

Web Appendix

**How Large Are the Effects from Temporary
Changes in Family Environment: Evidence from a
Child-evacuation Program during World War II
Torsten Santavirta**

September 14, 2011

Appendices

A The Evacuation Scheme¹ (Online only - Not for publication)

Historical Background

Finland fought two wars against the Soviet Union during World War II: The Winter War (November 1939 – March 1940) and the Continuation War (June 1941 – September 1944). Despite Finnish collaboration with the Axis Powers during World War II, Finland's resistance against Stalin's Red Army gave rise to feelings of sympathy in many countries. Food and material aid was received from foreign organizations and credit was granted by several countries.

In Sweden, a civilian movement to help Finland, called "Finland's cause is our cause", emerged within days after the breakout of the Winter War.² One of the most diplomatic ways for Swedish civilians to participate in helping the Finnish people was to act as foster parents to those Finnish children who were most exposed to the adversities of war. The idea to evacuate Finnish children to Swedish families emerged from the private initiative of Maja Sandler, the wife of the then Swedish Minister of Foreign Affairs, Rickard Sandler.

As the Continuation War broke out in June 1941, the plan of a large scale operation for evacuating Finnish children to Sweden was put into action. In Sweden, a voluntary organization called the Support Committee of Help for Finnish Children (henceforth the "Placement Committee") was established, and a large network of

¹The chief part of the documents that this section is based on are available in the Files for The Child Evacuation Scheme during World War II at The National Archives of Finland (NAF). When not specifically mentioned, I refer to Juhani Lomu (1974), who constructs a detailed report on the evacuation scheme based on the documents of NAF.

²The slogan was coined by the author and journalist Olof Lagercrantz, who wrote the pamphlet "Finland's Cause Is Our Cause" and had 600,000 copies printed and distributed to the Swedish civilian population.

families ready to accommodate child evacuees was created.³ Shortly after, negotiations regarding the transfer of children to Sweden started and on September 2, 1941, The Committee for Transporting Finnish Children to Sweden (hereafter called the “Evacuation Committee”) was established in Finland under the auspices of The Ministry of Social Affairs. The Evacuation Committee was granted funding by the Finnish government for organizing the logistics of the evacuation scheme and for covering the travel expenses of the evacuees.⁴ Although the Swedish government covered part of the transportation expenses, the main part of the financial support on the Swedish side came through private fund raising.

The Evacuation Committee designed the evacuation scheme and carried out the major part of the evacuations made between 1941 and 1946.⁵ The official motives for a mass evacuation of children were, as stated by the Evacuation Committee, that children who were particularly exposed to the various adversities of war should be given a better rearing environment. At first, each Finnish county was granted a quota of evacuees, but restricting the selection of participants to the stated quotas proved difficult as fear for air raids spread among the urban population and food became scarce. The original eligibility criteria were the following: 1. Children of relocated Karelian families⁶ 2. Children whose fathers were wounded in battle 3. Children who had lost their home in bombings 4. Children whose father’s had died in war or who had lost their parents in bombings. In January 1942, the criteria were expanded to comprise children from large families, and children whose mothers were working; also children who resided in towns that were potential targets for air raids. This latter criterion applied, in practice, to most eastern and southern towns of Finland, where hence most children were considered eligible. At first the objective

³No financial compensation for accommodating Finnish children was ever promised to the families, and none was ever going to be rewarded either for that matter. In other words, the accommodating of evacuees was based on purely philanthropic grounds.

⁴The word committee is rather misleading in describing both the Finnish and the Swedish organizations, as they cared for all the executive and organizational tasks.

⁵Most evacuations were made in the winter between 1941 and 1942 and in 1944.

⁶Being the border region between Finland and the Soviet Union, Karelia was the region most adversely affected by the war. Roughly 400,000 people, virtually the whole Karelian population, had to be relocated to other regions of Finland already in 1940 as a consequence of the Moscow Peace Treaty between the Soviet Union and Finland, which handed Karelia to the Soviet Union.

was to send preschoolers. A strict age criterion was however not applied in practice due, for instance, to the difficulty to age-discriminate between siblings. Statistics show that roughly half of the children were past school starting age by the time of evacuation.

