Master's thesis

NTNU
Norwegian University of Science and Technology
Faculty of Social and Educational Sciences
Department of Sociology and Political Science

Markus Lynum

"Great Expectations"

The Potential of Informal and Formal Organization to Promote Resilience and Educational Equity within Bounded Spaces

Master's thesis in Sociology
Supervisor: Håkon Leiulfsrud
August 2020

NTNU
Norwegian University of
Science and Technology

Markus Lynum

"Great Expectations"

The Potential of Informal and Formal Organization to Promote Resilience and Educational Equity within Bounded Spaces

Master's thesis in Sociology
Supervisor: Håkon Leiulfsrud
August 2020

Norwegian University of Science and Technology
Faculty of Social and Educational Sciences
Department of Sociology and Political Science

NTNU
Norwegian University of
Science and Technology

Preface

The process leading up to this thesis has been long, challenging and, fortunately, very interesting. There have been times when writing, analyzing and researching have felt like trying to decode a David Lynch film and times where it felt like completing a challenging hike to experience the reward of the view from the top. Before starting, I imagined the creation of my thesis would be much more fluctuating in terms of stress and anxiety, but I stand corrected, as this has probably been the most interesting part of my five years at university. Over the last year I've grown from an aspiring sociology student into a somewhat more fully-fledged sociologist. Using the analogy of life course development, it has felt like transiting from adolescence into the start of adulthood. All in all, it is with mixed feelings I deliver this thesis, as closing this chapter signifies the end of a student life I have thoroughly enjoyed and the start of working life which I'm really excited about.

I'd like to take this opportunity to give special thanks to my supervisor, Håkon Leiulfsrud, for helping me complete this project. He has provided me with critical input and challenges throughout the process that have helped me expand my sociological imagination and force myself to be more rigorous in both the way I write and how I relate to theory and analysis. I'd also like to thank the rest of the members of the Unequal Childhood project for allowing me to participate in field work, work on converting raw data into an operational dataset and participate actively in the research project. This has been a source of learning and competence I might not have had at university were it not for them.

I would also like to give special thanks to my parents for their emotional support during the process, and all the help they gave me during the final sprint. This has really helped maintain my motivation, while also being a great resource of external input to my thesis. I also want to thank my girlfriend for being a great support and putting up with me on particularly bleak days. Many thanks too to Katja Franko and Aurora Sørsveen for valuable input and advice during the final sprint towards the finish line.

Markus Lynum

Abstract

The theme of this thesis is resilience and risk in childhood with a focus on factors beyond the individual and family levels. Taking the individual- and family-centric literature on risk and resilience in childhood as its point of departure, this thesis examines the potential for resilience and risk embedded in the local context childhood takes place within. This is investigated by comparing the factors at the individual, family and community levels that predict increased/decreased mental well-being and ability to cope at school among children from three schools in Northtown. The schools are located in different socioeconomic contexts, and special attention is given to the differences between them.

The thesis has an interest in two community level factors. The first is in the potential capacity of school organization to mitigate risk and the second is in informal social organization among community members to promote social inclusion and well-being in the community. They are investigated through a comparative case approach, with a focus on how local community level factors may mitigate or amplify potential risks to children's mental well-being and ability to cope at school. Robust linear and logistic regression is applied in order to assess trends in the overall population before examining what predicts at-risk levels of perceptions of low mental well-being and ability to cope. This approach puts the lifeworld experiences of children into context with the local organization of childhood within bounded spaces.

The results suggest that individual and family level characteristics exert little influence on children's experience of well-being, compared to community-level factors. They suggest the importance of more attention being given to how the organization of schools can mitigate differences between areas that have different levels of embedded resources. However, the results also show that the increasing complexity of risks in schools' surrounding environment may increase external pressure on their organizational capacity to effectively moderate risks in local areas. On the other hand, the role played by experiences of social inclusion and community well-being draws attention to social interaction systems as central sites where children may have access to resilience-promoting resources derived from positive social relations and experiences. This is linked to the term *personal social capital*, which this thesis develops as referring to benefits of group/network membership for the individual experiencing them.

Contents

1. Introduction:

In the twentieth century, the welfare and development of children gained increasing attention and took an ever more important place in the consciousness of both the general public and academics (Havnes, 2010; Andvig, 2014). It transformed childhood from an arena where children governed their own development into a science concerned with parental and public involvement (Frønes, 1997; Andvig, 2014). This is evident in the frequency with which childhood deprivation and risk is addressed in the media and in the policy context (St. Mld. Nr. 6, (2019-2020); St. Mld. Nr. 39, (2001-2002); Tønset, Nordahl, 2019; Nystad, Gaup, 2018). As the question of how potential risks to children's development could be counteracted gained attention within political and expert systems, it also became a concern for parents in the general public. The extensive literature examining how parents may raise their children to tackle difficulties and challenges, leads parents to focus on their capacity for resilience (Hoffman, 2010). Resilience is seen, by both researchers and policy makers, as an important capacity facilitating the future success of children, which shows how positive development may come about when children face risk.

Since resilience is often viewed in the context of external benchmarks for "successful" development by parents and researchers, the emphasis on it has been criticized for putting forward a middle-class and family-centric conception of children (Hoffman, 2010; Howard et al., 1999; Ungar et al., 2005; Ungar, 2004). A common claim by critics is that the resilience literature lacks an insider interpretation in which the lifeworld perspective of children is considered, and their wider social contexts are included (Howard et al., 1999; Ungar et al., 2005). For this reason, I will assess factors promoting resilience within *bounded spaces*. Bounded spaces are demarcated geographical areas in which actors' everyday life experiences are situated. They are not just limited in space but also in the social relations taking place within them (Blokland & Savage, 2008; Bridger & Alter, 2006). Since bounded spaces may range widely between areas with high and low socioeconomic status (SES), we are particularly interested in how these relations may impact children's well-being in different areas. Well-being is understood in terms of children's own subjective experience of their daily life at school and of mental well-being. This highlights how local conditions of childhood may impact children's lifeworld experiences and the potential role of social organization and integration. The focus on potential differences between bounded spaces is grounded in a sociological

interest in how the conditions of childhood may be potentially impacted by the interplay between local area and social class.

Three research questions are guiding the analysis and discussion: 1) *How may informal and formal organization within bounded spaces mitigate risk and promote resilience in childhood?* 2) *Are there systematic differences between socioeconomic areas in terms of children's well-being?* And 3) *How well are schools in high and low SES areas mitigating risks to children's well-being that are embedded in their local vicinity?*

Based on earlier research and findings (chapter 2), four hypotheses will be tested in the empirical analysis and inform the subsequent discussion of the research questions.

1.1 Risk and Resilience in the Everyday Lives of Children

Resilience, in the broadest sense of the word, refers to a physical body's ability to recover its shape and function after being exposed to stress and pressure (Merriam-Webster). Applied to the study of children, it tends to refer to a child's ability to adapt positively after exposure to risks and stressors (Hayas et al., 2019). In childhood research resilience emerged from criticisms of social deprivation-based models, which spurred a shift towards models based on protective factors (Masten & Obradovic, 2006). The deprivation-based approach studied variables predicting negative development and behavior, psychopathology and low academic achievement (Masten, 2007). It also focused on children that adapt in a negative way after exposure to risk, by developing traits such as substance abuse, psychopathology or low everyday functioning compared to their peers (Masten & Obradovic, 2007). The shift towards a protection-oriented approach has led to an interest in children that do surprisingly well, despite high risk factors in their lives (Luthar & Zelazo, 2003). Focusing on children who are able to adjust positively to adverse circumstances, the research has generated an extensive body of literature that provides important information about potential factors and mechanisms that can promote the well-being and life chances of children.

Resilience research is currently situated within three paradigms of understanding of how protective factors and risk operate in the everyday lives of children. The research is divided into the *psychopathological developmental perspective* (Masten, 2006; Luthar & Zelazo, 2003), *a social stratification perspective* (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990; Boudon; 1974; Hjellbrekke & Korsnes, 2012) and an economic perspective primarily associated with the OECD's (2018;

2020) assessment of the PISA-results. The psychopathological developmental perspective focuses on how psychological and biological systems internal to the actor interact with his or her external environment (Masten, 2006; Luthar & Zelazo, 2003). The actor faces risks in terms of the probability of developing psychopathologies (e.g. depression, schizophrenia, anxiety). These risks may impair everyday functioning and exert a negative impact throughout the actor's life (Masten, 2006; Schoon et al., 2004; Werner, 1994). This perspective pays attention to how children's internal psychological and biological systems are enabled/disabled by their family and social context. The role played by social institutions outside of the family, as well as the potential agency of children, is not clearly conceptualized in this perspective. The social stratification perspective focuses on the school as a vehicle of social reproduction and on family background as the main determinant of life chances (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990; Boudon, 1974; Hjellbrekke & Korsnes, 2012). The economic perspective may be placed between the psychopathological developmental perspective and the stratification perspective in its focus on the promotion of educational equity. When assessing educational equity in OECD member countries it includes more extensive measures of the school environment than we find in the other two approaches. However, the understanding of the school environment in the OECD research tends to focus on its material and educational resources, and not on its organization.

I will argue that these approaches to understanding risks and protective factors in childhood share a conceptual blind spot when it comes to the potential role played by 1) the agency of children and 2) formal and informal organization within bounded spaces. Current perspectives on resilience focus on how internal systems of the child's psyche, biology and family background constitute risks. They concentrate on what are indisputably important moderating factors, but neglect how children themselves may take advantage of available resources, and the fact that schools may serve more functions than the promotion of educational development. Viewing children in relation to internal systems, family background and the role played by material and educational resources at school means that important mechanisms related to social organization are left out of the research agenda. It is therefore of great potential interest to provide insights into how school organization and social networks may respond to or mitigate pressures in their locality.

1.2 Two Areas of Risk

The psychopathological developmental perspective is the dominant approach to understanding risk and resilience in relation to children and their development (Masten, 2006). It focuses on

the risks posed by biological factors such as genetic disposition and interactions between internal systems and the child's social context (ibid). The social stratification perspective is more concerned with durable structures of inequality that manifest themselves in unequal access to educational and material resources during childhood (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990; Boudon, 1974; Hjelbrekke & Korsnes, 2012; Laureau, 1987). The economic perspective of the OECD (2018; 2020) primarily focuses on factors which can promote educational equity. While the social stratification approach usually draws upon extensive theoretical perspectives to explain the social mechanisms that produce the observed outcomes, the economic perspective employs a more descriptive approach. This is to be seen, for example, in a recent OECD report on educational attainment and resilience among students which focuses on the effects of students' socioeconomic backgrounds and motivation, rather than aiming to explain social mechanisms that may help cause the observed effects (OECD, 2018; 2020).

In summary, we find three well-established perspectives on resilience and two conceptual areas of risk that are employed to assess children's life chances and well-being. The first area of risk is the psychological-biological one and is primarily associated with the psychopathological developmental perspective: Here risk impacts children by manifesting as psychopathology, which results in impaired mental well-being and everyday functioning (Masten, 2007). The usual way of interpreting the processes leading to psychopathology is through a biological lens focusing on how psychological and biological systems may pose a danger to positive development (Masten, 2006). The second area of risk is that of social inequality and it is associated with the social stratification approach (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990; Boudon, 1974) and the OECD (2018; 2020). Risk is understood in relation to social divides in society that translate into differentials in terms of education, occupation, health and longevity (Hjellbrekke & Korsnes, 2012; Steingrímsdóttir, Næss & Moe et al., 2012; Braveman & Barclay, 2009).

Distinguishing between the two modes of understanding risk in childhood, we find one view that sees children's well-being as contingent on their internal systems, and another that focuses on their families' socioeconomic positions. Typical elements of the first approach to risk are self-perception, positive coping strategies, family structure and effective parenting (Masten, 2004; Cohn et al., 2009). The second approach tends to focus on how certain modes of childrearing, informal organization by community members and educational resources available outside the family may mitigate risks associated with social background (Laureau, 1987; Coleman, 1988; OECD, 2018; 2020). The remaining question is how the three

perspectives on resilience understand the probability of a child responding in a resilient way to risk exposure. To address this, we must provide an account of how these perspectives operate at a theoretical level.

1.3 The Psychopathological Developmental Perspective: Internally Embedded Risk

During the 1970s, resilience as a concept in studies of childhood emerged in the field of behavioral psychopathology when children developing well despite a risk-laden environment caught the eye of researchers (Masten & Obradovic, 2007). This prompted a shift away from deprivation-focused models to an approach emphasizing protective factors, initiating what Masten and Obradovic (2007) label the first wave of resilience research. This first wave focused on factors and processes associated with positive adaption by children considered to be particularly vulnerable to genetic and environmental risks (ibid). The research was descriptive in nature, and focused on what could be done to promote the chances of positive adaption by at-risk children and the improvement of their mental health (ibid). The first wave singled out factors like effective regulation of emotion and behavior, positive self-perception, relations with competent adults outside the family and pro-social friends (Masten, 2004). Risks believed to pose a threat to positive adaption included low birthweight and experiencing negative life events such as divorce and loss of a caregiver (Masten, 2001).

The second wave of resilience research set out to map the processes and regulatory systems that could account for the protective factors identified by the first wave (Masten & Obradovic, 2007). These explanations have mainly been developed within the theoretical context of developmental psychopathology (Masten, 2006). Assessing how psychopathologies like depression and anxiety may manifest within the psyche, the perspective draws on medical and psychological fields of expertise (ibid). It focuses on complex multi-level interactions between the child's internal systems and his or her environment. The perspective acknowledges that what is viewed as pathological is a normative evaluation of what is considered within society to be normal behavior and functioning for a given age or gender (ibid). Pathological behavior is therefore assessed through comparison with the normal distribution of functioning among the population; a below-average score indicates the presence of an inhibiting psychopathology (ibid). This perspective thus seeks to understand the negative or positive trajectories human development can take – towards or away from – psychopathology through focusing on the internal systems of individual actors.

The psychopathological developmental perspective operates with a model of the internal system as autopoietic (i.e. self-organizing, self-regulatory and self -righting), as it works to maintain its functionality in relation to external milieus (Masten, 2006; Vanderbilt-Adriance & Shaw, 2008). The relationship of internal interactions and between the internal and external, is viewed as relations of complex multi-level dynamics. The dynamics are commonly explored by applying models from fields such as embryology (Masten, 2006), behavioral genetics and epigenetics (Masten, 2006; Gottesman & Hanson, 2005; Chicchetti & Rogosch, 2012), neurology and psychology (Masten, 2006; Spann, et al., 2012; Samplin, et al., 2013). These models emphasize how the individual's environment interacts with neural and genetic activity and how this structures development and behavior (Masten, 2006; Vanderbilt-Adriance & Shaw, 2008). In the study of resilience, the focus is on how biological and psychological risks facing the child may be increased or decreased by external or internal factors. External factors are here understood as the child's family and social context, the social context being seen as a generic expression of an area's socioeconomic profile. The chances of promoting resilience and moderating risk are therefore associated with interventions aimed at individual children and their families. In this framework, the resilience of the child is largely determined by his or her own internal system's ability to cope positively and the family's ability to offset risk. The psychopathological developmental perspective has informed a number of policy interventions, as the third wave of resilience research focused on the promotion of resilience through policies of prevention and intervention (Masten & Obradovic, 2007).

The psychopathological developmental perspective views positive adaption of children at risk in one frame of psychological structures and strategies within the child, and in another of social factors at the family level. When attempting to explain why certain children show a higher degree of everyday functioning and mental well-being than expected, factors such as how their schools and local context are organized and how much agency they have, are left out. The focus is rather on how factors at the individual and family level interact with the child's internal systems.

1.4 The Social Reproduction of Inequality: The Burden of Social Background

Social stratification refers to social divides between groups in society marked by unequal access to resources, opportunities, rights and power (Grusky & Ku, 2008). Study of the phenomenon concerns itself with the structure of inequality in society, and how it is generated and reproduced over time (ibid). There have been many approaches to measuring how social stratification

perpetuates inequality and how it is manifested within different fields and domains in society. These approaches all take the notion of *social classes* as the defining feature of stratification systems (Grusky & Ku, 2008; Wright, 1984; Giddens, 1973; Grusky & Sørensen, 1998). Social classes are social groups where membership may be defined in terms of occupation (Grusky & Sørensen, 1998), market position as determined by possession of educational credentials, property ownership and labor-power (Giddens, 1973) and relation to control over organizational assets (Wright, 1984). In this sense, membership of a social class is defined by structural traits indicating an individual's relation to resources and opportunities that may increase or decrease their life chances. Through practices such as opportunity and resource hoarding, hierarchization and institutional control, social classes may be able to shut out outsiders from opportunities.

A site where these forms of inequality-generating mechanisms are said to particularly affect children is the educational system (Turner, 1960; Van Zanten, 2005; Brown, 2003). As children's family background is determined by their parent's relation to the labor market, their social background affects the resources and social support available to them during childhood, adolescence and adulthood (Harding et al., 2008). In this situation, social inequality is a risk in childhood, due to the influence it exerts on children's life chances and social outcomes (Hjellbrekke & Korsnes, 2012; Braveman & Barclay, 2009). The social class of parents is seen as a source of adversity or advantage, as it influences the material and intellectual resources available to the child (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990; Laureau, 1987). This means children enter the educational system with different chances of taking advantage of the opportunities available in it, which in turn facilitates the transmission of advantage from one generation to the next (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990; Boudon, 1988; Hjellbrekke & Korsnes, 2012).

There are several theoretical approaches to explaining how these social mechanisms play out within the educational system. One that is widely used is Bourdieu's concept of *symbolic violence*, where the educational system is seen as a vehicle of social reproduction (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). It understands the school's organization as reflecting the culture and interests of the dominant social groups in society when it comes to what is deemed the correct mode of presenting and relating to the knowledge it conveys (ibid). Symbolic violence is exerted by the educational system when it rewards students that have the correct, classed mastery of how to relate to conveyed knowledge. This enables the social groups in power to disguise their inherited advantage as a meritocratic outcome reflecting achievement (ibid). Following this

interpretation, the primary function of the education system is to reproduce and legitimate the existing social hierarchy by ensuring children of the dominant class monopolize legitimate achievement.

A different approach to understanding the interplay between social background and the education system is found in Boudon's (1974) *social position theory*. The theory is grounded on a rational choice perspective that focuses on the choices made by actors during their progress through the education system. The premise is that educational decisions are based on cost-benefit considerations aimed at the avoidance of social demotion (ibid). Educational decisions and choices are understood as being structured by the actor's social background, as this is their point of reference when assessing the possible advantages or disadvantages associated with different decisions. Although it diverges from Bourdieu's point of departure and his conceptualization of the actor, it still ends up ascribing observed differences in outcome to effects exerted by the family's socioeconomic position.

Even though schools and educational systems are important analytical entities for the social stratification perspective, it rarely takes into account how schools interact with their local environment. Relating this to the present discussion, the social stratification approach to risk and resilience overlooks the role that may be played by the school as a social agent within a bounded area. Because of this, the social stratification perspective neglects to consider how schools can perform many other functions than social reproduction. Thus, when examining how schools operate in high and low (i.e. advantaged and disadvantaged) socioeconomic areas, it is important to pay attention to functions that go beyond the educational work concerned directly with academic development. Turning the focus on schools as potential promoters of children's wellbeing, social inclusion and ability to cope, may be an important way of gaining knowledge about their capacity in local areas to promote resilience among their students.

1.5 Educational Equity and the OECD

In the economic perspective of the OECD, educational equity is framed as the normative goal of providing inclusive and high-quality education to all children, with the explicit goal of promoting learning opportunities for all throughout the course of their lives (OECD, 2020). The OECD's (2020) focus on educational equity is linked to a democratic concern about reducing the barriers erected by social background. It is also part of an economic and political aim to increase human capital in order to meet the demands of an increasingly automated and

technically oriented labor market, and to ensure continued economic growth (ibid). The question of educational equity is addressed through cross-country comparison of the data gathered by PISA-tests (OECD, 2018; 2020). This data also contains information about national spending on education, the structure of countries' education systems, school resources and information about students, such as their social background, academic motivation and self-esteem (ibid).

The PISA data have been used to identify students exhibiting resilience, as they can provide useful information about factors which promote educational equity at national, local and individual student levels. The OECD reports focus on how these levels interact to foster academic resilience among students, with elements such as family and teacher support, classroom climate and students' belief in their own abilities being seen as key factors (OECD, 2020). The OECD approach reflects a wider understanding of the role played by school factors than do the other two perspectives on resilience. However, its focus on how schools enable a positive educational climate in the classroom is grounded on attention to material and educational resources (Agasisti et al, 2018). The educational attainment of at-risk children is assessed in relation to student-teacher ratios, the availability of educational equipment, the educational level of teachers and the socioeconomic profile of the school (Agasisti et al., 2018).

