



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Vignettes to measure social interactions among non-parental adults and parents in the neighbourhood

A validation study

Rumping, S.; Fukkink, R.G.; Boendermaker, L.

Publication date

2022

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Journal of Social Inclusion

License

CC BY

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Rumping, S., Fukkink, R. G., & Boendermaker, L. (2022). Vignettes to measure social interactions among non-parental adults and parents in the neighbourhood: A validation study. *Journal of Social Inclusion*, 13(1), 66–85. <https://josi.org.au/articles/abstract/245/>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Vignettes to measure social interactions among nonparental adults and parents in the neighbourhood: A validation study

Sanne Rumping

Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, the Netherlands and University of Amsterdam

Ruben Fukkink

Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences and University of Amsterdam, Netherlands

Leonieke Boendermaker

Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences and University of Amsterdam, Netherlands

Abstract

In this study the Vignettes Parenting Interactions in the Neighbourhood (V-PIN) was validated. These vignettes can be used to gain insight into and reflect on interactions in the neighbourhood between parents and nonparental adults. A correlational design (N = 134) was used to assess the reliability (i.e. internal consistency, test-retest), convergent and discriminant validity and relations with background variables of the V-PIN. Reliability (both internal consistency and test-retest) proved good. Positive, significant correlations provided evidence for convergent validity. The measure did not correlate with non-related constructs or background characteristics, which was an indication for discriminant validity. The newly developed measure seems useful to explore the perspectives of nonparental adults in parent-child interactions in neighbourhoods with a wide group of stakeholders with diverse cultural backgrounds and can (complemented with visualisations), be used to stimulate supportive interactions and inclusion in social work practices and the community.

Key words: Vignettes, Validation, Reliability, Social Support, Nonparental Adults

Since the '90s there has been an increasing attention for the supporting role of communities in the wellbeing and development of children (Korbin & Coulton, 1996; McDonnell & Melton, 2008; Tomison & Wise, 1999). There has been a growing recognition of the positive influence of social community factors on parents in various contexts, varying from social support for families to the prevention of child maltreatment. Local governments, social work organizations, schools and parent support organizations often collaborate with local communities to support young children and their parents (Cohen et al., 2009; Gillies, 2004; Wilson, 2013). This has resulted in holistic prevention strategies for parents, with a focus on network building and developing relationships within the community to support positive youth development (McDonnell & Melton, 2008; Tomison & Wise, 1999).

A key concept of this prevention strategy is social support, which is linked to social networks, social inclusion and social connections (McGoron et al., 2020; McDonnell & Melton, 2008; Overmars-Marx et al., 2017; Tomison & Wise, 1999) and refers to the relations and interactions between community members (Gottlieb & Bergen, 2010). Social support positively influences the wellbeing of youth and parents. They can benefit from high-quality social support from wider networks, including interactions with nonparental adults (i.e. adults that have contact with children but are not the primary caregiver, see e.g. Rumping et al., 2021), resulting in fewer mental health and behavioural problems (Bosacki et al. 2007; McPherson et al., 2014) and is an important mechanism for social inclusion (Asmar et al., 2020; Overmars-Marx et al., 2017). For example, parents can benefit from social support by exchanging ideas with other parents and offering and receiving emotional support (Barrera, 2000; Langford et al., 1997; Sampson et al., 1997). Social support may also contribute to increased standards of parents, and is important for self-evaluation, for example in behavioural norms (i.e. appraisal support), instrumental support (i.e. tangible goods, e.g. exchanging toys), or informational support (e.g. advice; Barrera, 2000; Kesselring et al., 2012; Langford et al., 1997). Contextual determinants, such as locations in the neighbourhood (e.g. playgrounds or institutions) also influence social support (Geens et al., 2019; Lund, 2003; Witten et al., 2001). For instance, neighbourhood playgrounds can facilitate social support between parents (Witten et al., 2001; Wilson, 2013).

Individual and family characteristics are related to social support (McGoron et al., 2020; Mishra, 2020). The attitude parents, nonparental adults, and children have towards each other plays an important role in creating social support. Nonparental adults may feel ambivalent about responding to parenting situations (Horjus & van Dijken, 2017; Kesselring et al., 2012). They may, for example, not respond because they are unsure how the parent will react to the intervention of another adult, even though the parent acknowledges the importance of a supporting and safe neighbourhood for their child.

The interactions between parents, children, and nonparental adults in neighbourhoods contribute to the development of children (Garbarino, 2014; McPherson et al., 2014). However, the interactions and the underlying mechanisms between parents and nonparental adults in neighbourhoods related to caregiving of children have thus far received limited research attention (Negash & Maguire-Jack, 2016; Sampson et al., 1999; Turner & Brown, 2010). Understanding the perspective of nonparental adults in parent-child interactions in neighbourhoods and the dynamics of these interactions in the neighbourhood is important to gain insight into the social networks and the social norms in which children grow up, and for working on social support (Minh et al., 2017; Sampson et al., 1999).

Studying Interactions in the Neighbourhood

Examining the interactions between parents, children, and nonparental adults in the community is important to gain further insight into the dynamics of social support in the neighbourhood. Several instruments have been developed to examine the attitude of parents, children and nonparental adults towards pedagogical contexts, including raising children at home, in childcare and school (Cohen et al., 2009; Counts et al., 2010; Sampson et al., 1997). Instruments to study social support, and related concepts like social networks or social capital (e.g. Mishra, 2020) in neighbourhoods are widely used, but without an explicit focus on pedagogical interactions in the neighbourhood (Dambi et al., 2018; Ferligoj & Hlebec, 1999; Ferguson, 2006). The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS), for example, is a widely used measure to examine social support by family, friends, and significant others. However, it does not pay attention to specific contexts (e.g. *"I can count on my friends when things go wrong"*) (Dambi et al., 2018), whereas the Social Capital Index (SCI) (Ferguson, 2006) focuses on neighbourhood connections and informal interaction within the local area (e.g. *"Have you visited a neighbour in the past week?"*), but not on children and their parents.

