Supplementary online materials for the article

Social inequalities and the wellbeing of family caregivers across European care regimes

Martina Brandt, Christian Deindl, Ginevra Floridi, Robert Heidemann, Judith Kaschowitz, Nekehia T. Quashie, Ellen Verbakel, & Melanie Wagner

Published in: Journal of Family Research, https://doi.org/10.20377/jfr-861

Table 1: Overview of data, samples, and variables for the different analyses

Topic	Analyses on the influence of socio- economic status on the provision of informal care	Analyses on the association of SES and wellbeing among caregivers	Analyses on the relationship between wellbeing and care context
Citation	Quashie et al., 2022	Brandt et al., 2022	Floridi et al., 2022
Analytical approach(es)	Poisson regression and a multi-level structure with individuals nested in countries	Pooled least squares regression (POLS) with clustered standard errors at the individual level and fixed effects models (FEM)	Multivariate linear regression
DATA			
Survey data used	SHARE waves 1,2,4,5,6	SHARE waves 2, 4, 5, 6	SHARE wave 6
	ELSA waves 2,3,4,6,7		
Time span covered	2002-2015	2004-2015	2015
Additional notes on data	SHARE waves 3 and 7 were not part of the analysis because of their retrospective design	SHARE wave 1 was excluded due to a different construction of the dependent variable "life satisfaction".	Most recent survey wave with all the variables needed for the analyses, without being directly affected by the Corona pandemic with its varying impact in different countries
	ELSA wave 1 (no differentiation of place of care) and waves 5 & 8 (focus on partners) were excluded, too	SHARE waves 3 and 7 were excluded because of their retrospective design	
SAMPLE			
Gross sample	125,958 individuals	238,396 observations	49,115 individuals
Exclusion criteria	Missing values: n=3,023	Missing values: n=32,928	Partner does not live in the same household or does not wish to provide information: n=6,027
	Living alone: n=24,489	Living alone: n=51,162	
	Living only with children younger than 18 years: n=574		Partner is not 50 years or older or partner does not receive personal care: n= 38,850 individuals.

			Missing values on the couple level: n=773
Net sample	97,872 individuals	154,306 observations of 79,014 individuals	3,465 couples
Countries	21: Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, England, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland	17: Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland	17 Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland
Additional notes on sample	Without Israel due to focus on European countries	Only countries for which at least two survey waves were available	
VARIABLES			
Dependent variable(s)	Informal caregiving within the household (not limited to partner care)	Life satisfaction (0-10)	Life satisfaction (0-10)
Independent variable(s)	Education: low (ISCED 0-2), medium (ISCED 3-4) and high (ISCED 5-6)	Informal caregiving within the household (not limited to partner care)	Dummies for different partner care arrangements:
			Solo-care
	Equivalised income: (1) poor (below 50% of median income), (2) low middle income (50% of median income to median income), (3) middle medium income, reference group (median income to 200% of median income), (4) high middle income (200% to 300% of median income), and (5) high income (above 300% of median income)	Relative wealth: (total net worth of net financial and real assets), divided into quintiles based on the distribution in each country	Shared informal care
			Shared formal care
			Outsourced informal care
			Outsourced formal care

	Wealth (total net worth of net financial and real assets): (1) debts, negative wealth, (2) 0€–49 999€ (reference group), (3) 50 000€-99 999€, and (4) 100 000€ or more		
Control variables	Age (continuous)	Age (continuous)	Care receiver's health:
	Gender (male $= 0$, female $= 1$)	Gender (male = 0 , female = 1)	Self-rated health (0= not in poor health; 1 = in poor health)
	Household size (continuous)	Household size (continuous)	
	Employment status ($0 = \text{not working}$, $1 = \text{full-time}$, $2 = \text{part-time}$)	Area of residence (urban = 0, rural = 1)	Number of limitations in ADL (0-6) and IADL (0-7);
	Limitations with instrumental activities of daily living (IADL) as an indicator of physical health (0 = No IADL limitations, 1 = 1 or more limitations) Interview year (2004–2005, 2006–2007, 2008–2012, and 2013–2015)	Limitations with instrumental activities of daily living (0 = none, 1 = 1 or more limitations) Survey wave Country dummies	Number of diagnosed diseases (0-11)
			Low cognitive functioning (0=no; 1=yes [low memory score or low temporal orientation score])
			Caregiver characteristics:
			Age (continuous)
			Education level: low (ISCED 0-2), medium (ISCED 3-4) and high (ISCED 5-6)
			Employment status
			Existing limitations in ADL ($0 = \text{No}$ limitations, $1 = 1$ or more limitations) or IADL ($0 = \text{No}$ limitations, $1 = 1$ or more limitations)
			Poor self-rated health (0= not in poor health; 1 = in poor health)

Additional notes on variables

Number of activities participated in the last month (0=none; 1=one; 2=two or more)

Couple characteristics:

Income (equivalised couple income in in purchasing power parity Euros)

Wealth (equivalised household financial wealth in purchasing power parity Euros)

Parent status (0=no children; 1=with children outside the household; 2=with children, and at least one cohabiting)

Country dummies

For regional comparison, countries were clustered as follows:

Northern Europe: Denmark and Sweden

Western Europe: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg, and Switzerland

Southern Europe: Greece, Italy, Portugal, and Spain

Eastern Europe: Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Poland, and Slovenia