

## Societal conditions of consumptive social status homology: inequality of household equipment in Turkey, Greece and Germany

Papastefanou, Georgios; Fleck, Matthias; Lazaridis, Panagiotis

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Arbeitspapier / working paper

**Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:**

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

### Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Papastefanou, G., Fleck, M., & Lazaridis, P. (2010). *Societal conditions of consumptive social status homology: inequality of household equipment in Turkey, Greece and Germany*. (GESIS-Working Papers, 2010/10). Mannheim: GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-233236>

### Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

### Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

## Societal Conditions of Consumptive Social Status Homology

Inequality of Household Equipment in Turkey,  
Greece and Germany

*Georgios Papastefanou, Matthias Fleck,  
Panagiotis Lazaridis*



GESIS-Working Papers 2010|10

## **Societal Conditions of Consumptive Social Status Homology**

Inequality of Household Equipment in Turkey, Greece and Germany

*Georgios Papastefanou, Matthias Fleck,  
Panagiotis Lazaridis*

## **GESIS-Working Papers**

GESIS – Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Postfach 12 21 55

68072 Mannheim

Telefon: (0621) 1246 - 278

Telefax: (0621) 1246 - 100

E-Mail: [georgios.papastefanou@gesis.org](mailto:georgios.papastefanou@gesis.org)

ISSN: 1869-0483 (Print)

ISSN: 1869-0491 (Online)

Herausgeber,

Druck und Vertrieb: GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften  
Lennéstraße 30, 53113 Bonn

# 1 Introduction

---

Modernization processes after World War II in Western Europe led to a lasting upgrade of material standards of living and non-material quality of life, through improved education and knowledge, increased leisure time and social security, as well as by increasing freedom from traditional social bonds, norms and morals (Isengard, 2005). As Otte (2004) has summarized, opportunities and resources for individual actors in modern societies can be characterized by an increase in:

- economic resources: money, earnings and wealth
- knowledge and cognitive power by the expansion of education
- individual freedom and opportunities by the disappearance of traditional social cleavages, the loosening of traditional social bonds, the weakened influence of traditional social norms and morals
- disposable leisure time
- lifetime
- social security by welfare policy and the expansion of the welfare state
- mass consumption by industrial production of a vast variety of affordable everyday life goods

Even if it seems obvious to expect that these processes should have attenuated societal inequality structures, by enlarging middle class society, there is ongoing debate on how much life chances are still determined by differences in socio-economic resources. According to a longstanding de-structuration or individualization thesis, socio-economic disparities are expected to have lost determining power on daily life patterns (lifestyles) (Beck, 1986; Hradil, 1987; Hörning and Michailow, 1990; Schulze, 1992; Hörning et al., 1996). This thesis is also echoed in studies on the death of class (Berger, 1998; Breen and Rottman, 1995; Clark and Lipset, 1991; Clark et al., 1993; Grusky and Sørensen, 1998; Hout et al., 1993; Kingston, 2000; Pakulski and Waters, 1996; Strasser and Dederichs, 2000), or as decreasing explanatory power of structural variables (Jagodzinski and Quandt, 1997; Müller, 1997; Schnell and Kohler, 1995; Schnell and Kohler, 1997).

Nevertheless, it is still an empirically unresolved issue of social inequality research focusing on daily life patterns (Otte, 2004: 14). Some authors assume an autonomy of lifestyles (Hörning and Michailow, 1990; Johannsen, 2000; Müller-Schneider, 1994; Müller-Schneider, 2000), reflected by a diminishing association between class and lifestyle (Halle, 1992; Munters, 1977; Toivonen, 1992). Another group of studies posits that lifestyle is neither solely determined by social inequality nor is it autonomous and completely detached from resources and restrictions (Klocke, 1993; Georg, 1998; Herlyn et al., 1994; Konietzka, 1995; Buth and Johannsen, 1999; Johannsen, 2000; Reichenwaller, 2000; Spellerberg, 1996).

In contrast, some more recent studies have found an upward shift of social inequality as upper social status groups adopted an "omnivore" pattern of cultural consumption (Peterson and Simkus, 1992; Peterson and Kern, 1996; Peterson, 2005; Sullivan and Katz-Gerro, 2007; Katz-Gerro et al., 2009; Chan and Goldthorpe, 2007).

These studies relate to the homology thesis, which has been developed from Bourdieu's theory of distinction and lifestyle (Bourdieu, 1984) (for a recent discussion of the homology thesis see Coulangeon and Lemel, 2009). In this approach, which follows Veblen (1994 [1899]) in assuming that cultural preferences consolidate into distinguishable patterns of possessions, consumption is seen as a function of habitus and the capital endowment of an actor. Capital means resources available to the individual actor. Bourdieu distinguishes between different forms of capital, namely economic capital, based

mainly on income and wealth; cultural capital, given by educational skills and aspirations; social capital represented by social network connections and symbolic capital, such as reputation and prestige. Habitus refers to an actor's tastes and preferences, based on a general need for distinction. It is determined first and foremost by socialisation in the family of origin, as well as by the actor's available resources, especially by his cultural capital.

According to this approach, consumption behaviour is central for social inequality, because social relationships, social communication, and social hierarchy are expressed by specific patterns of consumption (Slater, 1997). As Douglas and Isherwood (1979: 59-60) have argued, consumer goods represent a communication system that renders "visible and stable the categories of culture" and enables individuals to "make and maintain social relationships", since they are being used as "fences or bridges" (Douglas and Isherwood, 1979: 12).

Accordingly, status groups reproduce themselves and legitimize their privileged position by adopting distinct cultural preferences (Lamont and Molnár, 2002; Lizardo, 2006). Symbolic boundaries are effective separable from socioeconomic boundaries (Lamont, 1992), which means that lifestyle differences can be observed within socio-economic classes (Blasius and Winkler, 1989).

Because economic, cultural and social resources translate into preferences for goods and services, they also should be reflected in consumption. Eventually, social status inequality manifests itself in household budget allocation differences (Uusitalo, 1980; Koelln et al., 1995; Cohen, 1998; Bihagen, 1999; Wong and Yu, 2002; Katz-Gerro, 2003). Independent of income differences, expenditure patterns are also influenced by household composition according to the number and age of adults, by the number of children (Uusitalo, 1980; Bihagen, 1999; Raper et al., 2002), by class and occupation (Uusitalo, 1980; Bihagen, 1999; Tomlinson, 1994; Wittmayer et al., 1994; Cohen, 1998), by race (Cowell and Green, 1994; Cohen, 1998; Fan, 1998; Fan and Lewis, 1999; Raper et al., 2002), as well as by urban status (Cowell and Green, 1994; Wu, 1997; Lázaro et al., 2000).

Against this background, the homology argument should be verified with realized expenditure patterns, whereby economic and cultural resources, as structural determinants, should be separately examined in relation to their determining power on expenditure patterns. Furthermore, the strong homology argument implies a general validity across societies, independent of their level of modernization, whereas post-modernist views claim that lifestyles no longer result from social structure, but are purely personal and are themselves the new entities of social structure. The proposed lifestyle differentiation would then have existed in France in a specific socio-historical period.

Therefore, as a further empirical test of the homology thesis, we will examine its validity for societies with different pathways to modernity. As the individualization thesis is widely discussed in Germany, it seems meaningful to consider contemporary German society, a modernized society with high levels of material living standards and liberal standards of public conduct. In contrast, Turkey seems to represent a country with traditional societal structures, which has only recently experienced significant economic modernization changes.

