

UiO : **Det juridiske fakultet**

Sexting and legal consciousness in Norway and the United States

Kandidatnummer: 669.

Leveringsfrist: 25.11.2019

Antall ord: 17952



1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LEGAL CONSCIOUSNESS IN A COMPARATIVE CONTEXT	2
2.1. Why legal consciousness?	2
2.2 What is legal consciousness?	3
2.2.1 Legal consciousness	3
2.2.3 Comparative legal consciousness.....	4
2.2.4 From comparative legal consciousness to global legal consciousness	5
2.3 Norwegian legal consciousness.....	6
2.4 American legal consciousness.....	9
3. TEENAGERS, THE INTERNET AND SEXTING	11
3.1 What are teenagers doing?	11
3.2 Sexting and the law	13
3.1.1 Norwegian law	13
3.1.2 Norwegian case law	14
3.1.3 American law	14
3.1.4 American case law	15
3.3 Teenagers legal consciousness of sexting	16
3.3.1 Norwegian research.....	16
3.3.2 American research.....	17
4. METHODOLOGY	17
4.1 Research question	17
4.2 Comparative methodology	19
4.3 Collecting data	19
4.4 Research design.....	20
5. DATA ANALYSIS	25
5.1. Legal Awareness	25
5.2 Use of law.....	33
5.3 Common consciousness among age groups	35
5.4 Different standard for boys and girls.....	38
6. DISCUSSION	42
7. CONCLUSION	45
8. LITERATURE	47
APPENDIX A	52
APPENDIX B	73

1. Introduction

The technological revolution that has taken place over the last fifty years has gradually transformed our societies and everyday life. One of the most prominent ways it has influenced society is how we communicate. Conversations that previously required physical interaction can now take place by the rapid sharing of texts and images via an app (Van Volkom, Stapley, & Amaturro, 2014). With communication moving from the physical realm to the digital realm all kinds of interactions, including sexual communication, are now taking place on technological devices. Commonly known as sexting, the sharing of explicit images online has become a world-wide phenomenon that is creating new legal dilemmas and problems. This is especially so for underage teenagers whose explicit photos are legally classify as child pornography (Crofts & Lee, 2013; Slane, 2013). Although there are reportedly high rates of sexting among teenagers, few research studies have been conducted to understand how both teenage sexting and its legal consequences are viewed and understood by society, also known as legal consciousness.

Given the existence of national legal cultures, one could assume that the legal consciousness regarding teenage sexting would differ depending on which country was the subject of the research. However, the global nature of technology and social media brings to question whether there could be emerging a common legal consciousness the exists across national borders (Langford & Sandvik, 2019). The intention of this paper is to find out whether legal consciousness regarding sexting is a national legal consciousness or a global legal consciousness. By conducting a comparative legal consciousness study, the intent is to contribute to the sexting literature in the USA and Norway, as well as the comparative legal consciousness literature. The research question in this paper is therefore if there exists a common legal consciousness regarding teenage sexting in Norway and the United States.

This question will be answered by researching and collecting data in the United State and Norway. Focusing on four aspects of legal consciousness; awareness, use, age and views on gender, this paper commences with a literature review of comparative legal consciousness (Chapter 2) and an overview of sexting culture and the laws regulating sexting (Chapter 3). This is followed by a presentation of the methodology (Chapter 4) and data analysis (Chapter

5), and a discussion on the legal consciousness of sexting on global legal consciousness (Chapter 6). The thesis concludes in chapter 7.

2. Legal consciousness in a comparative context

2.1. Why legal consciousness?

In today's modern society law has become a foundation for the understanding of ourselves, our rights and our social interactions. Scholars and students study statute and case law trying to find the normative rules, taking for granted that regulation functions from a top-down approach. However, understanding how the law works in society is equally important to understanding what the law says. Regardless of written law, it is what people think and do that regulates society and determines the impact of the law. Taking the politics and the political system into consideration it becomes clear that law in many ways is created from a bottom-up approach (Friedman, 1994, p. 118).

Fundamental to understanding how the law works in society is the understanding that it does not exist in a vacuum. Law is a social phenomenon that exists in a time and place and the use of it raises questions about policy, philosophy and political theory (Friedman, 1994, p. 118; Koch, Skodvin, & Sunde, 2017). A change in how law functions in society is rarely due to a textual change, but rather a change of social configuration as a result of changes and shifts in society at large. More often the not written law falls behind the normative rules and regulations governing society, especially within areas of rapid development such as technology. All these aspects come together to create a legal culture, which can be defined as the "ideas, values, attitudes, and opinions people in some society hold, with regard to law and the legal system"(Friedman, 1994, p. 118). Understanding legal culture is therefore essential to understanding how law works in practice, which is essential to creating good law.

Though legal culture is identifiable and measurable, researching it is a mammoth task as it encompasses almost all aspects of a society. It encompasses legal history, judicial structure and methodology and it exists as multiple different layers that are both static and changing at the same time (Koch et al., 2017, p. 17; R. Sacco, 1991) It is not limited by national borders and can also exist within or across cultures such as with immigrants and other minorities. The goal however is not to identify every aspect and nuance within a culture, but categorize and identify certain observations made about the ideas of and expectations of law(Koch et al., 2017). It is not the intent of this paper to identify and study all aspects of legal culture, but

rather the attitudes and opinions people have about the law, also known as legal consciousness (Engle, 1998; Ewick & Silbey, 1992; Friedman, 1994, p. 119; Halliday, 2019) .

2.2 What is legal consciousness?

2.2.1 Legal consciousness

The expression legal consciousness was first introduced in the early 1980s as a new concept that could be used to study how law functions in a society. Grown out of earlier research on legal needs, legal culture, legal ideology and dispute processing, the goal was to create an easier way to study how law function in society without being restricted to a specific research area (Engle, 1998). The concept has been studied by researchers of various academic backgrounds such as legal theorist, sociologists and anthropologists. As a result, there have been many understandings and definitions of what legal consciousness is and it has been used to study a plethora of topics such as class, education, gender, nationality and race. It cannot be considered a field of study, but rather a tool or a concept that can be applied to various areas of research (Halliday, 2019, p. 18).

The first legal consciousness research developed the critical approach as a guideline for their research methodology. With political philosophical roots in Marx, who focused on the consciousness of the systemic disadvantaged and downtrodden of society and asked why they accept the legitimacy of the institutions and society that keeps them in their state of disadvantage (Hunt 1986, Halliday p4). They described legal consciousness as “as part of a reciprocal process in which the meanings given by individuals to their world, and law and legal institutions as part of that world, become repeated, patterned and stabilized, and those institutionalized structures become part of the meaning systems employed by individuals” (Ewick & Silbey, 1992, p. 741). The focus was on people’s perception of law and legal institutions rather than the specific legal provision and they wanted to understand the consciousness of the everyday person (Ewick & Silbey, 1992) (Halliday, 2019).

A second approach is the interpretive approach, which is largely based on Weber who focused less on what was actually done and more on the meaning the individual attached to their behavior. This approach emphasizes on seeking “an interpretive understanding of social action” and how individuals interpreted their own actions. It falls within the interpretive tradition of

social sciences and is, compared to the critical approach, much more focused on personal understanding rather than the domination of social structures (Halliday, 2019, p. 8).

The third approach is the law in action approach which is based on Pounds distinction between law in action and law in books. Here the focus is on whether the law that is created and written is implemented as intended. They argue that the legal consciousness of the person implementing the law plays a role in how it is implemented. (Halliday, 2019, p. 11). For example, they could look at how a judge's understanding of community service effects how often they sentence someone to do community service.

A fourth approach is the comparative cultural approach. This method looks at the various legal cultures and compares them in an attempt to observe similarities and differences that can reveal cultural beliefs and ideas about the law. It is based on Durkheim's tradition of framing culture as a social fact which he describes a set of shared beliefs, ideas and moral attitudes that unified people within a society (Jary & Jary, 1995, p. 93). Meaning that consciousness is a positive and tangible concept that can be specific to a group of people. This is typically researched by using large 'n' surveys in an attempt to discover patterns of behavior across the different cultures. (Halliday, 2019, p. 10).

Taking all these different academic directions into consideration, legal consciousness can encompass the understanding, awareness, interpretation and perception of law by both laypeople and those who implement it. One can look at how the person perceives the legal system and how they perceive their own actions within the legal system. Not only can the legal consciousness of individuals be researched but also sub-cultures and national legal consciousness as well (Halliday, 2019). After an overview of the different definitions of legal consciousness in the research Engle found that legal consciousness had been described in two ways. Either legal consciousness was a perception or images of how the law worked, or it was an aptitude or competence within law (Engle, 1998, pp. 119-120).

2.2.3 Comparative legal consciousness

This paper will be looking at legal consciousness from a comparative national perspective. A general consensus has emerged from the research, which finds that a nation's legal consciousness is "a multilayered and dynamic construct, responsive to their surrounding social situa-

tion” (Kurkchian, 2011, p. 372). This suggests that societies construct a social order based on locally determined factors such as socio-economic and political affairs, the nature of civil society, health and welfare factors among others. These particular attributes of a society leads them to create a legal consciousness specific to them (Kurkchian, 2011). A national legal consciousness can therefore include aspects such as political tendencies, economic wealth and stability, age, gender perceptions and sexual freedom among many others.

As with comparing legal culture the core challenge to comparing legal consciousness is therefore identifying a specific national legal consciousness (Nelken, 2004). The research done on this so far has focused on as a society’s attitude toward the law and legal institutions, perception of the law and use of law within national jurisdictional boundaries. These different aspects can indicate how people use the law in their everyday life, their trust in government and their general opinions of law (Halliday, 2019, pp. 10-11).

Comparative legal consciousness doesn’t have to be between two nations, one can also compare groups at a sub-societal level such as age and gender (Halliday, 2019, p. 11). As a result, the choice of topic is many and varied when comparing legal consciousness. Not only can it be considered a person’s perception of law, but also an expression of their aptitude and competence (Engle, 1998, p. 120).

2.2.4 From comparative legal consciousness to global legal consciousness

The very notion of a national legal consciousness is being challenged by the technical revolutions the world has experienced over the last 50 years. Economic and cultural globalization followed by the rise of social media has given way to a new type of consciousness that is rooted in the fact that technology, in particular, is replacing law in multiple ways. Not only is the growing use of technology creating new social norms that are beyond the jurisdiction of nation states, power over creating these social norms have moved from government offices to the programming and development teams of big technical corporations (Langford & Sandvik, 2019; Lessig, 1999). As scholars have long observed, ‘technology in a true sense is legislation’ as it shapes the ‘basic pattern and content of human activity’ (Winner, 1977, p. 323).

Langford and Sandvik (2019), in an initial foray, therefore introduced the idea of techno-legal consciousness. They suggest that “techno-legal consciousness can be understood as the as-

sumptions that structure, inform, enable, constrain and routinize the thoughts and actions of citizens in techno-legal spheres and spaces”. They theorize that this new analytical category adds a new level to understanding of legal consciousness.

Though legal institutions have existed at the international level for over 100 years, these institutions are usually established by a top-down approach, meaning that the law was created first and the social configuration was expected to follow. With techno-legal consciousness we are possibly looking at the first instance where national law is of the intersection of legal and technological consciousness, often in global spaces. This indicates that not only does there now exist a modern legal culture as theorized by Friedman in 1994, but potentially a common consciousness across nation states, creating a global-legal consciousness among the people of the world.

2.3 Norwegian legal consciousness

Norway differs from other western countries in that the society in Norway is more cohesive and collectivistic than others (Milgram, 1961). There is a strong sense of belonging to the society and local community which gives Norwegians a strong need to conform to social norms. In many ways social norms make the social welfare state work, as the sense of belonging to a community makes you less compelled to take advantage of it. (Frønes & Kjølørød, 2010, pp. 174-175) (Avant & Knutsen, 1993). There is a very concrete understanding of what it means to be Norwegian, and multiculturalism and immigration often create mixed feelings as some considered it a threat to the homogenous society (Frønes & Kjølørød, 2010, pp. 438-439; Kramer, 1984, pp. 88-90). Even if Norwegians intentions are to maintain their social norms they are also advocates for human rights and often pride themselves in their just, democratic, and equal society (Frønes & Kjølørød, 2010, pp. 480-487).

Norway is a civil law country with an extensive use and practice of preparatory legal work, especially considering the very concise laws. Like other Scandinavian countries the Germanic legal tradition has been influential and the two countries share similar law and legal principles (Michalsen, 2011). However, the Norwegian court system has also been influenced by Anglo-American law. This can be seen in that all levels of the court can conduct judicial review as well as the role the courts have had in setting precedence (Koch & Sunde, 2019)

Low trust in governmental and legal institutions is often a good indicator of the political situation in a country and research finds that degree of participation is a vital part of trust in government. Norway has one of the highest levels of trust in Europe, with the police and legal institutions considered to be more trustworthy than the political institutions (Kleven, 2016). This trust does not only pertain to institutions but also to individuals and society in general (Kolbeinstveit, 2015). One of the reasons for high levels of trust is democratic participation another could be the political model itself (Jacobi, 2005).

Norwegians don't consider themselves to be a litigious society as it conflicts with their perception of being homogenous and cohesive. However, there is reason to believe that Norwegians are litigious, they just practice their legalism covertly or differently. Though legal questions are often not the center of political discussion, the political process is very legalistic with an emphasis on meticulous preliminary work. This can be seen in all aspects of Norwegian life, as social activities and groups are often regulated by predetermined rules and regulations (Eckstein, 2015). In recent years there has been an increase in the amount of court cases and American litigious culture seems to be having an effect on not only Norway, but Europe as well (Fleming, 2004)

Generational differences and characteristics are a popular topic in today's mass media, and though the scientific background lacks consistency there are proven definitive differences across generations (Reeves & Oh, 2008). Rapid political and economic changes in Norwegian society led to a substantial difference between generations in areas such as education and economic wealth. After the Second World War there was an explosion of people who received a higher education, which has led to higher incomes and to people establishing themselves later in life (Allén, Ramsøy, & Vaa, 1986, p. 186) There has also arguably been a shift of social economic differences between the generations with the finding of oil in the late 1960's (Allén et al., 1986, p. 193). These generational differences are especially true when it comes to the use of technology, which over the last 100 years has changed Norwegian society exponentially (Reeves & Oh, 2008). This rapid development has created a substantial difference between generations in the use, interest and attitude toward technology in everyday life. Research has found that older generations tend to express more skepticism and less interest in learning about and using technology (Nørh, 2006).

Women's gender roles have changed rapidly over the last 50 years. Traditionally women have had stereo-typical gender roles such as being stay at home moms and extramarital sexual relations were considered a sin (Alldén et al., 1986). In 1973, 54% of Norwegian families were single income families and almost half of Norwegian women born in 1933-1942 gave birth to their first child within seven months of getting married. As society modernized, and the oil industry helped transform the Norwegian economy, single-income families were reduced to a quarter of the population by 1981 (Alldén et al., 1986). Today Norwegian women are often considered the most equal in the world and Norwegian society is often considered one of the most progressive when it comes to women's rights (NTB, 2018). Though Scandinavian cultures have been considered more sexually liberal for years, Norwegian culture is considered to be one of the most sexual liberal for women in the world (Bendixen, Asao, Wyckoff, Buss, & Kennair, 2017; Christensen & Gregg, 1970)

There has not been a lot of research regarding the Norwegian legal consciousness. A Master's degree thesis from 2018 examined teenagers aged 13-15 and their legal consciousness of sexting. It found that though a lot of them knew sharing images was wrong, but they were not aware of the actual law as they could not distinguish between different ages (Skavlan & Viste, 2018). It is hard to generalize this to the entire society though given that the participants were so young and the topic so specific. Another research paper that looked at the collective legal consciousness of the perceptions of law and social order across European cultures found that Norwegian collective legal consciousness was more similar to English legal consciousness than Poland or Bulgaria. They found that the Polish and Bulgarians have a tendency to see law as a strict set of rules, but similar to England, the Norwegians surveyed in the study thought laws should function as a set of general principles and guidelines for the judiciary to follow, and wanted the courts to make independent decisions. Indicating that though there is a legal tradition for civil law in Norway, the participants thought the law should function similar to English common law. This was attributed to the political and democratic stability of both the English and Norwegian cultures (Kurkchyan, 2011).

To summarize Norway is a homogenous society with a collective mind set. The country has a significant level of equality and socio-economic stability. There is therefore a great trust in both their neighbors and the government, and they are therefore not very litigious. Based on these attributes, one can assume that Norwegians will not have a high legal awareness and will choose to solve issues outside of court.

2.4 American legal consciousness

The spectrum of individualism and collectivism and its differences across country lines has been a popular topic of study for social scientists which have generally found that Western, especially American culture, to be more individualistic and Eastern culture is more collectivistic. Founded in the fight for democracy in western cultures individualism tends to be seen as an expression of freedom (Zha, Walczyk, Griffith-Ross, Tobacyk, & Walczyk, 2010, p. 356). This is a simplistic understanding of individualism and collectivism today as there are constantly new determining factors that are influencing individualism and collectivism. The US has consistently becoming more multicultural and there is a constant impact of a “world-wide digital structure” that is arguably leading to cultural convergence (Vargas & Kemmelmeier, 2013, p. 199). Still the studies show that American’s with new technology are becoming even more individualistic especially among young Americans (Vargas & Kemmelmeier, 2013, p. 209).

The US is a common law country, like many other countries who were previously British colonies they continued using the common law system after they gained independence so(Clark, 2006). The common law uses and emphasizes case law rather the statute law to a much larger extent, and the use of preliminary work is limited if any. This is a contrast to Norway and other Scandinavian countries who, as mentioned, have an extensive use of preliminary work (Koch & Sunde, 2019).

American’s individualism could also be tied to their distrust in government and institutions. Often characterized as distrusted and cynical, it could rather be understood as a skepticism and “unwillingness to presume the political authorities should be given the benefit of the doubt”(Cook & Gronke, 2005, p. 785). Non-political institutions seem to possess more trust, and institutions such as the military and small businesses had trust of 74 percent and 67 percent of the people, respectively (McCarthy, 2018) American individualism and low trust in institutions can possibly have played a role in the image of American is a very litigious society. Though proof of their litigiousness might not always be substantial both Americans and foreigners consider them to be very litigious and law plays a large part in their social construct (Greenhouse, 1989, p. 264).

There was also a big change for women in the US during the 1970s as households changed from men being predominant breadwinners in 42% of households in 1960 to only 15% in 1988 (Wilkie, 1993, p. 261). Women in American today experience equality to a large extent, they make up the majority of college students and even make slightly more money than men in their 20s (Sahadi, 2016). However, the United States is a much less sexually liberal country than Norway. A study from 1970 did a comparison of college students' opinions of female virginity two areas in the US, Utah and the Mid-West, and Denmark. The study found that the majority of Danes did not mind if their partner was a virgin before marriage as much as their US counterparts, indicating a much more sexually conservative attitude in the United States (Christensen & Gregg, 1970). This sexually conservative attitude has continued with a general public attitude in favor of protecting teenage girls with laws in place protect them from the sexual advances of men, among them a large support in favor of restricting contraceptives and teaching abstinence only (Odem, 1995; Price, 2011). One can see this clearly in a statement made during the FDA hearing when discussing the approval of Plan B "Minor teenage girls should not be engaged in sexual activity of any kind. While physically able to perform the sex act, they are in no way mentally or emotionally ready to handle the multi-faceted aspects of this act, the physical consequences of pregnancy, nor the psychological consequences of intimacy" (*Public hearing on FDA regulation of over-the-counter drug products 2000*, pp. 68-69) (Price, 2011)

Similar to Norway, there are also generational differences in the use of technology between the generations in the United States (Reeves & Oh, 2008). American research found that older generations are generally less interested in technology and therefore report using it less. As a result, they experience more anxiety with using technology and more negative emotions in regard to both use and opinion of it than younger generations do who have integrated technology into their everyday lives (Van Volkom et al., 2014).

The study of legal consciousness in America has been much more extensive than in Norway. Beginning from the early 1980's research has been done to understand the "ways in which people make sense of law and legal institutions, that is, the understandings which give meaning to people's experiences and actions"(Ewick & Silbey, 1992, p. 734). After the Second World War, social scientists focused on attempting to understand and map out the American people's beliefs, attitudes and actions toward political and legal institutions and though Americans are usually found to be individualistic. The research showed that Americans "appeared

to be committed to both the desirability and possibility of realizing legal ideals of equal and fair treatment” even if they were skeptic to the fairness of the legal institutions (Ewick & Silbey, 1992, p. 739). A large part of the research done in the 1990s focused on the intersectionality of race and class. Here, scholars have found that not only do people of different race and class experience the law and legal system differently, they also use the legal system for different types of disputes which are then treated differently by the courts (Ewick & Silbey, 1992; Merry, 1990). Studies also showed that belonging to a lower social class and having less financial means led to one being less aware of one’s rights and these rights being less available to the individual. A different reality to the American ideological view of political liberalism and fairness (Engle, 1998; Ewick & Silbey, 1992).

In conclusion the American culture is multicultural and founded on the ideal of individualism. Their expectation of fairness and distrust of political and legal institutions should indicate a greater awareness of the law as they would need to protect their interests. However as seen, this awareness and use of law has been contingent on race and social class. They also are to a larger extent more protective and puritanical when it comes to their teenage girls and their sexuality which indicates that they will be in favor of stricter laws surrounding sexting.

3. Teenagers, the internet and sexting

3.1 What are teenagers doing?

Over the last 5 years the internet and social media has transitioned from being a place one visits, with businesses operating with in-store and online differences, to being a ubiquitous and natural part of our everyday experience, such as receiving mail and buying groceries (Langford & Sandvik, 2019). With 92% of American teens stating that they go online every day, we can no longer differentiate between virtual and physical, online and world life. The internet and particularly social media has become part of life (Holoyda, Landess, Sorrentino, & Friedman, 2018, p. 171). With a large part of our social interactions moving from the physical realm to the virtual realm our interpersonal relationships and social interactions are changing. The internet revolution has happened at a dramatic speed and this has created a clear generational difference. Parents and adults are not as familiar with the internet in its current form and are therefore unaware of the effects of social media on children. As a result, the adults and those who are supposed to help children navigate their way through adolescence are often unprepared and unknowledgeable about the challenges they face (Van Volkom et al., 2014).

Among the social interactions moving from the physical to the virtual world are sexual interactions, also known as sexting. Sexting is the act of sending text messages, photos and videos of a sexual content to another person with the use of cellphones and other internet enabled devices (Holoyda et al., 2018, p. 171). A study carried out in the USA in 2012 showed that 20% of those aged 15 and under had sent sexts, 33% of 17-year-olds indicated they has sent sexts and 45% of those who were 18 years or older had indicated they had sent sexts (Holoyda et al., 2018, p. 172). This mirrors studies done in Norway which show that 40% of Norwegian teenagers between the ages of 18 and 20 have taken nude photos of themselves (Bremnes, 2018). A vast increase from just a few years before in 2009 where only 8% of 17-year-olds with a cell phone had sexted (Holoyda et al., 2018, p. 172).

This development shows a dramatic change in how teenagers are expressing and exploring their sexuality as new tools are readily available to them. The ubiquitous presence of social media and the social encouragement to share sexual photos is constant. This unregulated influence is especially powerful since adolescence is a particularly important time for exploration and development of sense of self and this is often done without a complete perspective of the consequences. This doesn't mean that teenagers today are exhibiting more risky behavior than previous generations, it's just that the legal risks have become greater due to the current legislation and how permanent the internet is. (Larsen & Buss, 2010, p. 144).

Sexting also is also proven to have an effect on adolescent's psychological well-being. Sobring, Hallberg, Bohlin and Skoog's study from 2015 showed that an increased sexual activity online correlated with poorer levels of well-being. They also found that this had a greater impact on girls which they theorized was due to the greater awareness of so-called bad behavior (Sobring, Hallberg, Bohlin, & Skoog, 2015). There are also significant gender differences between the frequency of sexting and the social reaction to involvement of sexting. Research shows that girls engage in higher rates of sexting, while men are more often recipients (Strohmaier, Murphy, & DeMatteo, 2014) The perception of sharing nude or sexual photos also have very different social consequences for girls then for boys. There is a higher expectation for teenage girls to share nude photos, but they are also judged more for sharing and considered to be attention seeking or slutty, which creates a double pressure to conform to conflicting expectations (Mascheroni, Vincent, & Jimenez, 2015). This expectation is also present with parents who have more a negative opinion and understanding of girls engaging in sexual

activity online (Sobring et al., 2015). They were more concerned about teenage girls' vulnerability in their desire for love but thought that boys were more interested in sex. Boys sexting is considered to be a clueless act of aggression, but girls are viewed as calculating, abnormally aggressive, emotionally needy and lacking in self-esteem (Davidson, 2014). These societal assumptions and expectations play a large role in why engaging in sexual activity online has a greater effect on the psychological well-being of girls (Sobring et al., 2015). However there is no clear consensus on this literature, as some studies have found that not all teenagers engaged in sexting experience negative consequences (Strohmaier et al., 2014, p. 252).