In-depth data is needed to better understand the dynamics between nonparental adults in parent-child interactions in neighbourhoods and better understand social support, specifically emotional, appraisal, and informational support. This community perspective, which emphasizes the importance of social contexts for parenting, requires a measure that captures the in-depth perspective of individual nonparental adults in the neighbourhood (e.g. under which circumstances would they respond or not, and why/how would they respond?). Vignettes are often used to gain insight into decision-making processes and which factors people take into consideration (Evans et al., 2015; Tufford & Lee, 2018). Vignettes are short descriptions of hypothetical situations, based on a systematic combination of factors (Atzmüller & Steiner, 2010). Each vignette contains a unique combination of factors and is used to examine individuals' intentions in certain situations (Blodgett et al., 2011; Tettegah et al., 2006). They are used as qualitative or quantitative measures to gain insight into complex interaction practices in neighbourhoods or between professionals (Evans et al., 2015; Kandemir & Budd, 2018). For example, Kandemir and Budd (2018) examined in their vignette study how tolerance fosters community cohesion.

In short, previous research on parent-child interactions, communities, and social support has predominantly used questionnaires with Likert scales. Innovative measures such as vignettes with a hybrid format with both closed and open questions may offer an alternative method to collect data in empirical research. By systematically manipulating important variables of parenting situations in neighbourhoods, vignettes may provide information about feelings, thoughts, or behaviour of nonparental adults that cannot easily be made visible with other measures (Evans et al., 2015). However, little attention has been paid in social research to the psychometric quality of the vignette measure (Kandemir & Budd, 2018). The main focus in previous studies has been how participants in qualitative research (e.g., social work ethics) assess the authenticity of the vignettes (Kandemir & Budd, 2018; Wilks, 2003).

Development of the V-PIN

The Vignettes Parenting Interactions in the Neighbourhood (V-PIN), consisting of 12 items, was developed (see Table 1) to gain insight into interactions in the neighbourhood between parents, children and nonparental adults in various contexts and consequently into social support in parenting situations in neighbourhoods. Each vignette consists of a short description of a parenting situation in the neighbourhood, with corresponding questions. The

vignettes focus on children between the ages of two and four, as this is an important phase in the development of children, which parents often experience as being challenging (Kluwer, 2010; Minh et al., 2017; Nelson et al., 2015). Additionally, at this age children start to explore their immediate environment in the neighbourhood, which requires adult supervision.

Table 1 Vignettes Parenting Interactions in the Neighbourhood (V-PIN)

1. Parent and child are standing in the schoolyard after school. The child does not go to play on the schoolyard playground, but remains standing next to the parent. The child stares at the ground. The parent crouches down next to the child, looks at them, and says: "I see that you're not playing. Why aren't you playing?"
2. Parent and child are at the grocery store after school. The child does not go and stand next to the parent. The child lies down on the floor, clenches his fists, and starts turning red. The parent says: "Come stand over here" while the parent points at the space next to him.
3. Parent and child are standing in the schoolyard after school. The child does not go to play on the schoolyard playground, but remains standing next to the parent. The child stares at the ground. The parent is watching a video on YouTube.
4. The child does not go to play on the schoolyard playground, but remains standing next to the parent. The child stares at the ground. The child says to the parent: "You're fat and ugly", while the child pokes the parent's belly. The parent looks at the child, and says: "You're calling me fat and ugly. Why are you doing that?"
5. Parent and child are standing by a neighbourhood playground. The child does not go to play on the schoolyard playground, but remains standing next to the parent. The child stares at the ground. The parent says nothing and grabs the child by their arm. Holding their arm, the parent walks the child over to the playground.
6. Parent and child are standing in the schoolyard after school. Other children are playing together. The child says to the parent: "You're fat and ugly", while the child pokes the parent's belly. The parent says nothing and grabs the child by their arm. The parent takes the child with them in the direction of the schoolyard's fence.
7. Parent and child are riding the metro after school. The child climbs onto a parked bicycle in the metro. The parent walks over to the child, and says: "If you don't remain seated in the metro, you could hurt yourself."
8. The parent is sitting on a bench in the schoolyard after school. The child does not sit down next to the parent. The child lies down on the ground, clenches his fists, and starts turning red. The parent is checking Facebook messages on their phone.
9. Parent and child are standing by a neighbourhood playground. Other kids are playing together. The child is hiding behind the parent. The parent crouches down next to the child, looks at them, and says: "I see that you're not playing. Why aren't you playing?"
10. Parent and child are standing in the schoolyard after school. Other children are playing together. The child is hiding behind the parent. The parent says: "Go play on the slide!" while the parent points at the slide.
11. Parent and child are riding the metro after school. The child climbs onto a parked bicycle and bumps into other people. The parent is checking Facebook messages on their phone.
12. Parent and child are standing by a neighbourhood playground. Other children are playing together. The child is hiding behind the parent. The parent is watching a video on YouTube.

The vignette descriptions were based on items from validated questionnaires (Robinson et al., 1995; Konijn et al., 2009) and were developed by consulting 10 Dutch parenting experts. The relevance of the vignettes was subsequently assessed by school professionals, volunteers, and parents (n= 8) and tested and fine-tuned by 12 student assistants (Rumping et al., 2021).

To increase understanding of how nonparental adults respond to parent-child interactions in the neighbourhood, different types of parent-child interactions in various places in the neighbourhood were systematically combined. Specifically, three factors were combined in the vignettes: parenting style, child behaviour, and location in the neighbourhood.

First, three parenting styles were included in the vignettes: authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive (Baumrindt, 1971). This allowed for an exploration of the influence of different types of parenting styles on the response of nonparental adults. An authoritarian parenting style is characterized by a high level of parental control and little support for the child(ren), while the permissive parenting style is characterized by less parental control. An example of an item with an authoritarian parenting style (based on the Parenting Styles Dimension Questionnaire, Robinson et al., 1995) that was used for the vignettes is: “Demands that child does/do things”. An example of a permissive parenting style item is: “Allows child to annoy someone else”. The authoritative parenting style is characterized by a high level of parental control in combination with attention for the development of the child’s responsibility and for support of the child. An example of one such item is: “Explains the consequences of the child’s behaviour”. Maccoby & Martin (1983) distinguished a fourth style: uninvolved, which is characterized by low levels of both support and parental control. However, this style was not included because it was difficult to describe low levels of both support and parental control for the construction of the V-PIN. For example, vignette descriptions of going to the playground or school could already suggest supportive parents.