In the context of its history, Turkey is conceived as a class society with significant income inequality and traditional, patriarchal-authoritarian status hierarchy differentiation (Moser and Weithman, 2008: 30). From the early 1980s and up to the end of 1990s (era of Özal and Ciller), Turkish modernization policy changed the economy to one of liberal market principles by privatization measures. This led to increasing economic disparities between wealthy and rich winners of privatization vs. a growing group of modernization losers (Moser and Weithman, 2008: 34). This deepening of income inequality between poor and rich is embedded in a still existent patronage system, where social status mainly relates to family of origin, and its power, prestige and wealth. Explicitly shown wealth, fitting to the practice of conspicuous consumption, is highly prestigious without provoking hostile envy (Moser and Weithmann, 2008: 197).

As a third case, Greek society is taken into consideration, because this allows us to examine status homology in a society, which – even though it has been integrated into a westernized market society context – has specific traditional orientation structures that contrast with modernized western European societies. Two societal features seem to be characteristic for life style patterns in Greece, namely religious affiliation and educational status attainment.

About 92 percent of the Greek population belong to the Greek Orthodox religion, following a kind of "diffuse religiosity", which belongs, as a cultural resource, to modern Greek identity (Makrides, 2008: 368). Accordingly, the religious system can be assumed to influence value orientations of Greek daily life patterns. According to Savramis (1969), the traditional Greek way of life is formed by the Greek Orthodoxy's lack of rules for rational life organization, as is characteristic for Protestant and, to a lesser extent, also for Catholic religious life orientation, which stresses regulated and achievement oriented life patterns. In contrast, for the Greek Orthodox-based life style, professional ethos and guidelines, as well as achievement by postponing immediate gratifications, is less important. Instead, a more direct and immediate acquisition of goods is valued as a better way of obtaining and demonstrating success in life (Savramis, 1969: 73). Similar to life orientation in Turkey, possession of prestigious goods seem to be of high value for life styles in Greece. Thus quality, location and furnishings of the house are a crucial measure of the social position of a family in Greek urban life (Campbell, 1985: 200). A similar degree of expenditures for wedding celebrations (e.g. on food) is assumed for all people, no matter from which segment they come (Argyrou, 1996).

According to the destructure thesis, one would expect that cultural status resources should show the weakest determining power in Germany and the strongest power in Turkey, whereas we would expect Greek consumptive inequality figures to fall in between those of Germany and Turkey. In summary, the following analysis is aimed at providing empirical results for two questions: a) is the homology argument also valid for consumption decisions, as they are expressed in actual expenditure patterns, namely in household equipment, and b) to what extent does cultural resource homology prove to be specific for countries closer to traditional societal differentiation.

## 2 Data and Method

---

Since the main target of this paper is to estimate a homology function of household possession of durable goods, we use data from national Household Budget Surveys from Turkey, Greece and Germany. These types of data collections are designed and run by national statistical bureaus, to measure comprehensively households' income and expenditures as well as socio-economic status characteristics, mainly by applying household budget diaries plus interview methods. Because of accessibility limitations, we used data from 2003 for Germany and Turkey and from 1998/99 for Greece.

Data for Germany are drawn from the German Income and Expenditure Survey 2003 (Einkommens- und Verbrauchsstichprobe, EVS), which collected data from 42.082 households. The EVS is based on a stratified quota sample of about 0.2 percent of all private households. Participation in the survey program is voluntary. In fact, we used a scientific use file of the EVS: Grundfile Nr. 3<sup>1</sup>, an 80 percent random subset of the original microdata file of the EVS 2003.

Data for Greece are based on the Household Budget Survey (HBS), which was conducted from November 1998 to October 1999 by the Greek National Bureau of Statistics with a probability sample of 6,258 households selected from the total households in Greece, based on a two-stage stratified sampling procedure. The sample design was based on the 13 Regional Districts Development (RDO). Each RDO was divided, using the criterion of the degree of urbanization of the municipalities and communes, into 8 main strata (1991 census). Specifically, Athens and Thessaloniki were divided in 40 and 10 major strata, respectively. In all strata, two-stage sampling was employed.

Data for Turkey are based on the Income and Expenditure Survey of 2003, which is run by the State Institute of Statistics (SIS)<sup>2</sup>. This data program has been conducted annually since 2002. In 2003, the sample consisted of 25.920 households, drawn randomly on the basis of Census Enumeration Sheets. Diaries were used to collect expenditure data over a month.

### 2.1 Model

Empirically, we regard the homology model as a functional relationship between household equipment with durable goods and socio-economic status, controlled for gender and age of the household head, as well as of the location of the household residence, *ceteris paribus*.

- Consumption =  $f(\text{habitus}) = f(\text{economic capital, cultural capital}) = f(\text{income status, educational status, occupational status})$

As we want to compare the estimate of this functional equation between the selected countries, variables in the model have to be equivalent. In relation to the durable household goods, the cross-national meaning does not pose a problem, because durable commodities like cars, mobile phones, washing machines, etc., obviously have a straightforward, quasi-universal meaning in the context of the global economy. German and Turkish data sets provide information on the household's equipment

---

<sup>1</sup> For a detailed codebook of the scientific use-file see:  
[http://www.destatis.de/jetspeed/portal/cms/Sites/destatis/Internet/DE/Content/Statistiken/Wirtschaftsrechnung/enZeitbudg-ets/EinkommensVerbrauchsstichproben/content75/SUFMetadaten/EVS2003\\_\\_EI\\_\\_GS\\_\\_HB,property=file.pdf](http://www.destatis.de/jetspeed/portal/cms/Sites/destatis/Internet/DE/Content/Statistiken/Wirtschaftsrechnung/enZeitbudg-ets/EinkommensVerbrauchsstichproben/content75/SUFMetadaten/EVS2003__EI__GS__HB,property=file.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> The name of the survey was changed in 2003 to "Household Budget Survey". SIS (State Institute of Statistics) and TUIK (Turkish Statistical Institute) are the same institution. The name SIS was changed to TUIK in 2005. Since we used data produced before 2005, the name SIS was used in this paper.

with durables, namely car, computer, internet, telephone, mobile phone, TV, video recorder, DVD player, video camera, refrigerator, freezer, washing machine, dishwasher, clothes dryer. For Greece, data on telephone and DVD player were not available.

Indicators of a household's socio-economic resources have to be harmonized, because they relate to different national systems of currency, and of educational and occupational systems. To indicate economic resources, we transformed net yearly household income into equivalent net household income position, weighted by the household size, according to the new OECD scheme.<sup>3</sup> The resulting metric income position was then collapsed into six groups: a) those households whose net income is 50 percent or less of the median income (usually characterized as poor households), b) households whose net income is between 50 and 74 percent of median income, c) between 75 and 99 percent of median income, d) between 100 and 149 percent of median income, e) between 150 and 199 percent of median income or f) 200 percent or more of median income, which would denote the wealthy households (see Table A.1 in Appendix).

Because the Greek Income and Expenditure Survey data did not provide information on the household's net household income, we use the available data on yearly expenditures. A household's annual expenditure scores were transformed to an equivalent expenditure position score, which was collapsed to categories, as we did with the net equivalent income position scores from the German and Turkish data.

Educational status of the household head was used as an indicator of cultural capital. Targeted to a cross-nationally comparable indicator, we started with differentiating low educational status (those who had only primary educational achievement and no vocational training) and high educational status, comprising academic achievement. Those household heads with neither low nor high educational status were assigned to a residual group, which we can see as a middle educational status group. Since the German EVS from 2003 does not offer information on educational status, we had to take vocational training to roughly differentiate between educational groups. The transformation rules are documented in Table A.1 in the Appendix.