In the reports produced by the OECD (2018; 2020), factors such as self-esteem, academic motivation and attitudes towards school are primarily seen as individual dispositions related to the student's psychological systems. Traits like enjoying reading, working towards academic goals and feelings that one is coping well with everyday life at school are conceptualized as personality traits that help students to overcome adverse circumstances (OECD, 2020). This makes it hard to understand what the school itself can do to promote resilience among its students. It is an approach to resilience that resembles the psychopathological developmental perspective, while its focus on risk brings it closer to the social stratification perspective.

The OECD's research on resilience provides more contextual information about the school than what is typically found in the social stratification perspective, albeit limited to material and educational resources. It does not account for how schools respond to what it understands as the real challenges facing their students. Neither does it present a more positive view of the potential of schools to offset social heritage, than does the class and stratification literature. As is evident in the report *How Schools and education policy support or undermine student*

resilience (OECD, 2018), the focus is on how a positive disciplinary environment, and positive student-teacher and student-student relations in the classroom can improve learning. Even though it focuses on social relations at school, these are understood as disaggregated from the institutional context they take place within. Considering that both student-student and student-teacher relationships may be contingent on local mechanisms of social inclusion or exclusion, the OECD's explanations give little indication about how they may be facilitated in their local context.

1.6 Prying Open the Black Box:

This thesis will develop existing research on resilience by bringing in the role in securing children's well-being played by informal and formal organization within bounded spaces. Special attention is paid to the capacity of the school organization and social interaction systems to foster and promote resilience in children, and to the impact of these systems on children's lifeworld experiences of coping at school and mental well-being. This may provide interesting information about the school as a social agent, rather than an entity understood in light of its material and educational resources. This may also be seen as a conceptual break with approaches that see schools as agents of social reproduction, and leave out of account their role as welfare systems. As schools are places where children spend a significant amount of their childhood, it is important to try and identify mechanisms that may include resilience-promoting structures in the schools' operation at a local level. By addressing the school's role as a social agent as regards mechanisms of social inclusion/exclusion, this thesis hopes to start opening up the black boxes recording their agency and functioning, to see what they reveal.

2. Unequal Childhood: Socioeconomic and Institutional Boundaries

This thesis is part of a larger Nordic research project, "Unequal Childhood", which focuses on social inequality, welfare and well-being. The project opens the way for a study of how systematic sociodemographic differences between school areas may shape school organization and the everyday life experiences of children. The project includes data on children's subjective experience of mental well-being and of how they manage in different domains of their lifeworld. The role played by the school in fostering social inclusion among its students is of particular interest in this study. Knowledge about the school's ability to even out social differences between areas may provide us with useful insights into the organizational features that promote educational equity and resilience within bounded spaces.

The school may enhance social inclusion or social exclusion. It is also a domain where the educational system is combined with various other expert systems in order to promote the well-being of children. The effectiveness of these systems in promoting children's well-being and coping skills is also a measure of success in strategies to enhance "strong childhood communities" in Northtown. Children's well-being and ability to cope will be examined in the context of children's *personal social capital*, and its potential to promote these two objectives. Personal social capital is here conceptualized as a subcategory of social capital and refers to the benefits of network membership only available to the individual actor (Ben-Hador & Eckhaus, 2018). Personal social capital is contingent on involvement and participation in activities internal to a social network, and may benefit the actor through increased social support, power, feelings of confidence and local knowledge (Ben-Hador, 2018; Collins, 2004).

This thesis will build further upon this concept of personal social capital by linking it to resources gained through the child's experience of peers as a source of resilience. Personal social capital is of considerable significance in a study of social integration within a variety of socioeconomic (SES) contexts. As advantaged SES communities typically have more material and social resources for the organization of childhood (Conger & Donellan, 2007; Sampson et al., 1999; Kingston, Huang et al., 2013; Lapointe, Ford & Zumbo, 2007; Anderson, Leventhal & Dupéré, 2014), it is of sociological interest to know if schools in less advantaged SES communities are able to bridge the gap by increasing the personal social capital of their students.

Social inequality is often viewed as contingent on the individual attributes of children's parents and the deprivation or privilege of their community. By shifting the focus to the structures and

mechanisms promoting resilience among children, we may locate important factors that obstruct or enable social adjustment and adaption. This is also linked to a sociological interest in the possibility of increasing resilience and educational equity within bounded spaces.

2.1 Low well-being in Childhood and its Longitudinal Consequences

Depression at a clinical level is proven to impair the everyday functioning of the individual (Fried & Nesse, 2014); the same is true of depressive symptoms at subclinical levels (Van Lier et al., 2012). Lower levels of mental well-being in the form of subclinical levels of depression may mean that children relate less well to their peers and their schools (ibid). Negative development in terms of mental well-being may also have the potential to cascade in the long term. Internalizing and externalizing symptoms in childhood have been observed to result in reduced academic achievement during adolescence and less social competence during young adulthood (Obradovic, Burs & Masten, 2009; Bornstein, Hahn & Suwalsky, 2013). This may suggest that reduced mental well-being at an early age can have a durable effect on the life course of individuals by manifesting during childhood and cascading into the domains of academic and social competence later in life.

The longitudinal effects of low mental well-being are important for understanding the risks associated with prolonged experience of anxiety, sadness and stress during childhood. Recent research has shown that symptoms in childhood of depression among boys and anxiety among girls may intensify during the transition into adolescence (Andres & Davies et al., 2018). Girls are more prone to experiencing internalizing symptoms and stressors, while boys are more prone to externalizing symptoms, which means there is a gendered difference in well-being (Chaplin, Cole & Zahn-Wexler, 2005). The observed difference is ascribed to social pressures communicated through gendered childrearing (ibid). An observed consequence of the gendered divide in this area of well-being, is that the mental well-being of girls is often overlooked, as its easier for adults to notice externalizing symptoms that manifest themselves in behavior (De Los Reyes et al., 2015). This can lead to girls having a higher risk of not being referred to relevant interventions and expert systems. This may also affect later development and adjustment – researchers have observed a greater probability of avoiding difficulties with adjustment leading to internalizing problems in adolescence among children exhibiting externalizing symptoms (Panayiotou & Humphrey, 2018).

First- and second-generation immigrant children are more often at risk of impaired mental well-being due to internalizing symptoms than are the majority population (Vazsonyi, Trejos-Castillo & Huang, 2006). Earlier research suggests this may be due to minority youth experiencing discrimination from peers and teachers and having to operate within the sociocultural setting of the majority population at school, as well as within the cultural setting of the home (Oppedal, Røysamb & Sam, 2004). This may be both a source of protection and a risk, as the direction of effect depends on the interplay between the social support systems in the family and at school (ibid). The opposite may be true when it comes to adaption in domains like education (Sam et al., 2008). However, the negative trends in the area of psychological adaption (ibid) may pose a danger to healthy adaption in other domains over time (Obradovic, Burs & Masten, 2009; Bornstein, Hahn & Suwalsky, 2013).

2.2 Deprivation and Development

There is a well-documented link between mental health problems and growing up in families with lower socioeconomic status (Dearing & Taylor, 2007; Conger & Donnellan, 2007). This link is particularly visible in the United States, where levels of poverty and social inequality are higher than in Norway. It is, nonetheless, a phenomenon which is also to be found in Norway (Børe et al., 2011). Discrepancies in positive development between children from high and low SES backgrounds often translate into differences in social and cognitive outcomes in favor of advantaged SES children (Conger & Donnellan, 2007; Kingston, Huang et al., 2013; Lapointe, Ford & Zumbo, 2007; Anderson, Leventhal & Dupéré, 2014). Differences in outcomes attributed to SES are commonly explained by the stress suffered by families because of economic deprivation and/or by beliefs about what constitutes effective investment in children's development (Conger & Donnellan, 2007; Sayer et al., 2004). Differences in SES are typically associated with differences in social and cognitive stimulation within the home environment, different standards of living and differences in local resources that reinforce and reproduce existing inequality (Conger & Donnellan, 2007; Kingston, Huang et al., 2013; Lapointe, Ford & Zumbo, 2007; Anderson, Leventhal & Dupéré, 2014).

The correspondence between social and geographic distance can give children from advantaged SES backgrounds a double advantage because they live in well-resourced homes and neighborhoods. Social capital is strategic importance in this thesis, as it refers to resources that are embedded in neighborhoods and communities. It shows how parents in a neighborhood may mobilize collective pressure at the community or school level. Social capital, as conceptualized

by Coleman (1988), is the idea that informal exchanges based on reciprocity and trust in social relations between actors in either a community, or social organization, can function in a collective capacity to act and exert influence. Whether these networks are open or closed is an empirical question that may vary from case to case. The same applies as to whether it functions as an integrating and stabilizing factor within a community or neighborhood. One key point of interest here is that informal networks, frequently closed to outsiders, can exert an impact on school culture and local organization through applying external pressure on, for example, school organization. This is a discussion resembling E. Botts's network study from 1957, and a sociological important discussion of strong and weak ties (Granovetter, 1973).It should, therefore, be considered in empirical analysis, since this may enable us to go beyond the resources tied directly to the individual and their family. Raising a child in an advantaged SES area may not only be carried out by parents and families, but also by established normative systems and local institutions that make up the interpretive frame surrounding childrearing and the legitimate/respectable way of life (Sampson et al., 1999). These factors are also described in the literature on class-based child rearing (Laureau, 1987; Reay, 2005; Stefansen & Farstad, 2010).

2.3 Leisure Time Organizations and Well-Being

The understanding of children's development as contingent on active efforts by parents to engage them in stimulating activities has led to a marked intensification of the organization of childhood (Frønes, 1997). Historically, this represents a discontinuity in the way childhood is organized in Norway, where free-time activities and the school have become central areas for interaction and socialization (ibid). It is well documented, and widely believed, that middle-class children have a greater array of organized out-of-school activities available to them. These activities, and the resources embedded in them, may play an important role in the socialization of participating children (Bennet et al., 2012; Laureau, 1987). Reports have also linked not participating in highly structured leisure time activities to children exhibiting high levels of "anti-social behavior" (Mahoney & Stattin, 2000). Mahoney and Stattin (2000) present the argument that these activities involve greater social complexity, peer cooperation, support from family members and mentoring from adults outside the family, and may potentially exert a positive impact on children's development.

The portrayal of out-of-school activities as a wholly positive influence fails to take into account the possibility that they might exert negative influence through their built-in logic of

competition. While having a well-documented potential to include children and youth, they may also exclude children by matching individual attributes to results in the sport system (Vandorp et al., 2012; Collins, 2004; Elling & Kappers, 2005). It is also well known that children from financially constrained households tend to be underrepresented in organized sports (Krange & Strandbu, 2004, pp. 56). Following the marked differences between working-class and middle-class participation in sports in the 1950s and the more democratized distribution around the turn of the century, the present trend seems to be for increasing inequality once more (Strandbu et al., 2017).

The rise in socially stratified access to organized sports activities may be ascribed to the increasing financial and social costs of participation. The cost of membership and equipment, increased professionalization necessitating more knowledge and increased demands for active participation from parents, are all factors contributing to social exclusion in sports (Strandbu et al., 2017). Some researchers have argued that the financial cost of sports leads people in poverty not to participate to avoid the embarrassment of having their poverty made visible (Vandersmeerschen et al., 2017).

Factors like the lack of necessary skills, knowledge and social support may also raise the threshold for participation (Collins, 2004), while their gender may bar girls from entering traditional "masculine" sports and boys from entering traditional "feminine" sports (Elling & Kappers, 2005). The trend for unequal access to sports is consistent with data on children's participation in other forms of out-of-school activities such as music lessons, band practice and drama classes (Bakke et al., 2016). Highly organized activities in various areas of interest outside the school seem to be a salient feature of the way childhood is organized in an advantaged SES context, while loosely organized activities, such as those offered in youth community centers, seem to be the trend in disadvantaged SES environments (ibid).

2.4 Networked Resources and Organization

Out-of-school sites of organization and interaction may both increase and decrease children's social inclusion and well-being. Based on findings from previous research we can expect to find a greater proportion of children from more advantaged SES schools participating in out-of-school activities than of children from disadvantaged SES schools. This is of interest not just as an empirical question of participation rates, but also as a question of the processes that facilitate group integration and social inclusion among children in different SES areas. As

suggested by the empirical work of Laureau (1987), the formal organization of children's leisure time in a middle-class context can also facilitate informal organization among parents. Within this mode of organization, problems associated with social exclusion/inclusion and well-being in childhood are not only contingent on the family and school but may also include third parties organizing highly structured free time activities. This may potentially not only bear some of the burden of educational work aimed at social inclusion within an advantaged SES school, but also impact the overall level of children's well-being in an advantaged area.

The well-being and social inclusion of children is contingent on the social relations and informal networks they are part of. In addition to the role played by parents and other relations, this is also heavily dependent on peers. Children's experience of coping at school is an area where perceptions of social acceptance from peers seem to have an impact on well-being. According to Ladd et al. (1997) the social acceptance of peers has a positive impact on children's overall satisfaction with the school, feelings of loneliness and experience of social isolation. Positive relations with peers and adults at school can also be a factor that protects children from developing depressive symptoms (Minkkinen, 2014).

As disadvantaged SES communities are likely to have fewer organized out-of-school activities, the importance of the school as an arena of social inclusion will increase. Awareness of the lack of external sites promoting social integration among children in low SES areas may also lead to an increased focus on integrative measures in disadvantaged SES schools that may not necessarily be found in high SES schools (Rapp, 2018). As recognized by earlier waves of the "Unequal Childhood Project", if there is no difference between advantaged and disadvantaged SES settings, this may reflect greater awareness and an ability to cope with at-risk children, marginalization and social exclusion in the low SES schools. This may potentially reduce some disadvantages associated with having less capital and resources than the more advantaged SES areas. If this is the case, one can expect there to be difference in the low SES schools in children's mental well-being and ability to cope at school, or even results that favor the children attending them.

2.5 The Potential Benefits of Positive Feelings and Emotion

It may be beneficial for schools in socially disadvantaged areas to work to develop positive bonds between their students. This may be an effective way of connecting at-risk children to resilience-promoting resources embedded in social relations. When discussing the mental

characteristics that enable positive responses to adversity, Cohn et al. (2009) identify positive emotions and relations as the foundations on which positive strategies for organizing one's behavior and identifying opportunities are built. It is claimed that positive experiences and feelings help facilitate these outcomes (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005) and are predictors of improvements in educational, occupational and health outcomes throughout later life. This may indicate that the ability of a school to foster the development of positive social bonds between children can be a way to facilitate positive development and build resilience into its organization (Cohen et al., 2009; Lyumbomirsky et al., 2005; Cuellar, 2005). If schools are successful in connecting at-risk children to resources embedded in social relations, this should not be conflated with more collectively available resources. It should be understood, not in relation to social capital in the collective sense, but to our concept of personal social capital, as the benefits are conferred on individuals.

2.6 Organizational Promotion of Inequality and Equity

The approach to understanding the social mechanisms generating social inequality and equity taken in this thesis is inspired by Charles Tilly's (1998) concept of *Durable Inequality*. It focuses on the role played by organizations in how inequality tends to be maintained and reproduced. Taking organizations –schools in our case – as the point of departure means moving away from an individual-centered focus on variables predicting individual outcomes. Tilly (1998) presents a theoretical framework for assessing how wider structures of social inequality become linked to the local production of inequality through the matching of exterior categories to internal distinctions. In line with this approach, one can see educational inequality as generated by the matching of the exterior category of children's class backgrounds to the internal distinction between competent and incompetent students within the school (Reay, 2006). This is also a way to highlight at the meso level social mechanisms that link wider social structures to the everyday experience of actors within their local context.

The well-being and welfare of children has been part of the political discussion for several decades, and is an area where there has been extensive political intervention and social reform. In the United States schools have been organizationally integrated with social and health systems in order to reach out effectively to children where they live (Tyack, 1992). Attempts to achieve a tighter organization of schools and associated welfare systems (medical, social and educational expert systems) is also high on the political agenda in Norway (St. Mld. Nr.6(2019-2020)). Schools may serve as effective channels to link families and children to policy

intervention. In a study of how the social capital of parents and children in a particular class can have a positive effect in terms of reducing behavioral problems among the children, the school was found to be an effective agent linking families and children to welfare interventions (Turley et al., 2017). Using the school as a channel for making contact and a site of intervention, the research group were able to connect families at specific schools to the intervention program FAST (Families and Schools Together). This showed that schools may serve as effective agents in linking at-risk children to relevant expert systems and interventions geared towards improving their well-being. In view of the fact that mental health problems during childhood can have a lasting negative impact on the life course of the child (Cuellar, 2015), it is important to examine whether schools in areas with a higher density of potential risks are able to offset some of this threat.

2.7 Local and Structural Differences

Based on our empirical account, we may expect a high SES school to have a greater focus on children's academic development. In an advantaged SES environment, the chances of parents organizing effectively to exert pressure on school organization is higher than in a disadvantaged SES area (Rapp, 2018). This may be due to middle-class parents having greater concern about their children's development, as is suggested in the literature on class-based childrearing (Laureau, 1987; Reay, 2005; Stefansen & Farstad, 2010). Whether this is still the case in Northtown remains to be seen.

Having a student body more likely to be engaged in out-of-school activities serving as socialization sites in the high SES context, may offload some of the school's responsibility as an agent of socialization. It may also help promote academic achievement and development at the expense of children's well-being and ability to cope at school (Rapp, 2018; Reay, 2006) because it serves as an obstacle to registering performance-related anxiety and stress, which don't necessarily manifest themselves in at-school behavior. Conversely, a low SES school may be less likely to have an organized group of parents exerting pressure on its priorities and organization (Rapp, 2018). As a consequence of this, schools may develop their own welfare and security nets to deal with at-risk students and problems of marginalization. This may result in a school organization being better equipped to link disadvantage to intervention and convert marginalization into inclusion. Such organizational practices might enable their students to benefit more from their education in the classroom, if the school is successful in promoting social inclusion and positive relations. It is also likely that a low SES school will have a higher

degree of structural coupling with relevant expert systems than a high SES school. This may be a consequence of disadvantaged SES schools having a greater organizational focus on potential challenges in their external environment.

By including formal and informal organization of childhood in different SES contexts, this thesis will go beyond the individual and family focus of most of the resilience literature. Variables at the individual level will be included to compare with characteristics of intra-relational networks and social organization in different schools or communities. This will be done by accounting for the relative effect exerted by two schools in low SES areas and one in a high SES area.

2.8 Structural Differences and Subjective experiences

By addressing the subjective experience of mental well-being and ability to cope at school of children in advantaged SES and disadvantaged SES contexts, we are able to link a structural view of inequality to a lifeworld approach. This thesis will assess differences and similarities in how mental well-being and everyday life at school are experienced by children in different socioeconomic contexts and areas. This will hopefully prepare the ground for an interesting discussion on the potential role of schools and social relations in promoting educational equity and resilience among children. On the basis of previous research, and my own expectations inspired by this literature, I end up with the following hypotheses:

H1: *Middle-class children will have a greater measure of experienced mental well-being and ability to cope with school than children from working-class and unemployed households.*

H2: *Children attending the high SES school will experience markedly higher levels of mental well-being and ability to cope with everyday life at school than children in the low SES schools, due to the greater amount of resources embedded in their families and area of residence.*

H3: *There will not be marked differences between the children attending the low SES schools and the high SES school in their experience of mental well-being and ability to cope with everyday life at school, since the low SES schools are more sensitive to potential social exclusion and marginalization.*

H4: *The experience of social inclusion and well-being in relation to their local area will have a greater impact on children's experience of mental well-being and ability to cope at school than will traditional social class divides.*

3. Method and Data

This section will present the data used to conduct analyses, together with the statistical measures applied in the analysis of the data. The statistical measures consist of robust linear and logistic regression. This section will also present the operationalization of variables used in the models. The data gathered in relation to the project include the survey data analyzed in this thesis and qualitative interviews with key actors in the field of childhood in Northtown, such as principals, teachers and leaders in local expert systems geared towards children's well-being, together with some of the children attending the schools in question. Data-collection is currently taking place in Sweden and Finland, but this thesis will not make use of these data as they are still incomplete, compared to the Norwegian data.

