**Online Appendix**

1. **Country differences in gender role attitudes**

Gender-role attitudes are not equally distributed across the countries we study: Germany has often been classified as the ideal-typical male breadwinner state (Lewis 1992) with more traditional values than the U.S. (Alwin et al. 1992). Newer studies focusing on attitudes toward gender division, however, point toward more gender egalitarian values in Germany (e.g., Hudde (2018)). This change may partly be a function of reunification with East Germany (former GDR), which observes higher egalitarian views, as well as reforms and childcare expansion (Collischon et al. 2020), which led to higher dual-earner support in comparison to the U.S. (Sjöberg, 2016). Studies including Singapore show that the respondents in this East Asian country, on average, have more traditional values than in the two other countries (Williams and Best 1990), mirroring findings on other East Asian countries (e.g., see Hudde 2018, for a study including Germany, the U.S. and China). These countries are thought to constitute a cultural–institutional block (Ji 2015) that have in many ways embraced neoliberalism in the process of globalization. However, in Singapore, for example, the government promotes traditional family values. Families thus find themselves “subject to contradictory forces, experiencing both rapid changes and stubborn continuities” (Ji 2015).

1. **Detailed data description**

*Summary statistics and selection of variables*

Table S1 shows all variables used for the analyses. The descriptive statistics are based on the full sample, ignoring observations that are removed after cleaning the data. The column “Obs.” shows how many valid observations each variable has. Missing values (e.g., partner’s employment variables for respondents without partner) are not counted as valid observations. Missing values are not due to non-response as respondents were not able to skip questions in the survey. Note, however, that respondents were allowed to opt out of reporting information of potential sensitivity, such as income, and could choose an “I prefer not to say” option. Data cleaning involved deleting responses with implausible values on the variables of interest (i.e., dropping those with obvious mistakes in respondents’ answers to working hours or income).

Education was measured differently across the three countries to account for the differences in educational systems. We aggregate the answers to four ISCED categories, which are comparable across the U.S., Germany, and Singapore. Income percentiles were measured country specifically based on our analytical sample.

We include these control variables in both parts of the analyses for multiple reasons. In the first part of the analyses, we include variables that allow us to learn more about the potential mechanisms behind the association between gender and transition probabilities. These variables, for example, include education, which is unequally distributed across gender and associated with the probability of working from home or part-time work, which is more prevalent among women and associated with a higher unemployment risk. We moreover include region fixed effects as governmental responses to COVID-19 vary across regions, and transition risks might thus be unequally distributed. At the same time, women’s employment rates might also differ across regions. In the second part of the analyses, we include control variables to account for potential spurious correlations between employment transitions and gender-role attitudes. These variables, for example, include cohort or region variables, which are both associated with gender-role attitudes and employment transitions. All associations between the control variables and gender-role attitudes can be found in Table S7.