Finally, we tried to utilize the available information on occupational status. Because of the very sparse information on occupational status in the German and the Greek data, we create a variable which differentiates between farmers, manual workers, non-manual workers (including self-employed and professionals) and unemployed.

Control variables such as gender and age, as well as residence type by size, do not pose a comparison problem, except by scale of data. In relation to age, we introduced into the model as a linear continuous variable and with an age-squared term. Size of residence was collapsed to two main categories, namely size equal or below 20.000 inhabitants vs. size greater than 20.00 inhabitants.

Based on these transformed data, we estimated logistic regression models of possessing a specific commodity or not, depending on socio-economic status of the household, controlled for gender and age of household head, as well as for residence size type. This empirical homology function was estimated separately for each commodity.

---

<sup>3</sup> Weighting of household members according OECD scheme: first adult : 1, every additional person of 18 or older (adults): 0.5, every person below age 18 (children): 0.3.

### 3 Results

#### 3.1 Overall SES homology

To examine social homology with consumption, we use the improvement of model fit by socio-economic status variables of the regression function, as an indicator of overall socio-economic homology (see Table 1). In a following step, we take a closer look at the effects of single concepts that are of special theoretical interest.

Table 1: *Improvement of Model Fit by overall Socio-Economic Status (SES)*

	Turkey	Greece	Germany
Internet	24.83	13.55	4.66
Computer	19.92	8.76	5.85
Dishwasher	18.74	9.94	6.19
Video camera	17.51	7.58	90.05
Car	10.00	12.20	12.75
Refrigerator	10.46	2.51	2.50
Clothes dryer	9.28	8.00	2.57
Washing machine	9.03	6.67	6.67
Mobile phone	8.08	7.21	2.11
Video recorder	7.65	5.98	1.17
Freezer	5.58	1.31	2.97
DVD player	5.33	n.a.	0.85
Telephone	5.21	n.a.	6.28
TV	1.95	5.13	1.74
Motorcycle	1.26	5.04	56.02

The figures in Table 1 are percentages expressing how much the fit of the logistic regression (indicated by  $-2\text{LogLikelihood}$ ) on possessing a specific household durable is improved by adding the socio-economic status (SES) variables to the model, after controlling for gender, age and urbanity. The higher this model fit improvement, the stronger the homology. In this table, the commodities are sorted in descending order by their explained variance in Turkey.

The figures in the first column show that having access to internet, possessing a computer, a dishwasher or a video camera is highly dependent on SES of the household in Turkey. In Greece, these durables are also those with highest dependence on SES, but, compared to Turkey, overall SES differentiation is two or three times lower. Model fit improvement by adding overall socio-economic status indicators is most pronounced for having internet access in Turkey and Greece. In Germany, SES homology of internet access is one of the highest, compared to the other possessions, but compared to the SES homology in Turkey and Greece, we find a weaker homology in Germany.

In relation to possession of a video camera, homology differences between countries are also clear. In Turkey, and to a lesser extent also in Greece, video camera equipment is homologous with SES, but in Germany we did not find any SES inequality in relation to this commodity.

Overall, we find that, in Turkey, SES is significant for having a car, a washing machine, mobile phone or a video recorder; the SES effect is stronger than in Greece, especially for having a washing machine or a freezer. In Greece, SES effects for some of these goods are closer to Turkey (like a clothes dryer,

car), but for most of the commodities, explained variance by SES in Greece is at a low level, similar to that in Germany. In Germany, possessing a video camera, video recorder, DVD player, motorcycle, TV, refrigerator and also a washing machine, clothes dryer and mobile phone is nearly independent of SES. In Greece, this relationship exists for having a freezer and a washing machine; in Turkey it is a TV and a motorcycle whose availability is not related to SES.

In sum, we can state that homology is at remarkably strong in Turkey, and weaker in Greece. The commodity pattern of SES homology in Greece is similar to that in Germany. Further, SES homology of household equipment seems to depend on the type of commodity. Household durables can be ranked according to their homology with SES. Internet and computer access, possessing a dishwasher and a video camera are those commodities with highest levels of SES homology in Turkey, Greece and Germany, with the exception of video camera equipment, where we could not observe any SES differentiation in Germany.

### 3.2 Educational status homology

Now, we take a more detailed look at the homology argument by examining the adjusted educational status effects on household equipment with durables and services (see Table 2). From a Bourdieu point of view, adjusted educational status differences in consumption can be interpreted as cultural resource effects in status expression.

Table 2: *High vs. Low Educational Status – Adjusted Educational Status Differences in Household Equipment with Durables*

	Turkey	Greece	Germany
Internet	<b>22.81</b>	<b>6.90</b>	<b>2.61</b>
Dishwasher	<b>12.38</b>	<b>2.93</b>	1.14
Computer	<b>11.73</b>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>2.99</b>
Clothes dryer	<b>8.15</b>	<b>2.79</b>	<b>0.74</b>
Video camera	<b>8.05</b>	<b>2.94</b>	1.21
Washing machine	<b>6.18</b>	0.75	<b>1.35</b>
Refrigerator	<b>6.13</b>	0.83	1.28
Mobile phone	<b>5.00</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>1.37</b>
Telephone	<b>4.80</b>	n.a.	<b>2.27</b>
Car	<b>4.48</b>	<b>2.07</b>	<b>2.08</b>
Video recorder	<b>4.44</b>	<b>1.55</b>	1.10
Freezer	<b>2.63</b>	1.10	<b>0.78</b>
DVD player	<b>2.67</b>	n.a.	1.12
TV	<b>2.32</b>	0.74	<b>0.62</b>
Motorcycle	<b>0.28</b>	0.88	<b>0.74</b>

Note: The values shown are odds ratios. Significance at the 0.05 level is marked by bold figures. For transformations of these odds-ratios into probabilities see Table A.2 in Appendix.

The values in Table 2 show the difference between the lowest and highest educational status group in relation to the odds ratio of possessing a specific household commodity. So, for example, the figure 22.8 means that, in Turkey, high educational status households have a 22.8 times higher chance of having internet access than those of low educational status. In Germany, the internet access chance differences between low and high educational group are about 3, in Greece about 9 times higher.

In Turkey, for nearly every commodity, the highest educational status group (ESG) has more access to any of the durables than the lowest ESG. In Greece, the top hierarchical goods are the same as in Turkey on a lower level of difference, but for many goods, like washing machine, fridge, freezer, TV and motorcycle, there is no difference between the lowest and highest educational group. With respect to washing machine and refrigerator access, in Greece educational status differentiation is similar to that in Germany.

It is interesting that, for some durables - like freezer, TV and motorcycle - with no educational status differences in Greece, there is a kind of reversed homology in Germany, which means that they are more prevalent in lower educational status than in higher education status groups.

For consumer goods like video camera, video recorder, and DVD player, educational status homology was observable in Turkey and Greece, but not in Germany.

To complete the educational status comparison, we have also looked at differences between the low and middle educational status groups (see Table 3). Actually, one can find similar commodity and country differences comparing low and high educational status group possessions. But there is one exception. In Turkey, the chances of household equipment in the middle educational group are closer to that of the low educational group, whereas in Greece and Germany, the equipment chances of the middle educational status groups are right in the middle, between low and high education status households.

