

APPENDIX

Author(s): Jill Berrick, Marit Skivenes, Joe Roscoe

Title of publication: Parental Freedom in the Context of Risk to the Child: Citizens' Views of Child Protection and the State in California (USA) and Norway

Year: 2022

Journal / Publisher: Journal of Social Policy

Contents

Table A1: Overview of samples from 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: Descriptive statistics on the statement: "Julie should be free to bring her baby home regardless of the social worker's assessment".	8
Table A4: Descriptive statistics on the statement of "The baby should stay with Julie in a supervised setting" in three treatment scenarios.....	9
Table A5: Descriptive statistics on the statement of "The baby should be placed in foster care" in three treatment scenarios.....	10
Table A6: Mediation of association between country and suspended parenting	11
Table A7: Mediation of association between country and unrestricted parenting.....	12

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

Variable	Treatments		Norway		USA (California)	
			Number	%	Number	%
Gender	Low risk (X1)	Male	168	50	204	56
		Female	171	50	158	44
	Medium risk (X2)	Male	175	54	200	53
		Female	148	46	177	47
	High risk (X3)	Male	187	51	190	50
		Female	182	49	188	50
Metropolitan area	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
		Larger city	104	32	221	59
	High risk (X3)	Smaller city/rural area	230	62	154	41
		Larger city	139	38	224	59
Job status	Low risk (X1)	Unemployment	111	34	121	33
		Employment	215	66	241	67
	Medium risk (X2)	Unemployment	110	36	128	34
		Employment	199	64	249	66
	High risk (X3)	Unemployment	113	32	140	37
		Employment	236	68	238	63
Political orientation	Low risk (X1)	Left	101	40	170	56

		Center	62	25	13	4
		Right	88	35	121	40
	Medium risk (X2)	Left	117	49	178	57
		Center	53	22	16	5
		Right	70	29	119	38
	High risk (X3)	Left	123	46	187	60
		Center	60	22	15	5
		Right	86	32	109	35
	Domestic partner status	Low risk (X1)	No partner	108	33	147
Partner			220	67	215	59
Medium risk (X2)		No partner	100	32	180	48
		Partner	217	68	197	52
High risk (X3)		No partner	125	35	181	48
		Partner	234	65	197	52
Education Level	Low risk (X1)	No education/Lower education	105	31	37	10
		Average education	175	52	243	67
		Higher education	57	17	82	23
	Medium risk (X2)	No education/Lower education	90	28	48	13
		Average education	189	59	238	63
		Higher education	40	13	91	24
	High risk (X3)	No education/Lower education	102	28	51	13
		Average education	210	58	240	63
		Higher education	52	14	87	23

Religion	Low risk (X1)	No religion	132	40	99	28
		Have religion	197	60	249	72
	Medium risk (X2)	No religion	139	44	111	31
		Have religion	176	56	250	69
	High risk (X3)	No religion	163	46	113	32
		Have religion	191	54	245	68
Immigration status	Low risk (X1)	Non-migrant	322	95	289	80
		Migrant	17	5	73	20
	Medium risk (X2)	Non-migrant	306	95	309	82
		Migrant	17	5	68	18
	High risk (X3)	Non-migrant	356	96	299	79
		Migrant	13	4	79	21
Income Level	Low risk (X1)	Low income	35	13	107	33
		Average income	162	59	98	31
		High income	79	29	115	36
	Medium risk (X2)	Low income	33	13	100	30
		Average income	137	52	107	32
		High income	93	35	126	38
	High risk (X3)	Low income	41	13	110	34
		Average income	183	58	106	33
		High income	89	28	109	34
Age	Low risk (X1)	Younger (18-34)	60	18	110	30
		Mid-age (35-54)	129	38	119	33



