

APPENDIX

Author(s): Jill Duerr Berrick, Marit Skivenes & Joseph N. Roscoe

Title of publication: Public perceptions of child protection, children's rights, and personal values: An assessment of two states Year: 2023

Journal / Publisher: Children and Youth Services Review

Contents


Table A1: Overview of samples for three treatments (low risk X1, medium risk X2, high risk X3)	. 2
Table A2: Mean variations, standard error of mean, and N, based on the different types of treatments. Total and per country. Four	
point Likert scale from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (4)	. 6
Table A3: Multiple Mediator Model: Indirect Effects of Age and Immigrant Status on Parents' Rights	. 7



Variable	Treatments		Norw	Norway		USA (California)	
	1 reatments		Number	%	Number	%	
	Lorra riala (V1)	Male	168	50	204	56	
	Low risk (X1)	Female	171	50	158	44	
Caralan		Male	175	54	200	53	
Gender	Medium risk (X2)	Female	148	46	177	47	
		Male	187	51	190	50	
	High risk (X3)	Female	182	49	188	50	
	Low risk (X1)	Smaller city/rural area	217	64	144	40	
		Larger city	122	36	218	60	
	Medium risk (X2)	Smaller city/rural area	219	68	156	41	
Metropolitan area		Larger city	104	32	221	59	
	High risk (X3)	Smaller city/rural area	230	62	154	41	
		Larger city	139	38	224	59	
		Unemployment	111	34	121	33	
Job status	Low risk (X1)	Employment	215	66	241	67	
		Unemployment	110	36	128	34	
	Medium risk (X2)	Employment	199	64	249	66	
	High risk (X3)	Unemployment	113	32	140	37	
		Employment	236	68	238	63	

Table A1: Overview of samples for three treatments (low risk X1, medium risk X2, high risk X3)








		Left	101	40	170	56
	Low risk (X1)	Center	62	25	13	4
		Right	88	35	121	40
		Left	117	49	178	57
Political orientation	Medium risk (X2)	Center	53	22	16	5
		Right	70	29	119	38
		Left	123	46	187	60
	High risk (X3)	Center	60	22	15	5
		Right	86	32	109	35
	Low risk (X1)	No partner	108	33	147	41
		Partner	220	67	215	59
Domestic partner status	Medium risk (X2)	No partner	100	32	180	48
Domestic partice status		Partner	217	68	197	52
	High risk (X3)	No partner	125	35	181	48
	right lisk (XS)	Partner	234	65	197	52
		No education/Lower education	105	31	37	10
	Low risk (X1)	Average education	175	52	243	67
Education Level		Higher education	57	17	82	23
		No education/Lower education	90	28	48	13
	Medium risk (X2)	Average education	189	59	238	63
		Higher education	40	13	91	24





VERSI	
	3
	Ś
12	5
GEN)

		No education/Lower education	102	28	51	13
	High risk (X3)	Average education	210	58	240	63
		Higher education	52	14	87	23
	Low risk (X1)	No religion	132	40	99	28
	LOW IISK (AI)	Have religion	197	60	249	72
Religion	Medium risk (X2)	No religion	139	44	111	31
Kengion	Witchulli lisk (A2)	Have religion	176	56	250	69
	High risk (X3)	No religion	163	46	113	32
	Then tisk (XS)	Have religion	191	54	245	68
	Low risk (X1)	Non-migrant	322	95	289	80
		Migrant	17	5	73	20
Immigration status	Medium risk (X2)	Non-migrant	306	95	309	82
ininigration status		Migrant	17	5	68	18
	High risk (X3)	Non-migrant	356	96	299	79
		Migrant	13	4	79	21
		Low income	35	13	107	33
	Low risk (X1)	Average income	162	59	98	31
Income Level		High income	79	29	115	36
		Low income	33	13	100	30
	Medium risk (X2)	Average income	137	52	107	32
		High income	93	35	126	38



UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN



		Low income	41	13	110	34
	High risk (X3)	Average income	183	58	106	33
		High income	89	28	109	34
		Younger (18-34)	60	18	110	30
	Low risk (X1)	Mid-age (35-54)	129	38	119	33
		54+	150	44	133	37
		Younger (18-34)	60	19	129	34
Age	Medium risk (X2)	Mid-age (35-54)	122	38	133	35
		54+	141	44	115	31
		Younger (18-34)	63	17	130	34
	High risk (X3)	Mid-age (35-54)	149	40	133	35
		54+	157	43	115	30
	Low risk (V1)	No child	231	68	235	65
Children	Low risk (X1)	Have children	108	32	127	35
	Modium rich (X2)	No child	205	63	236	63
	Medium risk (X2)	Have children	118	37	141	37
		No child	267	72	236	62
	High risk (X3)	Have children	102	28	142	38




Table A2: Mean variations, standard error of mean, and N, based on the different types of treatments. Total and per country. Four point Likert scale from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (4)

Treatment Groups	Rights Statements	Total	Norway	USA (California)
	As the parent, Julie should	1.99	1.75	2.21
	have more rights than the	(0.80)	(0.65)	(0.86)
	baby	701	339	362
		2.86	2.83	2.89
Low	The baby should have the same rights as Julie	(0.81)	(0.81)	(0.82)
	same rights as june	701	339	362
	The baby should have more rights than Julie because of his vulnerability	2.89	3.08	2.71
		(0.88)	(0.86)	(0.87)
		701	339	362
	As the parent, Julie should	2.00	1.81	2.16
	have more rights than the	(0.74)	(0.63)	(0.79)
	baby	700	323	377
	The baby should have the same rights as Julie	2.80	2.83	2.77
Medium risk		(0.79)	(0.78)	(0.80)
115K	same rights as june	700	323	377
	The baby should have more	2.87	3.08	2.69
	rights than Julie because of	(0.86)	(0.83)	(0.84)
	his vulnerability	700	323	377







	As the parent, Julie should have more rights than the	1.96 (0.74)	1.75 (0.63)	2.15 (0.78)
	baby	747	369	378
High risk s	The baby should have the same rights as Julie	2.84	2.87	2.81
		(0.79)	(0.76)	(0.82)
		747	369	378
	The baby should have more rights than Julie because of his vulnerability	2.90	3.07	2.73
		(0.85)	(0.83)	(0.84)
		747	369	378

Table A3: Multiple Mediator Model: Indirect Effects of Age and Immigrant Status on Parents' Rights

	OR	95% CI	% Total Effect
Direct Effect	0.59***	(0.51, 0.68)	73%
Total Indirect Effect	0.82***	(0.76, 0.88)	27%
Age	0.96**	(0.93, 0.99)	5%
Migrant Status	0.85***	(0.78, 0.93)	22%
Total Effect	0.48***	(0.42, 0.55)	100%

Notes. Bootstrapped standard errors (reps=1,000)

** *p*≤0.01

*** *p*≤0.00