The motivation for using a quantitative method to assess mental well-being and the ability to cope at school is an interest in the ability to explain differences on an aggregated level in the population, rather than in a more qualitative focus on dimensions of experienced inequality in terms of well-being and coping at school. The quantitative method is well suited to testing hypotheses generated on the basis of different perspectives and previous research, which makes it a good fit for assessing the validity of this thesis's criticisms of the resilience literature. The aim being to examine the existence of social mechanisms and relations in the empirical world and to assess their strength, a quantitative method enables this in a more accessible way than a qualitative approach would (Mehmetoglu & Jakobsen, 2017). The quantitative approach will be explicitly used to make inferences about possible social mechanisms at play in order to conduct a theoretical discussion, and not to generalize findings from the children studied to a larger population. This is also a consequence of methodological considerations about the external validity of the data material that will be assessed in this section of the thesis.

3.1 The Data

The survey data were collected during the late fall of 2019 and the first months of 2020 in three different schools in Northtown, a large Norwegian city. The schools were selected on the basis of their SES profiles, in order to assess how children's welfare is affected by the broader social context they are situated in. The focus in the design of the survey was to capture relationships between the lifeworld of children and the social systems they are a part of (Leiulfsrud et al., 2003). This is achieved by the use of the CDI inventory (Children's Depression Index), a social integration questionnaire and a separate questionnaire filled out by teachers on each individual

child. The version of the CDI that was used is an enlarged version of the initial inventory developed by Kovac and Beck (1977) to measure children's psychological and corporal well-being in relation to different dimensions of depressive symptoms and low everyday functioning. The inventory has been shown to have a high degree of reliability and validity in its application and factor structure by earlier studies and reviews (Allgaier et al., 2012; Ivarsson et al., 2006; Aluja & Blanch, 1985). The social integration questionnaire indicates the children's experience of social relations at home and at school, their socioeconomic background, what they did after school the previous day and how they experience various dimensions of the social milieu at and outside of school. The teacher questionnaire contains information about gender, whether or not Norwegian is the children's native language, whether they are having special education interventions and the teacher's assessment of their academic and social competence. The questionnaires were designed to capture how differences in structural conditions, e.g. social background and gender, may translate into the lifeworld experiences of children.

The data were gathered from children from the 4th to the 7th grade at three schools in Northtown, and the research group visited each school on the day of data collection. The questionnaires were filled out in class, while one of the team members went through the questions one by one, and another two assisted the children if they wanted clarification of phrases or unfamiliar words. An active effort was made to not structure students' answers when helping them to understand the questions, however, time was set aside on each visit to help children who were unsure how to describe their parents' jobs. A lot of the answers about parents' jobs were supplemented by the questionnaires from the teachers, which made it possible to double-check the original responses or classify unclear student responses. An interesting qualitative difference between the high and low SES schools was the high degree of information about parents' occupations possessed by teachers at the low SES schools, and the correspondingly high degree of ignorance of parents' occupations at the high SES school. This might be something worthy of a qualitative investigation. This information about parents' job and occupation were coded in line with Erik Olin Wright's class scheme by Håkon Leiulfsrud.

The rest of the data were subsequently coded and systematized into an operative dataset by me, with a lot of work being put into identifying mismatches between the social integration questionnaire and the CDI inventory. A few blank questionnaires were handed in; the dataset consisted of a total of 397 N items after empty and double observations had been removed. The total amount of observations received from the three schools was 560: 188 from school 1 (the

high SES school), 265 from school 2 and 107 from school 3 (the two low SES schools). This means a total of 163 responses are missing from the data due to absence on the day of collection or lack of permission from parents. The distribution of missing responses is as follows: 13% missing from school 1, 29% missing from school 2 and 42% missing from school 3. The models themselves have an additional total of 68 missing items, due to the lack of answers in the collected questionnaires on certain variables which were therefore excluded from analysis by default by Stata, the statistics software used.

The sample size from each school is so large that it is unsuitable for making inferences about an overall population reflected in the sample (Mehmetouglu & Jakobsen, 2017). However, this aligns well with the purpose of this thesis, which is to make inferences about social mechanisms facilitating the empirical relationships observed. This thesis will therefore treat the respondents in the data as a whole population in order to conduct a case study of the relationships between the dependent and independent variables used in the models. This approach to quantitative research aligns itself with *stochastic model theory*, and not sample theory, where the objective is to use the confidence intervals and levels of significance to determine if the results are a product of social mechanisms and relations or random coincidences (Mehmetouglu & Jakobsen, 2017). By approaching the analysis this way, the confidence intervals and levels of significance have the function of determining whether or not we can infer that a social process has led X to produce Y, or if it should be ascribed to an unspecified random process (Mehmetouglu & Jakobsen, 2017).

Another issue concerning the dataset is the low N (N=3) at level 2, as the data analyzed in this thesis is hierarchically nested. The desirable N at level 2 is recognized as being between 20-40 units constituting different clusters when using multi-level models to analyze the data (McNeish & Stapelton, 2016). In the absence of a sufficient number of clusters to conduct a multi-level analysis, the choice of method had to be robust linear and logistic regression. Since the hierarchical nature of the data violates the assumptions of independent observations in the data, leading to the potential for auto-correlation among them (Mehmetouglu & Jakobsen, 2017), the model has controlled for one-way clustered standard errors in order to produce robust estimates that account for correlations between observations within the same cluster, in order to observe potential school differences in the models (Gu & Yoo, 2019).

3.1.1 Reliability and Validity

Reliability:

Reliability concerns the trustworthiness of the data and is determined by the way the data collection was conducted (Grønmo, 2011). Having a satisfactory level of reliability in the research design means that it is possible to reproduce the same data in other instances using the same instruments and strategies for data collection (Grønmo, 2011). Reliability concerns issues related to the wording of questionnaires, coding of the data and the way it is processed. By describing the data collection and its operationalization, one creates transparency about the research process in order to enable replication of the study. Another important aspect of process transparency is that it provides information about what is studied and how it is studied. This information provides a point of reference when assessing the probability that the observed variance between the units of analysis is due to actual empirical patterns rather than the methodological design of the data collection (Grønmo, 2011).

This thesis make use of three questionnaires that address different aspects of the everyday life and experience of children; two of them were filled out by individual children at school and the third was completed by the contact teachers of the children. The questions on the children's questionnaires were worded in such a way as to be clear and easy to understand for the children and were read out loud, with each question explained while the children filled out the surveys. They are designed to gain data about the life situation of the children, as they experience it, and the children were therefore told to give the answers they felt best described their life situation at the moment of the survey. The children were also encouraged to ask if they felt unsure of the meaning of words or phrases in the questionnaires, to help them to provide the most reliable answers possible. Before the collection of data, considerable efforts were made to ensure the clarity of the questionnaires, since unclear questions can result in unreliable data in quantitative research (Grønmo, 2011). Another issue is that respondents may deliberately answer in a misleading way or feel the need to give the answer that they feel is expected, rather than saying what they actually feel . The first problem is hard to guard against, while the second was addressed by spending time explaining that the data would be anonymized and that there were no right or wrong answers to the questions. The first of the children's questionnaires, the CDI, can be considered reliable because of the fact it was developed to assess and map out the mental well-being of children for clinical use, which lends it credibility as an empirical instrument. The second one, the social integration questionnaire, was used in the two earlier waves of the

"unequal childhood" research project and has produced consistent data on these occasions, which implies it is a reliable instrument in our case.

After the data were collected, the research group went through them to check the consistency of answers, remove duplicate forms and match forms with typing errors in the identification numbers to the right respondent. The occupations of the children's parents were cross-checked with the teachers' description of their jobs, and the cross-checks showed high consistency between what the students and what the teachers reported. Investigations into single responses across the two questionnaires also showed consistency as the norm, since the children reported the same experiences on similar, but differently framed, questions. This lends credibility to the answers making up the data and indicates that using children as respondents in childhood research can produce reliable information about their experience of everyday life.

Validity

The validity of a quantitative study refers to the degree to which it actually measures what one wishes to study (Skog, 2017). Three central issues related to validity should be paid special attention to when conducting quantitative research: the validity of measurements, the sensitivity of the design and the validity of the interpretations and generalizations drawn from the results (Skog, 2017). The validity of measurements was addressed prior to data collection, with the research group devoting considerable thought and time to identifying questions that might be unclear and changing the wording to make it more appropriate to the everyday of children in 2019/2020 rather than children in 2009/2010. During the data collections this was addressed by going systematically through the questions and emphasizing that there were no right or wrong answers, and that we were interested in what the children thought were the right answers for them.

The response from the children was that they thought the questions were clearly formulated, and the questionnaires were easy to fill out. There were a few exceptions, but children were encouraged to put up their hands to get help from the team with vague or unclear questions. This gave us the impression that the children took the surveys seriously, and that we explained the questions successfully. Due to the accessible phrasing of the questions and the time taken to explain them, and to answer questions about them during data collection, we have reason to believe that we have succeeded in measuring the subjective experiences of the children. The data is therefore unlikely to contain systematic errors in responses arising from

misinterpretation of the questions, but one cannot exclude the possibility that children deliberately gave false replies, and this would compromise the internal validity of the data.

One can criticize some items on the CDI and social integration forms for not being sensitive enough to capture more subtle differences between the children's evaluations of their experiences. Since three alternative answers are given per question, roughly divided into positive/moderate/negative answers, it is not hard to imagine that some of the answers could be false negatives or false positives if the children did not feel that their own experiences fitted the options provided. A few of the children did raise concerns of this nature on a few questions, but the general feedback from the children did not indicate this to be a significant problem.

3.2 Operationalization of Variables

3.2.1 The Dependent Variables

Mental Well-Being

The first dependent variable is "Mental Well-Being" and is a scale constructed from the following five topics from the CDI inventory:

1. Feeling sad
6. Afraid something terrible might happen
7. Liking myself
9. Crying
10. Appearances
36. Feeling stressed

The scale is a continuous one-factor measure in which children's well-being is measured by their subjective reports of levels of self-esteem, sadness and anxiety. The variable captures the subjective feelings associated with internalizing symptoms in children's everyday life and relates them to the question of well-being in terms of their emotional state. It shows high internal consistency in the factor analyses conducted, and strong intra-correlations within one factor-dimension with an eigenvalue above 2. A Cronbach's alpha test produced a desirable value (0.7655) above the critical cutoff off of 0.7, implying that the scale is a reliable construct explaining about 76.5% of the observed variation and that 23.5% of the variance observed is due to error (Mehmetouglu & Jakobsen, 2017).

The variable has a minimum value of 1, indicating high mental well-being, and a maximum value of 10 indicating low mental well-being. The mean value is 3.057 and the standard deviation is 2.189. Initially breaking the assumption of normally distributed residuals and homoscedasticity due to a curve-linear distribution of residuals, the variable has been log-transformed in order to better capture the relationship and avoid producing skewed estimates (Mehmethoglu & Jakobsen, 2017). After log-transforming the dependent variable for mental well-being, the link test now indicates that the linear models have the appropriate functional form (ibid). This also means that the linear model for mental well-being will show the relative and not the real change on Y when X rises with one unit (Skog, 2017). Unlike the model for coping at school, the linear model for mental well-being shows a rise on Y in percent per rise in X. The Breuch-Pagan test further confirms the appropriateness of log-transforming, as it confirms that the requirements for homoskedasticity are now present as the issue of right-skewedness is resolved (Mehmethoglu & Jakobsen, 2017)), while the Shapiro-Wilks test confirms that the residuals are now normally distributed (ibid).

Coping at School

This second dependent variable used in this thesis measures the children's subjective experience of coping with their everyday life at school. The variable measures the experience of life at school through questions related to the children's evaluation of their own ability to cope with schoolwork and their experience of enjoyment at school. The scale is constructed using four items from the CDI inventory and one item from the social integration inventory. Questions are asked about the following five topics:

CDI:

14. Difficulty doing schoolwork.
20. Fun at school.
22. Schoolwork going well.
37. Schoolwork taking time.

Social Integration:

24. Feeling good at school.

The variable is a continuous measure of children's own evaluation of how they experience school in terms of the coping with classroom activities related to schoolwork and homework,

and what they feel about the school as a place to be. Showing high consistency within one factor during factor analysis, the variable's covariation is concentrated within one factor with an eigenvalue slightly above 1.5 (Mehmetoglu & Jakobsen, 2017). The degree of internal factor consistency also implies that feelings about how the scholastic part of school is going are related to more general feelings of enjoying being at school. The Cronbach's alpha reliability test provides a significant value (0.7075) just above the required cutoff value of 0.7. This means that the variable explains 70.75% of the observed variation, while 29.25% is due to error in measurement (Mehmetouglu & Jakobsen, 2017). While this indicates that the reliability of the scale could be improved, the factor analysis shows strong covariation, while theoretical sensitivity provides a good frame of interpretation for the construct.

The variable operates with a minimum value of 1 and a maximum value of 6, where 1 indicates a very high degree of coping and 6 a very low degree of coping. The children with a value of 5 or 6 are considered to be in the risk zone as regards poor management of life at school. The mean of the variable is 3.057, with a standard deviation of 2.189.

3.2.2 Control Variables

Since the aim of this analysis is to study the relationship between children's well-being and local conditions, it is important to include a range of control variables to moderate the estimates produced by the model (Mehmethoglu & Jakobsen, 2017). By not including relevant control variables the relationships inferred from the model are likely to be misleading, since the effects are not seen in relation to other significant factors. By not including relevant information about the children studied at the individual level, we could end up making very misleading inferences about the relationship between well-being and local factors (Mehmetoglu & Jakobsen, 2017). The following control variables were included in the models:

Gender

This variable controls for the effect exerted by gender on the dependent variables in the models. The variable is a dummy coding of gender that shows the change in Y when the respondent is a girl and the differences between boys and girls in their experience of mental well-being and ability to cope with everyday life at school. The variable is coded so that boys have the value 0 and girls the value 1. The variable has a mean of 0.558 and a standard deviation of 0.497.

Norwegian As Native Language:

Since questions about ethnic background were not included in the questionnaire, the reports from the teachers in the teacher questionnaire that distinguish children who have Norwegian as their native language from those who do not are used as a proxy. As well as serving as a proxy for non-majority background, the variable also provides us with information about the potential role played by language-skills in perceived well-being. The variable is dummy-coded, with a value of X=1 referring to the difference observed on Y when the respondent does not have Norwegian as their native language. The variable has a mean of 0.242 and a standard deviation of 0.429.

More Than One Home

This variable shows the difference between children that reside in one house and those dividing their time between more than one home. This variable serves not only as an indicator of the impact of having one's everyday life divided into two different households, but also gives clues to the family situation by indicating whether the parents of the child cohabit. This variable has been dummy coded to show differences between those living in more than one home and those living in a single home; X increases to one, with more than one home being the reference category. The variable has a mean of 0.188 and a standard deviation of 0.391.

One-Provider Household

This variable observes the differences between children that live with both their parents/providers, either in one household or more, and those children that live with one parent/provider. This provides information about the effect of living in one-parent/provider households compared with living in two-parent/provider households. The variable is dummy-coded to show the effect of living in a single-provider household when X is 1. Interpreting the effect itself is quite straightforward but, in this case, making inferences about why that effect comes about can be more difficult. Since differences can be ascribed to limitations in both material and relational resources in the home, an observed negative effect on well-being can lead to conclusions that do not reflect reality. By taking a more instrumental approach to this variable one avoids making stigmatizing statements about a group that has often been singled out for stigma (Fraser & Godron, 1994) or about the ability of single parents to raise children, which is sometimes doubted (Jakobsen, 2000), and treat the variable more as a black box in

need of further knowledge to make it possible to make statements about social mechanisms. The variable has a mean of 0.218 and standard deviation of 0.414.

Subjective Experience of Family Economy

This variable measures the effect children's own experience of material resources at home has on their well-being and coping skills. The variable distinguishes between those reporting they feel they always have more than enough, those who feel they usually have enough, those feeling their family economy is strained and those saying they do not know about their family's home situation. The variable has a minimum value of 0, which refers to feelings of constant material sufficiency at home, while 3 indicates the feeling that the family economy is constantly strained. The variable has a mean of 1.627 and a standard deviation of 0.947.

Special Education

This variable tells us if the school has taken special measures to intervene in the child's school day to improve their educational development or functioning in class. It refers to both their scholastic competence, and to how they function in the class environment. The information is provided by the teacher questionnaires, and cross tabulation of the variable shows a greater number of children with interventions in the low SES schools (See table 4). The variable is likely to be most interesting in the models analyzing the mental well-being of children, as one would expect that the special interventions represented by this variable are a symptom of a poor ability to cope with everyday life at school. The variable is dummy coded so that 1 refers to having special interventions designed to improve functioning at school and 0 refers to the absence of such interventions. The variable has a mean of 0.239 and a standard deviation of 0.427.

The Social Competence of the Child

This variable represents the teacher's evaluation of the social competence of the child, measured on a 5-point scale from 1 to 5. This variable provides an external view of the child and is of interest because it gives an opportunity to assess the role played by the child's ability to employ their social skills and understanding. This variable is also of interest because a good level of well-being and ability to cope at school give us an idea of the role that may be played by the agency and competences of children in social interactions in achieving this. The variable

has a minimum value of 1, meaning low competence and 5 meaning high competence. The mean value is 4.038 and the standard deviation is 0.974.

The Academic Competence of the Child

This variable represents the teacher's evaluation of the child's competence in core subjects, measured on a 5-point scale from 1 to 5. This variable is of interest because it gives an idea of the contribution of scholastic achievement to well-being. Especially if seen in relation to the feeling of being able to cope at school, the role played by scholastic competence is of interest as it indicates the effect of being a competent student in the eyes of the teacher, and of the positive feedback received on one's performance. The variable has a minimum value of 1, meaning low academic competence, and a maximum value of 5, meaning high competence. The mean value is 3.779 and the standard deviation is 1.043.

Socioeconomic Background

This variable represents the social position of the child's family and is operationalized in accordance with the ESeC (European SocioEconomic Classification) schema, which builds on the well-known EGP schema developed by John H. Goldthorpe (Leiulfsrud, Bison & Solheim, 2010). The classifications in the schema are supported by strong empirical evidence of consistency and validity across national borders in Europe (ibid). The schema can be used to predict differences in health outcomes, educational and occupational outcomes, and other social differences such as voting behavior and patterns of consumption (ibid). It does so on the basis of an understanding of class position as determined by shared work and market situations among actors (Harrits, 2014). A shared work and market situation means that there are shared characteristics within occupational groups in relation to income, security and integration in the labor market, chances of promotion, and control and autonomy in the workplace (Harrits, 2014).

This variable is a construct based on the class position of the child's father and has been coded using information from both the social integration inventory and the teacher questionnaire. The decision to use the father's class position as the point of reference was based on practical considerations about its empirical relevance in the analysis, and because this has traditionally been the measure of social background. It does, however, constitute a limitation to the analysis of class background. During data collection, time was taken to help the children describe the jobs of their parents in as much detail as possible, in order to get reliable material to classify. The answers from students were later validated by these responses being cross-checked with

those of their teachers. The variable, initially constructed with 13 categories distinguishing between class groups, has been aggregated into a three-category measure that distinguishes between children from middle-class, working-class and unemployed households, in order to assess more traditional differences between the middle-class and working-class families, while also paying attention to how unemployment affects well-being and the ability to cope at school. The three-category measure has a minimum value of 1, meaning middle-class and a maximum of 3, meaning unemployed. Middle-class has been set as the reference category, and the mean value in the population is 1.573 and the standard deviation is 0.635.

Experience of Social Inclusion at School

This variable is a scale that measures how far the school is experienced as an inclusive social arena. In the social integration questionnaire, the scale is constructed by asking respondents to say if they agree with five statements about the social climate at school. The questions address the children's evaluation of social support from peers and adults at school, the focus on mental well-being within the school and parental participation in school-related activities and events. The following five statements show a high amount of covariance within one factor with an eigenvalue above 1.5:

> How much do you agree that (…)?
> 67. (…) the adults at school are supportive of us?
> 68. (…) my schoolmates accept me for who I am?
> 69. (…) we value diversity at school?
> 70. (…) my family participates in school-related activities?
> 71. (…) at school we talk about how we can do well?

The scale has a slightly problematic alpha-value of 0.6975 but is included nonetheless, since it shows high explanatory power in the models. It means that 30.25% of the variance accounted for by this variable is due to error rather than the required 30%. This discrepancy is considered to be of minor significance for interpreting the effect of this particular variable, but one should still be aware that there is a higher amount of uncertainty tied to this construct compared to the others in the models. The variable has a minimum value of 1, indicating little experience of social inclusion at school and a maximum value of 11, indicating a high degree of social inclusion experienced at school. The variable has a mean of 6.535 and a standard deviation of 3.036.

