

# 3

---

## *Child Care in a Dutch Context: On the History, Current Status, and Evaluation of Nonmaternal Child Care in the Netherlands*

LILY E CLERKX

*University of Amsterdam*

MARINUS H VAN IJZENDOORN

*Leiden University*

### HISTORICAL ROOTS OF CHILD CARE IN THE NETHERLANDS: DOMESTICITY, PILLARIZATION AND INDUSTRIALIZATION

In the Middle Ages the region now covered by the Netherlands and Belgium was divided into a large number of duchies, counties, and bishoprics. In the 14th century they were unified into one realm and a century later brought under the rule of the Spanish empire, although each unit kept its own laws and privileges (Goudsblom, 1967, p. 12).

The emergence of the Dutch state occurred at the end of the 16th century. Conflicts about taxes and religion with the Roman Catholic government in Spain led to a popular revolt. After an 80-year struggle for independence led by the Dutch Protestant bourgeoisie, the northern part of the low countries won its freedom—the Republic of the Seven United Provinces.

The new nation rapidly rose to “great economic prosperity, political power and cultural splendor” (Goudsblom, 1967, p. 14). The commercial successes of the state-supported East Indian Company strongly contributed to this development. In the arts and sciences the 17th century still stands out as the golden age of Dutch history, although at the same time many people lived in very poor conditions.

Several features characteristic of the Dutch state in its early years were to have an enduring impact on society. As the state was highly decentralized, many regional differences remained unaffected. Thus, the coastal provinces of Holland and Zeeland were dominated by a class of rich merchants, whereas the gentry managed to maintain a powerful feudal position in the rural inland regions.

Although the seven provinces were nominally of equal status, in fact the province of Holland was by far the most powerful. Even today the whole country is often referred to as "Holland." Its wealth derived mainly from shipping and commerce, the colonies in the East and West Indies contributed a great deal to it (Goudsblom, 1967, p. 16).

Within the dominant province of Holland, political and economic power rested almost exclusively with a comparatively small elite of rich merchants and their kin. Much that strikes today as typically Dutch can be traced back to the strong influence of this leading elite, whose life style was "averse to military grandeur and courtly splendor" (Goudsblom, 1967, pp. 16-17).

The Reformation also had great impact on Dutch society, notably Calvinism. Its growth coincided with the revolt against Spain. Once in power, the Calvinists declared their religion to be the state religion, trying to protestantize the people, for example, by school education. At this moment a segregation arose between the different religions that put its stamp on Dutch society until a short time ago (Goudsblom, 1967, p. 17).

Children had to learn the alphabet to be able to read the Bible. The clergymen could not leave this important task to the mothers, so they established infant schools with a master or more often a mistress, children had to be brought at the age of 2 or 3 years, as soon as they could walk or were weaned from the mother's breast. This lower limit to the entrance of infant schools here and elsewhere without doubt had much to do with this time of weaning.

The Dutch household was a small unit called *gezin* (*family*), consisting mostly of a husband, a wife, and some children. These children could be the couple's own children, or step- or fosterchildren. Because many adults died young, one third of all households were composite families, arranged after remarriage or by adopting orphans. Often a child did not live with its biological mother, but with its stepmother or fostermother. Sometimes a relative or a servant lived with the family. Richer families were larger than poorer families.

In general babies and infants were cared for by several persons, mostly women and older children. Young children were not only attached to their mothers, but to several caretakers. Yet, mostly there was a special tie between mother and child, in particular the youngest, a tie that had much to do with nursing. In that time, mother's milk was of vital importance for a baby, which meant that mother and child had frequent contact during the first 2 years.

On the other hand, a mother had to do more than care for and raise one child. She had to care for other persons as well as the housework and often had tasks in productive labor, in the farmhouse, or in handicraft—for the most part the place of work was in the house. Children had to learn to see their mother's work as important because it was in the interest of all members of the household, including the children. Among farmers and craftsmen children began to work at the age of 7 years.

The mother also had the responsibility for the physical and moral well being

of her children, although the father had formal power over them. Therefore the care for an infant by other persons always was a derived care. As far as is known, fathers had no important role in the practical care of infants, although in poor and isolated households where mothers had a heavy workload, fathers certainly would have to help out. In certain circumstances, especially in small, poor families, it happened that young children were brought to other women in the neighborhood (often widows), who were paid for their care. Some of these women made a living out of minding children in their own house (Van Rijswijk-Clerkx, 1981).

In the 17th century the bourgeois family experienced a separation between place of work and place of living (that is long before the start of industrialization!). The warehouse or office of the merchant no longer had its seat in the house. Consequently, the wife no longer participated in her husband's work—as was the case in earlier times and in lower social classes. Instead her main task was housekeeping.

The well-built and well furnished house in the town became the status symbol of the well-to-do *burghers*. Their example was followed by the *petits bourgeois*, building smaller houses of the same type in the sideroads. The *housewife* was responsible for the neatness and tidiness of the house, for the storecellar and the linen cupboard. She often had one maid-servant, with whom she did all the work in the household and took care of the children. The housewife had to live an orderly and decent life, predominantly inside the home. Family life centered in or near the house, where the family received guests, had dinners, and made music. These women in the bourgeois class cultivated the virtue of homely cosiness or *gezelligheid*.

Great value was attached to family cohesion and an introverted family culture. The members of the family, the *gezin*, felt a strong sense of togetherness. The example set by the leading burgher families in the 17th century, became a guiding model for Dutch family life in other social classes and later epochs (Goudsblom, 1967).

In the 18th century the aristocracy and the highest circles of the bourgeoisie did not do any housework or production work with their hands. They had many servants in the household. Child care and education were also seen as labor, for which one had live-in maids, nannies (*kindervermeid* or *kindervrouw*), governesses, and tutors. These families sometimes had a wet nurse for the baby for a period of about 2 years. In France families would send the baby away to a wet nurse in the countryside, but in Holland the nurse was always brought to the family, leaving her own child back home in her village. It is no wonder that children became more attached to their nurse than to their mother (Clerkx, 1984a).

It was characteristic of wealthier families in the Netherlands to keep their young children at home and hire personnel to care for them. Poor families brought their young children—only if necessary—outside the home to other people (Van Rijswijk-Clerkx, 1981).



