APPENDIX

Author(s): Kenneth Burns, Hege Stein Helland, Katrin Križ, Sagrario Segado Sánchez-Cabezudo, Marit Skivenes and Judit Strömpl

Contents

APPENDIX TO BURNS ET AL (2020). CORPORAL PUNISHMENT AND REPORTING TO CHILD PROTECTION AUTHORITIES: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF POPULATION ATTITUDES IN FIVE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

1

Differences in attitudes towards corporal punishment towards a child of migrant versus native background.

Table A1 Significant differences in accept towards corporal punishment towards a child of migrant versus native background.

Two-tailed Independent Samples T-Test. Sig. level: ***= p>.01, **= p>.05. Weighted sample.

	T-test for Equality of Means		
	p-value	**t-value**	**df**
Austria	,265	1,114	996,665
Estonia	,242	-1,171	1066,939
Ireland	,557	-,588	998
Norway	,831	-,214	1000
Spain	,774	-,288	998
Total	,705	-,378	5069

Table A2: Significant differences in attitudes towards reporting corporal punishment towards a child of migrant versus native background.

Two-tailed Independent Samples T-Test. Sig. level: ***= p>.01, **= p>.05. Weighted sample.

	T-test for Equality of Means		
	p-value	**t-value**	**df**
Austria	,945	-,069	998
Estonia	,204	1,272	1063,769
Ireland**	,031	2,161	997,978
Norway	,056	-1,917	998,992
Spain	,722	-,356	998
Total	,616	,501	5069

APPENDIX TO BURNS ET AL (2020). CORPORAL PUNISHMENT AND REPORTING TO CHILD PROTECTION
AUTHORITIES: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF POPULATION ATTITUDES IN FIVE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

2

Differences between countries in attitudes towards acceptance of CP and willingness to see CP reported to the child protection services

Table A3 Significant differences in responses (percent yes) between countries using Zigne (simple random sample, two-tailed).
Sig. level: ***= p>.01, **= p>.05.

	Answer 'Yes' on question:			
	Is the parents' method of punishment acceptable?		Report this matter to the child protection services?	
	T-value	Value	T-value	Value
Austria-Estonia	0.5	3.7[1]	3.3***	5.6
Austria-Ireland	4.7***	5.1	2.9***	5.7
Austria-Norway	6.0***	4.4	1.4	4.3[1]
Austria-Spain	7.7***	5.2	0.8	4.3[1]
Estonia-Ireland	4.3***	5.1	0.3	4.3[1]
Estonia-Norway	6.6***	4.3	4.7***	5.6
Estonia-Spain	7.3***	5.2	2.5**	4.3
Ireland-Norway	10.7***	4.7	4.3***	5.7
Ireland-Spain	2.9***	5.5	2.2**	4.3
Norway-Spain	13.8***	4.8	2.2**	4.3

Data analysis: Logistic regression of rejection of CP and on reporting of CP per country and total.

Binary logistic regression was used to evaluate which demographic variables were predictors to the dependent variables: the rejection or not of CP and whether the school should report the CP or not. Logistic regressions were performed for the five different countries and for the total sample. The introductory method of variables was Forward Selection (Wald) method. The proportion of variance in rejecting CP that could be explained by predictors was assessed based on the Nagelkerke pseudo R square. Variables were considered significant if the p-value was less than 0.05. Odd ratios (OR) and 95 per cent C.I. were reported. The covariates included in the analysis were age, gender, migration background, belonging to a religion, belonging to Christian religion, civil status, having children under

---

[1] Values for 5% significance level. As no significant difference was identified, 1% was not tested.

APPENDIX TO BURNS ET AL (2020). CORPORAL PUNISHMENT AND REPORTING TO CHILD PROTECTION AUTHORITIES: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF POPULATION ATTITUDES IN FIVE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

3

18 years living in the household, occupational status, occupation within the teaching sector, occupation within the health and social services sector, level of education, household income and urbanization. The column labeled OR in Table A4 and A5 indicates the degree to which a significant covariate increases or decreases the likelihood a person will reject CP compared to the reference group (reference value) while other covariates are held constant.