Table 3: *Mid vs. Low Educational Differences in Household Equipment*

	Turkey	Greece	Germany
Internet	<b>4.75</b>	<b>2.19</b>	<b>1.56</b>
Dishwasher	<b>3.83</b>	<b>2.34</b>	<b>1.26</b>
Washing machine	<b>3.45</b>	<b>1.47</b>	<b>1.51</b>
Clothes dryer	<b>3.44</b>	1.58	1.04
Computer	<b>3.13</b>	<b>2.01</b>	<b>1.46</b>
Refrigerator	<b>2.95</b>	1.57	1.46
Video camera	<b>2.56</b>	<b>2.36</b>	0.98
Video recorder	<b>2.34</b>	<b>1.75</b>	<b>1.28</b>
Telephone	<b>2.14</b>	n.a.	<b>1.91</b>
TV	<b>2.01</b>	1.71	1.08
Mobile phone	<b>2.04</b>	<b>1.28</b>	<b>1.34</b>
DVD player	<b>1.97</b>	n.a.	1.05
Freezer	<b>1.89</b>	1.05	1.11
Car	<b>1.86</b>	<b>1.81</b>	<b>2.30</b>
Motorcycle	<b>0.53</b>	1.83	1.04

Note: The values shown are odds ratios. Significance at the 0.05 level is marked by bold figures. For transformations of these odds-ratios into probabilities see Table A.3 in Appendix.

## 4 Summary and Conclusions

---

In sum, we found the following results:

- In Turkey, social status inequality is strongly expressed in household equipment; the same is true for Greece, but at a lower level. In Germany, this social differentiation of household equipment is at a very low level.
- Social status homology expression is different for different types of commodities. Household equipment with durables and services have specific distinctive power. But the distinctive power of some commodities seems to be country specific.
- Cultural resources, as indicated by educational status, are effective in consumption inequality. There is educational status homology of household equipment separate from economic homology.
- Overall, Bourdieu's homology argument seems to be valid, but with a specific societal pattern, namely for Turkey and for specific commodities. To a lesser extent, we also find status homology of household equipment in Greece. In Germany, status homology of household possessions was mostly not observable.

Of course, these results represent a cross-sectional pattern around the year 2000. Therefore, these results cannot be taken as evidence against or in support of the homology thesis in a dynamic, socio-historical change perspective. To proceed with a test of socio-historical validity of the homology argument, one has to examine consumptive inequality in these countries at different points of time. Household Budget Survey Data might be useful for a comparative static inequality analysis. Because they provide detailed data on consumption and possessions, these type of datasets would be very valuable if they also contained differentiated data on socio-economic status and educational status. This seems not to be the case for datasets collected before the nineties, but the latest survey programmes have incorporated these kinds of household data. So there is a chance to deepen the discussion about social status homology of consumption by using additional recent and future Household Budget Survey data collections.

## 5 References

---

- Argyrou, V. (1996). *Tradition and Modernity in the Mediterranean. The wedding as symbolic struggle*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Aydin, K. (2006). Social stratification and consumption patterns in Turkey. *Social Indicators Research*, 75, 463-501.
- Beck, U. (1986). *Risikogesellschaft. Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Berger, J. (1998). Was behauptet die Marxsche Klassentheorie – und was ist davon haltbar? In Giegel, H.-J. (Ed), *Konflikt in modernen Gesellschaften*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Bihagen, E. (1999). How do classes make use of their incomes? *Social Indicators Research*, 47, 119-151.
- Blasius, J. and Winkler, J. (1989). Gibt es die "feinen Unterschiede"? Eine empirische Überprüfung der Bourdieuschen Theorie. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 41, 72-94.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Breen, R. and Rottman, D. B. (1995). *Class Stratification. A Comparative Perspective*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Buth, S. and Johannsen, H. (1999). Determinieren soziale Strukturen Lebensstile? Ein Beitrag zur empirischen Lösung der Entstrukturierungsdebatte. In Honegger, C., Hradil, S. and Traxler, F. (Eds), *Grenzenlose Gesellschaft? Verhandlungen des 29. Kongresses der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie, des 16. Kongresses der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Soziologie und des 11. Kongresses der Schweizerischen Gesellschaft für Soziologie in Freiburg i.Br. 1998*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Campbell, J. K. (1985). Traditional values and continuities in Greek society. In Clogg, R. (Ed.), *Greece in the 1980s*. London: MacMillan.
- Chan, T. W. and Goldthorpe, J. H. (2007). Social stratification and cultural consumption: music in England. *European Sociological Review*, 23, 1-19.
- Clark, T. N., Lipset, S. M. and Rempel, M. (1993). The declining political significance of social class. *International Sociology*, 8, 293-316.
- Clark, T. N. and Lipset, S. M. (1991). Are social classes dying? *International Sociology*, 6, 397-410.
- Cohen, P. (1998). Replacing housework in the service economy: gender, class, and race-ethnicity in service spending. *Gender and Society*, 12, 2, 219-231.
- Coulangeon, P. and Lemel, Y. (2009). The homology thesis: distinction revisited. In Robson, K. and Sanders, C. (Eds.), *Quantifying Theory: Pierre Bourdieu*. Berlin: Springer, pp. 47-60.
- Cowell, D. K. and Green, G. P. (1994). Community attachment and spending location: the importance of place in household consumption. *Social Science Quarterly*, 75, 3, 637-655.
- DiMaggio, P. (1987). Classification in art. *American Sociological Review*, 52, 4, 440-455.
- Douglas, M. and Isherwood, B. (1979). *The World of Goods: Towards an Anthropology of Consumption*. New York: W. W. Norton. (cited by: DiMaggio, P. (1987): Classification in art. *American Sociological Review* 52, 4, 440-455.).