FIG 3 1 Rich bourgeois family making music, Maid with children in the distance Pieter de Hooch, "Family making music" 1665 oilpainting Cleveland Museum of Art

In the first half of the 19th century the economic situation was very bad, unemployment was a general phenomenon. Industrialization did not really start before 1870. A large portion of the population was pauperized and there were many foundlings. Members of the bourgeoisie used the growing need for cheap child day care of the poor in organizing *infant schools* or *bewaarscholen* as charitable institutions, where parents could bring their children from 2 years upward. There they could stay for the whole day. They were under cover and often got a meal.

Although Dutch pedagogues had beautiful ideas of elevating the whole population by educating young children in marvelous schools, the true purpose of the bourgeois boards of these infant schools was to discipline and civilize the children of the poor, they feared rebellion and criminality. Consequently, children were brought by hundreds to buildings such as old factories.

Pedagogues had no confidence in mothers of the lower classes. They preferred to take the children out of these "bad" families as early and as long as possible to keep them in infant schools in order to give them a better education. Mothers



FIG 3.2 Frans Hals, "Nurse and child" 1618/1620, oilpainting Berlin Dahlem, Gemaldegalerie

brought them there only out of necessity, because their small houses were overcrowded or because both parents worked outdoors. After 1870, unemployment was so great that there was generally little need for female and child labor. At the same time, male wages were so low that many married women needed to earn money (Singer, 1989, Van Rijswijk Clerkx, 1981).

Although parents often preferred the little schools led by women at their own home, these were often overcrowded. Mothers always tried first to get work at home where they could care for their children. In such cases the elder children could help their mother. If this was impossible they would take their children

with them to work in the fields or in factories Or, they worked in the evening when the husband was at home Still, more and more situations arose in which mothers and babies were separated during daytime

After 1870, on the initiative of bourgeois ladies for poor women, nurseries or *bewaarplaatsen* for the youngest children were established However, women had to prove they were obliged to work because of economic necessity Children from a few weeks upward could stay there for the whole day Mothers were encouraged to come in and breastfeed their babies According to the standards of the time, these nurseries were of good quality Much attention was paid to hygienic measures, necessary in a time of high infant mortality All nurses wore uniforms Every child was bathed daily The babies slept in nice cradles The children got milk and good meals The nurses, who came from the same social background as the parents of the children, did housekeeping work as well as caring for and playing with the children both inside the nursery and (preferably) on the playground Everything was controlled by the board of ladies

As a result of the rising standard of living and the development of the medical sciences at the end of the 19th century, the modern nuclear family first developed in the bourgeois class, and throughout the 20th century spread to other social classes The typical nuclear family consisted of two parents with their own children, all of whom were living longer, and eventually without other relatives in the house Middle- and upper-class families, including gentlemen-farmers,



FIG 33 Mothers took their children with them to their work "Meal time during field work" (Photo Regional Museum of Drenthe, Assen)



FIG. 3 4 Disciplining and civilizing the children of the poor. "Bewaarschool" Infant school in Amsterdam (1890. Photo: Municipal Archive Amsterdam).

however, kept their domestic staff until World War II. Wet nurses disappeared after the discovery of good quality bottle-milk around 1900. Child care and education got more attention from the experts. Children, especially boys, had to go through a longer process of socialization before arriving at the labor market. Compulsory education started in 1900 (Van Rijswijk-Clerkx, 1981).

At the end of the 19th century middle-class mothers were approached by pedagogues, such as Fröbel, to take up the education of their youngest children instead of leaving this task to domestic servants of low status. While offering mothers help in acquiring educational skills, Fröbel was met by reluctance. Rather than accepting such time-consuming and energy-depleting tasks by themselves, the mothers asked for better educated nannies. As a result, Fröbel and his (female) followers started courses for teachers, opened *kindergartens*, and tried to get the upper- and middle-class children into these schools. But significant numbers did not enroll in infant schools until 1920, when good quality *Montesorschools* were founded (Clerkx, 1984a).

In the long run, *kindergartens* became a general phenomenon in Holland, but nurseries remained restricted to a few dozen in the big cities. They never achieved the position of the *kindergartens*. Among pedagogues there was no debate about nurseries. It was their opinion that even poor women had to nurse and take care



FIG 3.5 Nursery in Amsterdam (1915. Photo: Institute Social History Amsterdam)

of their own babies, which was what the mothers wanted anyway. Even when mothers were obliged to look for a caretaker, they preferred somebody within their own family or neighborhood, rather than a nursery (Van Rijswijk-Clerkx, 1981).

Meanwhile in Dutch society a system of *verzuijing* or *pillarization* had arisen, the idea being that the various ideological groups of the population represent pillars supporting the national state. These pillars were Roman Catholicism, Protestantism, liberalism, and (later) socialism. They had their own political parties, schools, trade unions, mass media, and so on. The system of pillarization tended to restrain the modernization of society for a long time. People predominantly married within their own pillar. The traditional family standards were kept alive within the religious pillars (Goudsblom, 1967, pp. 32, 33).

Bourgeois feminists of the first wave—especially in the interbellum—exerted themselves to raise the status of the married wife as housekeeper and mother. They did not propagate nurseries for the youngest children, but were active in the kindergarten movement, especially with the purpose of obtaining jobs for unmarried educated women.

The proletarian women's league propagated nurseries only for a short time (as a part of the ideal of collectivizing housekeeping). Eventually they agreed with the male socialist strategy to raise male wages so mothers could stay at home to care for their husbands and children. The government aided the process with

protective legislation restricting female labor. Employers, churches, and social institutions also helped the process. In the end, the labor movement considered it an achievement that married women did not need to work outside their homes.

Pedagogic advice in the 1920s and 1930s stressed a parental attitude of cleanliness, tranquillity, and regularity (or in Dutch or German the "three Rs": *Reinheid, Rust en Regelmaat*). Feeding schedules had to be strict; infants should not be picked up in between, for fear of spoiling them. Mothers should let them cry, until it was their suckling time and should refrain from cuddling the infants. If possible, babies had to sleep in a quiet room undisturbed and alone. Older children had to obey, to be polite, and were not allowed to disturb or interrupt their parents. Although there may be a difference between pedagogic advice and parental attitudes, a certain convergence can be assumed (Singer, 1989; Van Rijswijk-Clerkx, 1981).

### RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN CHILD CARE: THE PILL, FEMINISM, AND THE LABOR MARKET

After World War II, politically powerful groups feared radicalization because of several years of lasting poverty and a widespread sympathy for the Russians and Communists due to their role in the war. The cold war soon brought an end to this radicalization. Emigration was stimulated on a large scale as a solution for poverty because of supposed overpopulation. The government tried to prevent the loss of norms and respect for authorities (Harmsen & Reinalda, 1975).

