



**Strengthening the Pedagogic Civil Society: a study on shared responsibilities in childrearing between parents and neighbors**

Master Thesis: Youth, Education & Society

Ruby van Vliet (6521215)

Date: 19 June, 2020

Supervisor: Dr. Eva van de Weijer-Bergsma

Second Assessor: Dr. Pascale Zantvliet

### Abstract

The numbers of families depending on professional care regarding mental health and childrearing keep growing. A solution was found in strengthening the Pedagogic Civil Society by increasing shared childrearing responsibilities among parents and neighbors. This research provides theoretical foundations to develop interventions that aim to mobilize parents and neighbors to share childrearing responsibilities. With a questionnaire among 76 Dutch parents, the relationship between a strong social network with their neighbors and practices of shared childrearing responsibilities was studied. In addition, the relationship between the strength of their social network and the actions that can be done to share childrearing responsibilities was researched. With six in-depth interviews the parents' personal motives, beliefs and concerns regarding shared childrearing responsibilities with their neighbors were studied. It was found that certain childrearing responsibilities can be shared between parents and neighbors notwithstanding the strength of their social network. However, for other childrearing responsibilities to be shared, a stronger social network between parents and neighbors is desired. The results of this study implicated that similarities between parenting styles of parents and neighbors were found to be an important predictor to sharing childrearing responsibilities.

*Keywords:* shared childrearing responsibilities, social network parents, neighbors, Pedagogic Civil Society

### Samenvatting

Het aantal gezinnen dat afhankelijk is van professionele zorg op het gebied van geestelijke gezondheid en opvoeding blijft groeien. Een oplossing is gevonden om de Pedagogische Civil Society te versterken door de gedeelde opvoedingsverantwoordelijkheden onder ouders en buren te vergroten. Dit onderzoek biedt theoretische fundering om interventies te ontwikkelen die tot doel hebben ouders en buren te mobiliseren om verantwoordelijkheden op het gebied van opvoeding te delen. Met een enquête onder 76 Nederlandse ouders is de relatie tussen een sterk sociaal netwerk met hun buren en gedeelde opvoedingsverantwoordelijkheden onderzocht. Daarnaast werd de relatie onderzocht tussen de sterkte van hun sociale netwerk en de acties die kunnen worden ondernomen om verantwoordelijkheden op het gebied van opvoeding te delen. Met zes diepte-interviews werden de persoonlijke motieven, overtuigingen en zorgen van ouders over gedeelde opvoedingsverantwoordelijkheden met hun buren, ondervraagd. Er werd vastgesteld dat bepaalde opvoedingsverantwoordelijkheden

kunnen worden gedeeld tussen ouders en buren, ondanks de sterkte van hun sociale netwerk. Echter om andere opvoedingsverantwoordelijkheden te delen, is een sterker sociaal netwerk tussen ouders en buren gewenst. De resultaten van deze studie impliceren dat overeenkomsten tussen opvoedingsstijlen van ouders en buren een belangrijke voorspeller blijken te zijn voor het delen van opvoedingsverantwoordelijkheden.

*Sleutelwoorden:* gedeelde opvoedingsverantwoordelijkheden, sociale netwerken ouders, buren, Pedagogische Civil Society

### **Introduction**

Over the last decade, the numbers of families depending on professional care regarding mental health and childrearing keep growing (Hermanns, 2009; Jager-Vreugdenhil, 2012; Van Yperen, Van de Maat, & Prakken, 2019). There has been an increase in children and parents seeking professional care from 50% in 2009 to 2018. Although the amount of youth care facilities has grown to provide room for this increased consumption of youth care, waiting lists are still present; one out of five children has to wait more than two months before starting treatment (Hermanns, 2009; MediQuest, 2017). Because coping with these growing numbers has become unaffordable, the Dutch government has changed its policy (Van Yperen, et al., 2019), requiring a decrease in government responsibilities in parents' childrearing practices and an increase in sharing these responsibilities with families' social environment. This policy change is in line with research that indicates that childrearing should be the responsibility of the wider social community surrounding families (Hermanns, 2009; Jager-Vreugdenhil, 2012; Van Yperen, et al., 2019). With the current study I want to explore opportunities to strengthen the communal involvement for childrearing practices, by mobilizing citizens to share childrearing responsibilities.

Relevant research on shared childrearing responsibilities indicates six developmental domains for understanding children's social interactions with people from their environment (Kesselring, De Winter, Horjus, & Van Yperen, 2016). Firstly, the social domain theory defines three different domains of social knowledge. The moral domain refers to the development of ethical values and children learning the universally accepted rules about right and wrong. In the social-conventional domain, children from three years and older learn that rules may differ per social context, such as between families or peer groups. In the personal domain, children become conscious of issues and choices that influence them personally, for example their choice of clothes, or what they do in their spare time. Secondly, Kesselring et al. (2016), identified three additional domains 'in order to cover all childrearing domains that may be delicate in light of sharing parenting responsibilities'. Stimulation of (school) learning relates to adults' involvement in cognitive learning situations, like school tasks, or other developmental tasks, like toilet training. Religious and sexual upbringing refers to the development of knowledge on religion, lifestyle attitudes and sexual development. Lastly, setting limits, meaning children learn what boundaries are and how to cope with these. In this research I will use these six developmental domains to identify the different responsibilities that belong to childrearing.

Bronfenbrenner's (1979) theory of social ecology provides a framework on communal involvement in the socialization process of children. The theory defines four basic structures in the social environment of children: the microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem and macrosystem. Each structure clusters different social groups by their differences in the distance to the child. The macrosystem describes the overarching culture that influences the child's development. The exosystem is about the links between the social settings surrounding the child. The mesosystem refers to the interconnections between the social groups of the microsystem. In the microsystem are the social groups that are most immediately connected to the child, for example family, peers, schools and the neighborhood. So, neighbors are involved in activities and relationships with the child in small settings and in this environment, children learn by gaining real life experiences and observations (Berns, 2013). Compared to the other groups of the microsystem, neighbors offer a unique combination of aspects. Namely, they live in close distance of the family and the contact is informal and voluntary.

A strong Pedagogic Civil Society (PCS) is a community of people with a strong social network who take care of each other, correct negative behavior and offer informal social control (De Winter, 2011). Thus, when parents and other adults carry the responsibility for the childrearing together with their social network, they form a strong PCS. Neighbors belong to the core of the PCS, because of the unique aspects of neighbors, namely, living close by and informal and voluntary contact (Barrera, 2000; Kesselring, De Winter, Horjus, Van de Schoot, & Van Yperen, 2012; Van Yperen & Van Woudenberg, 2011). Thus, a strong social network with their neighbors can offer children and adults a sense of belonging, companionship and mutual support (Lerner, Almerigi, Theokas, & Lerner, 2005). This contributes to more self-confidence, more resilience and the opportunity to relieve stress. As a result, shared childrearing responsibilities among neighbors can be an important protective factor against child maltreatment (Garbarino & Sherman, 1980), depression (Benson, 2003; Wickrama & Bryant, 2003) and youth crime (Junger-Tas, 2008; Sampson et al., 1997).

