

# Cultural transmission modes of music sampling traditions remain stable despite delocalization in the digital age

## S1 Appendix

Mason Youngblood<sup>a,b,1</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Psychology, The Graduate Center, City University of New York, New York, NY, USA

<sup>b</sup>Department of Biology, Queens College, City University of New York, Flushing, NY, USA

<sup>1</sup>myoungblood@gradcenter.cuny.edu

## NBDA

### 0.1 Primary OADA

The results of the multiplicative NBDA model fit to the primary OADA with all four individual-level variables.

Summary of Multiplicative Social Transmission Model  
Order of acquisition data  
Unbounded parameterisation.

Coefficients:

|                       | Estimate      | Bounded   | se           | z          | p            |
|-----------------------|---------------|-----------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| Social transmission 1 | 1.334607e-01  | 0.1177462 | NA           | NA         | NA           |
| gender                | -1.050416e-01 | NA        | 4.017186e-02 | -2.6148064 | 8.927804e-03 |
| popularity            | -1.335417e-02 | NA        | 1.465003e-03 | -9.1154550 | 0.000000e+00 |
| followers             | -9.611204e-08 | NA        | 1.956053e-08 | -4.9135695 | 8.943303e-07 |
| meandist              | -1.880816e-09 | NA        | 1.361273e-08 | -0.1381659 | 8.901093e-01 |

Likelihood Ratio Test for Social Transmission:

Null model includes all other specified variables  
Social transmission and asocial learning assumed to combine multiplicatively

|                             | Df | LogLik | AIC   | AICc  | LR     | p |
|-----------------------------|----|--------|-------|-------|--------|---|
| With Social Transmission    | 5  | 7354.4 | 14719 | 14719 | 143.09 | 0 |
| Without Social Transmission | 4  | 7425.9 | 14860 | 14860 |        |   |

The results of all NBDA models fit to the primary OADA. In the “Additive?” column TRUE means the model was additive, FALSE means the model was multiplicative, and NA means the model was asocial. In the “ILVs”, or individual-level variables, column the numbers correspond to the variables included in the model (1: gender; 2: popularity; 3: followers; 4: mean distance).

| Additive? | ILVs    | Social? | AICc             | deltaAICc |
|-----------|---------|---------|------------------|-----------|
| FALSE     | 1 2 3 4 | social  | 14718.7305939155 | 0         |
| FALSE     | 2 3 4   | social  | 14723.2581626229 | 4.53      |
| FALSE     | 1 2 4   | social  | 14749.7210576547 | 30.99     |
| FALSE     | 2 4     | social  | 14755.0075144196 | 36.28     |
| FALSE     | 1 3 4   | social  | 14795.6248094134 | 76.89     |
| FALSE     | 3 4     | social  | 14796.5052668663 | 77.77     |
| FALSE     | 4       | social  | 15956.6213244064 | 1237.89   |
| FALSE     | 1 4     | social  | 15957.1346280933 | 1238.4    |
| FALSE     | 1 2 3   | social  | 32229.4897515171 | 17510.76  |
| FALSE     | 1 2     | social  | 32260.0747802103 | 17541.34  |
| FALSE     | 2 3     | social  | 32267.3112186711 | 17548.58  |
| FALSE     | 2       | social  | 32298.2544538564 | 17579.52  |
| FALSE     | 1 3     | social  | 32356.8941850595 | 17638.16  |
| FALSE     | 3       | social  | 32389.9528866174 | 17671.22  |
| FALSE     | 1       | social  | 43609.4787479712 | 28890.75  |
| TRUE      | 1       | social  | 43612.45988987   | 28893.73  |
| NA        | 0       | social  | 43662.7306996825 | 28944     |
| NA        | 1       | asocial | 43779.4569488198 | 29060.73  |
| NA        | 0       | asocial | 43815.27922266   | 29096.55  |