In the initial years after the war, there were more divorces, unmarried motherhood, and some experts suggested that the youth were "running wild." As a result, with the support of private initiative, the government started a campaign called "Restoration of the family brings restoration of society." The nuclear family was the model for this campaign; the husband was the sole breadwinner and the wife was a housewife and mother.

During this period, special social work nurseries were set up in extremely impoverished urban quarters with the purpose of socializing children and educating housewives of large poor families, without allowing these women to earn money for their families. In reality many poor women did earn money. Some took in homework, seasonal work for factories, cleaned houses of richer families in the mornings, or cleaned offices and schools in the early mornings or evenings. In this way, husbands or older children were able to be home looking after the youngest children. The low wages in the years directly following the war made such practices necessary. Industry and transport had to be built up again and the Netherlands lost its colonies. Obviously, the government policy of low wages contradicted its policy of having only one breadwinner within the family (Moree & Van Vliet, 1989, p. 346).

Yet the government's goal of strengthening the nuclear family got support

because it corresponded with the needs of the people, who were looking for a new safety and trust after the war. The slowly rising level of living in the 1950s and especially the development of the welfare state in the long run made it possible to realize this policy.

In Western Europe after the war the interests of experts in children increased first from the medical side, later among psychologists. Investigations demonstrated that children, who during wartime stayed in institutions because of evacuation or loss of parents, showed disturbed behavior. This was ascribed to the absence of the mother, no attention was paid to the bad conditions in the institutions, or to the social situation of total deprivation of these children (in the Netherlands it was De Wit [1962] who wrote a thorough criticism of these investigations). On the basis of such investigations Bowlby (1951) wrote his report for the World Health Organization. He postulated that deprivation of mother love could result in irreparable psychic damage. Due to the general atmosphere in Dutch society, this theory fell on fertile soil. It was generally accepted and popularized in an unshaded way and found its way into social work and popular magazines. Mothers had to be present and available day and night, otherwise their children might turn out bad.

Kindergartens (*kleuterscholen*) were accepted now by the whole population, most of them developed out of the old ones (*bewaarscholen*). They were seen as an indispensable preparation for primary school (compulsory from 6 years onward). Their quality had been extremely improved as a result of legislation (1957), state subsidy, and supervision. The age of entrance rose from 3 to 4 years, children were no longer allowed to remain at school during lunchtime, and school hours were shortened. The infant school lost its caretaking function while its educational function increased now that more mothers were at home. Children of upper-class families also attended the infant schools, because the quality of the schools had improved and nannies were no longer used (Clerkx, 1984b).

In the 1950s and early 1960s the modern nuclear family had become the standard in the Netherlands. The number of married women working outside the home was at an all time low level. Only a single female physician and the league of communist oriented women supervised the few nurseries for children of working class women, these nurseries were unknown to the general public. Due to an increasing social security system the threat of poverty and illness declined. The birthrate fell sharply, especially after the introduction of the "pill" in 1964. Children were now cared for by their mothers. But these benefits also brought some unwanted consequences. Young children were restricted in their experiences because most of the time they had interaction only with one adult: the mother (the father was only available on the weekends) and sometimes with one brother or sister. All mothers, whatever their professional education, were restricted to kitchen, vacuum cleaner, washing diapers, and looking after the children. If they wanted to go out in daytime, that was possible only in the companionship of their offspring. As a consequence, a very intensive and

exclusive relation between mother and child arose, which implied that other people were experienced as strangers

In the Netherlands, as in the Western world in general, a situation had come into being, unique in time and space, in which more and more mothers could spend more time caring for fewer children. This situation was considered normal, in the 1950s and 1960s, and was reflected in the writings of Dutch child psychologists, pedagogues, and psychiatrists, who were strongly influenced by Bowlby's (1951) early theory. They took for granted that children attached themselves first to their mother, then to their father and other adults, and finally to other children. They thought that attachment of the infant to one person—the mother or mother figure—was a condition for good personality development. They legitimated the existing situation with this theory without recognizing it as a product of historical development that could change.

In addition, Dutch experts, such as professor Bladergroen (1957), asked mothers to pay more attention to the emotional well being and intellectual development of their babies and toddlers. Mothers had to be available day and night to comfort and play with them. Infants had to be fed when they asked for



FIG 3.6 Mothers spent more time with fewer children from the 1960s (Photo Cas Oortuys)

it Mothers had to be attentive to their needs and pick them up whenever they cried and cuddle them without being afraid of spoiling them – sensitive reacting was in the interest of the child Older children were allowed to move around more freely and to ask questions without being accused of insolence Strict obedience was no longer asked Parents' attitudes, especially in the middle class, became more tolerant, they subordinated themselves more and more to the needs of their children This attitude corresponded to the declining respect for authority in society and the rising quality of life, which made it possible for more and more parents to fulfil the needs and wishes of their children People listened less to prescriptions of the church and to advices of relatives and neighbors in matters of child care and education, this was part of the processes of migration, secularization, and de-pillarization in the postwar years Experts became more important Many advisory books on child care had been published, of which Dr Spock's – translated into Dutch – was the best known Special columns in women's magazines (such as *Margriet*) and even special magazines for parents arose Due to a smaller number of children and an easier, mechanized, housekeeping mothers had more time for their children They had a strong desire to do their best for their children and eagerly accepted expert advice (Brinkgreve & Korzec, 1978, Van Rijswijk-Clerkx, 1981)

It was the second feminist wave starting about 1970 that put an end to these ideas about an exclusive mother-child relation Several groups of higher-educated married women became discontented with their roles as housewives and full time mothers This discontent was sharply put into words by Joke Smit, whose impact in the Netherlands in this respect is comparable to Betty Friedan's in the United States (Kool-Smit, 1967) These higher-educated mothers felt torn between their aspirations to realize their own intellectual or artistic abilities and their responsibility for the proper care and education of their children In short, they felt a need for day care Small groups of mothers organized a kind of mutual *childminding* In turn, one mother cared for the children in her house so that the other mothers were free for some hours This was the beginning of playgroups Other mothers tried to get a place for their child in one of the existing nurseries, but these did not open their doors to them They were only interested in cases of emergency, especially in the lower classes They did not service middle-class mothers who wanted to study or to work Work was seen as luxury Besides, there were too few of these day-care centers (*kinderdagverblijven*)

Why did these women ask for institutional care and why did they not take a nurse inside their home to take care of the child? Many did hire baby-sitters (*oppas*), but in this newly arisen middle class there was no tradition of houseservants as was the case in the old upper classes There was an aversion to strangers in the house and an increasing notion of the child's need for contact with other children There was also a need for institutional care because of the lack of traditional caretakers in the network Due to migration, young families did not

always live in the same neighborhood as the grandparents, and older children, if present, were at school.

