Online Appendix to "Public Opinion on Human Rights in Putin-era Russia: Continuities, Changes, and Sources of Variation," by Theodore P. Gerber, in *The Journal of Human Rights*.

Data

In the early 2000s I conducted a series of polls in Russia with Sarah Mendelson and the Center for Strategic and International Studies about human rights and related issues (see Gerber and Mendelson 2002, 2008a, 2008b). Some of this research was part of a project to support Russian human rights NGOs' use of survey data in crafting their programs (Mendelson and Gerber 2007). The first four surveys (conducted 2001-2004) for the present article came out of that collaboration. So did the 2010 "Memory" survey, which focused especially on how respondents perceive human rights issues related to the Soviet past. The four "Democracy International Russian Election Surveys" (DIRES) were successive waves of a survey I conducted on behalf of Democracy International, a Washington DC-based consulting firm. These surveys covered a range of political and social topics, and they were designed to follow public opinion in Russia over the course of the December 2011 parliamentary ("Duma") election, and the March 2012 presidential election. Accordingly the waves were timed to precede and then immediately follow each election, and are conveniently labeled based on their relationship to the nearest election (e.g. pre-Duma, post-Duma, etc.) The final survey is part of the Comparative Housing Experiences and Social Stability (CHESS) survey, which I carried out in collaboration with Jane Zavisca in spring 2015.

[Table A1 here]

All ten surveys were conducted by the same Moscow-based survey research company, currently known as the Levada Analytic Center. All used stratified, multistage, clustered sampling procedures to obtain nationally representative probability samples of the adult Russian population, with the selection of dwellings within secondary sampling units accomplished using

random walk algorithms and the selection of adult respondents within households accomplished using the "nearest birthday" method. The interviews were conducted face-to-face by professional interviewers, and standard quality control procedures used to verify that interviewers followed protocols. A randomly selected 10% of the respondents were contacted by phone or mail by field supervisors to verify the correct application of random walk procedures, selection of the right respondent within a household, and the complete implementation of the questionnaire.

The age ranges of the target population varied somewhat across surveys. Because we are interested in change over time in population characteristics we must limit the population to those consistently included in all surveys, namely 20-59 year olds. The third and fourth DIRES survey included oversamples of Moscow residents and the CHESS oversampled residents of four predominantly Muslim provinces. Therefore, we use data weights to correct for the overrepresentation of the corresponding groups in those samples, as well as minor deviations of marginal distributions of gender, age, education, and locality type (urban versus rural) from population parameters. The weights insure that random sampling fluctuations (as well as designed oversamples) are not the driving factors behind any of the patters of change over time evident in our results.

Measures of covariates

Education is measured using dummy variables suitable for Russia, which has a "specialized" form of secondary-level education (higher than general secondary but lower than university) that prepares graduates for low-level professional jobs (such as lab technician) and a "lower vocational" degree that imparts skills in manual trades, often in combination with a formal general secondary degree. Household income is measured in quintiles, with a separate category for respondents who declined to state their household income. The "work status" measures are

dummy variables for self-employment, work for the military or police, and non-employment. Finer distinctions among those not working and more precise occupational categories cannot be used due to differences in questions across surveys.

Statistical Results

Table A2 shows the additive multinomial logistic regression models for support for civil rights (consisting of the preferred models reported in Table 3 minus the interaction terms that show change over time). The additive models are substantively similar to the interaction models, and the model for support for civil liberties shows significant improvement in fit when the interaction terms are incorporated in the model. Also, collapsing the income measure into a single dummy variable denoting the top three income quintiles (as in the preferred model reported in Table 3) is optimal, as this more parsimonious specification of the relationship between family income and support for civil right fits the data as well as the more detailed five-category measure.

Table A3 shows the average marginal effects implied by the multinomial logistic regression model for views of foreign funding of environmental NGOs. These results are very similar to those reported in Table 4, which pertain to the model for views of foreign funding of election-monitoring NGOs.

Appendix Table 1. National surveys including measures of support for human rights in Russia

Survey Project	Date	Valid N, rights questions	Valid N, NGO questions
CSIS Human Rights Project	October 2001	1,618	
CSIS Human Rights Project	May 2002	1,601	
CSIS Human Rights Project	January 2003	1,621	
CSIS Human Rights Project	July 2004	1,629	
Memory Survey	January 2010	2,009	
Democracy International Russian Election Surveys (DIRES): Pre-Duma	November 2011	883	
Democracy International Russian Election Surveys (DIRES): Post-Duma	December 2011	856	
Democracy International Russian Election Surveys (DIRES): Pre-Presidential	February 2012	1,006	797
Democracy International Russian Election Surveys (DIRES): Post-Presidential	March-April 2012		795
Comparative Housing Experiences and Social Stability (CHESS)	January-May 2015		2401
Total		11,223	3,993