3.2 Sexting and the law

The ubiquitous use of mobile phones and social media apps has turned sexting into a global phenomenon. This has presented several unique and difficult challenges, more specifically the sharing of nude images and videos among teenagers who are minors as this can fall under laws regulating child pornography (Crofts & Lee, 2013). Most of the laws in place today that regulate sharing images and videos of a sexual nature were created before the rise of smart phones and social media, and in an attempt to protect children classify any sexualized nude photo of someone under 18 as being child pornography. Because of the legislatures wish to protect children the laws created that left no room for exceptions for teenage exploration (Crofts & Lee, 2013, p. 95). As a result, children have been convicted by the very laws that were created to protect them. Such is in *State v. Gray* a 17-year-old boy who was convicted for child pornography because he sent a picture of his penis to a 22-year-old. Though various courts have done their best to prevent these seemingly unreasonable convictions, they cannot ignore the laws that are in place and that have to be followed (Crofts & Lee, 2013).

3.1.1 Norwegian law

In the Norwegian criminal code (CC) of 2005 sexual crimes are regulated in §291-§320. Though there is no explicit paragraph that regulates sexting between teenagers, the courts have been given the ability to make exceptions for teenagers in some instances.

In §311(1)(a) of the CC it states that you can be fined or put in jail for creating a composition that depicts sexual abuse towards children or a composition that sexualizes children, This also includes offering, selling, acquiring and possessing these types of compositions CC §311 (1)(b-c). Children in this paragraph are understood as anyone under the age of 18 CC §311 (2), which means that all taking and sharing of nude photos of people under the age of 18 is illegal and can be punished with fines or you can be sentenced up to three years in prison.

However, there is an exception in §311(4) which states that if the person takes or is in possession of a picture of a person in between the ages 16-18. The court can choose to not convict someone if: the person in the photo has given consent and they are of approximately equal age and maturity. This exception gives the courts room to assess the situation and make exceptions for teenagers that send nude photos to each other as long as they are over the age of 16, which is the age of consent in Norway see CC §304. This doesn't completely protect teenagers from conviction, but it does legally allow a judge to make rational assessments. However, the exception doesn't make exceptions for teenagers under the age of 16, which can be problematic as the age of accountability is 15 which results in a one-year gap. Interestingly the preliminary documents do not discuss this exception at length.

Sharing nude photos is not only regulated by the criminal code, but also by The Intellectual Property Rights Act §23 and §104, which state that a person who composes a picture has the sole right to possess and share the photo and you need to give consent before a picture of you can be shared or published. If these laws are broken, they can also be punished with fines or prison up to one year, see §79. These laws have been very important in Norwegian court cases regarding sharing of sensitive images (Bratheim, 2018).

3.1.2 Norwegian case law

Even though there is an exception in the law, there are several verdicts that lead to the conviction of teenagers for sharing nude or sexual photos and videos without consent. In one case a 16-year-old girl was sentenced to 35 days of prison for sharing a photo of a 14-year-old girl topless on Instagram. Though 18 at the time of the sentencing, she stated that she didn't know it was an offence to share a photo that was already available online (Madshus, 2019). There has also been an increasing amount of convictions for teenagers who share sexual photos and videos online (Aasheim & Nordli, 2018). What characterizes all these cases is that they are predominantly about teenagers sharing images and videos online without the other persons consent. There are no cases of teens being convicted for producing and creating the photos.

3.1.3 American law

Due to the US being a federal state there is no one law that regulates all 50 states. Teenage sexting is therefore regulated both by federal law and by state law.

The federal law that regulates teenage sharing of nude images is The Protect Act of 2003. Specifically §1466A which states that any person who knowingly produces, distributes, receives or possesses a visual depiction of any kind that depicts a minor engaged in sexual explicit conduct is subject to penalties provided in section 2252A(b)(1) in Title 18 of the United States code. The penalties include fines and a minimum of 5 years imprisonment. Though this law appertains to all citizens, cases where juveniles are the subjects of prosecution these matters should be carried out by the states in accordance to 18. U.S.C §2252 and §2252A.

This strict understanding was followed up by a Supreme Court case *New York v. Ferber* (1982), which categorically excluded protection of sexually explicit visual depictions of minors from the First Amendment right to free speech. Meaning that under no circumstance could a sexually explicit picture of a minor be protected by the first amendment (D. Sacco, Argudin, Maquire, & Tallong, 2010). The Protect Act of 2003 was later upheld in *United States v. Williams* (2008), cementing the strict interpretation of the first amendment regarding nude images of children.

Multiple states have responded to the increase of sexting among teenagers by modifying criminal laws and downgrading certain felonies, which has been done in Colorado, Missouri, Utah and Vermont. Nebraska has passed law that states that if it only the accused minor in the picture and the person who possesses it is close in age, they accused should not be guilty of child pornography laws. Other states such as South Carolina have passed education laws to increase awareness of the dangers (D. Sacco et al., 2010). California however, which is the focus of this research study, has not passed any laws regarding teenage sexting in particular, but the Assembly Concurrent Resolution 100 has encouraged all Californians to Observe National Teen Dating, Violence Awareness and Prevention Month (D. Sacco et al., 2010)

The California law states that it is illegal to knowingly possess or control any matter, data or image that contains a picture of a person under the age of 18 engaging in or simulating sexual conduct, which includes showing of the genitals, pubic and rectal areas, see PC 311.11(a). Penalties can be 2500\$ fine, a year in prison or both.

3.1.4 American case law

In contrast to Norway there are also a few cases where the teenager who shared the photo also was convicted, in addition to the teenagers who shared it. In one case a 14 year old girl was

faced with child pornography chargers after she uploaded 30 nude images of herself to MySpace.com (D. Sacco et al., 2010).

In *AH v State* (2007) a 16-year-old and 17-year-old in a relationship were found of guilty of producing and promoting photographs that they knew to be sexual conduct with a child because they took pictures of themselves naked and engaged in sexual behavior. These pictures were taken with consent from both parties and emailed from one party to the other and they were not shared with anyone else. The girl appealed the case arguing that it violated the right to privacy, which was denied because she had no reasonable expectation of privacy in the photographs.

3.3 Teenagers legal consciousness of sexting

3.3.1 Norwegian research

A Master's thesis from 2018 conducted an extensive study of teenagers, aged 13-15, picture sharing habits. Looking specifically at the sharing of nude photos among Norwegian teenagers. The authors conducted a survey of 297 respondents and found that 12.5 % of the participants had sent a nude photo and 6.7 % of those answered that they had shared a nude photo of someone else. However, 48.5 % claimed they had received a nude photo, where 60.8% of the girls reported to have received nude photos but only 27.1% of boys reported to have received nude photos. This is particularly interesting considering that they found that 98% knew that sharing nude pictures of someone else was illegal. However, when asked whether there was a difference between being over or under 16 years old, 37.5 % said yes and 36.5% said no (Skavlan & Viste, 2018)

They were also asked if there was a difference between being over or under 18 years old and 43,1% answered yes and 33,3% said no. This indicates that though they are aware that sharing nude pictures is illegal, they are unaware of the actual law. This understanding is reinforced by the fact that only 17,6% answered that it was probable or vary probable that this could lead to incarceration and 44,9% answered that nothing would happen. This indicates that they share nude photos even though they know it is illegal. A majority of respondents also replied that they would contact the police if someone shared a nude photo of them which indicates a great trust in the police force (Skavlan & Viste, 2018).

3.3.2 American research

A survey done of 606 high school students in south west USA showed that teens report receiving sexts as opposed to sending sexts at a significantly higher rate. When asked about their opinion on sexting there were clear gender differences, with 50.4% of females saying that it is always wrong to send or forward nude photos but only 33.9 % of males saying the same thing. They found that of those indicating the sending sext were wrong also sent less sexts, by 4.9%. Only 26% of students who responded to the open-ended question asking if they thought there were any and current legal consequences to sexting, with 58% of those who responded saying that the consequences were serious, naming jail time, child pornography charges or other sexual offences. They also found that students who responded to the question and had sent sexts were more likely to perceive legal consequences to their behavior. Finally, they found that the most common response to whether there should be legal consequences was that there shouldn't be any consequences with 21% saying this (Strassberg, McKinnon, Sustaíta, & Rullo, 2013).

In a survey done of 228 participants at Northeastern University the majority of respondents thought sexting among minors was a prosecutable offence. There was also a significant relationship between those who were aware of the legal consequences of sexting as minors and who sent sexts, with greater awareness of law correlating with a lower frequency of sexting. However, approximately one third of the respondents reported being undeterred continued sexting despite knowing that there were legal consequences. They also found a significant number of respondents who said they would not have been deterred if they had been aware (Strohmaier et al., 2014). Over one third supported prosecuting underage sexting and another third responded that some sort of legal punishment would be appropriate. However, the majority of respondents favored more lenient and rehabilitative approaches, rather than serious long-term penalties(Strohmaier et al., 2014).

4. Methodology

4.1 Research question

This study is an exploratory comparative study of legal consciousness in Norway and the USA. The main question is if the US and Norway have a common legal consciousness regarding teenage sexting, or if the growing use of technology and the techno-legal consciousness surrounding it constitutes a global legal consciousness. The goal is to see if there are national

differences between legal consciousness and if there are other identifiable patterns in individual legal consciousness. To find answers to the main question, four different research questions are posed regarding awareness, use, age and perception of gender.

Although the US and Norway are both industrial, Western and democratic countries, they have great differences in culture, specifically the difference between the individual mindset in the United States and the collective mindset in Norway (Milgram, 1961). The fact that both countries are similar can also give insightful information if a national legal consciousness is found since differences can be less easily attributed to something else.

The first research question is if there is a difference in *legal awareness* between in Norway and the United States. The anticipated result is that Norwegians will know less about the laws in place due to Norwegian's higher trust in governmental and judicial institutions as their trust would not incentivize them to find out (Kleven, 2016). The presumption is that trust reduces to increase legal knowledge. However, if awareness is similar in both countries this could be an argument in favor of legal consciousness being an attribute of subgroups across national lines or evidence of a global legal consciousness.

The second question is if there is a difference between how Norwegians and Americans view law *enforcement* and the handling of situations such as adolescent sexting. The anticipated result is that there will be a difference in how Norwegians and Americans use the law due to the United States' litigious culture (Cook & Gronke, 2005). If the both Americans and Norwegians report similarly on legal enforcement, this could indicate again that legal consciousness exists either at a sub-group level or a global level.

The third research question is if *age* influences the participants legal consciousness. The anticipated results are that there will be a greater difference between the legal consciousness of younger adults and older adults. Given the technological differences between generations older generations are predicted to know less about sexting and therefore know less about the rules regulating it (Reeves & Oh, 2008). The results can tell us if the subgroup age is a better indicator of legal consciousness than nationality.

The fourth and final research question is whether *legal consciousness* is inflicted by gendered perceptions of victimhood. Do people think laws are stricter or more lenient depending on whether the person subject to them is a boy or a girl. The anticipated result is that there will be a difference for the US respondents, but not between the Norwegian respondent given the

different cultural view of teenage girls and the greater sexual agency women in Norway experience (Bendixen et al., 2017). The results could indicate both whether differing cultural perceptions of gender shape ideas of criminality and to what extent public persecution of sexting regulation is driven by gender frames.

4.2 Comparative methodology

Modern comparative research has existed since the start of the 20th century and has become a large field of legal study across the world. Although a large amount of comparative research has been conducted the methodology is varied, often based on the individual researchers' background. There are therefore multiple ways of executing comparative legal research and multiple considerations that need to be taken into account (Van Hoecke, 2015).

Law is a product of history and societal norms that are essential to understanding how that countries law works. The contextualism approach states that to doing meaningful comparative research we must be aware of the context they exist in and consider them as a part of understanding a countries legal system (Langford & Berge, 2019). This is often called the law-in-context method which Rudolfo Sacco used in his research. He focused on legal formant which not only encompassed legal doctrine and case law, but also something he named cryptotypes (R. Sacco, 1991, p. 22). These cryptotypes are hidden elements that influence the way law is interpreted and understood, this can be anything from world view to personal experience. Cryptotypes are hard to find by reading case law and legal textbooks, empirical research it a macro level is therefore necessary to gain a greater understanding and which is why this research paper will be using empirical methods to do a comparative study (Van Hoecke, 2015, p. 18)

Though the comparative legal methodology gives insight on what to consider and how to compare, it does not facilitate or give guidance on how to conduct empirical research. For this we will have to use social science research methods.(Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 90)

4.3 Collecting data

Measuring legal consciousness requires a nuanced approach and the need for collecting and viewing data from multiple different angles. This multifaceted approach entails a mixed-methods approach in data collection, meaning that multiple ways of collecting data will be used to compensate for short comings data collecting method. As a result of this the research

methodology is influenced by several different approaches, most notably narrative research, phenomenological research but also ethnographic research. The goal is to understand the “lived experience of a phenomenon”, in this case sexting (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 75). To find what the participants have in common as in phenomenological research, but also the entire experience as it is expressed by the individual as seen in narrative research (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 67). Because the comparison is across cultures there is also an ethnographic element to the research which looks at the shared experience of a cultural group and tries to identify patterns (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 91).

A survey and focus groups will be used in the project to create a greater understanding of sexting. A self-administered questionnaire will be able to give insight into the participants' basic awareness and use of law. Compared to qualitative methods it will be easy to create a large sample and thus generalize to a greater extent. With the use of standardized questions and answers, it is easier to recognize patterns within and across the different countries, age groups, and genders. In addition, surveys can be easily accessible, they can guarantee anonymity and are easier to code and replicate (Nardi, 2014, p. 20). Though surveys give limited insight and information about the persons' inner thoughts and motives, it is optimal for answering the research questions at hand: a larger data sample can be used to recognize patterns that can be subject to comparison. (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 168)

The shortcomings of a survey can be compensated for by using focus groups. Focus groups are ideal as they can provide greater insight into understanding of why participants think, for example something is legal or illegal and help identify any underlying national differences (Nardi, 2014, p. 17). Focus group samples are usually small and located in one geographical area, which means that the results are not generalizable. There is also a risk of a few participants affecting what the others say, leaving minority views undisclosed. However, many of these challenges are made up for by conducting a survey (Nardi, 2014, p. 21).

4.4 Research design

4.4.1 Question design

The primary set of questions for both the questionnaire and the focus group interviews concerned various sexting scenarios. Participants were asked to say whether certain actions – self saving, sending, and saving again – were legal or not. This approach was chosen in order to prevent social biases, but also to pick up on nuanced differences of when they think that a situation becomes illegal.

The first five questions of the survey are informative questions such as age, gender, country, social media use and whether the participants are or are close to a lawyer or police officer can influence the answers of the participants. These control questions are asked so that differences in response to questions can be adjusted according to these background-variables (Nardi, 2014, p. 55).

To understand their awareness of the law, participants were introduced to several scenarios that change slightly in-between and asked if the actions in the scenarios are legal (see Appendix A). No option was provided for 'don't know'. Rather, participants were asked with what degree of confidence they answered the questions. To answer the research question four there will be three different surveys who will be identical except for the gender of the people in the scenarios. One will have a girl sending nude photos, one will have a boy sending nude photos and one will be gender neutral. The different results will be able to indicate whether there is a different legal consciousness for girls and boys.

In addition, there were two concrete questions about the source and enforcement of law and, again, degree of confidence questions was posed for each answer. The last of these questions concerned how likely respondents thought that there would be judicial consequences when sharing nude pictures, which was inspired by the previous research done on teenagers in Norway.

The questions from the survey were also used for the focus groups. The interview was divided into two parts. In the first part, a discussion was held concerning the legality of sexting and participants' knowledge about the relevant laws and regulations. They were first asked a general question about what they know about the law, and then introduced to the same eleven scenarios. In the second part, the local law was introduced, and the participants were asked what they thought of it and if they believed it suitable. There was no variation in the way the questions were asked, unlike the questionnaire. The final two questions were about what legal options they perceived were available and why they would use them, which will gain more insight into how they use the law. The structure of the interview was not rigid and permitted the participants to speak freely and give room for greater insight into their understanding.

4.4.2. Sampling and recruitment

Due to the limited time and resources the sampling technique used was non-probability sampling, through convenience and snowball. People in Norway and the US will be asked to an-

swer the questionnaire and tell their friends to answer this as well. To generate interest one participant from the US and one participant from Norway will get a chance to win fifty dollars or five hundred kroner if they participate in the survey (Nardi, 2014, p. 124). In total 434 participants answered the survey, 349 from Norway and 85 from the United States.

Both convenience sampling and snowball sampling was also used for recruiting the focus groups. There were four focus groups in total, two in Norway and two in the US. There were six participants in each focus group conducted in the United States and in Norway there was one focus group of five participants and one focus group of six. Invitations were sent to individuals known to the researcher, and invites were asked to bring someone they know to participate if they wished.

4.4.4. Data quality

Due to the sampling methods one cannot generalize the findings to the Norwegian and US populations. However, they provide an indication of the existence of differences in national legal consciousness and point out trends for further research.

To control for *observational error* in the statistics missing values will not be included and only results with a p-value of .05 or less will be considered a statistically significant correlation. However, as this is a student research project the question of the quality of the data will be limited and therefore the question of observational error cannot be eliminated.

Regarding the *reliability* of the data the intent of the paper is to look for inconsistencies the answers given based on the different control variable. Outside of this both focus groups and surveys were conducted in the same way each time. The results should therefore be very fairly reliable.

To be sure, there are *validity* errors that can occur with conducting surveys and focus groups. Especially considering the questions test knowledge and awareness, as there could be a social bias to select what seems right rather than what they think. This could give an inaccurate insight to their actual knowledge. Some respondents are likely to be prone to exaggerate their knowledge and understanding as that is more socially desirable, resulting in a response bias (Nardi, 2014, p. 88). For the focus groups, response bias can have an effect as there is a social dynamic that is catalyzed by being with other people in the same room, hearing the responses. The benefit, however, is that participants have a chance to explain themselves and clarify why they think the way they do which can soften the social expectations and pressure. Participants

were also informed of what the law was during the second half and be able to give an opinion on whether it matches what they think the law should be.

4.4.6 Ethics

All collection of personal data was conducted in accordance to the ethical guidelines of the University of Oslo, and the legal requirements of GDPR, and approval was sought from and given by NSD. This approval concerned the collection of names, emails for both survey and focus group. As well as being able to record of the focus group interviews using University of Oslo's interview app.

The information gathered in the survey or the focus groups is not sensitive information, so the questionnaire and the survey do not in and of themselves raise concerning ethical questions. Both the survey and the focus groups were voluntary and based on the will to participate. Only people who can give a knowing and willing consent and who are not part of a sensitive group were able to participate.

The survey were in-direct questions, designed such that the respondents weren't directly asked about their legal and institutional knowledge. Their knowledge of the law was determined on what they answered about each scenario. This can raise an ethical questions about whether the participants were tricked, as they are not asked point blank about whether they know something or not. However, the design of the question was presented and explained to the respondents before they responded so that they were aware of the research method. They were also informed of the possibility to withdraw their answers before answering questions.

Only the question asking them to submit their name was mandatory. This is done to respect respondent autonomy, especially since there is no option answering "I don't know". They were also made aware of the fact that the research is done in connection with a master's thesis and the author's email was provided.

Moreover, different ethical factors were considered for the focus groups. All participants were given information beforehand regarding the purpose of the research, the main research question, and the type of questions to be asked. Respondents were also informed of their right to not participate, to leave at any time and the possibility of amending and removing their answers after the interview is over. They will also be shown the consent form in advanced and sign it before the focus groups interview starts so that they have time to consider their participation.

Although participants were not asked any direct sensitive questions. Due to the subject matter might have wanted to share sensitive information or react negatively to some of the questions asked. To help prevent this kind of a situation arising, the participants were informed of the topic beforehand and made aware that if they are not comfortable talking about this issue it is best that they do not participate: see focus group consent form in Appendix A. The focus group were also commenced with a reminder of their rights as research participants. If any sensitive information was to be shared, the author had an articulated plan to stop the conversation and proceed to the next question or end the interview, depending on what appeared to be the most ethical choice for the participants and situation at hand. An email was sent to all participants a few days after the interview to check if the participants had a negative experience with partaking in the interview.

As this is a student project, and was conducted by a student researcher, there were additional ethical factors that need to be taken into consideration. Given that the student researcher is not as trained in conducting and leading focus groups there may be situations and instances that will not be handled as seamlessly as with an experienced researcher. The participants of the focus groups were therefore informed of this in advance and the sample groups were relatively small and homogenous, so that they were more easily manageable.

Information sheets about laws regarding sexting, information for police and support groups/pages as well as a summary and references to the laws and rights for research participants were also given to the participants after the interview that they can take home with them so that the information is made easily available.

4.4.7 Execution and analysis

The survey was conducted through the University of Oslo's "Nettskjema". The focus groups were arranged at a time and place that was best for all participants. In Norway they were held using available rooms at the University of Oslo while the focus groups in the USA were held at two of the participants homes. The goal was to make the participants feel as comfortable as possible with the situation. The researcher will be an active observer to the focus groups, meaning that they ask questions and probed for answer when necessary.

The survey data was coded numerically, and SPSS was used to conduct binary and multinomial logistic regressions to find if the different control variables indicate the odds of you selecting one answer or the other: see next section.

The data from the focus groups was organized and thematically coded in NVivo to create an overview of the different topics that were discussed in different focus groups.

5. Data analysis

5.1. Legal Awareness

In order to determine if there is a difference between the legal awareness in Norway and the United States respondents to both in the survey and the focus group were asked how they thought sexting was regulated and about their views on different scenarios. They were also asked if they had great, medium or little confidence in their results. Comparing these results to the actual law provides an indication the respondent’s awareness. The comparisons were performed by conducting binary and multi-nominal linear regression analysis, with answers to questions forming the dependent variable and the different characteristics of respondents being used as independent variables. The statistical significance of the results are determined through their p-values, indicating significance, while the coefficients for each independent variable is an odds ratio, indicating the likelihood of an answer. All logistical regressions can be found in Annex B, and the discussion on each theme is completed by the results from the focus groups.

5.1.1 Question on regulation

In Table 1 a majority of the participants were aware that taking and sharing nude photos was regulated by law, indicating no differences in awareness of legal methods between Norway and the US. A multi-nominal logistic regression was run to see if this was correct, and there were no significant results. Implying that both countries know that sharing nude photos is a legal matter and that Norwegians and Americans have a similar awareness of the law.

Table 1. How respondents think nude photos are regulated in percentages.

		How is taking and sharing nude photos regulated?		
		By law	By Social Norms	There is no regulation
What country do you live in?	Norway	82%	8%	10%
	USA	71%	14%	15%

5.1.2 A 15-year-old’s actions

A 15-year-old takes a nude photo of themselves, can they...						
	USA			Norway		
Confidence:	Great	Medium	Little	Great	Medium	Little
1. Save it to their phone?						
Yes	22%	32%	14%	48%	24%	17%
No	6%	15%	11%	3%	6%	2%
2. Send it to a 16-year-old?						
Yes	4%	19%	4%	8%	24%	15%
No	27%	32%	14%	16%	24%	13%
3. sends it to a 25-year-old?						
Yes	2%	3%	6%	8%	21%	15%
No	54%	22%	13%	24%	20%	12%

Table 2: Questions regarding a 15-year-olds actions that show what respondents answer and their confidence

In the three questions presented in Table 2, we observe a general trend among American respondents: they answer that the scenarios are illegal, which is the correct answer. The majority selected “no” with varying levels of certainty for the second and third question which concerned whether a 15-year-old was allowed to share a nude picture of themselves with another 16-year-old or a 25-year-old. The answers from the Norwegian respondents do not show the same trend. However, both the Norwegian and the American respondents answered that it was legal for the 15-year-old to take a nude photo of themselves and save it to their phone. Yet to varying degrees, with 68% of Americans answering “Yes” and 89% of Norwegians answered “Yes”.

These variations were tested with a binary logistic regression, see Table 3. It found that Norwegians were more likely to answer “Yes” to all the questions to different degrees, but with all differences being statistically significant. The greatest odds being that a Norwegian will answer “Yes” rather than “No” to question 3 compared to participant from the US.

	Question 1	Question 2	Questions 3
P-value	.000	.002	.002
Odds ratio	4.323	2.306	5.171

Table 3: Binary logistic regression showing Norwegian results, $p=0.05$

These results indicate that there is a difference in awareness of the law between Americans and Norwegians, with Americans being more aware of the illegality of different scenarios. However, there are several factors that could play into this calculus. First is the fact that the age of consent is 18 years in California and various other states in the US but 16 years in

Norway. This could have influenced the Norwegian perception of the law. Second, American society is more puritanical. This moral perspective may find expression in legal views but be evident here as legal awareness.