About 1970 feminist action groups asked the government for day-care institutions (*crèches* as they were called). This was the first time in history that mothers asked for institutional day care for their *own* children. They encountered great resistance. The ideology of the mother-at-home, supported by the psychological theories that the personality of the child would be hurt when missing its mother, even if it was only for a short time, was so strong that actions for day care were not well-received (Clerkx, 1986; Van Rijswijk-Clerkx, 1981).

At that time advocates of child day-care centers discovered a counter theory forwarded by the Dutch psychiatrist Van den Berg (1958). He pointed in particular to the dangers of isolated and overprotective love, through which the personality of the child is totally absorbed by the mother and susceptible to her neurotising influences. Van den Berg considered this as a modern development. He warned of the danger theories like that of Bowlby can have in stimulating an artificial love in the mother for the child (cf. De Wit, 1962). Van den Berg recommended giving more persons an opportunity to educate young children, even if the mother is a good mother. Advocates of day-care centers considered day care to be an opportunity to extend the educational environment, although Van den Berg did not mention it as such in 1958.

In the 1970s the number of employed mothers of young children increased. But the growth in the number of day-care institutions did not keep pace with this trend. Informal child-care arrangement involving family members and paid baby-sitters predominated. Only the playgroups—now in localities outside the home and under the supervision of paid nurses or teachers—expanded quickly over the whole country. These playgroups for toddlers (*peuterspeelzalen*), however, were only open 2 or 3 hours a day and not more than 2 days a week. They were intended for 3-year-old children (the age group excluded from the infant schools by law since 1957), but they had hardly any function for mothers. The growth of day-care centers, open every working day a whole day long, was so slow, because they were more expensive (needed more state subsidy) and because they still had a negative image. The feminist movement even lost its interest in this issue for a few years (Van Rijswijk-Clerkx, 1981). This negative image existed even though research had shown that a day-care center could stimulate children's cognitive development. In Amsterdam an experimental day-care center (the *Proefkroche*) had functioned from 1970 till 1975, which proved that all children benefitted intellectually by their stay in this center (Kohnstamm, 1976).

In the 1980s, when the recession was felt more sharply and professional women did not want to lose their jobs when having a baby, actions for day-care centers started again. As these actions expanded, mothers who wanted to use day-care facilities were accused of egoism, still more than before. In particular, a

small number of influential Dutch psychiatrists of the older generation felt compelled to act as defenders of the child. They rejected day-care centers and claimed that the mother should be the most important socializer during the child's first years. Relying mainly on the early Bowlby, they pleaded for the nuclear family with the protecting father and the caring mother. If it were possible they would have added proof that day-care centers are damaging, however no references to investigations were given.

Bowlby's early theory has been criticized by Dutch educational psychologists (Van IJzendoorn, Tavecchio, Goossens, and others). A child, indeed, needs secure attachment, but this is not necessarily restricted to one single person (the mother figure), as Bowlby proposed. Attachment to more persons at the same time (father, nurse in a day-care center) at a very young age might even be better for the child: In that case, it would be better prepared for possible separation from one of the caregivers, while its world of experience (other children, cognitive stimulation) is enriched at the same time. These Dutch researchers speak of an extension of the childrearing environment (Van IJzendoorn, Tavecchio, Goossens, & Vergeer, 1982). Their book was used as a support to advocates of good quality day-care centers.

In addition, the theory of psychoanalysis, which inspired the opponents of day care, appeared to be suitable for a feminist adaptation. We have in mind Chodorow (1978), who postulated that through unconscious processes in the early mother-child relation the exclusive mothering of women stimulated the reproduction of the female and male personality. From this followed the woman's deep wish and ability to mother, and the man's need to repress relational abilities. Shared parenthood can break this vicious circle. Chodorow did not speak about day-care centers, but she did break a lance for changing the exclusive mother-child relation. And so in the Netherlands her theory has been used, too, to defend institutional day care.

Some radical feminist groups criticized the actions for day care, because such facilities would restrict the pressure on men to take their part in housekeeping and child care. Although relations between men and women within the family have become more equal (Tavecchio, Van IJzendoorn, Goossens, & Vergeer, 1984), the hours men spend in housekeeping and child care do not equal the hours women spend in paid work; and more important, fathers do not take over or share in the responsibility for housekeeping and child care (Komter, 1985). Nevertheless the need for day care, agreed the feminists, did not decrease: Couples in which both members work, as well as single working mothers could not manage without caretakers.

The new ideas about child care not only fit in with the changing habits and opinions concerning the roles of men and women, and with the need for day care, but also with the changing family forms, such as the increase of divorce and remarriage, and the steprelations arising from them. Children increasingly get

confronted with loss of their own parents by divorce and with getting new parents by remarriage in an early phase of their life (Spruyt, 1988).

With the increasing emancipation of women and the changing scientific opinions, the attitudes toward day-care centers became gradually more positive. Independent advisory boards as well as committees of civil servants advised the national government positively concerning the extension of day-care centers. Day care had become a regular issue on the political agenda. However only in 1981, when for a short time there was a government with socialists and christian democrats, was a real day-care policy introduced; but afterward, during a coalition of christian democrats and liberals, the government could not be seduced into adopting nationwide policy and large-scale subsidy of institutional day care.

Meanwhile, the access to child-care facilities remains class bound. The well-to-do families can still allow themselves to hire a baby-sitter for some hours a day (*oppas*; the word *kindermeisje* or nanny is no longer used). At the same time there is a tendency at the governmental bureaus to reserve the largely state-subsidized whole day-care centers for both the lowest paid categories and emergency cases. This goes contrary to the wishes of the public, for better educated parents are overrepresented in day-care centers, whereas less educated parents prefer to keep their children at home. Several employers started workplace nurseries to keep their higher-educated, difficult to replace, female personnel (Pot, 1988).