Appendix Table 2. Alternative (additive) Models, Multinomial Logistic Regressions, Support for Civil and Material Rights in Russia, 2001-2012 *(Source:* pooled surveys, N=11223)

Dependent variable	***Civil Rights***				***Material Rights***			
Outome	**Strong support**		**No support**		**Strong support**		**No support**	
	B	**rse**	**B**	**rse**	**B**	**rse**	**B**	**rse**
Education (general secondary)								
University	.258 **	.100	-.267 **	.104	.006	.075	.091	.253
Specialized sec.	.211 **	.096	-.023	.101	.107	.073	.538 **	.243
Lower vocational	.057	.116	-.139	.115	.094	.085	.282	.312
Less than sec.	.193	.171	.231	.156	-.003	.122	.943 **	.361
Woman	-.095	.066	-.096	.073	-.071	.052	.277	.180
Age(-20)	.004	.003	-.003	.003	.007 **	.002	-.019 **	.008
Household income quintile (bottom)								
Second	-.049	.132	-.020	.128	-.016	.096	-.278	.338
Third	.059	.126	-.191	.134	.051	.097	-.229	.327
Fourth	.044	.130	-.141	.138	-.096	.098	-.382	.350
Top	.051	.140	-.201	.149	.001	.107	-.190	.405
Top three								
Missing	.180	.132	.013	.136	.043	.102	.509	.320
Work status (working for hire)								
Self-employed	-.043	.194	-.415	.210	-.102	.141	-.593	.484
Military/police	-.011	.392	.132	.359	.006	.298	.506	.813
Not working	.075	.074	.093	.078	.047	.057	.364 **	.181
Moscow	.050	.104	-.174	.124	-.035	.083	.111	.338
St.Petersburg	.376	.171	-.418 *	.223	-.066	.149	-.094	.787
Other large city	-.114	.090	-.120	.096	-.001	.069	.539 **	.207
Rural/village	-.148 *	.085	-.175	.092	-.008	.065	.242	.230
Household size	.008	.028	-.020	.030	.023	.022	-.183 **	.079
Year (2004)								
2001	-.165	.146	.463 **	.128	-.678 **	.101	-.032	.513
2002	-.118	.134	.078	.129	-.238 **	.098	.098	.503
2003	-.084	.139	-.010	.138	-.379 **	.099	-.799	.605
2010	.625 **	.112	.057	.121	-.426 **	.088	.525	.449
2011	.410 **	.113	-.313 **	.126	-.407 **	.089	.487	.452
2012	.631 **	.136	-.527 **	.169	-.165	.110	.612	.504
Constant	-1.779 *	.179	-1.042 **	.195	.221	.139	-3.344 **	.606
Log-likelihood	-9146.5				-8158.4			

*p < .05, one-tailed **p < .05, two-tailed

Table A3. Average Marginal Effects from Multinomial Logistic Regression Model for Support for Foreign Funding of Environmental NGOs

	Support		*Indifferent*		*Oppose*	
Education (general secondary)						
University	-.014	.028	-.082 **	.027	.097 **	.026
Specialized sec.	-.037	.028	-.053 **	.026	.089 **	.026
Lower vocational	.009	.042	-.002	.036	-.006	.040
Less than sec.	-.064	.066	-.044	.059	.108 *	.057
Woman	.035 *	.019	.019	.018	-.053 **	.017
Age(-18)	-.001	.001	.000	.001	.001	.001
Income quintile (bottom)						
Second quintile	-.037	.032	.062 **	.030	-.025	.029
Third quintile	.050	.032	.021	.029	-.071 **	.027
Fourth quintile	.055	.035	-.051 *	.030	-.004	.031
Top quintile	.067	.043	.019	.040	-.086 **	.035
Income missing	-.052	.032	.114 **	.031	-.061 **	.029
Work status (working for hire)						
Self-employed	-.054	.046	.021	.043	.033	.035
Military/Police	-.018	.106	-.001	.103	.019	.113
Not working	-.048 **	.021	.026	.020	.022	.019
Locality type (medium city or small town)						
Moscow	.122 **	.036	-.017	.035	-.105 **	.035
St.Petersburg	.044	.053	-.090	.057	.047	.053
Other large city	.007	.026	-.043 *	.025	.036	.022
Rural/village	-.019	.024	-.007	.022	.026	.021
Household size	-.013 *	.007	-.007	.007	.020 **	.006
2015 vs. 2012	-.284 **	.021	.125 **	.019	.159 **	.017

*p < .05, one-tailed **p < .05, two-tailed