- Fan, J. X. (1998). Ethnic differences in household expenditure patterns. *Family and Consumer Science Research Journal*, 26, 4, 371-400.
- Fan, J. X. and Lewis, J.K. (1999). Budget allocation patterns of African Americans. *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 33, 1, 134-164.
- Georg, W. (1998). *Soziale Lage und Lebensstil: Eine Typologie*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Gouvias, D. (1998). The relation between unequal access to higher education and labour market structure: the case of Greece. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 19, 305-333.
- Grusky, D. B. and Sørensen, J. B. (1998). Can class analysis be salvaged? *American Journal of Sociology*, 103, 1187-1234.
- Halle, D. (1992). The audience of abstract art: class, culture, and power. In Lamont, M. and Fournier, M. (Eds.), *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 131-151.
- Herlyn, U., Scheller, G. and Tessin, W. (1994). *Neue Lebensstile in der Arbeiterschaft? Eine empirische Untersuchung in zwei Industriestädten*. Opladen: Leske+Budrich.
- Hörning, K. H. and Michailow, M. (1990). Lebensstil als Vergesellschaftungsform. Zum Wandel von Sozialstruktur und sozialer Integration. In Berger, P. A. and Hradil, S. (Eds.), *Lebenslagen, Lebensläufe, Lebensstile. Soziale Welt, Sonderband 7*. Göttingen: Schwartz, pp. 501-521.
- Hörning, K. H., Ahrens, D. and Gerhard, A. (1996). Die Autonomie des Lebensstils. Wege zu einer Neuorientierung der Lebensstilforschung. In Schwenk, O. G. (Ed.), *Lebensstil zwischen Sozialstrukturanalyse und Kulturwissenschaft*. Opladen: Leske+Budrich, pp. 33-52.
- Hout, M., Brooks, C. and Manza, J. (1993). The persistence of classes in post-industrial societies. *International Sociology*, 8, 259-277.
- Hradil, S. (1987). Soziale Ungleichheiten, Milieus und Lebensstile in den Ländern der Europäischen Union. Modernisierungsabstände oder nationale Besonderheiten? In Hradil, S. and Immerfall, S. (Eds.), *Die westeuropäischen Gesellschaften im Vergleich*. Opladen: Leske+Budrich, pp. 475-519.
- Isengard, B. (2005): Freizeitverhalten als Ausdruck sozialer Ungleichheiten oder Ergebnis individualisierter Lebensführung? Zur Bedeutung von Einkommen und Bildung im Zeitverlauf. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 57, 254-277
- Jagodzinski, W. and Quandt, M. (1997). Wahlverhalten und Religion im Lichte der Individualisierungsthese. Anmerkungen zu dem Beitrag von Schnell und Kohler. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 49, 761-782.
- Johannsen, H. (2000). *Sozialstruktur und Lebensstile. Ein empirischer Beitrag zur Strukturierungs-Entstrukturierungsdebatte*. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg, Studiengang Soziologie. Unveröffentlichte Diplomarbeit. (cited by: Otte, G. (2004). Sozialstrukturanalysen mit Lebensstilen. Eine Studie zur theoretischen und methodischen Neuorientierung der Lebensstilforschung. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.).
- Katz-Gerro, T. (2003). Consumption-based inequality: household expenditures and possession of goods in Israel 1986-1998. In Shechter, R. (Ed.), *Houses in Motion: New Domesticities and the Consumption of Homes in the Middle East*. London: Palgrave, pp. 161-190.
- Katz-Gerro, T., Raz, S. and Yaish, M. (2009). How do class, status, ethnicity, and religiosity shape cultural omnivorousness in Israel? *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 33, 1-17.
- Kingston, P. (2000). *The Classless Society*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Klocke, A. (1993). *Sozialer Wandel, Sozialstruktur und Lebensstile in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Frankfurt a.M.: Lang.
- Koelln, K., Rubin, R. M. and Smith Picard, M. (1995). Vulnerable elderly household expenditures on necessities by older Americans. *Social Science Quarterly*, 76, 3, 619-633.
- Konietzka, D. (1995). *Lebensstile im sozialstrukturellen Kontext. Ein theoretischer und empirischer Beitrag zur Analyse sozialstruktureller Ungleichheiten*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Lamont, M. (1992). *Money, Morals and Manners*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lamont, M. and Molnár, V. (2002). The study of boundaries in the social sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28, 167-195.
- Lázaro, N., Moltó, M. L. and Sánchez, R. (2000). Unemployment and consumption patterns. *Applied Economics*, 32, 367-379.
- Lizardo, O. (2006). How cultural tastes shape personal networks. *American Sociological Review*, 71, 778-807.
- Makrides, V. N. (2008). Griechenland. In Buchstab, G. and Uertz, R. (Eds.), *Was eint Europa? Christentum und kulturelle Identität*. Freiburg i.B.: Herder, pp. 353-380.
- Moser, B. and Weithmann, M. (2008). *Landeskunde Türkei: Geschichte, Gesellschaft und Kultur*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Müller, W. (1997). Sozialstruktur und Wahlverhalten. Eine Widerrede gegen die Individualisierungsthese. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 49, 747-760.
- Müller-Schneider, T. (1994). *Schichten und Erlebnismilieus. Der Wandel der Milieustruktur in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitätsverlag.
- Müller-Schneider, T. (2000). Stabilität subjektzentrierter Strukturen. Das Lebensstilmodell von Schulze im Zeitvergleich. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 29, 361-374.
- Munters, Q. J. (1977). Social stratification and consumer behavior. *Netherlands Journal of Sociology*, 13, 137-154.
- Otte, G. (2004). *Sozialstrukturanalysen mit Lebensstilen. Eine Studie zur theoretischen und methodischen Neuorientierung der Lebensstilforschung*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Pakulski, J. and Waters, M. (1996). *The Death of Class*. London: Sage.
- Peterson, R. A. (2005). Problems in comparative research: the example of omnivorousness. *Poetics*, 33, 257-282.
- Peterson, R. A. and Simkus, A. (1992). How musical tastes mark occupational status groups. In Lamont, M. and Fournier, M. (Eds.), *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 152-86.
- Peterson, R. A. and Kern, R. M. (1996). Changing highbrow taste: from snob to omnivore. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 900-1007.
- Raper, K. C., Wanzala, M. N. and Nayaga Jr., R. M. (2002). Food expenditures and household demographic composition in the US: a demand systems approach. *Applied Economics*, 34, 981-992.
- Reichenwallner, M. (2000). *Lebensstile zwischen Struktur und Entkopplung. Beziehungen zwischen Lebensweisen und sozialen Lagen*. Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag.

- Savramis, D. (1969). Die religiösen Grundlagen der neugriechischen Gesellschaft. In Nikolinakos, M. and Nikolaou, K. (Eds.), *Die verhinderte Demokratie: Modell Griechenland*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, pp.64-87.
- Schnell, R. and Kohler, U. (1995). Empirische Untersuchung einer Individualisierungshypothese am Beispiel der Parteipräferenz von 1953-1992. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 47, 635-657.
- Schnell, R. and Kohler, U. (1997). Zur Erklärungskraft sozio-demographischer Variablen im Zeitverlauf. Entgegnung auf Walter Müller sowie auf Wolfgang Jagodzinski und Markus Quandt. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 49, 783-795.
- Schulze, W. (1992). *Die Erlebnisgesellschaft. Kultursoziologie der Gegenwart*. Frankfurt a.M.: Campus.
- Slater, D. (1997). *Consumer Culture and Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Spellerberg, A. (1996). *Soziale Differenzierung durch Lebensstile. Eine empirische Untersuchung zur Lebensqualität in West- und Ostdeutschland*. Berlin: Sigma.
- Strasser, H. and Dederichs, A. M. (2000). Die Restrukturierung der Klassengesellschaft: Elemente einer zeitgenössischen Ungleichheitstheorie. *Berliner Journal für Soziologie*, 10, 79-98.
- Sullivan, O. and Katz-Gerro, T. (2007). The omnivore thesis revisited: voracious cultural consumers. *European Sociological Review*, 23, 123-137.
- Toivonen, T. (1992). The melting away of class differences? Consumption differences between employee groups in Finland 1955-1985. *Social Indicators Research*, 26, 277-302.
- Tomlinson, M. (1994). Do distinct class preferences for food exist? An analysis of class-based tastes. *British Food Journal*, 69, 7, 11-17.
- Uusitalo, L. (1980). Identification of consumption style segments on the basis of household budget allocation. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 7, 451-459.
- Veblen, T. (1994 [1899]). *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Dover.
- Wittmayer, C., Schulz, S. and Mittelstaedt, R. (1994). A cross-cultural look at the 'supposed to have it' phenomenon: the existence of a standard package based on occupation. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 21, 427-434.
- Wong, G. K.-M. and Yu, L. (2002). Income and social inequality in China: impact on consumption and shopping patterns. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 29, 5, 370-384.
- Wu, Y. (1997). Wealth and spending patterns in China: empirical evidence from household surveys. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 24, 1007-1022.