**Table S1.** Descriptives for full analytical sample

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Obs. | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| *Dependent variables* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transition to working from home | 4,812 | 0.271 | 0.445 | 0 | 1 |
| Reduction in working hours *>* 10 | 4,812 | 0.129 | 0.336 | 0 | 1 |
| Transition to unemployment | 4,812 | 0.102 | 0.303 | 0 | 1 |
| Gender egalitarian index (average) | 4,810 | 3.700 | 0.815 | 1 | 5 |
| Gender egalitarian index (PCA) | 4,810 | -0.002 | 0.824 | -2.583 | 1.291 |
| Gender egalitarian index (IPF) | 4,810 | -0.002 | 0.999 | -3.297 | 1.579 |
| *Socio-demographics* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 4,812 | 0.531 | 0.499 | 0 | 1 |
| Partner in household | 4,812 | 0.559 | 0.497 | 0 | 1 |
| Children below the age of 5 in household | 4,806 | 0.092 | 0.288 | 0 | 1 |
| Birth cohorts |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1927-1956 | 4,812 | 0.225 | 0.417 | 0 | 1 |
| 1957-1964 | 4,812 | 0.184 | 0.387 | 0 | 1 |
| 1965-1978 | 4,812 | 0.209 | 0.407 | 0 | 1 |
| 1979-1989 | 4,812 | 0.200 | 0.400 | 0 | 1 |
| 1990-2001 | 4,812 | 0.183 | 0.386 | 0 | 1 |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lower secondary education or less | 4,804 | 0.095 | 0.293 | 0 | 1 |
| Upper secondary education | 4,804 | 0.279 | 0.449 | 0 | 1 |
| Post-secondary non-tertiary education or short-cycle tertiary education | 4,804 | 0.284 | 0.451 | 0 | 1 |
| Bachelor’s or higher | 4,804 | 0.342 | 0.474 | 0 | 1 |
| *Own employment variables* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working arrangement in Jan. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mostly working outside the home | 2,864 | 0.801 | 0.399 | 0 | 1 |
| Mostly working from home | 2,864 | 0.093 | 0.290 | 0 | 1 |
| Partly working from home | 2,864 | 0.106 | 0.308 | 0 | 1 |
| Employment relation in Jan. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time employed | 4,573 | 0.456 | 0.498 | 0 | 1 |
| Part-time employed | 4,573 | 0.110 | 0.313 | 0 | 1 |
| Self employed | 4,573 | 0.059 | 0.237 | 0 | 1 |
| Caregiver (e.g. children, elderly) or homemaker | 4,573 | 0.046 | 0.210 | 0 | 1 |
| Retired | 4,573 | 0.206 | 0.404 | 0 | 1 |
| Unemployed | 4,573 | 0.073 | 0.261 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | 4,573 | 0.049 | 0.215 | 0 | 1 |
| Country-specific income percentile | 2,204 | 5.394 | 2.841 | 1 | 10 |
| Working hours in January | 2,864 | 36.902 | 12.838 | 0 | 100 |
| *Partner’s employment variables* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working arrangement in Jan. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mostly working outside the home | 1,739 | 0.799 | 0.401 | 0 | 1 |
| Mostly working from home | 1,739 | 0.101 | 0.302 | 0 | 1 |
| Partly working from home | 1,739 | 0.099 | 0.299 | 0 | 1 |
| Employment relation in Jan. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time employed | 2,676 | 0.505 | 0.500 | 0 | 1 |
| Part-time employed | 2,676 | 0.087 | 0.282 | 0 | 1 |
| Self employed | 2,676 | 0.058 | 0.234 | 0 | 1 |
| Caregiver (e.g. children, elderly) or homemaker | 2,676 | 0.047 | 0.211 | 0 | 1 |
| Retired | 2,676 | 0.214 | 0.411 | 0 | 1 |
| Unemployed | 2,676 | 0.057 | 0.232 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | 2,676 | 0.031 | 0.173 | 0 | 1 |
| Working hours in January | 1,739 | 37.869 | 12.853 | 0 | 100 |
| *Survey country* |  |  |  |  |  |
| United States | 4,812 | 0.516 | 0.500 | 0 | 1 |
| Germany | 4,812 | 0.247 | 0.431 | 0 | 1 |
| Singapore | 4,812 | 0.236 | 0.425 | 0 | 1 |
| Maximum number of observations | 4,812 |  |  |  |  |

Notes: Unweighted descriptive results. Number of observations per variable indicate valid observations after data cleaning. Missing values (e.g., partner’s employment variables for respondents without partner) are not counted as valid observations.

Tables S2 to S4 show descriptions of the same variables for each country. The descriptive statistics are based on the full sample, ignoring observations that are removed after cleaning the data. The column “Obs.” shows how many valid observations each variable has. Missing values (e.g., partner’s employment variables for respondents without a partner) are not counted as valid observations.