|      |         |         |     |     |
|------|---------|---------|-----|-----|
| TRUE | 2       | social  | Inf | Inf |
| NA   | 2       | asocial | Inf | Inf |
| TRUE | 1 2     | social  | Inf | Inf |
| NA   | 1 2     | asocial | Inf | Inf |
| TRUE | 3       | social  | Inf | Inf |
| NA   | 3       | asocial | Inf | Inf |
| TRUE | 1 3     | social  | Inf | Inf |
| NA   | 1 3     | asocial | Inf | Inf |
| TRUE | 2 3     | social  | Inf | Inf |
| NA   | 2 3     | asocial | Inf | Inf |
| TRUE | 1 2 3   | social  | Inf | Inf |
| NA   | 1 2 3   | asocial | Inf | Inf |
| TRUE | 4       | social  | Inf | Inf |
| NA   | 4       | asocial | Inf | Inf |
| TRUE | 1 4     | social  | Inf | Inf |
| NA   | 1 4     | asocial | Inf | Inf |
| TRUE | 2 4     | social  | Inf | Inf |
| NA   | 2 4     | asocial | Inf | Inf |
| TRUE | 1 2 4   | social  | Inf | Inf |
| NA   | 1 2 4   | asocial | Inf | Inf |
| TRUE | 3 4     | social  | Inf | Inf |
| NA   | 3 4     | asocial | Inf | Inf |
| TRUE | 1 3 4   | social  | Inf | Inf |
| NA   | 1 3 4   | asocial | Inf | Inf |
| TRUE | 2 3 4   | social  | Inf | Inf |
| NA   | 2 3 4   | asocial | Inf | Inf |
| TRUE | 1 2 3 4 | social  | Inf | Inf |
| NA   | 1 2 3 4 | asocial | Inf | Inf |

## 0.2 Additional OADA

The eight songs in the “Most Sampled Tracks” on WhoSampled that were released after 1990. The fifth song, “I’m Good” by YG, was excluded from the additional OADA because it is a producer tag used by a single artist.

1. “Crash Goes Love (Yell Apella)” by Loleatta Holloway (1992)
2. “Shook Ones Part II” by Mobb Deep (1994)
3. “C.R.E.A.M.” by Wu-Tang Clan (1993)
4. “Sound of Da Police” by KRS-One (1993)
5. “I’m Good” by YG (2011) [excluded producer tag]
6. “Juicy” by The Notorious B.I.G. (1994)
7. “Sniper” by DJ Trace and Pete Parsons (1999)
8. “Who U Wit?” by Lil Jon and The East Side Boyz (1997)

The results of the additive NBDA model fit to the additional OADA. Remember that the fifth song was excluded, so the transmission estimates for five, six, and seven here are actually for six, seven, and eight.

Summary of Additive Social Transmission Model  
Order of acquisition data  
Unbounded parameterisation

| Coefficients        |   |            | Estimate   | Bounded |
|---------------------|---|------------|------------|---------|
| Social transmission | 1 | 0.13558602 | 0.11939740 |         |
| Social transmission | 2 | 0.28805974 | 0.22363849 |         |
| Social transmission | 3 | 0.05184340 | 0.04928814 |         |
| Social transmission | 4 | 0.60154771 | 0.37560399 |         |
| Social transmission | 5 | 0.06816578 | 0.06381573 |         |
| Social transmission | 6 | 0.07600555 | 0.07063677 |         |
| Social transmission | 7 | 0.01547410 | 0.01523830 |         |

Likelihood Ratio Test for Social Transmission:

Null model includes all other specified variables  
Social transmission and asocial learning assumed to combine additively

|                             | Df | LogLik | AIC   | AICc  | LR     | p |
|-----------------------------|----|--------|-------|-------|--------|---|
| With Social Transmission    | 7  | 6450   | 12914 | 12914 | 101.99 | 0 |
| Without Social Transmission | 0  | 6501   | 13002 | 13002 |        |   |

# STERGM

The results of all formation models of the STERGM fit to the data from 1984-1999. In the “ILVs”, or individual-level variables, column the numbers correspond to the variables included in the model (1: gender; 2: popularity; 3: followers; 4: mean distance).

| ILVs |       | AIC      | deltaAIC |
|------|-------|----------|----------|
| 1    | 2 4   | 7676.380 | 0.00000  |
| 1    | 2 3 4 | 7678.174 | 1.79348  |
|      | 1 2   | 7693.425 | 17.04473 |
| 1    | 2 3   | 7695.203 | 18.82240 |
|      | 1 4   | 7702.003 | 25.62300 |
| 1    | 3 4   | 7702.160 | 25.77921 |
|      | 2 4   | 7710.403 | 34.02256 |
| 2    | 3 4   | 7711.909 | 35.52898 |
|      | 1     | 7718.147 | 41.76695 |
| 1    | 3     | 7718.390 | 42.00953 |
|      | 2     | 7727.194 | 50.81323 |
| 2    | 3     | 7728.701 | 52.32017 |
|      | 4     | 7737.373 | 60.99249 |
| 3    | 4     | 7738.094 | 61.71319 |
|      | 0     | 7753.228 | 76.84742 |
| 3    |       | 7753.985 | 77.60457 |

The results of the best-fitting formation model of the STERGM with the most individual-level variables fit to the data from 1984-1999.