Experience of Well-Being in Relation to Local Community

This variable is a scale consisting of three questions from the social integration questionnaire that measure children's experience of feeling good at school, during breaks at school and in their local neighborhood. Factor analysis shows a high degree of consistency within one factor among the variables, with an eigenvalue close to 1.2. The questions on the following topics were used to construct the scale:

24. Feeling good at school.
26. Feeling good during breaks at school.
27. Feeling good in your neighborhood.

The scale has a satisfactory alpha value of 0.7045, meaning that it explains 70.55% of the observed variance while 29.45% of the observed variance is due to error. It also tells us that it is a good measure of the phenomenon, compared to other possible constructs one could have generated on the basis of the analyzed data. The variable has a minimum value of 1, indicating a low degree of well-being experienced in relation to the local community and a maximum value of 7, indicating a high degree of well-being experienced in relation to the local community. The variable has a mean value of 5.402 and a standard deviation of 1.325.

The Schools

The schools involved in this study have been included in the models to control for differences that can be ascribed to attending these specific schools. When filling out the forms, the children used identification numbers that identify the school they attend, the class they are in and the grade they are in. This information was used to group the anonymized identification numbers into the corresponding school cluster. Since the differences between the high SES and low SES schools are of particular interest in this thesis, the high SES school has been set as the reference category across the models. The use of this school as the reference category, in preference to a dummy-coding of high/low SES is because of differences in student number and social composition between the two low SES schools. This means that one should not treat them as analytically interchangeable entities, beyond the fact that they have the same SES profile. In the table, the coefficients of school 2 and school 3 show how they differ from the high SES

school in relation to the dependent variable (school 1). The variable has a mean value of 1.7 and a standard deviation of 0.661.

School 1(the advantaged SES school) is located in an area with a preponderance of single-residency villas, and a low rate of people moving out of the area (Leiulfsrud et al., 2003). It has a significantly higher proportion of parents with higher education than the other two schools (see table 1a.), and a much lower number of children with ethnic-minority backgrounds (see table 1b.). School 2 (Disadvantaged SES school 1) has a predominantly working-class SES profile (see table 2a.) and a much higher number of children with an ethnic minority background than School 1 (see table 2b.). It is located in a suburban area of Northtown and has a higher rate of turnover of residents (ibid). The predominant forms of housing are blockhouses and row houses (ibid). School 3 (Disadvantaged SES school 2) is significantly smaller than the other two and has a greater proportion of children with ethnic minority backgrounds in its student body school 1, but not than school 2 (see table 3b.). It is located in an urban area of Northtown and has a more heterogeneous composition in terms of the children's socioeconomic status than the other two schools (see table 3a.).

3.3 Methods of Analysis:

This thesis makes use of both robust linear and logistic regression in its analysis. Since there are too few variables at level 2 to conduct a reliable multi-level analysis (Maas & Hox, 2005; McNeish & Stapelton, 2016), the use of robust linear and logistic regression controlling for one-way clusters in the data seemed to be the lesser evil (Gu & Yoo, 2019). The problem of a sample size constituting about the whole population in two instances (schools 1 and 2) and approximately 50% in the third (school 3), is also tackled by interpreting the findings in line with stochastic model theory. This means that the findings are treated as valid within the population, but not as representative for any larger population, which they would be if the data met the conditions for employing regular sample-theory (Mehmetouglu & Jakobsen, 2017).

3.3.1 The Assumptions of Linear Regression:

In order to use linear regression as an approach to quantitative analysis, the analysis needs to meet the following criteria: the presence of homoscedastic error terms, there is no autocorrelation among the error terms, the model is correctly specified, there is no multicollinearity among the variables and residuals are normally distributed (Skog, 2017). All

the linear models get a non-significant value after the Breusch-Pagan/Cook-Weissenberg test for heteroskedasticity is run on them (ibid). This means that the standard error of our estimates is likely to be trustworthy (ibid). If the models had a problem with heteroskedasticity we would still have "correct" estimates, but we would be misinformed about their statistical precision (ibid).

When assessing the functional form of the model's residuals, the histogram showing the correspondence between the residuals' distribution and a normal distribution seem to indicate a mismatch. The models for mental well-being appear to be a bit skewed towards the right, while the models for coping at school seem to be a bit skewed towards the left. Applying the Shapiro-Wilks normality test to assess the potential issue, both models produce a non-significant result, which means that there is no issue concerning the distribution of residuals (Skog, 2017).

The assumption of appropriate functional form was initially breached in the first model for mental well-being and met in the model for coping at school. Suspecting the dependent variable for experienced mental well-being to depict a curve-linear relationship, this was examined by looking at the distribution of residuals. The histogram of residuals confirmed the curve-linear shape of the variable and it was log transformed, resulting in an appropriate functional form according to the linktest (Mehmetouglu & Jakobsen, 2017).

Testing for potential multicollinearity within the model, we assessed the variance inflation factor (vif) present. This procedure runs every independent variable in the models as the dependent variable in a regression with the other independent variables (Mehmethoglu & Jakobsen, 2017), and if any of these analyses produces a value below 0.2, the models have a problem with multicollinearity. None of the variables included in the models produced a value that fell below that of 1.0, so that we can assert that the variables in the models observe unique relationships within the data (ibid).

The assumption of no autocorrelation among the observations is breached in this thesis, as it has made use of a strategic selection of respondents by gathering data at three schools based on their SES profile. This means the data has three clusters, thus violating the assumptions of linear regression, while also lacking a proper number of units at level 2 to make use of multi-level models (McNeish & Stapelton, 2016). Solving this by applying robust linear regression analysis

that controls for one-way clusters, the model still provides reliable estimates (Gu & Yoo, 2019). In order to run a robust linear regression analysis with correction for autocorrelation in the estimates, the diagnostics of the model were run before the cluster-parameter was applied, as it is not possible to apply them to a robust-linear model in the Stata software.

3.3.2 The Assumptions of Logistic Regression

In the Logistic models, both the dependent variables were dummy-coded to distinguish between the children in the at-risk zone in terms of coping at school and their mental well-being. The variable measuring ability to cope at school was divided into the categories "coping with everyday life at school" (consisting of values 1-4) and "not coping with everyday life at school" (consisting of values 5 and 6), with "coping" having the value 0 and "not coping" the value 1. The non-log-transformed variable for mental well-being was coded into a dummy consisting of the category "high mental well-being" (consisting of values 1-4) and "low mental well-being" (consisting of values 5-10), with the "high mental well-being" category being given the value 0 and the "low mental well-being" category the value 1. It is worth noting the seemingly uneven distribution between the two categories in the dummy for mental well-being. Since the initial distribution of the continuous variable was markedly skewed towards the left, with a high number of students (approximately 200) having values 1 and 2, the categories from 5 to 10 were aggregated due to their noticeable deviation from the distributional norm. Values from five and up declined steadily: 35 children had the value 5 and 6 children had the value 10. These were deemed to be marginalized children in terms of mental well-being, due to their markedly different score from the majority in the population. This makes the results from the logistic model more generic in their interpretation: the results could have been more worrying if we had looked at the children with seriously poor mental well-being rather than those with a general at-risk level of mental well-being. However, since the logits and odds ratios retained their direction and power when comparing models with different severity of risk groups, it was decided to focus on a more generic group of at-risk children within this domain. This is also consistent with the logistic model for coping with school.

Logistic regression analysis requires fewer assumptions to be met than linear regression since the dummy-coding of the dependent variable eliminates the requirement for normally distributed residuals and homoscedasticity when operating with a continuous variable (Skog,

2017). The assumptions required for the use of logistic regression is that the relationships studied have a curve-linear relationship so that it is possible to describe it using a logistic function (Skog, 2017). Both models produce a significant _hat value and non-significant _hatsq value after the Hosmer-Lemeshow test has been applied to assess the functional fit of the model. This tells us that the models have an appropriate functional form consistent with the relationships portrayed with logistic regression. However, when checking for goodness-of-fit for the models as a whole, we see that the number of observations is close to the number of covariate patterns: 329/322 in the coping with school model and 328/321 in the mental well-being model. We therefore collapsed the tables on quantiles of estimated probabilities to assess whether the values on the dependent variable align with the number of covariate patterns and observations in our data (Mehmethoglu & Jakobsen, 2017). The non-significant result from the initial round of goodness-of-fit testing remains, and we conclude that the model has a reasonable fit with the relationships in the data (ibid).

The second assumption of logistic regression is that the observations are independent of each other. As we did not switch to a random sample in the logistic models, this is still violated in the data. Consequently, we use robust logistic regression rather than logistic regression, to control for the effect nested data can exert on the estimates and t-values (Gu & Yoo, 2019). In this instance we conducted the diagnostics both before and after controlling for clusters in the model, since Stata allows for this when it comes to logistic regression. The assumption of functional specification and goodness-of-fit were met in both instances.

3.4 Researching Children: Some Methodological and Ethical Considerations

It used to be common practice to use children's parents as proxies in childhood research, as children were not deemed competent to explain their views s and were considered too immature to understand the social world they live in (Huang et al., 2016). Things changed after the *Convention on the Rights of Children* stated that children should be included in decision-making processes affecting them, which spurred research to focus more directly on children (ibid). Research now assesses the opinions and experiences of children in accordance with their age and maturity. Even though children are not as reflective and knowledgeable about their situations as adults might be, it is important to include their perspectives so as to achieve an understanding of their lived experience of well-being (Fattore et al., 2007). If well-being is defined in the traditional way, in terms of developmental trajectories, behavioral problems and performance, this can easily end up imposing an adult-centric view on the experience of

childhood (Barker & Weller, 2003). Quantitative research tools applied to children, however, should be subject to extensive cross-referencing across various fields and cases, in order to generate reliable measures for children's experiences. The CDI inventory used to assess children's well-being in this thesis is a well-validated construct for use across samples and national contexts to assess the lifeworld experiences of children as regards mental well-being (Sun & Wang, 2015; Iverson, Svalander & Litlere, 2005).

The children in this study were recruited through the school they attended. Those who participated did so with the informed consent of their parents, as they all were under the legal age for giving legal consent in Norway (Huang et. al, 2016). The response rate from parents at school 3 was particularly low, which members of the school staff put down to poor school-parent relations in the area. However, one cannot entirely exclude the possibility that some parents thought the project was invasive of their children's privacy or was examining a particularly sensitive matter, given its focus on well-being and coping skills. When researching potentially sensitive matters such as children's well-being and ability to cope at school, it is important to be aware that questions about victimization by one's peers and other painful experiences might result in discomfort and anxiety (Huang et al., 2016). This issue was discussed by the research group prior to data collection, and the importance was recognized of putting children are their ease by establishing a feeling of safety and during the surveys and taking breaks to allow them to focus on something else between the two questionnaires. The children were also encouraged to contact their teacher or a member of the research group if they felt like talking about the experience of filling out the questionnaire. After collecting the data the research group felt that the children had enjoyed participating in the research, and that few of them had raised concerns about sensitive questions.

The children were fully informed about the steps taken by the research group to protect their privacy and anonymity (Huang et al., 2016). They were also told that they had the right to not answer questions they found uncomfortable, which may have contributed to the lack of some observations in the models, as certain of the key items used in the scale constructs could be upsetting for some children (for example, "I look good/I don't look good/I'm ugly" or "I hate myself/I don't like myself/ I like myself"). In order to make the children feel at ease while they filled out the questionnaires, data collection was conducted in the familiar setting of their school – in their classrooms, with their teacher present. All this was done to ensure that the data

gathered was reliable and that the interests and rights of the children providing the data were protected.

4. Presentation of Analysis and Results

In this part of the thesis we will analyze the results of the two models, starting with the coping at school models, and then moving on to the models assessing mental well-being. Both tables contain four models, with the first model containing only individual level characteristics (e.g. social background, gender, majority language and competence). The second model inserts a control variable for the school attended. This shows the change in individual level variables when measures of SES contexts are taken into account and differences between the advantaged and disadvantaged SES schools. Following this, the third model adds the scales controlling for effects exerted by experiencing the school as a socially inclusive arena and feelings of well-being in relation to the local community. By controlling for this in this sequence we are able to see how factors at the individual level change once factors lying beyond the individual and their family are included in the model. The fourth model is the logistic model in which the at-risk children are examined more closely. As the linear models are appended after the initial one, the introduced variables will be assessed, together with significant changes from the previous models. When the logistic model is introduced, it will be compared to the third linear model in order to explicate differences between the whole population and the at-risk children. The development in R^2, from linear to linear model, will be commented on as the models are introduced.

4.1 Coping at School

Table 1: Coping at School

	(1) School-Coping	(2) School-Coping	(3) School-Coping	(4) At-risk: School Coping:	(4) Odds Ratio
Girl	0.230	0.216	-0.047	-0.157***	0.855***
	(0.161)	(0.173)	(0.033)	(0.043)	(0.043)
Not native	-0.075	-0.189	-0.155	-0.183	0.833
	(0.235)	(0.267)	(0.205)	(0.362)	(0.362)
Several homes	0.077	-0.024	-0.084	-0.551	0.576
	(0.485)	(0.491)	(0.146)	(0.758)	(0.758)
Sole provider	0.265	0.294	0.068	0.165	1.171
	(0.556)	(0.536)	(0.094)	(0.440)	(0.440)
Money at home	0.179	0.156	0.009	-0.101	0.903
	(0.073)	(0.084)	(0.048)	(0.084)	(0.084)
Special education	0.416*	0.372	0.464**	0.654***	1.923***
	(0.119)	(0.133)	(0.071)	(0.142)	(0.142)
Social competence	-0.290*	-0.278*	-0.089	-0.275	0.762
	(0.072)	(0.069)	(0.095)	(0.251)	(0.251)
Academic competence	-0.280**	-0.296**	-0.263**	-0.425***	0.653***
	(0.053)	(0.049)	(0.038)	(0.018)	(0.018)
1.Middleclass					
2.Working Class	-0.092	-0.270	-0.139	-0.820**	0.440**
	(0.213)	(0.283)	(0.310)	(0.410)	(0.410)
3.Unemployed	-0.228	-0.369	-0.213	0.003	1.928
	(0.313)	(0.379)	(0.266)	(0.641)	(0.641)
1. High SES school					
2.Low SES school 1		0.403	0.051	0.515	1.673
		(0.242)	(0.234)	(0.341)	(0.341)
3.Low SES school 2		0.305	-0.069	0.549**	1.732**
		(0.247)	(0.248)	(0.247)	(0.247)
Social Inclusion			-0.112***	-0.225***	0.798***
			(0.007)	(0.023)	(0.023)
Community Well-being			-0.560***	-0.656***	0.519***
			(0.050)	(0.047)	(0.047)
_cons	5.004***	4.966***	3.944**	1.352	3.865
	(0.323)	(0.173)	(0.560)	(0.893)	(0.893)
Obs.	346	346	337	337	337
R-squared	0.129	0.171	0.473	.z	.z

Standard errors are in parenthesis
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

4.1.1 The Linear Models

The first thing we can see from model 1 is that teachers' assessment of academic and social competence exerts the only significant protective effect on how children experience their level of coping with daily life at school. The effect of academic competence is significant at the 5% level and social competence at the 10% level. These factors predict a decline in experienced outcomes of 0.29 in poor coping at school in the case of social competence and of 0.28 in the case of academic competence. This indicates that, of the individual level factors, it is the competence of the children themselves that exerts a positive influence on their experience of management in the school. Seen in the context of the lack of significant effect exerted by the social background variable, one might suspect that the effect exerted by competence is a spurious expression of class-background. This, however, is not likely to be the case, as early models focusing on the impact of social background on the general population which did not include competence produced the same result. We also see that being in special education has a negative effect on outcomes, and having special interventions into everyday life at school predicts an increase of 0.46 in negative outcomes. This inference seems rather predictable and is significant at the 10% level in the individual based model. The first model has a R-squared value of 12.9, implying that the control variables can account for about 13% of the observed variance in experienced ability to cope at school in the population. Something worth commenting on here is the absence of effect exerted by class, gender, family structure or ethnic minority background in model 1. These variables remain insignificant across the linear models as improvements are added, with sizable t-values implying a low probability of committing a type 2 error in their regard.

In model 2 we see that the addition of a control variable for the school attended does not exert a significant effect on outcomes for experienced ability to cope at school in the general population. We see that the competence of the child is still the main predictor of positive outcomes in terms of coping at school, and that it retains their power and level of significance when SES context is controlled for. We also observe an increase of R-squared value up to 17%, implying a slight improvement in the model's ability to account for observed variance.

In model 3 we add the scales measuring experiences of school as being a socially inclusive place and feelings of well-being in relation to the local community. The first thing to notice is that the protective effect exerted by social competence on outcomes is not retained from models 1 and 2, when measures for the role of social relations are included. We will see later that the

measures for positive social relations and social inclusion constitute the most significant predictors of positive outcomes in coping with life at school. We see that well-being in relation to the local community exerts the largest decrease (0.56) in negative outcomes when it rises by one value, and that it is significant at the 1% level. Experiencing the school environment as socially inclusive, on the other hand, predicts a positive decrease of 0.11 in outcomes when X increases by one, and is also significant at the 1% level. This result suggests that the key protective factors that enable children to cope with daily life at school are to be found in social relations and the positive feelings of inclusion they can produce.

On the basis of model 3 we see that, with the exception of academic competence, factors at the individual level, do not predict positive adaption to school life when the wider student population in the schools is analyzed. We also see that the inclusion of the variables predicting outcomes that are based on the experience of social inclusion and well-being in the community significantly improves the explanatory power of the model. With the R-squared value rising from 0.171 to 0.473, indicating an increase of 27% in explanation of the observed variance in the dependent variable, this change lends credibility to H3 (*There will not be marked differences between the children attending the low SES schools and the high SES school in their experience of mental well-being and ability to cope with everyday life at school, since the low SES schools are more sensitive to potential social exclusion and marginalization.)* and H4 (*The experience of social inclusion and well-being in relation to their local area will have a greater impact on children's experience of mental well-being and ability to cope at school than will traditional social class divides.*). Whereas, if H1 (*Middle-class children will have a greater measure of experienced mental well-being and ability to cope with school than children from working-class and unemployed households.*) and H2 (*Children attending the high SES school will experience markedly higher levels of mental well-being and ability to cope with everyday life at school than children in the low SES schools, due to the greater amount of resources embedded in their families and area of residence.*) were to hold true, we would have expected model 1 to show a significant difference between the middle-class children and the children of working-class and unemployed fathers and would have expected model 2 to show differences between the advantaged/disadvantaged SES school contexts in the general population. However, as the increase in the R-squared value is so marked between models 2 and 3, we will discuss the possibility that the model is overfitted at the end of the analysis section, after the results of the mental well-being models have been presented.

4.1.3 The Logistic Model

When dichotomizing the dependent variable to look at children in the at-risk category we can see from the logit-value for social background that the middle-class children have a greater chance being at-risk. This is significant at the 5% level and by converting the odds ratio to a percentage, we see that working-class children have a 56% higher probability of not being in the at-risk group compared to middle-class children. This contests H1, as the observed pattern indicates that children from working-class families are at risk of experiencing poor management of life at school to a lesser extent than children from families that probably have greater resources in terms of educational capital.

We also see that there is a significant difference between the advantaged SES school and the 2nd disadvantaged SES school (but not the 1st disadvantaged SES school). By converting the odds ratio to percentage we see that children at school 3 have a 73% higher probability of being in the at-risk group than the children at attending school 1. This difference in probability is significant at the 5% level. This result both supports and contests the school coping dimension of H2. We do indeed see a noticeable and significant difference in at-risk probability between one of the low SES schools and the high SES school, but the potential relationship between an area's local SES profile and at-risk outcome is obscured by there being no significant difference between school 1 and school 2. The difference between the two low SES schools might be due to particular circumstances or some aspect of school organization. This will be discussed further in section 5.

We also see that gender plays a role when it comes to being in the at-risk category, and that this is significant at the 1% level. This shows us that gendered effects do not necessarily predict a difference in outcomes for the general population, but they do exert a small protective effect on girls, as they are predicted to have a 14.5% smaller probability of being in the at-risk category than boys. We also see that academic competence now predicts a 34% decrease in the probability of being in the at-risk category, with X increasing by one unit, and that this is now significant at the 1% level.

Lastly, we see that the measures for social inclusion at school and well-being in relation to the local community continue to exert the most protective influence on the children when it comes to avoiding being in the at-risk group. Experiencing school as a socially inclusive place gives the child a decrease of 20.2% in the probability of being in the at-risk category when X increases

by one unit. This is significant at the 1% level, which is also the case for the measure of well-being in relation to the community. This exerts a positive influence on the children by reducing the probability of an at-risk outcome by 48.1% per unit increase in X. This supports the assessment from the linear models, that H4 seem to provide the best description of the factors exerting a protective influence on the children, and consequently contests the assertions of H1 and H2.