In Sweden, the Placement Committee established a placement scheme and took over all administrative and financial matters on the Swedish side of the border. Fortunately (for me), documents such as all minutes of both aforementioned committees' meetings and descriptive statistics of the evacuation are stored in the National Archives of both Finland and Sweden. It is thus a fairly simple task to construct a picture of the evacuation scheme and the way the evacuations were conducted. Sections A.1 and A.2 describe the stages of the evacuation from children's "biological" home to their final placement in foster care in Sweden.

The child transfers during the Continuation War can be divided into two waves. During the first wave, from September 1941 to June 1943, 22,398 children were evacuated through the Evacuation Committee. The second wave of evacuations took place in spring 1944, first during the bombings of Helsinki, and later that same spring after a massive Soviet offensive on the Karelian isthmus had begun. During the second evacuation wave, in 1944, 29,268 children, some of which were re-evacuees who had been claimed back in 1943 during a longer period of trench warfare, were evacuated to Sweden. In total 48,628 children were evacuated to Sweden by the Evacuation Committee. In addition to the evacuations supervised by the Evacuation Committee, roughly 10,000-15,000 children were sent to Sweden independently from the official evacuation program through private bilateral organizations and to family and acquaintances. In total, it is estimated that roughly 65,000-70,000 children spent between one and five years (on average two years) in foster care in Swedish families during World War II. The total amount of evacuees equals the size of one Finnish cohort during the 1930s.

In this study, I restrict the analysis to the children who were evacuated within the official evacuation scheme, i.e., the population for the study consists of those 48,628 children who were evacuated by the Evacuation Committee. Sections A.1 and A.2 show that the anecdotal evidence on the course of events that took place

between separation from the biological parents to the final placement in foster families supports the assumption of random assignment of foster parents with respect to all background characteristics except for gender and age at evacuation.

The description of the events during the transportation to the final destination suggests that the children were processed anonymously according to the information provided on an identification plate hanging around their neck, i.e., an assigned running number, name and gender, and re-shuffled randomly into smaller groups at several stages of the evacuation. By the time the children reached the last leg of their transportation, the inequalities in clothing, cleanness, and nutrition are supposed to have been levelled out, and thus to have made any inference of social background based on appearance difficult.

The Evacuation from Finland to Sweden

A large organization was set up on the foundations of the already established war time logistic organizations and volunteer institutions to carry out the evacuations.⁷ The organization made itself known through nationwide broadcasting and advertising in local newspapers. Headquarters were established in Helsinki, employing a large administrative staff. The Evacuation Committee set up and funded regional subsidiary offices that were largely run by volunteers such as local nurses and representatives from Christian and feminist organizations and political parties. The Evacuation Committee emphasized the importance of their unconditional possession of control over the evacuations in order to avoid incompleteness in the registries of evacuated children. After the evacuations began, in September 1941, the county offices were converted into evacuation centers handling the selection process, transportation arrangements, documentation, accounting, correspondence between the evacuees and their families, and advertising of the evacuation scheme in the local media. Absorption centers were set up near the ports of Turku and Vaasa, from where the evacuees were shipped to Sweden and in the border towns of Tornio and

⁷The Civilian Service of Finland contributed with an already existing network of volunteers. This organization was founded in 1939 for the purpose of distributing aid packages received from foreign organizations.

Kemi, from where the evacuees crossed the border by railway. All travel expenses were covered by the Evacuation Committee.

Parents who had heard of the evacuation program through mass media or local authorities first filed an application to the local evacuation office.⁸ When the application was approved, a health check at the local hospital followed and an identification document including a photograph was issued.⁹ The documents were sent to the local evacuation office where the child's file was put into a queue awaiting for information on the region's quota for the following evacuation round. As soon as the headquarters of the organization gave information of each region's quota for the next round, the county office gathered the children - according to the ordered date of application approval - to the nearest railway station from where they were sent to the absorption centers. The children were not allowed to carry any money and their ration cards (most grocery products were rationed in Finland during the war) needed to be handed in before departure.¹⁰ The children brought with them a franked envelope, which the foster parents that would be assigned in Sweden, were urged to post to the Finnish county office with notification of the child's arrival and their name and address, to enable correspondence between the biological parents and their child. Upon arrival at the absorption center, a brief health check was conducted and information on the children was entered into an evacuee register. Each child was assigned a running number according to arrival order and given an identification plate to carry around the neck.