Second, the well-known distinction between internalizing and externalizing behaviour was included in the vignettes (Achenbach, 1999). Internalizing behaviour is directed towards the self, an example of one such item is social anxiety (e.g. avoids contact with others, is afraid, Konijn et al., 2009) whereas externalizing behaviour is directed towards the environment.

Third, in order to explore how the context can influence their response, we added the factor ‘neighbourhood’ with two different locations: around (pre)school and neighbourhood (Horjus & van Dijken, 2017; Rumping et al., 2021; Wilson, 2013). These two locations represent informal meeting areas (i.e. the third place) where parents meet each other regularly (Rumping et al., 2021).

An example of a V-PIN vignette: “Parent and child are standing in the schoolyard after school. The child does not go to play on the schoolyard playground, but remains standing next to the parent. The child stares at the ground. The parent crouches down next to the child, looks at them, and says: “I see that you’re not playing. Why aren’t you playing?”. Each vignette was thus structured using a basic scheme including a parenting style, type of child behaviour, and a specific setting. The parenting style in the example vignette (authoritative) is authoritative, the child behaviour (**internalizing**) is internalizing, and the location (**around school**) is around school.

Each vignette was accompanied by eight questions that focused on the attitudes of nonparental adults and provided detailed insight into their actions. The first question was: “What would you do in this situation, assuming that you know the parent and the child?” The answer categories were: ‘I would respond to the parent’, ‘I would respond to the child’, ‘I would respond to the parent and child’, or ‘I wouldn’t respond’ or ‘Other, namely...’. Subsequently, participants were asked why they would respond. Examples of answer categories were: ‘I would like to ask the parent about or point out the child’s behaviour’, ‘I would like to make contact with the parent, by greeting or joking’, ‘I would like to ask the parent about their reaction’, ‘I would like to support the parent, by showing my understanding or experience’, or ‘Other, namely...’. Subsequently, it was asked: ‘What is your task in this situation?’. Answer categories were: ‘I don’t have a task’ and ‘I do have a task’, followed by: ‘My task is...’. We asked a follow-up question: “How do you assess the behaviour of the parent/child?” Examples

of answer categories were: 'Positive', 'Negative', 'Reassuring', 'Worrisome', or 'Other, namely...'. The final question pertained to their reasons for this assessment (e.g. 'That the child exceeds my norms and values').

The Present Study

This study is a validation study of the newly developed Vignettes Parenting Interactions in the Neighbourhood with two main questions: *What is the reliability (1) and the validity (2) of the newly developed V-PIN measure?* Specifically, we investigated the internal consistency and stability (*test-retest*) of the V-PIN. We also evaluated the convergent validity and discriminant validity of the V-PIN (see Hughes, 2018).

Method

Design and Sample

A correlational design was used to assess the reliability (i.e. internal consistency, test-retest), convergent and discriminant validity and relation with background variables of the V-PIN. A convenience sample consisting of a total of 134 parents from the Netherlands participated in this study. Only participants with children under 12 were recruited, because it was assumed that they could most easily empathize with the situations as they are oftentimes present in neighbourhood locations (e.g. around schools). Most (78%) of the participants were female. The mean age was 35.46 ($SD = 7.64$). About half (53%) of the participants had a Dutch background and 47% had a migration background. A minority (22%) worked with children professionally (i.e. as a teacher, social worker). An a priori power analysis with G*Power (Faul et al., 2007) indicated that a sample of 131 was adequate to demonstrate statistically significant validity coefficients (Pearson's r) of medium size ($r = 0.30$) with two-sided significance at the alpha level of .05 and a statistical power of $\beta = 0.90$.

Procedure

The V-PIN (vignettes and questionnaire) was first tested among 15 stakeholders in a pilot (i.e. parents, Bachelor Social Work students, and researchers) after which the questionnaire was shortened (by removing validation measures and 2 vignette questions about the task of participants in the vignette situation), because it was perceived as being too long. A group of Bachelor Social Work students with highly diverse migration backgrounds (e.g. AUAS, 2018) received a two-day training and were then involved in the data collection for the present study. In November and December 2019, students invited parents in their own networks face to face, via e-mail, or via SMS/WhatsApp to participate in the study. Participants were informed about the goal and procedure of the study during the recruitment. All respondents participated voluntarily. Data were collected via online survey program Qualtrics. First, participants signed informed consent, then they received a test vignette and six questions. Finally, participants responded to the twelve vignettes and the corresponding questions.

At the end of the survey, participants were invited to join in a follow-up, to which 52 participants agreed. After a period of two months, the V-PIN was sent to these participants. Within eighteen days, three reminders were sent via Qualtrics and e-mail to the participants, after which 11 participants responded. Their background characteristics and answers to vignette questions were similar to the original sample ($N = 134$); only slightly more men were involved in the small

follow-up sample. Finally, participants received a 10 euro gift voucher for their participation in the follow-up.

For the analysis, answers to the V-PIN question “What would you do in this situation?” were put into two categories: the category ‘response: yes, no’ and the category ‘response aimed towards: parent, child, or both’. For the analysis of the question “How do you assess the behaviour of the parent?” positive and reassuring assessments were grouped together, which resulted in the variable ‘positive assessment’. Negative and worrying assessments were put in the variable ‘negative’.

Validation Measures

Shared Childrearing Responsibility Scale (Kesselring et al., 2012). For convergent validity, an adapted version of the Dutch Shared Childrearing Responsibility Scale (SCRS, Bakker et al., 2016; Kesselring et al., 2012) was used to measure parents’ attitude towards shared childrearing responsibility. Items were rated on a 4-point Likert scale with the answer categories ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’. A high score indicates a positive attitude towards sharing parental responsibility (Kesselring et al., 2012). Previous research showed that the reliability of the SCRS is good in Dutch samples ($\alpha = 0.78$, Bakker et al., 2016). In the present study the Cronbach’s alpha for the SCRS (4 items) was good as well ($\alpha = 0.73$). One item (i.e. “How child(ren) are raised at home is only the parent(s) concern”) of the Dutch version of the SCRS (5 items, Bakker et al., 2016) was disregarded because it negatively affected the reliability of the scale. A significant positive, moderate correlation was expected, because SCRS and V-PIN both measure related constructs with a focus on shared childrearing.

Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (Robinson et al., 1995; translated by Schalenbourg & Verschueren, 2003). Convergent validity of the permissive parenting style from the vignette measure was determined with the widely used, self-reported permissive parenting style subscale of the Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ) (Robinson et al., 1995), translated by Schalenbourg and Verschueren (2003). This parenting style was examined because passive parenting styles might influence responses differently than an active parenting style (i.e. authoritative or authoritarian). For instance, when children disturb others and the parent using a permissive parenting style does not actively respond, nonparental adults may feel more responsible to intervene (e.g. Kesselring et al., 2016). The subscale consists of 5 items with a 5 point Likert scale, with answer categories varying from never (1) to always (5). Previous studies reported good internal consistency of the PSDQ scales (α between 0.75 and 0.91, Robinson et al., 1995), including in Dutch research (α between 0.60 and 0.93, see Schalenbourg & Verschueren, 2003). In the present study internal consistency of the permissive parenting scale of the PSDQ was sufficient ($\alpha = 0.63$). It was expected that when participant’ assessment towards a parenting style (i.e. *How do you assess the behaviour of the parent?*) is positive, their self-reported parenting style behaviour (intention) would be similar. A significant positive, moderate correlation was therefore expected.

Social Desirability Scale (Nederhof, 1981). The discriminant validity was investigated with the Social Desirability Scale (SDS, Nederhof, 1981). The SDS contains 11 items with two answer categories (always and never). A high score means a high level of socially desirable answers. The internal consistency of this scale is sufficient (Nederhof, 1981). In the present study, consistency proved high ($\alpha = 0.87$). A small, non-significant correlation was expected, because V-PIN and SDS measure two unrelated constructs.

Cantril's Ladder of Life (1965). This widely used and validated wellbeing measure is a single item scored on a scale between 1 and 10. Test-retest reliability was rated as acceptable ($r = 0.66 - 0.70$) and convergent validity was good in previous studies (Levin & Currie, 2014). A small, non-significant correlation with V-PIN was expected in our test of discriminant validity of the V-PIN, because the Cantril Ladder and V-PIN measure fundamentally different constructs.

Background characteristics. We explored whether V-PIN scores were related to participants' ethnic background, sex, and/or profession.

Results

This section describes the reliability (i.e. internal consistency, test-retest) and the convergent and discriminant validity of the V-PIN and its empirical relations with some background variables. Internal consistency involves the correlation between items of the V-PIN, whereas test-retest reliability involves the stability of the measure. Convergent and discriminant validity are both related to the construct validity and the nomological network of the newly developed measure. With convergent validity, we evaluated whether participants' scores for the newly developed V-PIN correlate positively with scores for related measures. With discriminant validity, we evaluated whether participants' V-PIN scores were not significantly related with unrelated measures that measure different constructs although with similar formats.

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics of how the participants would respond in a particular vignette of the V-PIN and, if so, to whom. Participants more often indicated that they would respond when vignettes included a permissive parenting style, compared to an authoritarian or authoritative parenting style. Participants more often indicated they would respond in case of a child's externalizing behaviour, compared to internalizing behavior. Parents responded more often when the location in the neighborhood was described, than around school.

Internal Consistency

Cronbach's alpha (α) for the answer categories 'response: yes/no' and 'response aimed towards: parent, child, or both' were 0.78 ($M = 4.90$, $SD = 2.88$) and 0.77 respectively ($M = 5.90$, $SD = 3.69$). Item-rest correlations were all positive, ranging between 0.30-0.54 for the yes/no response and 0.25-0.72 for the aimed towards response. Correlations between 'response: yes/no' and 'response aimed towards: parent, child, or both' on 12 vignettes of the V-PIN were also calculated, ranging from $r = 0.18$ ($p = 0.041$) to 0.48 ($p = 0.000$) and 0.19 ($p = 0.027$) to 0.48 ($p = 0.000$), respectively. Internal consistency was explored in a very small sample at the follow-up the results of which suggested similar results. For the answer categories 'response: yes/no' reliability was good, $\alpha = 0.82$ with item-rest correlations between 0.29-0.54, for 'response aimed towards: parent, child, or both' $\alpha = 0.77$ with item-rest correlations between 0.00-0.78.

Test-retest Reliability

With a very small sample, the V-PIN showed good stability at the retest. The correlation between the test scores at the test ($M = 4.18$, $SD = 2.93$) and the retest ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 2.76$) after (roughly) two months suggested strong results for both the answer category 'response: yes/no', $r = 0.80$ ($p = 0.003$), and the category 'response aimed towards parent, child, or both', $r = 0.87$ ($p = 0.000$).

Relationships between V-PIN Scores

Additionally, we examined the relationship between the total score of ‘response: yes/no’, ‘response aimed towards: parent, child, or both’ and ‘response per type of parenting style’. As expected, the correlation between ‘response: yes/no’ and ‘response aimed towards: parent, child, or both’ was high, $r = 0.94$, $p = 0.000$. Regarding the response to parenting styles in the vignettes, medium correlations were found between the sum scores for authoritarian and authoritative vignettes ($r = 0.33$, $p = 0.000$), for authoritarian and permissive vignettes ($r = 0.48$, $p = .000$) and for permissive and authoritative vignettes ($r = 0.43$, $p = 0.000$). Further, strong correlations were found between vignettes with internalizing and externalizing child behaviour ($r = 0.67$, $p = 0.000$), as well as between vignettes with the two types of locations in the neighbourhood ($r = 0.69$, $p = 0.000$).