It is also worth briefly commenting on the lack of either significant negative or positive influences from the individual level variables, with the exception of gender, academic competence and special education. The models predicting outcomes in terms of coping at school give a good indication that the majority of protective factors in this domain seem to lie beyond the individual and their family.

4.2 Mental Well-Being

1.0 **Table 2: Regression results**

	(1) Mental well-being	(2) Mental well-being	(3) Mental well-being	(4) At risk mental well-being:	(4) Odds ratio
Girl	0.390**	0.379*	0.276***	0.835 ***	2.304***
	(0.095)	(0.109)	(0.016)	(0.081)	(0.081)
Not native	0.163*	0.084	0.085	0.495***	1.641***
	(0.051)	(0.072)	(0.035)	(0.121)	(0.121)
Several homes	-0.025	-0.071	-0.146	0.161	1.174
	(0.316)	(0.296)	(0.197)	(0.697)	(0.697)
Sole provider	0.192	0.184	0.162	0.284	1.328
	(0.355)	(0.321)	(0.214)	(0.973)	(0.973)
Money at home	0.076*	0.054	0.001	0.169	1.184
	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.033)	(0.129)	(0.129)
Special Education	0.067	0.039	-0.050	0.229	1.126
	(0.132)	(0.113)	(0.130)	(0.433)	(0.433)
Social competence	-0.130	-0.129	-0.065	-0.349	0.705
	(0.045)	(0.048)	(0.062)	(0.340)	(0.340)
Academic competence	0.038	0.036	0.044	0.198**	1.219**
	(0.025)	(0.021)	(0.025)	(0.094)	(0.094)
1.Middleclass					
2.Working class	0.056	-0.071	-0.066	-0.095	0.909
	(0.101)	(0.080)	(0.106)	(0.305)	(0.305)
3.Unemployed	-0.131	-0.026	-0.274*	-0.997***	0.369***
	(0.126)	(0.151)	(0.068)	(0.213)	(0.213)
1.High SES school					
2.Low SES school 1		0.248**	0.146	0.524**	1.689**
		(0.057)	(0.061)	(0.256)	(0.256)
3.Low SES school 2		0.491**	0.331**	0.952***	2.592***
		(0.054)	(0.065)	(0.301)	(0.301)
Social Inclusion			-0.044*	-0.119**	0.888**
			(0.014)	(0.056)	(0.056)
Community Well-being			- 0.191***	-0.546***	0.579***
			(0.017)	(0.021)	(0.021)
_cons	0.819	0.764*	0.511	-2.316	0.099
	(0.339)	(0.229)	(0.455)	(0.021)	(1.962)
Obs.	346	346	336	336	336
R-squared	0.129	0.167	0.363	.z	.z

Standard errors are in parenthesis
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

4.2.1 The Linear Models

The first thing to notice in model 1 is that gender and ethnicity have a negative impact on the mental well-being of children in our population. We see that girls have a relative negative change of 39% when compared to boys. This inference is significant at the 5% level. We also see that children with an ethnic minority background have a relative increase of 16.3% in a negative direction, when compared to the other children, and that this inference is significant at the 10% level when we only control for individual factors. Later we see that the subjective experience of strained economic situation at home exerts a negative impact on the mental well-being of children, increasing by 7.6% per rise in X and being significant at the 10% level. This is an interesting aspect of model 1, as we see the subjective experience of the economic situation at home has a significant impact on the mental well-being of children, while the actual socioeconomic background remains insignificant. It is also interesting that the academic and social competence of the child does not seem to exert an influence here, although it did make a difference to the ability to cope at school. We also note that the R-squared value of model 1 shows that individual level variables explain 12.6% of the observed variance of the dependent variable.

When adding variables controlling for local SES context and the school attended in model 2, we see that low SES context has a negative impact on mental well-being in both the schools when social relations and inclusion are not controlled for in the model. We see that attending school 2 predicts a 24.8% change in direction of reduced mental well-being, and that this is significant at a level of 5%. Attending school 3 predicts a 49.1% change in a negative direction in mental well-being, with a significance level of 5%. We also see that having an ethnic minority background loses its significance in model 2, while gender goes down to a 10% significance level when the type of school is introduced. The introduction of school type and local SES profile improve the R-squared value by 3.8%, showing a modest improvement in the model's ability to explain the observed variance of Y.

Model 3 adds the variables accounting for protective factors embedded in experiences of social relations. We see that experiencing the school as socially inclusive has a less significant impact when it comes to mental well-being, having a positive effect of 4.4% per rise of 1 on X. The variable for well-being in relation to the local community constitutes the dominant protective force in model 3. The effect is significant at the 1% level, and the

coefficient shows a positive increase in mental well-being of 19% when x rises by one. Later we notice that the effect exerted by gender has been reduced from the coefficient in model 1, but that the effect is still significant at the 1% level. Another interesting change is that having an unemployed father exerts a small positive effect, with a significance at the 10% level in model 3, when the school attended, and social relations are controlled for. The last interesting difference between model 2 and model 3, is that attending the first low SES school does not predict reduced mental well-being when the model controls for the influence of social inclusion at school and well-being in relation to the local community, while attending the second low SES school retains its negative effect. Lastly, we see that the R-squared value in this model too, make a significant jump from 16.7% to 36.3% in the amount of variation in the dependent variable the model is able to explain. As in the case of the ability to cope at school, this makes it relevant to discuss the question of over-fit.

4.2.2 The Logistic Model

When assessing the children in the at-risk category we see that most of the effects present in model 3 are still to be found when we turn to the logistic model. The two most salient differences are the 1% level significance that an ethnic minority background now has in the model. From the odds ratio we can infer that ethnic minority children have a 64% higher probability of being in the at-risk group than the majority population. The same applies to girls, who have a 130.4% higher probability than boys of having seriously low mental well-being, a probability that is significant at the 1% level. We can also see that greater academic competence is associated with a greater likelihood of being in the at-risk group. It signals a relative rise of 21.9% in the chances of being in the at-risk group when the level of academic competence rises by one and is significant at the 5% level.

A more counter-intuitive result in the model is that children with unemployed fathers have a significantly lower probability of having at-risk levels of reduced mental well-being. The effect is significant at the 1% level, and the odds ratio tells us that they have a 63% lower probability of being in the at-risk group than the middle-class children do. However, this is a result that one should interpret with caution, due to the low number of children from households with unemployed fathers in the population studied. The more interesting point is that there is no significant difference between the chances of middle-class children and those of working-class children being in the at-risk category. This weakens the claims of H1 and lends support to H4.

We also see that the two low SES schools are more likely to have students in the at-risk group attending them. Both these schools are significantly different from the high SES school: the first low SES school has a significant, 5% level, 9.1% higher chance of having children in the at-risk category, while the second low SES school has a much greater chance of having at-risk students, with a 63.1% higher probability than the high SES school. This is significant at the 1% level. The difference in probability of having at-risk students between school 1 and school 3 initially lends support to H2. However, when we see this in the context of the difference between school 2 and school 1, this may also lend support to H3. This will be discussed further in chapter 5.

Lastly, we see that here too experiencing social inclusion at school and well-being in the community retain their positions as the strongest protective influences. Social inclusion at school predicts a 12.7% lower probability of being in the at-risk group, when the degree of experienced social inclusion rises by one on the independent variable. This finding is significant at the 5% level and remains important in both the linear and logistic models. The variable measuring community well-being gives a reduction of 72% in the chances of being in the at-risk category when children's experience of well being in relation to local community rises by one in the independent variable. This effect is significant at the 1% level. This outcome supports H4 and an interpretation of the model where the resources promoting reslilience do not seem to be directly tied to individual or family characteristics, but to social relations between members of the school and local community.

4.3 Overfitting of Data

The large number of R-squared values produced by the linear models presented in this section call for a brief discussion of the possibility of overfitted models. A model is overfitted when it is constructed in such a way that it corresponds too much to the specific data it is applied to (Oxford Dictionaries). What happens is that the model ends up describing the variance of the dependent variable produced by the control variables, as well as the statistical noise in the data. This leads to estimates that are too specific to the analyzed sample and that can therefore lead to highly misleading generalizations about the population represented by the sample. This limits the external validity of the study, and is a problem usually assessed through cross-validation with different samples.

In this thesis the issue of over-fitting is rather difficult to assess. This is because the data represent an almost complete population and are used in a case study aiming at theoretical discussion rather than statistical generalization. However, a few comments are worth making. The first is that, except for log-transforming the dependent variable for mental well-being, few adjustments have been made to the variables to meet the assumptions of linear regression. They have been coded on the basis of theoretical considerations about the potentially significant social differences we are trying to capture, so, for example, a more fine-grained operationalization of class-position is aggregated into a rougher divide between middle-class, working-class and unemployed. The focus has been on trying to avoid tailoring the model to fit the data, and letting the construction of the models be guided by theoretical sensitivity. However, the use of the same procedures in other cases is the best way increase or decrease confidence in the absence of overfitting and this may very well turn out to be the case for this analysis.

5. Discussion

This section will discuss the empirical analysis in the light of the theoretical perspectives on resilience and the four hypotheses formulated at the end of section 2. The discussion will start by assessing H1 in the light of the observations made of the role played by family social background as a determinant of individual outcomes. The impact of gender and an ethnic minority background will also be assessed, as they too relate to individual level factors. There will then be a discussion of our mixed results in terms of H2 and H3, and the role played by school organization in the three areas. Lastly, the observed effects of experiencing social inclusion at school and well-being in the community will be considered in relation to H4.

5.1 A Notable Absence of Class Advantage?

Managing Life at School

According to the class and social stratification literature and the research of the OECD, we would expect middle-class children to manage everyday life at school better because of their social background. They have more material and educational resources available to them during their upbringing, and there is a view that schools are geared to the middle-class mode of education and upbringing, so this relative advantage should translate into outcomes. In our analysis however, the socioeconomic advantage of the middle-class does not translate into how children experience managing the everyday at school. The differences we observed do not exclude the possibility that middle-class children may perform better in terms of scholastic achievement. However, the differences show the experience of managing everyday school life does not follow class divides in society that results in a middle-class advantage in this area. On the contrary, it seems that middle-class children have a greater risk of experiencing inability to cope with life at school. When examining the at-risk group, we see that middle-class children have a significantly higher risk of ending up in this group, than their working-class peers and children with unemployed fathers.

Considering the strong empirical evidence there is that mobility trajectories are structured by social background in the literature, we may think of the observed differences as a potential risk embedded in middle-class practices enabling mobility outcomes. In line with the literature suggesting that middle-class families are more geared towards active intervention in their children's development (Laureau, 1987; Reay, 2005; Stefansen & Farstad, 2010) it may be that this has the latent function of increasing pressure on the child. This may benefit children in

terms of achievement, but it may also be a potential cause of reduced well-being at school. Such differences are not likely to come about due to inherent differences between family economies and educational level, since childrearing is something that is actively organized by parents. This may therefore be a result of classed intra-family differences in how childhood is organized in different socioeconomic family contexts.

We may think of this as a double-edged sword for middle-class families, as it seems that the way they organize childrearing may put more emphasis on children's academic development than it does in working-class families. While being a potential source of advantage regarding educational outcomes, it may have a built-in risk of heightened pressures and expectations communicated by the home environment. Such pressures may also be communicated by the school if successful informal organization among parents exerts pressure on the organization of the school. Our results, however, do not imply that this is the case. On the other hand, the opposite may be true for working-class children. It seems that they may experience less pressure from their homes regarding their school activities and academic development. This may be a source of resilience when they face school-related difficulties such as feelings of inability to handle certain subjects or high workloads. It may also translate into experiences of mastering the everyday life at school and feelings of accomplishment. Then again, it may constitute a risk later in the educational trajectory when the school day becomes more geared towards the academic aspects of education than it is in elementary school.

In line with this understanding of the observed differences along socioeconomic lines, class differences in childrearing may be a source of both risk and resilience. Since middle-class children may experience more pressure from their home environment, this could be a source of stress and anxiety manifesting as long-lasting internalizing symptoms. However, the results do not suggest this is the case for most middle-class children, as we do not see this difference in the general population. It is only when we specifically examine the at-risk group that we see that middle-class children are more likely to be in it. Such pressures may thus constitute a source both of resilience and of risk for middle-class children. By this we mean that the pressure exerted on them may have a negative effect on middle-class children finding it difficult to cope at school, while for the majority the pressure is a resource when academic demands intensify in the later stages of the educational system. Conversely, in the case of working-class children, their early experience of mastering school life may become a risk as academic demands increase. Equally, one can also imagine that positive experiences in relation to school life may

prepare the ground for resilient responses to increased school pressure later on. However, this is an empirical question.

This discussion of our results undermines the claim put forward by H1 and constitutes a break with the understandings offered by the psychopathological developmental perspective, the social stratification perspective, and the OECD. All three perspectives understand the socioeconomic background of the child as a source of advantage or handicap that translates into positive or negative outcomes in various areas or in impaired everyday functioning. The results suggest that this does not seem to be the case when one examines the experiences children have of managing life at school. It points to an inverse relationship, where middle-class advantage seems to be accompanied by a greater probability of experiencing pressure at school. We highlight the relative risk for middle-class children in this area, but acknowledge the absence of class effects in the general population. This observation contests the view that middle-class children are better equipped mentally to cope with the pressures at school. Rather, our analysis supports the view that these children seem to be the ones most exposed to scholastic pressures. While not disputing that middle-class children may perform better at school or gain more advantage from educational opportunities, it indicates that pressure may be communicated to them by the way middle-class childhood is organized. This also raises the issue of school-related stress, which is often addressed by the media in relation to young people at the higher levels of the education system (Avseth, 2015; Rødevand, 2015; Trulsen, 2018), and suggests that this may also be a feature of children's experiences at earlier stages of childhood.

Mental Well-Being

The expected differences along socioeconomic divides do not make their presence felt when one looks at children's mental well-being. This seems to be the case as regards the general population and when the at-risk children are assessed. It goes against the assumption that factors related to the socioeconomic background of families exert a strong influence in this area. Instead, it suggests that this form of risk may follow a more "democratic" distribution at the individual level in terms of children's chances of experiencing it at-risk levels. We see that the children of unemployed fathers actually have a significantly lower risk than middle-class children of being in the at-risk category, which is also the case when one looks at its effect among the general population. However, this only becomes significant when we also control for experiences of social inclusion at school and community well-being. This may hint at a heightened awareness in schools or in local communities that these households could be in

difficulty. However, it may also be due to the small number of children in this category, which means that bold inferences based on mere significance should be avoided here.

The results for this area, do not agree with the family and individual focus of the resilience literature. If they did, we would have expected socioeconomic circumstances, one-provider households or divorced parents to exert a negative influence. Instead, the only factors at the individual level which predict reduced mental well-being are gender and ethnic minority background. These divides will be discussed in the following section, as we will now concentrate on the absence of differences attributable to the family's socioeconomic position. The lack of difference between middle- and working-class children across the models suggests that the risks to well-being are not located at the family level. This may be because children's experience of their own status does not translate for them into an experience of deprivation – an interpretation which is supported by the fact that changes in how the family economy is experienced lose their significance when local contexts are controlled for through the school variable. This may imply that socioeconomic background constitutes a source of risk when it makes socioeconomic differences between the individual child and his or her peers noticeable. Such differences may be made apparent by the fact one does not have the same toys, sports equipment or other things that children yearn for. If this is the case, then the mitigating effect the implementation of the school variable had in model 2 indicates that groups of children may be homogeneous in terms of their experienced socioeconomic likeness within the different SES contexts. This suggests that it may be necessary to experience marginalization in this regard before a child's social background turns into a risk to their sense of wellbeing. The lack of socioeconomic differences here may, perhaps, also be a result of successful policy or welfare interventions into the material circumstances of childhood. As with the fact that sole-provider households do not have a significantly negative effect, this may be due to the structural coupling of single parents to appropriate welfare systems that mitigate difference.

The results of the analysis and the discussion of the observations of the effect exerted by socioeconomic background do not support the view on this issue put forward by H1 either. Since we do not observe any difference between middle-class and working-class children in either area when we look at the general population, it seems that the greater resources of middle-class families do not translate into a class advantage. On the contrary, it seems that belonging to a middle-class family brings a heightened risk of feeling unable to manage life at school. This discussion suggests that, in a longer perspective, class differences in childrearing practices

maybe associated with various risks and advantages for children. On the basis of this discussion we reject the view put forward by H1, as the middle-class children in our population do not exhibit better ability to cope at school or better mental well-being. Due to the lack of significant differences favoring them across all the models, the potential for committing a type 2 error in this regard is deemed to be very low.

5.2 The Impact of Gender and Ethnicity on Well-Being

The only two factors at the individual level which predict both reduced mental well-being in the general population and increased chances of being in the at-risk category are gender and an ethnic minority background. Of these two, it is the gendered difference that really stands out as a significant individual-level risk factor. Considering that girls have a 130.4% greater chance of being in the at-risk category than boys, this would seem to be a particularly pressing matter. It's worthy of note that the results could have been skewed in the other direction if the dependent variable had focused on externalizing symptoms of reduced well-being (e.g. often being in conflict with peers, or never doing what one's told etc.), as girls are more prone to develop internalizing symptoms. This may therefore be a result of the dependent variable measuring signs of anxiety, stress, sadness and self-deprecation. The results seem to match the literature on gendered differences in children's mental well-being. However, as externalizing symptoms are more visible because of how they are manifested in behavior, girls are also at a higher risk of not getting appropriate interventions .

If we bear in mind the greater chances boys have of being in the at-risk group for poor ability to cope at school, this may help shift organizational focus away from girls struggling with their mental well-being. The results align with the literature that suggest that girls develop more internalizing symptoms due to gendered expectations about childrearing, and may also follow the literature in suggesting that risks to the well-being of girls are often overlooked because they are less visible. A potential effect of this is that social intervention systems the school is connected to have a built-in bias, as they are reliant on referrals from the adults surrounding the individual children. Since girls may be harder to notice, they may suffer negative effects in the long run, as research suggests that mental issues in childhood are very likely to cascade if they are left untreated.

When addressing the higher risk children with an ethnic-minority background have of being in the at-risk group, compared to the majority population, it is of interest to first address the

outcomes in the individual-level model. We see there that when local context and experienced social inclusion and community well-being are not controlled for, an ethnic minority background exerts a negative effect on children's well-being. When measures for social context are introduced, however, the negative association disappears from the models until we specifically examine the at-risk group. This suggests that this is an issue related to well-being experienced in relation to the local community and social inclusion at school. Such an interpretation aligns with the literature suggesting that children with minority backgrounds may experience increased pressure since they have to handle both the sociocultural setting of the majority population at school and that of their own minority background at home. Considering that they have a 64% greater chance of being in the at-risk category, it seems that children with an ethnic minority background are at greater risk of experiencing social exclusion and low well-being in relation to the local community. This means more attention needs to be paid to how they are integrated into their local environments, and how their social support system at home may operate to reduce the risk they face. At the same time, we see that they are not at-risk of poor ability to cope at school when compared to majority children. This is another result that aligns with the literature suggesting they show resilience at school but are exposed to risk as regards mental well-being.

5.3 Socioeconomic Profile of the School

The differences we found between the schools were harder to interpret on the basis of H2 and H3 than were socioeconomic differences on the basis of H1. Starting with the experience of coping at school, we see no significant difference between school 1 (high SES school) and school 2 (low SES school 1) in terms of their pupils' experiences of coping. As these two schools constitute the most clear-cut example of working-class vs. middle-class contexts, the results suggest that school 1 may be successfully mitigating the pressure that may be put on their predominantly middle-class students. When we see that middle-class children have a higher chance of being in the at-risk category of poor coping at school, we would expect a difference between the two schools in this regard. This suggests that the high SES school may have recognized school-related pressures are a risk to their students and taken steps to mitigate them.

The comparison between school 1 and school 3 (Low SES school 2) presents a very different picture. There is no significant difference in the general population in terms of experienced school coping, but when looking we look at the at-risk groups in this area we see that children

attending school 3 have a much greater chance of being at-risk. Since it has a 73% higher chance of having at-risk students, it may be that this school faces a much more complex risk-situation than schools 1 and 2. School 3 is located in an urban area, it has a more heterogeneous student body while having about the same amounts of children with ethnic minority background as school 2, so this may indicate that the organization has to deal with a more complex environment. The school may have to take steps to mitigate pressures on middle-class children, pressures on children from families with strained economies and pressures on minority-background children, which may put more strain on the organization.