5.1.2 A 16-year-old’s actions

A 15-year-old sends a nude photo to a 16-year-old, can the 16-year-old...						
	USA			Norway		
	Great	Medium	Little	Great	Medium	Little
4. save it to their phone?						
Yes	5%	8%	3%	3%	3%	3%
Yes, with consent	0%	12%	6%	7%	13%	6%
No	23%	28%	14%	34%	22%	9%
5. send it to another 16-year-old?						
Yes	0%	4%	2%	.5%	.2%	.3%
Yes, with consent	1%	6%	4%	1%	5%	3%
No	35%	33%	15%	50%	26%	14%
6. send it to a 25-year-old?						
Yes	0%	0%	1%	.8%	.3%	0%
Yes, with consent	1%	0%	2%	.3%	5%	3%
No	51%	26%	19%	52%	26%	13%

Table 4: Questions regarding a 16-year-olds actions that show what respondents answer and their confidence in their answer.

In Table 4, we can observe a greater similarity between the US and Norway with the majority of the participants answering “No” to all questions. However, in question 4 only 65% of both Norwegians and Americans answered “No”. This shows that participants are very aware that sharing a photo no matter the age is illegal. However, the dip in the percentage of those who say “No” in question 4 indicates that when the photo is not shared, the legality of it becomes more unclear. This is however the same in both countries.

The logistic regressions show varied answers to these three questions. For question 4 the logistic regression analysis revealed no significant finds, indicating that there was no difference between the US and Norway for this question, which aligns with what we can see in Table 3. However, there are significant results for the variables for social media in question 5(p-value: .017, odds ratio:.332) and question 6 (p-value:.013 odds ratio: .183) (Appendix B). This indicates that the respondent is less likely to answer “Yes” the less social media they use. This indicates that country and age don’t determine the answer, but rather the confidence the par-

participant had in their answer. These results confirm what was found in Table 3, that there is less of a difference of awareness of the law between the US and Norway when it comes to sharing photos. Most participants know that it is illegal.

5.1.3 25-year-olds actions

A 15-year-old sends a 25-year-old a nude photo, can the 25-year-old						
	USA			Norway		
	Great	Medium	Little	Great	Medium	Little
7. save it to their phone?						
Yes	2%	2%	1%	2%	3%	1%
Yes, with consent	0%	0%	1%	2%	4%	4%
No	52%	29%	13%	46%	28%	10%
8. send it to 16-year-old?						
Yes	0%	0%	1%	.5%	0%	.5%
Yes, with consent	0%	0%	1%	1%	3%	2%
No	49%	29%	11%	56%	26%	11%
9. send it to another 25-year-old?						
Yes	0%	2%	1%	.6%	0%	.3%
Yes, with consent	1%	0%	1%	.9%	2%	1%
No	62%	21%	11%	56%	27%	11%

Table 5: Questions regarding a 25-year-olds actions that show what respondents answer and their confidence in their answer.

Over 80% of the participants answered “No” to all three questions regarding a 15-year-old sending a nude photo to a 25-year-old. This indicates that not only is there an awareness of the illegality of sharing images in both countries, but also a potential awareness of the age limits in both countries.

The logistical regression analysis revealed no significant results for questions 8. The only significant result in question 9 was that the participant was less likely to answer positively if they used less social media (p-value: .016, odds ratio: .231). In question 7 the participants below 30 were less likely to choose “Yes” and people from Norway were more likely to answer “Yes, consent” than those from American (p-value: .026, odds ratio: 9.857). However, as seen in Table 5 the amount of people who answered “Yes, with consent” is limited compared

to those who answered no, therefore this does not indicate more than a slight difference. This confirms that people are aware that 25-year-old saving and sharing a nude photo of a 15-year-old is illegal.

5.1.4 Norwegian legal exceptions for teens between 16 and 18.

A 17-year-old sends a nude picture of themselves to a 16-year-old...						
	USA			Norway		
	Great	Medium	Little	Great	Medium	Little
10. Can the 17-year old-send the picture to the 16-year-old?						
Yes	0%	14%	11%	15%	21%	9%
Yes, with consent	1%	13%	2%	7%	16%	7%
No	18%	31%	10%	10%	10%	5%
11. Can the 16-year-old save the picture to their phone?						
Yes	4%	9%	4%	5%	8%	3%
Yes, with consent	0%	16%	7%	7%	24%	10%
No	15%	29%	15%	17%	17%	7%

Table 6: Questions regarding a 17-year-old and 16-year-old’s actions that show what respondents answer and their confidence in their answer.

These questions were designed to see if the participants were aware of the exception in Norwegian law for 16-18-year-olds that consent to the picture being taken and possessed by somebody else. We should therefore see a difference in the answers here as the law in each country differs.

For these two questions the majority of the American participants answered “No”, which is the correct answer in California at least. However, only 59% answered “No” to both questions indicating that there is less awareness and that based on their legal consciousness this isn’t as punishable as previous questions. The Norwegian responses are more spread out then before indicating that more may be aware that the law is different for teenagers then 25-year-olds. However, it is not clear that they are aware of the law as only 30% answered “Yes, with consent” to the question 10, which is correct, and 45% answered only “Yes”. This confusion is also seen in question 11 where 41% answer “No” and 41% answer “Yes, with consent”.

The logistical regression analysis for question 10 indicates that Norwegians were more likely to answer “Yes” (p-value:.000 odds ratio: 5.479) and “Yes, with consent” (p-value: .000, odds

ratio: 4.247). Both control variables “Use of social media” and “Age” were significant showing that the odds for responding “Yes” decreased in occurrence with social media use. If you were below thirty that increased the odds of you answering “Yes, with consent”. For question 11 the logistic regression found that Norwegians were more likely to choose “Yes, with consent” (p-value: .005, odds ratio: 2.289), is the correct answer. It also revealed that the less social media you used the less likely it was for you to answer “Yes” (p-value: .040, odds ratio: .678). However, if the participant had a legal or police background, they were less likely to choose “Yes, with consent” (p-value:.044, odds ratio: .617)

There is a significant difference between the countries in both question 10 and question 11, which there should be given the legal differences. This indicates that there is a different legal consciousness in the US and Norway regarding teenagers.

5.1.5 Focus groups

To understand the participants awareness of the law they were first asked a general question as to whether they knew which laws regulated sexting. Following this opening, they were presented with the same scenarios as in the survey and asked whether they were legal or not.

Not one participant in all four focus groups referenced specific paragraphs and clauses, but rather spoke of laws in general. In both Norwegian focus groups the criminal code was mentioned, as well as other laws such as the intellectual property code and the children law. However, there were several of the participants who stated that they were not sure, and the discussion moved quickly towards whether specific examples and situations were legal or not. When discussing whether something was legal or not some referenced information from media and television, using examples of what they had seen happen. Others stated that they didn't know the specifics, but they had a general sense of what would be right and what would be wrong.

In the United States the focus groups didn't reference specific statutes as in the Norwegian focus groups. Both focus groups expressed that they didn't know what the laws were and quickly started discussing examples and scenarios, similar to the Norwegian focus groups. One of the participants referenced the creation of revenge porn laws and stated that they thought there had been some development there recently. In both of the American focus groups the fact that a picture was private property was mentioned during this discussion, which was only mentioned in one of the Norwegian focus groups, and then only when asked

specifically why they thought it should be legal for teens to share a nude photo with each other if they consent.

The fact that Norwegians knew more specific laws indicates that they have a more general knowledge of the legal system. However, several of the participants in both Norwegian focus groups had various legal backgrounds so that might have had an effect their general awareness and effect the results. There were no participants with legal backgrounds in the US focus groups and their answers seem to match those who did not have a legal background in the Norwegian focus groups. What is interesting is how both of the American focus groups referenced the right to private property, indicating that they have a greater awareness, or concern about their individual rights than participants of the Norwegian focus groups.

Though there seems to be some differences between the US and Norwegian focus groups, all four groups mentioned that a nude photo of someone under 18 would be child pornography, and would therefore be illegal. However, they expressed insecurity as to whether that would be the case in all situations.

When presented with the question of whether a 15-year-old could take a nude picture of themselves and save it to their phone all the focus groups answered that yes that would be legal. Specifying in several cases that it would be legal as long as it's not shared with others. Both participants in the US and in Norway referenced family photos of naked children when answering this question, asking if that would not be the same thing.

In response to the question regarding whether the 15-year-old could send the photo to a 16-year-old there was no consensus and participants disagreed in all four of the focus groups. Those who stated that they thought it was illegal referenced the fact they were underage, while those who argued that it was legal stated that there was no difference from the 15-year-old and 16-year-old showing each other their bodies. In one of the focus groups in the US they argued that they didn't think it was illegal or regulated by law, just that it was something they shouldn't do

For the question of the 16-year-old saving it to their phone the American focus groups both integrated this into the answer of whether it could be shared between the two individuals, and their opinion was contingent on their answer to that question. The Norwegian focus groups differed in their answers with the participants in one of them saying it was illegal, and the participants in the other saying it was legal if there was consent. Both focus groups in Norway

brought up the challenge of technology, and how once you have received it it's saved to your device.

There was complete consensus between all four focus groups that the 16-year-old was not allowed to share the nude photo with anyone else, even if the 15-year-old consented to it being shared to others. When asked why consent wasn't enough several participants in both the Norwegian and US focus groups stated that they wouldn't understand the consequences of their actions.

Generally, all question regarding the 25-year-old were considered illegal without much discussion. The only aspect of these scenarios that were questioned was the 25-year-olds intent. If they had solicited the photo, then the participants found that it was clearly illegal. However, if a 15-year-old had sent a photo to them with them asking for it. Say a student having a crush on a teacher, should not create legal consequences for the 25-year-old given that they take action to delete the photo. When asked why both a Norwegian and US focus groups stated the age difference was the main reason, and that since the 15-year-old was a minor it would be illegal.

This indicates that all participants have a general awareness of what is illegal in regard to sharing of nude images between those over and under 18 and sharing of nude images in general. However, there was less awareness and knowledge of the laws surrounding those sharing with one person under the age of 18, with the differences varying not by nationality, but within the different focus groups. And there was almost no awareness of the fact that taking a nude photo of your-self was technically illegal. There were participants in all focus groups that expressed that they thought punishing those who had taken the picture which were later shared to others was wrong.

5.1.6 Summary

Both the focus groups and the surveys indicate that all participants are aware that sharing nude photos with others is illegal. Indicating that that majority of people have a similar legal consciousness surrounding the issue. The question that the participants in the survey answered incorrectly were generally questions regarding sharing a nude photo between two consenting teenagers, as seen in question four. This was also found when conducting the focus group as there were disagreement regarding this in all four of them.

This indicates that there is a general legal awareness of the legality of sharing nude images, but less awareness of the age limits with Norwegian respondents being more likely to say that sharing the photos between two teenagers was acceptable as seen in question 4, 10 and 11. This indicates that Norwegians have a different legal consciousness in regards to teenagers sharing nude photos consensually, being more accepting to it.

5.2 Use of law

To answer the second research question and obtain information regarding people’s use of law the respondents in both the surveys and focus groups were asked questions regarding what they would do if a photo were to be shared to others without their consent and how they would go about it. As this question requires more in depth answers more information were collected from the focus groups then the surveys.

5.2.1 Action

As Table 7 shows, the majority of respondents answered that you can contact the police in both countries. However, there is a clear difference as a larger section of Americans respondents chose to answer that you can contact the social media platform. This is confirmed by the logistic regression that found, with a significant level of that Norwegians were less likely to choose to contact the social media platform rather the contact the police (p-value: .001, odds ratio .343).

The logistic regression also found that the less you use social media the less likely it was for you to choose the alternative that you can contact the social media platform (p-value:.002, odds ratio: .545). This is a logical result as the more you use the greater understanding you have of how it functions. However, this is not relevant for the research question. This indicates that there is a difference between the US in Norway in how they use the law, with Norwegians being more likely to use the law and contact the police.

	What can you do if a nude photo has been shared without consent?			
	The affected parties can contact each other	Contact the police	Contact the social media platform	Nothing
Norway	2%	88%	8%	2%
USA	4%	69%	26%	1%

Table 7: Question on what action to take, shows the percentages

5.2.2 Probability

The raw data in Table 8 reveals a difference between the US and Norway in that the majority of Norwegian respondents chose “Maybe probable” and “Probable”, and the majority of

Americans chose “Probable” and “Very probable”. This difference is confirmed by the logistic regression analysis that found that Norwegians were more likely to select either “Maybe probable” (p-value:.000 odds ratio: 4.828) or “Probable” (p-value: .047 odds ratio: 1.841) rather the “Very probable”. Whereas there was no significant difference for the American respondents. The logistical regression also found that the respondent was more likely to answer “Maybe probable” if they were under 30 (p-value: .001, odds ratio: 2.529)

This difference indicates that Norwegians respondents thought it less likely that there will be any consequences if a picture is shared. This signals that they either have less faith in the efficiency of political and justice systems then Americans do, or they don’t consider sharing a photo to be as wrong as Americans do.

	How probable do you think it is that there will be legal consequences (prison, fine etc.) if you share a nude photo of someone under the age of 18?			
	Not probable	Maybe probable	Probable	Very probable
Norway	3%	41%	34%	21%
USA	14%	16%	32%	37%

Table 8: Question regarding the probability of punishment. Shows percentages.

5.2.3 Focus group

To find out how the participants in the focus group used the law they were asked two open ended questions. First, what kind of punishment they thought was appropriate for this situation and, secondly, what one could do if a nude photo of oneself was shared to other people. In one of the American focus groups the last question was forgotten by the author, and therefore not discussed.

In all four focus groups the participants explicitly expressed that they thought it was good that the laws were strict and that this was important to protect teenagers and adults from people sharing their nude photos. However, the majority of participants differed between consensually sharing pictures in between two people and sharing it on the internet. There were participants in all focus groups that argued that there should be exceptions in place for a teenage boyfriend and girlfriend who shared pictures of themselves with each other. When told about the *AH v Florida* (2007) case where two teenagers were convicted for sharing nude photos of themselves to each other, almost all participants found the verdict to be harsh and when asked

why a participant in Norway explained that it was because it was consensual and they were almost adults.

In both a focus group in Norway and a focus group in the US several participants expressed that going to prison would be appropriate for someone who shared photos. However, those in the US expressed that the minimum five-year sentence in federal law was too much. In all the focus groups the majority of the participants suggested less severe punishments such as fines and community service.

When asked about they would do in a situation where a nude photo of them had been shared both Norwegian focus groups and the US focus group expressed a sense of helplessness in that once the picture was on the internet, it would never disappear. One could contact the police but there was nothing the police could do to get it back.

In both Norwegian focus groups, it was clear that there was a difference between having a photo you had taken yourself spread over the internet, and someone taking a photo or video of you without your permission. For the latter the participants agreed that they would contact the police directly. However, if they had taken the photos themselves, they would want to hide it from their parents, stating that they would contact the police as a last resort, indicating that there was an element of shame in taking your own picture.

In the American focus group, there was more focus on the fact that the underage minor could risk incriminating themselves by reporting it to the police, and therefore discussed that fact that there were not very many options for teenagers to report a bad situation.

5.2.4 Summary

Here we see more of a difference between the two countries. Though most participants said they could contact the police, there was a clear difference in the US responses indicating that they use the law differently. This is also reflected in the fact that the Norwegian participants thought it was much less likely what would be punished.

This was also reflected in the focus groups as both Norwegian focus groups questioned if the police could do anything in this kind of situation. This was not mentioned in the American focus groups. These results indicate that there is difference between the two countries in how they use the law.

5.3 Common consciousness among age groups

To understand if age affects legal consciousness a logistic regression analysis was conducted been conducted concerning all the questions to see if there was a significant difference between different age groups in the survey. The focus groups were also coded to see if people commented on age difference without being question on it specifically.

5.3.1 Significant results from the survey

	18-20	21-24	25-30	30-40	41-50
1. 15-year-old save photo to their phone?	<u>Yes:</u> P:.000 OR:4.149				
2. Send it to a 16-year-old?		<u>Yes:</u> P: .019 OR:2.318	<u>Yes</u> P:.008 OR:2.330		
4. 16-year-old save it to their phone?		<u>Yes</u> P: .025 OR: .253		<u>Yes</u> P: .047 OR: .320	<u>Yes</u> P: .011 Or: .183
5. Send it to a 16-year-old?			<u>With consent</u> P: .030 OR: .299		
7. 25-year-old allowed to save it on their phone?		<u>Yes</u> P: .006 OR: .052 <u>With consent:</u> P: .023 OR: .272	<u>With consent</u> P:.031 OR: .343	<u>Yes</u> P: .011 OR: .132	<u>Yes</u> P: .047 OR: .326

Table 8: This shows the significant results of age differences in the questions. P= 0.05, Odds ratio (OR), >1= more likely

The results for in question 1 through 9 are sporadic and don't indicate a distinctive difference in age. However, there is an indication that younger respondents were more likely than older respondents to answer that sharing between teenagers was legal, as seen in question 1 and 2. While older respondents are more likely to answer that saving it on a phone is legal compared to younger people, as seen in question four and seven. This indicates that younger respondents think sharing between teenagers is legal.

10. 17-year-old allowed to send the nude photo to a 16-year-old?	<u>With consent</u> P: .002 OR: 7.717	<u>With consent</u> P: .001 OR: 5.900	<u>With consent</u> P:.015 OR: 3.079		
11. Can the 16-year-old save the photo?	<u>With consent</u> P: .012 OR: 3.464	<u>With consent</u> P:.009 OR: 2.860			

Table 9: This shows the significant results of age differences in the questions. P= 0.05, Odds ratio (OR), >1= more likely

In questions 10 and 11 we can see that the majority of those under 30 answer “Yes, with consent”, which is the correct answer. This reflects the findings in questions 1-9 as younger people tend to think sharing between teenagers is legal. Indicating they have a different legal consciousness than those older than 30.

This indicates again that those who are younger are more aware of the laws regarding sexting between two teenagers, which argues in favor of there being an age difference in the legal consciousness of sexting.

12. How is sharing nude photos regulated?				<u>Not regulated</u> P:.022 OR: .245	<u>Not regulated</u> P: .005 OR: .186
14. Probability there will be legal consequences?		<u>Maybe</u> P:.000 OR: 5.986	<u>Maybe</u> P: .023 OR: 1.32		

Table 10: This shows the significant results of age differences in the questions. P= 0.05, Odds ratio (OR), >1= more likely

The statistically significant result from the logistic regression for question 12 show that those aged 30-50 were less likely to answer, “Not regulated”. Since the correct answer is “By law”, this could indicate that those over 30 are less aware of the law.

The logistic regression for question 14 showed that those aged 21-30 were more likely to choose “Maybe probable” rather than “Very probable”. This indicates that there is an age dif-

ference in the respondents under 30's legal consciousness regarding probability of punishment.

5.3.2 Focus groups

The question of teens legal consciousness regarding sexting was not explicitly asked during the focus groups, as there are already good records of teenager's awareness both in Norway and the USA. However, the research participants shared their assumptions of teenagers' awareness of the laws surrounding sexting even though.

All four focus groups had discussions on whether teenagers and kids were aware of the laws after having been presented what they were. The impression in all four focus groups were that the teenagers had no idea what the rules and consequences were. In two of the American focus groups and one of the Norwegian focus groups the participants started discussing how teenagers could get this information, as laws were difficult to find, and one American and one Norwegian focus group talked about using schools as a tool to inform them.

One of the participants in a Norwegian focus groups argued that even if they were informed, they wouldn't care anyway, but this sentiment was not found in any of the other focus groups.

This indicates that the focus groups in both countries thought that teenagers' legal consciousness surrounding sexting is minimal and that they need to be informed of the laws.

5.3.3 Summary

The statistically significant results of the logistic regression of the survey answers indicate that there is most likely an age difference in awareness. This indicates that younger people are more conscious of the laws than those that are older, especially the laws regulating consensual teenage sharing. However, the lack of significant results for the other questions in the survey and the ubiquitous perception that teenagers don't know anything about these laws indicate that there is not a great difference between adults and teenagers. Interestingly focus group participants in both countries expressed that they didn't think teenagers were aware of the laws, which contradicts the findings in the surveys and in the previous research on teenagers awareness (Skavlan & Viste, 2018; Strassberg et al., 2013; Strohmaier et al., 2014)

5.4 Different standard for boys and girls

To find out whether the respondents' legal consciousness was affected by the stated gender of the persons pictured in the questions. Three versions of the survey were created. The gender

was switched in the four different scenarios that were presented to see if the respondents would answer differently based on which gender sent and received the photos. Similar to the question of age, the question of gender differences was not asked directly to the focus group, but rather the results were coded to see if gender came up as a topic.

5.4.1 Survey data

When the different surveys were compared to each other only three significant result of the logistic regression: question 3, 10 and 11.

Table 11: Shows the significant results of the three different questionnaires, that vary based on the gender of the person in the question.

		Questionnaire		
		1. 15-year-old girl sends photo/16-year-old girl receives photo	2. 15-year-old boy sends photo/16-year-old boy receives photo	3. 15-year-old sends photo/16-year-old receives photo
Question 3	Yes	44.3%	37.2%	26.3%
	No	55.7%	62.8%	73.7%
Question 10	Yes	48.9%	41.9%	26.3%
	Yes, with consent	28.4%	20.9%	33.3%
	No	22.7%	37.2%	40.4%
Question 11	Yes	19.3%	15.5%	11.4%
	Yes, with consent	40.9%	38.5%	35.1%
	No	39.8%	45.9%	53.5%

The logistical regression found that respondents who answered questionnaire one had a higher likelihood of answering “Yes” to that a 15-year-old girl was legally allowed to send a picture to a 25-year-old (p-value: .018 OR: 1.909). The participants in questionnaire one were also more likely to answer that a 17-year-old boy could send a nude photo to a 16-year-old girl(p-value: .000, OR: 2.918), and she could save it (p-value: .030 OR: 2.282). This can also be seen when looking at the table as the percentage of those who said yes to questions were higher than questionnaire three in all three questions. This also matches the percentages of those who answered no. Though there are slight differences between whether the person sending the picture was a boy or a girl, the clear difference is between whether gender was mentioned at all or not that is the clearest.

There are however few differences between the US and Norway when looking and the tables for question three.

	Is it legal for a 15-year-old to send a nude photo to a 25-year-old?					
	Norway			USA		
	Girl	Boy	Neutral	Girl	Boy	Neutral
Yes	47.0%	35.1%	17.9%	58.3%	16.7%	25.0%
No	39.6%	33.5%	26.9%	25.6%	34.6%	39.7%

Table 12: Shows the different percentages of answers in Norway and the US

Looking at the Table 12 it is clear that respondents from the US and Norway are both more likely to answer “Yes”, that it was legal, if it was a girl sending them. Even though there are some differences in the percentages, they are not large enough to constitute a clear difference between the two countries.

	Is a 17-year- old is legally allowed to send a nude photo of themselves to a 16-year-old					
	Norway			USA		
	Boy	Girl	Neutral	Boy	Girl	Neutral
Yes	51.7%	47.1%	28.7%	33.3%	20.7%	20.6%
Yes, with consent	30.2%	21.8%	41.3%	18.5%	17.2%	14.7%
No	18.1%	31.1%	30.0%	48.1%	62.1%	64.7%

Table 13: Shows the different percentages of answers in Norway and the US

Table 13 also reveals a difference between the two countries. Though both countries are slightly more likely to say “Yes” when a boy sends a picture rather than a girl. There is a big difference between whether the respondent thinks it is legal or not, which matches the results for the first research question. However, the most poignant difference is whether gender is mentioned or not. Both for the Norwegian results with 41% answering “Yes, with consent” and the American results with 64% answering “No”. This indicates that the respondents don’t necessarily consider genders differently, but rather the deciding factor is whether gender is mentioned at all.

	Can the 16-year-old can save the image of the 17-year-old to their phone?					
	Norway			USA		
	Boy	Girl	Neutral	Boy	Girl	Neutral
Yes	50.0%	35.7%	14.3%	42.9%	21.4%	35.7%
Yes, with consent	44.2%	33.3%	22.4%	31.8%	36.4%	31.8%
No	38.6%	34.5%	26.9%	25.9%	33.3%	40.7%

Table 11: Shows the different percentages of answers in Norway and the US

The tendency to choose “Yes” when a gender was mentioned can also be seen in question eleven, but it is not as stark of a difference as in question ten. With Norwegians respondents still more likely to answer “Yes” when a boy sends the picture rather than when asked about a girl or if gender is not mentioned.

These results indicate that Norwegians are more likely to say that a boy sending a nude photo is fine than when it is a girl, or gender isn’t mentioned. While both Norwegians and Americans are more likely to find it ok if a girl sends a nude to a male 25-year-old rather than a boy sending a nude photo to a 25-year-old woman, or if gender isn’t mentioned.

