

APPENDIX

Author(s): Hege Stein Helland; Siri Hansen Pedersen & Marit Skivenes

Title of publication: Comparing population view's on state responsibility for children in vulnerable situations – the role of institutional context and demographic characteristics.

Year: In Press

Journal / Publisher: Journal of public child welfare.

Innhold

Education variable.....	2
The five statements.....	2
Table 1.0A Correlation between the five statements.....	2
Table 2.0A. A two-sample t-test was used to test for significant differences in mean values from table 2 in the manuscript (0.01 significant level).	2
Descriptive statistics of analysis sample	3
Table 3.0A. Summary statistics (mean and standard deviation) of the samples used in the regression analysis.	3
Predicted probability based on ordered logistic regression model with pooled sample (table 3 in paper).	4
Table 4.0A. Predicted probability of being from one of the four countries on strongly disagree-strongly agree with each statement.....	4
Ordered logistic regression analysis for each country	5
Table 5.1A Ordered logistic models with the sample from Norway.	5
Table 5.2A. Ordered logistic models with the sample from Finland.	5
Table 5.3A. Ordered logistic models with the sample from England.	6
Table 5.4A. Ordered logistic models with the sample from California, US.	6

Education variable

Textbox – Education variable

Education is measured as a binary variable distinguishing between higher education (1) and no high education (0). This binary distinction is made to overcome challenges with comparability between the four countries school systems and thus different wording of the question relating to education. The higher education category (1) is an academic degree beyond high school education; Bachelor's/undergraduate degree (university/college 1-3 year); Master's degree (university/college/graduate school 4+ years); or Doctorate/professor degree (university/college/graduate school 5+ years). The no higher education (0) category indicates individuals that have either completed primary, secondary or further education (which is not an academic degree). A limitation with the education measure is that individuals outside the school system are not included. Respondent could choose the response category "other", and a total of 106 respondents did this. However, why they choose this category could be something different than being outside the school systems and is therefore treated as missing value (which is 106 observations).

The five statements

Table 1.0A Correlation between the five statements

	S1 Neglect	S2 Service	S3 Care order	S4 Well-being	S5 Work
S1 Neglect	1				
S2 Service	.279	1			
S3 Care order	.637	.323	1		
S4 Well-being	.378	.535	.410	1	
S5 Work	.372	.473	.453	.673	1

Table 2.0A. A two-sample t-test was used to test for significant differences in mean values from table 2 in the manuscript (0.01 significant level).

Statement	Significant difference between
Neglect (S1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Norway differs from Finland/England/CA,USA ○ Finland differs from England/CA, USA ○ England differs from CA, USA
Service (S2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Norway differs from England/USA ○ Finland differs from CA, USA ○ England differs from CA, USA
Care order (S3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Norway differs from Finland/England/CA, USA ○ England differs from Finland/CA, USA
Well-Being (S4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ England differs from Finland/CA, USA
Work (S5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Norway differs from Finland/England ○ CA, USA differs from /England

Descriptive statistics of analysis sample

Table 3.0A. Summary statistics (mean and standard deviation) of the samples used in the regression analysis.

Variable	Pooled sample (n=2439)	Norway (n=802)	Finland (n=528)	England (n=468)	California, US (n=613)
S1Neglect	3.37 (1.07)	3.65 (.889)	3.34 (1.04)	3.06 (1.09)	3.28 (1.22)
S2Service	4.26 (.785)	4.32 (.779)	4.29 (.786)	4.22 (.716)	4.19 (.836)
S3Careorder	3.05 (1.17)	3.11 (1.112)	2.84 (1.17)	3.27 (1.05)	2.99 (1.31)
S4Wellbeing	3.99 (.833)	3.98 (.788)	3.90 (.862)	4.10 (.776)	3.98 (.916)
S5Work	3.67 (.929)	3.62 (.83)	3.71 (.934)	3.73 (.878)	3.66 (1.01)
Gender Male/Female=1	.474 (.499)	.462 (.498)	.488 (.500)	.483 (.500)	.471 (.499)
Age	47.5 (16.68)	50.3 (16.66)	49.1 (16.4)	44.05 (17.52)	45.27 (15.41)
Child under 18 No/Yes=1	.332 (.471)	.279 (.448)	.331 (.471)	.342 (.475)	.393 (.488)
Education No higer/Higher=1	.276 (.447)	.339 (.473)	.234 (.424)	.161 (.368)	.324 (.468)
Ideology Left/Centre/Right=3	2.18 (.774)	2.03 (.891)	2.03 (.808)	2.21 (.659)	2.47 (.546)

Predicted probability based on ordered logistic regression model with pooled sample (table 3 in paper).