We may therefore conceptualize this intra-school difference as contingent on the complexity of pressures facing the school. If the student body was more homogeneous in terms of individual characteristics this would make it possible to have a more concentrated organizational focus and use of resources, rather than the school having to mitigate risk on several fronts. Another factor that may provide a plausible explanation could be its location in an urban area rather than in a suburb or villa area. The effort to establish social integration and well-being within the school, may be hampered by its heterogeneous urban environment. This will be discussed in more depth below.

The differences between schools 1 and 3 become even greater when we assess the well-being of the children attending them. At school 3 the discrepancy in students' well-being also applies to the general population. In the case of school 2, it does so only when controlling for individual level factors and school attended. However, this discrepancy is not observed in the whole population when we include measures of experiencing school as socially inclusive and well-being in relation to the local community. This supports what was suggested in relation to the differences in ability to cope at school: that school 3 may be situated in an environment where children experience less well-being in relation to this. This is supported by the effect the addition of the two measures also exert on school 3's coefficient, when we see the school attended lose explanatory power. This suggest that the school has a much more complex environment in terms of risk mitigation, and that the heterogeneous nature of its student body is a further complication.

When comparing school 1 and 2 in in the area of mental well-being it seems at first that there is a considerable difference between them. As regards the difference between the overall populations of the schools, we see that the reduction of well-being among students in school 2

does not persist when social inclusion and community well-being are controlled for. This may imply that children at school 2 experience less well-being in relation to their local community than children at school 1. This could be due to differences in how their out-of-school life is organized, with children in the middle-class milieu of school 1 spending more time engaged in highly structured leisure time activities. Another explanation, which is not inconsistent with the one just mentioned, is that parents in the high SES area may be more successful in mobilizing around their children's free time within the community. That is to say, they may be more successful in securing their children's well-being through the maintenance of informal networks. Such networks may also be facilitated by middle-class parents taking their children to the same highly structured out-of-school activities, thus increasing the amount of social capital in the high SES area. This highlights how the potential existence of weak ties between parents may be an important resource in the organization of childhood that enable them to create and take advantage of social capital.

The discrepancies between the areas in terms of mental well-being seem to reflect the different amounts of resources embedded in them. While such an observation supports H2, on closer inspection of the differences in probability of having at-risk children the case does not seem so clean-cut. When examining the greater probability school 2 has of having at-risk students compared to school 1, we see that the chances are only 9.1% greater. Contextualized with the 63.1% probability school 1 has of having at-risk students, it may seem that school 2 is rather successful in mitigating risk. There may also be a more complex interplay between risks and local factors in the case of school 3.

Since, for H3 to be true there would have to be significant differences between the high and low SES schools, and since H2 asserts that school 1 would have higher levels of mental well-being, there is no clear result. In the case of school 1 compared to school 2, it may seem appropriate to reject H2 since there is no observed difference between the schools in terms of coping with school, and very little difference in terms of mental well-being. Interpreting this in support of H3, we recognize these differences can be seen as being due to the school organization being more sensitive to risks of marginalization, reduced everyday functioning and social exclusion among its students. This supports H3 by indicating that school 2 has been successful taking steps to promote resilience in its pupils. However, the observations of school 3 in both areas complicate this interpretation of H3. We see that the socioeconomic profile of school 2 is accompanied by higher levels of both coping at school coping and well-being than

is the case for the children at school 3. This lends support to H2, and indicates that the school is not succeeding in mitigating risks that it faces because of the more limited resources embedded in its locality.

Rather than picking either H2 or H3 as the right description of the analysis, it is more appropriate to reject them both and offer something different. It looks to be more likely that the differences observed between schools 2 and 3 in how risk is mitigated are due to the demands of different environments. Given the characteristics of school 3, it is more likely that the negative fallout it has in both dimensions may be attributed to more complex risks among its children. Such an interpretation puts the focus on both the ability of schools to mitigate risk, and how risk may make it harder for them to promote resilience. If this is the case, then the results observed probably stem from school 2 facing less organizational strain because it has a less complicated composition of risk among its students to deal with. This may allow school 2 to focus more of its organizational attention on specific areas of risk and tackle them more effectively. By contrast, school 3 has to divide its organizational focus between several areas of risk, which affects its ability to concentrate resources on particular challenges. Having rejected H2 and H3, we maintain that there are differences in the well-being of children that follow socioeconomic divides between bounded areas and that schools can mitigate these differences. However, we now also recognize that the capacity of schools to mitigate risk is contingent on the complexity of risk they face, as this affects their organizational capacity to devote their focus and resources to building resilience in relation to specific problems.

5.4 Resilience in Social Integration and Inclusion

The most salient feature in both tables is the protective influence exerted by experiencing the school as socially inclusive and well-being in the community. As the most potent and significant effects in both dimensions of well-being in this analysis, they imply there are resilience-promoting resources in positive social relations and the experiences they bring. They seem to constitute a form of networked resource that may be facilitated by social capital, but which falls into our definition of personal social capital. Given that this form of resilient resource is not available to network members in terms of favors and information exchange, it suggests there is a more subjective benefit from social integration in a network. The resilience-promoting resources that may be available through participation in a social network are only available to those experiencing positive social bonds and support, and suggests positive experiences are derived through social interaction. On the basis of the idea of personal social capital, this thesis

proposes that the benefits for well-being that come from positive experiences of social inclusion and peer relationships should be included in how the personal benefits membership of a network are understood. Considering only factors such as increased power, social support, local knowledge and experienced confidence means that the long-term benefits of social relations are neglected. We also highlight the potential for enabling positive adaption that is present in resources found in social systems outside the individual and the family.

Here we are talking about a social interaction system among children and adults that may be facilitated by both informal and formal organization. To judge by the results of the analysis, such systems exert a significant effect across institutional domains (e.g. the family and the school). Their observed protective influence highlights their potential for promoting resilience and well-being through social mechanisms exerting an integrating force within bounded spaces. This calls attention to how the social organization surrounding childhood takes place within an institutional and local context that may make it harder or easier for children to be connected with these resources.

The benefits gained through the accumulation of personal social capital seem to be positive experiences, feelings of social inclusion and peer support that may help children develop positive coping strategies and social capabilities. This indicates the importance of the role of children's own agency when it comes to taking advantage of the resources embedded in these kinds of social systems. Since these benefits are not made available by simply driving 10-year-olds to football practice twice a week, it presupposes that children are able to foster relations with other children to gain access to these experiences. An understanding of how children operate within their own social environment is therefore required to understand how they may expose themselves to or withdraw themselves from this form of personal social capital.

H4 will then be retained on the basis of the empirical evidence supporting it, and our discussion. The choice of H4 highlights blind spots concerning the observed role played by potentially integrative social mechanisms in the literature on risk and resilience in childhood. We have seen that individual and family factors only explain to a very small degree increases or decreases of risk to children's experienced well-being, while factors to do with locality and at the intra-relational level have constituted the main sources of risk and resilience. This suggests that the role played by informal and formal organization by agents in bounded spaces should be paid more attention when conceptualizing how one might promote resilience and educational

equity. As intra-relational factors seem to be the dominant protective influence on children's well-being, their potential in mitigating dangers to positive development in childhood should be integrated better into one's understanding of risk, resilience and childhood.

This analysis shows the importance of examining more closely the way in which schools and parents' organizations, and interaction between children structure the setting childhood takes place within, as individual and family factors do not seem to capture the mechanisms that may bring about resilient responses. Social exclusion and negative feelings of well-being in relation to the local community seem to be the main contributors to low mental well-being and reduced functioning within the school. There is therefore a need to address how organizational sensitivity in schools and parent networks have the potential to offset risk by linking children at risk of marginalization and exclusion to potential sources of social integration and inclusion. This would put focus on the capacity in local organization to tackle social inequality in childhood between different areas, by the linking of a socially disadvantaged background to arenas where children may accumulate personal social capital. The capacity to do so seem to be highly contingent on the ability of social capital within bounded spaces to work as an integrative force, which highlights how weak ties between community members may serve as an important resource in the local organization of childhood. Our analysis also suggests that more attention should be paid to the way in which children navigate their social surroundings and how this may hinder them from accumulating personal social capital. Paying more attention to how the social competence of children affects their ability to form positive social bonds with others may make it possible to identify family factors that affect whether children struggle or are successful in this regard. In order to identify such factors, more attention should be paid to how childhood is experienced and navigated by the children themselves, which calls for more research based on data gathered on, and from, children.

6. Conclusion

The research question guiding this thesis was: *How may informal and formal organization within bounded spaces mitigate risk and promote resilience in childhood?* This was further divided into two questions: *are there systematic differences between different socioeconomic areas in terms of children's well-being*? and *to what degree are schools able to mitigate potential risks to children's well-being that are present in the local area?* This was addressed by testing four hypotheses concerning the risk posed by social background, the role played by local socioeconomic conditions as a source of risk, schools' capacity to mitigate risks in areas with a low socioeconomic profile and the potential role played by experiencing social inclusion through well-being at school and in the community.

The empirical analysis has shown that individual and family factors exert little protective influence on the well-being of children. With the exception of academic and social competence, the significant effects observed at the individual and family level constituted potential risks to the well-being of children. This was seen in the effect gender and an ethnic-minority background exerted on mental well-being and in the fact that their class background was associated with middle-class children being in the at-risk category.

Significant protective factors, as well as sources of risk, were found to be connected to the school attended and experiences of social inclusion at school and well-being in the community. The differences between the schools highlighted how risks embedded in schools' environment may have varying degrees of complexity that will affect their ability to tackle risks present in their locality. Consequently, it seems that the local environment in which childhood unfolds, exerts a strong impact on the potential reproduction of durable inequalities within this domain as it may strain or facilitate organizational practices aimed at reducing inequalities. The differences we observed between schools 2 and 3 in regard to both mental well-being and the ability to cope at school provide an illustration of this, as the heterogeneous student body at school 3 and its location in an urban setting may strain its ability to mobilize resources around risks. This indicates that schools are capable of mitigating risk to children in their vicinity, but that, if the risk factors are complex, this may hinder schools from tackling them, and inequality, effectively.

We observed, then, that there were at times systematic difference between socioeconomic areas, but not always. We saw that the differences in children's well-being between schools 1 and 2

remained small throughout the analysis, and that this may be due to the schools having more homogeneous student populations in terms of social class background. This supports the claim that the ability of schools to mitigate risk is also contingent on their environment. In the case of school 2, its apparent success in mitigating differences may be due to the fact that it is under less external pressure, which allows for a greater organizational focus on a narrower set of risks, and the concentration of resources on them.

However, the role of school organization was often mediated by children's experience of social inclusion. This points to the importance of social interaction systems as arenas where children may unlock personal social capital through experiencing positive social relations and inclusion. This shows the importance of the ability of informal and formal organizations to facilitate integrative social mechanisms in local contexts, and hints at the great potential for the promotion of resilience that such action might have. It highlights how the organization of the social environment of children has the potential to link them to arenas where they may experience social inclusion as a source of resilience. Pointing to the potential role of social capital among parents and community members, it highlight the potential of weak ties as an important resource in the local organization of childhood. This way of addressing risk and resilience in childhood focuses on mechanisms related to social inclusion/exclusion among children and how this may affect their well-being. It breaks with the individual and family focus of the resilience literature we reviewed, and points to the potential benefits of studying how organizational practice may increase or decrease the well-being of children within bounded spaces.

6.1 Future Research and Limitations

The implication these results have for future research into the issue of resilience and risk in childhood is found in the potential benefits deriving from factors located beyond the individual and family. Now that potential mechanisms located in the interplay between the school and its local environment that enable mitigation of risk have been pointed out, there is a need for a more focused and thorough investigation of how they may operate. Potential areas of interest are the relationship between schools in different social contexts and their parent groups, the relationship between out-of-school sites and social integration of children, with a focus on who such sites are arenas of integration/exclusion for. Also, of great possible interest are the factors that determine the well-being children experience in relation to their local community, as this seems to be an important determinant of whether children avoid experiencing reduced well-

being. This calls for the employment of a more comprehensive perspective on childhood, that actively take children's experiences and surroundings into account. In order to not reduce children's experiences to a direct product of their social background or their internal systems, more research should include the lifeworld experiences of children. By gaining more insights into how children feel, experience and navigate their own social world, a more accurate picture of how local conditions of childhood impact them may be constructed. Correspondingly, if one is to address how social inequality may manifest itself during childhood, it is important to actively include the perspectives of the people it concerns. However, in order to do so, research on data gathered on and from children is needed.

To turn to the limitations of this study, the most notable of these is the lack of external validity. Since the data worked with are not suitable for use as a representative sample, the findings of this thesis are limited to the particular case in question. Another issue related to the design of the data collection is the low number of N at level 2. With a larger sample consisting of more schools one could have used more accurate methods to analyze the data, which would have increased the reliability of the analysis. Lastly, as this thesis discusses observations that diverge from what the literature of resilience and risk would lead one to expect, the degree to which the suggested explanations are actually the factors at work is an empirical question that remains to be answered.

7. Literature

Agasisti, T. et al. (2018). "Academic resilience: What schools and countries do to help disadvantaged students succeed in PISA", *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 167, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/e22490ac-en.

Allgaier, A-K., Frühe, B., Pietsch, K., Saravo, B., Baethmann, M., & Schulte-Körne, G. (2012). 'Is the children's depression inventory-short version a valid screening tool in pediatric care? A comparison to its full-length version', *Journal of Psychosomatic Research,* 73(5), pp. 369-374.

Anderson, S., Leventhal, T. & Dupéré, V. (2014). 'Exposure to Neighborhood Affluence and Poverty in Childhood and Adolescence and Academic Achievement and Behaviour', *Applied Developmental Science*, 18(3), pp. 123-138, https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2014.924355

Andvig, J. C. (2014). Barndom, barn og «globalisering» - politikk og idéspredning. *Internasjonal Politikk* (4), pp. 500-510.

Avseth, H., (2015). Fra prestasjon til depresjon, *NRK nyheter*, (21.05.12), retrieved from: https://www.nrk.no/ytring/fra-prestasjon-til-depresjon-1.12369440 (15.06.20).

Aluja, Anton & Blanch, Angel. (1985). 'The Children Depression Inventory as Predictor of Social and Scholastic Competence', *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*. 18. pp. 259-274. 10.1027//1015-5759.18.3.259

Bakken, A., Frøyland, L. R., & Sletten, M. A. (2016). Sosiale forskjeller i unges liv. Hva sier Ungdata-undersøkelsene? Retrieved from Oslo: http://www.hioa.no/content/download/123772/3198955/file/Sosiale-forskjeller-i-unges-liv-NOVA-Rapport-3-2016-18-april-.pdf.

Barker, John & Weller, Susie, (2003). '"Is it fun?" developing children centred research methods', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 23(1/2), pp. 33–58.

Ben-Hador, B., & Eckhaus, E., (2018). 'The different impact of personal social capital and intra-organizational SC', *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 21(1), pp. 28–47.

Blokland, T. & Savage M., (2008). 'Social Capital and Networked Urbanism', in Blokeland, T & Savage, M. (Eds.), (2008) *Networked urbanism: social capital in the city*, Aldershot: Ashgate

Bornstein M. H., Hahn, C.-S. & Suwalsky, J. T. D., (2013). 'Developmental Pathways Among Adaptive Functioning and Externalizing and Internalizing Behavioral Problems: Cascades From Childhood Into Adolescence', *Applied Developmental Science*, 17:2, pp. 76-87, DOI: 10.1080/10888691.2013.774875.

Bott, E. (1957). *Family and social network: roles, norms, and external relationships in ordinairy urban families*, London: Tavistock.

Boudon, Raymond (1974). *Education, Opportunity and Social Inequality*, John Wiley & Sons Inc, Hoboken.

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J.-C., (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* [New ed.] preface by Pierre Bourdieu., London: Sage.

Braveman P. & Barclay C. (2009). 'Health disparities beginning in childhood: a life-course perspective', *Pediatrics*, 124, pp. 163–175.

Bridger, J. C. & Alter, T. R. (2006). 'Place, Community Development, and Social Capital, *Community Development*, 37(1), pp. 5-18, https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330609490151

Brown, P. (2003). 'The Opportunity Trap: Education and Employment in a Global Economy, *European Educational Research Journal*, 2(1), pp. 141 – 179.

Bøe, T., Øverland, S., Lundervold, A.J. Hysing, M. (2011). 'Socioeconomic status and children's mental health: results from the Bergen Child Study', *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* 47**,** pp. 1557–1566 (2012). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-011-0462-9

Chaplin T.M., Cole P.M., Zahn-Waxler C., (2005). 'Parental socialization of emotion expression: gender differences and relations to child adjustment', *Emotion*, 5(1), pp. 80-88. doi:10.1037/1528-3542.5.1.80.

Cicchetti, D. & Rogosch, F. A. (2012). 'Gene by Environment interaction and resilience: effects of child maltreatment and serotonin, corticotropin releasing hormone, dopamine, and oxytocin genes', *Development and psychopathology*, 24(2), pp. 411-427.

Cohen, J.R., Andrews, A.R., Davis, M.M. & Rudolph, K.D. (2018). 'Anxiety and Depression During Childhood and Adolescence: Testing Theoretical Models of Continuity and Discontinuity', *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 46**,** pp**.** 1295–1308. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-017-0370-x.

Cohn, M. A., Fredrickson, B. L., Brown, S. L., Mikels, J. A., & Conway, A. M. (2009). 'Happiness unpacked: positive emotions increase life satisfaction by building resilience', *Emotion 9*(3), pp. 361–368. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015952.

Coleman, J., (1988). 'Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital', *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, pp. 95–120.

Collins, M., (2004). 'Sport, physical activity and social exclusion', *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 22:8, 727-740, DOI: 10.1080/02640410410001712430.

Conger, R.D. & Donnellan, M.B. (2007), 'An Interactionist Perspective on the Socioeconomic Context of Human Development', *Annual Review Psychology*, 58: pp.175–99.

Cuellar, A., (2015). 'Preventing and treating child mental health problems', *The Future of Children*, 25(1), pp.111–134.

De Los Reyes, A., Augenstein, T. M., Wang, M., Thomas, S. A., Drabick, D., Burgers, D. E., & Rabinowitz, J. (2015). 'The validity of the multi-informant approach to assessing child and adolescent mental health', *Psychological bulletin*, *141*(4), pp. 858–900. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038498.

Dearing, E. & Taylor, B.A., (2007). 'Home improvements: Within-family associations between income and the quality of children's home environments', *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 28(5-6), pp. 427–444.

Fattore, T., Mason, J. & Watson, E. (2007). 'Children's conceptualisation(s) of their well-being', *Social Indicators Research* 80, pp. 5–29. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-006-9019-9.

Fraser, N., Gordon, L., (1994). '"Dependency" Demystified: Inscriptions of Power in a Keyword of the Welfare State', *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, Vol 1(1) , pp 4–31, https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/1.1.4.

Fried E.I., Nesse R.M. (2014). 'The Impact of Individual Depressive Symptoms on Impairment of Psychosocial Functioning', *PLOS ONE* 9(2): e90311. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.009031.

Frønes, I., (1997). 'The Transformation of Childhood: Children and Families in Postwar Norway', *Acta Sociologica*, 40(1), pp.17–30.

Giddens, A. (1973) 'The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies', in Szelényi, S., Grusky, D.B. (Eds.) & Ku, M.C., (2008). *Social stratification: class, race, and gender in sociological perspective* 3rd edn., Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.

Gottesman, I. I. & Hanson, D. R. (2005). 'Human Development: Biological and Genetic Processes', *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56(1), pp. 263-286.

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). 'The Strength of Weak Ties', *The American journal of sociology*, 78(6), pp. 1360 – 1380.

Grusky, D. B. & Ku, M. C. (2008) 'Gloom Doom and Inequality', in Szelényi, S., Grusky, D.B. (Eds.) & Ku, M.C.,(2008). *Social stratification: class, race, and gender in sociological perspective* 3rd edn., Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.

Grusky D. B. & Sørensen, J. B. (1998) 'Are There Big Social Classes?', in Szelényi, S., Grusky, D.B. (Eds.) & Ku, M.C., (2008). *Social stratification: class, race, and gender in sociological perspective* 3rd ed., Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.

Grønmo, S. (2004). *Samfunnsvitenskapelige metoder* 4th edn., Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Gu, A. and Yoo, H. I. (2019) 'vcemway: A one-stop solution for robust inference with multiway clustering', *The Stata Journal*, 19(4), pp. 900–912. doi: 10.1177/1536867X19893637.

