Partner not in paid work | -0.060 | -0.060 | -0.059 | -0.059 | -0.059 | -0.057 |
| (ref: no partner) | (0.063) | (0.063) | (0.063) | (0.063) | (0.063) | (0.063) |
| Partner in part-time work | -0.038 | -0.038 | -0.036 | -0.036 | -0.036 | -0.034 |
|  | (0.077) | (0.077) | (0.076) | (0.076) | (0.076) | (0.076) |
| Partner in full-time work | 0.051 | 0.051 | 0.052 | 0.053 | 0.052 | 0.054 |
|  | (0.059) | (0.059) | (0.059) | (0.059) | (0.059) | (0.059) |
| Partner: Below upper secondary education | -0.138\*\*\* | -0.138\*\*\* | -0.143\*\*\* | -0.146\*\*\* | -0.144\*\*\* | -0.149\*\*\* |
| (ref: no partner) | (0.052) | (0.052) | (0.051) | (0.051) | (0.051) | (0.051) |
| Partner: Upper secondary education | -0.058 | -0.059 | -0.064 | -0.065 | -0.064 | -0.069 |
|  | (0.055) | (0.055) | (0.055) | (0.055) | (0.055) | (0.055) |
| Partner: Tertiary education | 0.150\*\* | 0.148\*\* | 0.144\*\* | 0.140\*\* | 0.140\*\* | 0.136\*\* |
|  | (0.068) | (0.068) | (0.068) | (0.068) | (0.068) | (0.068) |
| Relative income: no own income | -0.622\*\*\* | -0.621\*\*\* | -0.620\*\*\* | -0.618\*\*\* | -0.618\*\*\* | -0.616\*\*\* |
| (ref: no partner) | (0.089) | (0.089) | (0.089) | (0.089) | (0.089) | (0.089) |
| Relative income: partner earns more | 0.071 | 0.071 | 0.072 | 0.075 | 0.073 | 0.075 |
|  | (0.066) | (0.066) | (0.066) | (0.066) | (0.066) | (0.066) |
| Relative income: both earn the same | 0.204\*\*\* | 0.204\*\*\* | 0.206\*\*\* | 0.207\*\*\* | 0.206\*\*\* | 0.207\*\*\* |
|  | (0.071) | (0.071) | (0.071) | (0.071) | (0.071) | (0.071) |
| Relative income: partner earns less | 0.096 | 0.095 | 0.097 | 0.099 | 0.098 | 0.099 |
|  | (0.067) | (0.067) | (0.067) | (0.066) | (0.066) | (0.066) |
| Relative income: only respondent has income | -0.459\*\*\* | -0.459\*\*\* | -0.457\*\*\* | -0.457\*\*\* | -0.457\*\*\* | -0.455\*\*\* |
|  | (0.085) | (0.085) | (0.085) | (0.085) | (0.085) | (0.085) |
| Age | -0.013\*\*\* | -0.013\*\*\* | -0.013\*\*\* | -0.013\*\*\* | -0.013\*\*\* | -0.013\*\*\* |
|  | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) |
| Female | 0.450\*\*\* | 0.450\*\*\* | 0.449\*\*\* | 0.450\*\*\* | 0.449\*\*\* | 0.449\*\*\* |
|  | (0.030) | (0.030) | (0.030) | (0.030) | (0.030) | (0.030) |
| Children in school age | -0.110\*\*\* | -0.110\*\*\* | -0.110\*\*\* | -0.110\*\*\* | -0.110\*\*\* | -0.110\*\*\* |
|  | (0.031) | (0.031) | (0.031) | (0.031) | (0.031) | (0.031) |
| Toddlers | -0.046 | -0.046 | -0.045 | -0.046 | -0.046 | -0.044 |
|  | (0.040) | (0.040) | (0.040) | (0.040) | (0.040) | (0.040) |
| Religious practice | -0.254\*\*\* | -0.254\*\*\* | -0.253\*\*\* | -0.255\*\*\* | -0.254\*\*\* | -0.253\*\*\* |
|  | (0.028) | (0.028) | (0.028) | (0.028) | (0.028) | (0.028) |
| Year=2012 | 0.673\*\*\* | 0.741\*\*\* | 0.765\*\*\* | 0.274\* | 0.298 | 0.331\* |
| (ref: year=2002) | (0.162) | (0.203) | (0.198) | (0.144) | (0.187) | (0.183) |
| Public childcare spending (mean) |  | 0.063 | 0.062\* |  | 0.093\*\*\* | 0.065\*\* |
|  |  | (0.040) | (0.032) |  | (0.033) | (0.027) |
| Public childcare spending (diff) |  | -0.039 | -0.046 |  | -0.012 | -0.019 |
|  |  | (0.071) | (0.069) |  | (0.063) | (0.061) |
| Childcare inequality (mean) |  |  | -0.198\*\*\* |  |  | -0.203\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.063) |  |  | (0.060) |
| Childcare inequality (diff) |  |  | 0.162 |  |  | 0.150 |