---

---

## Summary of model fit

---

---

Formula: `y.form ~ edges + nodecov("meandist") + absdiff("popularity") + absdiff("followers") + nodematch("gender", diff = TRUE)`  
 <environment: 0x1cb31da8>

Iterations: 11 out of 20

## Monte Carlo MLE Results:

|                     | Estimate   | Std. Error | MCMC % | z value | Pr(> z )     |
|---------------------|------------|------------|--------|---------|--------------|
| edges               | -9.382e+00 | 1.089e-01  | 0      | -86.175 | < 1e-04 ***  |
| nodecov.meandist    | -1.292e-07 | 3.371e-08  | 0      | -3.833  | 0.000126 *** |
| absdiff.popularity  | -1.618e-02 | 3.284e-03  | 0      | -4.927  | < 1e-04 ***  |
| absdiff.followers   | 1.194e-08  | 2.579e-08  | 0      | 0.463   | 0.643396     |
| nodematch.gender.-1 | 1.926e+00  | 3.293e-01  | 0      | 5.851   | < 1e-04 ***  |
| nodematch.gender.0  | 3.478e-01  | 1.965e-01  | 0      | 1.770   | 0.076773 .   |
| nodematch.gender.1  | 5.313e-01  | 1.117e-01  | 0      | 4.757   | < 1e-04 ***  |

Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Null Deviance: 6349494 on 4580192 degrees of freedom  
 Residual Deviance: 7664 on 4580185 degrees of freedom

AIC: 7678 BIC: 7772 (Smaller is better.)

The results of the goodness-of-fit analysis of the formation model of the STERGM with the most individual-level variables fit to the data from 1984-1999.

## Goodness-of-fit for degree

|    | obs   | min   | mean     | max MC | p-value |
|----|-------|-------|----------|--------|---------|
| 0  | 10698 | 10388 | 10484.50 | 10553  | 0.00    |
| 1  | 801   | 1032  | 1101.97  | 1200   | 0.00    |
| 2  | 148   | 89    | 104.41   | 126    | 0.00    |
| 3  | 43    | 16    | 20.71    | 29     | 0.00    |
| 4  | 15    | 5     | 8.01     | 11     | 0.00    |
| 5  | 0     | 0     | 0.38     | 2      | 1.00    |
| 6  | 6     | 0     | 0.95     | 2      | 0.00    |
| 7  | 1     | 0     | 0.07     | 1      | 0.14    |
| 8  | 12    | 4     | 6.55     | 7      | 0.00    |
| 9  | 1     | 0     | 0.42     | 3      | 0.62    |
| 10 | 1     | 0     | 0.03     | 1      | 0.06    |
| 11 | 2     | 0     | 0.91     | 1      | 0.00    |
| 12 | 2     | 0     | 1.00     | 2      | 0.14    |
| 13 | 0     | 0     | 0.08     | 1      | 1.00    |
| 14 | 0     | 0     | 0.01     | 1      | 1.00    |

## Goodness-of-fit for edgewise shared partner

obs min mean max MC p-value

|      |     |     |        |     |   |
|------|-----|-----|--------|-----|---|
| esp0 | 533 | 608 | 645.34 | 700 | 0 |
| esp1 | 92  | 43  | 43.01  | 44  | 0 |
| esp2 | 42  | 19  | 19.01  | 20  | 0 |
| esp3 | 6   | 3   | 3.00   | 3   | 0 |
| esp7 | 71  | 36  | 36.00  | 36  | 0 |
| esp8 | 1   | 0   | 0.00   | 0   | 0 |

Goodness-of-fit for minimum geodesic distance

|     | obs      | min      | mean        | max MC   | p-value |
|-----|----------|----------|-------------|----------|---------|
| 1   | 745      | 709      | 746.36      | 801      | 0.92    |
| 2   | 421      | 186      | 212.11      | 249      | 0.00    |
| 3   | 243      | 46       | 67.21       | 102      | 0.00    |
| 4   | 138      | 14       | 22.30       | 45       | 0.00    |
| 5   | 60       | 6        | 8.67        | 22       | 0.00    |
| 6   | 19       | 0        | 1.07        | 7        | 0.00    |
| 7   | 5        | 0        | 0.06        | 3        | 0.00    |
| Inf | 68788954 | 68789399 | 68789527.22 | 68789605 | 0.00    |

