

**The Dutch, White, Middle-Class Family Reforged:
A Journey of Confrontation, Introspection, and Reimagination**

Michel Radosevic (577797mr)

Erasmus School of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Erasmus University Rotterdam

FSWS-575: Master's Thesis

Supervisor: prof.dr. Willem Schinkel

Second Reader: dr. Bonnie French

June 20, 2021

Abstract

Much has been written about institutional racism and looking into the perspectives of people of color and other minorities for insights on tackling social systems that fuel white supremacy and perpetuate racial disparities. However, this study focuses on a more unusual target demographic: the Dutch, White, middle-class family. The aim of this paper is to gain a better understanding of the ways Dutch, White, middle-class, families can function as public spheres in their role as knowledge mediators concerning institutional racism. The participants in this study were eight families, each consisting of at least one parent and teenager, which fit the target demographic and were sampled through family/friend connections followed by a snowball sampling. The data collection process consisted of holding 30-45+ minute conversations with each family over Zoom, in which a variety of topics related to racism were discussed. In terms of the overarching results, it seemed as though most families either remained rigid on their viewpoints or attempted to engage with the foreign knowledge, yet only resulting in more uncertainty. It was only a couple of families that felt a push to spread the knowledge concerning institutional racism to their other social circles, which may result in these families actually bringing forth meaningful change to their society.

Keywords: institutional racism, intergenerational solidarity, public sphere, white family, white privilege

**The Dutch, White, Middle-Class Family Reforged:
A Journey of Confrontation, Introspection, and Reimagination**

Introduction

Ever since the murder of George Floyd less than a year ago, I have been extremely intrigued by the aftershock of his death. Unlike the deaths of so many other victims of police brutality, Floyd's death has sparked a reinvigorated outrage, extensive media coverage, and protests on a global scale through the Black Lives Matter movement (Kirby, 2020). One of the reasons for my interest in this event, in particular, was its timing. This particular epoch is the fusion of a tense health crisis with the injustice brought forth by police brutality, something Laila Frank elegantly phrases as, "a perfect storm" (Op1, 2020, 18:22). What must be stressed, however, is that everyone weathers the storm differently. Classical mantras such as 'we are all in this together', despite their attempts to evoke feelings of mutual solidarity in society, are not applicable for all. It has been demonstrated that for instance, businesses owned by Black people in the United States have suffered far worse than those owned by White people (Brooks, 2020). When it came to civilian casualties caused by law enforcement, former U.S. President Donald Trump attempted to mislead his people by stating that more White people have died that way compared to Black people, despite refraining to mention that non-Hispanic/Latinx White people roughly outnumber Black people by a 4:1 ratio (U.S. Census Bureau, 2019). Additionally, a "Northeastern-Harvard data-driven study . . . found that Black people were killed at a rate higher than their proportion to the national population" (Thomsen, 2020, para. 7). What must be acknowledged is that these statistics are no mere coincidences, but rather consequences of a system which not only smites marginalized groups with disparities and rendering them invisible but also justifies itself through these actions to maintain a social hierarchy tailored to white supremacy.

These power relations, cultivated by white supremacy, are entwined with the sharing and silencing of certain forms of knowledge as “[i]deologically, the rhetoric of white supremacy supplies a fantasy of whiteness” (hooks, 1992, p.340). There is great power hidden in whiteness under its goodhearted guise, falsely assumed by most White people like how they think they are portrayed to Black people (hooks, 1992). Ultimately, they fail to realize how “whiteness makes its presence felt in black life, most often as terrorizing imposition, a power that wounds, hurts, tortures, is a reality that disrupts the fantasy of whiteness as representing goodness” (hooks, 1992, p.341).

In an attempt to help further unveil these systems which are seemingly invisible to most White people, this thesis will concern itself with the mediation of knowledge through the intergenerational relations between members of the family. My main focus is on the Dutch, White, middle-class family, as this would allow me to take a more intersectional approach in understanding how nationality, race, and class can affect one another in my research. Additionally, this particular demographic is a reflection of my positionality, stemming from my fascination with the conversations I have had with my own family on institutional racism and police brutality in the wake of Floyd’s murder, which we never truly had before last year’s protests. I believe that this sudden shake-up in my family is a step in the right direction, as this rethinking and adjustment to this reality may serve as a possible tool to dent white supremacy’s rigid power. Could these dents truly remold one of white supremacy’s ideals, the White family, and in so doing constitute the family as a public sphere as they become new knowledge mediators?