Recently a new form of privately paid care, *childminding* (*gastouders* or *gastparents*) developed. Guestmothers take care of children of working mothers in their own house. This form of child care is rather expensive when compared with centers, and the income of the guestmother is low. This type of care is rarely subsidized and unsupervised. For women it promotes inequality between better paid professional women with social security rights, working outside and bringing their child, and housewives getting some extra earnings without social security rights, staying at home caring for others', and sometimes also their own, children.

The day-care situation for children from ethnic minority groups is still worse. Although Dutch-speaking Surinam mothers usually find their way to day-care centers, Moroccan and Turkish mothers try to find solutions within their own family or neighborhood, often in the form of ethnic guestmothers.

Since 1982 the policy of the national government was inspired by the idea of nonintervention in private family matters and heavily underlining parental responsibilities in childrearing. The situation in general is as follows: Nearly 66% of U.S. mothers with infants less than 3 years old work full-time (Hofferth & Phillips, 1987), whereas only 26% of Dutch mothers with infants younger than 4 years of age are employed, part-time or full-time (Van Wezel, 1989). The pregnancy leave is relatively short (6 weeks before and 6 weeks after delivery).



FIG. 3.7 Slow integration of children from different backgrounds is taking place. (Photo: Willem Nes, copyright NIZW)

The age at which compulsory education begins has recently been reduced to 5 years. Ninety percent of 4-year-old children attend nursery school. One third of all 2- and 3-year-olds attend a playgroup. But only 2.5% of all children younger than 4 years have access to a full- or part-time place in public day care (Van Wezel, 1989). There are more children on waiting lists than are actually receiving care (Pot, 1988).

In Table 3.1, the approximate numbers of nonmaternal care facilities as well as the number of participating children is presented (Wilbrink-Griffioen, Van Vliet, & Elzinga, 1987, p. 14).

Most of the working mothers of children between the age of 0 and 4 (173,500) appear to make use of some kind of nonmaternal care facilities outside the

TABLE 3.1  
Number of Nonmaternal Care Facilities and Participating Children (1987)

	<i>Nonmaternal Care Facilities</i>	<i>Children Participating in Nonmaternal Care</i>
Playgroup	3,282	135,000
Public day care	209	10,000
Commercial day care	100	2,500
Semi-day care	54	850
Childminding	30	1,000
Private child care Centers	57	900
Total	3,732	150,250

extended family. However, most also depend on private solutions such as baby-sitters because most facilities allow for only a very restricted period of care per day and per week. During the past few years, the number of public and commercial day-care facilities has grown tremendously: In 1989 about twice as many crèches were registered as in 1986. The growth in the number of commercial day-care facilities initiated by companies and industries is especially remarkable (Federatie Nederlandse Vakbeweging, 1990). The Dutch government has now begun to strongly stimulate the economic independence of women, and the demand for employed women is increasing in the areas of education, health care, and geriatric care, so it is expected that in the year 2000 there will be need for 9 times the present number of public day-care facilities (Den Hartog, 1989).

### RESEARCH ON THE EFFECTS OF NONMATERNAL CARE IN THE NETHERLANDS

Dutch research on the relation between maternal employment, nonmaternal child care, and child development is very scarce. In the United States, a heated discussion about the influence of nonmaternal care on children's socioemotional development has been going on. The central issue is whether nonmaternal care leads to less secure attachment relationships for children of working mothers. In the Netherlands, five studies have been carried out that may shed some light on this issue.

This section reports on a secondary analysis combining the five studies to test the hypothesis that nonmaternal care is related to less secure attachments. Furthermore, in addition to the available U.S. data some Dutch data on attachment between child and professional caregivers in day-care centers is provided. U.S. research on maternal employment has focussed too much on the family and not enough on nonmaternal care. Finally, a Dutch study on the long-term concomitants of maternal employment is described. Nonmaternal child care might have some short-term negative consequences, but it has not been shown if those consequences can be observed later in the child's life.

#### **Maternal Employment and Attachment: A Secondary Analysis**

The quality of the infant-mother attachment relationship is considered to be one of the cornerstones of children's socioemotional development (Sroufe, 1979). Maternal employment is expected to stimulate the development of insecure attachments due to the fact that the infants will frequently be separated from their mothers because of their employment (Belsky & Rovine, 1988). Results of separate U.S. studies appeared to be various and conflicting, and secondary and

metanalyses are indispensable to review the controversial area of maternal employment and attachment. Both Belsky and Rovine (1988), as well as Clarke-Stewart (1989), combined data of several studies in their secondary analyses. Maternal employment (full-time/part-time/nonworking) or extent of nonmaternal care (full-time/part-time/absent) was cross-tabulated against quality of the infant-mother attachment relationships as measured using the well-known *Strange Situation* (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978). The results seemed to confirm the hypothesis that maternal employment implied less secure attachments: Infants of full-time working mothers were 1.6 (Belsky & Rovine, 1988) or 1.2 (Clarke-Stewart, 1989) times more likely to be classified as insecure in their relationship with the mother. In contrast, Clarke-Stewart (1989) questioned the *Strange Situation* as an appropriate procedure for measuring the quality of attachment between infants and their working mothers: These infants are more used to the absence of their mother and as a result the short separations during the *Strange Situation* might not be so stressful to them.

McCartney and Phillips (1988) did not analyze raw data from several studies (a secondary analysis) but they computed combined effect sizes (a metaanalysis). The combined effect sizes of the association between day-care and infant-mother attachment quality turned out to be low (varying from .01 to .16). They concluded that infants attending day care are no more anxiously attached to their mothers than those children reared at home. The three secondary- and metaanalyses were based on different sets of studies, and because different criteria were used to divide the subjects into full-time/part-time/nonworking subgroups, the results are equivocal.