Several indicators may predict a strong PCS in the neighborhood, meaning because of their strong social network, parents and their neighbors share childrearing responsibilities. Firstly, neighbors are more likely to build a strong social network when the neighborhood offers the opportunity to meet each other (Berns, 2013). For example, at recreational facilities or in the way houses and streets are arranged. In addition, research among African American youth and their parents found that when they feel safe in their neighborhood, they are also more likely to engage in outside activities (Kegler et al., 2005). For the strength of the PCS,

meeting each other and engaging in outside activities means more informal social control and companionship. Secondly, Bould's (2003) research among white, middle class residents from the northeastern and mid-Atlantic United States, found the amount of time people intend to remain in the neighborhood is related to the effort neighbors put in to establish a close relationship and share childrearing responsibilities. Thirdly, with this research, Bould (2003) differentiated between caring and non-caring (suburban) neighborhoods, meaning whether the neighborhoods shared more or less childrearing responsibilities. Accordingly, when comparing the neighborhoods, the distinguishing characteristic was that none of the caring neighborhoods emphasized privacy, implying that neighborhoods where privacy has little value allow for more intimate contact. Lastly, in a survey among U.S. adults, 63% stated that they either knew only some of the names of the neighbors that live close to them or did not know any of their closest neighbors' names at all (Child Welfare League of America, 1999). Scales et al. (2004) use this argument to explain the results of their survey where 1,425 U.S. adults expressed that it is important to know the parents' childrearing values before they would participate in the childrearing responsibilities. The qualitative research of Kesselring et al. (2016) among 37 Dutch parents confirms this finding, as it appears that for Dutch parents as well, it is important they share similar norms and values with the other adult, before they are willing to accept involvement in their childrearing responsibilities. It is not yet known if and how in the Dutch society a strong social network between parents and especially their neighbors relates to sharing childrearing responsibilities in the six developmental childrearing domains.

Research indicates four actions used to share the responsibilities that relate to parents' and neighbors' personal motives, beliefs and concerns (Kesselring, De Winter, Horjus, & Van Yperen, 2013). Firstly, parents' and children's confidence can grow when they receive emotional support, like reassurance or comfort (Barrera, 2000). Secondly, other adults can bring parents some relief by spending time with their child, taking the child to school or babysitting the child, referred to as instrumental support (Andresen & Telleen, 1992). Thirdly, parents might need informational support, like advice on parenting issues or by receiving feedback to strengthen their coping skills (Barrera, 2000). Lastly, when other adults help with the moral upbringing of the child by, for example, being a positive role model, this is labeled as normative support (MacPhee et al., 1996). To develop an intervention that aims to strengthen the PCS in the neighborhood it is important to know how the strength of the social network relates to the four actions. This has not yet been researched.

It is an inescapable element of a strong PCS that it cannot be imposed with a top down approach (De Winter, 2011). Therefore parents' and their neighbors' personal motives, beliefs and concerns on sharing childrearing responsibilities need to be identified (Kesselring et al., 2016). In a questionnaire with over one thousand participants, 78.6% of Dutch parents responded positively to the statement that neighbors can help out with the upbringing of their children (Kesselring et al., 2012). Recent research among 37 Dutch parents provides insight into the attitudes of parents towards sharing their childrearing responsibilities with other adults in general (Kesselring et al., 2016). For example, parents expect other adults to correct their child when the child breaks a moral rule. Parents find it can be enriching to involve other adults in the development of their child's social-conventional domain. Yet, other adults should not forcefully impose their rules on the child. Other adults' contribution to the personal domain can be experienced as positive, as long as this is done through positive stimulation and without judgement. Parents find it important to decide for themselves when their child is ready to learn a new task, but playful and spontaneous learning seems to be accepted. According to parents, other adults can enrich children's worldview or be a positive role model when experiences in religious or sexual upbringing are shared. Parents stated that they are positive about other adults giving a suitable, mild sanction when their child misbehaves, and the other adult wants to set limits. This research provides interesting insight on parents' attitudes towards shared childrearing responsibilities with other adults, which is important to create an intervention with a bottom-up approach. Yet, studies on parents' and neighbors' personal motives, beliefs and concerns when 'the other adult' is specified as a neighbor does not yet provide sufficient theoretical foundation to develop such an intervention (Kesselring et al., 2016).

With this research I want to contribute to a theoretical foundation to develop interventions that aim to strengthen the PCS by mobilizing parents and neighbors to share childrearing responsibilities. To find if and how the Dutch society shows similarities with earlier research, I will first investigate the following sub question: Does a strong social network between Dutch parents and their neighbors relate to sharing childrearing responsibilities in the six developmental domains? In addition, I will research the second sub question: Can a relationship be found between the strength of the social network and the four childrearing actions? Accordingly, to provide sufficient theoretical foundation to develop such an intervention the third sub question of this study is: What are Dutch parents' and neighbors' personal motives, beliefs and concerns regarding shared childrearing responsibilities in the six developmental domains? Regarding the nature of the first two

questions, they will be studied using a questionnaire. The third question asks for more exploratory methods, therefore in-depth interviews will be held. Thus, in this mixed methods research, an explanatory sequential design will be used, in which the qualitative data will be used to explain the results of the quantitative data.

## Method

### Quantitative research

**Participants.** For the period of one month I recruited parents of primary school children in three ways, using voluntary response sampling methods. I distributed the questionnaire by e-mail to parents that make use of the services of a daycare center in Utrecht, offering placement for about 650 children between the ages of 0 to 13. I posted a link to the questionnaire on the Oudersonline parenting forum. I distributed the link to the questionnaire via social media pages (Facebook and LinkedIn).

A total amount of 84 participants filled out the questionnaire. Eight respondents did not sign the consent form or did not respond to all items, hence, they were excluded from the analysis. Table 1 shows the sample characteristics of the 76 participants that were included in the analysis. All data was treated anonymously, personal data was saved separately from the responses.

**Table 1**

*Sample Characteristics Questionnaire (N = 76)*

Variable	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Parents in household	1 Parent		2 Parents					
	7	9	69	91				
Country of birth	The Netherlands		Other					
	69	91	7	9				
Current province	Utrecht		Other		Unknown <sup>a</sup>			
	45	59	30	40	1	1		
Gender	Female		Male		Unknown <sup>a</sup>			
	61	80	14	18	1	1		
Age	20 - 30		31 - 40		> 41			
	7	9	39	51	30	40		



Number of children	1		2		3		4	
	31	41	27	36	11	14	7	9
Education	MBO		HBO		University		Other	
	7	9	39	51	29	38	1	1

*Note.*  $f$  = frequency.

<sup>a</sup> Participant did not want to specify.

**Measuring instruments.** All items of the questionnaire, except one, utilized a 4-point Likert scale, as follows: 1) strongly agree, 2) agree, 3) disagree, 5) strongly disagree. The other item utilized a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer and was recoded, into scale, no = 1, yes = 4. In addition, participants were questioned on background characteristics. The questionnaire can be found in Appendix 1

To measure the strength of the social network between the respondent and his or her neighbors I used a ten item Likert scale. The scale was developed from the theoretical constructs described in the introduction section, namely, opportunities to engage in outside activities (Berns, 2013; Kegler et al., 2005), the amount of time people intend to remain in the neighborhood (Bould, 2003), value attached to privacy, shared childrearing norms and values (Kesselring, et. al., 2016; Scales et al., 2004). The internal consistence was proved by a Cronbach’s alpha of .84. Examples of items are: “I think my neighbors and I have similar ideas of how to respond when a child does not listen”, and “I live in a safe neighborhood”.

I developed the items to measure childrearing responsibilities in the different domains based on the examples of the focus group interview given in the research of Kesselring, et al. (2016). Examples of these items are: “I want my neighbors to address my child about his or her behavior” (moral domain), “I like it when my neighbors inspire my child to a new hobby” (personal domain), and “I don't want my neighbors to interfere with my child's school performance” (stimulation of learning). I recoded negative items and a high score for the item is indicative of a positive attitude. To measure the moral domain, the personal domain, stimulation of (school) learning and setting limits, two items were used. For the social-conventional domain three items were used. For religious and sexual upbringing one item was used. Literature did not provide enough theory on how to design a sufficient question on sexual upbringing, therefore I did not develop an item about this construct.