For this research, I wanted to stay as close as I could to my positionality as that is the only position I can speak from and this helped enable me to empathize with my participants. Perhaps due to Black Lives Matter branching out internationally, with for instance the thousands of people protesting on the dam in Amsterdam (van den Brand, 2020), it may have

reignited its relevance closer to home, potentially triggering shake-ups in hundreds if not thousands of Dutch households. Struggles over racism aren't new to the Netherlands; these range from cultural disputes such as the portrayal of Black Pete (RTL Nieuws, 2019) to acts of senseless violence such as the murder of Kerwin Duinmeijer, an Antillean boy whose death by racial violence was marked the first in the Netherlands since the Second World War (van der Mee, 2020). While the Dutch, White, middle-class family may seem like an odd choice for a target demographic when it comes to discussing institutional racism, I do believe that there lies hidden potential in these people disassembling and reassembling themselves when confronted by knowledge unknown and/or uncomfortable to them, possibly weakening one of the main support structures white supremacy has built itself on.

A proponent of the aforementioned contestation may take on an intergenerational form, which is why this thesis emphasizes the private sphere, mainly the ideological relations between family members. I, therefore, propose the following question: how do Dutch, White, middle-class, families function as public spheres in their role as knowledge mediators concerning institutional racism? In doing so, I believe there to be great potential in not only the production/sharing of knowledge regarding institutional racism, but also that these families can constitute themselves as a public sphere through them experiencing this 'new' knowledge, forcing them to interact with it, allowing it to question their reality, and letting them redefine themselves.

Theoretical Framework

Discussing Public/Private Spheres

In *Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy* (1990), Nancy Fraser takes on Jürgen Habermas' conceptions of the bourgeois public sphere. One aspect tackled by Fraser is Habermas' definition of the public sphere, him

believing it to be “a body of ‘private persons’ assembled to discuss matters of ‘public concern’ or ‘common interests’” (Fraser, 1990, p.58). Fraser argues that Habermas’ ideas behind these private people and their common interests clash with reality, as his ‘people’ were mainly White men with property and their ‘interests’ would most likely not include those of marginalized groups (1990).

Fraser argues instead that marginalized groups have already organized themselves in “*subaltern counterpublics* in order to signal that they are parallel discursive arenas where members of subordinated social groups invent and circulate counterdiscourses, which in turn permit them to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests, and needs” (1990, p.67).

By thinking with Fraser, it is possible to further explore her notion of counterpublics and envision the family as another public sphere in which knowledge can be mediated.

In line with this thought, I turn to a critique of Hannah Arendt’s *The Human Condition* by Seyla Benhabib (1993). What is being disputed is Arendt’s ideas behind the stark divide between the *oikos* and the *polis*, mainly when it comes to ‘actions’ only being performed by men in the public realm and the female labor being relegated to the domestic realm (1958). Benhabib breaks down Arendt’s work through the perspective of the female body in the following way:

In entering the public realm women seem to be bringing with them a principle of reality into this sphere, namely the necessities which originate with having a body, and which from Arendt’s point of view strictly have no place in the public. (Benhabib, 1993, p.98)

Thinking with Benhabib, I want to further counter Arendt and extend Benhabib’s idea of women’s possibilities to alter public spheres with that of childrens’. To me, the home can

become the training grounds for performing ‘actions’ by which intergenerational connections may support the public sphere of the family.

Discussing White Supremacy and the Dutch, White, Middle-Class Family

In this work, I aim to present the Dutch, White, middle-class family as potential subaltern counterpublics, despite that this demographic, based on marginalization, would likely be the least fit choice to become one. To justify this, I turn to literature focusing on white supremacy and one of its cornerstones; the White family itself (Vasquez-Tokos & Yamin, 2021). In so doing, it may be possible to see that events such as the murder of George Floyd and the increasing attention towards the Black Lives Matter movement forced White people to respond, to defend themselves, and to potentially reform, rather than to continue being oblivious towards it. It is exactly this forced adjustment that may bend the power of white supremacy, as its cornerstone is moving further towards fluidity and slowly abandoning its intended nature of rigidity.

To elaborate on this key thought, I want to think with bell hooks and explore where this rigid nature of white supremacy lies. In her work *Representing Whiteness in the Black Imagination* (1992), hooks brings up the notion of invisibility, the one that may be linked to what many White people were experiencing before Floyd’s death. Behind this invisibility lurks a power dynamic, as “white people can ‘safely’ imagine that they are invisible to black people since the power they have historically asserted, and even now collectively assert over black people accorded them the right to control the black gaze” (hooks, 1992, p.340). Additionally, hooks mentions there to be another aspect to this invisibility, the one donned by black slaves to strip them from their subjectivity and make them objects; for “[t]o be fully an object then was to lack the capacity to see or recognize reality” (1992, p.340). This remains relevant as it has manifested itself into contemporary society, through the avoidance of using

Black people in commercials and social media catered to the White masses as well as the reinforcement of a society in which violence is thwarted off White people (hooks, 1992).