Binary Logistic Regression analysis: Rejection of CP. Significant demographic variables, per country and total.

As can be seen in the table A4, for Austria only two of the demographic variables were significant: *Sex*, which shows that women had more odds of rejecting CP than men (OR = 1.93), and *Adults living with children under 18*, whose odds of rejecting CP were greater than those without children (OR = 1.54). In Estonia, women were three times more likely to reject CP than men (OR = 3.01). In the case of Norway, four of the independent variables were significant and revealed that being a woman quadrupled the odds of rejecting CP (OR = 4.31). The odds were also increased for those that had a high *level of education* (OR = 1.76), were either employed or studying (OR = 1.67). The odds of rejecting CP were double in the case of Norwegian ethnicity (non-immigrants) (OR = 2.28). The results for Spain, show a logistic regression with five significant demographic variables, which are, ranging from greater odds to reject CP to fewer odds: *Adults living with children under 18* doubled the odds than those without children at home (OR = 2.30). The odds were high, too, for people not belonging to a religion (OR = 1.91). In the case of the *Age* variable, there was a divide into three groups (Young: 18–34 years, Middle: 35-54 years, Older: 55+ years): the odds of rejecting CP increased when stepping one unit upwards, from Young to Middle, or Middle to Older (OR = 1.54). The odds for a person *without a partner* (OR = 1.53) was also significant; and finally, the *location size* showed that the odds of rejecting CP are greater when an individual is living in a large city (OR = 1.34). And finally, for Ireland, as in the case of Estonia, only the variable *Sex* was significant, and like in the other countries where this variable was significant, women were more likely to reject CP than men (OR=1.78).

The logistic regression was also ran for the whole sample. In this case, four out of the total demographic variables showed a strong significance: being a woman resulted in more odds of rejecting CP than being a man (OR = 1.88). The next variable in order from more to fewer odds was *Education level*, in which changing one unit up (from Low to Middle, or Middle to Higher) represented an increase in the odds of rejecting CP (OR = 1.35). *Adults living with children under 18* had more odds than those ones without children at home to reject CP (OR = 1.29). Finally, *Age* was also significant, and likewise in the results for Spain, when changing one unit up (from Young to Middle, or Middle to Older), the odds of rejecting CP increased, in this case by 22% (OR = 1.22).

APPENDIX TO BURNS ET AL (2020). CORPORAL PUNISHMENT AND REPORTING TO CHILD PROTECTION AUTHORITIES: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF POPULATION ATTITUDES IN FIVE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

4

Table A4. Binary Logistic Regression analysis: Rejection of CP. Significant demographic variables, per country and total.

CP is <u>not</u> acceptable

Country	Variable (respondent's characteristic)			
	Covariates	Chi-square	OR (95% C.I.)	R^2 Nagelkerke
Austria (76.8%)	Sex = Woman	18.91***	1.93 (1.43-2.62)	0.036
	With children < 18 years	5.42*	1.54 (1.06-2.23)	
Estonia (75.9%)	Sex = Woman	57.28***	3.01 (2.52-4.04)	0.078
Norway (87.0%)	Sex = Woman	48.71***	4.31 (2.75-6.76)	0.122
	Level of education = High	7.32**	1.76 (0.84-2.59)	
	Active or in education = Yes	5.61*	1.67 (1.21-2.49)	
	Immigrant background = No	4.55*	2.28 (1.11-4.66)	
Spain (61.2%)	With children < 18 years	15.18***	2.30 (1.69-3.15)	0.078
	Age group = Older	16.03***	1.54 (1.27-1.86)	
	Belongs to a religion = No	12.13***	1.91 (1.41-2.60)	
	Civil status = Without a partner	7.97**	1.53 (1.13-2.07)	
	Location size = Large city	4.63*	1.34 (1.03-1.76)	
Ireland (67.4%)	Sex = Woman	17,89***	1.78 (1.36-2.32)	0.025
Total (75.2%)	Sex = Woman	77.99***	1.88 (1.64-2.16)	0.040
	Level of education = High	20.81***	1.35 (1.18-1.55)	
	Age group = Older	13.79***	1.22 (1.11-1.33)	
	With children < 18 years	11.55**	1.29 (1.11-1.50)	

Binary Logistic Regression analysis: <u>Reporting of CP.</u> Significant demographic variables, per country and total.