Harding, D. J., Jencks, C., Lopoo, L. M., Mayer, S. E. (2008) 'Family Background and Income in Adulthood, 1961-1999', in Szelényi, S., Grusky, D.B. (Eds.) & Ku, M.C., (2008). *Social stratification: class, race, and gender in sociological perspective* 3rd ed., Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.

Havnes, T. (2010). 'Sosial mobilitet og offentlige investeringer i barn og ungdom', *Søkelys på arbeidslivet, 27*(1-02), 135-146.

Harrits, Gitte Sommer (2014). *Klasse*. *En introduktion*. *Hans Reizels forlag*, København.

Hayas L., Izco-Basurko, I., Fullando, A. et al. (2019). 'Upright, a resilience-based intervention to promote mental well-being in schools: Study rationale and methodology for a European randomized controlled trial', *BMC Public Health*, vol. 19:1413. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-7759-0.

Hjellbrekke J. & Korsnes O. (2012). *Sosial Mobilitet*, Det Norske Samlaget [2nd edn], Oslo.

Hoffman D. M., (2010). 'Risky investments: Parenting and the production of the "resilient child"', *Health, Risk & Society*, 12:4, 385-394, DOI: 10.1080/13698571003789716

Howard, S., Dryden, J. & Johnson, B. (1999). 'Childhood Resilience: Review and critique of literature', *Oxford Review of Education, 25*(3), 307-323. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/030549899104008

Huang, X. et al. (2016). 'Ethical and methodological issues in qualitative health research involving children: A systematic review', *Nursing Ethics*, 23(3), pp. 339–356. doi: 10.1177/0969733014564102.

Ivarsson, T., Svalander, P., & Litlere, O., (2006). 'The Children's Depression Inventory (CDI) as measure of depression in Swedish adolescents. A normative study', *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry*, 60:3, 220-226, DOI: 10.1080/08039480600636395

Jacobsen, K., (2000). Alenemødre Lager Dårlige Soldatsønner, *Dagbladet*, 07.02, Tilgjengelig fra: https://www.dagbladet.no/nyheter/alenemodre-lager-darlige-soldatsonner/65575761 (Hentet 15.06.2000)

Kingston, S., Huang, K. Y., Calzada, E., Dawson-McClure, S. & Brotman, L. (2013). 'PARENT INVOLVEMENT AS A MODERATOR OF FAMILY AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SOCIOECONOMIC CONTEXT ON SCHOOL READINESS AMONG YOUNG CHILDREN', *Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(3), pp. 265-276. doi:10.1002/jcop.21528

Kovacs, M. & Beck, A.T. (1977). 'An empirical-clinical approach toward a definition of childhood depression', in Schulterbrandt J.G. & Raskin, A. (Eds.) *Depression in childhood: Diagnosis, treatment and conceptual models*. New York: Raven Press.

Krange, O., & Strandbu, Å. (2004). 'Ungdom, idrett og friluftsliv. Skillelinjer i ungdomsbefolkningen og endringer fra 1992 til 2002', *NOVA rapport* 16/4. Retrieved from: http://www.hioa.no/content/download/45590/675315/file/518_1.pdf (08.06.2020)

Ladd, G.W., Kochenderfer, B.J. & Coleman, C.C., (1997). 'Classroom Peer Acceptance, Friendship, and Victimization: Distinct Relation Systems That Contribute Uniquely to Children's School Adjustment?', *Child Development*, 68(6), pp.1181–1197.

Lapointe, V. R., Ford, L., Zumbo, B. D. (2007). 'Examining the Relationships Between Neighbourhood Environment and School Readiness for Kindergarten Children', *Early Education and Development*, 18(3), pp. 473-495, https://doi.org/10.1080/10409280701610846

Leiulfsrud, H., Jensberg, H., Endresen, B., Dahl, Ø. (2003). *Children's life-worlds: a comparative study of children's life chances and well-being in the Nordic countries*, Allforsk, ISBN: 82-7570-143-0.

Leiulfsrud, H, Bison, I, Solheim, E (2010). 'Social class in Europe II: The European Social Survey 2002–2008', NTNU, Department of Sociology and Political Science Discussion Paper. Available at: http://www.svt.ntnu.no/iss/ESSReport2010.pdf.

Laureau, Anette (1987). 'Social Class Differences in Family – School relationships: the Importance of Cultural Capital', *Sociology of Education,* vol. 60, No. 2 (April, 1987), pp. 73-75.

Luthar S.S., Zelazo L.B., (2003). 'Research on resilience: An integrative review', In: Luthar S.S., (ed.). *Resilience and vulnerability: Adaptation in the context of childhood adversities,* Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, pp. 510–549.

Lyubomirsky, S., King, L. & Diener, E., (2005). 'The benefits of frequent positive affect: does happiness lead to success?', *Psychological Bulletin*, vol.131(6):803-855. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.131.6.803.

Mahoney, J.L. & Stattin, H., (2000). 'Leisure activities and adolescent antisocial behavior: The role of structure and social context', *Journal of Adolescence*, 23(2), pp.113–127.

Masten, A.S., (2007). 'Resilience in developing systems: Progress and promise as the fourth wave rises', *Development and psychopathology*, 19(3), pp. 921–930.

Masten, A. S. (2006) 'Developmental psychopathology: Pathways to the future', *International Journal of Behavioral Development,* 30(1), pp. 47–54. doi: 10.1177/0165025406059974.

Masten, A.S., (2004). 'Regulatory Processes, Risk, and Resilience in Adolescent Development', *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1021(1), pp. 310–319.

Masten, A.S. (2001). 'Ordinary magic. Resilience processes in development', *The American psychologist, 56 3*, pp. 227-38.

Masten, A. S. & Obradovic, J, (2006). 'Competence and Resilience in Development', *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences.*, 1094(1), pp.13–27.

McNeish, D., & Stapleton, L. M., (2016) 'Modeling Clustered Data with Very Few Clusters', *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 51:4, 495-518, DOI: 10.1080/00273171.2016.1167008

Mehmetoglu, M. & Jakobsen, T. G. (2017). *Applied Statistics using STATA: A Guide for the Social Sciences*, London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Resilience. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved April 22, 2020, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resilience

Minkkinen J. (2014). 'Associations between school-related factors and depressive symptoms among children: A comparative study, Finland and Norway', *School Psychology International*, vol. 35(5), p. 463 – 474, https://doi.org/10.11777014303431351 1008.

Nystad, M. E., Gaup A. N., et. al. (2018). Jeg vil jo ikke at barna skal lide selv om jeg sliter økonomisk, *NRK*, 06.07.2018, available from: https://www.nrk.no/sapmi/hvert-tiende-barn-i-norge-lever-i-fattigdom-1.14096170 (retrieved: 05.07.2020).

Obradović, J., Burt, K. B., & Masten A. S., (2009). 'Testing a Dual Cascade Model Linking Competence and Symptoms Over 20 Years from Childhood to Adulthood', *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 39:1, 90-102, DOI: 10.1080/15374410903401120

OECD (2018). 'How schools and education policy support or undermine student resilience', in *The Resilience of Students with an Immigrant Background: Factors that Shape Well-being*, *OECD Publishing*, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264292093-10-en.

OECD (2020). 'How PISA examines equity in education: Inclusion and fairness', in *PISA 2018 Results (Volume II): Where All Students Can Succeed*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/2c1b1289-en

Oppedal, B., Røysamb, E., & Sam, D. L. (2004). 'The effect of acculturation and social support on change in mental health among young immigrants', *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 28(6), 481–494. https://doi.org/10.1080/01650250444000126

Oxford Dictionaries (n.d). Overfitting, *Oxford dictionaries*, Retrieved from: https://www.lexico.com/definition/overfitting (17.06.2020).

Panayiotou, M., & Humphrey, N. (2018). 'Mental health difficulties and academic attainment: Evidence for gender-specific developmental cascades in middle childhood'—ADDENDUM, *Development and Psychopathology, 30*(2), 719-719. doi:10.1017/S0954579418000111

Rapp, A. C. (2018). *Organisering av social ojämlikhet i skolan. En studie av barnskolors institutionella utformning och praktik i två nordiska kommuner*. PhD. Trondheim: Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet.

Reay, D., (2006). 'THE ZOMBIE STALKING ENGLISH SCHOOLS: SOCIAL CLASS AND EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 54(3), pp. 288–307.

Reay, D. (2005). 'Doing the Dirty Work of Social Class? Mothers' Work in Support of Their Children's Schooling', *Sociological Review* 53, pp. 104–116.

Rødevand, L., (2015). "Generasjon-prestasjon" må bli mye bedre til å på en ting, og det er å prioritere, *Psykologisk.no*, 09.06.15, retrieved from: https://psykologisk.no/2015/06/generasjon-prestasjon-ma-prioritere/ (15.06.2020).

Sam D. L., Vedder P., Liebkind K., Neto F. & Virta E. (2008). 'Immigration, acculturation and the paradox of adaptation in Europe', *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 5:2, 138-158, DOI: 10.1080/17405620701563348

Samplin, E., Ikuta, T., Malhotra, A. K., Szeszko, P. & DeRosse, P. (2013). 'Sex differences in resilience to childhood maltreatment: Effects of trauma history on hippocampal volume, general cognition and subclinical psychosis in helalthy adults', *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 47(9), pp. 1174 – 1179.

Sampson, R., Morenoff, J.D. & Earls, F., 1999. 'Beyond social capital: Spatial dynamics of collective efficacy for children', *American Sociological Review*, 64(5), pp. 633–660.

Schoon, I., Parsons, S. and Sacker, A. (2004) 'Socioeconomic Adversity, Educational Resilience, and Subsequent Levels of Adult Adaptation', *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 19(4), pp. 383–404. doi: 10.1177/0743558403258856.

Skog, O.-J., (2017), *Å Forklare Sosiale Fenomener: en regresjonsbasert tilnærming*, Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS.

Spann, M. N, Mayes, L. C., Kalmar, J. H., Guiney, J., Wormer, F. Y., Pittman, B., Mazure, C. M., Sinha, R. & Blumberg, H. P. (2012). 'Childhood abuse and neglect and cognitive flexibility in adolescents', *Child Neuropsychology*, 18(2), pp. 182-189.

Stefansen K. & Farstad G. R. (2010) 'Classed parental practices in a modern welfare state: Caring for the under-threes in Norway', *Critical Social Policy*, vol. 30(1), p. 120 – 141.

Steingrímsdóttir, Ó.A., Næss, Ø., Moe, J.O. *Grøholt, M-K., Thelle, D.S., Strand, B.H. & Bævre, K.* (2012). 'Trends in life expectancy by education in Norway 1961–2009', *European Journal of Epidemiology*, 27, p. 163–17. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-012-9663-0

Strandbu, Å., Gulløy, E., Andersen, P.L, Seippel, Ø & Dalen, H.B. (2017). 'Ungdom, idrett og klasse: Fortid, samtid og framtid.', , *Norwegian Journal of Sociology*, (2), pp.132–151. https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.2535-2512-2017-02-03

St. Mld. nr. 6 (2019-2020). *Tett på – tidlig innsats og inkluderende fellesskap i barnehage, skole og SFO*.

St. Meld. nr. 39 (2001-2002). *Oppvekst – og levekår fr barn og ungdom i Norge*.

Sun, S., Wang, S. (2015). 'The Children's Depression Inventory in Worldwide Child Development Research: A Reliability Generalization Study', *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 24**,** 2352–2363. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-014-0038-x

Tilly, C., (1998). *Durable inequality*, Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press.

Trulsen, D., (2018). Nesten annenhver 10-klassing sliter psykisk i Oslo-skolen, *Dagbladet*, 20.11.2020, retrieved from: https://www.dagbladet.no/kultur/nesten-annenhver-10-klassing-sliter-psykisk-i-oslo-skolen/70466277 (15.06.2020)

Turley, R.N.L., Gamoran, A., McCarthy, A.T. & Fish, R. (2017). 'Reducing children's behavior problems through social capital: A causal assessment', *Social Science Research*, 61, pp.206–217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2016.06.015

Turner, R. H. (1960). 'Sponsored and Contest Mobility and the School System', in Szelényi, S., Grusky, D.B. (Eds.) & Ku, M.C., 2008. *Social stratification: class, race, and gender in sociological perspective* 3rd ed., Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.

Tyack, D. (1992). 'Health and Social Services in Public Schools: Historical Perspectives', *The Future of Children*, 2(1), pp.19–31.

Tønset, T. S., Nordahl, A. M. (2019). Dette er «Jonas» (13) sin første utflukt i sommer, *NRK*, 08.08.2019, available from: https://www.nrk.no/osloogviken/dette-er-_jonas_-_13_-sin-forste-utflukt-i-sommer-1.14653284 (retrieved: 06, 07, 2020).

Ungar, M. (2004). 'A Constructionist Discourse on Resilience: Multiple Contexts, Multiple Realities among At-Risk Children and Youth', *Youth & Society, 35*(3), 341-365. doi:10.1177/0044118X03257030

Ungar, M., Clark, S. E., Kwong, W.-M., Makhnach, A., & Cameron, C. A. (2005). 'Studying Resilience Across Cultures',. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 14*(3-4), 1-19. doi:10.1300/J051v14n03_01

Vanderbilt-Adriance E., & Shaw D. S. (2008). 'Conceptualizing and Re-Evaluating Resilience Across Levels of Risk, Time, and Domains of Competence', *Clinical child and family psychology review*, vol. 11(1-2), p. 30-58. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-008-0031-2.

Van Lier, P., Vitaro, F., Barker, E., Brendgen, M., Tremblay, R., & Boivin, M. (2012). 'Peer Victimization, Poor Academic Achievement, and the Link Between Childhood Externalizing and Internalizing Problems', *Child Development, 83*(5), 1775-1788.,

Van Zanten, A. (2005). 'New Modes of Reproducing Social Inequality in Education: The Changing Role of Parents, Teachers, Schools and Educational Policies', *Eurpoean Educational Research Journal*, 4(3), pp. 155 – 169.

Vazsonyi, A.T., Trejos-Castillo, E. & Huang, L. (2006). 'Are Developmental Processes Affected by Immigration? Family Processes, Internalizing Behaviors, and

Externalizing Behaviors', *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* **35,** 795. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-006-9104-z

Werner EE. (1995). 'Resilience in development', *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, vol. 3, pp. 81–85.

Wright, E. O. (1984) 'A General Framework for the Analysis of Class Structure', in Szelényi, S., Grusky, D.B. (Ed.) & Ku, M.C. (2008). *Social stratification: class, race, and gender in sociological perspective* 3rd ed., Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.

8. Appendix

Table 1a.

Socioeconomic background	Frequency	Percent
Middle-class	132	82.50%
Working-class	23	14.38%
Unemployed	5	3.12%
Total	160	100%

Table 1b.

Norwegian as native language	Frequency	Percent
Native speaker	147	94.84%
Not native speaker	8	5.16%
Total	160	100%

Table 2a.

Socioeconomic background	Frequency	Percent
Middle-class	52	27.81%
Working-class	117	62.57%
Unemployed	18	9.63%
Total	187	100%

Table 2b.

Norwegian as native language	Frequency	Percent
Native speaker	108	61.02%
Not native speaker	69	39.98%
Total	187	100%

Table 3a.

Socioeconomic background	Frequency	Percent
Middle-class	14	31.11%
Working-class	23	51.11%
Unemployed	8	17.78
Total	45	100%

Table 3b.

Norwegian not native language	Frequency	Percent
Native speaker	30	66.66%
Not native speaker	15	33.33%
Total	45	100%

Table 4a.

Special Education: school 1	Frequency	Percent
No special education	146	89.02%
Special Education	18	10.98%
Total	164	100%

Table 4b.

Special Education: school 2	Frequency	Percent
No special education	127	67.55%
Special education	61	32.45%
Total	188	100%

Table 4c.

Special education: school 3	Frequency	Percent
No special education	29	64.44%
Special education	16	35.56%
Total	45	100%

The Questionnaires:

The CDI

1.	☐	**Jeg føler meg sjelden trist.**
	☐	**Jeg føler meg ofte trist.**
	☐	**Jeg føler meg alltid trist.**
2.	☐	Jeg er sikker på at det ikke vil gå bra med meg i livet.
	☐	Jeg er usikker på om det vil gå meg bra i livet.
	☐	Jeg er sikker på at det vil gå bra med meg i livet.
3.	☐	**Jeg gjør de fleste ting rett.**
	☐	**Jeg gjør mange ting galt.**
	☐	**Alt jeg gjør er galt.**
4.	☐	Jeg har det ofte morsomt.
	☐	Jeg har det morsomt av og til.
	☐	Jeg har det aldri morsomt.
5.	☐	**Jeg er alltid slem.**
	☐	**Jeg er ofte slem.**
	☐	**Av og til er jeg slem.**
6.	☐	Jeg er ikke redd for at noe fryktelig kan hende meg.
	☐	Jeg er redd for at noe fryktelig vil hende meg.
	☐	Jeg er sikker på at noe fryktelig vil hende meg.
7.	☐	**Jeg hater meg selv.**
	☐	**Jeg liker ikke meg selv.**

	☐	**Jeg liker meg selv.**
8.	☐	Dumme ting som skjer er ikke min feil.
	☐	Noen dumme ting som skjer, er min feil.
	☐	Alle dumme ting som skjer, er min feil.
9.	☐	**Jeg føler for å gråte hver dag.**
	☐	**Jeg føler ofte for å gråte.**
	☐	**Av og til føler jeg for å gråte.**
10.	☐	Av og til er det ting som plager meg.
	☐	Det er ofte ting som plager meg.
	☐	Det er bestandig ting som plager meg.
11.	☐	**Jeg liker vanligvis å være sammen med andre.**
	☐	**Ofte liker jeg ikke å være sammen med andre.**
	☐	**Jeg liker aldri å være sammen med andre.**
12.	☐	Jeg klarer ikke å bestemme meg.
	☐	Jeg synes det er vanskelig å bestemme meg.
	☐	Jeg synes det er lett å bestemme meg.
13.	☐	**Jeg ser bra ut.**
	☐	**Jeg ser ikke bra ut.**
	☐	**Jeg er stygg.**
14.	☐	Det er enkelt å gjøre skolearbeid.
	☐	Jeg må ofte tvinge meg selv til å gjøre skolearbeid.
	☐	Jeg må hver dag tvinge meg selv til å gjøre skolearbeid.
15.	☐	**Det er alltid vanskelig å sove.**
	☐	**Det er ofte vanskelig å sove.**

☐ **Jeg sover bestandig godt.**

16.

☐ Av og til føler jeg meg trøtt.

☐ Jeg føler meg ofte trøtt.

☐ Jeg føler meg bestandig trøtt.

17.

☐ **Jeg har bestandig dårlig matlyst.**

☐ **Jeg har ofte dårlig matlyst.**

☐ **Jeg har alltid god matlyst.**

18.

☐ Jeg er ikke urolig for å ha vondt.

☐ Jeg er ofte urolig for å ha vondt.

☐ Jeg er alltid urolig for å ha vondt.

19.

☐ **Jeg føler meg ikke ensom.**

☐ **Jeg føler meg ofte ensom.**

☐ **Jeg føler meg alltid ensom.**

20.

☐ Det er aldri morsomt på skolen.

☐ Av og til er det morsomt på skolen.

☐ Det er ofte morsomt på skolen.

21.

☐ **Jeg har mange venner.**

☐ **Jeg har ikke nok venner.**

☐ **Jeg har ingen venner.**

22.

☐ Skolearbeidet mitt går greit.

☐ Skolearbeidet mitt går ikke så bra.

☐ Jeg mislykkes med skolearbeidet.

23.

☐ **Jeg mobber ikke andre.**

☐ **Jeg mobber andre av og til.**

☐ **Jeg mobber andre nesten hver dag.**

24.

☐ Jeg er aldri like god som andre.

☐ Jeg prøver å være like god som de andre.

☐ Jeg er like god som alle andre.

25.

☐ **Det er ingen som virkelig bryr seg om meg.**

☐ **Jeg er usikker på om noen bryr seg om meg.**

☐ **Jeg er sikker på at noen bryr seg om meg.**

26.

☐ Jeg gjør vanligvis det jeg blir bedt om.

☐ Jeg gjør vanligvis ikke det jeg blir bedt om.

☐ Jeg gjør aldri det jeg blir bedt om.

27.

☐ **Jeg kommer godt overens med andre.**

☐ **Jeg krangler ofte med andre.**

☐ **Jeg krangler alltid med andre.**

28.