To add to this contemporary relevance, I want to bring other voices into the discussion, starting with Cheryl Harris through her work *Whiteness as Property* (1993). In it, she points out that ‘whiteness’ is a calculated contraption, as “[t]he law constructed . . . [it] as an objective fact, although in reality, it is an ideological proposition imposed through subordination” (Harris, 1993, p.1730). When something such as whiteness then becomes fact, it turns invisible, it becomes a given. Its powers are similar to property, in that “[i]ts attributes are the right to transfer or alienability, the right to use and enjoyment, and the right to exclude others” (Harris, 1993, p.1731).

On the basis of whiteness, particularly its power to exclude the ‘other’, I aim to dissect my target demographic; the Dutch, White, middle-class family. To do so, I want to think with Kathy Davis and Lorraine Nencel (2011) about race in conjunction with nationality and Steve Garner (2006) about race when linked to class. In the work of Davis and Nencel, they focus on people integrating into Dutch society but comment on the idea of ‘Dutch-ness’ as a national identity being tied to whiteness and a ‘we’ versus the ‘other’ mentality (2011). Despite this, “[t]he Dutch majority does not, however, speak of itself as white and few members of the white majority would regard themselves as the recipients of white privilege” (Davis & Nencel, 2011, p.480). In line with this intersectional questioning, Garner also elaborates on the benefits gained from whiteness, but through a connection made between race and class. He emphasizes that sociologists focused on Europe can learn a great deal from American studies which analyze whiteness, one such example lays down the connection with class (Garner, 2006). As Garner states:

Class influences the way ‘race’ is spoken about, the meanings attached to it, and the ease with which racelessness can be invoked. Clearly, while enjoying the ‘wages of

whiteness', Americanized nouveau-white workers were, and many of their descendants are still, on a considerably lower 'wage' than other whites. (Garner, 2006, p.265)

Essentially, as "[w]hiteness . . . is mediated by class" (Garner, 2006, p.265), so too will the social privileges granted to White people depend on their class backgrounds. This may result in White middle-class families being given an economical advantage over White lower-income households which can transform into another social advantage. Ultimately this disrupts the 'we' population, those benefitting from whiteness, as class has forced a percentage of that raceless or 'unmarked' group to become 'marked', which in turn can make them vulnerable to similar "discriminatory practices that non-white, 'marked' immigrants" (Davis & Nencel, 2011, p.470) face, resulting in again another form of 'othering'.

This exclusion, perpetuated by white supremacy and facilitated by the privileges birthed by whiteness, is also analyzed in the field of family science, brought to light through the works of Ashley Walsdorf, Lorien Jordan, Christi McGeorge, and Margeret Caughy (2020) as well as Bethany Letiecq (2019). In Walsdorf and colleagues' work, they put the focus on white supremacy filling the role of "the precursor to and creator of the contexts of immense disparity in wealth, access to resources, segregation, and thus, family well-being" (2020, p.65). In Letiecq's case, she emphasizes family privilege and how it has become interwoven with white privilege, mainly through "defin[ing it] as the benefits, often invisible and unacknowledged, that one receives by belonging to family systems long upheld in society as superior to all others" (2019, p.398). Letiecq believes that what family science needs, to make progress, is for family privilege to be acknowledged by its users (2019), similarly to a person being self-critical about one's white privilege. By thinking with these authors, the link between the White family and white supremacy becomes abundantly clear with the result

being a tandem working system designed to justify disparities between families and the reinforcement of a multilayered social hierarchy.

Discussing Intergenerational Solidarity

This section focuses on the intergenerational bonds within these families, intergenerational solidarity, and by thinking with multiple authors one will have a better understanding of its intricacies. I first want to draw inspiration from Aafke Komter and Wilma Vollebergh with their work *Solidarity in Dutch Families* (2002). Komter and Vollebergh are interested in understanding how families in the Netherlands handle intergenerational solidarity, with their perspective mainly set towards an economic/societal lens (2002). As they put it:

Today, economic exchange between family members is no longer a vital precondition for individual survival. Nevertheless, people's well-being still depends largely on the exchange of goods and services with other people. A substantial part of that exchange continues to occur within the family. (Komter & Vollebergh, 2002, p.172)

What I mainly want to draw from their thinking is that I believe that the process of knowledge production through intergenerational interactions may be tied to this solidarity. For instance, with the case of Black Lives Matter, it may very well be possible that a teenager who seeks to discuss the topic with their parents may not emphasize their arguments to preserve and cherish their intergenerational solidarity, implying some sort of "feelings of obligation of younger people toward their parents" (Komter & Vollebergh, 2002, p.175). Ultimately, this could result in the perpetuation of the silencing of such topics, hindering knowledge transfer, and so keeping the cornerstone of white supremacy intact.