		54+	150	44	133	37
	Medium risk (X2)	Younger (18-34)	60	19	129	34
		Mid-age (35-54)	122	38	133	35
		54+	141	44	115	31
	High risk (X3)	Younger (18-34)	63	17	130	34
		Mid-age (35-54)	149	40	133	35
		54+	157	43	115	30
Children	Low risk (X1)	No child	231	68	235	65
		Have children	108	32	127	35
	Medium risk (X2)	No child	205	63	236	63
		Have children	118	37	141	37
	High risk (X3)	No child	267	72	236	62
		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	Assessment Statements	Total	Norway	USA (California)
Low risk (X1)	Julie should be free to bring her baby home regardless of the social worker's assessment	1.91	1.65	2.15
		(0.85)	(0.65)	(0.94)
		701	339	362
	The baby should stay with Julie in a supervised setting	3.07	3.28	2.88
		(0.84)	(0.77)	(0.85)
		701	339	362
	The baby should be placed in foster care	2.29	2.17	2.40
		(0.89)	(0.83)	(0.93)
		701	339	362
Medium risk (X2)	Julie should be free to bring her baby home regardless of the social worker's assessment	1.78	1.60	1.93
		(0.80)	(0.65)	(0.89)
		700	323	377
	The baby should stay with Julie in a supervised setting	3.02	3.20	2.86
		(0.82)	(0.79)	(0.82)
		700	323	377
	The baby should be placed in foster care	2.41	2.40	2.43
		(0.86)	(0.87)	(0.86)
		700	323	377
High risk (X3)	Julie should be free to bring her baby home regardless of the social worker's assessment	1.67	1.49	1.85
		(0.78)	(0.61)	(0.89)
		747	369	378
	2.93	3.09	2.77	



	The baby should stay with Julie in a supervised setting	(0.84)	(0.82)	(0.84)
		747	369	378
	The baby should be placed in foster care	2.50	2.39	2.60
		(0.87)	(0.87)	(0.85)
		747	369	378

Table A3: Descriptive statistics on the statement: “Julie should be free to bring her baby home regardless of the social worker’s assessment”.

Treatment	Response category	Total		Norway		USA	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Low risk (X1)	1-2(Disagree)	566	80.7	311	91.7	255	70.4
	3-4(Agree)	135	19.3	28	8.3	107	29.6
	Total	701	100.0	339	100.0	362	100.0
Medium risk (X2)	1-2(Disagree)	593	84.7	299	92.6	294	78.0
	3-4(Agree)	107	15.3	24	7.4	83	22.0
	Total	700	100.0	323	100.0	377	100.0
High risk (X3)	1-2(Disagree)	654	87.6	351	95.1	303	80.2
	3-4(Agree)	93	12.4	18	4.9	75	19.8
	Total	747	100.0	369	100.0	378	100.0

Table A4: Descriptive statistics on the statement of “The baby should stay with Julie in a supervised setting” in three treatment scenarios.

Treatment	Response category	Total		Norway		USA	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Low risk (X1)	1-2(Disagree)	131	18.7	44	13.0	87	24.0
	3-4(Agree)	570	81.3	295	87.0	275	76.0
	Total	701	100.0	339	100.0	362	100.0
Medium risk (X2)	1-2(Disagree)	144	20.6	48	14.9	96	25.5
	3-4(Agree)	556	79.4	275	85.1	281	74.5
	Total	700	100.0	323	100.0	377	100.0
High risk (X3)	1-2(Disagree)	189	25.3	69	18.7	120	31.7
	3-4(Agree)	558	74.7	300	81.3	258	68.3
	Total	747	100.0	369	100.0	378	100.0

Table A5: Descriptive statistics on the statement of “The baby should be placed in foster care” in three treatment scenarios.

Treatment	Response category	Total		Norway		USA	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Low risk (X1)	1-2(Disagree)	459	65.5	243	71.7	216	59.7
	3-4(Agree)	242	34.5	96	28.3	146	40.3
	Total	701	100.0	339	100.0	362	100.0
Medium risk (X2)	1-2(Disagree)	401	57.3	185	57.3	216	57.3
	3-4(Agree)	299	42.7	138	42.7	161	42.7
	Total	700	100.0	323	100.0	377	100.0
High risk (X3)	1-2(Disagree)	389	52.1	218	59.1	171	45.2
	3-4(Agree)	358	47.9	151	40.9	207	54.8
	Total	747	100.0	369	100.0	378	100.0



Table A6: Mediation of association between country an suspended parenting

	OR	95% CI	% Total Effect
Direct Effect	0.80***	(0.71, 0.90)	102%
Total Indirect Effect	1.01	(0.96, 1.05)	-2%
Age	0.96***	(0.93, 0.98)	21%
City	1.05*	(1.01, 1.10)	-23%
Total Effect	0.80***	(0.72, 0.89)	100%

Table A7: Mediation of association between country and unrestricted parenting

	OR	95% CI	% Total Effect
Direct Effect	0.54***	(0.46, 0.64)	78%
Total Indirect Effect	0.85***	(0.78, 0.92)	22%
Age	0.94***	(0.91, 0.97)	8%
Migrant Status	0.90*	(0.82, 0.98)	14%
Total Effect	0.46***	(0.40, 0.53)	100%