Based on the literature of Andresen and Telleen (1992) and Barrera (2000) I developed five questions about childrearing actions. For emotional support, two items were

used: “If needed, I would want my neighbors to comfort my child” and “If needed, I would like my neighbors to comfort me”, because this action has a different effect when child or parent directed. For all other actions one item was used. For example: “When needed, I would like to receive tips and advice from my neighbors about childrearing” (informational support).

**Data analysis.** The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25 was used to provide the descriptive statistics and frequencies of the data. In addition, I did a correlational analysis using Spearman’s rho to examine whether a strong social network between parents and their neighbors is related to their willingness to share childrearing responsibilities, using the strength of the social network as independent and the domains of childrearing responsibilities as dependent variables. This was done to answer the first sub question. In addition, I did similar correlation analyses to examine whether the childrearing actions provide additional explanations for the findings of this research, using the strength of the social network as independent and the childrearing actions as dependent variables.

**Qualitative research**

**Participants.** In total, I invited seven parents to participate in individual interviews to contribute to this research. One parent declined, therefore the total sample consisted of six participants. I interviewed five participants with an online video-call. One participant received open questions by e-mail and audiotaped the answers. I used convenience sampling methods by approaching four parents from my network and two other parents that were introduced by another participant (snowball sampling method). Table 1 shows their sample characteristics.

**Table 2**

*Sample Characteristics Interview (N = 6)*

Characteristic	Resp. 1	Resp. 2	Resp. 3	Resp. 4	Resp. 5	Resp. 6
Gender	Female	Female	Male	Male	Female	Female
Age*	34	33	65	37	38	44
Caretakers in household	2	2	2	3	1	3
Education	HBO	HBO	HBO	HBO	MBO	HBO
Age of children*	3, 10	1, 3	0.5, 33	2, 5, 7	8	10, 13, 15

\* Age is the number in years

**Measuring instruments.** The in-depth interviews ran for 40 to 60 minutes and were conducted in Dutch. With permission of the participants I audio recorded the interviews. I provided the participants with a brief description of the research, but no background information. I explained to the participants that participation was voluntary, anonymous, and they had the opportunity to withdraw at any time. Also, I explained that the aim of the interview was to collect data on personal motives, beliefs and concerns, therefore no right or wrong answers were possible. All participants signed an informed consent form.

The interview protocol consisted of three parts. First, the background characteristics were questioned. Second, the participants were invited to give a description of their perceptions of their current neighborhood. To gather data about shared childrearing responsibilities in the six domains, I described vignettes (Appendix 2). The situations described in the vignettes were based on the results of the focus group interviews from the research of Kesselring et al. (2016). The participants were questioned about their personal motives, beliefs and concerns on the vignettes. I formulated the vignettes from the perspective of the participant, in an attempt to invite the participants to respond close to reality (Hughes & Huby, 2004). To ensure the vignettes were sufficiently relatable for the respondents, I held a pilot interview with a 37-year-old father of one (five year old) child and a baby on the way. The results showed that the proposed vignettes related to the daily life of the parent but needed to be adjusted to the age(s) of the children of the participants. Therefore, I developed additional vignettes. The pilot interview also indicated that timewise it was not possible to also question childrearing actions, therefore, I did not include this topic.

After conducting the first two interviews, I revised the vignettes. Originally I planned to conduct four interviews with parents and an additional interview with a neighbor of each parent. This brought some difficulties, because not all parents were able to introduce a neighbor. Also, collecting the perceptions of each participant from the parents', as well as the neighbors' point of view, offered the opportunity to get insight on the discontinuities that occurred in the motives, beliefs and concerns.

**Data analysis.** I analyzed the data in a deductive way, and designed a code tree. Beforehand, I defined seven topics. First, 'the social network'. By open and axial coding, three labels occurred, 1) reasons there is no network, 2) reasons there is a network, and 3) beliefs on why a network is important. In the stage of selective coding, I used the research of Berns (2013), Bould (2003), and Kegler et al. (2005), to indicate the right codes to the quotes. I derived the other six topics from the six childrearing domains. By open and axial coding, I

created two labels that were similar for each domain, 1) why, 2) beliefs and concerns. In the stage of selective coding, I used the research of Turiel (1983) and Kesselring et al. (2016) to indicate the right codes to the quotes and assign the codes to the right topic.

## **Results**

### **Qualitative data**

**Table 3**

*Descriptive Statistics*

Item	% 1	% 2	% 3	% 4	n	M	SD
Parents' social network in their neighborhood (predictor)					76	3,05	0,44
Childrearing actions (dependent variables)							
Emotional support							
Comfort my child	0	17	59	24	76	3,07	0,64
Comfort me	4	36	58	3	76	2,59	0,62
Instrumental support							
Help me with practical issues	1	11	68	20	76	3,07	0,60
Informational support							
Receive tips and advice		30	55	9	76	2,68	0,72
Normative support							
Educating my child on norms and values	7	18	68	7	76	2,75	0,68
Childrearing domains (dependent variables)							
Moral domain							
If my child misbehaves outside, I would like neighbors to tell me so that I can address my child	0	16	53	32	76	3,16	0,67
If my child misbehaves outside, I want my neighbors to address my child	1	1	71	26	76	3,22	0,53
Social-Conventional domain							
Visit neighbors to learn that rules are context dependent	4	22	58	16	76	2,86	0,73
When visiting a neighbor without me, I want my child to adapt to the rules of the neighbor	0	9	45	46	76	2,37	0,65
When visiting a neighbor with me, I want my child to adapt to the rules of the neighbor	1	15	72	12	76	2,95	0,56
Personal Domain							
I like it when my neighbors inspire my child to a new hobby	0	4	65	32	76	3,28	0,53
I find it helpful to hear how neighbors feel about their children's leisure activities	3	17	58	22	76	3	0,71
Stimulation of (School) Learning							
Enthusiastic when my child helps my neighbors with chores and learns in a playful way	4	20	65	12	76	3,25	0,71
I want my neighbors to interfere with my child's school performance	3	8	51	38	76	2,84	0,67
Religious and Sexual Upbringing							
I would like my child to be able to ask neighbors about different religion or conviction about life	0	4	71	25	76	3,21	0,50
Setting Limits							
Neighbor asks child to play soccer elsewhere	0	4	57	40	76	3,36	0,56
Neighbor takes the ball from my child and gives it back to me	11	50	34	5	76	2,34	0,74

Note. 1= Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree; M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; Items are shortened, complete survey questions can be found in Appendix 1

**Social network.** Most parents agreed their social network with their neighbors is strong, namely, the main score of the items that measure their assessment is 3.05 (Table 3).

**Childrearing responsibilities.** As shown in Table 3, only one item was not popular among the parents, as 60% of them disagreed or strongly disagreed with the idea of the neighbor giving the child’s ball back to the parent in order to set his or her limits. However, 70% or more parents agreed or strongly agreed with all other items regarding shared childrearing responsibilities. Furthermore, there were four items that 95% of the parents agreed or strongly agreed with. Firstly, regarding the moral domain, when the child misbehaves outside, the neighbor can address the child. Secondly, regarding the personal domain, the neighbor can inspire the child to a new hobby. Thirdly, children can ask neighbors about their religion or convictions about life. Lastly, neighbors can ask children to play soccer elsewhere when they want to set their limits.

The correlational analyses showed that when parents rate their social network with their neighbors as more positive, they also agreed more with being informed by the neighbor on their child’s misbehavior (moral domain), neighbors teaching their children rules can differ depending on the social context (social-conventional domain), and the neighbor inviting the child to help doing some chores (stimulation of school learning) (Table 4).