Table 4.0A. Predicted probability of being from one of the four countries on strongly disagree-strongly agree with each statement.

		Norway	Finland	England	California, US
S1 Neglect	Strongly disagree	2% (.020)	3% (.004)	4% (.006)	3% (.004)
	Disagree	14% (.009)	20% (.013)	27% (.016)	22% (.013)
	Neither/nor	24% (.009)	28% (.010)	30% (.010)	29% (.010)
	Agree	38% (.011)	34% (.013)	28% (.014)	32% (.013)
	Strongly agree	20% (.012)	14% (.011)	9% (.008)	12% (.010)
S2 Service	Strongly disagree	1% (.001)	1% (.001)	1% (.002)	1% (.002)
	Disagree	2% (.002)	2% (.002)	2% (.003)	2% (.003)
	Neither/nor	8% (.006)	9% (.007)	10% (.008)	10% (.008)
	Agree	43% (.013)	44% (.014)	46% (.014)	47% (.013)
	Strongly agree	45% (.017)	45% (.021)	40% (.211)	39% (.019)
S3 Care order	Strongly disagree	8% (.007)	12% (.010)	6% (.006)	10% (.008)
	Disagree	24% (.011)	29% (.013)	19% (.011)	26% (.013)
	Neither/nor	31% (.009)	30% (.009)	30% (.009)	30% (.009)
	Agree	23% (.010)	19% (.011)	26% (.011)	21% (.011)
	Strongly agree	14% (.009)	10% (.008)	18% (.013)	12% (.009)
S4 Well being	Strongly disagree	1% (.001)	1% (.002)	0.5% (.001)	1% (.001)
	Disagree	6% (.005)	7% (.006)	4% (.004)	5% (.005)
	Neither/nor	15% (.009)	16% (.011)	11% (.009)	14% (.010)
	Agree	53% (.010)	53% (.010)	51% (.012)	53% (.010)
	Strongly agree	24% (.013)	23% (.015)	33% (.019)	28% (.017)
S5 Work	Strongly disagree	1% (.002)	1% (.002)	1% (.001)	1% (.002)
	Disagree	11% (.008)	9% (.007)	8% (.007)	9% (.008)
	Neither/nor	30% (.012)	26% (.013)	24% (.013)	27% (.013)
	Agree	41% (.011)	44% (.011)	45% (.011)	43% (.011)
	Strongly agree	15% (.010)	20% (.014)	21% (.015)	18% (.013)

Note: Predicted probabilities are based on the ordered logistic regression models from table 3. All other variables are held at their mean value—standard errors in parentheses.

Ordered logistic regression analysis for each country

Table 5.1A Ordered logistic models with the sample from Norway.

Norway	S1 Neglect (1)	S2 Service (2)	S3 Care order (3)	S4 Well-being (4)	S5 Work (5)
Gender (Female)	.056 (.133)	.433*** (.139)	-.039 (.130)	.252* (.138)	.200 (.132)
Age	.011** (.004)	.007 (.004)	.013*** (.004)	.009** (.004)	.013*** (.004)
Child u18 (Yes)	-.008 (.158)	.059 (.164)	-.093 (.153)	-.112 (.166)	-.024 (.159)
Education (Higher)	.184 (.140)	.253* (.146)	.089 (.136)	.059 (.145)	.127 (.140)
Ideology					
Left-wing	ref. category	ref. category	ref. category	ref. category	ref. category
Centrist	-.238* (.178)	-.174 (.185)	-.156 (.173)	-.393** (.186)	-.269 (.178)
Right-wing	-.002 (.150)	-.058 (.155)	-.023 (.145)	-.093 (.154)	-.008 (.148)
N	802	802	802	802	802
R-squared	0.007	0.013	0.006	0.009	0.008
Prob > Chi²	0.025	0.013	0.019	0.0929	0.013

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Note: Coefficient (std. dev.).