**Table S2.** Descriptive statistics for the full analytical sample in the United States

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Obs. | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| *Dependent variables* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transition to working from home | 2,485 | 0.212 | 0.409 | 0 | 1 |
| Reduction in working hours *>* 10 | 2,485 | 0.125 | 0.331 | 0 | 1 |
| Transition to unemployment | 2,485 | 0.136 | 0.342 | 0 | 1 |
| Gender egalitarian index (average) | 2,483 | 3.650 | 0.860 | 1 | 5 |
| Gender egalitarian index (PCA) | 2,483 | -0.024 | 0.873 | -2.583 | 1.291 |
| Gender egalitarian index (IPF) | 2,483 | -0.055 | 1.056 | -3.297 | 1.579 |
| *Socio-demographics* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 2,485 | 0.547 | 0.498 | 0 | 1 |
| Partner in household | 2,485 | 0.579 | 0.494 | 0 | 1 |
| Children below the age of 5 in household | 2,481 | 0.095 | 0.293 | 0 | 1 |
| Birth cohorts |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1927-1956 | 2,485 | 0.238 | 0.426 | 0 | 1 |
| 1957-1964 | 2,485 | 0.206 | 0.404 | 0 | 1 |
| 1965-1978 | 2,485 | 0.196 | 0.397 | 0 | 1 |
| 1979-1989 | 2,485 | 0.199 | 0.399 | 0 | 1 |
| 1990-2001 | 2,485 | 0.162 | 0.368 | 0 | 1 |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lower secondary education or less | 2,485 | 0.041 | 0.199 | 0 | 1 |
| Upper secondary education | 2,485 | 0.285 | 0.452 | 0 | 1 |
| Post-secondary non-tertiary education or short-cycle tertiary education | 2,485 | 0.324 | 0.468 | 0 | 1 |
| Bachelor’s or higher | 2,485 | 0.349 | 0.477 | 0 | 1 |
| *Own employment variables* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working arrangement in Jan. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mostly working outside the home | 1,434 | 0.782 | 0.413 | 0 | 1 |
| Mostly working from home | 1,434 | 0.120 | 0.325 | 0 | 1 |
| Partly working from home | 1,434 | 0.098 | 0.298 | 0 | 1 |
| Employment relation in Jan. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time employed | 2,399 | 0.419 | 0.494 | 0 | 1 |
| Part-time employed | 2,399 | 0.116 | 0.320 | 0 | 1 |
| Self employed | 2,399 | 0.063 | 0.242 | 0 | 1 |
| Caregiver (e.g. children, elderly) or homemaker | 2,399 | 0.055 | 0.228 | 0 | 1 |
| Retired | 2,399 | 0.206 | 0.404 | 0 | 1 |
| Unemployed | 2,399 | 0.083 | 0.276 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | 2,399 | 0.059 | 0.235 | 0 | 1 |
| Country-specific income percentile | 1,080 | 5.403 | 2.847 | 1 | 10 |
| Working hours in January | 1,434 | 36.351 | 12.437 | 0 | 100 |
| *Partner’s employment variables* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working arrangement in Jan. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mostly working outside the home | 886 | 0.775 | 0.418 | 0 | 1 |
| Mostly working from home | 886 | 0.132 | 0.339 | 0 | 1 |
| Partly working from home | 886 | 0.093 | 0.290 | 0 | 1 |
| Employment relation in Jan. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time employed | 1,430 | 0.478 | 0.500 | 0 | 1 |
| Part-time employed | 1,430 | 0.077 | 0.267 | 0 | 1 |
| Self employed | 1,430 | 0.065 | 0.247 | 0 | 1 |
| Caregiver (e.g. children, elderly) or homemaker | 1,430 | 0.049 | 0.216 | 0 | 1 |
| Retired | 1,430 | 0.229 | 0.421 | 0 | 1 |
| Unemployed | 1,430 | 0.060 | 0.238 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | 1,430 | 0.041 | 0.199 | 0 | 1 |
| Working hours in January | 886 | 38.474 | 12.202 | 0 | 80 |
| Maximum number of observations | 2,485 |  |  |  |  |

Notes: Unweighted descriptive statistics. Number of observations per variable indicate valid observations after data cleaning. Missing values (e.g., partner’s employment variables for respondents without a partner) are not counted as valid observations.