Until 1944, most transports were conducted by boat due to the capacity constraints of the highly congested Swedish railways. Also air planes were occasionally used during the winter season when an impenetrable ice layer prevented shipping. From 1944 onwards, train was considered the safest way of transportation due to the hydro-mines spread around the Finnish Gulf.

Based on the above description of the evacuation, it is plausible that the evac-

⁸If the father was on duty, the mother could file the application without his consent. However, in case the father should disapprove, he could have his child returned immediately.

⁹It took on average 21 days from the time of filing the application to embarking the evacuation transit to Sweden (author's calculation).

¹⁰This made any form of bribing of the officials difficult for the children.

uation created randomness in the order in which the children were transported to Sweden. The strongest arguments in favor of random order of evacuation with respect to any background characteristics are that the children were processed according to a running number upon the arrival to the absorption centers (and boarded the vehicle of transportation accordingly). Also the fact that, on the ships, complete registers of the children on board were put together en route suggests that the separation into small groups upon embarkment is likely to have taken place in a haphazard fashion. The fact that no money or ration cards were allowed on the trip is important for the sake of the random assignment argument in that it suggests that the children could not possibly have affected the placement by bribing the officials. Furthermore, the biological parents' unawareness of both the final destination and the identity of the foster parents, for which the request for identity and address of the foster parents in the form of a franked envelope is a concrete indicator, made any possible manipulation of the placement difficult.

The Placement to Foster Families in Sweden

In Sweden, the structure of the Placement Committee was literally a mirror image of the Evacuation Committee on the Finnish side. Its main office was located in Stockholm and each county had its own local committee led by an authorized representative who was in charge of the placement of the children into families. In practice, large local volunteer organizations conducted the major part of the placement, and the provincial offices handled registries of children and other administrative issues. Quarantine centers were established in geographically strategic Swedish towns, usually the capital of the county.

At first, as the contingents arrived in Swedish territory, they were taken to sanitary centers, which were located in the near proximity of the arrival port or station (Stockholm, Umeå and Haparanda), where brief health checks and delousing was conducted.¹¹ At the sanitary centers, the contingents were split into smaller groups

¹¹A common delousing method widely practiced with child evacuees was to shave their heads.

which were placed in quarantine centers for a week¹². They went through careful health checks to make sure they were not carrying any contagious diseases before being assigned a county of destination and finally a foster family. Although medical issues were of first priority, much weight was put on nutrition and inventory of the children's luggage. Clothes were provided to poorly equipped children, and all children were cleaned thoroughly. When leaving the quarantine centers, the children were separated into smaller groups and transported via the county offices - where the group would be re-shuffled into smaller units - to their final destinations.

Little is documented about the final stage of the evacuation, that is, the placement in foster families, and thus one is principally referred to anecdotal evidence as recalled or retold by the evacuees.¹³ Regarding the different stages of the journey until the local Swedish provincial offices, anecdotal evidence conforms unusually well with the information in official documents. The final stage of the trip to the eventual placement seems to have been completed in three different ways: 1. when several children arrived at the same time to a community, the distribution of children to foster families would take place at some temporary lodging, e.g. the local parish house or school premises, according to a first-come first-served process,¹⁴ 2. in sparsely populated areas, or in areas where only one family was awaiting a child, the assigned family would receive the child on a bus stop or train station without any possibilities to affect the choice of child, 3. in some cases the local ombudsman for the placement committee, often the local priest or school principal, assigned the children to families at their arrival on the train or bus station.

¹²The children who were evacuated towards the end of the war in 1944 were generally in worse health and thus the quarantine period was prolonged to 14 days in spring 1944.