Results from the logistic regressions are presented in table A5. They show some significant differences in attitudes towards reporting by population subgroups. For Austria, only one demographic variable regarding reporting was significant: women had more odds of reporting to the child protection authorities than men (OR = 1.48). For Estonia, as in Austria, women had more odds of reporting to the child protection authorities than men (OR = 1.37). In Norway, three of the independent variables were significant. It revealed that people with non-immigrant background had almost three times higher odds to report than those of immigrant background. Equally, people with a higher *level of education* (OR = 1.45) or who were either employed or studying (OR = 1.67) had more odds, too, of reporting compared

APPENDIX TO BURNS ET AL (2020). CORPORAL PUNISHMENT AND REPORTING TO CHILD PROTECTION AUTHORITIES: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF POPULATION ATTITUDES IN FIVE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

5

to those with lower education levels or who were unemployed. The results for Spain revealed a logistic regression with four significant demographic variables. The presence of immigrant background has a very strong position in this country (OR=3.04). Also *Having children under 18 years old* (OR=1.95), being a man (OR=1.69) and not being Christian (OR=1.48). Finally, for the last binary logistic regression that includes all the countries, there are three independent demographic variables that showed statistical significance as predictors of reporting CP to the child protection authorities: having children under 18-years old (OR=1.40), having an Occupation in the teaching sector (OR=1.48) and having a Higher level of education (OR =1.23).

Table A5. Binary Logistic Regression analysis: Reporting of CP. Only displaying significant demographic variables, per country and total.

Yes. the school should report

	Variable (respondent's characteristic)			
Country	Covariates	Chi-square	OR (95% C.I.)	R^2 Nagelkerke
Austria (59.8%)	Sex = Woman	9.30**	1.48 (1.15-1.91)	0.013
Estonia (52.6%)	Sex = Woman	6.41*	1.37 (1.07-1.74)	0.080
Norway (62.7%)	Immigrant background = No	15.51***	2.80 (1.60-4.89)	0.043
	Level of education = High	13.15***	1.45 (1.10-1.90)	
	Active or in education = Yes	8.58**	1.67 (1.26-2.21)	
Spain (58.1%)	With children < 18 years	22.46***	1.95 (1.47-2.58)	0.074
	Sex = Man	12.82***	1.69 (1.30-2.19)	
	Immigrant background = Yes	12.70***	3.04 (1.61-5.75)	
	Christian = No	8.33**	1.48 (1.13-1.95)	
Total (57.3%)	With children < 18 years	11.6**	1.40 (1.18-1.67)	0.008
	Occupation teaching sector = Yes	6.7**	1.48 (1.10-2.00)	
	Occupation health and social services = Yes	6.8*	1.42 (1.10-1.84)	

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001; OR: Odds Ratio

APPENDIX TO BURNS ET AL (2020). CORPORAL PUNISHMENT AND REPORTING TO CHILD PROTECTION AUTHORITIES: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF POPULATION ATTITUDES IN FIVE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

6

Testing for significant differences in demographic composition of mismatch versus match groups.