An additional author who has studied the dimensions of intergenerational solidarity is Mark Szydlik through his study, *Intergenerational Solidarity and Conflict* (2008). In it,

Szydluk elaborates on the ways the presence or absence of conflict between family members is structured with intergenerational solidarity, mainly through a system of layers (2008). What has stood out in his theoretical interpretation of the systems surrounding intergenerational solidarity is the outermost layer, ‘cultural-contextual structures’, creating a trickle-down effect onto the inner layers in the system (Szydluk, 2008). Essentially, this outer layer “represent[s] societal conditions within which intergenerational relations develop” (Szydluk, 2008, p.100). Szydluk notes that these societal conditions house a myriad of societal and economic systems, including “specific rules and norms of certain institutions and groups” (2008, p.100). This is where I find a strong link to white supremacy and how it has been enacted through the White family; an invisible force dripping through and contaminating these different layers.

A final point of interest to mention in Szydluk’s work is his perspective on intergenerational solidarity and conflict. When it comes to the former, “one should not idealize intergenerational solidarity” (Szydluk, 2008, p.101). In my interpretation of his thoughts, it would seem like intergenerational solidarity should not be the crown goal all families should strive towards, but rather that it is a family’s state of being and that it carries high and low points represented by the fluctuation of intergenerational conflict (Szydluk, 2008). In a similar vein, conflicts should not be demonized as they can also be productive (Szydluk, 2008). As Szydluk explains it:

Respectful arguments between family members offer, for example, the chance to clarify different opinions and wishes and thereby keep the relationship alive, shape and develop it. Such respectful arguments between family members are then a component and opportunity for active, lively relationships. People who argue with each other also still show an interest in each other and the [*sic*] wish to continue the relationship. (Szydluk, 2008, pp.101-102)

By thinking with Szydlik, it may be possible to use conflict to enable the flow of new knowledge. White supremacy's silencing power, through the White family, may have resulted in a form of compliance in which families could cater to intergenerational solidarity's promised harmony, yet participate in blissful ignorance. Ultimately, productive conflict could negate the makeshift feeling of family comfort, a possible synonym for this ignorance, escape or flight, and instead force them to confront this new knowledge and as a result, readjust.

Methods

In terms of my methods, I conducted interviews catered to the participants and goals of my research. A part of this process was tied to the theory based on intergenerational solidarity, for which I turned to Bengston and Roberts' (1991) six different elements that constitute the concept. The one I primarily concentrated on was 'consensual solidarity', which focuses on the "degree of agreement on values, attitudes, and beliefs" (Bengston & Roberts, 1991, p.857) between family members. Through the discussions I have had with these families on the theme of institutional racism, I aimed to observe how the individual ideologies of family members could impact their relations in tandem with the production of knowledge.

It would seem that a good amount of studies dedicated to understanding the intricacies of intergenerational solidarity have used surveys, interviews, and a combination of the two (Daatland & Lowenstein, 2005; Komter & Vollebergh, 2002; Szydlik, 2008). However, I do believe that aspects such as intergenerational solidarity, especially in the context of discussing institutional racism, cannot be limited to a set amount of closed questions. Therefore, my interviews harbor traits from both in-depth interviews, to gain "detailed information about a person's thoughts and behaviors" (Boyce & Neale, 2006, p.3), as well as from focus groups, to allow "participants . . . to talk to one another and build on one other's comments" (Krueger

et al., 2001, p.5). I opted for this style of an interview as my research does not fit the mold of traditional in-depth interviews and focus groups. In standard in-depth interviews, there is a focus on solely one interviewee (Boyce & Neale, 2006), and in focus groups, it is suggested that these groups consist of between five to eight participants (Krueger et al., 2001); my methodology deviates from these criteria.

The participants in this research consisted of eight Dutch, White, middle-class families, with each family represented by two to four participants, of which at least one parent and child. The main approach used to scouting these families was through the use of social media as well as contacting close friends and relatives and applying a snowballing technique. The families that participated in the research were asked to provide their names, ages as well as parental consent, as the children were mainly teenagers. Their names were then subsequently replaced for this written work to maintain anonymity. The families were informed that the interviews would be recorded for the benefit of the researcher but also promised that these recordings would be thoroughly disposed of after the research was finished.