|  |  |  | (0.148) |  |  | (0.130) |
| Female labor force participation rate (mean) | 0.048\*\*\* | 0.025 | 0.003 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.018) | (0.022) | (0.019) |  |  |  |
| Female labor force participation rate (diff) | -0.036 | -0.036 | -0.036 |  |  |  |
|  | (0.030) | (0.030) | (0.029) |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate (mean) |  |  |  | 0.010 | 0.002 | -0.000 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.021) | (0.017) | (0.014) |
| Unemployment rate (diff) |  |  |  | 0.026\*\*\* | 0.025\*\* | 0.025\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  | (0.010) | (0.010) | (0.010) |
| Constant | -1.813 | -0.373 | 1.100 | 1.413\*\*\* | 1.503\*\*\* | 1.518\*\*\* |
|  | (1.195) | (1.464) | (1.274) | (0.314) | (0.275) | (0.226) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 34425 | 34425 | 34425 | 34425 | 34425 | 34425 |
| Number of countries | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Number of country-years | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 |
| Random intercept variance (country) | 0.164\*\* | 0.138\*\* | 0.072 | 0.267\*\* | 0.170\*\* | 0.088\* |
|  | (0.078) | (0.069) | (0.047) | (0.106) | (0.074) | (0.046) |
| Random intercept variance (country-year) | 0.115\*\*\* | 0.113\*\*\* | 0.106\*\*\* | 0.087\*\*\* | 0.087\*\*\* | 0.081\*\*\* |
|  | (0.041) | (0.040) | (0.038) | (0.031) | (0.031) | (0.029) |
| Standard errors in parentheses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Table A.3: Multilevel random intercept regressions: Attitudes towards maternal employment; maximum likelihood estimates | | |
|  | M1 | M2 |
| VARIABLES | Attitudes towards maternal employment | |
| Household income: Q1 | -0.199\*\*\* | -0.150 |
| (ref: Q3) | (0.042) | (0.096) |
| Q2 | -0.072\* | -0.224\*\*\* |
|  | (0.040) | (0.087) |
| Q4 | 0.125\*\*\* | 0.006 |
|  | (0.041) | (0.084) |
| Q5 | 0.202\*\*\* | 0.130 |
|  | (0.045) | (0.092) |
| Below upper secondary education | -0.645\*\*\* | -0.745\*\*\* |
| (ref: Tertiary education) | (0.043) | (0.089) |
| Upper secondary education | -0.394\*\*\* | -0.459\*\*\* |
|  | (0.042) | (0.081) |
| Paid work (part-time) | 0.137\*\*\* | 0.470\*\*\* |
| (ref: not in paid work) | (0.049) | (0.085) |
| Paid work (full-time) | 0.199\*\*\* | 0.532\*\*\* |
|  | (0.033) | (0.070) |
| Partner not in paid work | -0.059 | -0.223 |
| (ref: no partner) | (0.063) | (0.151) |
| Partner in part-time work | -0.035 | -0.027 |
|  | (0.077) | (0.180) |
| Partner in full-time work | 0.053 | 0.022 |
|  | (0.059) | (0.105) |
| Partner: Below upper secondary education | -0.147\*\*\* | -0.145 |
| (ref: no partner) | (0.052) | (0.105) |
| Partner: Upper secondary education | -0.075 | -0.149 |
|  | (0.055) | (0.109) |
| Partner: Tertiary education | 0.125\* | -0.170 |
|  | (0.068) | (0.132) |
| Relative income: no own income | -0.609\*\*\* | -0.696\*\*\* |
| (ref: no partner) | (0.089) | (0.155) |
| Relative income: partner earns more | 0.078 | -0.032 |
|  | (0.066) | (0.119) |
| Relative income: both earn the same | 0.208\*\*\* | 0.061 |
|  | (0.071) | (0.137) |
| Relative income: partner earns less | 0.100 | 0.496\*\*\* |
|  | (0.066) | (0.151) |
| Relative income: only respondent has income | -0.451\*\*\* | 0.100 |
|  | (0.085) | (0.222) |