**Table S3.** Descriptive statistics for the full analytical sample in Germany

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Obs. | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| *Dependent variables* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transition to working from home | 1,189 | 0.144 | 0.351 | 0 | 1 |
| Reduction in working hours *>* 10 | 1,189 | 0.071 | 0.256 | 0 | 1 |
| Transition to unemployment | 1,189 | 0.038 | 0.191 | 0 | 1 |
| Gender egalitarian index (average) | 1,189 | 3.968 | 0.777 | 1 | 5 |
| Gender egalitarian index (PCA) | 1,189 | 0.246 | 0.779 | -2.583 | 1.291 |
| Gender egalitarian index (IPF) | 1,189 | 0.324 | 0.947 | -3.297 | 1.579 |
| *Socio-demographics* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 1,189 | 0.500 | 0.500 | 0 | 1 |
| Partner in household | 1,189 | 0.570 | 0.495 | 0 | 1 |
| Children below the age of 5 in household | 1,188 | 0.072 | 0.259 | 0 | 1 |
| Birth cohorts |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1927-1956 | 1,189 | 0.298 | 0.457 | 0 | 1 |
| 1957-1964 | 1,189 | 0.162 | 0.369 | 0 | 1 |
| 1965-1978 | 1,189 | 0.205 | 0.404 | 0 | 1 |
| 1979-1989 | 1,189 | 0.156 | 0.363 | 0 | 1 |
| 1990-2001 | 1,189 | 0.179 | 0.384 | 0 | 1 |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lower secondary education or less | 1,187 | 0.280 | 0.449 | 0 | 1 |
| Upper secondary education | 1,187 | 0.382 | 0.486 | 0 | 1 |
| Post-secondary non-tertiary education or short-cycle tertiary education | 1,187 | 0.121 | 0.327 | 0 | 1 |
| Bachelor’s or higher | 1,187 | 0.217 | 0.413 | 0 | 1 |
| *Own employment variables* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working arrangement in Jan. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mostly working outside the home | 592 | 0.816 | 0.388 | 0 | 1 |
| Mostly working from home | 592 | 0.069 | 0.254 | 0 | 1 |
| Partly working from home | 592 | 0.115 | 0.319 | 0 | 1 |
| Employment relation in Jan. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time employed | 1,113 | 0.392 | 0.488 | 0 | 1 |
| Part-time employed | 1,113 | 0.101 | 0.301 | 0 | 1 |
| Self employed | 1,113 | 0.039 | 0.193 | 0 | 1 |
| Caregiver (e.g. children, elderly) or homemaker | 1,113 | 0.035 | 0.184 | 0 | 1 |
| Retired | 1,113 | 0.334 | 0.472 | 0 | 1 |
| Unemployed | 1,113 | 0.054 | 0.226 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | 1,113 | 0.046 | 0.209 | 0 | 1 |
| Country-specific income percentile | 469 | 5.371 | 2.815 | 1 | 10 |
| Working hours in January | 592 | 35.861 | 11.233 | 0 | 80 |
| *Partner’s employment variables* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working arrangement in Jan. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mostly working outside the home | 423 | 0.851 | 0.356 | 0 | 1 |
| Mostly working from home | 423 | 0.057 | 0.232 | 0 | 1 |
| Partly working from home | 423 | 0.092 | 0.290 | 0 | 1 |
| Employment relation in Jan. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time employed | 670 | 0.466 | 0.499 | 0 | 1 |
| Part-time employed | 670 | 0.133 | 0.340 | 0 | 1 |
| Self employed | 670 | 0.033 | 0.178 | 0 | 1 |
| Caregiver (e.g. children, elderly) or homemaker | 670 | 0.025 | 0.157 | 0 | 1 |
| Retired | 670 | 0.293 | 0.455 | 0 | 1 |
| Unemployed | 670 | 0.033 | 0.178 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | 670 | 0.018 | 0.133 | 0 | 1 |
| Working hours in January | 423 | 35.234 | 11.806 | 0 | 80 |
| Maximum number of observations | 1,189 |  |  |  |  |

Notes: Unweighted descriptive statistics. Number of observations per variable indicate valid observations after data cleaning. Missing values (e.g., partner’s employment variables for respondents without a partner) are not counted as valid observations.