The interviews were conducted with all family members interviewed together in sessions of thirty to forty-five minutes with the scheduling of these interviews left to the preference of the families. Interviews could exceed that timeframe if the family was still interested in continuing the discussion. To ensure the safety of these families due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the meetings took place on Zoom, despite the potential risk of 'zoom fatigue': the "tiredness, anxiety, or worry resulting from overusing virtual videoconferencing platforms" (Wiederhold, 2020, p.437), which may have resulted in more reluctant participants. Therefore, a few minutes were taken before the interview to thank the families for wanting to participate in the research and some chit-chat ensued to put them at ease.

In terms of the contents of the interview, I provided a set of key discussion points to maintain a roadmap for the interview. However, the participants were encouraged to introduce relevant topics which they were interested in into the discussion if they had any. A partial purpose of these interviews was to incite uncomfortable conversations, but if a particular discussion point was deemed too sensitive to one or all family members, then the participants would notify the mediator and the discussion point would be omitted. The six constant discussion points selected for these interviews were as follows: Black Lives Matter in 2020, the Black Pete discussion, racism/the slave trade taught at school, apologizing for the Dutch colonial past, the invisibility of institutional racism, and white privilege. These topics were always covered, but sometimes in alternate order depending on how participants steered the conversation. What did remain constant were two questions asked at the start of the interview: 1.) How important do you feel talking about racism is? 2.) Can you recall a time when you, as a family, had a genuine talk about racism? After the interviews were over, the participants were once again greatly thanked for their time and input into these discussions.

Lastly, in terms of my data analysis, I was inspired by the work of van Bohemen, Den Hertog, and van Zoonen, with their analysis focusing on grounded theory and inductive reasoning (2018). Similarly, I listened through the recordings from these interviews and noted down the general response from my participants to each discussion point whilst placing extra emphasis on any striking comments. The interviews, through these keynotes, were then compared and contrasted accordingly. It must be noted that this form of data selection may be influenced by research bias, but this may be justified considering the importance of emphasizing certain unexpected perspectives found during these interviews. These partially transcribed responses were then linked with the appropriate theory mentioned previously to possibly draw certain conclusions.

Data Analysis

This section aims to explore the participants' answers through the lens of the public/private sphere, white supremacy and the Dutch, White, middle-class family, and intergenerational solidarity to tackle the proposed research question: how do Dutch, White, middle-class, families function as public spheres in their role as knowledge mediators concerning institutional racism? As mentioned previously, their answers during the discussions were guided by six previously mentioned topics which were implemented to support these three theoretical pillars.

Before delving deeper into those factors, I do find it useful to engage with their comments regarding the two initial questions posed to them. When asked if they felt that it was important to talk about racism, the vast majority said yes. The following perspectives are a few examples to illustrate their opinions.

For instance, Daughter Smits (19) believes that it is important to talk about racism since most countries, including the Netherlands, have become multicultural. Additionally, she thinks that racism is much more prominent than is shown, especially for her as a Dutch, White person, since she does not suffer from it. Mother (50) and father (51) Smits agree with their daughter. Mother Smits reiterates that they have not suffered from it, but that also does not mean that it does not exist.

When talking with the Alberts family, mother Alberts (51) explained that it is very important, especially when she looks at herself. She does not consider herself a racist, but she may be one without being aware of it since she believes that she approaches everyone else similarly. Mother Alberts emphasizes that this could be even worse since you don't pay much thought to it, while it could simultaneously hurt others. Son Alberts (13) finds it also important, but he wants to place an emphasis on outlining exactly what is and isn't racism. He sometimes hears from friends or on social media about stories of people who are quickly

labeled as racists when the severity of the case may not be so high. Mother Alberts agrees with her son's point.

Lastly, father Cornelissen (51) believes that there are two sides to the situation. Racism should be discussed more often, but also that talking about racism can be misinterpreted. At his work, he is often surrounded by minority families and he believes that whenever someone criticizes them, that these families will associate that with racism. His children, son (16) and daughter (18) Cornelissen, understand their father's perspective but they also emphasize that racism and talking about it is bound to circumstances and situations.

What these perspectives have shown me is that these families place a certain value on their everyday situations. To them, the importance of discussing racism is tied to that value, and all three processed it differently. Additionally, it is just as fascinating seeing how the other family members of each household react to their initial speaker. Some just went along with what the first member said, whilst others thought more critically about what was said and how they could dig deeper into the conversation.