Based on the results from the survey where we asked a representative sample in each of the five countries included in the study if they 1) accept CP, and 2) if they would want the school to report CP to the CPS, we found that the respondents could be distributed into four groups:

1. Those who accept CP and do not want it reported (M1)

2. Those who do not accept CP and want it reported (M2)

3. Those who accept CP but want it reported (AM)

4. Those who do not accept CP but do not want it reported (RM)

We have named groups 1 and 2 the match groups and group 3 and 4 the mismatch groups. We want to test if there are differences in the different values on all of the variables in tables 2 and 3 between the match and the mismatch groups (tested horizontally). For instance, we are trying to find out if the percentage of men is higher in the match group than it is in the mismatch group. For example, one can see from table 2 that there is a higher share of respondents in the age group 18-34 years in the mismatch group (43%) than in the match group (31.4%). We have conducted tests for different samples with Zigne to see if the observed differences are significant.

Table A6. Significant differences in attitudes towards reporting corporal punishment among those who accepted corporal punishment. Demographic variables. All five countries grouped.

Two-tailed Independent Samples T-Test. Sig. level: ***= p>.01, **= p>.05. Weighted sample.

CP is acceptable		Match Group (M1)		Mismatch Group (AM)			
		& No Report	N=	But Report	N=	Value	T-value
Gender	Men	60.6%	598	60.2%	209	6	0.13
	Women	39.4%	389	39.8%	138	6	0.13
	Total	*100%*	*987*	*100%*	*347*		
Immigration Background	No**	89.0%	717	84.1%	227	4.9	1.97
	Yes**	11.0%	89	15.9%	43	4.9	1.97
	Total	*100%*	*806*	*100%*	*270*		
Belonging to a Religion?	Yes	71.3%	389	70.5%	144	7.3	0.16
	No	28.7%	157	29.5%	60	7.3	0.16
	Total	*100%*	*546*	*100%*	*204*		
Christianity?	No	34.9%	191	39.9%	82	7.8	1.25
	Yes	65.1%	355	60.1%	123	7.8	1.25
	Total	*100%*	*546*	*100%*	*205*		
Age group?	18-34***	31.4%	310	43.0%	149	7.8	3.78
	35-54	35.8%	353	34.6%	120	5.8	0.4
	>54***	32.8%	324	22.4%	78	6.9	3.82
	Total	*100%*	*987*	*100%*	*347*		

Civil status	Without a partner**	34.9%	314	41.6%	128	6.3	2.1
	With a partner**	65.1%	587	58.4%	179	6.3	2.1
	Total	*100%*	*901*	*100*	*307*		
Children under 18 in household	No	70.6%	670	65.1%	214	5.9	1.89
	Yes	29.4%	278	34.9%	115	5.9	1.89
	Total	*100%*	*948*	*100%*	*329*		
Level of education	No higher education	57.9%	527	53.9%	171	6.4	1.23
	Higher education	42.1%	383	46.1%	146	6.4	1.23
	Total	*100%*	*910*	*100%*	*317*		
Location Size	Small town / rural area***	55.0%	541	46.1%	158	8	2.85
	Larger city***	45.0%	443	53.9%	185	8	2.85
	Total	100%	984	100%	343		
Income group	Low Income***	17.6%	152	25.4%	79	7.1	2.74
	Average Income	53.2%	460	55.1%	173	6.4	0.64
	High Income***	29.3%	253	19.5%	61	7	3.56
	Total	*100%*	*865*	*100%*	*313*		
Are you active or in education?	Not working / not under education	32.3%	306	26.6%	87	5.6	1.91
	Occupational / under education	67.7%	643	73.4%	239	5.6	1.91
	Total	*100%*	*949*	*100%*	*326*		
Occupation within the teaching sector	Other professions	96.4%	877	96.7%	317	2.3	0.09
	Teaching	3.6%	32	3.3%	11	2.3	0.09
	Total	*100%*	*909*	*100%*	*328*		
Occupation within the health & social services sector	Other professions	95.8%	839	95.1%	292	2.7	0.57
	Health and social services	4.2%	36	4.9%	15	2.7	0.57
	Total	*100%*	*875*	*100%*	*307*		

APPENDIX TO BURNS ET AL (2020). CORPORAL PUNISHMENT AND REPORTING TO CHILD PROTECTION AUTHORITIES: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF POPULATION ATTITUDES IN FIVE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

8

Table A7. Significant differences in attitudes towards reporting corporal punishment among those who did not accept corporal punishment. Demographic variables. All five countries grouped.