Participants' positive judgment of the vignettes was not related to their response. Correlations between ‘positive assessment parenting style’ and ‘response: yes/no’, ‘response aimed towards: parent, child, or both’ were non-significant and low ($r = 0.00$ $p = 0.966$ and $r = 0.05$, $p = 0.579$, respectively). A small-to-medium significant correlation was found between the likelihood to respond and a negative judgment of the vignette description ($r = 0.20$, $p = 0.022$).

Convergent Validity

As expected, the correlations between V-PIN and the Shared Childrearing Responsibility Scale were small but significant for both ‘response: yes/no’ ($r = 0.22$, $p = 0.011$) and ‘response aimed towards: parent, child, or both’ ($r = 0.24$, $p = 0.006$). We subsequently investigated which vignette factors correlated with the SCRS scale (see Table 2). Significant positive small to medium correlations were found for vignettes with the factors permissive parenting style, externalizing child behaviour, and the location around school, both for the intended behaviour (i.e. ‘response: yes/no’) and the number of actors involved (i.e. ‘response aimed towards: parent, child, or both’).

The correlation between the assessment of permissive parenting style and self-report of the permissive parenting scale was significant and, as expected, moderate to strong ($r = 0.47$, $p = 0.035$). As expected, there were no significant correlations between the assessment of the authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles, and self-report of the permissive parenting scale ($r = 0.12$, $p = 0.249$ and $r = 0.11$, $p = 0.200$, respectively).

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Vignettes for each Factor and Relation with the Shared Childrearing Responsibility Scale (N = 134)

Factor	Response: yes/no			Response aimed towards: parent, child, or both		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>R</i> _{V-PIN - SCRS}	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>R</i> _{V-PIN - SCRS}
Parenting style						
Authoritarian	1.39	1.33	0.17	1.60	1.62	0.19*
Authoritative	0.84	1.03	0.13	1.02	1.35	0.13
Permissive	2.72	1.28	0.20*	3.28	1.75	0.23
Problem behaviour						
Internalizing	2.25	1.61	0.16	2.66	2.11	0.17*
Externalizing	2.69	1.55	0.24	3.24	1.96	0.26**
Public Space						
School	2.38	1.69	0.21	2.80	2.10	0.23**

Neighbourhood	2.56	1.45	0.19	3.09	1.99	0.19
---------------	------	------	------	------	------	------

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Note Higher scores indicate that parents reported responding more or more often to both parent and child.

Discriminant Validity

As expected, small and non-significant correlations were found between the response scores of the V-PIN and Social Desirability Scale, $r = 0.16$, $p = 0.072$ and between the V-PIN and the Cantril Ladder ($r = 0.10$, $p = 0.244$), as were the correlation between the V-PIN scores for 'response aimed towards: parent, child, both' and our social desirability measure ($r = 0.09$, $p = 0.283$) and between the V-PIN and the wellbeing score of the Cantril Ladder ($r = 0.06$, $p = 0.518$).

Relationships with Background Variables

The relation between the V-PIN category 'response yes/no' and cultural background ($\eta = .04$, $p = 0.686$), sex ($\eta = 0.05$, $p = 0.576$) or pedagogical profession ($\eta = 0.06$, $p = 0.528$) were not significant. Similar results were found for the V-PIN category 'response aimed towards: parent, child, or both', with non-significant correlation for cultural background ($\eta = 0.10$, $p = 0.320$), sex ($\eta = 0.09$, $p = 0.320$), and pedagogical profession ($\eta = 0.03$, $p = 0.982$). There was no relation between participants' age and their yes/no-responses ($r = 0.03$, $p = 0.753$) and 'response aimed towards: parent, child, both' ($r = 0.04$, $p = 0.615$).

Discussion

This validation study showed that the newly developed Vignettes Parenting Interactions in the Neighbourhood (V-PIN) has a good reliability. Overall, internal consistency was good and the results from a small-scale follow-up suggested stability over a two-month period. Additionally, significant correlations were found between the sum scores of factors (i.e. parenting style, child behaviour, and location in the neighbourhood) in the vignettes, which shows that participants' responses to the vignettes were significantly related across different dimensions (e.g. parenting style, location) of the V-PIN.

Our validation study provided indications for convergent and discriminant validity. V-PIN scores were positively associated with related constructs (i.e. Shared Childrearing Responsibility Scale (Kesselring et al., 2012) and PSDQ (Robinson et al., 1995)). As expected, low and non-significant correlations were found between the V-PIN and the Social Desirability Scale and Cantril's ladder of life, which measure theoretically different constructs. Hence, participants' answers do not seem to be heavily biased by the tendency to give socially desirable answers. Finally, participants' responses to the vignettes do not seem to be influenced by demographic background characteristics such as sex and ethnicity.

Validity refers to the degree to which evidence and theory support the interpretations of test scores for proposed uses of tests (AERA, 2014). Hence, this validation study has not demonstrated the validity of our newly developed measure in an absolute sense. It should also be noted that the reported validation coefficients only provide circumstantial evidence

for the validity of a measure (Borsboom et al., 2004). The empirical evidence from our study with a community-based convenience sample (see also Reimers et al., 2013) provides some support for its validity, but additional studies are required for further validation. Relatedly, our study has provided support for the V-PIN in a specific context, which involved urban-residing participants in the urban region of Amsterdam. Validation in rural and suburban regions, but also other urban cities in the Netherlands would strengthen the support for our measure. The urban context requires also further validation to determine whether our measure honours different cultural and ethnic pedagogical practices of different minorities.

The specific focus of the V-PIN on interactions in the neighbourhood between parents, children and nonparental adults means that there is no single 'golden standard' for validation purposes. However, there are interesting and theoretically linked neighbourhood environmental constructs in the literature that fit in with the nomological network of the V-PIN. It seems interesting to further explore convergent validity with existing measures for informal social control and social cohesion (see Sampson et al., 1997), social isolation (Blair & Ford, 2019), and environmental support from the neighbourhood (Risco et al., 2016). Discriminant validity could be further explored with the various civic engagement measures from the study of Lenzi et al. (2013), for example. These measures are related to attachment with the neighbourhood (i.e., global civic response, intergenerational closure, social relationships with neighbours) but without the specific pedagogical dimension from our measure. Finally, it is important to explore the predictive validity of our measure, because this type of validity was not included in our cross-sectional study. Specifically, it seems interesting to explore whether respondents who have reported on the V-PIN that they are active in the public domain, monitor children's behaviour and possibly support each other in public spaces in the neighbourhood.