In a secondary analysis, Van Dam and Van IJzendoorn (1990) combined five Dutch studies in which the quality of the infant-mother attachment relationship as well as the number of hours that mothers were working outside the home, was measured (Van IJzendoorn, Goossens, Kroonenberg, & Tavecchio, 1985; Goossens & Van IJzendoorn, 1990; Van IJzendoorn & Hubbard, 1990; Bus & Van IJzendoorn, 1988; Lambermon & Van IJzendoorn, 1989). 282 Mother-infant dyads were included in this secondary analysis addressing the question whether infants of full-time/high part-time/low part-time/nonworking mothers differed in security of attachment. Following Barglow, Vaughn, and Molitor (1987) maternal employment was divided into four categories: (a) nonworking (0 hrs.); (b) low part-time working (1 to 20 hrs.); (c) high part-time working (21 to 29 hours); (d) full-time working (30 to 40 hrs). Belsky and Rovine (1988) and Clarke-Stewart (1989) both used the criterion of 20 hours to divide part-time from full-time maternal employment or day-care attendance. Full-time maternal employment and quality of attachment did not appear to be related. Avoidant attachment seemed to be overrepresented in the group of high-part-time working mothers, but not in the group of full-time working mothers. Some studies showed a significant effect of nonmaternal care on attachment behaviors in the *Strange Situation*, especially on avoidance (Belsky & Rovine, 1988), thus the relations between maternal employment and avoidant and resistant behaviors

during the two reunion episodes of the Strange Situation were examined. No relation appeared to exist. Van Dam and Van IJzendoorn (1990) concluded that in the Dutch samples, full-time maternal employment and nonmaternal care are not related to the quality of the infant-mother relationship nor to anxious attachment behaviors in the Strange Situation.

It is unclear why the Dutch results on full-time employment differ slightly from the U.S. results of Belsky and Rovine (1988) and those of Clarke-Stewart (1989), but do correspond to the McCartney and Phillips (1988) outcome. The method of analysis was similar to the reviews with discrepant results, and dissimilar to the review with convergent results. If nonmaternal care in the United States is supposed to negatively influence attachment, a few factors can be indicated, to which a divergent Dutch result may be attributed. It is our impression that most U.S. mothers have stronger financial reasons for working than the Dutch working mothers. The extensive Dutch social security system may even prevent divorced mothers from being employed only to solve the financial problems. Therefore Dutch women may evaluate their employment more positively—for example, as a means of developing their talents and broadening their social network. Furthermore, Dutch child-care arrangements may be of higher quality than U.S. arrangements, and Dutch mothers may therefore be somewhat more confident in leaving their child in nonmaternal care. In one of our studies, mean ratio of professional caregivers to children in 56 public care centers was 1:4.5 (Goossens & Van IJzendoorn, 1990). Nonmaternal care in the United States is much more commercially oriented than in the Netherlands. The geographical distances are short in the Netherlands, so relatives are often able to take care of the infant in the absence of the mother. Furthermore, because of state-subsidized and state-supervised day-care facilities, Dutch working mothers may trust alternative care as an adequate replacement of maternal care more than their U.S. counterparts do.

### **Professional Caregivers and Attachment**

*Children of working mothers do not only develop attachment relationships to their mothers. Although the current U.S. debate on the relation between nonmaternal care and attachment appears to almost exclusively focus on the infant-mother bond, children have been shown to be attached to their fathers (Lamb, Thompson, Gardner, & Charnov, 1985), and to professional caregivers in Israeli kibbutzim (Sagi, Lamb, Lewkowicz, Shoham, Dvir, & Estes, 1985). If it is hypothesized that frequent separations from the mother are causing attachment insecurity, one should also take into account the quality of attachments the children develop in absence of their mother. It may well be that separations from the mother at the same time are experienced as reunions with alternative attachment figures. Infants attending day care, for example, may not experience separations from their mothers as disruptions of their only bond because they*

have the opportunity to relate to alternative attachment figures, that is, professional caregivers.

In a Dutch study addressing the issue of children's network of attachment relationships, Goossens and Van IJzendoorn (1990) tried to answer the following questions. First, what attachment relationships develop, if any, between infants and their professional caregivers? Parents and especially mothers seem to be more prominent in the lives of their infants than professional caregivers, and because the latter always care for three or more infants at the same time, one may expect more insecure and maybe even unclassifiable, that is, nonexistent, attachments between infant and caregiver. Second, are infant-caregiver attachments concordant to infant-parent attachments? Different attachment relationships in the same attachment network are hypothesized to be nonconcordant because every single attachment is supposed to reflect the specific history of interaction within a given dyad (Sroufe, 1985). If infant-caregiver attachments are different from infant-parent attachments, the former may compensate for a completely insecure network of attachments within the family (Van IJzendoorn, & Tavecchio, 1987). Third, which factors contribute to the development of a secure attachment relationship between the infants and their professional caregivers? Characteristics of the day-care environment, of the caregivers' personality and interaction style, and of the family were analyzed to answer this question.

Seventy-five infants along with their mothers, fathers, and professional caregivers served as subjects in this study. All infants knew their assigned caregiver for at least 3 months before the first assessment of attachment quality using the Strange Situation procedure (which was carried out between 12 and 18 months of age). Infants spent about 25 hours per week in day care, and the average staff-infant ratio was 1 to 4.5. Results showed that most infant-caregiver relationships could be easily classified according to the classical coding system (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Only five infant-caregiver relationships had to be classified as avoidant/resistant, which may be interpreted as difficult-to-classify. Comparing the distribution of anxious and secure attachments between infant and mother, and between infant and caregiver showed that distributions were essentially the same.

The attachment classifications to caregiver and to mother were not related. When considering the attachment network (mother, father, caregiver), in almost 10% of the cases a secure relationship to the caregiver compensated for a completely anxious family network. Infants with a secure attachment relationship to their caregiver spent more hours per week in day care, and they were from a predominantly middle-class background. Their caregivers were somewhat younger and more sensitive to the infants' signals than were caregivers with insecure relationships (Goossens & Van IJzendoorn, 1990).

The results of this study show that research on working mothers and attachment should not focus only on infant-mother attachments. The U.S. debate does not take into account that working outside the home does not necessarily imply

the disruption of every attachment relationship the child has developed. These Dutch data show that infants of full-time working mothers do develop (secure and insecure) attachment relationships with their professional caregivers. In 10% of the cases secure caregiver–infant attachments even may compensate for insecure attachments with both parents. These results may depend on culture-bound characteristics of day care in the Netherlands. The study was carried out in officially registered and subsidized noncommercial day-care centers with a high staff–infant ratio and well-equipped environments.