## 6 Appendix

Table A.1: Transformation Rules for Harmonizing Socio-economic Status Variables of German, Turkish and Greek HBS Datasets

Harmonized data		Original Data		
Variable name	Variable values	Data of German EVS 2003	Data of Turkish HBS 2003	Data of Greek HBS 1998
Income/expenditure position	lessthan_50percent i50_74percent i75_99percent i100_149percent i150_199percent i200_morepercent	Net household income	Net household income	Sum of expenditures
Educational status	lower	No degree in vocational training, No vocational training, Student	Illiterate, literate without diploma, primary school	No school, did not finish primary, finished only primary
	middle	Degree at master school (also master craftsman), technician school Apprenticeship degree or similar, Other occupational degree, In vocational training, scholar/student	Primary education, junior high school, vocational school at jr.high school level, high school, vocational school at high school level	First 3 years of high school, high school, technical high school.
	upper	University degree, Polytechnical or senior technical college degree	2 year higher educational institution, higher educational institutions and faculties, master and doctorate	College (tei), aei
Occupational status	farmer	Self-employed farmer	Skilled agricultural and fishery workers	Working in agriculture, livestock and fishing
	manual occupation	Worker, Occupational training	Crafts and related trade workers, plant machine operators and assemblers, elementary occupations, unskilled	Employed

Table A.1 (continued): Transformation Rules for Harmonizing Socio-economic Status Variables of German, Turkish and Greek HBS Datasets

Harmonized data		Original Data		
Variable name	Variable values	Data of German EVS 2003	Data of Turkish HBS 2003	Data of Greek HBS 1998
	non_manual	Self-employed businessman, craftsman,artisan professionals Civil servant, judge, professional mili- tary, military duty Employee	Legislators senior officers, managers, professionals, technicians, associate professionals, office clerks, customer service clerks, service workers, shop and market sales workers	
	non_employed	Unemployed Retirement pensioner Old-age pensioner Scholar Other unemployed (housewife, stu- dent etc.)	Unemployed, Unemployed, Scholar	Unemployed, Retired, retirement pensioner, Student, Housewife, Unable to work, Others
Gender of head of household	female	Female	Female	Female
	male	Male	Male	Male
Age of head of household		Year of birth	Year of birth	Year of birth
Size of residence location	Rural < 20 000 inhabitants	<i>Size of place of residence</i> less than 5000 inhabitants 5000 until less than 20 000 inhabi- tants	Rural	Rural
	Urban > 20 000	20 000 until less than 100 000 inhabi- tants 100 000 until less than 500 000 inha- bitants 500 000 inhabitants and more less than 20 000 inhabitants 20 000 inhabitants and more 100 000 inhabitants and more	Urban	Athens, Thessaloniki, Other Urban, Semiurban

Table A.2: *High vs. Low Educational Status – Adjusted Educational Status Differences in Household Equipment with Durables*

	Turkey	Greece	Germany
Internet	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.72</b>
Dishwasher	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>0.53</b>
Computer	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>0.75</b>
Clothes dryer	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.43</b>
Video camera	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.75</b>	0.55
Washing machine	<b>0.86</b>	0.43	<b>0.57</b>
Refrigerator	<b>0.86</b>	0.45	0.56
Mobile phone	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.57</b>	<b>0.58</b>
Telephone	<b>0.83</b>	n.a.	<b>0.69</b>
Car	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.68</b>
Video recorder	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0.61</b>	0.52
Freezer	<b>0.72</b>	0.52	<b>0.44</b>
DVD player	<b>0.73</b>	n.a.	0.53
TV	<b>0.70</b>	0.43	<b>0.38</b>
Motorcycle	<b>0.22</b>	0.47	<b>0.43</b>

Note: The values shown are probabilities, based on the odds ratios shown in Table 2, calculated by the following formula:  $P = e^{\text{Logit}} / 1 + e^{\text{Logit}}$  or  $P = e^{\beta_0 + \beta X} / 1 + e^{\beta_0 + \beta X}$ . Significance at the 0.05 level is marked by bold figures.

Table A.3: *Mid vs. Low Educational Differences in Household Equipment*

	Turkey	Greece	Germany
Internet	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>0.61</b>
Dishwasher	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.56</b>
Washing machine	<b>0.78</b>	<b>0.60</b>	<b>0.60</b>
Clothes dryer	<b>0.77</b>	<b>0.61</b>	0.51
Computer	<b>0.76</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.59</b>
Refrigerator	<b>0.75</b>	0.61	0.59
Video camera	<b>0.72</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.49</b>
Video recorder	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.56</b>
Telephone	<b>0.68</b>	n.a.	<b>0.66</b>
TV	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.63</b>	0.52
Mobile phone	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.57</b>
DVD player	<b>0.66</b>	n.a.	0.51
Freezer	<b>0.65</b>	0.51	0.53
Car	<b>0.65</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.70</b>
Motorcycle	<b>0.35</b>	0.65	0.51

Note: The values shown are probabilities, based on the odds ratios shown in Table 2, calculated by the following formula:  $P = e^{\text{Logit}} / 1 + e^{\text{Logit}}$  or  $P = e^{\beta_0 + \beta X} / 1 + e^{\beta_0 + \beta X}$ . Significance at the 0.05 level is marked by bold figures.

Table A.6: Regression models and results for Greece (N = 6258)

reference category in the equation		car	motor cycle	mobile phone	computer	internet	TV	video recorder	video camera	fridge <sup>4</sup>	washing machine	freezer	dish wash-er	cloth dryer
i100_149percent	lessthan_50percent	<b>0,16</b>	<b>0,26</b>	<b>0,22</b>	<b>4,00</b>	<b>0,17</b>	<b>0,22</b>	<b>0,36</b>	<b>0,27</b>	<b>0,30</b>	<b>0,21</b>	<b>0,46</b>	<b>0,25</b>	<b>0,20</b>
	i50_74percent	<b>0,39</b>	<b>0,37</b>	<b>0,46</b>	<b>0,55</b>	<b>0,55</b>	0,45	<b>0,58</b>	<b>0,53</b>	0,55	<b>0,59</b>	<b>0,73</b>	<b>0,48</b>	1,01
	i75_99percent	<b>0,59</b>	0,47	<b>0,71</b>	0,87	<b>0,51</b>	0,99	<b>0,77</b>	0,95	<b>0,35</b>	0,86	0,88	<b>0,72</b>	0,73
	i150_199percent	1,29	0,89	<b>1,41</b>	1,01	1,41	3,11	1,11	1,31	-	0,99	1,04	<b>1,33</b>	<b>2,71</b>
	i200_morepercent	1,10	0,20	<b>1,29</b>	0,84	1,45	0,77	<b>1,40</b>	<b>1,52</b>	1,17	<b>0,60</b>	1,01	1,15	<b>2,37</b>
low education	mid_educ	<b>1,81</b>	1,83	<b>1,28</b>	<b>2,01</b>	<b>2,19</b>	1,71	<b>1,75</b>	<b>2,36</b>	1,57	<b>1,47</b>	1,05	<b>2,34</b>	1,58
	hi_educ	<b>2,07</b>	0,88	<b>1,32</b>	<b>3,91</b>	<b>6,90</b>	0,74	<b>1,55</b>	<b>2,94</b>	0,83	0,75	1,10	<b>2,93</b>	<b>2,79</b>
Other occupational status	farmer	<b>0,42</b>	0,00	0,82	0,54	0,51	<b>0,49</b>	<b>0,42</b>	<b>0,47</b>	0,79	<b>0,55</b>	1,28	<b>0,57</b>	0,60
	unemployed	<b>0,80</b>	0,88	0,88	1,12	<b>1,63</b>	1,05	<b>0,80</b>	1,00	1,69	<b>0,59</b>	1,03	<b>0,67</b>	0,81
household headfemale	household head male	<b>6,47</b>	6,38	<b>2,14</b>	<b>1,46</b>	<b>1,54</b>	<b>3,03</b>	<b>2,78</b>	<b>2,87</b>	1,46	<b>2,97</b>	<b>2,36</b>	<b>2,06</b>	0,85
	age	<b>2,02</b>	<b>2,69</b>	<b>1,16</b>	<b>1,62</b>	<b>1,39</b>	<b>1,56</b>	<b>1,54</b>	<b>1,34</b>	1,33	<b>1,94</b>	<b>1,49</b>	<b>1,38</b>	1,21
	agesq	<b>0,95</b>	<b>0,94</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,96</b>	<b>0,97</b>	<b>0,97</b>	<b>0,97</b>	<b>0,97</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,96</b>	<b>0,97</b>	<b>0,98</b>	0,99
rural	urban	1,15	0,99	<b>1,95</b>	<b>1,66</b>	<b>2,53</b>	<b>1,48</b>	<b>1,46</b>	<b>1,74</b>	1,11	<b>1,70</b>	<b>0,39</b>	<b>1,91</b>	2,17
	-2 Log likelihood	-3132,14	-188,82	-3179,45	-1419,52	-921,24	-598,02	-3367,20	-1538,56	-389,86	-1872,17	-2343,06	-2826,71	-475,44
	Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0,277	0,106	0,202	0,153	0,207	0,160	0,212	0,188	0,034	0,199	0,068	0,187	0,115
gender, age, rural only	-2 Log likelihood	-3567,27	-198,85	-3426,39	-1543,89	-1065,58	-630,35	-3581,21	-1664,69	-402,48	-2006,05	-2374,06	-3138,60	-516,80
difference full model - demo-model	-2 Log likelihood	-435,13	-10,03	-246,93	-124,37	-144,33	-32,34	-214,01	-126,13	-10,09	-133,88	-31,00	-311,89	-41,35
	Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	-0,28	-0,11	-0,20	-0,15	-0,21	-0,16	-0,21	-0,19	-0,03	-0,20	-0,07	-0,19	-0,12
	%logl	12,20	5,04	7,21	8,06	13,55	5,13	5,98	7,58	2,51	6,67	1,31	9,94	8,00