Considering that the discussion that I had with my participants could have been their first substantial conversation about racism, I promptly asked them whether they have ever started a serious discussion about it amongst themselves.

With the Verbruggen family, Father Verbruggen (53) explained that they do not often discuss racism at home, mainly due to it not affecting them negatively. However, when he notices racism at work or on the street, he will make note of that and talk about it at home with Son Verbruggen (16). Father Verbruggen works with children who have suffered trauma including children with immigrant backgrounds, and he was also once married to a Turkish woman, so he has had many opportunities to gain a better insight into racism. Son Verbruggen did mention that the last time they genuinely sat down to discuss anything linked to racism was with the protesters on the dam in the Netherlands. He could recall that both of

them were wondering why so many people would want to be so close together during the pandemic. He was against the idea that people here put aside the main problem that they are facing right now in the Netherlands to deal with a problem that came from the United States. Father Verbruggen did respond to this by saying that he sees the protests as an expression of dissatisfaction, but he believes that this is not where the solution lies.

Another family that I want to introduce here is the Feenstra family. Father (49) and mother (52) Feenstra only ever talked about racism when discussions surrounding close-to-home topics such as Black Pete flared up, but nothing else. Mother Feenstra then attributes this to the lower severity of racism in the Netherlands when compared to the United States. She also mentions that people did not discuss racism when she was young, jokingly remarking that racism did not exist back then. Despite acknowledging that they barely discuss racism as a family, father Feenstra does try to correct his wife's remark by saying that it probably was not such a hot topic then compared to now. He also adds that talking about racism has been facilitated by the Internet, so that is probably why it is more prevalent to talk about it now than thirty years ago.

What struck me most with these comments was the possible link with the denial of the reality of exclusion performed through the identity of whiteness. This made me return to the thoughts of Davis and Nencel when they mention that even "critical Dutch intellectuals frequently distance themselves from discussions on racism, defining it as a problem 'over there' (in the US or in South Africa) rather than 'here', in the Netherlands" (2011, p.480). This denial resonated primarily with the comments of son Verbruggen and mother Feenstra, as both have unknowingly resisted against the idea of their Dutch identity being linked to an "ethnicized or racialized identity that provides them with a privileged social position" (Davis & Nencel, 2011, p.480). This matters as they are unwittingly maintaining a raceless identity that will allow them to fully benefit from their whiteness.

Returning to Public/Private Spheres

To describe the goal of my research in broad strokes, it is to observe how members of a White family can gain foreign knowledge and discuss it amongst each other to enable them to introspect on and reshape themselves. Their remolding would then, in my hopes, allow for them to brainstorm and/or consider making changes to the racist systems that contemporary society is still latching on to. The theoretical knowledge behind public/private spheres has enabled me to ponder on such a dynamic. On the note of reinventing oneself, the answers given by my participants could be grouped into three encompassing perspectives.

The first perspective remains quite rigid as these participants believe that it is not so much that they must change in their ways, but rather that minorities need to step up their game when it comes to integrating into Dutch society. Mother Smits believes that people who come to the Netherlands can keep their cultures and their traditions, but they need to adapt to Dutch society. She believes that these types of adaptations are not always met in the Netherlands, which can lead to Dutch people feeling irritated. Father Smits then continued the conversation about integration by looking at families with an immigrant background and how the eldest generation in those families do not want to be vaccinated for the Covid-19 virus, because they believe that what the prime minister is saying is a form of disinformation. He felt annoyed that those people think like that, especially since they either could not or would not want to adapt to Dutch norms and values, despite living in the Netherlands for several decades. The irritation for father Smits lies with these people claiming that they experience racism for not being well informed due to the government not putting enough effort to make it so. So he is not quite sure who is to blame for this, although he believes that the government has done enough to inform everyone. To him, it lies mainly in the unwillingness of these people to adapt to Dutch society.

The second perspective came from people who understood that change was necessary, but they were unsure of what exactly needed to change or what they could do to have a meaningful impact on society when it comes to tackling racism. The discussion I had with the Groothuis family is an interesting example to examine these doubts. While on the topic of white privilege, I had asked them how they felt emotionally about their own privilege. All of the children responded with it being unfair, but they also asked what they were supposed to do about it. Father Groothuis (48) asked them that now that they are more aware of their privilege, would they still continuously choose to use it? Eldest son Groothuis (15) responded with a yes, as he believes that at the end of the day you do and use what is in your best interest. Daughter (14) and youngest son (12) Groothuis also thought in a similar way about it, with daughter Groothuis giving a hypothetical scenario of a job application. If she had to compete with a person of color for a job and win, she would not feel good giving the job to her competitor as a form of charity just because they are not White. She added that society should strive for equality, but she feels that the three of them feel powerless to make a meaningful change to society.