### Long-Term Consequences of Early Nonmaternal Care

Whether or not differences in quality of attachment between infants of full-time/part-time/nonworking mothers exist, it is important to study the influence of early nonmaternal care on later cognitive and socioemotional development. In the absence of differences in infancy, a *sleeping effect* may be hypothesized to determine long-term negative consequences. To our knowledge, the longitudinal study by Van IJzendoorn, Van der Veer, and Van Vliet-Visser (1987; see also Van IJzendoorn, & Van Vliet-Visser, 1988) is the only Dutch research project aiming at testing for the presence of a sleeping effect. Seventy-seven mother–child dyads were observed in the Strange Situation procedure at 24 months. About 50% of the mothers were working 15 hours or more per week outside the home; the rest were full-time homemakers. Sixty-five of the 77 children participated in the follow-up study 3 years later. Mean age of the children was 64 months. Parents and kindergarten teachers completed the Block Q-sort for ego resiliency and ego control, validated by Van Lieshout and colleagues (1983) for Dutch children. Block and Block (1980) defined *ego resiliency* as the competence to react flexibly, but also persistently, in problem situations. *Ego control* is defined as the disposition to repress or express impulses and emotions. In the laboratory, mother–child dyads had to complete four instructional tasks (Duplo, Logics, Butterdish, and Wiggly) to measure fluency and emotional climate of the instruction and problem-solving process. The children had to complete an IQ test called the Leiden Diagnostic Test (Schroots, 1979). The subtests selected to measure independent cognitive performance of individual kindergarten children were block patterns, word span, pictures, repeating sentences, and comprehension (Schroots, 1979).

Results showed only two significant differences between children of homemakers and working mothers. First, working status of the mother contributed significantly to the prediction of optimal ego control as observed by the parents, as did sex of child. Children of full-time homemakers appeared to be more optimally controlled than children of working mothers; girls were more optimally controlled than boys. Attachment classification did not predict optimal control 3 years later (Van IJzendoorn et al., 1987). Second, children of working mothers did perform better on word span, one of the verbal subtests of the Leiden

Diagnostic Test, indicating that they had somewhat better language abilities than their peers who were raised by full-time homemakers (Van IJzendoorn & Van Vliet-Visser, 1988). On the other tasks and variables, for example, instruction and ego resiliency, no differences between the two groups could be found. These results confirm the expectation of few differences between children of homemakers and working mothers: Children of working mothers appear to be somewhat less adapted in the area of emotion control, whereas they are more proficient in the cognitive domain, especially with respect to verbal intelligence. It may be hypothesized, that their experience with nonmaternal care has trained them to express their thoughts and feelings verbally in a more explicit way. From the parental perspective, however, they appear to control their emotions less optimally, maybe because they had to emphasize the (verbal and nonverbal) expression of their needs and emotions more strongly, for example in a day-care or playgroup environment.

## CONCLUSIONS

In sum, the following factors appear to determine the low numbers of working married women and of child day-care provisions in the Netherlands in comparison to the surrounding countries:

- the late start of the industrialization at the end of the 19th century;
- the surplus of unemployed male laborers at that time;
- the early beginning of protective legislation concerning female labor;
- the strong influence of religion reinforced by the pillarization;
- the strong position of the Christian Democratic party in the government during the 1970s and 1980s reacting against the rising desire among women to take part in the labor market; and
- the deep-rooted bourgeois ideal stemming from the golden age of domesticity and of the housewife as mistress of the house.

In the last decennia the situation is changing rapidly. The Netherlands has been highly industrialized and, because of demographic processes, a shortage of labor is expected in the near future. More and more mothers are working outside and a rising portion of young children stays several days a week for some hours in a child-care setting. Wages of men and women are becoming individualized, as are the tax and social security system out of reasons of emancipation, so it will no longer be only the wish of mothers for exploration and independence to work outside, but more and more an economic necessity for both parents to earn money. The period of the nuclear family, with one breadwinner and one caregiving parent, seems to have come to an end and research shows that the situation in which the child spends a considerable amount of time in nonma-

ternal care is not necessarily detrimental to child development. Dutch studies on nonmaternal care have shown that there is no reason to be opposed to early nonmaternal care because of supposed adverse effects on child development. A secondary analysis of five studies showed that full-time nonmaternal care is not related to a negative quality of attachment in infancy. Even in a day-care setting, infants have the opportunity to find an alternative attachment figure, and to remain embedded in a protective network of attachment relationships. At kindergarten age, children of working mothers appear to be somewhat less well adapted socioemotionally, but better adapted cognitively, than the children of full-time homemakers.

If parents and children should both benefit optimally from recent socio-economic trends, they at least will need more child-care facilities, whose quality is guaranteed by legislation and inspection.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The secondary analysis was supported in part by a PIONEER grant from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) to Marinus H. van IJzendoorn

### REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Barglow, P., Vaughn, B. E., & Molitor, N. (1987). Effects of maternal absence due to employment on the quality of infant-mother attachment in a low-risk sample. *Child Development, 58*, 945-954.
- Belsky, J., & Rovine, M. (1988). Nonmaternal care in the first year of life and the security of infant-parent attachment. *Child Development, 59*, 157-167.
- Bladergroen W. J. (1957). *Speel goed met speelgoed* [Play well with playthings]. The Hague: Mouton.
- Block, J. H., & Block, J. (1980). The role of ego-control and ego-resiliency in the organization of behavior. In W. A. Collins (Ed.), *Development of cognition, effect and social relations. Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology (Vol. 13)*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bowlby, J. (1951). *Maternal care and mental health*. (Monograph Series No. 2). Genève: World Health Organization.
- Brinkgreve, C., & Korzec, M. (1978). *Margriet weet raad. Gedrag, gevoel en moraal in Nederland* [Margriet gives advice. Feelings, behaviour and morals in the Netherlands.] Utrecht: Aula.
- Bus, A. G., & Van IJzendoorn, M. H. (1988). Mother-child interactions, attachment, and emergent literacy: A cross-sectional study. *Child Development, 59*, 1262-1272.
- Chodorow, N. (1978). *The reproduction of mothering. Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clarke-Stewart, K. A. (1989). Maligned or malignant? *American Psychologist, 44*, 266-273.
- Clerkx, L. E. (1984a). De kinderjuffrouw [The nanny]. *Sociologisch Tijdschrift, 10*, 671-715.
- Clerkx, L. E. (1984b). De afstoting van de bewaarfunctie uit het kleuteronderwijs [The pushing out of the care taking function from kindergartens]. *Comenius, 13*, 3-24.
- Clerkx, L. E. (1986). Moeders, baby's en crèches [Mothers, babies, and day care]. *Jeugd en Samenleving, 16*, 167-190.