**Table 4**

*One-tailed Spearman Rho correlations between the strength of parents’ social network with their neighbors and their attitudes on sharing childrearing responsibilities*

	Parents’ social network with their neighbors
<b>Moral domain</b>	
If my child misbehaves outside, I would like neighbors to tell me so that I can address my child.	.31**
If my child misbehaves outside, I want my neighbors to address my child.	.11
<b>Social-Conventional domain</b>	
Visit neighbors to learn that rules are context dependent.	.31**
When visiting a neighbor without me, I want my child to adapt to the rules of the neighbor.	-.03

When visiting a neighbor with me, I want my child to adapt to the rules of the neighbor.	-.05
Personal Domain	
I like it when my neighbors inspire my child to a new hobby.	.15
I find it helpful to hear how neighbors feel about their children's leisure activities.	.19
Stimulation of (School) Learning	
Enthusiastic when my child helps my neighbors with chores and learns in a playful way.	.35**
I want my neighbors to interfere with my child's school performance.	.09
Religious and Sexual Upbringing	
I would like my child to be able to ask neighbors about different religion or conviction about life.	.16
Setting Limits	
Neighbor asks child to play soccer elsewhere.	.10
Neighbor takes the ball from my child and gives it back to me.	.03

---

\*\* $p < 0.001$ .

**Childrearing Actions.** As shown in Table 3, parents generally agreed with all four actions to share childrearing responsibilities with their neighbors. The least popular actions were parent-directed emotional support and informational support, as roughly only 60% of the parents agreed or strongly agreed with these items. However, more than 80% of the parents agreed or strongly agreed with the idea that their neighbor comforts their child, in other words, child-directed emotional support was assessed positive. Instrumental support was the most popular action, namely, 88% agreed or strongly agreed with their neighbor being a source for practical help. In addition, 75% of the parents agreed or strongly agreed with their neighbors educating their child on their norms and values by providing normative support.

The correlational analyses showed that when parents rated their social network with their neighbors as more positive, they also agreed more with receiving emotional support, instrumental support and informational support (Table 5).

**Table 5**

*One-tailed Spearman Rho correlations between the strength of parents' social network in their neighborhood and their attitudes on childrearing actions*

	Parents' social network with their neighbors
Emotional Support	
Comfort my child	.39**
Comfort me	.37**
Instrumental Support	
Help me with practical issues	.24*
Informational Support	
Receive tips and advice	.50**
Normative Support	
Educating my child on norms and values	.14

\* $p < 0.05$ . \*\* $p < 0.001$ .

### Qualitative Data

**Social network.** Parents described the strength of the social network with their neighbors differently ( $n = 6$ ). For example, they greet each other and sometimes have a chat ( $n = 3$ ). Other parents described a stronger social network ( $n = 3$ ), like making appointments to undertake parent-child activities together ( $n = 2$ ) or reaching out to them when they need someone to shortly watch their child ( $n = 1$ ).

Parents expressed different reasons why they have a stronger social network with their neighbors ( $n = 3$ ). For example, one parent expressed she lives in the same neighborhood her husband was born, therefore he already knew a lot of people. Another mother mentioned she feels it is easier to meet people because they have similar lifestyles, which makes it easier to run into each other when you leave the house at the same time. Also, one parent explained that the contact with her neighbors has positively changed since she moved to a different neighborhood. She now lives in a more safe neighborhood, where people do not move every two years, and she has a home with a garden instead of an apartment.

In addition, a strong social network was appreciated in different ways due to personality and time ( $n = 3$ ). Regarding parent-child activities, one parent commented: "We regularly do participate, also because we think that is great for (name child) to be able to do [parent-child activities]. However, half of the time, I participate out of some sort of social



obligation". She argued she has a busy lifestyle and would rather spend her spare time with her friends. Also, she found the way she was brought up and her personality are reasons for not having interest in these kinds of social activities. On the contrary, another parent actively reaches out to parents in the neighborhood, attending parent-child activities that are organized through Facebook. This mother also mentioned time as a factor, "But well, of course, I am unemployed. I can imagine, when you are free of work only one or two days a week, . . . you'll probably be busy running errands and cleaning your house". In addition, this mother commented she does have a very easy-going personality. Both parents feel that as a parent you should put in effort if you want a strong social network with your neighbors and that you need to have the right personality to do so.

Accordingly, the mother who experienced the social network with her neighbors as a social obligation, thought this will affect both ways. Namely, she felt other parents might think she would not want to be involved in their childrearing responsibilities. She argued this might be because she does not participate in all the organized activities:

It is not because I would not want to help people when there are having issues they need help with. . . . They probably have other people in the neighborhood they have better contacts with. . . . On the other hand, it is probably also because they are wondering if I would feel like it, . . . , to be approached in that way, that often, whereas I would not have any issues with it.

**The Moral Domain.** All parents wanted the neighbor to intervene when their child treats another child inappropriately ( $n = 6$ ). For example, because children need to learn that rules at home also apply on the street ( $n = 3$ ) or when the neighbor is bothered by the behavior of the child ( $n = 1$ ). Also, as one mother mentioned, this might contribute to the safety of children, "the other child gets a little protection, when you see it is not able to defend itself".

Yet, two parents also mentioned reasons for the neighbor not to intervene when their child treats another child inappropriately. Namely, the importance of children having the opportunity to learn from each other ( $n = 1$ ), and the personality of their child, "My children are actually children who have to learn to be assertive, so in their case, if they would act like this occasionally, that would be good" (Resp. 6).

As a condition for the neighbors interference, parents assumed the neighbor uses a parenting style similar to their own ( $n = 5$ ). For example, the neighbor should explain to the children why their behavior is not appreciated ( $n = 3$ ) and ask the children questions about the

consequences of their behavior ( $n = 2$ ). One mother commented that because she knows who her neighbors are, she trusts they have similar styles to educate their children. Therefore, she would not want her child to be reprimanded by a total stranger.

Parents had contrary opinions about their neighbor addressing them instead of the child when he or she misbehaves. Although all parents would appreciate the intentions of the neighbor ( $n = 5$  out of 5), three parents expressed they do not prefer this, because children should have an immediate response to their actions. If not, the child might not understand what it is about ( $n = 1$ ) or the child might deny what had happened ( $n = 1$ ). On the contrary, there was one father who explicitly mentioned he wanted to be informed by the neighbor. Not because he would not want the neighbor to reprimand his child, but because he would want to know what had happened.

When asked about their personal motives, beliefs and concerns as a neighbor, almost all parents said they would act when they see another child misbehaving outside ( $n = 5$ ). Four parents would directly address the child that misbehaves. For example, because they feel it is important that they, as neighbors, teach other children about norms and values and they attach great value to justice ( $n = 2$ ). One father would prefer to address the parents, "Because I do not know how parents want to raise their children".

In contrast, one parent said he would not intervene when he sees neighborhood children act negatively to another child, because he does not feel the responsibility. Partly, because he feels this is part of life. Furthermore, he feels parents might interpret his involvement as criticism. Therefore, only if the behavior of the other children could be labeled as aggressively bullying and lasted a long time, would he address the children's parents. Yet he added, "But I don't even know which parents belong to which children".

**The Social-Conventional Domain.** When the differences between their neighbors' rules and their own are acceptable, all parents found this can teach their child to be flexible and adapt to different circumstances ( $n = 4$  out of 4). Acceptable differences are described as "normal things" ( $n = 3$ ), for example, taking your shoes off when you go inside the house ( $n = 1$ ), or eating with a knife and fork ( $n = 1$ ). One mother described she might take measures when the neighbors' rules are too different from hers:

Suppose your child has a friend who is allowed to watch 16+ movies. . . . That a mother or father is watching it, while the children are playing around. For me, that would be a no go. . . . in that case, he can invite that friend over here. Then they can

still play, but I would not allow my child to go there, because these are things I just wouldn't want to expose him to.