Note: Bold figures indicate  $p < 0.5$ . There were no questions about telephone or DVD-player.

<sup>4</sup> Due to multicollinearity we specified a slightly different model for fridge as a dependent variable, we had to omit the income group of 150 to 199 percent of median income.

Table A.7: Regression models and results for Germany (N = 42082)

reference category in the equation		car	motor cycle	telephone	mobile phone	computer	internet	TV	video recorder	DVD-player	video camera	fridge	washing machine	freezer	dish washer	cloth dryer
i100_149percent	lessthan_50percent	<b>0,08</b>	<b>0,31</b>	<b>0,14</b>	<b>0,36</b>	<b>0,29</b>	<b>0,33</b>	<b>0,40</b>	<b>0,43</b>	<b>0,48</b>	<b>0,49</b>	<b>0,22</b>	<b>0,33</b>	<b>0,28</b>	<b>0,18</b>	<b>0,31</b>
	i50_74percent	<b>0,28</b>	<b>0,52</b>	<b>0,39</b>	<b>0,62</b>	<b>0,49</b>	<b>0,52</b>	<b>0,63</b>	<b>0,72</b>	<b>0,70</b>	<b>0,82</b>	<b>0,47</b>	<b>0,67</b>	<b>0,51</b>	<b>0,38</b>	<b>0,52</b>
	i75_99percent	<b>0,62</b>	<b>0,78</b>	<b>0,73</b>	<b>0,88</b>	<b>0,74</b>	<b>0,76</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,87</b>	<b>0,88</b>	<b>0,97</b>	<b>0,69</b>	<b>0,99</b>	<b>0,81</b>	<b>0,68</b>	<b>0,78</b>
	i150_199percent	<b>1,32</b>	<b>1,14</b>	<b>0,93</b>	<b>1,21</b>	<b>1,33</b>	<b>1,30</b>	<b>1,07</b>	<b>1,09</b>	<b>1,07</b>	<b>0,97</b>	<b>0,94</b>	<b>1,09</b>	<b>1,11</b>	<b>1,41</b>	<b>1,14</b>
	i200_morepercent	<b>1,26</b>	<b>1,29</b>	<b>0,93</b>	<b>1,23</b>	<b>1,43</b>	<b>1,47</b>	<b>0,91</b>	<b>1,04</b>	<b>1,01</b>	<b>0,58</b>	<b>1,05</b>	<b>0,89</b>	<b>1,01</b>	<b>1,68</b>	<b>1,29</b>
low education	mid_educ	<b>2,30</b>	<b>1,04</b>	<b>1,91</b>	<b>1,34</b>	<b>1,46</b>	<b>1,56</b>	<b>1,08</b>	<b>1,28</b>	<b>1,05</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>1,46</b>	<b>1,51</b>	<b>1,11</b>	<b>1,26</b>	<b>1,04</b>
	hi_educ	<b>2,08</b>	<b>0,72</b>	<b>2,30</b>	<b>1,36</b>	<b>2,94</b>	<b>2,62</b>	<b>0,61</b>	<b>1,08</b>	<b>1,10</b>	<b>1,25</b>	<b>1,23</b>	<b>1,34</b>	<b>0,76</b>	<b>1,13</b>	<b>0,72</b>
manual occupation	farmer	<b>0,89</b>	<b>1,04</b>	<b>0,81</b>	<b>1,00</b>	<b>0,99</b>	<b>1,03</b>	<b>1,07</b>	<b>1,02</b>	<b>1,01</b>	<b>1,20</b>	<b>0,74</b>	<b>1,01</b>	<b>0,95</b>	<b>1,14</b>	<b>1,04</b>
	non-manual	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,84</b>	<b>0,94</b>	<b>1,01</b>	<b>0,96</b>	<b>0,95</b>	<b>1,15</b>	<b>1,02</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>1,00</b>	<b>0,73</b>	<b>1,06</b>	<b>0,88</b>	<b>0,93</b>	<b>0,84</b>
	unemployed	<b>0,97</b>	<b>0,90</b>	<b>0,90</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,87</b>	<b>0,92</b>	<b>1,08</b>	<b>1,02</b>	<b>0,96</b>	<b>1,02</b>	<b>0,75</b>	<b>0,96</b>	<b>0,90</b>	<b>0,96</b>	<b>0,90</b>
household headfemale	household head male	<b>3,65</b>	<b>1,79</b>	<b>0,97</b>	<b>1,77</b>	<b>2,02</b>	<b>1,81</b>	<b>1,48</b>	<b>1,89</b>	<b>1,89</b>	<b>2,03</b>	<b>0,84</b>	<b>1,15</b>	<b>1,83</b>	<b>1,94</b>	<b>1,79</b>
	age	<b>1,34</b>	<b>1,35</b>	<b>1,43</b>	<b>0,92</b>	<b>1,07</b>	<b>1,02</b>	<b>1,41</b>	<b>1,29</b>	<b>0,94</b>	<b>1,30</b>	<b>1,55</b>	<b>2,23</b>	<b>1,58</b>	<b>1,50</b>	<b>1,35</b>
	agesq	<b>0,97</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,99</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,99</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,97</b>	<b>0,96</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,97</b>	<b>0,98</b>
rural	urban	<b>0,36</b>	<b>0,81</b>	<b>1,06</b>	<b>1,17</b>	<b>1,11</b>	<b>1,13</b>	<b>0,91</b>	<b>1,12</b>	<b>1,29</b>	<b>1,01</b>	<b>1,00</b>	<b>0,64</b>	<b>0,56</b>	<b>0,70</b>	<b>0,81</b>
	-2 Log likelihood	-11873,08	-26858,37	-5120,14	-18325,04	-18665,98	-23558,91	-7203,02	-21834,30	-23794,47	-2065,14	-1495,43	-6201,30	-21915,42	-22917,99	-26858,37
	Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0,26	0,09	0,10	0,14	0,25	0,18	0,05	0,08	0,09	0,04	0,05	0,13	0,10	0,14	0,07
gender, age, rural only	-2 Log likelihood	-13607,34	-15044,72	-5463,13	-18719,16	-19825,24	-24710,77	-7330,50	-22093,45	-23998,84	-20759,08	-1533,84	-6644,49	-22587,11	-24430,37	-27567,48
difference full model - demo-model	-2 Log likelihood	-1734,27	11813,65	-343,00	-394,12	-1159,26	-1151,86	-127,48	-259,16	-204,37	-18693,93	-38,41	-443,19	-671,68	-1512,38	-709,12
	Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	-0,26	-0,09	-0,10	-0,14	-0,25	-0,18	-0,05	-0,08	-0,09	-0,04	-0,05	-0,13	-0,10	-0,14	-0,07
	%logl	12,75	-78,52	6,28	2,11	5,85	4,66	1,74	1,17	0,85	90,05	2,50	6,67	2,97	6,19	2,57