5.4.2 Focus groups

As mentioned above gender was not an explicit question for the focus groups in an attempt to see if gender was brought up and referenced by the participants of their own accord. However, in one of the focus groups conducted in Norway the participants were asked if there was a difference for boy’s and girl’s sharing nude photos as follow up question. This question was the last question asked and did not therefore affect the results of the focus group.

To this several of the participants answered that the social consequences for girls were more severe and that the experience of having your nude photo shared was different for girls and boys. This was challenged by the other participants who argued that the experience would be just as humiliating for a 15-year-old insecure boy as it would be for a girl, but the overall consensus seemed to be that though the experience may be similar there were more social ramifications for girls. However, all the participants agreed that the law shouldn’t differentiate between girls and boy.

Boy’s sharing of nude photos, in particular *dick-pics* were a common topic in both Norwegian focus groups. They were never discussed in a positive light and in both focus groups they were introduced as a nuisance that girls had to endure with one person even jokingly stating

that all *dick-picks* should be illegal. This understanding of *dick-pics* seemed to be ubiquitous across the groups and participants as it was referenced several times by multiple different participants.

Dick-pics were never mentioned in either of the focus groups conducted in the US. In contrast boys were to a larger extent referenced as neutral participants in the situation and when using example to ask question the participants used both boys and girls to a more equal extent than in Norway.

Not once were nude pictures of girls discussed in a similar negative manner as *dick-pics* in any of the focus groups. Not only were nude photos of girls generally spoken about in a neutral manner, one of the Norwegian contestant even referenced to nude pictures of girls positively by using an example where a 15-year-old girl wanted to take a picture of their boobs because they had just grown out and they were proud of them.

5.4.3 Summary

Looking at both the survey and the focus groups there seems to be a difference between the respondents. The results can indicate that boys in Norway are given more freedom to send nude photos, but also scrutinized more for sending them as *dick-pics* were brought up in the focus groups as a common nuisance girl experienced. The fact that *dick-pics* were not even mentioned in the US indicates that this is not as relevant of a topic in the US as in Norway. However, considering that only one of the eleven questions in the survey had a statistically significant difference between Norway and the US indicates that the respondents consider the situation of boys and girls equally.

6. Discussion

The findings in this thesis suggest that there is no common legal consciousness in Norway and the US regarding sexting as a whole. Respondents in both countries found that the act of sharing nude photos to others or over the internet was illegal and wrong but differed on questions regarding use of law, consensual sharing between two teenagers, and gender perceptions. Though the results are fragmented they do support the existence of a national legal consciousness, as well as a global techno-legal consciousness.

Considering the difference in trust of government and litigiousness between the US and Norway, the results concerning the use and enforcement of law is perhaps the least surprising.

This is possibly a natural consequence of having different legal systems, as the respondents will consider different ways to deal with an issue dependent on their legal system. That Americans respondents were more likely to choose to contact the IT-company rather than the police could be a testament to the American litigiousness as it indicates that Americans are more likely the Norwegians to contact someone other than public authority, in this case the police, when they experienced a wrongdoing, leading potentially to a higher number of lawsuits. This deterrence from public authority could also be due to the fact that, as discussed in the focus group, one risks incriminating oneself in the United States.

The difference in results on consensual sharing of nude images in between two teenagers, also coincides with variations in sexual norms. Norway, and other Scandinavian countries, are less sexually conservative the United States (Bendixen et al., 2017; Christensen & Gregg, 1970). However, the finding that Norwegians found it to be more acceptable for a boy to share a nude photo with a girl is contrary previous research that indicate that Norwegian women are more sexually liberated then in other countries (Bendixen et al., 2017). Even though the greatest difference was between whether the person in the scenario was neutral or had a gender. These results might indicate a difference between written law and empirical fact. Considering that boy's nude photos were generally considered as in the focus groups, there seems to be an ambivalent opinion regarding boy's nude photos. The finding that there was no difference between genders for the American respondents is also interesting considering that teenage girls are often considered to be more vulnerable and have a greater need of protection in American society (Price, 2011).

These results might support the existence of a Norwegian legal consciousness and an American legal consciousness as the use of law, and the social-political perception on gender and sex are likely to be elements of a national legal consciousness (Halliday, 2019; Kurkchian, 2011). This supports Kurkchian's findings that "societies construct a sense of social order that is specific to them" and as an aspect of this create a common legal consciousness that helps them interpret the "meaning, the content, and the roles of law in the lives of the people"; it also shapes how they interact with legal institutions (Kurkchian, 2011, p. 390).

Though there are definitive identifiable markers of a national legal consciousness there were still many results that did not indicate any differences. This can be attributed to collective or national legal consciousness being "too complex of a phenomenon to be subjected to analyti-

cal modeling” (Kurkchian, 2011). Understanding and defining a national legal consciousness as a constant and unchanging entity will never be a possibility as it is a dynamic concept and constantly influenced by social surroundings. The findings can however help identify differences and similarities in the legal cultures

Though one can identify aspects of a national legal culture, the findings show that there is common consciousness regarding sharing nude photos to 25-year-olds, to others than the person initially intended or on the internet. Both American and Norwegian respondents in the surveys overwhelmingly thought this was illegal, which was mirrored in the focus groups who thought it was illegal and wrong. This can indicate a common understanding of the use and rules regulating technological activity; as sexting and the sharing nude photos in an inherently technological phenomenon (Langford & Sandvik, 2019). All four focus groups also found that punishing two teenagers for consensually sharing nude photos was in disconnect with what they considered to be right. Potentially indicating that there is a common legal consciousness that laws should to adapt to.

This could indicate the existence of a global techno-legal consciousness, meaning that people in countries around the world have a similar understanding of the rules and use of technology. More research would have to be conducted in order to determine whether this was true, as Norway and the US are both democratic and stable western countries. However, the findings in this paper indicate that at least a cross national techno-legal consciousness exists.

The existence of a global techno-legal consciousness would be a new phenomenon in culture and research as it would seemingly be one of the first times laws and regulations could be created from a bottom-up approach at the international level. Shifting from a national to an international social configuration, technology could create a common global perspective and thus orientation towards law (Friedman, 1994, p. 119). This could lead to a shift in how laws are created and implemented as the issues that stemmed from the global use of technology and social media would be solved nationally, therefore creating an international bottom-up effect. However, as the companies who create and own technology, both hardware and software, gain enormous power through its use, the argument could be made that instead these technological are acquiring legislative power from traditional democratic institutions (Langford & Sandvik, 2019; Lessig, 1999)

The common understanding of sharing nude photos in both the US and Norway could also be an indication that technology is leading to a convergence of legal cultures, which would potentially create a common modern culture with little national variations. Friedman argued in 1994 that this was already happening and pointed to the increasing rights-consciousness and litigiousness in society (Friedman, 1994, p. 125). This increased litigiousness can also be seen in Europe as well indicating that Friedman was correct (Fleming, 2004).

If differences in legal consciousness cannot be attributed to nation states, perhaps one can identify similarities and differences between “horizontal” sub-cultures that cross national borders, such as age (Friedman, 1994, p. 127). The results of the survey showed that the younger participants answered similarly to questions regarding teenage consensual sharing than older participants. Younger participants were also more likely to question the probability of receiving punishment if pictures were shared. This indicates that there may exist a common legal consciousness of horizontal sub-groups across national borders. Younger people’s skepticism of the probability of legal consequences was also found in the research on teenagers. With 17% of Norwegian teenagers answering that it was unlikely that sharing nude photos could lead to punishment and 21% of US teenagers thought sharing nude photos would not lead to consequences. A significant number of respondents in one of the studies also stated that if it were illegal it would not deter them. This supports the assumption that there is a common legal consciousness for younger generations, which supports the idea of a global legal consciousness as it exists across national borders.

The results clearly indicate that there is no common legal consciousness regarding sexting as a whole in Norway and the US. However, they do lend support to the existence of both national legal consciousness and well as an emerging global legal consciousness. This could indicate that societies are in a transition period from the existence of national legal culture to the creation of a modern legal culture, at least in some aspects.

7. Conclusion

This thesis has examined the question of whether there exists a common legal consciousness regarding teenage sexting in Norway and the United States. The intention was to see if the use of technology is creating a global or a cross-national ‘techno-legal’ consciousness, or if a national legal consciousness can be identified. A study was conducted using both surveys and

focus groups to identify differences and similarities among the respondents from both the US and Norway. Participants in both countries were asked questions on their awareness and use of law. Their responses were then analyzed with a logistic regression and compared to the results from the focus groups.

The findings show that although there does not exist a common legal consciousness regarding sexting as a whole, there were both differences and similarities in the results that give support to the existence of both a national legal consciousness and global techno-legal consciousness. This shows that different aspects to legal consciousness can belong to different theoretical categories. Though new social constructions and technological developments the US and Norway, at least in some age groups, seem to be developing a common consciousness. However, older social constructs such as the use of law, attitudes towards sex and gender norms have been created and manifested over several hundred years of development, making them an expression of a specific culture. More research would have to be conducted in order to make any definitive conclusion on what Norwegian and American legal consciousness consists of, specifically which factors are attributed to national cultures, and which are not.

It would be premature to conclude that global legal consciousness existed without further research both in other countries and regarding different technical phenomenon. However, this project and the results suggest that it is possible to study global techno-legal consciousness and identify cross national shifts in society's social configuration that are transforming cultural understandings of law.

8. Literature

- Aasheim, A., & Nordli, Ø. (2018). Flere unge blir dømt for å ha delt nakenbilder av andre. Flere enn 13 dømt de siste månedene. *Aftenposten*. Retrieved from <https://www.aftenposten.no/norge/i/zL7g64/flere-unge-blir-doemt-for-aa-ha-delt-nakenbilder-av-andre-flere-enn-13-doemt-de-siste-maanedene>
- Alldén, L., Ramsøy, N. R., & Vaa, M. (1986). *Det Norske Samfunn*. Drammen: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag A/S.
- Avant, G. R., & Knutsen, K. P. (1993). Understanding cultural differences: Janteloven and Social Conformity in Norway. *A Review of General Semantics*, 50(4), 449.
- Bendixen, M., Asao, K., Wyckoff, J. P., Buss, D. M., & Kennair, L. E. O. (2017). Sexual regret in US and Norway: Effects of culture and individual differences in religiosity and mating strategy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 116, 246-251.
- Bratheim, N. S. (2018). Uten en tråd uten samtykke. *Rettt24*. Retrieved from <https://rett24.no/articles/uten-en-trad-uten-samtykke>
- Bremnes, L. (2018, 16/08/2018). Nakenbilder på avveie. from <https://www.unicef.no/nyheter/37656/nakenbilder-pa-avveie>
- Christensen, H. T., & Gregg, C. F. (1970). Changing Sex Norms in America and Scandinavia. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 32(4), 616-627. doi: 10.2307/350255
- Clark, D. S. (2006). Comparative Law in The USA. In M. Reimann & R. Zimmermann (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, T. E., & Gronke, P. (2005). The Skeptical American: Revisiting the Meanings of Trust in Government and Confidence in Institutions. *The Journal of Politics*, 67(3), 784-803.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design. Choosing Among Five Approaches* (Fourth Edition ed.). UK: Sage.
- Crofts, T., & Lee, M. (2013). 'Sexting', Children and Child pornography. *Sydney Law Review*, 35, 85-106.
- Davidson, J. (2014). *Sexting: Gender and Teens*. Rotterdam: SensePublishers.
- Eckstein, H. (2015). *Division and Cohesion in Democracy : A Study of Norway*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Engle, D. M. (1998). How Does Law Matter in the Constitution of Legal Consciousness? In B. G. Garth, Austin Sarat (Ed.), *How Does Law Matter?* United States of America: Northwestern University Press.

- Ewick, P., & Silbey, S. S. (1992). Conformity, contestation, and resistance: An account of legal consciousness. *New England Law review*, 26(3), 731-750.
- Fleming, C. (2004). Europe Learns Litigious Ways. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB107756988142136876>
- Friedman, L. M. (1994). Is There a Modern Legal Culture? *Ratio Juris*, 7(2), 117-131.
- Frønes, I., & Kjølsvrød, L. (2010). *Det norske samfunn* (6th edition ed.). Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS
- Greenhouse, C. J. (1989). Interpreting American Litigiousness. In J. F. C. June Starr (Ed.), *History and Power in the Study of Law*. Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press.
- Halliday, S. (2019). *After Hegemony? The Varieties of Legal Consciousness Research*. *Social and Legal Studies*, 28(6), 859-878.
- Holoyda, B., Landess, J., Sorrentino, R., & Friedman, S. H. (2018). Trouble at teens' fingertips: Youth sexting and the law. *Behavioral Science and the Law*, 36, 170-181.
- Jacobi, T. (2005). *Explaining American Litigiousness: A Product of Politics, Not Just Law*. American Political Science Association. Washington, DC.
- Jary, D., & Jary, J. (1995). *Collins Dictionary of Sociology*. Glasgow: HarperCollins.
- Kleven, Ø. (2016). Nordmenn på tillitstoppen i Europa. *Samfunnsspeilet*, 2.
- Koch, S., Skodvin, K. E., & Sunde, J. Ø. (2017). *Comparing Legal Cultures*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Koch, S., & Sunde, J. Ø. (2019). *Draft version of Introduction to Norwegian legal culture*. *Unpublished Manuscript*.
- Kolbeinstveit, L. (2015). Vil den norske tilliten forvitte? *Dagsavisen*. Retrieved from <https://www.dagsavisen.no/debatt/vil-den-norske-tilliten-forvitte-1.458797>
- Kramer, J. (1984). Norsk identitet - et produkt av underutvikling og stammetilhørighet. In A. M. Klausen (Ed.), *Den norske væremåten*. Norway: J.W.Cappelens Forlag a.s.
- Kurkchian, M. (2011). Perceptions of Law and Social Order: A Cross National Comparison of Collective Legal Consciousness. *Wisconsin International Law Journal*, 29, 366-392.
- Langford, M., & Berge, B. K. (2019). Norway's Constitution in a Comparative Perspective. *Oslo Law Review*, 6(3).
- Langford, M., & Sandvik, K. B. (2019). *Techo-Legal Consciousness*. Paper presented at the Law and Society Association Annual Conference, Washington DC.
- Larsen, R. J., & Buss, D. M. (2010). *Personality Psychology: Domains of Knowledge About Human Nature*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Lessig, L. (1999). *Code and Other Laws of Cyberspace*. New York: Basic Books.
- Madshus, K. (2019). Jente dømt til betinget fengsel for å ha delt lettkleddbilde av jente (14) på Instagram. *Dagbladet*. Retrieved from <https://www.dagbladet.no/nyheter/jente-domt-til-betinget-fengsel-for-a-ha-delt-lettkleddbilde-av-jente-14-pa-instagram/70861484>
- Mascheroni, G., Vincent, J., & Jimenez, E. (2015). "Girls are addicted to likes so they post semi-naked selfies": Peer mediatoin, normativity and the construction of identity online. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace*, 9(1). doi: 10.5817/CP2015-1-5
- McCarthy, N. (2018). The Institutions Americans Trust Most And Least In 2018 [Infographic]. *Forbes*.
- Merry, S. E. (1990). *Jetting Justice and Getting Even: Legal Consciousness among Working-Class Americans*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Michalsen, D. (2011). *Rett. En Internasjonal historie*. Oslo: Pax Forlas A/S.
- Milgram, S. (1961). Nationality and Conformity. *Scientific American*, 205, 45-51.
- Nardi, P. M. (2014). *Doing Survey Research. A Guide to Quantitative Methods* (Third ed.). London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Nelken, D. (2004). Comparing Legal Cultures. In A. Sarat (Ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Law and Society*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Nørh, Ø. N. (2006). De kompetente eldre. Aldring og digital kompetanse – konflikt eller lykke? . Lillehammer: Høgskolen i Lillehammer.
- NTB. (2018). Norge er verdens nest mest likestilte land. *Dagsavisen*. Retrieved from <https://www.dagsavisen.no/nyheter/innenriks/norge-er-verdens-nest-mest-likestilte-land-1.1249866>
- Odem, M. E. (1995). *Delinquent daughters: protecting and policing adolescent female sexuality in the United States, 1885–1920*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Price, K. (2011). The Quest for Purity: The Role of Policy Narratives in Determining Teen Girls' Access to Emergency Contraception in the USA. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 8, 282-293. doi: 10.1007/s13178-011-0068-8
- Public hearing on FDA regulation of over-the-counter drug products* (2000).
- Reeves, T. C., & Oh, E. (2008). Generational differences. In M. J. Spector, Marcy Driscoll, M. David Merrill, Jeroen van Merriënboer (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology: A Project of the Association for*

- Educational Communications and Technology* (Third ed.). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sacco, D., Argudin, R., Maquire, J., & Tallong, K. (2010). Sexting: Youth Practices and Legal Implications.
- Sacco, R. (1991). A Dynamic Approach to Comparative Law (Installment I of II). *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 39(1), 1-34.
- Sahadi, J. (2016). Young women are asking for (and getting) more pay than men. *CNN*. Retrieved from <https://money.cnn.com/2016/04/12/pf/gender-pay-gap/>
- Skavlan, T. E., & Viste, I. (2018). *Mindreårig ungdom og deling av nakenbilder* (Master thesis). University of Oslo. Retrieved from https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/63835/1/Viste-Ebbing_Master.pdf
- Slane, A. (2013). Sexting and the law in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 22(3), 117-122. doi: 10.3138/cjhs.22.3.C01
- Sobring, E., Hallberg, J., Bohlin, M., & Skoog, T. (2015). Parental attitudes and young peoples online sexual activities. *Sex Education*, 15(2), 129-143. doi: 10.1080-14681811.2014.981332
- Strassberg, D. S., McKinnon, R. K., Sustaíta, M. A., & Rullo, J. (2013). Sexting by High School Students: An Exploratory and Descriptive Study. *Archeives of Sexual Behavior*, 42, 15-21.
- Strohmaier, H., Murphy, M., & DeMatteo, D. (2014). Youth Sexting: Prevalence Rates, Driving Motivations, and the deterrent Effect of Legal Consequences. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 11, 245-255. doi: 10.1007/s13178-014-0162-9
- Van Hoecke, M. (2015). Methodology of Comparative Legal Research. *Law and Method*, 1-35. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5553/rem/.000010>.
- Van Volkom, M., Stapley, J. C., & Amaturro, V. (2014). Revisiting the Digital Divide: Generational Differences in Technology Use in Everyday Life. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 16(3), 557-574.
- Vargas, J. H. V., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2013). Ethnicity and Contemporary American Culture: A MetaAnalytic Investigation of Horizontal–Vertical Individualism–Collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 44(2), 195-222. doi: 10.1177/0022022112443733
- Wilkie, J. R. (1993). Changes in U.S. Men's Attitudes toward the Family Provider Role, 1972-1989. *Gender and Society*, 7(2), 261-279.

Winner, L. (1977). *Of Autonomous Technology. Technics-out-of-Control as a theme in political thought*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.

Zha, P., Walczyk, J. J., Griffith-Ross, D. A., Tobacyk, J. J., & Walczyk, D. F. (2010). The Impact of Culture and Individualism–Collectivism on the Creative Potential and Achievement of American and Chinese Adults. *Creativity Research Journal*, 18(3), 355-366. doi: 10.1207/s15326934crj1803_10

Law:

Straffeloven. (2005) Lov om Straff. (LOV-2005-05-20-28) Retrieved from <https://lovdata.no/lov/2005-05-20-28>

Åndsverkloven. (2018) Lov om opphavsrett til åndsverk mv. (LOV-2018-06-15-40) Retrieved from <https://lovdata.no/lov/2018-06-15-40>

California Penal Code, (1961) section 311.11(a). Retrieved from https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PEN§ionNum=311.11

The PROTECT Act of 2003 Pub.L. 108–21, 117 Stat. 650, S. 151, enacted April 30, 2003. Retrieved from <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18/1466A>

Title 18 of The United States Code, section 2252a(b)(1). Retrieved from <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18/2252A>

Cases:

AH v. State of Florida, 949 So. 2d 234 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 2007)

New York v. Ferber, 458 U.S. 747 (1982)

State v. Gray, 402 P.3d 254 (Wash. 2017).

United States v. Williams, 553 U.S. 285 (2008)

Appendix A

Appendix A consists of interview guides, information handed out to the participants and the consent form

1. Survey

Version 1 (girl 15)

Information:

Please read before you continue

Information about the research project:

The goal of this research project is to do a comparative study of the legal consciousness surrounding sexting in Norway and the USA. To research this we need participants who live in Norway or the USA, are age 18 or older and can consent to participating in research.

It is completely voluntary to partake in the study and if you chose to do so it entails that you use approximately 5 minutes to answer 34 questions regarding the laws that regulate teenage sexting.

0. Gender?

- Woman

-

-Other

Male

0. How old are you?

-18-20 years old

-21-24 years old

-25-30 years old

-31-40 years old

-41-50

years

- Above 50 years old

old

0. What country do you live in?

- Norway

- USA

- Other

0. Which social media platforms do you use?

- Facebook

- Instagram

- Snapchat

- Other

- None

0. Are you or anyone in your close family an educated lawyer or police officer?

-Lawyer

-Police

officer

-

Both

- None

Sexting

With the increased use of smart phones and social media, sexting (sharing nude images) has become more common, especially among teenagers. A study done in the United States in 2012 showed that 20% of those aged 15 and under indicated that they had sent sexts, 33% of 17 year olds indicated they has sent sexts and 45% of those who were 18 years or older indicated that they had sent sexts.

On the next four pages you will be asked questions about different scenarios. You are supposed to answer what you think is legal.

A 15-year-old girl takes a nude photo with her phone.

1. According to your understanding is she legally allowed to save the photo on her phone?

-Yes

- No

2. According to your understanding is she legally allowed to send it to a 16-year-old boy?

-Yes

-No

3. According to your understanding is she legally allowed to send it to a 25-year-old man?

-Yes

-No

1.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 1?

- Low security

- Medium security

- Great security

2.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 2??

- Low security

- Medium security

- Great security

3.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 3?

- Low security

- Medium security
- Great security

A 15-year-old girl sends a nude photo of herself to a 16-year-old boy.

4. According to your understanding is the 16-year-old boy legally allowed to save the photo on his phone?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

5. According to your understanding is the 16-year-old boy legally allowed to send the photo to another 16 year old?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

6. According to your understanding is the 16-year-old boy legally allowed to send the photo to a 25 year old?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

4.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 4?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

5.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 5?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

6.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 6?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

A 15-year-old girl sends a nude photo of herself to a 25-year-old man.

7. According to your understanding is the 25-year-old man legally allowed to save the photo on his phone?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

8. According to your understanding is the 25-year-old man legally allowed to send the photo to a 16-year-old?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

9. According to your understanding is the 25-year-old man legally allowed to send the photo to another 25-year-old?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

7.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 7?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

8. 2 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 8?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

9.3 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 9?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

A 17-year-old boy sends a nude picture of themselves to a 16-year-old girl.

10. According to your understanding is the 17-year-old boy legally allowed to send the nude photo?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

11. According to your understanding is the 16-year-old girl legally allowed to save the photo to her phone?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

10.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer question 10?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

11.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 11?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

12. How is taking and sharing nude photos regulated?

- there is no regulation
- by social norms
- by law

12.1 With what degree of security did feel you could answer this question?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

13. How can you resolve an issue where a nude photo of someone is shared without their consent.

- you can't do anything
- the affected parties can solve it
- you can contact the police.
- contact the social media company

13.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer this question?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

14. How probable do you think it that there will be legal consequences (prison, fine etc.) if you share a nude photo of someone under the age of 18?

- Very probable
- Probable
- Maybe probable
- Not probable

Prize!

If you want to you can submit your email and get the chance to win 50 dollars.

What is your email address?

Information on storage, use and changing of data

The information provided will be stored on an internal drive at the University of Oslo with restricted secure access. The names and email addresses will not be used in the research, published or shared with others. All the information will be anonymized by the end of the research project in December 2019. Participants can contact us at any time at h.s.c.vongravendyrstad@student.jus.uio.no or malcolm.langford@jus.uio.no to gain insight or a copy of the information. Or to rectified or remove information from the questionnaire, according to articles 16 and 17 of General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Participants also have the right to lodge a complaint with a supervisory authority concerning the use of the data (Article 13(d), GDPR). You can contact «Personombudet» at the Universitetet i Oslo. As requested by the University of Oslo «NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS» (The Norwegian senter for research data) has concluded that the management of personal information in this research project is in accordance with person data protection laws.

Provision of Consent

By answering this questionnaire, I confirm that the information I have shared in this questionnaire is based on my own knowledge and that I have shared this information by my own free will. I understand that this information will be used in a research project for a master thesis written for the University of Oslo. Only the researchers in connection with this paper will have the right to inspect and analyze the information.