Accordingly, when her child tells her he has a new friend he wants to visit, she actively reaches out to the parents to get to know them. Another mother provided an example of when her child had visited a household of which she had been afraid the [social] rules would be too different from hers. Initially, she was a bit worried, yet when she discovered this opportunity taught her child about her own opinions, how to express them and how to cope with feedback, she had changed her mind, “When she is approached in the way I am approaching her, well, then it is similar to what she already knows. When she feels surprised, or maybe a bit shocked, . . . it is actually more interesting”.

Parents described different responses in case their child experiences the rules at the neighbors' house as unpleasant ( $n = 3$ ). Two mothers who both have a child around the age of nine, believed their child would just not want to go over to the neighbors' house anymore, and they would be okay with that. Another mother, who has a child of the age of three, said she would explain that rules can differ and that her daughter has to learn to cope with this.

Parents responded differently when asked how they would react when a child from their neighborhood visits and tells them they have other rules at home ( $n = 4$ ). Two parents would adjust their dining rules to the rules the child is used to. They give different arguments for doing so, for example because they want the child to feel welcome and at home ( $n = 2$ ). One parent specified this, namely he does expect the child to get more adjusted to his house rules when he or she visits more often. The other two parents would not adjust their rules to the visiting child, “I would explain that every family is different and that these rules hold here, so these are the rules we apply”. Yet one parent went into further detail, arguing that it does matter what the rules are about. She felt it is important to teach children how they can behave socially, when they are at her place. However, she did not feel the need to hold her rules on table manners to other children.

**The Personal Domain.** Parents expressed that they like to learn about the opinions of other parents on how their child spends his or her free time ( $n = 3$  out of 3), for example, discussing how long their children are allowed to play on the PlayStation makes them reflect about their own reasoning ( $n = 2$ ).

One mother described a benefit of sharing responsibilities regarding the personal domain, is to become on the same page. To illustrate, when her child goes over to the neighbors' house to play, she discusses the rules on screen time with her neighbor. This way

she makes sure her child is not given the opportunity to get twice as much screen time she would want him to have.

There was one parent who gave an example about being involved in other children's spare time. She sometimes played soccer with a child from her neighborhood. Although they both enjoyed this, one day the child told her his father no longer allowed him to play soccer with adults when there were no other children, "Apparently that man had thought, stop bothering that woman. Where I just thought, . . . it was quite fun to just shoot the ball a few times".

**Stimulation of (school) learning.** The parents expressed that they did not like to receive parent or child directed advice from their neighbors on their child's learning activities ( $n = 4$  out of 4). Parents described this as 'unsolicited' advice ( $n = 3$ ). They explained that teaching their children new things feels like a personal, private issue ( $n = 3$ ), "It is something I am really busy with myself, to train her in this. She just finds it difficult". Also, two parents mentioned they do not need advice, as they already have three children, "We have already experienced most issues with the children, and we have thought those issues through. So, well, . . . I do not have much insecurities".

Both parents with three children were asked if they would want to share their experience with neighbors. Although they were very much willing to provide informational support, both would not want to do this without the neighbor inviting them to. To illustrate, one father described that when he ran into his neighbor at a new year's gathering, the neighbor asked him about his parenting experiences with the issues that come with having a toddler. Because his children were already a bit older he had enjoyed sharing stories and providing advice.

**Religious and sexual upbringing.** Parents felt that neighbors can inspire their children with their religious beliefs ( $n = 3$ ) as it teaches them to be respectful ( $n = 2$ ) and make their own opinions ( $n = 1$ ). The parents found that the neighborhood can be a specifically inspiring social environment, because it consists of a heterogenic group of people ( $n = 3$ ). To illustrate this value, two parents described their own homogenic religious background. As one father explains, "I am from a reformed family and . . . in our case that was quite a small social environment, you were in. So quite limited. And I have always experienced this as . . . quite oppressive".

In addition, one mother illustrated how she has been an example of introducing heterogeneity in the child's social environment:

One and a half years ago, one of the boys next door was standing in front of me saying: 'What?! But that means you are a lesbian!', he was eight at the time. So I responded with, yes, you're right. 'Oh!' he says, 'I have never seen one in real life!'

The neighborhood children often ask her questions about how she could have gotten a child, when she was in a relationship with another woman. She stated she was very open about sharing her experiences when children ask about it. Moreover, because of her pedagogical background she felt she has enough experience to be involved in this part of children's sexual upbringing.

**Setting Limits.** None of the parents had any issues when the neighbor sets their limits, for example when the ball of their child keeps going into their garden ( $n = 4$  out of 4). On the other hand, the parents wondered whether this would actually be a real issue ( $n = 2$ ).

When the topic of setting limits was brought up when other childbearing responsibilities were discussed, all parents found it was positive when a neighbor expressed his or her limits to their child ( $n = 6$ ). To illustrate, one parent found, "When you see other children are shooting their ball to the neighbors' car, you have to say something. And the children need to accept this".

### Discussion

In this research I revealed the relationships between the strength of parents' social network with their neighbors and their shared childbearing responsibilities. In addition, I provided a rich description of parents' and neighbors' personal motives, beliefs and concerns regarding this matter. In this chapter I will link the results of these quantitative and qualitative research questions, in order to contribute to a theoretical foundation on the practice of parents and their neighbors sharing childbearing responsibilities. These insights can be used for developing interventions that aim to strengthen the PCS by mobilizing parents and neighbors to share childbearing responsibilities.

Before interpreting the data, it is important to note certain limitations and strengths regarding the methods of this research. Firstly, despite the enriching subsequent design, timewise it was not possible to gather the quantitative and qualitative data subsequently, which might have limited the findings. Secondly, as a consequence of convenience sampling, both sample groups were mainly homogenic. Therefore, the collected data might not represent the whole population of Dutch parents. On the other hand, its consistency did provide more sufficient data about a specific group of parents and their neighbors. Also, a strength of the

research is that the quantitative and qualitative results about parents' social network with their neighbors was consistent with the literature, proving the validity. In general, parents responded positively to sharing childrearing responsibilities with their neighbors (Kesselring et al., 2012). Additionally, the interviewed parents described some similarities as to why they have a stronger social network with their neighbors, namely, the safety of the neighborhood (Kegler et al., 2005) and the amount of time people remain in the same neighborhood (Bould, 2003). Thereby, the results suggested additional predictors like having similar lifestyles, type of housing, and having the time and personality to put in effort, which can be used for future research.

The questionnaire found almost all parents are positive if their neighbor intervenes when their child breaks a moral rule, notwithstanding the strength of their social network. This is in resemblance with the research of Kesselring et al. (2016), stating parents expect other adults to intervene. The qualitative data found different motivations than a strong social network such as: parents find children should have an immediate response to their actions, it provides children the opportunity to learn similar rules apply on the streets as at home, and it might provide safety.

However, it needs to be noted that other results showed a stronger social network does relate to sharing childrearing responsibilities in the moral domain among parents and neighbors. Obviously, neighbors need to know who the parents of the children are in order to address them. A relationship was found between the strength of their social network and parents wanting their neighbor to inform them when their child misbehaves morally. Also, the qualitative data showed parents assume the neighbor will use similar parenting styles as they would use themselves. This shows resemblance to the findings of Kesselring et al. (2016), reporting that the tone of voice that is used by the other adult is found to be important. For parents to assume their parenting styles to be similar, it seems that at least a certain social relation must exist.

Parents with a stronger social network with their neighbors agreed more with sharing childrearing responsibilities in the social-conventional domain. The qualitative data showed that for neighbors to teach children that rules can be context dependent, the differences between their neighbors' rules and those of their own need to be acceptable. When having a stronger social network, parents do know more about their neighbors' parenting styles (Scales et al., 2004), therefore, this might explain the relationship. Nevertheless, parents with older children remarked that their child might stop visiting the neighbors' house if he or she cannot

agree with the rules. Therefore, age could also play a part in neighbors' involvement in this domain.