¹³I make use of a compilation of 135 short stories of recollections by the evacuees edited by Leila Lehtiranta (1996).

¹⁴Pirkko Bergman, a one time child evacuee, recalls "we (the children) were taken to a room and were told to sit on chairs with the identification plates visibly displayed. A group of people rushed in and among the first ones was a tall man who examined me, wrote something indicating "reserved" on the parcel I was carrying and continued to examine others. Others showed interest in me but noticed the reservation sign on the package. The tall man, who turned out to be the priest of the village of Åsunden, Gösta Rosen, returned to pick me up together with another child, whom, I found out upon our arrival in the village, he had chosen for himself, I was assigned to a neighbouring family" (Lehtiranta 1996).

The description of the events during the journey to the final destination suggests that the children were processed anonymously according to the information provided on an identification plate hanging around their neck, i.e., an assigned running number, name and gender, and sorted randomly at several stages of the journey. By the time the children reached the last leg of their transportation, the inequalities in clothing, cleanness, and nutrition are supposed to have been leveled out, and thus to have made any inference of social background based on appearance difficult.

The aforementioned documentation provides credible support for the assumption that no sorting of the children was made based on their background characteristics. Casual evidence based on first hand accounts by the evacuees also supports this random nature of the assignment. There are however two caveats to the random assignment assumption that point towards some selection based on demographic characteristics. First, many of the numerous first hand accounts show that siblings would end up in families living close to each other.¹⁵ One reasonably innocuous reason for this is that siblings, already at the beginning of the journey, were assigned consecutive running numbers. However, it is almost equally plausible, that the officials were trying to arrange it so that siblings would be placed in the same region. Second, anecdotal evidence also reveals that foster parents were, in some cases, able to present preferences regarding children's age and gender.¹⁶ Thus it is essential to control for these characteristics in order to exclude sorting into foster families.

B Variable Definitions: (Online only - Not for publication)

School track choice

¹⁵Some of the many first person accounts provide evidence that siblings could be separated from each other at any stage of the journey.

¹⁶Numerous first person accounts show that the failure to meet the foster parents-to-be's qualifications seldom led to the rejection of the child. Marja Leskipohja, aged only 9 months at the time of evacuation, recalls: "my foster parents have later told me that they were hoping to host a boy but as they arrived to pick up the child I was the only one left of the contingent that had arrived to Karlstad" (Lehtiranta, 1996).

At the time around World War II Finland had a two-track school system. In this system, cohorts attended uniform education only the first four grades of elementary school, after which they were divided into two tracks that differed both in terms of content of education, as well as eligibility to further education. The comprehensive school reform was implemented between 1972 and 1977, imposing a uniform academic curriculum for the entire cohort until age 16. School starting age was seven years so the tracking was made at age eleven. After fourth grade of elementary school all pupils had to choose whether to apply to general secondary school, or to continue in elementary school. Those who continued another four years in elementary school, were restricted to vocational professions, whereas those who were admitted to junior secondary school often continued to upper secondary school and were eligible to apply to tertiary education. A more detailed description of the Finnish two-track system is found in Tuomas Pekkarinen, Roope Uusitalo, and Sari Kerr (2009). The surveyees are asked to indicate their highest completed education on a five class categorization: 1. Elementary school 2. Lower secondary school or civic school 3. Vocational school 4. Upper secondary school 5. Tertiary (University) education. Educational attainment is also obtained from census data of Statistics Finland. I collapse the 5 classes into a dummy variable measuring whether the person continued to secondary school after the fourth grade of civic school. Classes 2, 4 and 5 obtain value one and classes 1 and 3 obtain value zero.

University degree

The aforementioned five class categorization of education is collapsed into a dummy variable measuring whether the person completed a tertiary education. Class 5 obtain value one and all other classes obtain value zero.