What is your name (first name and last name)?

Version 2 (boy 15)

Information:

Please read before you continue

Information about the research project:

The goal of this research project is to do a comparative study of the legal consciousness surrounding sexting in Norway and the USA. To research this we need participants who live in Norway or the USA, are age 18 or older and can consent to participating in research.

It is completely voluntary to partake in the study and if you chose to do so it entails that you use approximately 5 minutes to answer 34 questions regarding the laws that regulate teenage sexting.

0. Gender?

- Woman

-

-Other

Male

0. How old are you?

-18-20 years old

-21-24 years old

-25-30 years old

-31-40 years old

-41-50

years

old

- Above 50 years old

0. What country do you live in?

- Norway

- USA

- Other

0. Which social media platforms do you use?

- Facebook

- Instagram

- Snapchat

- Other

- None

0. Are you or anyone in your close family an educated lawyer or police officer?

-Lawyer

-Police

-

- None

officer

Both

Sexting

With the increased use of smart phones and social media, sexting (sharing nude images) has become more common, especially among teenagers. A study done in the United States in 2012 showed that 20% of those aged 15 and under indicated that they had sent sexts, 33% of 17 year olds indicated they has sent sexts and 45% of those who were 18 years or older indicated that they had sent sexts.

On the next four pages you will be asked questions about different scenarios. You are supposed to answer what you think is legal.

A 15-year-old boy takes a nude photo with his phone.

1. According to your understanding is he legally allowed to save the photo on his phone?

-Yes

- No

2. According to your understanding is he legally allowed to send it to a 16-year-old girl?

-Yes

-No

3. According to your understanding is he legally allowed to send it to a 25-year-old woman?

-Yes

-No

1.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 1?

- Low security

- Medium security

- Great security

2.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 2??

- Low security

- Medium security

- Great security

3.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 3?

- Low security

- Medium security

- Great security

A 15-year-old boy sends a nude photo of himself to a 16-year-old girl.

4. According to your understanding is the 16-year-old girl legally allowed to save the photo on her phone?

-Yes

-Yes, with consent

- No

5. According to your understanding is the 16-year-old girl legally allowed to send the photo to another 16-year-old?

-Yes

-Yes, with consent

-No

6. According to your understanding is the 16-year-old boy legally allowed to send the photo to a 25-year-old?

-Yes

-Yes, with consent

-No

4.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 4?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

5.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 5?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

6.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 6?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

A 15-year-old boy sends a nude photo of himself to a 25-year-old woman.

7. According to your understanding is the 25-year-old woman legally allowed to save the photo on her phone?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

8. According to your understanding is the 25-year-old woman legally allowed to send the photo to a 16-year-old?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

9. According to your understanding is the 25-year-old woman legally allowed to send the photo to another 25-year-old?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

7.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 7?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

8. 2 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 8?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

9.3 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 9?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

A 17-year-old girl sends a nude picture of themselves to a 16-year-old boy.

10. According to your understanding is the 17-year-old girl legally allowed to send the nude photo?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

11. According to your understanding is the 16-year-old boy legally allowed to save the photo to her phone?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

10.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer question 10?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

11.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 11?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

12. How is taking and sharing nude photos regulated?

- there is no regulation
- by social norms
- by law

12.1 With what degree of security did feel you could answer this question?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

13. How can you resolve an issue where a nude photo of someone is shared without their consent.

- you can't do anything
- the affected parties can solve it
- you can contact the police.
- contact the social media company

13.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer this question?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

14. How probable do you think it that there will be legal consequences (prison, fine etc.) if you share a nude photo of someone under the age of 18?

- Very probable
- Probable
- Maybe probable
- Not probable

Prize!

If you want to you can submit your email and get the chance to win 50 dollars.

What is your email address?

Information on storage, use and changing of data

The information provided will be stored on an internal drive at the University of Oslo with restricted secure access. The names and email addresses will not be used in the research, published or shared with others. All the information will be anonymized by the end of the research project in December 2019. Participants can contact us at any time at h.s.c.vongravendyrstad@student.jus.uio.no or malcolm.langford@jus.uio.no to gain insight or a copy of the information. Or to rectified or remove information from the questionnaire, according to articles 16 and 17 of General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Participants also have the right to lodge a complaint with a supervisory authority concerning the use of the data (Article 13(d), GDPR). You can contact «Personombudet» at the Universitetet i Oslo. As requested by the University of Oslo «NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS» (The Norwegian senter for research data) has concluded that the management of personal information in this research project is in accordance with person data protection laws.

Provision of Consent

By answering this questionnaire, I confirm that the information I have shared in this questionnaire is based on my own knowledge and that I have shared this information by my own free will. I understand that this information will be used in a research project for a master thesis written for the University of Oslo. Only the researchers in connection with this paper will have the right to inspect and analyze the information.

What is your name (first name and last name)?

Version 3 (neutral 15)

Information:

Please read before you continue

Information about the research project:

The goal of this research project is to do a comparative study of the legal consciousness surrounding sexting in Norway and the USA. To research this we need participants who live in Norway or the USA, are age 18 or older and can consent to participating in research.

It is completely voluntary to partake in the study and if you chose to do so it entails that you use approximately 5 minutes to answer 34 questions regarding the laws that regulate teenage sexting.

0. Gender?

- Woman

-

-Other

Male

0. How old are you?

-18-20 years old

-21-24 years old

-25-30 years old

-31-40 years old

-41-50

years

- Above 50 years old

old

0. What country do you live in?

- Norway

- USA

- Other

0. Which social media platforms do you use?

- Facebook

- Instagram

- Snapchat

- Other

- None

0. Are you or anyone in your close family an educated lawyer or police officer?

-Lawyer

-Police

-

- None

officer

Both

Sexting

With the increased use of smart phones and social media, sexting (sharing nude images) has become more common, especially among teenagers. A study done in the United States in 2012 showed that 20% of those aged 15 and under indicated that they had sent sexts, 33% of 17 year olds indicated they has sent sexts and 45% of those who were 18 years or older indicated that they had sent sexts.

On the next four pages you will be asked questions about different scenarios. You are supposed to answer what you think is legal.

A 15-year-old takes a nude photo with their phone.

1. According to your understanding are they legally allowed to save the photo on their phone?

-Yes

- No

2. According to your understanding are they legally allowed to send it to a 16-year-old?

-Yes

-No

3. According to your understanding are they legally allowed to send it to a 25-year-old?

-Yes

-No

1.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 1?

- Low security

- Medium security

- Great security

2.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 2??

- Low security

- Medium security

- Great security

3.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 3?

- Low security

- Medium security
- Great security

A 15-year-old sends a nude photo of themselves to a 16-year-old.

4. According to your understanding is the 16-year-old legally allowed to save the photo on their phone?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

5. According to your understanding is the 16-year-old legally allowed to send the photo to another 16-year-old?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

6. According to your understanding is the 16-year-old legally allowed to send the photo to a 25-year-old?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

4.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 4?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

5.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 5?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

6.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 6?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

A 15-year-old sends a nude photo of himself to a 25-year-old.

7. According to your understanding is the 25-year-old legally allowed to save the photo on their phone?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

8. According to your understanding is the 25-year-old legally allowed to send the photo to a 16-year-old?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

9. According to your understanding is the 25-year-old legally allowed to send the photo to another 25-year-old?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

7.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 7?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

8. 1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 8?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

9.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 9?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

A 17-year-old sends a nude picture of themselves to a 16-year-old.

10. According to your understanding is the 17-year-old legally allowed to send the nude photo?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

11. According to your understanding is the 16-year-old legally allowed to save the photo to her phone?

- Yes
- Yes, with consent
- No

10.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer question 10?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

11.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer the question 11?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

12. How is taking and sharing nude photos regulated?

- there is no regulation
- by social norms
- by law

12.1 With what degree of security did feel you could answer this question?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

13. How can you resolve an issue where a nude photo of someone is shared without their consent.

- you can't do anything
- the affected parties can solve it
- you can contact the police.
- contact the social media company

13.1 With what degree of security did you feel you could answer this question?

- Low security
- Medium security
- Great security

14. How probable do you think it that there will be legal consequences (prison, fine etc.) if you share a nude photo of someone under the age of 18?

- Very probable
- Probable
- Maybe probable
- Not probable

Prize!

If you want to you can submit your email and get the chance to win 50 dollars.

What is your email address?

Information on storage, use and changing of data

The information provided will be stored on an internal drive at the University of Oslo with restricted secure access. The names and email addresses will not be used in the research, published or shared with others. All the information will be anonymized by the end of the research project in December 2019. Participants can contact us at any time at h.s.c.vongravendyrstad@student.jus.uio.no or malcolm.langford@jus.uio.no to gain insight or a copy of the information. Or to rectified or remove information from the questionnaire, according to articles 16 and 17 of General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Participants also have the right to lodge a complaint with a supervisory authority concerning the use of the data (Article 13(d), GDPR). You can contact «Personombudet» at the Universitetet i Oslo. As requested by the University of Oslo «NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS» (The Norwegian senter for research data) has concluded that the management of personal information in this research project is in accordance with person data protection laws.

Provision of Consent

By answering this questionnaire, I confirm that the information I have shared in this questionnaire is based on my own knowledge and that I have shared this information by my own free will. I understand that this information will be used in a research project for a master thesis written for the University of Oslo. Only the researchers in connection with this paper will have the right to inspect and analyze the information.

What is your name (first name and last name)?

2. Focus groups

0. Hi, thank you so much for choosing to participate in this research project. I have a few things I want to make clear before we start, if that is ok. First things first, my number one priority is making sure that all of you have a good experience partaking in this research. I sincerely do not want anyone to feel uncomfortable, tense or for it to create any kind negative feelings in any way. If I sense that it is I will either skip to the next question or end the interview. I also want to remind you that if any of you would like to leave during the interview please feel free to do so. Whether it's to go to the bathroom or go home or whatever, this is all based on what you consent to.

Secondly there are a few things I want to mention before we start. I am a student, meaning I do not have the same experience in conducting focus groups as someone who has done a lot of research, but I will do my vey best to moderate the conversation.

As a person conducting research it is my responsibility not only to inform you about the topic and get your consent. By I am also obliged to protect your personal integrity, preserve individual freedom and self-determination, respect privacy and family life, and safeguard against harm and unreasonable strain during the entire research process. I am also responsible for not subjecting you to mental strain, pain and stress. Though there is no risk for physical harm, this do encompass everyday discomfort, risk of retraumatization, and also more serious mental strain which the research may cause the participants pain and stress.

I am also responsible for protecting the rights of third parties. Since they are not here they cannot consent to participating in the research and it is important that this is protected. I therefore ask you not to tell identifiable stories about people that are here. You can of course build on what you know and your experience, but I want to protect their privacy as well.

Finally, I just want to mention that this is not a competition or a quiz, so don't feel bad if you don't know or aren't sure about something. I personally did not know these laws before I started this paper, and considering this is such a new area of law/social interaction it is no wonder.

So the interview will be divided roughly into three. First I'm going to ask what you know about the law, then I'm going to present a few scenarios and ask you if you think they are legal or illegal and third I will present the law to you and ask your opinion on it. I will also mention a few cases if people are interested.

1. General discussion; what is the legal status of sexting?

2. Do you think it is legal for...

- A 15-year-old girl to take a naked picture
- A 15-year-old girl to send a naked photo to a 16-year-old boy.
- The 16-year-old boy to save the image to his phone
- The 16-year-old boy to share the image with another 16-year-old boy
- The other 16-year-old boy to save it to his phone
- The 15-year-old girl to send a naked photo to a 25-year-old
- the 25-year-old to save the photo on his phone
- The 25-year-old to share it with another 25-year-old
- The other 25-year-old to save it on their phone.

3. Present the law

California law "PC 311.11(a): *Every person who knowingly possesses or controls any matter, data, or image, including, but not limited to, any film or photo, negative, slide, photocopy, videotape, computer hardware or software, data storage media, or computer generated image, that contains the depiction of a person under 18 years of age, engaging in, or simulating*

sexual conduct, is guilty of the crime of possessing obscene matter depicting a minor engaging in sexual conduct (PC 311.11(a) [Abbr.]).”

4. General discussion,

-what do you think of the law?

- does it properly regulate the situation?

5. What kind of punishment is appropriate for these situations?

6. What are do you have if you are sent a nude photo without consent from the person in the picture?

3. Consent form

Declaration of consent

I have received and understood information regarding the research project “A comparative legal study of legal consciousness and sexting in Norway and the United States” and have been given the opportunity to ask questions. I consent to:

Partaking in a focus group interview

That a recording of the interview is saved until it is transcribed (max 2 weeks)

To share my email adresse so I can be sent the trancript of the interview.

I consent that my information can be handeled until the research project is over, December 2019.

Email:

(Signed by participant, date)

4. Research project information

Would you like to partake in the research project

” A comparative legal study of legal consciousness and sexting in Norway and the United States ”?

This is an invitation to partake in a research project where the purpose is to do a comparative study of legal consciousness in Norway and the United States. In this paper we will give you information about the goals of the project and what participation will mean for you.

Purpose

The purpose of the research project is to do a comparative study of legal consciousness in Norway and the US. The aim of the research is to give insight to whether there is difference in legal consciousness across nations, gender, age or if there is a global legal consciousness. Legal consciousness in short terms is people’s awareness, understanding and use of law. We will specifically be looking at the laws surrounding sexting among teenagers. I will not be asking any sensitive information about personal experiences, sexual orientation, political opinion etc.

Who is responsible for the research project?

The University of Oslo is responsible for the project and it will be executed for a master thesis at University of Oslo’s law school.

Why are you being asked to partake?

The participants must be able to give consent, over 18-years-old and be from the USA or Norway. Participants for the research will be recruited using the snowball method and convenient method, meaning that sample will largely be from the researcher’s network.

What does this mean for you?

If you chose to partake in the project that means that you will partake in a group interview with approximately 5 other people. It will take approximately one hour to complete, and you will given questions about different scenarios and asked if you think they are legal or illegal.

I will record the sound during the interview using the University of Oslo’s secure interview app. This will be done for practical reasons and the recording will be transcribed and deleted within 14 days after the interview is conducted.

Risk?

The focus of the group interview is your knowledge and views concerning the law surrounding sexting among teenagers and not personal experiences. However, the topic of sexting among teenagers can be a sensitive topic and talking about it can trigger negative emotions or memories.

It is therefore completely fine to change your mind about participating or to leave during the interview if you so wish. To help prevent and uncomfortable situations I will be moderating the discussion and will either change the question or end the interview if it becomes clear that the situation has become uncomfortable for any of the participants.

Participation is voluntary

It is completely voluntary to partake in this project. If you chose to partake, you can withdraw your consent at any time without giving a reason. All information about you will then be deleted and anonymized. There will be no negative consequences for you if you don't want to partake or later chose to withdraw your consent.

Your data protection– how we store and use your information

We will only use the information about you for the purposes that have been described in this letter. We will treat the information with confidentiality and in accordance with data protection laws both in Norway and in the United States. Only the student and the advisor of the project will have access to the information.

Your name and contact information will be saved separate from the other data and the consent form will be stored in a locked facility and only be accessible for the student executing the research project.

The information provided will be stored on an internal drive at the University of Oslo with restricted secure access. The names and email addresses will not be used in the research, published or shared with others. All the information will be anonymized by the end of the research project in December 2019. The participants will not be recognizable in the master thesis.

What happens with your information when the research project ends?

The project is scheduled to end 20. December 2019. All information will be anonymized, and personal and contact information will be deleted.

Your rights

As long as you can be identified in the data material, you have the right to:

gain insight to what information is gathered about you

rectify information about you

remove information about you

be given a copy of your personal information (data portability), and

to send a complaint to the data protection office or Datatilsynet (Data protection agency) about the treatment of your personal information.

What gives us the right to manage your personal information?

We manage your information because you have given your consent.

As requested by the University of Oslo «NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS» (The Norwegian senter for research data) has concluded that the management of personal information in this research project is in accordance with person data protection laws.

What do I do now?

Read and consider the information in this paper and see if this is something you want to partake in. If so, all you have to do is meet at the agreed time. There is no need for preparation.

Where can I find more information?

If you have questions about the research project or you want to execute your rights, you can contact:

The University of Oslo via h.s.c.vongraven-dyrstad@student.jus.uio.no or malcolm.langford@jus.uio.no

Our data protection official: personvernombud@uio.no

NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS, via email (personverntjenester@nsd.no) or telephone: 55 58 21 17.

Regards,

Project advisor

Student

Appendix B

Appendix B consists of all the binary and multi-nominal regression analysis

1. Legal awareness

Question 1

		Variables in the Equation					
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1 ^a	Below	-.402	.292	1.888	1	.169	.669

Norway	1.464	.295	24.587	1	.000	4.323
Female	-.051	.298	.030	1	.863	.950
Education	.138	.295	.218	1	.641	1.148
Sosial medier	.162	.184	.779	1	.377	1.176
Constant	-2.437	.663	13.506	1	.000	.087

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Below, Norway, Female, Education, Sosial medier.

Question 2:

Variables in the Equation

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1 ^a Below	.497	.209	5.649	1	.017	1.644
Norway	.835	.270	9.609	1	.002	2.306
Female	-.130	.215	.366	1	.545	.878
Education	.033	.217	.023	1	.880	1.033
Sosial medier	.132	.139	.895	1	.344	1.141
Constant	-.442	.497	.792	1	.374	.643

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Below, Norway, Female, Education, Sosial medier.

Question 3:

Variables in the Equation

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1 ^a Below	.375	.218	2.967	1	.085	1.455
Norway	1.643	.339	23.543	1	.000	5.171
Female	-.001	.224	.000	1	.998	.999
Education	.284	.226	1.578	1	.209	1.329
Sosial medier	.082	.148	.309	1	.578	1.086
Constant	-.337	.526	.411	1	.521	.714

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Below, Norway, Female, Education, Sosial medier.

Question 4:

Parameter Estimates

Q4+sikkerhet ^a	B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound

0	Intercept	1.751	1.252	1.956	1	.162			
	Sosial medier	.068	.395	.029	1	.864	1.070	.493	2.321
	[Below=0]	.194	.595	.106	1	.744	1.214	.378	3.900
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.731	.656	1.240	1	.266	2.077	.574	7.519
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.615	.688	.800	1	.371	.541	.140	2.082
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.544	.682	.635	1	.426	1.722	.452	6.562
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1	Intercept	2.055	1.261	2.654	1	.103			
	Sosial medier	-.035	.399	.008	1	.929	.965	.441	2.112
	[Below=0]	-.004	.605	.000	1	.995	.996	.305	3.257
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.253	.657	.148	1	.701	1.288	.355	4.670
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.354	.701	.255	1	.613	.702	.178	2.771
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.427	.692	.380	1	.537	1.532	.395	5.948
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
2	Intercept	.775	1.360	.324	1	.569			
	Sosial medier	.096	.432	.050	1	.823	1.101	.472	2.568
	[Below=0]	.235	.654	.130	1	.719	1.265	.351	4.556
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.089	.709	.016	1	.901	1.093	.272	4.382
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.539	.742	.528	1	.468	.583	.136	2.497
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.964	.725	1.770	1	.183	2.623	.633	10.862
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
3	Intercept	.191	1.477	.017	1	.897			
	Sosial medier	.174	.466	.140	1	.708	1.190	.478	2.965
	[Below=0]	-.128	.697	.034	1	.854	.880	.225	3.447
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.356	.778	.209	1	.648	1.427	.310	6.561
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.660	.783	.711	1	.399	.517	.111	2.397
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.832	.769	1.170	1	.279	2.298	.509	10.373
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
4	Intercept	1.286	1.324	.942	1	.332			

	Sosial medier	-.312	.422	.548	1	.459	.732	.320	1.673
	[Below=0]	.681	.643	1.121	1	.290	1.975	.560	6.965
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.646	.714	.818	1	.366	1.907	.471	7.726
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.015	.740	.000	1	.984	.986	.231	4.200
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.300	.728	.170	1	.680	1.350	.324	5.620
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
5	Intercept	-	1.527	109.698	1	.000			
		15.993							
	Sosial medier	-.054	.479	.013	1	.910	.947	.371	2.422
	[Below=0]	-.218	.712	.094	1	.760	.804	.199	3.245
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	17.791	.000	.	1	.	53271874.442	53271874.442	53271874.442
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.987	.787	1.574	1	.210	.373	.080	1.742
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.158	.833	.036	1	.849	1.171	.229	6.000
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
6	Intercept	.753	1.620	.216	1	.642			
	Sosial medier	-.344	.519	.440	1	.507	.709	.256	1.960
	[Below=0]	-.505	.817	.382	1	.537	.604	.122	2.995
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.606	.919	.435	1	.510	1.833	.302	11.114
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.078	.939	.007	1	.934	.925	.147	5.827
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.075	.930	.007	1	.935	1.078	.174	6.678
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
7	Intercept	2.117	1.471	2.073	1	.150			
	Sosial medier	-.458	.488	.883	1	.348	.632	.243	1.645
	[Below=0]	.092	.787	.014	1	.907	1.097	.235	5.127
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.457	.811	.318	1	.573	.633	.129	3.105
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.746	.859	.755	1	.385	.474	.088	2.552
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.111	.882	.016	1	.900	1.117	.198	6.287
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 8.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Parameter Estimates

Q4dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-.492	.646	.581	1	.446			
	Sosial medier	-.321	.216	2.211	1	.137	.725	.475	1.108
	[Below=0]	-.254	.347	.536	1	.464	.775	.393	1.532
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.461	.374	1.516	1	.218	.631	.303	1.313
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.166	.374	.196	1	.658	1.180	.567	2.454
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.515	.389	1.755	1	.185	.597	.279	1.280
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-.949	.511	3.446	1	.063			
	Sosial medier	-.160	.161	.988	1	.320	.852	.621	1.168
	[Below=0]	.101	.243	.175	1	.676	1.107	.688	1.780
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.420	.318	1.748	1	.186	1.523	.816	2.840
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.062	.251	.061	1	.805	1.064	.650	1.742
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.156	.254	.375	1	.540	.856	.520	1.409
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 5:

Parameter Estimates

Q5+sikkerhet ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Con
								Lower B
0	Intercept	36.138	5006.045	.000	1	.994		
	Sosial medier	1.493	.951	2.464	1	.116	4.452	
	[Below=0]	18.120	1.357	178.251	1	.000	74002601.457	51763
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.

