**Appendix A: Online supplementary appendix for the paper:**

**Parental Freedom in the Context of Risk to the Child: Citizens' views of child protection and the state in U.S and Norway**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Treatments** | **Variable** |  | **Norway** | **USA (California)** |
| **Number** | **%** | **Number** | **%** |
| Lower risk (X1) | Gender | Male | 168 | 50 | 204 | 56 |
| Female | 171 | 50 | 158 | 44 |
| Medium risk (X2) | Male | 175 | 54 | 200 | 53 |
| Female | 148 | 46 | 177 | 47 |
| Higher risk (X3) | Male | 187 | 51 | 190 | 50 |
| Female | 182 | 49 | 188 | 50 |
| Lower risk (X1) | City size | 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 |
| Higher risk (X3) | Smaller city/rural area | 230 | 62 | 154 | 41 |
| Larger city | 139 | 38 | 224 | 59 |
| Lower risk (X1) | Job status | Unemployment | 111 | 34 | 121 | 33 |
| Employment | 215 | 66 | 241 | 67 |
| Medium risk (X2) | Unemployment | 110 | 36 | 128 | 34 |
| Employment | 199 | 64 | 249 | 66 |
| Higher risk (X3) | Unemployment | 113 | 32 | 140 | 37 |
| Employment | 236 | 68 | 238 | 63 |
| Lower risk (X1) | Political orientation | 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 |
| Higher risk (X3) | Left | 123 | 46 | 187 | 60 |
| Center | 60 | 22 | 15 | 5 |
| Right | 86 | 32 | 109 | 35 |
| Lower risk (X1) | Partnership/marital status | No partner | 108 | 33 | 147 | 41 |
| Partner | 220 | 67 | 215 | 59 |
| Medium risk (X2) | No partner | 100 | 32 | 180 | 48 |
| Partner | 217 | 68 | 197 | 52 |
| Higher risk (X3) | No partner | 125 | 35 | 181 | 48 |
| Partner | 234 | 65 | 197 | 52 |
| Lower risk (X1) | Education | 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 |
| Higher risk (X3) | No education/Lower education | 102 | 28 | 51 | 13 |
| Average education | 210 | 58 | 240 | 63 |
| Higher education | 52 | 14 | 87 | 23 |
| Lower risk (X1) | Religious belonging | 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 |
| Higher risk (X3) | No religion | 163 | 46 | 113 | 32 |
| Have religion | 191 | 54 | 245 | 68 |
| Lower risk (X1) | Immigration background | 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 |
| Higher risk (X3) | Non-migrant | 356 | 96 | 299 | 79 |
| Migrant | 13 | 4 | 79 | 21 |
| Lower risk (X1) | Income | 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 |
| Higher risk (X3) | Low income | 41 | 13 | 110 | 34 |
| Average income | 183 | 58 | 106 | 33 |
| High income | 89 | 28 | 109 | 34 |
| Lower risk (X1) | Age | 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 |
| Higher risk (X3) | Younger (18-34) | 63 | 17 | 130 | 34 |
| Mid-age (35-54) | 149 | 40 | 133 | 35 |
| 54+ | 157 | 43 | 115 | 30 |
| Lower risk (X1) | Children under 18 | 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 |
| Higher 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 |
| The baby should stay with Julie in a supervised setting | 2.93 | 3.09 | 2.77 |
| (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” by treatment scenario**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 scenario**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 scenario**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 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% |

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

\*\* *p*≤0.01

\*\*\* *p*≤0.001

**Figure A1 Mean variations by country according to risk level and agreement with response statements (unrestricted parenting, restricted parenting, and suspended parenting)**