| Age | -0.013\*\*\* | -0.015\*\*\* |
|  | (0.001) | (0.004) |
| Female | 0.449\*\*\* |  |
|  | (0.030) |  |
| Children in school age | -0.111\*\*\* | -0.061 |
|  | (0.031) | (0.058) |
| Toddlers | -0.046 | 0.082 |
|  | (0.040) | (0.062) |
| Religious practice | -0.254\*\*\* | -0.319\*\*\* |
|  | (0.028) | (0.058) |
| Year=2012 | 0.711\*\*\* | 0.529\*\*\* |
| (ref: year=2002) | (0.151) | (0.178) |
| Public childcare spending (mean) | 0.065\*\* | 0.057\* |
|  | (0.027) | (0.033) |
| Public childcare spending (diff) | 0.173 | 0.157 |
|  | (0.133) | (0.150) |
| Childcare inequality (mean) | -0.224\*\*\* | -0.265\*\*\* |
|  | (0.062) | (0.080) |
| Childcare inequality (diff) | -0.078 | -0.027 |
|  | (0.069) | (0.094) |
| Childcare inequality (mean) \* Public childcare spending (diff) | -0.076\*\* | -0.130\*\*\* |
|  | (0.033) | (0.046) |
| Household income: Q1 \* inequality (mean) | 0.040 | -0.010 |
|  | (0.026) | (0.058) |
| Q2 \* inequality (mean) | 0.045\* | 0.150\*\*\* |
|  | (0.026) | (0.055) |
| Q4 \* inequality (mean) | 0.005 | -0.004 |
|  | (0.028) | (0.056) |
| Q5 \* inequality (mean) | 0.004 | 0.001 |
|  | (0.030) | (0.060) |
| Household income: Q1 \* spending (diff) | -0.028 | -0.063 |
|  | (0.034) | (0.080) |
| Q2 \* spending (diff) | -0.004 | 0.023 |
|  | (0.035) | (0.080) |
| Q4 \* spending (diff) | -0.028 | -0.074 |
|  | (0.037) | (0.081) |
| Q5 \* spending (diff) | 0.010 | -0.023 |
|  | (0.038) | (0.085) |
| Household income: Q1 \* inequality (mean) \* spending (diff) | -0.007 | -0.025 |
|  | (0.023) | (0.051) |
| Q2 \* inequality (mean) \* spending (diff) | 0.006 | 0.055 |
|  | (0.023) | (0.049) |
| Q4 \* inequality (mean) \* spending (diff) | 0.002 | 0.052 |
|  | (0.025) | (0.051) |
| Q5 \* inequality (mean) \* spending (diff) | 0.040 | 0.116\*\* |
|  | (0.027) | (0.055) |
| Constant | 1.334\*\*\* | 1.814\*\*\* |
|  | (0.135) | (0.204) |
| Observations | 34,425 | 9,047 |
| Number of countries | 18 | 18 |
| Number of country-years | 36 | 36 |
| Random intercept variance (country) | 0.086\* | 0.135\*\* |
|  | (0.046) | (0.067) |
| Random intercept variance (country-year) | 0.085\*\*\* | 0.088\*\* |
|  | (0.031) | (0.040) |
| Standard errors in parentheses |  |  |
| \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1 |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table A.4: Multilevel random intercept regressions: Attitudes towards maternal employment; maximum likelihood estimates | |
|  | M1 |
| VARIABLES | Attitudes towards maternal employment |
| Household income: Q1 | -0.164\*\*\* |
| (ref: Q3) | (0.052) |
| Q2 | -0.084\* |
|  | (0.051) |
| Q4 | 0.147\*\*\* |
|  | (0.053) |
| Q5 | 0.194\*\*\* |
|  | (0.055) |
| Below upper secondary education | 0.258\*\*\* |
| (ref: Tertiary education) | (0.031) |
| Upper secondary education | 0.645\*\*\* |
|  | (0.043) |
| Paid work (part-time) | 0.147\*\*\* |
| (ref: not in paid work) | (0.049) |
| Paid work (full-time) | 0.204\*\*\* |
|  | (0.033) |
| Partner not in paid work | -0.050 |
| (ref: no partner) | (0.063) |
| Partner in part-time work | -0.026 |
|  | (0.077) |
| Partner in full-time work | 0.051 |
|  | (0.059) |
| Partner: Below upper secondary education | -0.154\*\*\* |
| (ref: no partner) | (0.051) |
| Partner: Upper secondary education | -0.088 |
|  | (0.055) |
| Partner: Tertiary education | 0.091 |