In sum, this validation study resulted in positive outcomes which underline the reliability and validity of the V-PIN instrument to measure interactions between nonparental adults, parents, and children in the neighbourhood and to contribute to a better understanding of attitudes towards supportive interactions between community members. Additionally, further details about the use of vignettes, including the response of parents and social professionals, in parenting interactions in the neighbourhood, is also described in another publication (see Rumping et al., 2021).

There has been relatively little attention for the validity and quality of vignettes in social work research (Kandemir & Budd, 2018). This study shows that it is possible to gain insight into the reliability and validity of the vignettes, which contributes to their use in qualitative and quantitative research. In an ongoing project, illustrations are currently being developed, based on the neighbourhood parenting interaction situations (see Figure 1 for an example) to make them more appealing and to increase the applicability of the vignette measure for participants with different backgrounds (Tettegah et al., 2006), such as people with lower levels of literacy (Garcia-Retamero et al., 2012).

Figure 1. Example of an Illustration Based on the Vignettes



The illustrations, which support written scripts of vignettes, may stimulate further use in research into attitudes and intentions regarding supportive parenting interactions in neighbourhoods. The vignettes of the V-PIN and the corresponding visualizations could also be used for educational purposes. The V-PIN may also be used as a tool to stimulate discussion, and reflection with various community members (Blodgett et al., 2011; Evans et al., 2015; Joram, 2007; Kandemir & Budd, 2018). Professionals from social work and voluntary organizations, social welfare institutions, or schools might use the vignettes (possibly complemented with the visualizations) to discuss support networks and to stimulate supportive interactions and social inclusion in the local community.

Limitations

This study is not without limitations. The first limitation concerns the new measure. The V-PIN comprises only a limited number of vignettes. Each vignette provides a rich description in comparison to traditional survey measures (e.g. Likert scales), but their extensive format puts logistic constraints on the number of items that can be included in practice. Second, the present validation study included a selection of useful validation measures, but other measures may contribute significantly to the assessment of the construct validity of the V-PIN. The validation of (new) measures is an ongoing process in social sciences and, seen from that perspective, this study has provided the first promising results which need further validation in future research, including a larger sample for the test-retest. Third, a confirmatory factor analysis may shed further light upon the psychometric structure of the V-PIN and its manipulated factors. Fourth, the participants in this study were all parents from the

Netherlands, and women were predominant in our sample. These parents may all have their own cultural beliefs systems regarding parenting and child development (i.e. parental ethnotheories, see Harkness et al., 2000), related to their familiarity with other community members. A larger sample with more participants from various demographic backgrounds (e.g. sex, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, urban and rural setting) and other variables (e.g. cultural beliefs systems, professionals, volunteers, and neighbours) would increase the generalizability of the current findings.

Conclusion

The V-PIN is a new instrument to explore the perspective and dynamics of nonparental adults in parent-child interactions in the neighbourhood, which is important for measuring social support in the community. The V-PIN may be used in social work and community settings to discuss perspectives and dynamics with various stakeholders, and can be supplemented with visualizations of neighbourhood interactions to make vignettes more easily usable for marginalized audience. The present study encompasses the description of an innovative measure and the first validation results for the Vignettes Parenting Interactions in the Neighbourhood (V-PIN), which indicate good reliability and validity.

Ethical Considerations

This study is carried out in line with the Netherlands code of conduct for scientific practice (2018).

Acknowledgments

We thank AUAS Bachelor Social Work students for their contributions to this project.

References

- Achenbach, T. M. (1999). The Child Behavior Checklist and related instruments. In: M. E. Maruish (Ed.), *The use of psychological testing for treatment planning and outcomes assessment* (pp. 429–466). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- AERA (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. AERA.
- Amsterdam University for Applied Sciences (2018). Jaarverslag 2018 [Annual report 2018]. <https://www.hva.nl/over-de-hva/organisatie/plannen-feiten-en-verslagen/jaarverslag/jaarverslag.html>
- Asmar, A., van Audenhove, L., & Mariën, I. (2020). Social support for digital inclusion: Towards a typology of social support patterns. *Social Inclusion, 8*(2), 138-150.
- Atzmuller, C., & Steiner, P.M. (2010). Experimental vignette studies in survey research. *Methodology, 6*(3), 128–138. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-2241/a000014>
- Bakker, L., Damen, R., van den Bos, K., & Burgers, R. (2016). *Samen opvoeden in de gemeente Barneveld!?* [Shared childrearing responsibility in Barneveld?!] University Utrecht: master thesis. <https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/338108>
- Barrera M. (2000). Social support research in community psychology. In Rappaport, J., & Seidman, E. (eds), *Handbook of Community Psychology* (pp. 215-245). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-4193-6_10
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs, 4*, 1-103. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0030372>
- Blair, L. M., & Ford, J. L. (2019). Neighborhood context and the risk for developmental disabilities in early childhood. *Maternal and Child Health Journal, 23*, 1213–1219. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10995-019-02757-w>
- Borsboom, D., Mellenbergh, G. J., & van Heerden, J. (2004). The concept of validity. *Psychological Review, 111*(4), 1061-1071. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.111.4.1061>
- Bosacki, S., Dane, A., & Marini, Z. (2007). Peer relationships and internalizing problems in adolescents: mediating role of self-esteem. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 12*, 261–282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632750701664293>
- Blodgett, A. T., Schinke, R. J., Smith, B., Peltier, D., & Pheasant, C. (2011). In Indigenous Words: Exploring Vignettes as a Narrative Strategy for Presenting the Research Voices of Aboriginal Community Members. *Qualitative Inquiry, 17*(6), 522-533. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800411409885>
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs, 4*(1, Pt.2), 1–103. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0030372>
- Cantril, H. (1965). *The pattern of human concerns*. Rutgers University Press.
- Cohen, J., McCabe, L., Michelli, N. M., & Pickeral, T. (2009). School Climate: Research, Policy, Practice, and Teacher Education. *Teachers College Record, 111*(1), 180-213. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ826002>
- Counts, J. M., Buffington, E. S., Chang-Rios, K., Rasmussen, H. N., & Preacher, K. J. (2010). The development and validation of the protective factors survey: A self-report measure of protective factors against child maltreatment. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 34*(10), 762–772. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2010.03.003>
- Dambi, J. M., Corten, L., Chiwaridzo, M., Jack, H., Mlambo, T., & Jelsma, J. (2018). A systematic review of the psychometric properties of the cross-cultural translations and adaptations of the Multidimensional Perceived Social Support Scale (MSPSS). *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes, 16*(1), 80–80. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-018-0912-0>
- Evans, S. C., Roberts, M. C., Keeley, J. W., Blossom, J. B., Amaro, C. M., Garcia, A. M., Stough, C.O., Canter, K. S., Robles, R., & Reed, G. M. (2015). Vignette