	[Norway=0]	-18.871	1.226	237.072	1	.000	6.375E-9	5.7
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Female=0]	-17.916	5006.044	.000	1	.997	1.656E-8	
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Education=0]	17.453	10363.462	.000	1	.999	37981623.584	
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
1	Intercept	36.584	5006.045	.000	1	.994		
	Sosial medier	1.258	.953	1.743	1	.187	3.520	
	[Below=0]	18.081	1.360	176.818	1	.000	71224142.768	49565
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Norway=0]	-19.279	1.230	245.812	1	.000	4.239E-9	3.8
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Female=0]	-17.866	5006.044	.000	1	.997	1.742E-8	
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Education=0]	17.465	10363.462	.000	1	.999	38466555.602	
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
2	Intercept	35.006	5006.045	.000	1	.994		
	Sosial medier	1.525	.964	2.506	1	.113	4.597	
	[Below=0]	17.731	1.376	166.165	1	.000	50178920.253	33859
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Norway=0]	-19.242	1.253	235.682	1	.000	4.397E-9	3.7
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Female=0]	-17.595	5006.044	.000	1	.997	2.282E-8	
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Education=0]	17.750	10363.462	.000	1	.999	51143132.078	
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
3	Intercept	34.326	5006.045	.000	1	.995		
	Sosial medier	1.319	1.019	1.674	1	.196	3.738	
	[Below=0]	18.329	1.472	154.952	1	.000	91234334.774	50910
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Norway=0]	-19.303	1.385	194.359	1	.000	4.138E-9	2.7
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Female=0]	-18.119	5006.044	.000	1	.997	1.353E-8	
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Education=0]	17.108	10363.462	.000	1	.999	26903306.943	
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
4	Intercept	34.818	5006.045	.000	1	.994		
	Sosial medier	1.135	.988	1.321	1	.250	3.111	
	[Below=0]	18.617	1.421	171.592	1	.000	121630716.849	75046
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Norway=0]	-19.177	1.315	212.641	1	.000	4.696E-9	3.5

	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Female=0]	-17.697	5006.044	.000	1	.997	2.062E-8	
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Education=0]	17.261	10363.462	.000	1	.999	31348242.301	
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
5	Intercept	28.675	5006.046	.000	1	.995		
	Sosial medier	2.518	1.236	4.152	1	.042	12.399	
	[Below=0]	19.077	1.771	115.993	1	.000	192758599.824	59879
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Norway=0]	-19.497	1.658	138.238	1	.000	3.410E-9	1.3
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Female=0]	-16.993	5006.044	.000	1	.997	4.171E-8	
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Education=0]	-1.823	14194.536	.000	1	1.000	.162	
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
6	Intercept	17.207	2.955	33.911	1	.000		
	Sosial medier	.170	1.291	.017	1	.895	1.185	
	[Below=0]	18.647	2.046	83.086	1	.000	125441695.821	22755
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Norway=0]	-20.208	1.907	112.231	1	.000	1.675E-9	3.9
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Female=0]	.509	.000	.	1	.	1.664	
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Education=0]	18.788	10363.462	.000	1	.999	144413222.774	
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
7	Intercept	34.789	5006.045	.000	1	.994		
	Sosial medier	.434	1.161	.140	1	.708	1.544	
	[Below=0]	19.959	.000	.	1	.	465522077.140	4655220
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Norway=0]	-21.631	.000	.	1	.	4.033E-10	4.0
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Female=0]	-16.710	5006.045	.000	1	.997	5.534E-8	
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Education=0]	-1.054	12402.385	.000	1	1.000	.349	
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	

a. The reference category is: 8.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

c. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

Parameter Estimates

Q5dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-1.620	1.329	1.485	1	.223			
	Sosial medier	-1.103	.462	5.709	1	.017	.332	.134	
	[Below=0]	.602	.801	.566	1	.452	1.826	.380	
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-1.251	.756	2.740	1	.098	.286	.065	
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	1.649	1.143	2.081	1	.149	5.202	.553	
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.734	.849	.747	1	.387	.480	.091	
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-2.037	.716	8.086	1	.004			
	Sosial medier	-.101	.231	.192	1	.661	.904	.575	
	[Below=0]	.525	.363	2.086	1	.149	1.690	.829	
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.204	.412	.246	1	.620	.815	.364	
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.076	.362	.044	1	.834	1.079	.531	
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.484	.396	1.499	1	.221	.616	.284	
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 6:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Q6+sikkerhet ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
0	Intercept	35.432	4413.694	.000	1	.994			
	Sosial medier	1.923	.901	4.550	1	.033	6.838	1.169	40.004
	[Below=0]	17.210	3796.409	.000	1	.996	29814022.436	.000	. ^b
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-19.228	2920.696	.000	1	.995	4.461E-9	.000	. ^b
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-17.696	3309.113	.000	1	.996	2.065E-8	.000	. ^b
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0

	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-1.329	1.414	.883	1	.347	.265	.017	4.234
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
1	Intercept	35.389	4413.694	.000	1	.994			
	Sosial medier	1.652	.904	3.344	1	.067	5.219	.888	30.669
	[Below=0]	17.208	3796.409	.000	1	.996	29738058.866	.000	. ^b
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-	2920.696	.000	1	.995	5.065E-9	.000	. ^b
		19.101							
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-	3309.113	.000	1	.996	2.172E-8	.000	. ^b
		17.645							
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-1.343	1.421	.893	1	.345	.261	.016	4.229
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
2	Intercept	34.287	4413.694	.000	1	.994			
	Sosial medier	1.949	.914	4.549	1	.033	7.023	1.171	42.121
	[Below=0]	16.876	3796.409	.000	1	.996	21327387.918	.000	. ^b
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-	2920.696	.000	1	.995	3.213E-9	.000	. ^b
		19.556							
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-	3309.113	.000	1	.996	2.451E-8	.000	. ^b
		17.524							
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-1.048	1.431	.536	1	.464	.351	.021	5.795
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
3	Intercept	33.784	4413.694	.000	1	.994			
	Sosial medier	1.343	.966	1.933	1	.164	3.831	.577	25.440
	[Below=0]	16.660	3796.409	.000	1	.996	17191488.604	.000	. ^b
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-	2920.696	.000	1	.995	8.564E-9	.000	. ^b
		18.576							
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-	3309.113	.000	1	.996	1.978E-8	.000	. ^b
		17.739							
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-1.023	1.531	.446	1	.504	.359	.018	7.231
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
4	Intercept	14.370	3309.113	.000	1	.997			
	Sosial medier	2.161	.987	4.793	1	.029	8.681	1.254	60.094

	[Below=0]	17.223	3796.409	.000	1	.996	30181477.720	.000	. ^b
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-1.540	.000	.	1	.	.214	.214	.214
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-	3309.113	.000	1	.996	2.969E-8	.000	. ^b
		17.332							
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-1.491	1.523	.959	1	.327	.225	.011	4.452
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
5	Intercept	15.683	2920.697	.000	1	.996			
	Sosial medier	1.626	1.193	1.859	1	.173	5.084	.491	52.639
	[Below=0]	16.637	3796.409	.000	1	.997	16805996.997	.000	. ^b
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-	2920.696	.000	1	.995	2.377E-9	.000	. ^b
		19.857							
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.034	.000	.	1	.	1.034	1.034	1.034
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-	6249.031	.000	1	.998	5.053E-9	.000	. ^b
		19.103							
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
6	Intercept	17.747	8051.114	.000	1	.998			
	Sosial medier	-	2439.354	.000	1	.995	5.985E-7	.000	. ^b
		14.329							
	[Below=0]	17.148	6233.784	.000	1	.998	28006927.353	.000	. ^b
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-	5503.580	.000	1	.997	1.294E-9	.000	. ^b
		20.466							
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-1.141	6315.545	.000	1	1.000	.319	.000	. ^b
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	15.547	3784.878	.000	1	.997	5651517.017	.000	. ^b
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
7	Intercept	-	8161.693	.000	1	.998			
		19.675							
	Sosial medier	1.510	1.940	.606	1	.436	4.529	.101	202.808
	[Below=0]	35.160	9001.440	.000	1	.997	1861637995491315.800	.000	. ^b
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-2.493	.000	.	1	.	.083	.083	.083
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.114	.000	.	1	.	1.120	1.120	1.120

[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
[Education=0]	- 9363.720	.000	1	.998	6.975E-9	.000	.	^b
	18.781							
[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0

- a. The reference category is: 8.
- b. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.
- c. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for		
		Std.				Exp(B)			
Q6dummy ^a	B	Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
.00	Intercept	-	1.417	205.034	1	.000			
		20.290							
	Sosial medier	-1.701	.687	6.134	1	.013	.183	.048	.701
	[Below=0]	-.719	1.218	.348	1	.555	.487	.045	5.308
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	1.836	1.404	1.710	1	.191	6.272	.400	98.294
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	18.901	.000	.	1	.	161684696.749	161684696.749	161684696.749
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.999	1.046	.912	1	.340	2.715	.350	21.086
[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	
1.00	Intercept	-3.127	.917	11.627	1	.001			
	Sosial medier	-.118	.270	.192	1	.661	.888	.523	1.509
	[Below=0]	-.189	.392	.233	1	.629	.828	.384	1.784
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	1.002	.636	2.482	1	.115	2.725	.783	9.482
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.266	.430	.383	1	.536	1.305	.562	3.034
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.125	.429	.084	1	.771	.883	.381	2.047
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

- a. The reference category is: 2.00.
- b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 7:

Parameter Estimates

Q7+sikkerhet ^a		B	Std. Er- ror	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
0	Intercept	2.836	1.602	3.134	1	.077			
	Sosial medier	.313	.473	.436	1	.509	1.367	.541	3.457
	[Below=0]	.816	.761	1.150	1	.284	2.262	.509	10.058
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.197	.863	.052	1	.819	.821	.151	4.459
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-1.314	1.083	1.471	1	.225	.269	.032	2.247
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	1.216	1.083	1.261	1	.261	3.374	.404	28.170
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1	Intercept	2.783	1.614	2.974	1	.085			
	Sosial medier	.107	.478	.050	1	.823	1.113	.436	2.840
	[Below=0]	.684	.770	.788	1	.375	1.981	.438	8.965
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.026	.875	.001	1	.976	1.027	.185	5.710
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-1.276	1.090	1.370	1	.242	.279	.033	2.363
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	1.241	1.089	1.299	1	.254	3.460	.409	29.266
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
2	Intercept	.405	1.729	.055	1	.815			
	Sosial medier	.526	.514	1.046	1	.306	1.692	.618	4.631
	[Below=0]	.899	.814	1.219	1	.270	2.456	.498	12.111
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.353	.921	.147	1	.702	.703	.116	4.273
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.982	1.127	.759	1	.384	.374	.041	3.411
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	1.558	1.116	1.950	1	.163	4.749	.533	42.287
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
3	Intercept	-.743	2.135	.121	1	.728			
	Sosial medier	-.094	.605	.024	1	.877	.910	.278	2.981
	[Below=0]	.914	.937	.950	1	.330	2.493	.397	15.655
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	1.247	1.353	.849	1	.357	3.478	.245	49.333
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.112	1.321	.007	1	.932	.894	.067	11.901
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

	[Education=0]	.390	1.319	.087	1	.768	1.477	.111	19.596
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
4	Intercept	-18.765	2.184	73.822	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	.703	.647	1.180	1	.277	2.019	.568	7.173
	[Below=0]	.853	.942	.820	1	.365	2.347	.370	14.887
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	17.010	.000	.	1	.	24397071.556	24397071.556	24397071.556
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.607	1.257	.233	1	.629	.545	.046	6.398
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	1.977	1.195	2.736	1	.098	7.223	.694	75.205
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
5	Intercept	-18.575	3639.836	.000	1	.996			
	Sosial medier	.960	.785	1.498	1	.221	2.612	.561	12.156
	[Below=0]	-.762	1.139	.447	1	.504	.467	.050	4.354
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	16.846	3639.835	.000	1	.996	20705811.969	.000	. ^c
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-1.125	1.368	.677	1	.411	.325	.022	4.737
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.406	1.528	.070	1	.791	1.500	.075	29.961
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
6	Intercept	-16.158	3109.161	.000	1	.996			
	Sosial medier	-.337	.749	.202	1	.653	.714	.165	3.098
	[Below=0]	-.805	1.364	.348	1	.555	.447	.031	6.479
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.999	1.480	.456	1	.500	2.716	.149	49.379
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	15.793	3109.161	.000	1	.996	7222752.522	.000	. ^c
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	1.575	1.396	1.273	1	.259	4.830	.313	74.491
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
7	Intercept	.462	2.048	.051	1	.822			
	Sosial medier	.254	.607	.175	1	.676	1.289	.392	4.238
	[Below=0]	-1.171	1.088	1.158	1	.282	.310	.037	2.617
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.344	1.161	.088	1	.767	1.410	.145	13.717
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

[Female=0]	-1.119	1.267	.781	1	.377	.327	.027	3.910
[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Education=0]	.545	1.326	.169	1	.681	1.725	.128	23.200
[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

- a. The reference category is: 8.
b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.
c. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

Parameter Estimates

Q7dummy ^a	B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-2.410	.927	6.756	1	.009		
	Sosial medier	-.199	.279	.508	1	.476	.820	.475 1.416
	[Below=0]	-1.446	.494	8.569	1	.003	.236	.089 .620
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Norway=0]	.479	.546	.770	1	.380	1.615	.554 4.710
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Female=0]	.859	.564	2.318	1	.128	2.361	.781 7.137
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	-.599	.521	1.318	1	.251	.550	.198 1.527
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
1.00	Intercept	-5.238	1.281	16.722	1	.000		
	Sosial medier	.155	.279	.309	1	.578	1.168	.676 2.016
	[Below=0]	-.225	.372	.367	1	.545	.798	.385 1.654
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Norway=0]	2.288	1.030	4.935	1	.026	9.857	1.309 74.210
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Female=0]	.696	.440	2.507	1	.113	2.006	.847 4.749
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	-.067	.397	.029	1	.866	.935	.429 2.037
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.

- a. The reference category is: 2.00.
b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 8:

Parameter Estimates

Q8+sikkerhet ^a	B	Std. Er- ror	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
0	Intercept	18.521	5124.906	.000	1	.997			
	Sosial medier	17.663	2604.355	.000	1	.995	46885972.199	.000	. ^b
	[Below=0]	15.448	3976.522	.000	1	.997	5116334.652	.000	. ^b
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-18.544	3087.704	.000	1	.995	8.841E-9	.000	. ^b
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-17.230	3240.830	.000	1	.996	3.289E-8	.000	. ^b
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.818	6592.689	.000	1	1.000	2.266	.000	. ^b
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
1	Intercept	17.984	5124.906	.000	1	.997			
	Sosial medier	17.567	2604.355	.000	1	.995	42605592.506	.000	. ^b
	[Below=0]	15.425	3976.522	.000	1	.997	5002447.611	.000	. ^b
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-18.563	3087.704	.000	1	.995	8.675E-9	.000	. ^b
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-17.112	3240.830	.000	1	.996	3.700E-8	.000	. ^b
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.851	6592.689	.000	1	1.000	2.343	.000	. ^b
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
2	Intercept	15.890	5124.906	.000	1	.998			
	Sosial medier	17.956	2604.355	.000	1	.994	62845279.944	.000	. ^b
	[Below=0]	15.090	3976.522	.000	1	.997	3577607.452	.000	. ^b
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-18.537	3087.704	.000	1	.995	8.899E-9	.000	. ^b
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-16.900	3240.830	.000	1	.996	4.574E-8	.000	. ^b
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	1.145	6592.689	.000	1	1.000	3.141	.000	. ^b
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
3	Intercept	14.714	5124.906	.000	1	.998			
	Sosial medier	17.163	2604.355	.000	1	.995	28441527.693	.000	. ^b
	[Below=0]	15.697	3976.522	.000	1	.997	6565224.304	.000	. ^b
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-17.835	3087.705	.000	1	.995	1.797E-8	.000	. ^b
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0

	[Female=0]	-16.046	3240.831	.000	1	.996	1.075E-7	.000	. ^b
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.837	6592.689	.000	1	1.000	2.309	.000	. ^b
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
4	Intercept	-.922	4108.427	.000	1	1.000			
	Sosial medier	17.462	2604.355	.000	1	.995	38357954.187	.000	. ^b
	[Below=0]	15.083	3976.522	.000	1	.997	3553075.584	.000	. ^b
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.711	.000	.	1	.	.491	.491	.491
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-17.634	3240.830	.000	1	.996	2.197E-8	.000	. ^b
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.230	6592.689	.000	1	1.000	1.259	.000	. ^b
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
5	Intercept	-20.430	2604.358	.000	1	.994			
	Sosial medier	18.005	2604.355	.000	1	.994	65957933.782	.000	. ^b
	[Below=0]	14.469	3976.522	.000	1	.997	1922257.145	.000	. ^b
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-1.242	.000	.	1	.	.289	.289	.289
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.390	.000	.	1	.	1.477	1.477	1.477
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-16.612	8787.021	.000	1	.998	6.102E-8	.000	. ^b
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
6	Intercept	-1.001	3984.380	.000	1	1.000			
	Sosial medier	15.950	2604.355	.000	1	.995	8451175.736	.000	. ^b
	[Below=0]	16.843	3976.522	.000	1	.997	20653638.772	.000	. ^b
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-18.876	3087.705	.000	1	.995	6.345E-9	.000	. ^b
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	1.242	.000	.	1	.	3.461	3.461	3.461
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	1.734	6592.689	.000	1	1.000	5.662	.000	. ^b
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 8.

b. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

c. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Parameter Estimates

Q8dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-	1.597	160.437	1	.000			
		20.231							
	Sosial medier	-2.325	.937	6.152	1	.013	.098	.016	.614
	[Below=0]	.724	1.485	.238	1	.626	2.063	.112	37.917
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	1.031	1.578	.426	1	.514	2.802	.127	61.800
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	19.787	.000	.	1	.	392175605.883	392175605.883	392175605.883
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.582	1.429	.166	1	.684	1.790	.109	29.484
[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	
1.00	Intercept	-3.754	1.278	8.626	1	.003			
	Sosial medier	-.242	.315	.589	1	.443	.785	.424	1.456
	[Below=0]	-.205	.461	.199	1	.656	.814	.330	2.009
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	1.822	1.045	3.041	1	.081	6.183	.798	47.914
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.190	.500	.144	1	.704	1.209	.454	3.219
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.548	.568	.928	1	.335	.578	.190	1.762
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 9:

Q9+sikkerhet ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)
								Lower Bound
0	Intercept	35.348	5674.692	.000	1	.995		
	Sosial medier	1.878	.952	3.892	1	.049	6.543	
	[Below=0]	-.796	1.566	.258	1	.611	.451	
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Norway=0]	-17.853	4122.085	.000	1	.997	1.764E-8	
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	
	[Female=0]	-17.926	3900.067	.000	1	.996	1.641E-8	
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	

	[Education=0]	16.576	6562.667	.000	1	.998	15802064.900
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
1	Intercept	34.655	5674.692	.000	1	.995	
	Sosial medier	1.757	.956	3.379	1	.066	5.798
	[Below=0]	-.848	1.573	.291	1	.590	.428
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Norway=0]	-17.448	4122.085	.000	1	.997	2.646E-8
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Female=0]	-18.063	3900.067	.000	1	.996	1.430E-8
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Education=0]	16.663	6562.667	.000	1	.998	17246252.865
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
2	Intercept	32.810	5674.692	.000	1	.995	
	Sosial medier	2.160	.974	4.920	1	.027	8.668
	[Below=0]	-1.163	1.591	.534	1	.465	.313
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Norway=0]	-17.784	4122.085	.000	1	.997	1.890E-8
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Female=0]	-17.785	3900.067	.000	1	.996	1.889E-8
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Education=0]	16.916	6562.667	.000	1	.998	22200424.572
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
3	Intercept	31.863	5674.692	.000	1	.996	
	Sosial medier	1.250	1.096	1.300	1	.254	3.490
	[Below=0]	-.024	1.802	.000	1	.989	.976
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Norway=0]	-17.387	4122.085	.000	1	.997	2.811E-8
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Female=0]	-16.887	3900.067	.000	1	.997	4.635E-8
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Education=0]	15.876	6562.667	.000	1	.998	7852452.268
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
4	Intercept	14.524	3900.067	.000	1	.997	
	Sosial medier	1.929	1.085	3.157	1	.076	6.880
	[Below=0]	-.663	1.733	.146	1	.702	.515
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Norway=0]	-.084	.000	.	1	.	.920
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Female=0]	-18.212	3900.067	.000	1	.996	1.232E-8
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Education=0]	15.599	6562.667	.000	1	.998	5950989.425

	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
5	Intercept	15.094	4122.086	.000	1	.997	
	Sosial medier	1.827	1.182	2.389	1	.122	6.213
	[Below=0]	-1.891	1.965	.926	1	.336	.151
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Norway=0]	-18.070	4122.085	.000	1	.997	1.421E-8
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Female=0]	-.357	.000	.	1	.	.700
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Education=0]	-1.139	8479.716	.000	1	1.000	.320
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
6	Intercept	-13.538	7372.002	.000	1	.999	
	Sosial medier	-14.937	1602.666	.000	1	.993	3.259E-7
	[Below=0]	-15.663	2867.748	.000	1	.996	1.576E-7
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Norway=0]	-.622	4422.683	.000	1	1.000	.537
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Female=0]	14.023	5428.613	.000	1	.998	1230204.533
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Education=0]	49.421	7315.879	.000	1	.995	29051986787629 94000000.000
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
7	Intercept	19.147	7335.964	.000	1	.998	
	Sosial medier	1.358	1.252	1.177	1	.278	3.888
	[Below=0]	-17.177	3716.860	.000	1	.996	3.469E-8
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Norway=0]	-36.100	5721.145	.000	1	.995	2.099E-16
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Female=0]	-2.497	6068.341	.000	1	1.000	.082
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.
	[Education=0]	-.864	8087.071	.000	1	1.000	.421
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.

a. The reference category is: 8.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

c. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

Parameter Estimates							95% Confidence Interval for
Q9dummy ^a	B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Exp(B)

							Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
.00	Intercept	-	1.147	254.221	1	.000			
		18.281							
	Sosial medier	-1.467	.606	5.859	1	.016	.231	.070	.756
	[Below=0]	-.608	1.211	.252	1	.615	.544	.051	5.847
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.235	1.005	.055	1	.815	.790	.110	5.666
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	18.315	.000	.	1	.	89966752.607	89966752.607	89966752.607
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.032	.965	.001	1	.974	1.033	.156	6.840
[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	
1.00	Intercept	-3.349	1.173	8.154	1	.004			
	Sosial medier	-.199	.348	.326	1	.568	.820	.414	1.622
	[Below=0]	.093	.511	.033	1	.856	1.097	.403	2.988
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.695	.776	.801	1	.371	2.003	.438	9.168
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.520	.586	.787	1	.375	1.682	.533	5.306
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-1.210	.761	2.529	1	.112	.298	.067	1.325
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 10:

Parameter Estimates							95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)			
		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Q10+sikkerhet ^a	0	Intercept	17.645	.938	353.656	1	.000			
		Sosial medier	.324	.294	1.211	1	.271	1.382	.777	2.459
		[Below=0]	-.671	.422	2.532	1	.112	.511	.223	1.168
		[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
		[Norway=0]	-18.280	.452	1632.055	1	.000	1.152E-8	4.744E-9	2.795E-8
		[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
		[Female=0]	-.565	.428	1.742	1	.187	.568	.246	1.315
		[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

	[Education=0]	-.110	.434	.064	1	.800	.896	.383	2.096
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1	Intercept	17.638	.923	365.055	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	.315	.291	1.171	1	.279	1.370	.775	2.423
	[Below=0]	-.385	.416	.854	1	.355	.681	.301	1.539
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-18.750	.429	1909.881	1	.000	7.192E-9	3.102E-9	1.667E-8
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.033	.438	.006	1	.939	1.034	.438	2.440
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.319	.431	.545	1	.460	.727	.312	1.693
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
2	Intercept	16.963	1.084	245.027	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	.232	.344	.452	1	.501	1.261	.642	2.476
	[Below=0]	-.680	.505	1.813	1	.178	.507	.188	1.363
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-18.341	.530	1196.140	1	.000	1.083E-8	3.832E-9	3.063E-8
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.048	.532	.008	1	.929	.953	.336	2.702
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.016	.509	.001	1	.975	.984	.363	2.669
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
3	Intercept	15.759	1.236	162.670	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	-.192	.360	.286	1	.593	.825	.408	1.670
	[Below=0]	.468	.536	.765	1	.382	1.597	.559	4.563
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-16.392	.820	399.450	1	.000	7.601E-8	1.523E-8	3.793E-7
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.195	.546	.128	1	.720	1.216	.417	3.542
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.253	.539	.221	1	.638	.776	.270	2.232
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
4	Intercept	17.200	.909	357.685	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	.116	.277	.176	1	.675	1.123	.652	1.934
	[Below=0]	.144	.395	.132	1	.716	1.155	.532	2.506
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-17.334	.469	1366.332	1	.000	2.963E-8	1.182E-8	7.429E-8

	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.129	.401	.104	1	.747	.879	.400	1.930
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.530	.416	1.619	1	.203	.589	.260	1.332
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
5	Intercept	14.194	1.359	109.034	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	.456	.374	1.484	1	.223	1.577	.758	3.284
	[Below=0]	.837	.587	2.035	1	.154	2.309	.731	7.293
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-16.600	.819	410.586	1	.000	6.176E-8	1.240E-8	3.076E-7
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.651	.501	1.689	1	.194	.521	.195	1.392
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.016	.514	.001	1	.975	1.016	.371	2.785
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
6	Intercept	16.416	1.088	227.557	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	-.211	.321	.432	1	.511	.810	.431	1.520
	[Below=0]	-.181	.455	.158	1	.691	.835	.342	2.034
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-17.542	.523	1126.890	1	.000	2.407E-8	8.645E-9	6.704E-8
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	1.692	.680	6.190	1	.013	5.431	1.432	20.594
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.350	.475	.540	1	.462	.705	.278	1.790
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
7	Intercept	18.393	.777	560.654	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	-.358	.259	1.912	1	.167	.699	.421	1.161
	[Below=0]	-.008	.375	.000	1	.983	.992	.476	2.067
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-16.975	.000	.	1	.	4.244E-8	4.244E-8	4.244E-8
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.005	.389	.000	1	.989	.995	.464	2.131
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.239	.388	.380	1	.538	.787	.368	1.685
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 8.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Q10dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-.134	.508	.070	1	.792			
	Sosial medier	-.538	.170	10.022	1	.002	.584	.419	.815
	[Below=0]	.518	.251	4.248	1	.039	1.679	1.026	2.749
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	1.701	.311	29.927	1	.000	5.479	2.979	10.077
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.485	.265	3.346	1	.067	1.624	.966	2.732
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.041	.259	.025	1	.874	.960	.578	1.594
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-1.206	.588	4.204	1	.040			
	Sosial medier	-.191	.187	1.045	1	.307	.826	.572	1.192
	[Below=0]	.902	.279	10.469	1	.001	2.465	1.427	4.259
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	1.446	.343	17.826	1	.000	4.247	2.170	8.312
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.052	.278	.035	1	.851	1.054	.611	1.816
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.205	.287	.510	1	.475	.815	.464	1.430
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 11:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Q11+sikkerhet ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
0	Intercept	1.012	1.144	.782	1	.377			
	Sosial medier	.297	.355	.702	1	.402	1.346	.672	2.697
	[Below=0]	-.442	.530	.695	1	.404	.643	.227	1.817
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