|  | (0.068) |
| Relative income: no own income | -0.599\*\*\* |
| (ref: no partner) | (0.089) |
| Relative income: partner earns more | 0.087 |
|  | (0.066) |
| Relative income: both earn the same | 0.218\*\*\* |
|  | (0.071) |
| Relative income: partner earns less | 0.105 |
|  | (0.066) |
| Relative income: only respondent has income | -0.446\*\*\* |
|  | (0.085) |
| Age | -0.014\*\*\* |
|  | (0.001) |
| Female | 0.447\*\*\* |
|  | (0.030) |
| Children in school age | -0.117\*\*\* |
|  | (0.031) |
| Toddlers | -0.054 |
|  | (0.040) |
| Religious practice | -0.253\*\*\* |
|  | (0.028) |
| Year=2012 | 0.668\*\*\* |
| (ref: year=2002) | (0.125) |
| Public childcare spending (mean) | 0.006 |
|  | (0.031) |
| Public childcare spending (diff) | -0.049 |
|  | (0.051) |
| Childcare inequality (mean) | -0.185\*\*\* |
|  | (0.067) |
| Childcare inequality (diff) | 0.218\*\* |
|  | (0.104) |
| Childcare inequality (mean) \* Public childcare spending (mean) | -0.032\* |
|  | (0.018) |
| Public childcare spending (mean) \* 2012 | 0.072\*\* |
|  | (0.031) |
| Childcare inequality (mean) \* 2012 | -0.168\*\* |
|  | (0.068) |
| Inequality (mean) \* Spending (mean) \* 2012 | 0.001 |
|  | (0.019) |
| Household income: Q1 \* inequality (mean) | 0.027 |
|  | (0.033) |
| Q2 \* inequality (mean) | 0.022 |
|  | (0.034) |
| Q4 \* inequality (mean) | -0.019 |
|  | (0.036) |
| Q5 \* inequality (mean) | -0.048 |
|  | (0.037) |
| Household income: Q1 \* spending (mean) | -0.013 |
|  | (0.016) |
| Q2 \* spending (mean) | -0.022 |
|  | (0.016) |
| Q4 \* spending (mean) | 0.027 |
|  | (0.017) |
| Q5 \* spending (mean) | 0.030\* |
|  | (0.017) |
| Household income: Q1 \* 2012 | -0.033 |
|  | (0.080) |
| Q2 \* 2012 | 0.065 |
|  | (0.082) |
| Q4 \* 2012 | -0.004 |
|  | (0.086) |
| Q5 \* 2012 | 0.072 |
|  | (0.091) |
| Household income: Q1 \* spending (mean) \* 2012 | 0.003 |
|  | (0.026) |
| Q2 \* spending (mean) \* 2012 | 0.030 |
|  | (0.026) |
| Q4 \* spending (mean) \* 2012 | 0.024 |
|  | (0.028) |
| Q5 \* spending (mean) \* 2012 | 0.014 |
|  | (0.030) |
| Household income: Q1 \* inequality (mean) \* 2012 | 0.045 |
|  | (0.057) |
| Q2 \* inequality (mean) \* 2012 | 0.075 |
|  | (0.058) |
| Q4 \* inequality (mean) \* 2012 | 0.068 |
|  | (0.064) |
| Q5 \* inequality (mean) \* 2012 | 0.094 |
|  | (0.069) |
| Household income: Q1 \* inequality (mean) \* spending (mean) | 0.003 |
|  | (0.009) |
| Q2 \* inequality (mean) \* spending (mean) | 0.002 |
|  | (0.010) |
| Q4 \* inequality (mean) \* spending (mean) | -0.020\* |
|  | (0.011) |
| Q5 \* inequality (mean) \* spending (mean) | -0.012 |
|  | (0.011) |
| Household income: Q1 \* inequality (mean) \* spending (mean) \* 2012 | 0.030\* |
|  | (0.016) |
| Q2 \* inequality (mean) \* spending (mean) \* 2012 | 0.018 |
|  | (0.016) |
| Q4 \* inequality (mean) \* spending (mean) \* 2012 | 0.032\* |
|  | (0.018) |
| Q5 \* inequality (mean) \* spending (mean) \* 2012 | -0.009 |
|  | (0.020) |
| Constant | 0.672\*\*\* |
|  | (0.122) |
| Observations | 34,425 |
| Number of countries | 18 |
| Number of country-years | 36 |
| Random intercept variance (country) | 0.085\*\* |
|  | (0.038) |
| Random intercept variance (country-year) | 0.047\*\*\* |
|  | (0.018) |
| Standard errors in parentheses |  |
| \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1 |  |