Kesselring et al. (2016) found it is important neighbors do not forcefully impose their rules on children. This is in line with the ways in which the parents in this research aimed to provide the opportunity for neighbor children to learn rules can be context dependent. Namely, they search for a balance between imposing their rules, yet making the child feel welcome and at ease.

The data provided reasons unrelated to the strength of the social network for why parents share childrearing responsibilities with their neighbors in the personal domain, for example, because this allows them to become on the same page when their children play together. Also, earlier literature stated parents find it important that the involvement of other adults in the personal domain is positive and without judgment (Kesselring et al., 2016). Since the questionnaire showed almost all parents agree with their neighbor inspiring their child to a new hobby, this could be a way to bring this in practice.

Literature predicted that parents might be more positive on sharing childrearing responsibilities that belong to the domain stimulation of (school) learning when this is done in a spontaneous and playful way (Kesselring et al., 2016). Neighbors inviting the child to help with some chores is an example of this, and the results showed parents were indeed positive. In addition, a relationship was found with sharing childrearing responsibilities in this domain and the strength of parents' social network with their neighbors. This might be explained by the other conditions' parents require. For example, in resemblance to literature, the qualitative results showed parents want to be the owner of their child's learning process (Kesselring et al., 2016). Parents might feel more in control of this process when they have a stronger social network.

Irrespective of the strength of their social network with their neighbors, parents liked them to be involved in their children's religious upbringing, by answering related questions. This is in resemblance with the research of Kesselring et al., (2016) which found parents believed other adults can enrich children's worldview. The qualitative data showed similar views. In addition, parents stressed that they find the neighborhood is more heterogeneous than other social environments and therefore suitable for children to be enriched. The results also found differences among neighbors and parents in inviting children to meet people with varying forms of relationships. On the other hand, referring to the first paragraph of this section, parents argued similar lifestyles can be a reason to develop a stronger social network. Literature also refers to this contradiction between the opportunities of a heterogeneous vs. a

homogeneous neighborhood, yet no solutions are given (Berns, 2013). Future research could therefore further investigate these conflicting opportunities.

The quantitative data showed that parents are more positive about the neighbor setting their limits when this is done child directed rather than parent directed. However, the qualitative data showed that parents wondered if the example given in the questionnaire about the neighbor addressing the parent, would be a realistic example. Therefore, it is not possible to draw any conclusions on this topic based on these results.

In the questionnaire, parents' practices regarding four different actions to provide childrearing support were measured. Although not further elaborated with qualitative research, the results might provide additional explanations for parents sharing childrearing responsibilities with their neighbors. Related to the ways parents and neighbors share childrearing responsibilities, certain predictors were found which might be useful for future research. Emotional support is more popular when it is child directed and when the social network with their neighbors is stronger. In addition, also receiving instrumental and informational support is related to a stronger social network. The least popular way to support is informational. One explanation for this was found in the qualitative results, namely, parents said that they don't need their neighbors' advice because they have already raised multiple children.

Implications were found for professional practice and future research. Certain childrearing responsibilities can be shared between parents and neighbors notwithstanding the strength of their social network. This provides opportunities for successful interventions that aim to strengthen the PCS, even when the predictors for a stronger social network are not present in the neighborhood. Yet, for other responsibilities to be shared, a stronger social network between parents and neighbors is desired. Therefore, when developing an intervention these conditions should be taken into account. The results of this research stress that future research should investigate similarities between parenting styles of parents and neighbors, as this was found to be an important predictor to sharing childrearing responsibilities. In conclusion, this research has shown that neighbors provide sufficient opportunities to share childrearing responsibilities and thereby strengthen the PCS.



## References

- Andresen, P. A., & Telleen, S. L. (1992). The relationship between social support and maternal behaviors and attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 20*, 753-774. Retrieved from: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF00942236>
- Barrera Jr., M. (2000). Social support research in community psychology. In J. Rappaport & E. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of community psychology* (pp. 215-245). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Benson, P. L. (2003). Developmental Assets and Asset-Building Community: Conceptual and Empirical Foundations. In: R. M. Lerner & P. L. Benson (eds.), *Developmental Assets and Asset-building Communities* (pp. 19-43). Boston, MA: Springer.
- Berns, R. M. (2013). *Child, Family, School, Community: Socialization and Support*. Wadsworth, Ohio: Nelson Education.
- Bould, S. (2003). Caring neighborhoods: Bringing up the kids together. *Journal of Family Issues, 24*, 427-447. doi:10.1177/0192513X02250830
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Child Welfare League of America. (1999). *Assessing public opinion and perceptions regarding child abuse in America*. Washington, DC: Author (final report from Liberman Research Worldwide, available from <http://www.lironline.com>).
- De Winter, M. (2011). *Verbeter de Wereld, Begin bij de Opvoeding. Vanachter de Voordeur naar Democratie en Verbinding*. Den Haag, the Netherlands: SWP.
- Garbarino, J., & Sherman, D. (1980). High-risk neighborhoods and high-risk families: The human ecology of child maltreatment. *Child Development, 51*, 188-198. doi: 10.2307/1129606

- Hermanns, J. (2009). *Het Opvoeden Verleerd*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: University Press.
- Hugs, R., & Huby, M. (2004). The construction and interpretation of vignettes in social research. *Social Work & Social Sciences Review*, *11*, 36-51. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1921/swssr.v11i1.428>
- Jager-Vreugdenhil, M. (2012). *Nederland Participatieland? De Ambitie van de Wet Maatschappelijke Ondersteuning (Wmo) en de Praktijk in Buurten, Mantelzorgrelaties en Kerken*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: University Press.
- Junger-Tas, J. (2008). Actuele Visies op Jeugdcriminaliteit. In: W. Koops, B. Levering & M. De Winter (eds.), *Opvoeding als Spiegel van de Beschaving. Een Moderne Antropologie van de Opvoeding* (pp. 102-144). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: SWP.
- Kegler, M. C., Oman, R. F., Vesely, S. K., McLeroy, K. R., Aspy, C. B., Rodine, S., & Marshall, L. (2005). Relationships among youth assets and neighborhood and community resources. *Health, Education and Behavior*, *32*, 380-397. doi:10.1177/1090198104272334
- Kesselring, M., De Winter, M., Horjus, B., & Van Yperen, T. (2013). Allemaal opvoeders in de pedagogische civil society. Naar een theoretisch raamwerk van een ander paradigma voor opgroeien en opvoeden. *Pedagogiek*, *33*, 5-20. Retrieved from: <https://doi-org.proxy.library.uu.nl/10.5117/PED2013.1.KESSE>
- Kesselring, M., De Winter, M., Horjus, B., Van de Schoot, R., & Van Yperen, T., (2012). Do parents think it takes a village? Parents' attitudes towards nonparental adults' involvement in the upbringing and nature of children. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *40*, 921-937. doi:10.1002/jcop.21497
- Kesselring, M., De Winter, M., Van Yperen, T., & Lecluijze, S. (2016). Partners in parenting: An overview of the literature on parents' and nonparental adults' perspectives on shared responsibilities in childrearing. *Issues in Social Sciences*, *4*, 69-97. doi:10.5296/iss.v4i1.8764