Goodness-of-fit for model statistics

|                     | obs           | min           | mean          | max MC        | p-value |
|---------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------|
| edges               | 745.00        | 709.00        | 746.36        | 801.00        | 0.92    |
| nodecov.meandist    | -298388294.47 | -366967354.28 | -300622250.67 | -216526380.89 | 0.94    |
| absdiff.popularity  | 16092.87      | 15023.48      | 16140.46      | 17764.91      | 0.94    |
| absdiff.followers   | 631702714.34  | 538012952.78  | 636527414.86  | 770413121.94  | 1.00    |
| nodematch.gender.-1 | 20.00         | 13.00         | 20.16         | 28.00         | 1.00    |
| nodematch.gender.0  | 68.00         | 56.00         | 68.37         | 80.00         | 1.00    |
| nodematch.gender.1  | 384.00        | 361.00        | 385.54        | 424.00        | 1.00    |

The results of all formation models of the STERGM fit to the data from 2000-2017. In the “ILVs”, or individual-level variables, column the numbers correspond to the variables included in the model (1: gender; 2: popularity; 3: followers; 4: mean distance).

| ILVs    | AIC      | deltaAIC  |
|---------|----------|-----------|
| 1 2 3   | 14194.16 | 0.00000   |
| 1 2 3 4 | 14196.11 | 1.94688   |
| 2 3     | 14365.84 | 171.67787 |
| 2 3 4   | 14367.30 | 173.13943 |
| 1 2     | 14409.22 | 215.06168 |
| 1 2 4   | 14410.98 | 216.82145 |
| 1 3     | 14563.71 | 369.55351 |
| 1 3 4   | 14565.71 | 371.55212 |
| 2       | 14599.55 | 405.39275 |
| 2 4     | 14600.59 | 406.43284 |
| 1       | 14636.97 | 442.80822 |
| 1 4     | 14638.95 | 444.78763 |
| 3       | 14748.97 | 554.80763 |
| 3 4     | 14750.71 | 556.55346 |
| 0       | 14836.01 | 641.84666 |
| 4       | 14837.57 | 643.40921 |

The results of the best-fitting formation model of the STERGM with the most individual-level variables fit to the data from 2000-2017.

---

Summary of model fit

---

Formula:  $y_{\text{form}} \sim \text{edges} + \text{nodecov}(\text{"meandist"}) + \text{absdiff}(\text{"popularity"}) + \text{absdiff}(\text{"followers"}) + \text{nodematch}(\text{"gender"}, \text{diff} = \text{TRUE})$   
 <environment: 0x1ad107308>

Iterations: 10 out of 20

Monte Carlo MLE Results:

|                     | Estimate   | Std. Error | MCMC % | z value  | Pr(> z )    |
|---------------------|------------|------------|--------|----------|-------------|
| edges               | -8.530e+00 | 7.639e-02  | 0      | -111.660 | < 1e-04 *** |
| nodecov.meandist    | -3.907e-09 | 1.702e-08  | 0      | -0.230   | 0.81847     |
| absdiff.popularity  | -4.764e-02 | 2.799e-03  | 0      | -17.022  | < 1e-04 *** |
| absdiff.followers   | 1.726e-07  | 9.188e-09  | 0      | 18.786   | < 1e-04 *** |
| nodematch.gender.-1 | 8.030e-01  | 3.605e-01  | 0      | 2.227    | 0.02592 *   |
| nodematch.gender.0  | -7.953e-01 | 2.582e-01  | 0      | -3.080   | 0.00207 **  |
| nodematch.gender.1  | 8.877e-01  | 7.878e-02  | 0      | 11.269   | < 1e-04 *** |

Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Null Deviance: 7195553 on 5190494 degrees of freedom  
 Residual Deviance: 14182 on 5190487 degrees of freedom

AIC: 14196 BIC: 14290 (Smaller is better.)

The results of the goodness-of-fit analysis of the formation model of the STERGM with the most individual-level variables fit to the data from 2000-2017 are below.