Table 5.2A. Ordered logistic models with the sample from Finland.

Finland	S1 Neglect (1)	S2 Service (2)	S3 Care order (3)	S4 Well-being (4)	S5 Work (5)
Gender (Female)	-.037 (.159)	.938*** (.173)	-.209 (.175)	.469*** (.136)	.200 (.164)
Age	.020*** (.002)	.017*** (.006)	.018*** (.005)	.013** (.006)	.012** (.005)
Child u18 (Yes)	.002 (.181)	.196 (.196)	-.026 (.181)	-.048 (.192)	-.037 (.188)
Education (Higher)	-.489** (.190)	.139 (.204)	-.107 (.184)	.024 (.221)	.201 (.196)
Ideology					
Left-wing	ref. category	ref. category	ref. category	ref. category	ref. category
Centrist	.513*** (.197)	-.283 (.213)	.297 (.195)	-.012 (.209)	.052 (.202)
Right-wing	.668*** (.197)	-.073 (.212)	.636*** (.196)	-.088 (.207)	.237 (.203)
N	528	528	528	528	528
R-squared	0.024	0.038	0.018	0.011	0.009
Prob > Chi²	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.030	0.054

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Note: Coefficient (std. dev.).

Table 5.3A. Ordered logistic models with the sample from England.

England	S1 Neglect (1)	S2 Service (2)	S3 Care order (3)	S4 Well-being (4)	S5 Work (5)
Gender (Female)	-.359** (.163)	.615*** (.175)	-.588*** (.173)	-.076 (.183)	.113 (.167)
Age	.003 (.005)	.012** (.006)	.001 (.005)	.011* (.006)	.007 (.005)
Child u18 (Yes)	.320* (.185)	.068 (.197)	.285 (.184)	-.131 (.198)	-.040 (.190)
Education (Higher)	.613*** (.223)	.072 (.237)	.217 (.220)	.203 (.239)	.413* (.232)
Ideology					
Left-wing	ref. category	ref. category	ref. category	ref. category	ref. category
Centrist	-.088 (.257)	-.104 (.269)	.096 (.253)	.216 (.266)	.088 (.258)
Right-wing	.452 (.281)	.103 (.291)	.216 (.277)	.466 (.288)	.256 (.281)
N	496	496	496	496	496
R-squared	0.017	0.018	0.012	0.012	0.006
Prob > Chi²	0.000	0.005	0.007	0.040	0.236

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Note: Coefficient (std. dev.).

Table 5.4A. Ordered logistic models with the sample from California, US.

California, US	S1 Neglect (1)	S2 Service (2)	S3 Care order (3)	S4 Well-being (4)	S5 Work (5)
Gender (Female)	-.359** (.163)	.615*** (.175)	-.588*** (.173)	-.076 (.183)	.113 (.167)
Age	.003 (.005)	.012** (.006)	.001 (.005)	.011* (.006)	.007 (.005)
Child u18 (Yes)	.320* (.185)	.068 (.197)	.285 (.184)	-.131 (.198)	-.040 (.190)
Education (Higher)	.613*** (.223)	.072 (.237)	.217 (.220)	.203 (.239)	.413* (.232)
Ideology					
Left-wing	ref. category	ref. category	ref. category	ref. category	ref. category
Centrist	-.088 (.257)	-.104 (.269)	.096 (.253)	.216 (.266)	.088 (.258)
Right-wing	.452 (.281)	.103 (.291)	.216 (.277)	.466 (.288)	.256 (.281)
N	496	496	496	496	496
R-squared	0.017	0.018	0.012	0.012	0.006
Prob > Chi²	0.000	0.005	0.007	0.040	0.236

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Note: Coefficient (std. dev.).