Figure A.1: Average marginal effects of changes in public childcare spending on attitudes towards maternal employment conditioned by inequality in childcare enrolment; by different sub-samples



Note: Average marginal effects of an increase in public childcare spending by 0.1 percentage points of GDP and 95 percent confidence intervals based on Table A.3, only that models are estimated for three differently defined sub-samples. Values estimated for low- and high-inequality countries at the 10 and 90 percentile of levels of inequality in childcare enrolment.

Figure A.2: Average marginal effects of changes in public childcare spending on parents´ attitudes towards maternal employment conditioned by inequality in childcare enrolment



Note: Average marginal effects of an increase in public childcare spending by 0.1 percentage points of GDP and 95 percent confidence intervals based on Models 1-2 in Table A.3, only that the sample is restricted to parents (left) and mothers (right panel) below the age of 45. Values estimated for low- and high-inequality countries at the 10 and 90 percentile of levels of inequality in childcare enrolment.

Figure A.3: Average marginal effects of changes in public childcare spending on the likelihood of women below age 45 to be in paid work conditioned by inequality in childcare enrolment



Note: Average marginal effects of an increase in public childcare spending by 0.1 percentage points of GDP and 95 percent confidence intervals based on Model 2 in Table A.3, only that the dependent variable is a dummy variable indicating whether respondents are in paid work or not, and the variable of relative income is dropped. Values estimated for low- and high-inequality countries at the 10 and 90 percentile of levels of inequality in childcare enrolment.

Figure A.4: Average marginal effects of changes in public childcare spending on attitudes towards maternal employment conditioned by inequality in childcare enrolment; by educational attainment



Note: Average marginal effects of an increase in public childcare spending by 0.1 percentage points of GDP and 95 percent confidence intervals based on Models 1-2 in Table A.3, only that income is replaced with educational attainment as moderating variable at the individual level. Values estimated for low- and high-inequality countries at the 10 and 90 percentile of levels of inequality in childcare enrolment.

Figure A.5: Predicted probabilities of support for maternal employment in 2002 and 2012 in low- and high-inequality countries; by educational attainment

****

Note: Predicted probabilities and 95 percent confidence intervals based on Model 1 in Table A.4, only that income is replaced with educational attainment as moderating variable at the individual level. Values estimated for 2002 and 2012 and for low- and high-inequality countries at the 10 and 90 percentile of levels of inequality in childcare enrolment.