☐ Andre barn mobber meg nesten hver dag.

☐ Andre barn mobber meg av og til.

☐ Andre barn mobber meg ikke.

29.

☐ **Jeg har sjelden vondt i hodet.**

☐ **Jeg har ofte vondt i hodet.**

☐ **Jeg har vondt i hodet nesten hver dag.**

30.

☐ Jeg har vondt i magen nesten hver dag.

☐ Jeg har ofte vondt i magen.

☐ Jeg har sjelden vondt i magen.

31.

☐ **Jeg har sjelden vondt noen andre steder.**

☐ **Jeg har ofte vondt andre steder.**

	☐	**Jeg har vondt andre steder nesten hver dag.**
32.	☐	Jeg er sjelden kvalm.
	☐	Jeg er ofte kvalm.
	☐	Jeg er kvalm nesten hver dag.
33.	☐	**Når jeg er hjemmefra er jeg alltid redd.**
	☐	**Når jeg er hjemmefra er jeg redd noen steder.**
	☐	**Jeg er ikke redd noen steder.**
34.	☐	Andre bestemmer alt i mitt liv.
	☐	Andre bestemmer det meste i mitt liv.
	☐	Jeg bestemmer det meste i mitt liv selv.
35.	☐	**Jeg må nesten alltid gjøre ting jeg ikke vil.**
	☐	**Jeg må av og til gjøre ting jeg ikke vil.**
	☐	**Jeg må nesten aldri gjøre ting jeg ikke vil.**
36.	☐	Jeg føler meg nesten alltid stresset.
	☐	Jeg føler meg av og til stresset.
	☐	Jeg føler meg nesten aldri stresset.
37.	☐	**Jeg synes skolearbeidet tar altfor mye tid.**
	☐	**Jeg synes skolearbeidet tar litt for mye tid.**
	☐	**Jeg synes skolearbeidet tar passe tid.**

2. Har du søsken?

☐Ja ☐Nei

3. Bor begge foreldrene dine sammen med deg?

☐Ja ☐Nei

4. Hvor mange steder bor du?

5. Hvor mange ganger har du flyttet?

☐Aldri ☐1-2 ganger ☐3-4 ganger ☐Flere enn 4 ganger

6. Hvor mange ganger har du byttet skole?

☐Aldri byttet ☐1-2 ganger ☐3-4 ganger ☐Flere enn 4 ganger

7. Har du bodd der du bor lenger enn et år?

☐Ja ☐Nei

8. Hva gjør din mor?

☐Ansatt på en jobb

☐Eget firma

☐Hjemmeværende

☐Studerer

☐Arbeidsløs

☐Kan ikke svare

9. Hva gjør din far?

☐Ansatt på en jobb

☐Eget firma

☐Hjemmeværende

☐Studerer

☐Arbeidsløs

☐Kan ikke svare

10. Hva jobber din mor med?

11. Hva jobber din far med?

12. Er din mor sjef hvor de jobber?

☐ Ja

☐ Nei

13. Er din far sjef hvor de jobber?

☐ Ja

☐ Nei

14. Har din familie god eller dårlig råd?

☐ Hjemme hos oss har vi alltid god råd

☐ Hjemme hos oss har vi passe god råd

☐ Hjemme hos oss har vi alltid dårlig råd

☐ Vet ikke/kan ikke svare

Hvor viktig er disse personene for deg?

15. Venner på skolen

☐ Veldig viktig ☐ Ganske viktig ☐ Ikke viktig ☐ Passer ikke

16. Venner utenfor skolen

☐ Veldig viktig ☐ Ganske viktig ☐ Ikke viktig ☐ Passer ikke

17. Mamma

☐ Veldig viktig ☐ Ganske viktig ☐ Ikke viktig ☐ Passer ikke

18. Pappa

☐ Veldig viktig ☐ Ganske viktig ☐ Ikke viktig ☐ Passer ikke

19. Søsken

☐ Veldig viktig ☐ Ganske viktig ☐ Ikke viktig ☐ Passer ikke

20. Besteforeldre/slektninger

☐ Veldig viktig ☐ Ganske viktig ☐ Ikke viktig ☐ Passer ikke

21. Lærere på skolen

☐ Veldig viktig ☐ Ganske viktig ☐ Ikke viktig ☐ Passer ikke

22. Trenere/andre lærere

☐ Veldig viktig ☐ Ganske viktig ☐ Ikke viktig ☐ Passer ikke

23. Andre:

Hvordan trives du?

24. På skolen

☐ Jeg stortrives ☐ Jeg trives ganske bra ☐ Jeg trives ganske dårlig

25. Hjemme

☐ Jeg stortrives ☐ Jeg trives ganske bra ☐ Jeg trives ganske dårlig

26. I området der du bor

☐ Jeg stortrives ☐ Jeg trives ganske bra ☐ Jeg trives ganske dårlig

27. I friminuttet

☐ Jeg stortrives ☐ Jeg trives ganske bra ☐ Jeg trives ganske dårlig

28. I fritiden/etter skoletid

☐ Jeg stortrives ☐ Jeg trives ganske bra ☐ Jeg trives ganske dårlig

29. I helgene

☐ Jeg stortrives ☐ Jeg trives ganske bra ☐ Jeg trives ganske dårlig

30. I skoletimene

☐ Jeg stortrives ☐ Jeg trives ganske bra ☐ Jeg trives ganske dårlig

---

31. Føler du at du kan påvirke hvordan skoledagen din skal være?

☐ Ofte
☐ Noen ganger
☐ Aldri

32. Forstår lærerne deg når skolearbeidet er vanskelig?

☐ Nesten alltid
☐ Noen ganger

☐ Nesten aldri

33. Forstår lærerne deg når du er lei deg?

☐ Nesten alltid
☐ Noen ganger
☐ Nesten aldri

Blir du mobbet?

34. Av elever i klassen

☐ Nei, aldri ☐ Av og til ☐ Ofte

35. Av andre barn/ungdom

☐ Nei, aldri ☐ Av og til ☐ Ofte

36. Av lærerne

☐ Nei, aldri ☐ Av og til ☐ Ofte

37. Av andre voksne

☐ Nei, aldri ☐ Av og til ☐ Ofte

38. På sosiale medier (Facebook, Instagram, SMS, Snapchat o.l)

☐ Nei, aldri ☐ Av og til ☐ Ofte

---

39. Om du er lei deg har du vanligvis noen du kan snakke med og som forstår deg?

☐ Ja ☐ Nei

40. Har du snakket med lege, helsesøster eller psykolog fordi du har vært lei deg?

☐ Ja
☐ Nei

41. Har du hatt lyst til å snakke med lege, helsesøster eller psykolog fordi du har vært lei deg?

☐ Ja ☐ Nei

42. Om du er glad, har du vanligvis noen du kan dele gleden med?

☐ Ja ☐ Nei

43. Om du er glad eller trist, hvem kan du da snakke med?

☐ Har vanligvis ingen å snakke med
☐ Venner, andre barn
☐ Voksne hjemme
☐ Andre voksne

44. Så du på TV, Netflix, YouTube eller andre strømmetjenester i går?

☐ Nei
☐ Ja – hvor mange timer

45. Brukte du PC, nettbrett, TV-spill eller mobiltelefon til å spille i går?

☐ Nei

☐ Ja – hvor mange timer

46. Brukte du PC, nettbrett eller mobiltelefon til å surfe eller være på sosiale medier i går?

☐ Nei
☐ Ja – hvor mange timer

47. Har du noen regler for hvor mye tid du kan bruke på mobil, data, nettbrett, TV-spill og lignende? (eks: spilletid, mobilfri-tid)

☐ Nei ☐ Ja

Gjorde du noen av disse tingene i går?

48. Dusjet eller badet

☐ Ja ☐ Nei

49. Skiftet til rene klær

☐ Ja ☐ Nei

50. Spiste frokost

☐ Ja ☐ Nei

51. Spiste skolemat

☐ Ja ☐ Nei

52. Spiste middag

☐ Ja ☐ Nei

53. Spiste kveldsmat

☐ Ja ☐ Nei

54. Spiste godteri/potetgull

☐ Ja ☐ Nei

55. Spiste lite/ingenting

☐ Ja ☐ Nei

56. Sov godt hele natten

☐ Ja ☐ Nei

---

57. Hvor mange timer sov du i natt? Verdien må være mellom 0 og 24.

58. Hadde du problemer med å få sove i går natt?

☐ Ja ☐ Nei

59. Når gikk du til sengs i går?

☐ Før klokken ni
☐ Mellom klokken ni og elleve
☐ Mellom klokken elleve og ett
☐ Etter klokken ett

Var du noen gang hjemme uten voksne i går?

60. På morgenen

☐ Ja ☐ Nei

61. Etter skolen

☐ Ja ☐ Nei

62. På kvelden

☐ Ja ☐ Nei

63. På natten

☐ Ja ☐ Nei

64. Beskriv kort hva du gjorde etter skoletid i går:

65. Gjorde du noe sammen med dine foreldre i går?

☐ Nei

☐ Ja – Hva?

66. Var dagen i går en normal dag?

☐ Ja, ganske normal dag

☐ Nei, en litt spesiell dag fordi:

Hvor bra passer setningene under om miljøet på skolen din?

67. Jeg har minst én voksen ved skolen som kjenner meg og støtter meg

☐ Helt uenig ☐ Litt uenig ☐ Middels ☐ Litt enig ☐ Helt enig

68. Jeg opplever at klassekameratene mine aksepterer og setter pris på meg

☐ Helt uenig ☐ Litt uenig ☐ Middels ☐ Litt enig ☐ Helt enig

69. Elevene og lærerne setter pris på at vi er ulike (f.eks. når det gjelder status, kjønn, kultur, religion, funksjonshemming)

☐ Helt uenig ☐ Litt uenig ☐ Middels ☐ Litt enig ☐ Helt enig

70. Familien min deltar i skolens aktiviteter

☐ Helt uenig ☐ Litt uenig ☐ Middels ☐ Litt enig ☐ Helt enig

71. På skolen snakker vi om hvordan vi kan føle oss bra, og om hvordan vi kan få hjelp hvis vi sliter med noe

☐ Helt uenig ☐ Litt uenig ☐ Middels ☐ Litt enig ☐ Helt enig

Syns du det har vært greit å svare på disse spørsmålene?

72. Ja, fordi

73. Nei, fordi

The Teachers' questionnaire

Elevens alder: _____ år	Elevens kjønn: jente ☐ gutt ☐	Norsk som morsmål: Ja ☐ Nei ☐
Vennligst svar så detaljert du klarer: Mors yrkesstatus/jobb:		
Fars yrkesstatus/jobb:		

1. **Behøver denne eleven ekstra tilpasning for å nyttiggjøre seg undervisningen?**

   ☐ Nei

   ☐ Ja, eksempler på tilpasning:

2. **På hvilke områder behøver eleven tilrettelegging? (mulig å markere flere alternativer)**

   ☐ Skolefaglige utfordringer ☐ Norsk som andrespråk

   ☐ Vedtak om spesialundervisning ☐ Sosiale/ atferdsmessige utfordringer

   ☐ Diagnose, spesifiser:

   ☐ Annet, spesifiser:

3. I hvilken grad har du tid og ressurser til å gi eleven den tilretteleggingen han/hun behøver?

   ☐ I høy grad

   ☐ I noen grad

   ☐ I liten grad

4. Utfordrer elevens eventuelle problem ditt arbeid som lærer?

   ☐ Nei

   ☐ Ja, spesifiser problem og utfordring:

5. Er elevens største utfordring sosial eller faglig? Spesifiser:

6. I hvilken grad samarbeider skole og hjemmet om det du anser som elevens største utfordring?

- ☐ I høy grad
- ☐ I noen grad
- ☐ I liten grad

7. I hvilken grad er samarbeidet mellom skole og hjemmet preget av enighet omkring *hva* som er elevens utfordringer?

- ☐ I høy grad
- ☐ I noen grad
- ☐ I liten grad

8. I hvilken grad følger foresatte/ hjem opp elevens skolearbeid?

- ☐ I høy grad
- ☐ I noen grad
- ☐ I liten grad
- ☐ Vet ikke

9. I hvilken grad følger foresatte/ hjem opp elevens orden?

- ☐ I høy grad
- ☐ I noen grad
- ☐ I liten grad
- ☐ Vet ikke

10. Er det noe som hindrer eleven i å bruke sitt intellektuelle/ kognitive potensial i skolearbeidet?

- ☐ Nei
- ☐ Ja, spesifiser:

11. Hva er elevens største potensial, etter din mening?

_____

12. Vurder elevens ferdigheter i basisfag på en skala fra 1 – 5, der 1 er svært lav kompetanse og 5 er særlig høy kompetanse.

Forestilt karakter:

13. Vurder elevens sosiale/ atferdsmessige ferdigheter på en skala fra 1 – 5, der 1 er svært lav kompetanse og 5 er særlig høy kompetanse.

Forestilt karakter:

14. Noe du ønsker å tilføye:

Approval for the use of personal information in the research

NSD NORSK SENTER FOR FORSKNINGSDATA

NSD sin vurdering

Prosjekttittel

Barndom og velferd i Norden 2019

Referansenummer

540980

Registrert

22.08.2018 av Anna Cecilia Rapp - anna.cecilia.rapp@ntnu.no

Behandlingsansvarlig institusjon

Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet NTNU / Fakultet for samfunns- og utdanningsvitenskap (SU) / Institutt for lærerutdanning

Prosjektansvarlig (vitenskapelig ansatt/veileder eller stipendiat)

Anna Rapp, anna.cecilia.rapp@ntnu.no, tlf: 41363994

Type prosjekt

Forskerprosjekt

Prosjektperiode

01.01.2019 - 31.12.2024

Status

03.09.2019 - Vurdert

Vurdering (4)
03.09.2019 - Vurdert
Vi viser til endring registrert 02.09.2019.

Endring: Det er lagt til noen nye spørsmål i spørreskjemaet. Endringen påvirker ikke vår vurdering.

OPPFØLGING AV PROSJEKTET
NSD vil følge opp underveis (hvert annet år) og ved planlagt avslutning for å avklare om behandlingen av personopplysningene er avsluttet/pågår i tråd med den behandlingen som er dokumentert.

Lykke til videre med prosjektet!

Kontaktperson hos NSD: Kajsa Amundsen Tlf. Personverntjenester: 55 58 21 17 (tast 1)

29.07.2019 - Vurdert

NSD har vurdert endringen registrert 22.07.2019.

Det er vår vurdering at behandlingen av personopplysninger i prosjektet vil være i samsvar med personvernlovgivningen så fremt den gjennomføres i tråd med det som er dokumentert i meldeskjemaet med vedlegg den 29.07.2019. Behandlingen kan fortsette.

Endring: Det er lagt til ett nytt utvalg. Barn mellom 9-12 år skal intervjues om skolehverdagen. Det skal ikke diskuteres potensielt sensitive temaer under intervjuene. NSD minner om at i tillegg til foreldrenes skriftlige samtykke, må barna ønske å delta. Vi ber også om at forskerne i forkant av intervjuet ber barna unnlate navn på andre personer eller karakteristisk beskrivelser.

OPPFØLGING AV PROSJEKTET
NSD vil følge opp ved planlagt avslutning for å avklare om behandlingen av personopplysningene er avsluttet.

Lykke til med prosjektet!

Kontaktperson hos NSD: Kajsa Amundsen Tlf. Personverntjenester: 55 58 21 17 (tast 1)

01.02.2019 - Vurdert

NSD har vurdert endringen registrert 30.01.2019.

Det er vår vurdering at behandlingen av personopplysninger i prosjektet vil være i samsvar med personvernlovgivningen så fremt den gjennomføres i tråd med det som er dokumentert i meldeskjemaet med vedlegg den 12.12.2018. Behandlingen kan fortsette.

OPPFØLGING AV PROSJEKTET
NSD vil følge opp ved planlagt avslutning for å avklare om behandlingen av personopplysningene er avsluttet.

Lykke til med prosjektet!

Kontaktperson hos NSD: Kajsa Amundsen Tlf. Personverntjenester: 55 58 21 17 (tast 1)

03.12.2018 - Vurdert

Det er vår vurdering at behandlingen vil være i samsvar med personvernlovgivningen, så fremt den gjennomføres i tråd med det som er dokumentert i meldeskjemaet 03.12.2018 med vedlegg, samt i meldingsdialogen mellom innmelder og NSD. Behandlingen kan starte.

MELD ENDRINGER
Dersom behandlingen av personopplysninger endrer seg, kan det være nødvendig å melde dette til NSD ved å oppdatere meldeskjemaet. På våre nettsider informerer vi om hvilke endringer som må meldes. Vent på svar før endringen gjennomføres.

TYPE OPPLYSNINGER OG VARIGHET
Prosjektet vil behandle særlige kategorier av personopplysninger om helseforhold og alminnelige personopplysninger frem til 31.12.2024.

VURDERING AV BEHOV FOR DPIA
Det behandles i prosjektet særlige kategorier av personopplysninger (sensitive opplysninger) om en potensielt sårbar gruppe. Vi vurderer likevel at det ikke er snakk om høy risiko for de registrertes friheter og rettigheter, og at det dermed ikke er nødvendig å gjøre en personvernkonsekvensvurdering (DPIA) jf.

personvernforordningen art. 35. Dette er begrunnet blant annet i følgende momenter: Fokuset i prosjektet er ikke på enkeltelevene, men på skolen; koblingen på individnivå lagres i en kort periode; tilgangen begrenses til prosjektleder og få interne ansatte; foreldrene vil få informasjon om at de kan se gjennom spørsmålene i forkant. Informasjonssikkerheten vurderes videre som tilfredsstillende.

LOVLIG GRUNNLAG
Prosjektet vil innhente samtykke fra de registrerte til behandlingen av personopplysninger. Vår vurdering er at prosjektet legger opp til et samtykke i samsvar med kravene i art. 4 nr. 11 og art. 7, ved at det er en frivillig, spesifikk, informert og utvetydig bekreftelse, som kan dokumenteres, og som den registrerte kan trekke tilbake.

Lovlig grunnlag for behandlingen vil dermed være den registrertes uttrykkelige samtykke, jf. personvernforordningen art. 6 nr. 1 a), jf. art. 9 nr. 2 bokstav a, jf. personopplysningsloven § 10, jf. § 9 (2).

PERSONVERNPRINSIPPER
NSD vurderer at den planlagte behandlingen av personopplysninger vil følge prinsippene i personvernforordningen:

- om lovlighet, rettferdighet og åpenhet (art. 5.1 a), ved at de registrerte får tilfredsstillende informasjon om og samtykker til behandlingen

- formålsbegrensning (art. 5.1 b), ved at personopplysninger samles inn for spesifikke, uttrykkelig angitte og berettigede formål, og ikke viderebehandles til nye uforenlige formål

- dataminimering (art. 5.1 c), ved at det kun behandles opplysninger som er adekvate, relevante og nødvendige for formålet med prosjektet
- lagringsbegrensning (art. 5.1 e), ved at personopplysningene ikke lagres lengre enn nødvendig for å oppfylle formålet

DE REGISTRERTES RETTIGHETER
Så lenge de registrerte kan identifiseres i datamaterialet vil de ha følgende rettigheter: åpenhet (art. 12), informasjon (art. 13), innsyn (art. 15), retting (art. 16), sletting (art. 17), begrensning (art. 18), underretning (art. 19), dataportabilitet (art. 20).

NSD vurderer at informasjonen som de registrerte vil motta oppfyller lovens krav til form og innhold, jf. art. 12.1 og art. 13.

Vi minner om at hvis en registrert tar kontakt om sine rettigheter, har behandlingsansvarlig institusjon plikt til å svare innen en måned.

FØLG DIN INSTITUSJONS RETNINGSLINJER
NSD legger til grunn at behandlingen oppfyller kravene i personvernforordningen om riktighet (art. 5.1 d), integritet og konfidensialitet (art. 5.1. f) og sikkerhet (art. 32).

For å forsikre dere om at kravene oppfylles, må prosjektansvarlig følge interne retningslinjer/rådføre seg med behandlingsansvarlig institusjon.

OPPFØLGING AV PROSJEKTET
NSD vil følge opp underveis (hvert annet år) og ved planlagt avslutning for å avklare om behandlingen av personopplysningene er avsluttet/pågår i tråd med den behandlingen som er dokumentert.

Lykke til med prosjektet!

Kontaktperson hos NSD: Kajsa Amundsen Tlf. Personverntjenester: 55 58 21 17 (tast 1)

Markus Lynum

"Great Expectations"

NTNU
Norwegian University of
Science and Technology