Goodness-of-fit for degree

|    | obs   | min   | mean     | max MC | p-value |
|----|-------|-------|----------|--------|---------|
| 0  | 11179 | 10679 | 10811.81 | 10930  | 0.00    |
| 1  | 1507  | 1878  | 2005.54  | 2115   | 0.00    |
| 2  | 371   | 313   | 351.05   | 398    | 0.24    |
| 3  | 130   | 76    | 88.47    | 104    | 0.00    |
| 4  | 68    | 17    | 25.10    | 31     | 0.00    |
| 5  | 26    | 3     | 7.85     | 13     | 0.00    |
| 6  | 5     | 0     | 1.94     | 6      | 0.06    |
| 7  | 5     | 0     | 1.94     | 3      | 0.00    |
| 8  | 0     | 0     | 0.26     | 2      | 1.00    |
| 9  | 2     | 0     | 0.04     | 1      | 0.00    |
| 10 | 1     | 0     | 0.00     | 0      | 0.00    |

Goodness-of-fit for edgewise shared partner

|      | obs  | min  | mean    | max MC | p-value |
|------|------|------|---------|--------|---------|
| esp0 | 1176 | 1324 | 1379.71 | 1458   | 0       |
| esp1 | 294  | 144  | 144.42  | 147    | 0       |
| esp2 | 75   | 35   | 36.03   | 37     | 0       |
| esp3 | 22   | 10   | 10.02   | 11     | 0       |

Goodness-of-fit for minimum geodesic distance

|     | obs      | min      | mean        | max MC   | p-value |
|-----|----------|----------|-------------|----------|---------|
| 1   | 1567     | 1514     | 1570.18     | 1648     | 0.90    |
| 2   | 1189     | 607      | 677.37      | 735      | 0.00    |
| 3   | 1107     | 320      | 373.55      | 436      | 0.00    |
| 4   | 950      | 177      | 225.67      | 286      | 0.00    |
| 5   | 658      | 83       | 123.00      | 177      | 0.00    |
| 6   | 380      | 37       | 69.22       | 125      | 0.00    |
| 7   | 182      | 15       | 39.00       | 82       | 0.00    |
| 8   | 79       | 3        | 19.09       | 47       | 0.00    |
| 9   | 16       | 1        | 8.26        | 34       | 0.22    |
| 10  | 1        | 0        | 2.59        | 14       | 1.00    |
| 11  | 0        | 0        | 0.58        | 7        | 1.00    |
| 12  | 0        | 0        | 0.12        | 4        | 1.00    |
| 13  | 0        | 0        | 0.02        | 1        | 1.00    |
| Inf | 88352442 | 88355141 | 88355462.35 | 88355763 | 0.00    |

Goodness-of-fit for model statistics

|                     | obs           | min           | mean          | max MC       | p-value |
|---------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------|
| edges               | 1567.00       | 1514.00       | 1570.18       | 1.648000e+03 | 0.90    |
| nodecov.meandist    | -52499302.28  | -196776194.24 | -55329463.86  | 1.010890e+08 | 0.96    |
| absdiff.popularity  | 25911.58      | 24355.87      | 25912.42      | 2.714093e+04 | 0.98    |
| absdiff.followers   | 2958736083.69 | 2685506866.45 | 2938426320.54 | 3.215706e+09 | 0.86    |
| nodematch.gender.-1 | 16.00         | 10.00         | 16.04         | 2.400000e+01 | 1.00    |
| nodematch.gender.0  | 31.00         | 23.00         | 31.33         | 4.200000e+01 | 1.00    |
| nodematch.gender.1  | 1012.00       | 956.00        | 1014.21       | 1.069000e+03 | 0.94    |

The results of the formation models of the STERGM with all individual-level variables assuming different transition years. The top and bottom tables show the results for before and after each transition year. The number of unique artists in each time period is included in the second row. Regardless of the transition year, mean distance and gender (F and M) had the same significance pattern and direction of effect observed in the main analysis. The results for popularity only varied from the main analysis in the first time period when the transition year was 1994 or 1996, which could be the result of lower sample sizes. The results for followers were consistent with the main analysis in the second time period, but fluctuated dramatically across transition years in the first time period.