- methodologies for studying clinicians' decision-making: Validity, utility, and application in ICD-11 field studies. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology, 15* (2), 160-170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijchp.2014.12.001>
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*, 175-191. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146>
- Ferguson, K. M. (2006). Social capital and children's wellbeing: a critical synthesis of the international social capital literature. *International Journal of Social Welfare, 15*, 2-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2397.2006.00575.x>
- Ferligoj, A., & Hlebec, V. (1999). Evaluation of social network measurement instruments. *Social Networks, 21*(2), 111-130. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-8733\(99\)00007-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-8733(99)00007-6)
- Garbarino, J. (2014). Ecological Perspective on Child Well-Being. In: A. Ben-Arieh, F. Casas, I Frønes, J. Korbin (eds), *Handbook of Child Well-Being* (pp. 1365-384). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9063-8_140
- Garcia-Retamero, R., Okan, Y., & Cokely, E. T. (2012). Using visual aids to improve communication of risks about health: A review. *The Scientific World, 2012*, 562637–10. <https://doi.org/10.1100/2012/562637>
- Geens, N., Roets, G., & Vandebroek, M. (2019). Parents' perspectives of social support and social cohesion in urban contexts of diversity. *European Journal of Social Work, 22*(3), 423-434. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691457.2017.1366426>
- Gillies, V. (2004). Parenting and social capital: Accessing help and support from informal social networks. *Sociologija, 46*(3), 245-258. <https://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/0038-0318/2004/0038-03180403245G.pdf>
- Gottlieb, B. H., & Bergen, A. E. (2010). Social support concepts and measures. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 69*(5), 511–520. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2009.10.001>
- Harkness, S., Super, C. M., & Tijen, N. V. (2000). Individualism and the “Western Mind” reconsidered: American and Dutch parents' ethnotheories of the child. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 2000*(87), 23–39. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.23220008704>
- Horjus, B. & van Dijken, M.W. (2017). Op zoek naar verbinding in de samenleving - Lessen uit acht jaar onderzoek naar De Vreedzame Wijk. [Searching for connection within society – lessons from eight years of research into the Vreedzame Wijk] *Pedagogiek, 37*(2), 119-130. <https://doi.org/10.5117/PED2017.2.HORJ>
- Hughes, D. J. (2018). Psychometric Validity: Establishing the Accuracy and Appropriateness of Psychometric Measures. In P. Irwing, T. Booth, & D. J. Hughes (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of psychometric testing: A multidisciplinary approach to survey, scale and test Development*. Wiley.
- Joram, E. (2007). Clashing epistemologies: Aspiring teachers', practicing teachers', and professors' beliefs about knowledge and research in education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(2), 123-135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.04.032>
- Kandemir, A., & Budd, R. (2018). Using vignettes to explore reality and values with young people. *Qualitative Social Research, 9*(2), 1-23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fqs-19.2.2914>
- Kesselring, M.C., de Winter, M., van de Schoot, R., & van Yperen, T. (2012). Do parents think it takes a village? Parents' attitude towards nonparental adult' involvement in the upbringing of children. *Journal of Community Psychology, 40*(8), 821-937. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21497>
- Kesselring, M., De Winter, M., Horjus B., & Van Yperen, T. (2016). Private worry or public issue? A focus group study on parents' perspectives on nonparental adult's roles and responsibilities in childrearing (pp.77-98). Dissertation.

- <http://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/342106>
- Korbin, J. E., & Coulton, C. J. (1996). The role of neighbors and the government in neighborhood-based child protection. *Journal of Social Issues, 52*(3), 163-76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1996.tb01584.x>
- Konijn, C., Lekkerkerker, L., & Matthaei, H. (2009). CAP-J, de nieuwe DSM voor de jeugdzorg [CAP-J, the new DSM for youth care]. *Jeugd en Co Kennis, 3*, 19-29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03087515>
- Kluwer, E. (2010). From partnership to parenthood: A review of marital change across the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Family Theory and Review, 2*, 105-125. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-2589.2010.00045.x>
- Langford, C. P. H., Bowsher, J., Maloney, J. P., & Lillis, P. P. (1997). Social support: a conceptual analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 25*, 95-100. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.1997.1997025095.x>
- Lenzi, M., Vieno, A., Pastore, M., & Santinello, M. (2013). Neighborhood social connectedness and adolescent civic engagement: An integrative model. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 34*, 45-54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2012.12.003>
- Levin, K.A. & Currie, C. (2014). Reliability and validity of an adapted version of the Cantril ladder for use with adolescent samples. *Social Indicators Research, 119*, 1047–1063. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0507-4>
- Lund, H. (2003). Testing the claims of new urbanism: Local access, pedestrian travel, and neighboring behaviors. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 69*(4), 414–429. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944360308976328>
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology*. Wiley.
- McDonell J. R., & Melton, G. B. (2008). Toward a science of community intervention. *Family & Community Health, 31*(2), 113-125. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.fch.0000314572.66528.fe>
- McGoron, L., Riley, M. R., & Scaramella, L. V. (2020). Cumulative socio-contextual risk and child abuse potential in parents of young children: Can social support buffer the impact? *Child & Family Social Work, 25*(4), 865–874. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12771>
- McPherson, K. E., Kerr, S., McGee, E., Morgan, A., Cheater, F. M., McLean, J., & Egan, J. (2014). The association between social capital and mental health and behavioural problems in children and adolescents: an integrative systematic review. *BMC Psychology, 2*(7). <https://doi.org/10.1186/2050-7283-2-7>
- Minh, A., Muhajarine, N. Janus., Brownell, M., & Guhn. M. (2017). A review of neighborhood effects and early child development: How, where, and for whom, do neighborhoods matter? *Health & Place, 46*, 155-174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2017.04.012>
- Mishra, S. (2020). Social networks, social capital, social support and academic success in higher education: A systematic review with a special focus on “underrepresented” students. *Educational Research Review, 29*, 100307–. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2019.100307>
- Nederhof, A. J. (1985). Methods of coping with social desirability bias: a review. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 15*, 263-280. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420150303>
- Negash, T., & Maguire-Jack, K. (2016). Do social services matter for child maltreatment prevention?: Interactions between social support and parent's knowledge of available local social services. *Journal of Family Violence, 31*, 557–565. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-015-9788-5>
- Nelson, S. K., Kushlev, K., English, T., Dunn, E.W., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2013). In defense of parenthood: Children are associated with more joy than misery. *Psychological Science, 24*(1), 3-10.