The third perspective is the most in tune with the teachings of Fraser and Benhabib. Fraser's notion of subaltern counterpublics returns as the following perspective shows a diversion from the established societal norm by actively accepting and working with knowledge foreign to them (1990). The thoughts of Benhabib are also reflected in these people's words and actions as they are already seeking to impact their social circles and are finding the support to make changes through their interactions with the rest of their families (1993).

Having spoken to the Jansen family, it was clear that mother Jansen (49) believes that the stories of people of color should be shared more often to open the eyes of others. She did so with father (53) and son (15) Jansen by showing them the movie *The Hate U Give*, which

tells the story of a Black girl growing up in an all-Black neighborhood in the United States and confronting the hardships found through the setbacks she faces. She felt that it was an important story to share with her family and she encouraged them to discuss it with her thoroughly. Additionally, Mother Jansen mentioned that Dutch, White people should be more open towards different cultures and customs. She wants that to change as she feels that Dutch people like to categorize everything and everyone; it is something that makes them feel comfortable. To do so, she believes that she could start by having more discussions and spread more awareness by holding discussions about racism with her group of friends instead of only with her own family.

Another great example of promoting change was the conversation I had with the Verbruggen family. Father Verbruggen asked his son how the changes being made to tackle racism could be improved upon. Son Verbruggen replied by saying that already making clear and decisive changes to controversial topics, such as the Black Pete discussion, is a strong first step. Father Verbruggen added that he believes that there are two important steps to making Dutch society a better whole, the first being that Dutch society needs to reinvent itself, and the second being the wait required for the changes to settle in. Give time to let there be more racially mixed couples, more teachers with an immigrant background at Dutch schools, and so on. He believes that we may have to experience pain and confrontation while we wait, but that would be part of the process. This to him seemed more meaningful than short-term reactions such as protesting on the dam.

Having judged these three representative perspectives, I believe that they encompass different understandings towards the dichotomous nature of the tolerant, multicultural society that Dutch, White people are often told to be proud of. I say dichotomous, as I refer once more to the notion of the 'we' versus the 'other' mentality. The first perspective aims to maintain this divide and keep the sides distinct from one another, whereas the third

perspective wants to part ways with this mentality by promoting more inclusion and therefore blurring the lines that neatly categorize both sides. This remains true for many hot-button topics in the Netherlands such as integration, which is inexplicably tied with the “everyday cultural politics of belonging, of what is involved in being treated as a member of the community” (Davis & Nencel, 2011, p.470). Ultimately, the families that are open to foreign knowledge, who have gone through introspection with that knowledge, and have reformed themselves by pushing for the dismantling of the systems that support these social barriers, are those that can cultivate their own counterpublics to counter the systems that perpetuate the ‘othering’, instead of continuing to support them.

Returning to White Supremacy and the Dutch, White, Middle-Class Family

The White family to me is more than just a collective of relatives who seem to occupy the norm of Western civilizations. It could also be an influential cornerstone to white supremacy (Vasquez-Tokos & Yamin, 2021), which is influencing contemporary societal systems that these White families are supporting and interacting with, albeit often unknowingly. Could these families attempt to make the rigid nature of white supremacy malleable if they would be open to rethinking, and in so doing, reshaping themselves?

When I discussed topics that were related to these systems of exclusion and white supremacy, the answers I received showed links connected to the relevant literature that I have amassed so far. For instance, hooks’ thoughts on invisibility (1992) resonate here on a myriad of levels, from topics such as the obscured perception of institutional racism in the Netherlands to the acknowledgment of one’s white privilege. On the other hand, Harris’ idea behind ‘whiteness’ being a calculated contraption (1993) was ever-present in the discussions surrounding the Dutch education system.

Starting with the notion of invisibility surrounding institutional racism, I want to further discuss the conversation I had with the Cornelissen family. Daughter Cornelissen believes that it could be invisible, but it is hard to say how deep it is rooted in the Netherlands as she has not experienced racism herself. Son Cornelissen brought up an interesting case of a man of color in the Netherlands who was stopped 214 times by the police, with zero traffic violations. He felt quite shocked when he heard stories like these since it seemed quite unfair for the people that suffer such harassment. Father Cornelissen agreed with his children, but he also emphasized that what happens in the Netherlands to minority groups is still less severe than in the United States.