- Lerner, R. M., Lerner, J. V., Almerigi, J. B., Theokas, C., Phelps, E., Gestsdottir, S., ... & Smith, L. M. (2005). Positive youth development, participation in community youth development programs, and community contributions of fifth-grade adolescents: Findings from the first wave of the 4-H study of positive youth development. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 25, 17-71. doi:10.1177/0272431604272461
- MacPhee, D., Fritz, J., & Miller-Heyl, J. (1996). Ethnic variations in personal social networks and parenting. *Child Development*, 67, 3278-3295. Retrieved from: <https://srcd.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1996.tb01914.x>
- MediQuest. (2017, 28 september). Wachttijd jeugd GGZ aanbieders regio Utrecht te lang en niet transparant. Retrieved from: <https://home.mediquest.nl/wachttijd-jeugd-ggz-aanbieders-regio-utrecht-lang-en-transparant/>
- Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277, 918-924. doi:10.1126/science.277.5328.918
- Scales, P. C., Benson, P. L., Roehlkepartain, E. C., Hintz, N. R., Sullivan, T. K., & Mannes, M. (2004). The role of parental status and child age in the engagement of children and youth with adults outside their families. *Journal of Family Issues*, 25, 735-760. doi:10.1177/0192513X03259139
- Turiel, E. (1983). *The Development of Social Knowledge: Morality and Convention*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Yperen, T., & Van Woudenberg, A. (2011). *Werk in Uitvoering. Bouwen aan het Nieuwe Jeugdstelsel*. Utrecht, the Netherlands: Nederlands Jeugdinstituut.
- Van Yperen, T., Van de Maat, A., & Prakken J. (2019). *Het groeiend jeugdzorg gebruik. Duiding en aanpak*. Utrecht, the Netherlands: Nederlands Jeugdinstituut.

Wickrama, K. A. S., & Bryant, C. M. (2003). Community context of social resources and adolescent mental health. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *65*, 850-866.  
doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2003.00850.x

## Appendix 1

### Online Survey Ouders & Buurtbewoners

Alvast heel erg bedankt voor het deelnemen aan deze enquête! Ik ben benieuwd naar uw mening en ervaringen als ouder of verzorger, er zijn dan ook geen goede of foute antwoorden mogelijk. Deelname is vrijwillig, u kunt op elk gewenst moment stoppen, uw antwoorden worden dan verwijderd en niet meegenomen in de resultaten.

**De volgende vragen en stellingen gaan over de buurt waarin u nu woont en over uw huidige buurtbewoners. Met buurtbewoners worden de mensen bedoeld die dichtbij u in de buurt wonen, die u dus ook tegen kunt komen zonder dat u van tevoren met elkaar heeft afgesproken. Soms worden er voorbeeldsituaties gegeven. Als het voorbeeld niet op u van toepassing is, wil ik u vragen om u de situatie in te beelden met uw huidige buurtbewoners en dan uw mening te geven.**

Ik maak regelmatig gebruik van een recreatieplek bij mij in de buurt (bijvoorbeeld een speeltuin, park, grasveld, etc.).

Helemaal mee eens	Mee eens	Niet mee eens	Helemaal niet mee eens
-------------------	----------	---------------	------------------------

Ik woon in een veilige buurt.

Helemaal mee eens	Mee eens	Niet mee eens	Helemaal niet mee eens
-------------------	----------	---------------	------------------------

Ik denk dat mijn burens en ik dezelfde normen en waarden delen.

Helemaal mee eens	Mee eens	Niet mee eens	Helemaal niet mee eens
-------------------	----------	---------------	------------------------

Ik weet van mijn meeste buurtbewoners de (voor)naam.

Helemaal mee eens	Mee eens	Niet mee eens	Helemaal niet mee eens
-------------------	----------	---------------	------------------------

Mijn burens en ik vragen regelmatig aan elkaar hoe het gaat.

Helemaal mee eens	Mee eens	Niet mee eens	Helemaal niet mee eens
-------------------	----------	---------------	------------------------

In mijn buurt helpen we elkaar.

Helemaal mee eens	Mee eens	Niet mee eens	Helemaal niet mee eens
-------------------	----------	---------------	------------------------

Ik en mijn burens hebben onderling vertrouwen in elkaar.

Helemaal mee eens	Mee eens	Niet mee eens	Helemaal niet mee eens
-------------------	----------	---------------	------------------------

Ik denk dat mijn burens en ik dezelfde ideeën hebben over hoe je kunt reageren als een kind niet luistert.

Helemaal mee eens	Mee eens	Niet mee eens	Helemaal niet mee eens
-------------------	----------	---------------	------------------------

Ik denk dat mijn burens en ik dezelfde ideeën hebben over hoe je een kind kunt motiveren als het geen zin heeft om iets te doen wat toch moet gebeuren.

Helemaal mee eens	Mee eens	Niet mee eens	Helemaal niet mee eens
-------------------	----------	---------------	------------------------

Als mijn kind zich tijdens het buitenspelen misdraagt en ik ben er niet bij, wil ik dat aanwezige buurtbewoners dit aan mij vertellen, zodat ik mijn kind zelf kan aanspreken op zijn of haar gedrag.

<b>Helemaal mee eens</b>	<b>Mee eens</b>	<b>Niet mee eens</b>	<b>Helemaal niet mee eens</b>
--------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Ik wil liever niet dat mijn buurtbewoners een rol spelen in het bijbrengen van normen en waarden aan mijn kind.

<b>Helemaal mee eens</b>	<b>Mee eens</b>	<b>Niet mee eens</b>	<b>Helemaal niet mee eens</b>
--------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Ik vind het een goede oplossing als mijn buurman of buurvrouw mijn kind verzoekt om ergens anders te gaan voetballen als de bal een aantal keer achter elkaar in de buurtuin is beland.

<b>Helemaal mee eens</b>	<b>Mee eens</b>	<b>Niet mee eens</b>	<b>Helemaal niet mee eens</b>
--------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Ik wil graag dat mijn kind bij buurtbewoners op bezoek gaat waar andere huisregels gelden om te leren dat regels contextafhankelijk zijn.

<b>Helemaal mee eens</b>	<b>Mee eens</b>	<b>Niet mee eens</b>	<b>Helemaal niet mee eens</b>
--------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Als dat nodig is wil ik graag dat mijn kind terecht kan bij mijn buurtgenoten voor een luisterend oor of troostende woorden.

<b>Helemaal mee eens</b>	<b>Mee eens</b>	<b>Niet mee eens</b>	<b>Helemaal niet mee eens</b>
--------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Als mijn kind zonder mij of een andere ouder/verzorger op bezoek is bij een buurtbewoner wil ik dat mijn kind zich houdt aan de regels die hij of zij van mij geleerd heeft, ook als die anders zijn dan die van mijn buurtgenoot.

<b>Helemaal mee eens</b>	<b>Mee eens</b>	<b>Niet mee eens</b>	<b>Helemaal niet mee eens</b>
--------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Als buurtbewoners mijn kind inspireren tot een nieuwe hobby vind ik dat leuk.

<b>Helemaal mee eens</b>	<b>Mee eens</b>	<b>Niet mee eens</b>	<b>Helemaal niet mee eens</b>
--------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Op de speelplaats bespreken buurtgenoten met elkaar het aantal uren 'schermtijd' dat zij gepast vinden (tijd die het kind op een digitaal apparaat mag besteden). Ik vind het nuttig om te horen hoe andere mensen uit mijn buurt denken over de vrijetijdsbesteding van hun kinderen.

<b>Helemaal mee eens</b>	<b>Mee eens</b>	<b>Niet mee eens</b>	<b>Helemaal niet mee eens</b>
--------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Ik ben enthousiast als een van mijn buurtbewoners mijn kind vraagt om mee te helpen met het klussen aan hun schuur of een ander klusje waar mijn kind op speelse wijze van kan leren.

<b>Helemaal mee eens</b>	<b>Mee eens</b>	<b>Niet mee eens</b>	<b>Helemaal niet mee eens</b>
--------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Als iemand uit de buurt hoort dat mijn kind moeite heeft met rekenen en aan mij aanbiedt om af en toe wat oefeningetjes met mijn kind te komen doen, wijs ik dit af. Ik wil niet dat mijn buuren zich bemoeien met de schoolprestaties van mijn kind.