Foster family's socioeconomic status

Socioeconomic status of the foster family is based on father's occupation. In the survey, the respondents are asked to report their foster father's occupations. These are coded into the 1,506 occupational categories of the four-digit International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO) released by International Labor Organization (ILO) in 1968. The motivation for an occupation-based measure is that parent's occupation is arguably easier to recall as compared to parent's income or

education. This holds, in particular, for questions on socioeconomic characteristics of the foster parents, with whom respondents only spent part of their childhood (and have not necessarily been in touch with since the war ended). The occupation-based measure used for father's socioeconomic status is the International Socio-Economic Index of occupational status (SEI). The SEI scale is derived by Ganzeboom et al. (1992) in the spirit of the Duncan index, (Otis D. Duncan 1961), so that a weighted sum of the average schooling and the average income levels of occupations determine their status. The scores are rescaled to a range from sixteen (the lower end) to ninety (the higher end) (See Ganzeboom et al. (1992) for the algorithm for estimating their scaled SEI variable).

Although foster mother's occupation is available from the survey responses, the low degree of labor force participation among married women in the Nordic countries during World War II (70 percent of the foster mother's were housewives) hinders me from using it in the analysis without seriously altering the sample size.

Biological family's socioeconomic status

Socioeconomic status of the biological family is calculated analogously as for the foster family. Biological father's occupation is also available in the preintervention government records, i.e., the aforementioned evacuee cards. Survey data on biological father's occupation is however relied on primarily for the construction of biological father's SEI (only missing survey answers on biological father's occupation are replaced with occupation as reported in the evacuee cards).

Swedish proficiency prior to evacuation

There is information on proficiency in Swedish from three sources: the evacuation card registry, Populations Register Center in Finland (PRCF), and the survey. The evacuation card recorded "Proficiency in Swedish prior to evacuation", whereas the survey and PRCF recorded native language. The correlation between the survey answer and the information native language from the records of PRCF is 0.84 whereas the correlation between the evacuation card variable and information from PRCF is 0.68.

Mother's labor force participation

All surveyees whose mothers were reported to have been at home or housewives

were coded as zero and the ones with a reported occupation were coded as one.

Family lived in town

The information on whether the biological family lived within an urban area (coded as one) was coded based on the reported municipality of birth derived from the evacuation cards for the evacuees and the Populations Register Center for the nonevacuees.

Non-differentiation between foster children and foster siblings

The surveyees are asked whether the foster family differentiated between the inputs to foster children and foster siblings (differentiation is coded as zero).

C Additional Results (Online only - not for publication)

TABLE C-1-ESTIMATING A NONLINEAR MODEL WITH INTERACTIONS

	School track	School track	University	University
	choice	choice		
Foster father's SEI	0.0036 (0.0026)	0.0118* (0.0069)	-0.0009 (0.0021)	0.0006 (0.0056)
Biological father's SEI	0.0089*** (0.0031)	0.0029 (0.0065)	0.0040 (0.0028)	-0.0046 (0.0052)
(Foster father's SEI*Biological father's SEI)/100	-0.0022 (0.0062)	-0.0017 (0.0067)	0.0053 (0.0061)	0.0043 (0.0061)
(Foster father's SEI) ² /100		-0.0087 (0.0071)		-0.0013 (0.0052)
(Biological father's SEI) ² /100		0.0064 (0.0076)		0.0097 (0.0059)
Observations	599	599	599	599

Notes: OLS coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. An intercept, a gender dummy, 21 regional dummies, and 18 cohort dummies are included in each regression. Sampling weights are used.

*** Significant at the 1 percent level.

** Significant at the 5 percent level.

* Significant at the 10 percent level.

D Test for Association between Identification for Survey and Positive Response and Background Characteristics (Online only - Not for publication)

TABLE D-1-RESPONSE RATE FOR THE MAILINGS

Mailing to the evacuees			
	Sent	Responded	Response rate
Original draw	1157	752	64.9
Identified from comparison group	171	135	78.9
Total	1328	887	67.7
Mailing to the nonevacuees*			
Nonevacuees	3097	1749	56.4

*The 171 evacuees identified through the matched comparison group are excluded.