**Table S4.** Descriptive statistics for the full analytical sample in Singapore

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Obs. | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| *Dependent variables* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transition to working from home | 1,138 | 0.533 | 0.499 | 0 | 1 |
| Reduction in working hours *>* 10 | 1,138 | 0.199 | 0.400 | 0 | 1 |
| Transition to unemployment | 1,138 | 0.098 | 0.297 | 0 | 1 |
| Gender egalitarian index (average) | 1,138 | 3.527 | 0.674 | 1.25 | 5 |
| Gender egalitarian index (PCA) | 1,138 | -0.212 | 0.683 | -2.44 | 1.291 |
| Gender egalitarian index (IPF) | 1,138 | -0.228 | 0.827 | -3.025 | 1.579 |
| *Socio-demographics* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 1,138 | 0.530 | 0.499 | 0 | 1 |
| Partner in household | 1,138 | 0.506 | 0.500 | 0 | 1 |
| Children below the age of 5 in household | 1,137 | 0.105 | 0.306 | 0 | 1 |
| Birth cohorts |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1927-1956 | 1,138 | 0.120 | 0.325 | 0 | 1 |
| 1957-1964 | 1,138 | 0.158 | 0.365 | 0 | 1 |
| 1965-1978 | 1,138 | 0.243 | 0.429 | 0 | 1 |
| 1979-1989 | 1,138 | 0.247 | 0.431 | 0 | 1 |
| 1990-2001 | 1,138 | 0.232 | 0.422 | 0 | 1 |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lower secondary education or less | 1,132 | 0.019 | 0.138 | 0 | 1 |
| Upper secondary education | 1,132 | 0.157 | 0.364 | 0 | 1 |
| Post-secondary non-tertiary education or short-cycle tertiary education | 1,132 | 0.367 | 0.482 | 0 | 1 |
| Bachelor’s or higher | 1,132 | 0.456 | 0.498 | 0 | 1 |
| *Own employment variables* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working arrangement in Jan. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mostly working outside the home | 838 | 0.825 | 0.381 | 0 | 1 |
| Mostly working from home | 838 | 0.062 | 0.241 | 0 | 1 |
| Partly working from home | 838 | 0.113 | 0.317 | 0 | 1 |
| Employment relation in Jan. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time employed | 1,061 | 0.608 | 0.488 | 0 | 1 |
| Part-time employed | 1,061 | 0.106 | 0.307 | 0 | 1 |
| Self employed | 1,061 | 0.074 | 0.263 | 0 | 1 |
| Caregiver (e.g. children, elderly) or homemaker | 1,061 | 0.038 | 0.191 | 0 | 1 |
| Retired | 1,061 | 0.073 | 0.260 | 0 | 1 |
| Unemployed | 1,061 | 0.073 | 0.260 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | 1,061 | 0.029 | 0.168 | 0 | 1 |
| Country-specific income percentile | 655 | 5.397 | 2.854 | 1 | 10 |
| Working hours in January | 838 | 38.581 | 14.345 | 0 | 100 |
| *Partner’s employment variables* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working arrangement in Jan. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mostly working outside the home | 430 | 0.798 | 0.402 | 0 | 1 |
| Mostly working from home | 430 | 0.081 | 0.274 | 0 | 1 |
| Partly working from home | 430 | 0.121 | 0.326 | 0 | 1 |
| Employment relation in Jan. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time employed | 576 | 0.618 | 0.486 | 0 | 1 |
| Part-time employed | 576 | 0.059 | 0.236 | 0 | 1 |
| Self employed | 576 | 0.071 | 0.257 | 0 | 1 |
| Caregiver (e.g. children, elderly) or homemaker | 576 | 0.066 | 0.248 | 0 | 1 |
| Retired | 576 | 0.087 | 0.282 | 0 | 1 |
| Unemployed | 576 | 0.078 | 0.269 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | 576 | 0.021 | 0.143 | 0 | 1 |
| Working hours in January | 430 | 39.214 | 14.682 | 0 | 100 |
| Maximum number of observations | 1,138 |  |  |  |  |

Notes: Unweighted descriptive statistics. Number of observations per variable indicate valid observations after data cleaning. Missing values (e.g., partner’s employment variables for respondents without a partner) are not counted as valid observations.

*Sample restrictions*

From the total sample of 5,008 respondents, we constructed the analytical sample used in this article by dropping respondents with implausible values on the variables of interest (i.e., obvious mistakes in respondents’ answers to working hours or income) and with non-male or female gender, arriving at 4,812 respondents. We further restricted our analyses regarding men’s and women’s employment transitions to respondents who were full- or part-time employed in January (2,589 respondents). For the second part of our analyses, we moreover focus only on respondents who share the same household with a partner and whose partner was also full- or part-time employed in January, further reducing the sample size to 1,130 (1,563 respondents who worked full or part time in January do have a partner living in the same household).

To analyze the associations between gender and transitions to working from home, we furthermore restrict the sample to all who were mostly or partly working outside the home in January. To analyze the relationships between gender and a reduction of working hours of more than 10 hours, we restrict the sample to all who worked more than 10 hours per week in January. To analyze transitions to unemployment, we restrict the sample to all who worked more than 0 hours per week in January.

Examining gender-role attitudes, we are—based on our theoretical framework—interested in the statistical associations between changes in the employment situation of cohabiting couples and attitudes. As our predictions are based on different scenarios for cohabiting working couples, including transitions to working from home, reduction in working hours, and transitions to unemployment, we restrict our sample to cohabiting couples who worked part or full time in January 2020. As a sensitivity check, we recalculated the analyses by further restricting the sample to couples in which both partners have been working outside the home for more than 10 hours per week. The reason for this calculation is that the estimates of some variables (e.g., transitions to unemployment) might be dependent on transitions of employees’ with more or less than 10 working hours per week. The results do not substantially change, and relationship directions as well as significance remain similar.