	[Norway=0]	-.491	.704	.485	1	.486	.612	.154	2.435
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.098	.533	.034	1	.854	.907	.319	2.577
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.362	.574	.398	1	.528	1.436	.467	4.418
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1	Intercept	1.936	1.106	3.063	1	.080			
	Sosial medier	.109	.346	.098	1	.754	1.115	.565	2.198
	[Below=0]	-.480	.525	.839	1	.360	.619	.221	1.729
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.895	.685	1.707	1	.191	.408	.107	1.565
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.016	.529	.001	1	.976	.984	.349	2.774
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.475	.565	.706	1	.401	1.608	.531	4.867
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
2	Intercept	.759	1.231	.380	1	.538			
	Sosial medier	.149	.386	.150	1	.699	1.161	.545	2.476
	[Below=0]	-.570	.585	.947	1	.330	.566	.180	1.782
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-1.171	.731	2.563	1	.109	.310	.074	1.300
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.542	.623	.757	1	.384	1.719	.507	5.830
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.733	.614	1.427	1	.232	2.081	.625	6.929
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
3	Intercept	-.465	1.293	.130	1	.719			
	Sosial medier	.220	.394	.313	1	.576	1.247	.576	2.700
	[Below=0]	.063	.581	.012	1	.913	1.065	.341	3.330
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.144	.783	.034	1	.854	.866	.187	4.017
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.722	.616	1.377	1	.241	2.059	.616	6.883
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.116	.626	.034	1	.853	1.123	.329	3.828
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
4	Intercept	1.549	1.104	1.970	1	.160			
	Sosial medier	-.154	.343	.201	1	.654	.857	.438	1.680
	[Below=0]	.210	.521	.163	1	.686	1.234	.445	3.426
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.059	.701	.007	1	.932	.942	.239	3.723

	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.468	.528	.787	1	.375	1.597	.568	4.492
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.037	.566	.004	1	.947	1.038	.342	3.151
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
5	Intercept	-1.050	1.585	.438	1	.508			
	Sosial medier	.086	.405	.045	1	.832	1.090	.493	2.409
	[Below=0]	.280	.624	.201	1	.654	1.323	.389	4.496
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	1.607	1.206	1.777	1	.183	4.989	.469	53.009
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.753	.595	1.605	1	.205	.471	.147	1.510
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.249	.690	.130	1	.719	.780	.202	3.015
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
6	Intercept	1.688	1.435	1.384	1	.239			
	Sosial medier	-.398	.469	.721	1	.396	.672	.268	1.683
	[Below=0]	-.839	.765	1.203	1	.273	.432	.096	1.936
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.413	.938	.194	1	.660	.662	.105	4.161
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.349	.756	.213	1	.644	.705	.160	3.103
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.530	.933	.323	1	.570	.588	.095	3.661
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
7	Intercept	1.860	1.194	2.426	1	.119			
	Sosial medier	-.235	.380	.384	1	.535	.790	.375	1.664
	[Below=0]	-.690	.589	1.373	1	.241	.501	.158	1.591
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.317	.767	.170	1	.680	.729	.162	3.276
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.343	.589	.339	1	.561	.710	.224	2.252
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.616	.624	.974	1	.324	1.852	.545	6.295
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 8.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Parameter Estimates

Q11dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-.113	.571	.039	1	.844			
	Sosial medier	-.389	.189	4.230	1	.040	.678	.468	.982
	[Below=0]	-.009	.296	.001	1	.976	.991	.555	1.769
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.561	.357	2.469	1	.116	1.753	.870	3.529
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.283	.300	.890	1	.345	.753	.418	1.357
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.233	.308	.573	1	.449	.792	.433	1.448
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-.675	.488	1.914	1	.167			
	Sosial medier	-.212	.154	1.892	1	.169	.809	.597	1.094
	[Below=0]	.670	.231	8.431	1	.004	1.954	1.243	3.072
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.905	.291	9.663	1	.002	2.471	1.397	4.371
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.218	.240	.828	1	.363	1.244	.778	1.989
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.484	.240	4.071	1	.044	.617	.385	.986
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 12:

Q12+sikkerhet ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
0	Intercept	-	1.368	179.073	1	.000			
		18.308							
	Sosial medier	-1.388	.507	7.487	1	.006	.250	.092	.674
	[Below=0]	-.299	.804	.138	1	.710	.742	.153	3.587
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	18.075	.000	.	1	.	70779313.982	70779313.982	70779313.982
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Female=0]	1.888	1.155	2.672	1	.102	6.604	.687	63.508	

	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.845	1.108	.581	1	.446	.430	.049	3.772
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1	Intercept	-.411	1.008	.167	1	.683			
	Sosial medier	-.611	.357	2.931	1	.087	.543	.270	1.092
	[Below=0]	-.152	.586	.067	1	.796	.859	.273	2.709
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-1.168	.607	3.709	1	.054	.311	.095	1.021
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	1.050	.696	2.275	1	.131	2.856	.730	11.173
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.033	.565	.003	1	.953	.967	.319	2.930
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
2	Intercept	-.197	.897	.048	1	.826			
	Sosial medier	-.568	.305	3.469	1	.063	.567	.312	1.030
	[Below=0]	-.044	.475	.009	1	.926	.957	.377	2.428
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.548	.559	.961	1	.327	.578	.193	1.729
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.962	.550	3.066	1	.080	2.618	.892	7.687
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-1.350	.650	4.306	1	.038	.259	.072	.928
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
3	Intercept	-1.324	1.056	1.573	1	.210			
	Sosial medier	.117	.341	.118	1	.731	1.125	.576	2.194
	[Below=0]	-.264	.517	.260	1	.610	.768	.279	2.118
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-1.305	.547	5.687	1	.017	.271	.093	.793
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.268	.537	.250	1	.617	1.308	.456	3.746
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.459	.557	.680	1	.409	.632	.212	1.881
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
4	Intercept	-2.205	1.209	3.328	1	.068			
	Sosial medier	.283	.385	.540	1	.463	1.327	.624	2.826
	[Below=0]	-.088	.578	.023	1	.878	.915	.295	2.842
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-1.177	.616	3.657	1	.056	.308	.092	1.030
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.122	.566	.047	1	.829	.885	.292	2.684
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

	[Education=0]	.223	.560	.159	1	.690	1.250	.417	3.750
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
5	Intercept	-24.042	2.689	79.963	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	.933	.757	1.521	1	.217	2.543	.577	11.211
	[Below=0]	.021	.918	.001	1	.982	1.021	.169	6.175
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	17.358	.000	.	1	.	34540065.090	34540065.090	34540065.090
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	1.180	1.116	1.118	1	.290	3.255	.365	29.020
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-1.043	1.122	.865	1	.352	.352	.039	3.175
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
6	Intercept	-.737	.747	.974	1	.324			
	Sosial medier	-.086	.240	.127	1	.721	.918	.573	1.469
	[Below=0]	-.279	.353	.625	1	.429	.756	.378	1.512
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.423	.442	.916	1	.339	.655	.275	1.559
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.565	.380	2.209	1	.137	1.760	.835	3.708
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.221	.367	.362	1	.547	.802	.391	1.646
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
7	Intercept	.166	.531	.098	1	.755			
	Sosial medier	.053	.168	.100	1	.751	1.055	.759	1.465
	[Below=0]	-.179	.245	.532	1	.466	.836	.517	1.352
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.538	.315	2.926	1	.087	.584	.315	1.082
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.457	.251	3.310	1	.069	1.580	.965	2.586
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.292	.253	1.331	1	.249	.747	.455	1.226
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 8.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Parameter Estimates

Q12dummy ^a	B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval
							for Exp(B)

								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-.361	.615	.344	1	.557			
	Sosial medier	-.720	.214	11.290	1	.001	.487	.320	.741
	[Norway=0]	-.194	.387	.252	1	.616	.824	.386	1.758
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.833	.408	4.170	1	.041	2.299	1.034	5.112
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Below=0]	-.002	.339	.000	1	.995	.998	.514	1.937
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.585	.388	2.281	1	.131	.557	.260	1.190
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-2.264	.765	8.762	1	.003			
	Sosial medier	.240	.242	.985	1	.321	1.271	.791	2.041
	[Norway=0]	-.730	.383	3.622	1	.057	.482	.227	1.022
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.033	.364	.008	1	.927	.967	.474	1.976
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Below=0]	-.020	.355	.003	1	.954	.980	.489	1.965
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.089	.367	.059	1	.809	.915	.445	1.880
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

2. Use of law

Question 13:

Parameter Estimates							95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
Q13+sikkerhet ^a	B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
0	Intercept	-	11871.577	.000	1	.998		
		36.430						
	Sosial medier	-.122	1.376	.008	1	.929	.885	.060 13.118
	[Below=0]	16.767	6758.351	.000	1	.998	19137212.269	.000 ^b
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Norway=0]	16.785	9760.073	.000	1	.999	19488670.869	.000 ^b

	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-	7655.745	.000	1	.998	9.177E-9	.000	. ^b
		18.507							
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-	8203.508	.000	1	.998	3.349E-8	.000	. ^b
		17.212							
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
1	Intercept	-	4691.561	.000	1	.993			
		44.095							
	Sosial medier	2.012	1.188	2.868	1	.090	7.476	.729	76.675
	[Below=0]	-	4861.129	.000	1	.997	3.063E-9	.000	. ^b
		19.604							
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	17.464	.000	.	1	.	38430135.836	38430135.836	38430135.836
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	17.710	4691.559	.000	1	.997	49114388.920	.000	. ^b
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.425	1.301	.107	1	.744	1.530	.119	19.597
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
2	Intercept	.747	2.171	.118	1	.731			
	Sosial medier	-1.198	.865	1.918	1	.166	.302	.055	1.644
	[Below=0]	-.404	1.626	.062	1	.804	.668	.028	16.169
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-1.708	1.496	1.304	1	.254	.181	.010	3.401
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.717	1.591	.203	1	.652	.488	.022	11.027
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-	8210.465	.000	1	.998	1.033E-8	.000	. ^b
		18.388							
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
3	Intercept	-.972	1.779	.299	1	.585			
	Sosial medier	-.587	.590	.991	1	.319	.556	.175	1.766
	[Below=0]	-.030	.984	.001	1	.976	.971	.141	6.684
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.515	1.166	.195	1	.659	.597	.061	5.867
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.285	.956	.089	1	.766	.752	.115	4.903
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-	7492.173	.000	1	.998	6.991E-9	.000	. ^b
		18.779							
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0

4	Intercept	-.538	1.852	.084	1	.771			
	Social medier	.125	.591	.045	1	.832	1.133	.356	3.608
	[Below=0]	-2.449	1.189	4.241	1	.039	.086	.008	.888
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-1.828	1.008	3.293	1	.070	.161	.022	1.158
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-1.695	.980	2.987	1	.084	.184	.027	1.255
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.854	1.160	.542	1	.462	.426	.044	4.134
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
5	Intercept	-	9452.748	.000	1	.997			
		39.909							
	Social medier	.712	1.795	.157	1	.692	2.038	.060	68.696
	[Below=0]	-	8701.920	.000	1	.998	6.405E-9	.000	. ^b
		18.866							
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	17.120	.000	.	1	.	27239920.078	27239920.078	27239920.078
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	17.329	9452.746	.000	1	.999	33576838.230	.000	. ^b
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
[Education=0]	-	.000	.	1	.	2.521E-8	2.521E-8	2.521E-8	
	17.496								
[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0	
6	Intercept	.166	1.125	.022	1	.883			
	Social medier	-1.429	.444	10.354	1	.001	.240	.100	.572
	[Below=0]	-.072	.747	.009	1	.924	.931	.215	4.023
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.004	.835	.000	1	.996	.996	.194	5.111
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.027	.776	.001	1	.972	1.027	.224	4.704
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	1.142	.707	2.608	1	.106	3.132	.783	12.517
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
7	Intercept	.773	.798	.938	1	.333			
	Social medier	-.519	.267	3.763	1	.052	.595	.352	1.005
	[Below=0]	-.355	.429	.684	1	.408	.701	.303	1.625
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-1.350	.453	8.868	1	.003	.259	.107	.630
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.457	.482	.901	1	.343	1.580	.614	4.061
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0

	[Education=0]	-1.141	.532	4.601	1	.032	.319	.113	.906
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
8	Intercept	.482	1.353	.127	1	.722			
	Sosial medier	-.023	.440	.003	1	.958	.977	.412	2.314
	[Below=0]	-1.720	.835	4.246	1	.039	.179	.035	.920
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-3.231	.884	13.369	1	.000	.040	.007	.223
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-1.629	.792	4.230	1	.040	.196	.042	.926
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.122	.753	.026	1	.871	1.130	.258	4.943
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
9	Intercept	-.124	.780	.025	1	.874			
	Sosial medier	.071	.243	.085	1	.771	1.073	.666	1.729
	[Below=0]	-1.040	.368	7.979	1	.005	.354	.172	.727
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-1.362	.399	11.661	1	.001	.256	.117	.560
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.253	.407	.387	1	.534	1.288	.580	2.859
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.545	.397	1.879	1	.170	.580	.266	1.264
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
10	Intercept	.303	.545	.308	1	.579			
	Sosial medier	-.007	.167	.002	1	.967	.993	.715	1.379
	[Below=0]	-.500	.241	4.288	1	.038	.607	.378	.974
	[Below=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.331	.323	1.046	1	.306	.719	.381	1.354
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.009	.249	.001	1	.971	.991	.608	1.615
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.224	.249	.808	1	.369	.799	.491	1.303
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 11.

b. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

c. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Parameter Estimates

Q13dummy ^a	B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound

								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-3.181	1.887	2.843	1	.092			
	Sosial medier	-.041	.569	.005	1	.943	.960	.315	2.930
	[Below=0]	-1.044	.906	1.330	1	.249	.352	.060	2.076
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.045	1.127	.002	1	.968	1.046	.115	9.524
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.314	.888	.125	1	.724	.731	.128	4.167
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.749	1.109	.456	1	.500	.473	.054	4.157
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-1.254	1.237	1.027	1	.311			
	Sosial medier	-.183	.398	.212	1	.645	.832	.381	1.817
	[Below=0]	-.956	.671	2.033	1	.154	.384	.103	1.431
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.641	.710	.815	1	.367	.527	.131	2.119
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.840	.639	1.729	1	.188	.432	.123	1.510
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-1.527	1.063	2.063	1	.151	.217	.027	1.745
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
2.00	Intercept	.611	.575	1.129	1	.288			
	Sosial medier	-.607	.200	9.240	1	.002	.545	.368	.806
	[Below=0]	-.170	.336	.256	1	.613	.843	.436	1.631
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-1.071	.337	10.093	1	.001	.343	.177	.664
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.094	.350	.072	1	.788	.910	.458	1.809
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.195	.350	.312	1	.577	.823	.415	1.632
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 3.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 14:

Parameter Estimates

Hvor stor tror du sannsynligheten er for å få juridiske konsekvenser (fengsel, bot osv.) hvis man har delt et nakenbilde av Neien andre uten samtykke? ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
0	Intercept	-1.484	.923	2.588	1	.108			
	Sosial medier	.133	.298	.201	1	.654	1.143	.638	2.048
	[Below=0]	-.280	.498	.317	1	.573	.756	.285	2.004
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.940	.482	3.802	1	.051	.391	.152	1.005
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.206	.535	.149	1	.700	1.229	.431	3.504
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.369	.484	.583	1	.445	1.447	.561	3.733
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1	Intercept	-.865	.563	2.361	1	.124			
	Sosial medier	-.246	.181	1.845	1	.174	.782	.549	1.115
	[Below=0]	.928	.276	11.289	1	.001	2.529	1.472	4.346
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	1.574	.359	19.266	1	.000	4.828	2.390	9.753
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.167	.283	.350	1	.554	1.182	.679	2.059
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.161	.293	.301	1	.583	1.174	.661	2.085
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
2	Intercept	-.913	.557	2.688	1	.101			
	Sosial medier	.144	.179	.641	1	.423	1.154	.812	1.641
	[Below=0]	.338	.271	1.561	1	.212	1.402	.825	2.384
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.611	.308	3.929	1	.047	1.841	1.007	3.368
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.118	.282	.173	1	.677	1.125	.647	1.956
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.307	.286	1.151	1	.283	1.359	.776	2.379
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 3.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

3. Age

Question 1:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Yes ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
0	Intercept	1.404	.631	4.957	1	.026			
	Sosial medier	-.152	.188	.655	1	.418	.859	.595	1.241
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	-.824	.594	1.924	1	.165	.439	.137	1.405
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	-.110	.530	.043	1	.836	.896	.317	2.531
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	-.584	.438	1.776	1	.183	.558	.236	1.316
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	-.257	.510	.254	1	.615	.773	.285	2.102
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	.020	.551	.001	1	.970	1.021	.347	3.006
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	1.423	.302	22.222	1	.000	4.149	2.296	7.496
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.092	.301	.095	1	.758	.912	.506	1.643
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.138	.299	.212	1	.645	1.148	.638	2.064
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 1.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 2:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
YesQ2 ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-1.079	.485	4.954	1	.026			
	Sosial medier	-.150	.142	1.116	1	.291	.861	.652	1.137

[Hva er din alder?=0]	.573	.449	1.628	1	.202	1.774	.736	4.278
[Hva er din alder?=1]	.841	.358	5.525	1	.019	2.318	1.150	4.674
[Hva er din alder?=2]	.846	.321	6.947	1	.008	2.330	1.242	4.371
[Hva er din alder?=3]	.677	.380	3.178	1	.075	1.967	.935	4.140
[Hva er din alder?=4]	.282	.374	.569	1	.451	1.326	.637	2.763
[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Norway=0]	.899	.275	10.693	1	.001	2.458	1.434	4.213
[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Female=0]	-.133	.218	.372	1	.542	.876	.572	1.342
[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Education=0]	-.030	.221	.018	1	.892	.970	.629	1.497
[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 1.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 3:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
YesQ3 ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-1.926	.534	12.992	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	-.075	.150	.248	1	.619	.928	.691	1.246
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	.216	.453	.228	1	.633	1.241	.511	3.015
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	.411	.359	1.314	1	.252	1.509	.747	3.046
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	.317	.324	.955	1	.329	1.373	.727	2.590
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	-.098	.401	.059	1	.807	.907	.413	1.991
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	-.032	.381	.007	1	.934	.969	.459	2.044

[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Norway=0]	1.632	.341	22.835	1	.000	5.113	2.618	9.986
[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Female=0]	-.015	.226	.004	1	.948	.985	.633	1.535
[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Education=0]	.285	.230	1.539	1	.215	1.330	.848	2.086
[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 1.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 4:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Q4dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	.025	.681	.001	1	.970			
	Sosial medier	-.270	.222	1.484	1	.223	.763	.494	1.179
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	-1.045	.826	1.602	1	.206	.352	.070	1.775
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	-1.377	.614	5.039	1	.025	.252	.076	.840
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	-.779	.432	3.257	1	.071	.459	.197	1.069
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	-1.138	.573	3.950	1	.047	.320	.104	.984
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	-1.696	.670	6.415	1	.011	.183	.049	.681
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.481	.388	1.540	1	.215	.618	.289	1.322
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.233	.381	.374	1	.541	1.262	.598	2.664
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.488	.398	1.502	1	.220	.614	.281	1.339
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-.811	.565	2.062	1	.151			
	Sosial medier	-.187	.165	1.287	1	.257	.830	.601	1.146

[Hva er din alder?=0]	.533	.491	1.180	1	.277	1.704	.651	4.458
[Hva er din alder?=1]	-.006	.410	.000	1	.989	.994	.445	2.223
[Hva er din alder?=2]	-.066	.372	.032	1	.858	.936	.451	1.940
[Hva er din alder?=3]	-.110	.442	.062	1	.803	.896	.377	2.129
[Hva er din alder?=4]	-.093	.423	.049	1	.825	.911	.398	2.085
[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Norway=0]	.390	.323	1.455	1	.228	1.477	.784	2.783
[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Female=0]	.080	.254	.098	1	.754	1.083	.658	1.783
[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Education=0]	-.121	.258	.220	1	.639	.886	.535	1.469
[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 5:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Q5dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-1.180	1.400	.710	1	.399			
	Sosial medier	-1.166	.504	5.349	1	.021	.312	.116	.837
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	1.528	1.404	1.184	1	.276	4.609	.294	72.249
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	-19.031	.000	.	1	.	5.431E-9	5.431E-9	5.431E-9
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	.269	.964	.078	1	.780	1.308	.198	8.659
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	-1.141	1.235	.853	1	.356	.320	.028	3.597
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	-.908	1.214	.560	1	.454	.403	.037	4.353

	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-1.243	.793	2.458	1	.117	.289	.061	1.365
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	1.862	1.160	2.574	1	.109	6.435	.662	62.545
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.672	.863	.607	1	.436	.510	.094	2.772
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-1.351	.753	3.215	1	.073			
	Sosial medier	-.127	.236	.291	1	.589	.880	.554	1.398
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	.560	.615	.830	1	.362	1.751	.525	5.842
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	-.081	.536	.023	1	.881	.923	.322	2.640
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	-.213	.478	.198	1	.656	.808	.317	2.061
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	-.959	.702	1.862	1	.172	.383	.097	1.519
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	-1.436	.804	3.187	1	.074	.238	.049	1.151
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.299	.424	.498	1	.480	.741	.323	1.702
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.110	.368	.090	1	.764	1.117	.543	2.296
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.422	.402	1.105	1	.293	.656	.298	1.440
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 6:

Parameter Estimates							95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
Q6dummy ^a	B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00 Intercept	-18.729	1.545	146.864	1	.000			

	Sosial medier	-1.827	.784	5.425	1	.020	.161	.035	.749
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	1.441	1.550	.865	1	.352	4.225	.203	88.076
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	-19.121	9399.298	.000	1	.998	4.962E-9	.000	. ^b
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	-18.764	6765.060	.000	1	.998	7.091E-9	.000	. ^b
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	-19.618	.000	.	1	.	3.019E-9	3.019E-9	3.019E-9
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	-19.959	.000	.	1	.	2.148E-9	2.148E-9	2.148E-9
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	1.811	1.535	1.392	1	.238	6.118	.302	123.980
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	18.475	.000	.	1	.	105557538.609	105557538.609	105557538.609
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	1.412	1.124	1.577	1	.209	4.105	.453	37.191
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-2.353	.936	6.317	1	.012			
	Sosial medier	-.148	.280	.279	1	.598	.863	.498	1.494
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	-.157	.675	.054	1	.816	.855	.228	3.210
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	-.705	.569	1.531	1	.216	.494	.162	1.509
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	-1.206	.556	4.709	1	.030	.299	.101	.890
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	-1.478	.808	3.343	1	.067	.228	.047	1.112
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	-1.215	.687	3.129	1	.077	.297	.077	1.140
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.894	.651	1.887	1	.170	2.446	.683	8.762
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.286	.440	.421	1	.517	1.331	.561	3.155
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.033	.441	.006	1	.940	1.034	.435	2.454
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

- b. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.
- c. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 7:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for		
		B	Std. Er- ror	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Exp(B)	
Q7dummy ^a								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-1.855	.945	3.849	1	.050			
	Sosial medier	-.134	.290	.212	1	.645	.875	.495	1.545
	[Hva er din al- der?=0]	-1.231	.835	2.176	1	.140	.292	.057	1.499
	[Hva er din al- der?=1]	-2.950	1.068	7.621	1	.006	.052	.006	.425
	[Hva er din al- der?=2]	-2.272	.675	11.326	1	.001	.103	.027	.387
	[Hva er din al- der?=3]	-2.024	.793	6.523	1	.011	.132	.028	.624
	[Hva er din al- der?=4]	-1.122	.565	3.950	1	.047	.326	.108	.985
	[Hva er din al- der?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.363	.568	.408	1	.523	1.438	.472	4.378
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.956	.575	2.762	1	.097	2.602	.842	8.035
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.412	.538	.587	1	.444	.662	.231	1.901
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-4.565	1.297	12.385	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	.235	.290	.659	1	.417	1.265	.717	2.232
	[Hva er din al- der?=0]	-.728	.672	1.174	1	.279	.483	.129	1.803
	[Hva er din al- der?=1]	-1.304	.574	5.164	1	.023	.272	.088	.836
	[Hva er din al- der?=2]	-1.071	.496	4.665	1	.031	.343	.130	.906
	[Hva er din al- der?=3]	-21.883	.000	.	1	.	3.135E- 10	3.135E-10	3.135E-10