TABLE D-2-TEST FOR SELECTIVE IDENTIFICATION OF TREATED SAMPLE
 UNITS BY THE POPULATION REGISTER CENTER OF FINLAND

Probit model with dependent variable: dummy for sample unit identified by PRCF	
Age at evacuation	-0.009** (0.004)
Proficiency in Swedish	-0.055* (0.032)
Female	0.050** (0.022)
Family relocated from war zone	-0.012 (0.028)
Father wounded in war	0.001 (0.047)
Father died in war	-0.028 (0.040)
Subject to air raids	0.040 (0.036)
Family lived in town (town=1)	0.018 (0.024)
Observations	1931
F-test, background point estimates = 0	15.07
$p > \chi^2$	0.058

Notes: The entries in Table D-2 represent the marginal effects of a probit model evaluated at the means of the independent variables. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. All right hand side variables are pulled from the evacuee cards in the Child evacuee records at the National Archives. The whole sample drawn from the evacuee card register with nonmissing values on the relevant variables is included. A probit model is estimated with the dependent variable taking value one if the observation was identified by the Population Register Center, Finland. The marginal effects are evaluated at the mean of age at evacuation.

*** Significant at the 1 percent level.

** Significant at the 5 percent level.

* Significant at the 10 percent level.

TABLE D-3-TEST FOR SELECTIVE RESPONSE TO SURVEY
WITH RESPECT TO PRE-INTERVENTION CHARACTERISTICS

Probit model with dependent variable: dummy for response
to survey questionnaire

Age at evacuation	-0.001 (0.005)
Swedish speaking	-0.019 (0.041)
Female	0.048* (0.028)
Family relocated from war zone	0.003 (0.034)
Father wounded in war	-0.105* (0.061)
Father died in war	0.038 (0.049)
Subject to air raids	0.088** (0.042)
Family lived in town (town=1)	0.040 (0.030)
Observations	1157
F-test, background point estimates = 0	13.29
$p > \chi^2$	0.10

Notes: The entries in Table D-3 represent the marginal effects of a probit model evaluated at the means of the independent variables. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. The dependent variable taking value one for a positive response on the original survey or the reminder. All right hand side variables are pulled from the evacuee cards in the Child evacuee records at the National Archives. I include all observations that are identified and to whom we have sent the survey questionnaire.

*** Significant at the 1 percent level.

** Significant at the 5 percent level.

* Significant at the 10 percent level.

TABLE D-4-COMPARISON OF BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS BETWEEN
SAMPLE OF RETURNED EVACUEES AND ADOPTED EVACUEES

	Children who returned Mean	Adopted by foster family Mean
Both parents alive=1	0.81 (0.40)	0.55 (0.50)
SEI-score of biological father	37.67 (14.96)	30.97 (11.72)
Family relocated from war zone	0.26 (.44)	0.24 (0.43)
Single-parent household=1	0.01 (0.11)	0.09 (0.29)
Age at evacuation (months)	65.60 (30.74)	51.19 (28.70)
Observations	887	120

Notes: Standard deviations are reported in parentheses.

E Descriptive Statistics and Robustness Tests (Online only - Not for publication)

TABLE E-1-SOCIOECONOMIC CLASS-FREQUENCIES

	Foster parents	Biological parents
Professionals, higher-grade	99 (13.60)	66 (7.58)
Professionals, lower-grade and technicians, higher-grade	95 (13.05)	53 (6.08)
Routine non-manual, higher-grade	3 (0.41)	13 (1.49)
Routine non-manual, lower grade	6 (0.82)	12 (1.38)
Small employers	14 (1.92)	8 (0.92)
Self-employed workers (nonprof.)	60 (8.24)	57 (6.54)
Farmers	321 (44.09)	87 (9.99)
Technicians, lower-grade, supervisors of manual workers	13 (1.79)	41 (4.71)
Skilled manual workers	56 (7.69)	289 (33.18)
Nonskilled manual workers	35 (4.81)	223 (25.60)
Agricultural workers	26 (3.57)	22 (2.53)
Observations	728 (100.00)	871 (100.00)

Notes: Entries represent the number of families belonging to each socioeconomic class of the eleven-category discrete class scheme by Robert Erikson, John Goldthorpe, and Lucienne Portocarero (1979). In this classification, class is determined by the employment relation, and occupation (based on the ISCO68 occupational code) is used as an indicator of that relation. I apply the standard module generated by Paul M. De Graaf, Ganzeboom, and Matthijs Kalmijn (1989) to derive the categories from ISCO-68. The fractions are presented in parentheses as percentage of total.