*Sampling strategy*

In each country, the survey was constructed to be a nationally representative sample using YouGov’s proprietary advanced matching algorithm. This sampling strategy involves a two-staged process. First, a random sample is drawn from the target population, which is representative of the sampling frame it was drawn from. Second, for each member, one or more matching members from YouGov’s pool of opt-in respondents are matched. Matching is accomplished using a large set of variables that are available in consumer and voter databases for both the target population and the opt-in panel (Graham et al. 2020). YouGov’s matched samples have been shown to outperform unmatched samples and produce comparable results to random samples, e.g., from the GSS (Graham et al. 2020), and to accurately predict voting outcomes (Twyman 2008).

The sample thus does not depict a true random sample of the population, but it is a balanced sample representative for age, education, gender in all three countries and in addition to these characteristics for region and race in the U.S.

1. **Relationship heterogeneities among countries**

The main analyses showed that—pooled across all three countries—women were more likely to transition to working from home, reduce working hours, or transition to unemployment. Analyzing these employment-related transitions separately for the U.S., Germany, and Singapore reveals remarkable heterogeneities among the countries. Figure S5 shows the associations of gender with each of the three outcomes separately for the U.S., Germany, and Singapore.

While women’s risk of transitioning to unemployment is significantly higher than men’s only in Germany and Singapore, the likelihood of reducing working hours or transitioning to working from home is only significantly higher for women in the U.S. and close to zero and non-significant for the other countries. These differences might result from variations in the gendered nature of the labor market and the state of the pandemic in each country at the time of data collection or from other factors such as differences in the gender gap in education (Legewie and DiPrete 2009). The findings support recent work that points toward the higher likelihood that women work in jobs that can be done remotely in U.S. (Kochhar and Passel 2020) as well as studies that show that women in Germany were more likely to become unemployed but not reduce working hours or work from home (Bünning et al. 2020). However, our findings stand in contrast to official unemployment rates, which show that so far, women have been slightly less affected than men in Germany (Schäfer and Schmidt 2020). One reason might be statutory periods of notice, which allow workers who have already received notice of a layoff to become unemployed later.

**Table S5.** Country-specific regression: COVID-related changes in labor market outcomes by gender

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Transition to working from home | | |  | Reduction in working hours | | |  | | Transition to unemployment | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |  | (4) | (5) | (6) | |  | | (7) | (8) | (9) | |
|  | U.S. | Germany | Singapore |  | U.S. | Germany | Singapore | |  | | U.S. | Germany | Singapore | |
| Male | 0.138\*\*\* | 0.013 | 0.006 |  | 0.131\*\*\* | -0.012 | -0.029 | |  | | 0.024 | 0.046+ | 0.056\* | |
|  | (0.03) | (0.04) | (0.04) |  | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.04) | |  | | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.02) | |
| Number of observations | 872 | 419 | 566 |  | 872 | 419 | 566 | |  | | 872 | 419 | 566 | |

Notes: Survey weights used; + *p <* 0*.*01; \* *p <* 0*.*05; \*\* *p <* 0*.*01; \*\*\* *p <* 0*.*001

1. **Factor analyses**

Our main index for gender-egalitarian values is based on four items taken from the General Social Survey. Specifically, we ask whether the respondents agree or disagree to the following statements: “A working mother can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children”; “A pre-school child is likely to suffer if his or her mother works”; “Having a job is the best way for a woman to be an independent person. Both the husband and the wife should contribute to the household income”; and “A husband’s job is to earn money; a wife’s job is to look after the home and family.” The answers are assessed on a 5-point Likert-scale of agreement. The items are recoded so that higher values indicate more egalitarian views. The index is the arithmetic average of the items. Cronbach’s alpha for the four items is 0.65, indicating an acceptable reliability score. Deleting any one or two items does not substantially increase the alpha value.

To analyze the sensitivity of this gender-role attitudes index, we calculate two alternative versions of this index. We employ (1) iterated principal factor (IPF) analyses and (2) principal component analyses (PCA) to identify latent factors that capture distinguishable aspects of gender-role attitudes. The factors are rotated using promax rotation. In this procedure, we follow Hudde (2018), who identify gender-role attitudes in a similar manner. In both cases, the Kaiser Criterion suggests generating one factor out of the four items, as only one factor displays an eigenvalue greater than 1. Figure S1 shows the respective screeplots for both analyses. The identification of one factor allows a clear interpretation as all items target attitudes toward mothers’ or women’s employment.

**Figure S1.** Screeplots for factor analyses
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Table S6 shows the factor loadings from both types of analyses.