- <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612447798>
- Overmars-Marx, T., Thomése, F., & Meininger, H. (2017). Social inclusion in the neighbourhood and the professional role identity of group home staff members: views and experiences of staff regarding neighbourhood social inclusion of people with intellectual disabilities. *Society, Health and Vulnerability*, 8(1), 1395676–. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20021518.2017.1395676>
- Reimers, A. K., Mess, F., Bucksch, J., Jekauc, D. & Alexander Woll, A. (2013). Systematic review on measurement properties of questionnaires assessing the neighbourhood environment in the context of youth physical activity behaviour. *BMC Public Health*, 13, 461. <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2458/13/461>
- Risco, C. M., Collado, A. D., Reynolds, E. K., Lejuez, C. W., & MacPherson, L. (2016). Evaluation of the Environmental Supports Scale with a community sample of adolescents. *Prevention Science*, 17, 493–502. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-016-0637-4>
- Robinson, C.C., Mandleco, B., Frost Olsen, S., & Hart, C.H. (1995). Authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting practices: development of a new measure. *Psychological Reports*, 7(7), 819-830. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1995.77.3.819>
- Rodrigo, M., S. Byrne and B. Rodríguez (2014), “Parenting styles and child well-being”, In: A. Ben-Arieh, F. Casas, I. Frønes, & J. Korbin (Eds.), *Handbook of Child Well-Being* (pp. 2173-2196). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9063-8_86
- Rumping, S. M., Boendermaker, L., & Fukkink, R. G. (2021). Social interactions among nonparental adults and parents in the neighbourhood: a mixed-method vignette study. *European Journal of Social Work*, 25(3), 376-390.
- Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277(5328), 918-924. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.277.5328.918>
- Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D., & Earls, F. (1999). Beyond social capital: spatial dynamics of collective efficacy for children. *American Sociological Review*, 64, 633-660. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2657367>
- Schalenbourg, K., & Verschueren, K. (2003). Probleemgedrag van kleuters op school en de relatie met ouderlijke opvoeding. [Problem behaviour of toddlers on school and the relation with parenting]. *Kind en Adolescent*, 24, 111-121. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03060891>
- Tettegah, S., Taylor, K., Won Whang, E., Meistninkas, S., & Chamot, R. (2006). Can virtual reality simulations be used as a research tool to study empathy, problems solving and perspective taking of educators? Theory, method and application. *ACM SIGGRAPH Educators Program, ACM*, 35-es. Web. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1179295.1179331>
- Tomison, A. & Wise, S. (1999). Community Based Approaches in Preventing Child Maltreatment. *Issues in Child Abuse Prevention*, 11. <http://aifs.gov.au/nch/pubs/issues/issues11/issues11.pdf>
- Tufford, L. & Lee, B. (2018) Decision-Making Factors in the Mandatory Reporting of Child maltreatment. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Trauma*, 12(2), 233-244. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40653-018-0211-2>
- Turner, R. J., & Brown, R. L. (2010). Social support and mental health. In T. L. Scheid & T. N. Brown (Eds.), *A handbook for the study of mental health: Social contexts, theories, and system* (pp. 200-212). Cambridge University Press.
- VSNU (2018). Nederlandse gedragscode wetenschappelijke integriteit. [Netherlands code for conduct of scientific practice]. <https://www.vsnunl/files/documenten/Nederlandse%20gedragscode%20wetenschappelijke%20integriteit%202018.pdf>
- Wilks, T. (2004). The use of vignettes in qualitative research into social work values. *Qualitative Social Work*, 3(1), 78–87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325004041133>
- Wilson. H. F. (2013). Collective life: parents, playground encounters and the multicultural

city. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 14(6), 625-648.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2013.800220>

Witten, K., McCreanor, T., Kearns, R., & Ramasubramanian, L. (2001). The impacts of a school closure on neighbourhood social cohesion: narratives from Invercargill, New Zealand. *Health & Place*, 7(4), 307–317. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1353-8292\(01\)00023-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1353-8292(01)00023-5)

Biographical Notes

Sanne Rumping, MSc, is researcher at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences and PhD student by the Research Institute for Child Development and Education at the University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Themes in her work are, intervention development for youth social work, implementation, collaboration between professionals, parents and volunteers and urban education.

Ruben Fukkink, PhD, is professor of Pedagogy at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences and is also professor by Special Appointment of Childcare and Education Services for Young Children in the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences at the University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands. His work has appeared in various peer-reviewed journals. Special themes in his work are: early childhood education and care, parental support, urban education.

Leonieke Boendermaker, PhD, is professor implementation and effectiveness in youth care services at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences and is also professor by Special Appointment of implementation in youth care in the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences at the University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Her work focusses on the development, implementation, quality and effectiveness of interventions in youth care services, with special attention for residential care, interventions for young people with serious behavioural problems and urban education.