TABLE E-2-SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR SAMPLES GROUPED BY
SWEDISH PROFICIENCY BEFORE EVACUATION

	Evacuees, no		Evacuees, with	
	proficiency in Swedish*		proficiency in Swedish*	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
<i>Panel A. Schooling outcomes</i>				
School track choice	0.30	(0.46)	0.55	(0.50)
University	0.11	(0.31)	0.26	(0.44)
<i>Panel B. Demographic and program characteristics</i>				
Female	0.55	(0.50)	0.55	(0.50)
Age at evacuation (months)	65.14	(30.48)	68.13	(32.01)
Duration of evacuation (months)	26.82	(15.57)	22.00	(12.82)
<i>Panel C. Biological family characteristics</i>				
SEI-score of biological father	36.24	(13.81)	43.78	(18.55)
SEI-score of biological father (as filed in evacuee card preintervention)	35.38	(13.54)	42.88	(17.74)
Relocated from war zone* (Karelian families)	0.31	(0.46)	0.03	(0.18)
Father died in war*	0.11	(0.31)	0.05	(0.22)
Father wounded in war*	0.05	(0.22)	0.08	(0.27)
Subject to air raids*	0.14	(0.35)	0.11	(0.31)
Family lived in town (town=1)*	0.58	(0.49)	0.74	(0.44)
Parents divorced	0.12	(0.33)	0.15	(0.36)
Mother's labor force participation	0.69	(0.46)	0.79	(0.41)
<i>Panel D. Foster family characteristics</i>				
SEI-score of foster father	39.60	(17.86)	45.74	(19.12)
Non-differentiation btw foster child and foster siblings	0.91	(0.28)	0.93	(0.25)
Number of observations	599		117	

Notes: The reported number of observations refers to the observations with non-missing values in the key variables used in the benchmark estimations in Table 3. For the variables marked with an asterisk, the entries are pulled out from the evacuation cards, i.e., preintervention government records. The rest of the data was collected through the survey. In cases where data on Swedish proficiency was missing in the preintervention government records we use data on native language from the Populations Register Center in Finland.

TABLE E-3-SENSITIVITY ANALYSES

Dependent variable:	School track choice		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Foster father's SEI	0.0021 (0.0013)	0.0020 (0.0012)	0.0019 (0.0012)
Biological father's SEI		0.0087*** (0.0016)	0.0082*** (0.0017)
Parents divorced			0.0777 (0.0778)
Father died in war			-0.0411 (0.0693)
Father wounded in war			0.1240 (0.1158)
Family relocated from war zone			-0.170** (0.0692)
Family lived in town			0.0229 (0.0471)
Subject to air raids			-0.0105 (0.0658)
Mother's labor force participation			-0.0247 (0.0448)
Observations	469	469	469

Notes: OLS coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. An intercept, a gender dummy, 18 cohort dummies, and 21 regional dummies are included in each regression. Sampling weights are used in all regressions.

TABLE E-4-TESTING FOR RECALL BIAS

	Vocational	Academic	Age at evacuation			
	track	track	<24 (months)	24-47	48-83	84≤
Recall biological father's occupation correctly (yes=1) (government records vs. survey)	0.861 (0.35)	0.871 (0.34)				
Recall foster father's occupation (non-missing=1)	0.802 (0.40)	0.838 (0.37)	0.750 (0.44)	0.783 (0.41)	0.819 (0.385)	0.842 (0.37)

Notes: The entries represent the means of dummy variables. Standard deviations are reported in parentheses. The first row refers to the discrepancy between biological father's occupation as reported in the government records and as reported by the evacuee in the survey as of 2005. The second row refers to a dummy variable on whether the evacuee reported a non-missing entry for foster father's occupation in the survey.