**Table S6.** Result from factor analyses

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Factor loadings for Factor 1 based on: | |
|  | IPF | PCA |
| A working mother can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children | 0.571 | 0.724 |
| A pre-school child is likely to suffer if his or her mother works | 0.661 | 0.749 |
| Having a job is the best way for a woman to be an independent person. Both the husband and the wife should contribute to the household income | 0.390 | 0.572 |
| A husband’s job is to earn money; a wife’s job is to look after the home and family | 0.640 | 0.744 |

Items have been recoded so that higher values indicate more egalitarian views.

In each case, a higher value on the factor represents a more egalitarian attitude. Figure S2 shows the distribution of all three indexes. While values for the three indexes are generated differently (e.g., our main index is calculated as an arithmetic mean; indexes based on IPF and PCA are calculated based on a weighted average of the respective items), all are highly correlated, with at least r = 0.989.

**Figure S2.** Density distributions of indexes
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1. **Additional results: Gender-role attitudes**

**Table S7.** Linear regression: Gender egalitarian attitudes (corresponds to Figure 2)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | Associations among men | | | |  | Associations among women | | |
|  |  |  | (1) | | (2) | (3) |  | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  |  |  | Mean | | IPF | PCA |  | Mean | IPF | PCA |
| *Employment transitions in HH* | | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | *Transitions to unemployment* | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Only men | 0.324\* | | 0.312\* | 0.379\* |  | 0.037 | 0.099 | 0.053 |
|  |  |  | (0.12) | | (0.12) | (0.15) |  | (0.16) | (0.17) | (0.20) |
|  |  | Only women | 0.136 | | 0.144 | 0.167 |  | -0.302\* | -0.282\* | -0.369\* |
|  |  |  | (0.24) | | (0.24) | (0.29) |  | (0.13) | (0.13) | (0.16) |
|  |  | Both partners | -0.254 | | -0.192 | -0.304 |  | -0.130 | -0.012 | -0.138 |
|  |  |  | (0.25) | | (0.22) | (0.30) |  | (0.32) | (0.34) | (0.40) |
|  | *Reducing hours* | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Only men | -0.067 | | -0.054 | -0.076 |  | -0.016 | -0.047 | -0.021 |
|  |  |  | (0.13) | | (0.12) | (0.16) |  | (0.11) | (0.11) | (0.13) |
|  |  | Only women | -0.142 | | -0.117 | -0.163 |  | 0.042 | 0.012 | 0.046 |
|  |  |  | (0.15) | | (0.16) | (0.19) |  | (0.13) | (0.13) | (0.16) |
|  |  | Both partners | -0.000 | | -0.031 | -0.005 |  | -0.156 | -0.181+ | -0.187+ |
|  |  |  | (0.11) | | (0.12) | (0.13) |  | (0.09) | (0.10) | (0.11) |
|  | *Transition to working from home* | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Only men | 0.245+ | | 0.253+ | 0.302+ |  | 0.096 | 0.171 | 0.134 |
|  |  |  | (0.13) | | (0.14) | (0.16) |  | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.15) |
|  |  | Only women | 0.048 | | 0.057 | 0.057 |  | 0.053 | 0.091 | 0.077 |
|  |  |  | (0.14) | | (0.14) | (0.17) |  | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.12) |
|  |  | Both partners | 0.203+ | | 0.220+ | 0.252+ |  | -0.019 | 0.022 | -0.009 |
|  |  |  | (0.12) | | (0.11) | (0.14) |  | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.14) |
| Children below the age of 5 in household | | | 0.080 | | 0.062 | 0.099 |  | -0.199\* | -0.229\* | -0.254\* |
|  |  |  | (0.14) | | (0.15) | (0.17) |  | (0.09) | (0.10) | (0.11) |
|  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education  *(ref: Lower secondary or less)* | | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Upper secondary education | | -0.302\* | | -0.289\* | -0.367\* |  | -0.184+ | -0.119 | -0.211+ |
|  |  |  | (0.14) | | (0.13) | (0.17) |  | (0.10) | (0.11) | (0.13) |
|  | Post-secondary non-tertiary education or short-cycle tertiary education | | -0.339\* | | -0.305+ | -0.404+ |  | -0.205\* | -0.168 | -0.239+ |