- Den Hartog, J. A. (1989). De toekomstige vraag naar kinderopvang [The future demand of child care]. *Tijdschrift voor Jeugdhulpverlening en Jeugdwerk*, 7, 60-68.
- De Wit, J. (1962). *Problemen rond de moeder-kind relatie* [Problems around the mother-child relation]. Amsterdam: Van Loghum Slaterus.
- Federatie Nederlandse Vakbeweging (FNV) (1989). *De baas past op de kleintjes*. [Commercial day care]. Amsterdam: Federatie Nederlandse Vakbeweging.
- Goossens, F. A., & Van IJzendoorn, M. H. (1990). Quality of infants' attachment to professional caregivers: Relation to infant-parent attachment and daycare characteristics. *Child Development*, 61, 832-837.
- Goudsblom, J. (1967). *Dutch society*. New York: Random House.
- Harmsen, G., & Reinalda, B. (1975). *Voor de bevrijding van de arbeid* [To the liberation of labour]. Nijmegen: SUN.
- Hofferth, S. L., & Phillips, D. A. (1987). Child care in the United States, 1970-1995. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 49, 559-571.
- Kohnstamm, D. et al. (1976). *Had de Proefkrece effect?* [Did the Proefkrece have any effect?]. Nijmegen: Dekker & Van Vegt.
- Komter, A. (1985). *De macht van de vanzelfsprekendheid in de relatie tussen vrouwen en mannen* [The power of self-evidence in the relation of men and women]. Leiden: DSWO-Press.
- Kool-Smit, J. (1967). Het onbehagen bij de vrouw. [The discomfort of women]. *De Gids*, 130, 267-281.
- Lamb, M. E., Thompson, R. A., Gardner, W., & Charnov, E. L. (1985). *Infant-mother attachment: The origins and developmental significance of individual differences in strange situation behavior*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lambermon, M. W. E., & Van IJzendoorn, M. H. (1989). Influencing mother-infant interaction through videotaped or written instruction: Evaluation of a parent education program. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 4, 449-458.
- McCartney, K., & Phillips, D. (1988). Motherhood and child care. In B. Birns & D. F. Hay (Eds.), *The different faces of motherhood* (pp. 157-183). New York: Plenum.
- Moree, M., & Van Vliet, I. (1989). Economische onafhankelijkheid: van Aletta Jacobs tot heden [Economic independence: From Aletta Jacobs to the present]. *Jeugd en Samenleving*, 19, 341-359.
- Pot, L. (1988). *Kinderopvang nu - zorgen voor morgen* [Child care - care of the future]. Amsterdam: Swets.
- Sagi, A., Lamb, M. E., Lewkowicz, K. S., Shoham, R., Dvir, R., & Estes, D. (1985). Security of infant-mother, -father, -metapelet attachments among kibbutz-reared Israeli children. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), *Growing points of attachment theory and research. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50 (1-2, Serial No. 209), 257-275.
- Schroots, J. J. F. (1979). *Leidse diagnostische test. Deel 5, Cognitieve ontwikkeling, leervermogen en Schoolprestaties* [Leiden Diagnostic Test, Part 5. Cognitive development and school achievement]. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Singer, E. (1989). *Kinderopvang en de moeder-kind relatie* [Child-care centres and the mother-child relationship]. Deventer: Van Loghum Slaterus.
- Spruyt, A. P. (Ed.). (1988). *Leven in een stiefgezin* [Life in a stepfamily]. Amersfoort: Giordano Bruno.
- Sroufe, L. A. (1979). The coherence of individual development. *American Psychologist*, 34, 834-841.
- Sroufe, L. A. (1985). Attachment classifications from the perspective of infant-caregiver relationships and infant temperament. *Child Development*, 56, 1-14.
- Tavecchio, L. W. C., Van IJzendoorn, M. H., Goossens, F. A., & Vergeer, M. M. (1984). The division of labor in Dutch families with preschool children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 46, 231-242.
- Van Dam, M., & Van IJzendoorn, M. H. (1990). *Are infants of working mothers insecurely attached?* Leiden: Center for Child and Family Studies.
- Van den Berg, J. H. (1958). *Dubieuze liefde in de omgang met het kind* [Dubious love in the interaction with the child]. Nijkerk: Callenbach.
- Van IJzendoorn, M. H., Goossens, F. A., Kroonenberg, P. M., & Tavecchio, L. W. C. (1985). Dependent attachment. B4-children in the Strange Situation. *Psychological Reports*, 57, 439-451.

- Van IJzendoorn, M H , & Hubbard, F O A (1990) *Crying and attachment* Unpublished manuscript, University of Leiden, Center for Child and Family Studies
- Van IJzendoorn, M H , & Tavecchio, L W C (1987) The development of attachment theory as a Lakatosian research program Philosophical and methodological aspects In L W C Tavecchio & M H van IJzendoorn (Eds ), *Attachment in social networks Contributions to the Bowlby-Ainsworth attachment theory* (pp 3-33) Amsterdam Elsevier Science Publishers
- Van IJzendoorn, M H & Van Vliet-Visser, S (1988) Attachment and intelligence The relationship between quality of attachment in infancy and IQ in kindergarten *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 149, 23-28
- Van IJzendoorn, M H , Tavecchio, L W C , Goossens, F A , & Vergeer, M M (1982) *Opvoeden in geborgenheid Een kritische analyse van Bowlby's attachmenttheorie* [Growing up secure] Deventer Van Loghum Slaterus
- Van IJzendoorn, M H , Van der Veer, R , & Van Vliet Visser, S (1987) Mother-infant attachment and developmental status in kindergarten In L W C Tavecchio & M H van IJzendoorn (Eds ), *Attachment in social networks* (pp 185-225) Amsterdam Elsevier North Holland
- Van Lieshout, C F M , Riksen-Walraven, J M A , Ten Brink, P W M , Siebenheller, F A , Mey, J Th H et al (1983) *Zelfstandigheidsontwikkeling in het basisonderwijs* [Autonomy in elementary schools] (Intern Rapport 83 ON 04, SVO-project BS560) Nijmegen SUN
- Van Rijswijk Clerkx, L E (1981) *Moeders, kinderen en kinderopvang* [Mothers, children, and child care] Nijmegen SUN
- Van Wezel, M (1989) Bedrijfsgerichte kinderopvang [Employer-sponsored child care] *Tijdschrift voor Jeugdhulpverlening en Jeugdwerk*, 7, 27-31
- Wilbrink Griffioen, D , Van Vliet, I , & Elzinga, A (1987) *Kinderopvang en arbeidsparticipatie van vrouwen* [Child care and women's employment] Den Haag SoZa