**Table 2: Fitting Covariates for Piecewise Constant Model (using Rosenberg = 40 as cut-off)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **(A)** | **(B)** | **(C)** | **(D)** | **(E)** | **(F)** | **(G)** |
| **A. Women** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parameter of Self-Esteem | 0.561\*\*\* | 0.541\*\*\* | 0.560\*\*\*1 | 0.638\*\*\* | 0.659\* | 0.827 | 0.932 |
| Standard Error of Self-Esteem | 0.139 | 0.141 | 0.141 | 0.167 | 0.173 | 0.189 | 0.203 |
| Number of Participants | 24318 | 24318 | 24318 | 20138 | 19298 | 16889 | 15238 |
| Number of Lay Offs | 369 | 369 | 369 | 307 | 302 | 273 | 248 |
| *Goodness of Fit* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Log-likelihood | -2598 | -2598 | -2598 | -2112 | -2068 | -1836 | -1652 |
| Deviance | 15.1 | 20.5 | 30.2 | 57.6 | 80.7 | 96.7 | 153.3 |
| Number of Parameters | 1 | 3 | 5 | 13 | 26 | 28 | 29 |
| Akaike Information Criterion | 5183 | 5181 | 5175 | 4193 | 4108 | 3631 | 3208 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **B. Male** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parameter of Self-Esteem | 0.631\* | 0.604\*\* | 0.653\* | 0.691 | 0.679 | 0.976 | 1.309 |
| Standard Error of Self-Esteem | 0.181 | 0.185 | 0.184 | 0.205 | 0.213 | 0.246 | 0.289 |
| Number of Participants | 22852 | 22852 | 22852 | 19204 | 18514 | 16506 | 15247 |
| Number of Lay Offs | 340 | 340 | 340 | 298 | 292 | 267 | 238 |
| *Goodness of Fit* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Log-likelihood | -2388 | -2388 | -2388 | -2055 | -2005 | -1806 | -1596 |
| Deviance | 5.7 | 31.1 | 64.5 | 94.2 | 158.8 | 173.2 | 222.1 |
| Number of Parameters | 1 | 3 | 5 | 13 | 26 | 28 | 29 |
| Akaike Information Criterion | 4773 | 4752 | 4722 | 4042 | 3903 | 3495 | 3028 |
| **Notes**: a) \*\*\* = .000, \*\* = .01, \* = .05. b) Model A includes no covariates, in model B age and education are added, model C includes children and partner status, model D includes dummies for sector of employment, model E includes dummies for type of job and model F includes dummies for mental health and excessive alcohol consumption. In Model G, not included in the original paper, a measure of job-satisfaction is included. Unfortunately there was no data available on union participation or regional unemployment rates, as included in the original paper. c) Using BIC instead of AIC would give the same conclusion. 1 Partner is statistically significant in a Schoenfeld Residuals Test, indicating that for this regression the proportional hazards assumption might be violated. | | | | | | | |
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