Note: Bold figures indicate  $p < 0.5$ .

Table A.8: Regression models and results for Turkey (N = 25764)

reference category in the equation		car	motor cycle	telephone	mobile phone	computer	internet	TV	video recorder	DVD-player	video camera	fridge	washing machine	freezer	dish washer	cloth dryer
i100_149percent	lessthan_50percent	<b>0,35</b>	1,06	<b>0,48</b>	<b>0,49</b>	<b>0,31</b>	<b>0,24</b>	<b>0,58</b>	<b>0,54</b>	<b>0,50</b>	<b>0,32</b>	<b>0,43</b>	<b>0,38</b>	<b>0,39</b>	<b>0,40</b>	0,65
	i50_74percent	<b>0,60</b>	1,10	<b>0,76</b>	<b>0,59</b>	<b>0,47</b>	<b>0,40</b>	<b>0,85</b>	<b>0,79</b>	<b>0,63</b>	<b>0,54</b>	0,90	<b>0,75</b>	<b>0,68</b>	<b>0,58</b>	0,57
	i75_99percent	<b>0,76</b>	1,14	0,93	<b>0,76</b>	<b>0,72</b>	<b>0,74</b>	<b>0,89</b>	<b>0,84</b>	<b>0,79</b>	0,91	1,04	0,91	0,91	<b>0,82</b>	1,22
	i150_199percent	<b>1,50</b>	1,08	<b>1,36</b>	<b>1,44</b>	<b>1,41</b>	<b>1,40</b>	1,28	<b>1,26</b>	<b>1,18</b>	<b>1,82</b>	1,36	<b>1,45</b>	<b>1,36</b>	<b>1,54</b>	0,99
	i200_morepercent	<b>2,18</b>	1,18	<b>1,54</b>	<b>2,22</b>	<b>2,87</b>	<b>3,32</b>	1,48	<b>2,21</b>	<b>1,66</b>	<b>5,08</b>	1,56	<b>1,95</b>	<b>2,26</b>	<b>2,90</b>	<b>2,60</b>
low education	mid_educ	<b>1,86</b>	<b>0,53</b>	<b>2,14</b>	<b>2,04</b>	<b>3,13</b>	<b>4,75</b>	<b>2,01</b>	<b>2,34</b>	<b>1,97</b>	<b>2,56</b>	<b>2,95</b>	<b>3,45</b>	<b>1,89</b>	<b>3,83</b>	<b>3,44</b>
	hi_educ	<b>4,48</b>	<b>0,28</b>	<b>4,80</b>	<b>5,00</b>	<b>11,73</b>	<b>22,81</b>	<b>2,32</b>	<b>4,44</b>	<b>2,67</b>	<b>8,05</b>	<b>6,13</b>	<b>6,18</b>	<b>2,63</b>	<b>12,38</b>	<b>8,15</b>
manual occupation	farmer	1,06	1,27	1,21	1,08	0,87	0,51	1,13	<b>1,04</b>	1,07	0,73	1,61	0,96	<b>1,87</b>	1,16	2,37
	non-manual	1,07	0,95	1,00	0,98	0,99	0,91	1,07	1,07	1,02	0,96	1,07	1,00	0,97	<b>1,16</b>	1,09
	unemployed	<b>1,12</b>	1,10	0,93	0,93	0,11	0,97	1,02	1,06	0,99	0,92	0,96	0,94	1,02	1,09	1,13
household headfemale	household head male	<b>3,00</b>	<b>3,15</b>	<b>1,26</b>	<b>1,26</b>	<b>0,79</b>	<b>0,62</b>	<b>1,52</b>	0,82	1,07	<b>0,58</b>	<b>1,47</b>	<b>1,18</b>	0,86	<b>0,76</b>	0,64
	age	<b>1,58</b>	0,95	<b>2,09</b>	<b>1,14</b>	<b>1,58</b>	<b>1,39</b>	<b>1,40</b>	<b>1,50</b>	1,01	<b>1,16</b>	<b>1,72</b>	<b>1,42</b>	<b>1,55</b>	<b>1,39</b>	<b>1,95</b>
	agesq	<b>0,97</b>	1,00	<b>0,96</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,97</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,99</b>	<b>0,99</b>	<b>0,97</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,98</b>	<b>0,96</b>
rural	urban	<b>1,16</b>	<b>0,65</b>	<b>1,70</b>	<b>1,96</b>	<b>2,80</b>	<b>2,21</b>	<b>3,02</b>	<b>2,00</b>	<b>2,31</b>	<b>1,65</b>	<b>3,37</b>	<b>4,67</b>	0,93	<b>3,29</b>	1,58
	-2 Log likelihood	-12204,92	-2893,97	-9028,64	-15093,37	-5612,45	-2467,30	-3012,68	-5340,12	-11258,18	-1801,09	-21621,40	-10649,17	-4488,67	-10169,19	-859,66
	Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0,140	0,028	0,118	0,153	0,248	0,282	0,086	0,106	0,110	0,197	0,117	0,198	0,068	0,238	0,121
gender, age, rural only	-2 Log likelihood	-13560,52	-2930,91	-9525,30	-16420,77	-7008,19	-3282,18	-3072,75	-5782,25	-11891,93	-2183,44	-2262,50	-11706,26	-4753,76	-12513,70	-947,63
difference full model - demo-model	-2 Log likelihood	-1355,60	-36,95	-496,66	-1327,40	-1395,74	-814,87	-60,07	-442,12	-633,75	-382,35	19358,90	-1057,10	-265,09	-2344,51	-87,97
	Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	-0,14	-0,03	-0,12	-0,15	-0,25	-0,28	-0,09	-0,11	-0,11	-0,20	-0,12	-0,20	-0,07	-0,24	-0,12
	%logl	10,00	1,26	5,21	8,08	19,92	24,83	1,95	7,65	5,33	17,51	-855,64	9,03	5,58	18,74	9,28

Note: Bold figures indicate  $p < 0.5$ .