<b>Helemaal mee eens</b>	<b>Mee eens</b>	<b>Niet mee eens</b>	<b>Helemaal niet mee eens</b>
--------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Als ik een buurtbewoner heb met een andere geloofs- of levensovertuiging dan ikzelf, wil ik graag dat mijn kind hen hier - op een beleefde manier - vragen over kan stellen.

Helemaal mee eens	Mee eens	Niet mee eens	Helemaal niet mee eens
-------------------	----------	---------------	------------------------

Als dat nodig is wil ik graag bij mijn buurtgenoten terecht kunnen voor een luisterend oor of troostende woorden met betrekking tot de opvoeding van mijn kind.

Helemaal mee eens	Mee eens	Niet mee eens	Helemaal niet mee eens
-------------------	----------	---------------	------------------------

Ik vind het een goede oplossing als mijn buurman of buurvrouw de bal van mijn kind afpakt en aan mij teruggeeft als deze een aantal keer achter elkaar in de buurtuin is beland.

Helemaal mee eens	Mee eens	Niet mee eens	Helemaal niet mee eens
-------------------	----------	---------------	------------------------

Als mijn kind zich tijdens het buitenspelen misdraagt en ik ben er niet bij, wil ik dat aanwezige buurtbewoners mijn kind aanspreken op zijn of haar gedrag.

Helemaal mee eens	Mee eens	Niet mee eens	Helemaal niet mee eens
-------------------	----------	---------------	------------------------

Als ik samen met mijn kind bij een buurtbewoner op bezoek ben wil ik dat mijn kind zich aanpast aan de regels van de buurtbewoner, ook als deze anders zijn dan die van mij

Helemaal mee eens	Mee eens	Niet mee eens	Helemaal niet mee eens
-------------------	----------	---------------	------------------------

Ik wil niet dat mijn buren mij helpen met praktische opvoedingszaken zoals oppassen of af en toe mijn kinderen naar school brengen.

Helemaal mee eens	Mee eens	Niet mee eens	Helemaal niet mee eens
-------------------	----------	---------------	------------------------

Als ik er behoefte aan heb, ontvang ik graag tips en advies van mijn buurtgenoten over de opvoeding van mijn kind.

Helemaal mee eens	Mee eens	Niet mee eens	Helemaal niet mee eens
-------------------	----------	---------------	------------------------

**Tot slot wil ik u vragen de volgende informatie over uzelf in te vullen:**

Vul de leeftijd en het geslacht van elk kind uit uw huishouden in (bijvoorbeeld: meisje, 3; jongen 5):

---

Woont u langer dan 5 jaar in uw huidige buurt, of als u er nog geen vijf jaar woont, bent u van plan daar langer dan vijf jaar te blijven wonen?

Ja/Nee

Wat is uw geslacht?

Vrouw; Man; Anders; Wil ik niet zeggen

Wat is uw leeftijd?

< 20; 20 – 30; 31 – 40; > 41

Hoeveel ouders/verzorgers zijn er in uw huishouden?

1; 2; Anders, namelijk: \_\_\_\_\_

Wat is uw hoogst genoten opleiding?

Basischool; Middelbare school; MBO; HBO; Universitair;

Anders, namelijk: \_\_\_\_\_

Wat zijn uw geboorteland en plaats?

Geboorteland \_\_\_\_\_

Geboorteplaats \_\_\_\_\_

Wat zijn uw huidige woonplaats en in welke provincie?

Huidige woonplaats: \_\_\_\_\_

Provincie: \_\_\_\_\_



## Appendix 2

### Interview Questions and Vignettes

#### Personal Questions

Hoe oud ben je?

Hoeveel kinderen heb je en wat zijn hun leeftijden?

Hoe is je gezinssituatie?

Wat is het opleidingsniveau van de ouders/verzorgers?

Kan je iets vertellen over je buurt?

#### Vignettes

##### *Moral Domain*

Als een van je buurtbewoners zijn straat in loopt ziet hij een groepje van vijf kinderen, waaronder jouw kind, buitenspelen. Hij hoort jouw zoon kwetsende dingen tegen hun buurmeisje roepen.

- a. De buurtbewoner besluit in te grijpen, hij roept de kinderen bij elkaar en lost de situatie met ze op.
- b. De buurtbewoner belt bij jou aan en verteld wat hij heeft zien gebeuren.

Is het belangrijk:

- c. Wat voor relatie je hebt met de buurtbewoner?
- d. Dat je dezelfde normen en waarden deelt?
- e. Maakt het verschil of je er wel of niet bij bent?
- f. Stel jij bent de buurtbewoner en het is niet jouw kind. Wat zou je doen?

##### *Social Conventional Domain*

Er is een kind bij je op bezoek, tijdens het lunchen blijkt dat hij thuis andere afspraken heeft over wat wel en niet moet tijdens de lunch dan hoe jij deze hebt.

- a. Hoe ga je hiermee om?
- b. Maakt het uit wat voor relatie je hebt met de ouders?
- c. Hoe zou je willen dat jou kind hiermee om gaat?

Je zoon is aan het spelen bij een kind uit de buurt, waar andere regels gelden dan bij jullie thuis.

- a. Hoe zou je willen dat je zoon hiermee omgaat?
- b. Maakt het uit wat voor relatie je hebt met deze buren?
- c. Maakt het uit of de ideeën over opvoeding verschillen?

*Personal Domain*

Een van je burens verteld tijdens een bezoekje over de regels die bij hun thuis gelden met betrekking tot 'schermtijd'. Deze zijn anders als die voor jou kind(eren) gelden.

- a. Maakt het uit of de buur het vertelt aan jou of aan je kind?
- b. Maakt het uit wat voor relatie je hebt met de buur?
- c. Het onderwerp wordt besproken met een groepje buurt ouders op de speelplaats.

*Stimulation of (school) learning*

Je dochter zegt dat ze naar de w.c. moet en wilt dat je mee gaat om te helpen. Je worstelt al een tijdje met het nog niet zelfstandig naar de w.c. kunnen van je dochter.

- a. De buur moedigt je dochter aan om het zelf te doen. Wat vind je hiervan?
- b. De buur verteld hoe hij/zij het leren van zelfstandig naar de w.c. gaan bij zijn of haar kind heeft aan gepakt.
- c. Stel dit gebeurd tijdens het buitenspelen of als de buur bij jou op bezoek is.

Iemand uit de buurt hoort dat je kind moeite heeft met rekenen en biedt aan om af en toe wat oefeningetjes met je kind te komen doen.

- d. Wat vind je hiervan?
- e. Als de situatie andersom is?

*Religious and sexual upbringing*

Je zoon heeft vragen over de Islam. Bij jou in de straat woont een Islamitisch gezin.

- a. Zie je mogelijkheden om hen te helpen de vragen van je zoon te beantwoorden?
- b. Maakt het uit wat de relatie met de burens is?

Als een van de buurtkinderen bij jullie aan het spelen is, stelt ze vragen over jullie geloof.

- a. Hoe reageer je?
- b. Stel het gebeurt tijdens het buitenspelen, hoe reageer je dan?
- c. Hoe zou je willen dat jouw eigen kinderen hiermee om gaan?

*Setting Limits*

Tijdens het voetballen beland de bal een aantal keer achter elkaar in de tuin van de burens.

- a. De buur vraagt je kind ergens anders te gaan voetballen
- b. De buur pakt de bal af en brengt hem naar jou
- c. Maakt het uit of jij in de buurt bent?

Tijdens het voetballen beland de bal een aantal keer achter elkaar in je tuin.

- a. Wat doe je als de ouders niet in de buurt zijn?
- b. Wat doe je als de ouders wel in de buurt zijn?