Two-tailed Independent Samples T-Test. Sig. level: ***= p>.01, **= p>.05. Weighted sample.

CP is not acceptable		Match Group (M2)		Mismatch Group (RM)			
		& Report	N=	But No Report	N=	Value	T-value
Gender	Men	44.7%	1142	43.9%	518	3.4	0.46
	Women	55.3%	1414	56.1%	662	3.4	0.46
	Total	*100%*	*2556*	*100%*	*1180*		
Immigration Background	No	89.5%	1853	87.0%	744	2.6	1.88
	Yes	10.5%	218	13.0%	111	2.6	1.88
	Total	*100%*	*2071*	*100%*	*855*		
Belonging to a Religion?	Yes	62.6%	1003	66.3%	430	4.3	1.67
	No	37.4%	599	33.7%	219	4.3	1.67
	Total	*100%*	*1602*	*100%*	*649*		
Christianity?	No	43.4%	695	42.9%	278	4.5	0.26
	Yes	56.6%	908	57.1%	371	4.5	0.26
	Total	*100%*	*1603*	*100%*	*649*		
Age group?	18-34***	31.4%	802	27.0%	319	4.1	2.78
	35-54	36.8%	940	35.7%	422	3.3	0.65
	>54***	31.9%	814	37.3%	440	4.3	3.27
	Total	*100%*	*2556*	*100%*	*1181*		
Civil status	Without a partner	34.4%	784	35.6%	372	3.5	0.67
	With a partner	65.6%	1497	64.4%	673	3.5	0.67
	Total	*100%*	*2281*	*100%*	*1045*		
Children under 18 in household	No**	64.0%	1607	67.6%	789	3.3	2.15
	Yes**	36.0%	905	32.4%	378	3.3	2.15
	Total	*100%*	*2512*	*100%*	*1167*		
Level of education	No higher education	49.9%	1153	47.5%	500	3.6	1.29
	Higher education	50.1%	1156	52.5%	552	3.6	1.29
	Total	*100%*	*2309*	*100%*	*1052*		
Location Size	Small town / rural area	54.7%	1393	54.0%	636	3.4	0.4
	Larger city	45.3%	1152	46.0%	542	3.4	0.4
	Total	*100%*	*2545*	*100%*	*1178*		
Income group	Low Income***	21.5%	464	26.2%	248	4.3	2.8
	Average Income**	50.9%	1098	45.9%	434	3.8	2.52
	High Income	27.7%	598	27.9%	263	3.4	0.06
	Total	*100%*	*2160*	*100%*	*945*		

Are you active or in education?	Not working / not under education**	29.8%	715	33.8%	378	3.3	2.36
	Occupational / under education**	70.2%	1688	66.2%	740	3.3	2.36
	Total	*100%*	*2403*	*100%*	*1118*		
Occupation within the teaching sector	Other professions**	94.8%	2288	96.5%	1072	1.4	2.55
	Teaching**	5.2%	126	3.5%	38	1.4	2.55
	Total	*10%*	*2414*	*100%*	*1110*		
Occupation within the health & social services sector	Other professions	92.7%	2140	94.3%	960	1.8	1.77
	Health and social services	7.3%	168	5.7%	58	1.8	1.77
	Total	*100%*	*2308*	*100%*	*1018*		

References

Aardal, B. & Berglund, F. (2014) ZIGNE. Signifikans 5.9. Available from: https://www.sv.uio.no/isv/forskning/prosjekter/valgforskning/zigne-signifikanstesting.html.

APPENDIX TO BURNS ET AL (2020). CORPORAL PUNISHMENT AND REPORTING TO CHILD PROTECTION AUTHORITIES: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF POPULATION ATTITUDES IN FIVE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

10