|  |  |  | (0.17) | | (0.15) | (0.20) |  | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.12) |
|  | Bachelor’s or higher | | -0.228 | | -0.195 | -0.264 |  | 0.012 | 0.031 | 0.017 |
|  |  |  | (0.14) | | (0.13) | (0.17) |  | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.15) |
| Birth cohort  *(ref: 1927-1956)* | | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1957-1964 | -0.103 | | -0.090 | -0.130 |  | -0.026 | -0.061 | -0.033 |
|  |  |  | (0.16) | | (0.15) | (0.19) |  | (0.24) | (0.24) | (0.29) |
|  |  | 1965-1978 | 0.018 | | 0.028 | 0.016 |  | -0.125 | -0.163 | -0.146 |
|  |  |  | (0.14) | | (0.14) | (0.16) |  | (0.24) | (0.24) | (0.30) |
|  |  | 1979-1989 | -0.192 | | -0.204 | -0.247 |  | -0.197 | -0.220 | -0.232 |
|  |  |  | (0.15) | | (0.14) | (0.18) |  | (0.23) | (0.24) | (0.29) |
|  |  | 1990-2001 | -0.359\*\* | -0.350\*\* | | -0.447\*\* |  | -0.045 | -0.072 | -0.057 |
|  |  |  | (0.13) | | (0.13) | (0.16) |  | (0.27) | (0.28) | (0.33) |
| *Own employment variables* | | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Working arrangement in Jan.  *(ref: Mostly working outside)* | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mostly working from home | | -0.043 | | -0.048 | -0.057 |  | -0.411+ | -0.415+ | -0.509+ |
|  |  |  | (0.28) | | (0.27) | (0.34) |  | (0.24) | (0.24) | (0.29) |
|  | Partly working from home | | -0.103 | | -0.125 | -0.136 |  | -0.295+ | -0.268 | -0.348+ |
|  |  |  | (0.12) | | (0.13) | (0.15) |  | (0.17) | (0.18) | (0.20) |
|  | Employment relation in Jan.  *(ref: Full-time employed)* | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Part-time employed | -0.253 | | -0.184 | -0.299 |  | -0.022 | -0.001 | -0.020 |
|  |  |  | (0.23) | | (0.24) | (0.28) |  | (0.13) | (0.14) | (0.16) |
|  | Working hours in January | | -0.008\* | | -0.007+ | -0.009\* |  | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.002 |
|  |  |  | (0.00) | | (0.00) | (0.00) |  | (0.01) | (0.00) | (0.01) |
| *Partner’s employment variables* | | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Working arrangement in Jan.  *(ref: Mostly working outside)* | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mostly working from home | -0.284+ | | -0.359\* | -0.351+ |  | 0.042 | 0.087 | 0.065 |
|  |  |  | (0.15) | | (0.16) | (0.19) |  | (0.20) | (0.22) | (0.25) |
|  |  | Partly working from home | -0.310\* | | -0.314\* | -0.381\* |  | -0.245 | -0.244+ | -0.288 |
|  |  |  | (0.13) | | (0.13) | (0.15) |  | (0.16) | (0.14) | (0.19) |
|  | Employment relation in Jan.  *(ref: Full-time employed)* | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Part-time employed | 0.066 | | 0.053 | 0.079 |  | -0.183 | -0.232 | -0.234 |
|  |  |  | (0.11) | | (0.11) | (0.14) |  | (0.15) | (0.16) | (0.19) |
|  | Working hours in January | | 0.012\*\*\* | | 0.012\*\*\* | 0.014\*\*\* |  | 0.004 | -0.004 | -0.006 |
|  |  | | (0.00) | | (0.00) | (0.00) |  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.01) |
| Survey country  *(ref: U.S.)* | | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Germany | | 0.874\*\*\* | | 0.991\*\*\* | 1.138\*\*\* |  | 1.358\*\*\* | 1.189\*\*\* | 1.581\*\*\* |
|  |  | | (0.19) | | (0.19) | (0.23) |  | (0.25) | (0.25) | (0.31) |
|  | Singapore | | 0.271+ | | 0.306\* | 0.351\* |  | 0.246 | 0.109 | 0.211 |
|  |  | | (0.14) | | (0.13) | (0.17) |  | (0.21) | (0.22) | (0.26) |
| Income percentiles | | | Yes | | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| State fixed effects | | | Yes | | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Number of observations | | | 445 | | 445 | 445 |  | 434 | 434 | 434 |

Notes: Sample conditioned to respondents who worked full or part time in January and whose cohabiting partners worked full or part time in January; Survey weights used; Gender-role index based on *mean*: on arithmetic mean; *IPF*: Iterated principle factor analysis; *PCA*: Principle component analysis

+ *p <* 0*.*01; \* *p <* 0*.*05; \*\* *p <* 0*.*01; \*\*\* *p <* 0*.*001
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