[Hva er din alder?=4]	-.930	.587	2.513	1	.113	.395	.125	1.246
[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Norway=0]	2.163	1.038	4.346	1	.037	8.696	1.138	66.448
[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Female=0]	.687	.450	2.325	1	.127	1.987	.822	4.803
[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Education=0]	.138	.411	.112	1	.738	1.148	.513	2.570
[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 8:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Q8dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-18.038	3987.096	.000	1	.996			
	Sosial medier	-2.489	1.187	4.394	1	.036	.083	.008	.851
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	-15.154	.000	.	1	.	2.623E-7	2.623E-7	2.623E-7
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	-17.147	6542.111	.000	1	.998	3.574E-8	.000	. ^b
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	.793	1.788	.197	1	.657	2.211	.066	73.487
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	-18.035	7261.178	.000	1	.998	1.471E-8	.000	. ^b
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	-18.236	7596.536	.000	1	.998	1.203E-8	.000	. ^b
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.971	1.518	.409	1	.522	2.641	.135	51.787
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	18.749	3987.096	.000	1	.996	138921335.57	.000	. ^b
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.564	1.415	.159	1	.690	1.758	.110	28.146
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0

1.00	Intercept	-3.321	1.311	6.419	1	.011			
	Sosial medier	-.308	.329	.881	1	.348	.735	.386	1.399
	[Hva er din al- der?=0]	.486	.737	.435	1	.510	1.625	.384	6.887
	[Hva er din al- der?=1]	-1.159	.853	1.848	1	.174	.314	.059	1.669
	[Hva er din al- der?=2]	-.650	.646	1.015	1	.314	.522	.147	1.850
	[Hva er din al- der?=3]	-.669	.854	.613	1	.434	.512	.096	2.732
	[Hva er din al- der?=4]	-.598	.736	.661	1	.416	.550	.130	2.327
	[Hva er din al- der?=5]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	1.794	1.056	2.886	1	.089	6.013	.759	47.638
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.293	.510	.330	1	.566	1.341	.493	3.646
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.408	.578	.498	1	.480	.665	.214	2.065
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

c. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 9:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Q9dummy ^a		B	Std. Er- ror	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-17.193	1.304	173.901	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	-1.585	.685	5.356	1	.021	.205	.053	.784
	[Hva er din al- der?=0]	1.758	1.529	1.323	1	.250	5.803	.290	116.077
	[Hva er din al- der?=1]	-18.368	8738.80 3	.000	1	.998	1.054E-8	.000	. ^b

	[Hva er din alder?=2]	-18.214	6134.968	.000	1	.998	1.230E-8	.000	. ^b
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	-19.743	8675.110	.000	1	.998	2.666E-9	.000	. ^b
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	-1.202	1.201	1.000	1	.317	.301	.029	3.168
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.624	1.061	.346	1	.556	.536	.067	4.288
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	18.379	.000	.	1	.	95896406.738	95896406.738	95896406.738
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.301	1.047	.083	1	.774	1.351	.174	10.518
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-2.771	1.216	5.192	1	.023			
	Sosial medier	-.242	.359	.453	1	.501	.785	.389	1.587
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	.454	.822	.305	1	.581	1.574	.314	7.889
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	-.896	.874	1.051	1	.305	.408	.074	2.264
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	-.421	.672	.392	1	.531	.656	.176	2.452
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	-1.240	1.124	1.217	1	.270	.289	.032	2.621
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	-.824	.861	.916	1	.338	.439	.081	2.370
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.598	.790	.573	1	.449	1.818	.387	8.547
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.627	.596	1.108	1	.293	1.872	.582	6.022
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-1.083	.768	1.990	1	.158	.339	.075	1.525
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

c. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 10:

Parameter Estimates

Q10dummy ^a	B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	.135	.547	.061	1	.806		
	Sosial medier	-.547	.173	9.957	1	.002	.579	.412 .813
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	.736	.589	1.561	1	.211	2.087	.658 6.619
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	.640	.432	2.191	1	.139	1.896	.813 4.422
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	.153	.353	.189	1	.664	1.166	.584 2.326
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	-.534	.430	1.543	1	.214	.586	.253 1.361
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	-.104	.404	.066	1	.798	.902	.408 1.992
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Norway=0]	1.613	.315	26.294	1	.000	5.019	2.709 9.298
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Female=0]	.456	.268	2.902	1	.088	1.578	.934 2.666
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	.005	.264	.000	1	.984	1.005	.600 1.685
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
1.00	Intercept	-1.457	.677	4.626	1	.031		
	Sosial medier	-.269	.191	1.981	1	.159	.765	.526 1.111
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	2.017	.647	9.728	1	.002	7.517	2.116 26.700
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	1.775	.524	11.484	1	.001	5.900	2.114 16.469
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	1.125	.463	5.889	1	.015	3.079	1.242 7.637
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	.918	.516	3.172	1	.075	2.505	.912 6.881
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	.512	.539	.903	1	.342	1.669	.581 4.797
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Norway=0]	1.418	.348	16.572	1	.000	4.127	2.086 8.166
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Female=0]	.032	.282	.013	1	.910	1.032	.594 1.793

[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Education=0]	-.239	.293	.669	1	.413	.787	.443	1.397
[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 11:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for		
Q11dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	.355	.611	.337	1	.561			
	Sosial medier	-.391	.193	4.078	1	.043	.677	.463	.989
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	-.574	.737	.607	1	.436	.563	.133	2.389
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	.197	.463	.182	1	.670	1.218	.492	3.016
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	-.658	.413	2.539	1	.111	.518	.230	1.163
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	-.578	.484	1.427	1	.232	.561	.217	1.449
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	-.700	.496	1.991	1	.158	.497	.188	1.313
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.478	.364	1.719	1	.190	1.612	.789	3.293
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.351	.305	1.324	1	.250	.704	.387	1.280
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.214	.314	.463	1	.496	.808	.437	1.494
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-.602	.543	1.233	1	.267			
	Sosial medier	-.251	.158	2.535	1	.111	.778	.571	1.060
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	1.242	.494	6.330	1	.012	3.464	1.316	9.118
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	1.051	.401	6.873	1	.009	2.860	1.304	6.273

[Hva er din alder?=2]	.528	.352	2.249	1	.134	1.695	.850	3.379
[Hva er din alder?=3]	.003	.426	.000	1	.994	1.003	.436	2.311
[Hva er din alder?=4]	.286	.403	.504	1	.478	1.331	.605	2.929
[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Norway=0]	.828	.295	7.863	1	.005	2.289	1.283	4.084
[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Female=0]	.200	.243	.675	1	.411	1.221	.758	1.965
[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Education=0]	-.454	.243	3.477	1	.062	.635	.394	1.023
[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 12:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Q12dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	.309	.659	.220	1	.639			
	Sosial medier	-.695	.221	9.835	1	.002	.499	.323	.771
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	-.902	.818	1.215	1	.270	.406	.082	2.016
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	-.918	.534	2.951	1	.086	.399	.140	1.138
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	-.660	.421	2.457	1	.117	.517	.226	1.180
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	-1.408	.616	5.233	1	.022	.245	.073	.817
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	-1.684	.600	7.875	1	.005	.186	.057	.602
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.256	.403	.405	1	.524	.774	.351	1.705
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

	[Female=0]	.920	.418	4.854	1	.028	2.509	1.107	5.687
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.563	.397	2.015	1	.156	.569	.262	1.239
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-1.829	.823	4.939	1	.026			
	Sosial medier	.170	.244	.483	1	.487	1.185	.734	1.912
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	.222	.662	.113	1	.737	1.249	.341	4.571
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	-.437	.604	.523	1	.469	.646	.198	2.112
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	-.352	.520	.458	1	.499	.703	.254	1.948
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	.171	.557	.094	1	.759	1.187	.398	3.536
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	-2.077	1.089	3.639	1	.056	.125	.015	1.058
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-.677	.398	2.890	1	.089	.508	.233	1.109
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.003	.370	.000	1	.994	1.003	.486	2.069
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.153	.376	.165	1	.685	.858	.411	1.794
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 13:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Q13dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-3.858	2.074	3.460	1	.063			
	Sosial medier	-.066	.571	.013	1	.908	.936	.306	2.867
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	-18.304	.000	.	1	.	1.124E-8	1.124E-8	1.124E-8
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	-18.046	7917.039	.000	1	.998	1.454E-8	.000	. ^b

	[Hva er din alder?=2]	.110	1.267	.008	1	.931	1.116	.093	13.385
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	1.159	1.271	.831	1	.362	3.186	.264	38.460
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	.135	1.429	.009	1	.925	1.145	.070	18.840
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.325	1.137	.082	1	.775	1.384	.149	12.839
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.217	.896	.058	1	.809	.805	.139	4.667
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.947	1.123	.711	1	.399	.388	.043	3.506
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-.229	1.307	.031	1	.861			
	Sosial medier	-.195	.414	.222	1	.637	.823	.365	1.852
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	-1.086	1.193	.828	1	.363	.338	.033	3.500
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	-.489	.804	.369	1	.544	.613	.127	2.968
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	-19.097	4031.721	.000	1	.996	5.087E-9	.000	. ^b
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	-1.234	1.141	1.169	1	.280	.291	.031	2.726
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	-1.503	1.126	1.782	1	.182	.223	.025	2.021
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	-1.043	.745	1.962	1	.161	.352	.082	1.517
	[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-1.004	.647	2.404	1	.121	.367	.103	1.303
	[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-1.581	1.095	2.087	1	.149	.206	.024	1.758
	[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
2.00	Intercept	.250	.638	.154	1	.695			
	Sosial medier	-.573	.203	8.010	1	.005	.564	.379	.838
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	-17.632	4145.371	.000	1	.997	2.200E-8	.000	. ^b
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	-.757	.713	1.126	1	.289	.469	.116	1.899

[Hva er din alder?=2]	.338	.466	.527	1	.468	1.403	.563	3.497
[Hva er din alder?=3]	.512	.520	.969	1	.325	1.669	.602	4.626
[Hva er din alder?=4]	-.042	.555	.006	1	.940	.959	.323	2.847
[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^c	.	.	0
[Norway=0]	-.897	.343	6.838	1	.009	.408	.208	.799
[Norway=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
[Female=0]	-.043	.357	.015	1	.903	.957	.476	1.928
[Female=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0
[Education=0]	-.269	.353	.583	1	.445	.764	.383	1.525
[Education=1]	0 ^c	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 3.00.

b. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

c. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 14:

Parameter Estimates

		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
0	Intercept	-1.933	1.060	3.325	1	.068			
	Sosial medier	.066	.306	.047	1	.829	1.068	.587	1.946
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	.186	1.265	.022	1	.883	1.205	.101	14.387
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	1.239	.947	1.712	1	.191	3.452	.540	22.085
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	.183	.804	.052	1	.820	1.201	.248	5.811
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	1.078	.779	1.913	1	.167	2.938	.638	13.533
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	.927	.803	1.334	1	.248	2.528	.524	12.199
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0

	[Norway=0]	-.937	.498	3.532	1	.060	.392	.148	1.041
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.125	.540	.054	1	.817	1.133	.393	3.265
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.317	.493	.412	1	.521	1.372	.522	3.607
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1	Intercept	-.865	.610	2.011	1	.156			
	Sosial medier	-.282	.186	2.315	1	.128	.754	.524	1.085
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	.581	.556	1.092	1	.296	1.789	.601	5.323
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	1.789	.511	12.276	1	.000	5.986	2.200	16.289
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	.897	.395	5.175	1	.023	2.453	1.132	5.315
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	.589	.473	1.554	1	.213	1.803	.714	4.555
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	-.133	.473	.079	1	.778	.875	.346	2.212
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	1.599	.366	19.104	1	.000	4.947	2.415	10.133
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.111	.287	.149	1	.700	1.117	.637	1.961
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.083	.299	.076	1	.782	1.086	.605	1.951
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
2	Intercept	-.957	.599	2.552	1	.110			
	Sosial medier	.137	.183	.561	1	.454	1.147	.801	1.643
	[Hva er din alder?=0]	.063	.557	.013	1	.911	1.065	.357	3.173
	[Hva er din alder?=1]	1.048	.511	4.213	1	.040	2.852	1.048	7.757
	[Hva er din alder?=2]	.334	.384	.758	1	.384	1.397	.658	2.967
	[Hva er din alder?=3]	.144	.460	.098	1	.754	1.155	.469	2.846
	[Hva er din alder?=4]	.251	.429	.344	1	.558	1.286	.555	2.978
	[Hva er din alder?=5]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Norway=0]	.588	.314	3.501	1	.061	1.801	.972	3.336

[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Female=0]	.066	.285	.054	1	.817	1.068	.611	1.868
[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Education=0]	.281	.291	.936	1	.333	1.325	.749	2.343
[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 3.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

4. Gender differences

Question 1:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Yes ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
0	Intercept	1.169	.592	3.904	1	.048			
	Sosial medier	-.158	.184	.736	1	.391	.854	.595	1.225
	[Norway=0]	1.433	.299	23.048	1	.000	4.192	2.335	7.524
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.055	.299	.034	1	.854	.946	.526	1.702
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.133	.295	.203	1	.652	1.142	.640	2.037
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Below=0]	-.417	.298	1.966	1	.161	.659	.368	1.181
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Spørreun- dersøkelse=1]	.221	.333	.440	1	.507	1.248	.649	2.397
	[Spørreun- dersøkelse=2]	.167	.344	.235	1	.627	1.182	.602	2.320
	[Spørreun- dersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 1.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 2:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
YesQ2 ^a		B	Std. Er- ror	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Exp(B)

							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-.885	.465	3.622	1	.057		
	Sosial medier	-.149	.141	1.117	1	.291	.862	1.135
	[Norway=0]	.806	.273	8.713	1	.003	2.238	3.821
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Female=0]	-.106	.217	.240	1	.624	.899	1.376
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	.034	.218	.024	1	.876	1.035	1.587
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Below=0]	.449	.211	4.505	1	.034	1.567	2.371
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	.404	.252	2.564	1	.109	1.498	2.457
	[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	.026	.265	.010	1	.922	1.026	1.726
	[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0	.	.	.

a. The reference category is: 1.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 3:

Parameter Estimates

							95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
YesQ3 ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-2.310	.535	18.664	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	-.088	.150	.344	1	.557	.916	.682	1.229
	[Norway=0]	1.591	.342	21.629	1	.000	4.908	2.510	9.595
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.002	.227	.000	1	.992	1.002	.642	1.564
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.299	.228	1.721	1	.190	1.349	.863	2.109
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Below=0]	.343	.220	2.418	1	.120	1.409	.915	2.170
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	.644	.272	5.608	1	.018	1.904	1.117	3.243
	[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	.431	.285	2.289	1	.130	1.539	.880	2.691

[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0
------------------------	----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

a. The reference category is: 1.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 4:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Q4dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-.745	.696	1.148	1	.284			
	Sosial medier	-.314	.218	2.077	1	.150	.731	.477	1.120
	[Norway=0]	-.519	.379	1.874	1	.171	.595	.283	1.251
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.146	.375	.152	1	.697	1.158	.555	2.415
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.522	.390	1.790	1	.181	.593	.276	1.275
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Below=0]	-.245	.353	.479	1	.489	.783	.392	1.565
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	.326	.443	.543	1	.461	1.386	.581	3.304
	[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	.438	.433	1.021	1	.312	1.549	.663	3.622
	[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-1.104	.544	4.124	1	.042			
	Sosial medier	-.164	.163	1.022	1	.312	.848	.617	1.167
	[Norway=0]	.379	.321	1.389	1	.239	1.460	.778	2.741
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.066	.253	.068	1	.794	1.068	.651	1.754
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.155	.255	.368	1	.544	.857	.520	1.412
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Below=0]	.077	.245	.099	1	.753	1.080	.668	1.745
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	.343	.298	1.326	1	.249	1.409	.786	2.526

[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	.206	.312	.434	1	.510	1.228	.666	2.265
[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 5:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Q5dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-1.560	1.374	1.290	1	.256			
	Sosial medier	-1.131	.476	5.656	1	.017	.323	.127	.820
	[Norway=0]	-1.221	.769	2.521	1	.112	.295	.065	1.331
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	1.696	1.157	2.151	1	.142	5.455	.565	52.652
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.709	.854	.690	1	.406	.492	.092	2.623
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Below=0]	.548	.830	.436	1	.509	1.729	.340	8.794
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	.117	.910	.016	1	.898	1.124	.189	6.692
	[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	-.206	.878	.055	1	.814	.814	.146	4.546
	[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	1.00	Intercept	-2.298	.779	8.691	1	.003		
Sosial medier		-.097	.233	.173	1	.678	.907	.574	1.434
[Norway=0]		-.268	.418	.413	1	.520	.765	.337	1.733
[Norway=1]		0 ^b	.	.	0
[Female=0]		.063	.363	.030	1	.863	1.065	.523	2.169
[Female=1]		0 ^b	.	.	0
[Education=0]		-.489	.397	1.522	1	.217	.613	.282	1.334
[Education=1]		0 ^b	.	.	0
[Below=0]		.505	.368	1.883	1	.170	1.656	.806	3.405
[Below=1]		0 ^b	.	.	0

[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	.450	.448	1.009	1	.315	1.569	.651	3.778
[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	.378	.471	.644	1	.422	1.459	.580	3.671
[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 6:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Q6dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-37.782	1.507	628.182	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	-1.853	.774	5.727	1	.017	.157	.034	.715
	[Norway=0]	1.588	1.436	1.223	1	.269	4.894	.293	81.619
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	18.982	.000	.	1	.	175268639.243	175268639.243	175268639.243
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.876	1.057	.687	1	.407	2.402	.302	19.076
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Below=0]	-.932	1.213	.590	1	.443	.394	.037	4.248
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	18.807	1.123	280.242	1	.000	147119284.372	16270520.768	1330263741.557
	[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	18.082	.000	.	1	.	71268699.555	71268699.555	71268699.555
	[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-3.496	.994	12.363	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	-.121	.275	.193	1	.660	.886	.517	1.519
	[Norway=0]	.928	.641	2.097	1	.148	2.529	.720	8.874
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.259	.433	.357	1	.550	1.295	.554	3.027
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

[Education=0]	-.112	.430	.068	1	.794	.894	.385	2.077
[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Below=0]	-.208	.395	.276	1	.599	.812	.374	1.763
[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	.592	.543	1.188	1	.276	1.808	.623	5.241
[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	.552	.553	.997	1	.318	1.738	.587	5.139
[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 7:

Q7dummy ^a		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-2.911	1.024	8.076	1	.004			
	Sosial medier	-.229	.286	.641	1	.423	.795	.453	1.394
	[Norway=0]	.352	.554	.403	1	.525	1.421	.480	4.209
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.893	.569	2.468	1	.116	2.443	.801	7.447
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.600	.525	1.307	1	.253	.549	.196	1.535
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Below=0]	-1.511	.500	9.139	1	.003	.221	.083	.588
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	.989	.626	2.496	1	.114	2.687	.788	9.160
	[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	.738	.606	1.483	1	.223	2.092	.638	6.864
	[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-5.640	1.345	17.582	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	.120	.286	.175	1	.676	1.127	.643	1.974
	[Norway=0]	2.196	1.034	4.515	1	.034	8.991	1.186	68.170
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

[Female=0]	.742	.444	2.793	1	.095	2.100	.880	5.011
[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Education=0]	-.035	.399	.008	1	.930	.965	.441	2.112
[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Below=0]	-.310	.376	.680	1	.410	.734	.351	1.532
[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	.956	.526	3.306	1	.069	2.602	.928	7.294
[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	.439	.564	.605	1	.437	1.551	.513	4.687
[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 8:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Q8dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-19.976	1.807	122.228	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	-2.087	.940	4.930	1	.026	.124	.020	.783
	[Norway=0]	.970	1.626	.356	1	.551	2.639	.109	63.945
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	19.435	.000	.	1	.	275656515. 290	275656515. 290	275656515. 290
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	.510	1.445	.124	1	.724	1.664	.098	28.240
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Below=0]	.969	1.526	.404	1	.525	2.636	.132	52.465
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	-18.677	.000	.	1	.	7.738E-9	7.738E-9	7.738E-9
	[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	-.108	1.337	.007	1	.935	.897	.065	12.325
	[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-3.882	1.325	8.588	1	.003			

Sosial medier	-.201	.316	.403	1	.526	.818	.440	1.521
[Norway=0]	1.816	1.046	3.012	1	.083	6.148	.791	47.794
[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Female=0]	.137	.504	.074	1	.786	1.146	.427	3.077
[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Education=0]	-.551	.569	.936	1	.333	.576	.189	1.760
[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Below=0]	-.145	.467	.096	1	.757	.865	.346	2.162
[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	-.243	.607	.160	1	.689	.784	.239	2.579
[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	.285	.573	.247	1	.619	1.329	.433	4.084
[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 9:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Q9dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-36.503	1.265	832.944	1	.000			
	Sosial medier	-1.375	.611	5.070	1	.024	.253	.076	.837
	[Norway=0]	-.669	1.022	.428	1	.513	.512	.069	3.798
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	18.350	.000	.	1	.	93153866.913	93153866.913	93153866.913
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.320	1.031	.096	1	.756	.726	.096	5.474
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Below=0]	-.659	1.216	.294	1	.587	.517	.048	5.602
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	18.243	1.215	225.459	1	.000	83718383.619	7738292.049	905725412.172

	[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	18.991	.000	.	1	.	176867100.639	176867100.639	176867100.639
	[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-3.702	1.258	8.666	1	.003			
	Sosial medier	-.184	.353	.272	1	.602	.832	.417	1.661
	[Norway=0]	.609	.782	.607	1	.436	1.839	.397	8.512
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.475	.589	.650	1	.420	1.607	.507	5.096
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-1.207	.762	2.511	1	.113	.299	.067	1.331
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Below=0]	.128	.519	.061	1	.805	1.136	.411	3.143
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	.355	.714	.247	1	.619	1.426	.352	5.782
	[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	.661	.700	.892	1	.345	1.936	.491	7.628
	[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 10:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Q10dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-.497	.550	.819	1	.365			
	Sosial medier	-.582	.173	11.260	1	.001	.559	.398	.785
	[Norway=0]	1.647	.319	26.618	1	.000	5.189	2.776	9.699
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.554	.271	4.165	1	.041	1.740	1.022	2.963
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.038	.262	.020	1	.886	.963	.576	1.611
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Below=0]	.410	.257	2.547	1	.110	1.507	.911	2.494
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

	[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	1.071	.321	11.141	1	.001	2.918	1.556	5.474
	[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	.323	.318	1.031	1	.310	1.381	.741	2.575
	[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-1.042	.610	2.917	1	.088			
	Sosial medier	-.220	.188	1.376	1	.241	.802	.555	1.159
	[Norway=0]	1.477	.348	18.055	1	.000	4.381	2.216	8.659
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.120	.281	.182	1	.670	1.127	.650	1.956
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.219	.289	.574	1	.449	.804	.456	1.415
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Below=0]	.836	.283	8.743	1	.003	2.307	1.326	4.015
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	.174	.322	.291	1	.589	1.190	.633	2.235
	[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	-.514	.333	2.383	1	.123	.598	.311	1.149
	[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Question 11:

		Parameter Estimates					95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
Q11dummy ^a		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
.00	Intercept	-.439	.623	.496	1	.481			
	Sosial medier	-.413	.193	4.592	1	.032	.661	.453	.965
	[Norway=0]	.475	.363	1.707	1	.191	1.608	.789	3.277
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	-.254	.304	.701	1	.403	.776	.428	1.406
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.248	.311	.638	1	.424	.780	.425	1.434
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0

	[Below=0]	-.078	.299	.067	1	.795	.925	.515	1.664
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	.825	.379	4.730	1	.030	2.282	1.085	4.799
	[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	.394	.397	.985	1	.321	1.482	.681	3.224
	[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0
1.00	Intercept	-.804	.513	2.462	1	.117			
	Sosial medier	-.212	.155	1.878	1	.171	.809	.597	1.096
	[Norway=0]	.868	.293	8.749	1	.003	2.381	1.340	4.232
	[Norway=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Female=0]	.220	.241	.832	1	.362	1.246	.777	1.997
	[Female=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Education=0]	-.485	.240	4.094	1	.043	.615	.385	.985
	[Education=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Below=0]	.651	.233	7.771	1	.005	1.917	1.213	3.029
	[Below=1]	0 ^b	.	.	0
	[Spørreundersøkelse=1]	.284	.274	1.078	1	.299	1.329	.777	2.272
	[Spørreundersøkelse=2]	.172	.282	.369	1	.543	1.187	.683	2.065
	[Spørreundersøkelse=3]	0 ^b	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 2.00.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.