|               | Pre-1994<br>n = 205 |         | Pre-1996<br>n = 286 |         | Pre-1998<br>n = 370 |         | Pre-2000<br>n = 450 |         |
|---------------|---------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|
|               | Estimate            | p-value | Estimate            | p-value | Estimate            | p-value | Estimate            | p-value |
| Mean Distance | -2.0e-07            | 9.0e-04 | -1.0e-07            | 1.1e-02 | -1.1e-07            | 3.2e-03 | -1.3e-07            | 1.3e-04 |
| Popularity    | -5.1e-03            | 2.9e-01 | -5.9e-03            | 1.6e-01 | -1.2e-02            | 1.5e-03 | -1.6e-02            | 8.4e-07 |
| Followers     | -2.3e-07            | 8.0e-03 | -2.4e-07            | 1.9e-03 | -8.3e-08            | 5.5e-02 | 1.2e-08             | 6.4e-01 |
| Gender (F)    | 1.5e+00             | 1.0e-02 | 1.3e+00             | 3.1e-02 | 1.3e+00             | 1.3e-02 | 1.9e+00             | 4.9e-09 |
| Gender (M)    | 5.8e-02             | 7.3e-01 | 2.6e-01             | 7.4e-02 | 4.7e-01             | 1.4e-04 | 5.3e-01             | 2.0e-06 |
|               | Pre-2002<br>n = 520 |         | Pre-2004<br>n = 593 |         | Pre-2006<br>n = 659 |         |                     |         |
|               | Estimate            | p-value | Estimate            | p-value | Estimate            | p-value |                     |         |
|               | -1.1e-07            | 1.6e-04 | -1.2e-07            | 1.2e-05 | -1.1e-07            | 2.0e-05 |                     |         |
|               | -1.8e-02            | 1.7e-09 | -2.0e-02            | 9.9e-13 | -2.2e-02            | 4.4e-17 |                     |         |
|               | 2.8e-08             | 2.0e-01 | 3.9e-08             | 4.3e-02 | 4.6e-08             | 8.0e-03 |                     |         |
|               | 1.8e+00             | 5.1e-09 | 1.7e+00             | 6.1e-08 | 1.5e+00             | 1.6e-06 |                     |         |
|               | 5.7e-01             | 2.0e-08 | 6.7e-01             | 5.8e-13 | 6.7e-01             | 7.5e-15 |                     |         |

|               |           |         |           |         |           |         |           |         |
|---------------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|
|               | Post-1994 |         | Post-1996 |         | Post-1998 |         | Post-2000 |         |
|               | n = 876   |         | n = 836   |         | n = 781   |         | n = 725   |         |
|               | Estimate  | p-value | Estimate  | p-value | Estimate  | p-value | Estimate  | p-value |
| Mean Distance | -2.0e-08  | 2.1e-01 | -2.2e-08  | 1.7e-01 | -9.3e-09  | 5.8e-01 | -3.9e-09  | 8.2e-01 |
| Popularity    | -4.3e-02  | 9.3e-72 | -4.4e-02  | 2.4e-70 | -4.7e-02  | 1.7e-68 | -4.8e-02  | 5.7e-65 |
| Followers     | 1.6e-07   | 2.6e-74 | 1.6e-07   | 1.6e-77 | 1.7e-07   | 1.1e-75 | 1.7e-07   | 9.9e-79 |
| Gender (F)    | 1.3e+00   | 3.7e-07 | 1.3e+00   | 9.2e-07 | 8.3e-01   | 1.4e-02 | 8.0e-01   | 2.6e-02 |
| Gender (M)    | 8.9e-01   | 7.3e-37 | 9.0e-01   | 2.0e-35 | 8.6e-01   | 2.8e-30 | 8.9e-01   | 1.9e-29 |
|               | Post-2002 |         | Post-2004 |         | Post-2006 |         |           |         |
|               | n = 667   |         | n = 607   |         | n = 544   |         |           |         |
|               | Estimate  | p-value | Estimate  | p-value | Estimate  | p-value |           |         |
|               | 1.2e-09   | 9.4e-01 | 1.7e-08   | 3.4e-01 | 2.2e-08   | 2.6e-01 |           |         |
|               | -4.9e-02  | 3.4e-61 | -5.3e-02  | 2.4e-58 | -5.5e-02  | 3.1e-52 |           |         |
|               | 1.8e-07   | 3.2e-77 | 1.9e-07   | 1.9e-81 | 2.0e-07   | 1.2e-83 |           |         |
|               | 8.7e-01   | 1.5e-02 | 9.7e-01   | 7.6e-03 | 1.2e+00   | 1.4e-03 |           |         |
|               | 8.6e-01   | 1.5e-25 | 8.4e-01   | 4.7e-21 | 9.2e-01   | 5.6e-21 |           |         |