On a similar note to what father Cornelissen said, mother Feenstra believes that racism is also more visible in the United States, mainly due to the power of social media. She believes that social media is not as powerful in the Netherlands and that Dutch people have a more sober mindset. When I asked father Feenstra about racism being invisible in the Netherlands, he could agree with that statement, especially when it comes to the job or housing market. However, he also added that he never felt for a moment that he was chosen over others during job applications on the basis of his skin color and background.

Transitioning to the topic of white privilege, I had already begun to notice that there were some stark contrasts between certain families. For instance, father and daughter Smits had some very strong opinions on this subject. Daughter Smits does not believe that White people should have inherent priorities, but she does believe that if you do not want to conform to the norms and values of a society, then your setbacks are justified. She elaborated on this thought by saying that everyone should have the same rights and chances to succeed no matter their background, but if you cannot adapt to society then you should leave.

Father Smits did raise an interesting point regarding the early years of his career. He wanted to work for the police force, but even after passing all the tests, he was not chosen due

to the police wanting to be a more accurate reflection of society, thus choosing new officers on the basis of representation through their ethnic background and skin color. He felt discriminated against in that sense and explained that being White does not always inherently help someone, which in turn made it difficult for him to acknowledge his white privilege.

Most other families were unsure of their white privilege, although the Jansen family was an exception. Mother Jansen found white privilege to be very impactful, as it can give immediate advantages to some and therefore disadvantage others. She then explained that because Dutch, White folk are complying with this system, that judgment towards people with immigrant roots became fiercer. These people had to prove that they were worthy of certain chances by putting in more work, whereas the Dutch, White people do not have to. She is aware of the fact that her whiteness benefits her. That is why she tries to raise her son in such a way that he will understand how the adult world works with and through racism.

Having described moments from my conversations with these families which focused on the invisibility of racist social systems and the power behind white privilege, I once again resonated with the thoughts of hooks. As she puts it:

To name that whiteness in the black imagination is often a representation of terror: one must face a palimpsest of written histories that erase and deny, that reinvent the past to make the present vision of racial harmony and pluralism more plausible.
(hooks, 1992, p.342)

Whereas some families highlight their ties to whiteness and encourage their family members to become aware of them as well, others will mask their privileges under the guise of normalcy and reinforce that charade through their own interpretations of how Dutch society was always meant to be. This reinforcement is the lifeblood of white supremacy, the scaffolding to let it run its unending course. Even if the performance of overt racism is being

tackled, “the habits of being cultivated to uphold and maintain institutionalized white supremacy [will] linger” (hooks, 1992, p.340).

To understand these disguised mechanisms and how they are being reinforced through White people’s perceptions and beliefs, I must first return to where most people’s minds are being sculpted in the first place; at school. The following descriptions detail the participants’ relations to the Dutch education system and how Dutch schools have taught and are now teaching students about racism, the Golden Age, and/or the slave trade. I explicitly asked the parents how these subjects were taught to them when they were as young as their children now since it seemed interesting to compare the experiences of the parents and their children.

Not all parents were taught about these subjects, but those who did all felt that the lessons were taught objectively. It was seen as a history class, nothing more. Almost every single parent also added a remark that their schools were close to if not completely White. This was most likely due to White parents choosing to put their children into schools with other White children, suspecting that non-Dutch children would lower the education standards, even if it meant registering them into schools that were out of their district or even city; resulting in White schools and Black schools (Koster, 2021). This is in stark contrast to contemporary Dutch schools which have a more ethnic mix of students.

On a lighter note, the children did point out to me that after hearing how their parents were taught, most could confidently say that times have changed. Son Alberts has yet to be taught about the slave trade or the colonial past, but his class already had conversations in both serious and relaxed atmospheres at school about racism, especially around the time of the death of George Floyd. He also noticed that some of his teachers were very passionate about addressing racism.

Son Cornelissen did explain that there was a clear distinction between what is being taught in his social science class and his history class. He was taught about slavery in his

history class in a more objective way, whereas in his social science class, the teacher would attempt to push students to discuss contemporary issues surrounding racism. Daughter Cornelissen had her social science class two years ago, but she cannot recall them discussing racism. Her brother then added that it is probably due to the change in textbooks, stating that his new book from last summer already had chapters about the Black Lives Matter movement. Daughter Cornelissen also mentioned that she would often discuss what she learned in class with her friends, and she mentioned that due to the pandemic that this has stopped. These perspectives do show that the younger generation is being taught these topics and that they are being incentivized to hold discussions about them, especially outside of the classroom. This enables children to be introduced to foreign knowledge, and perhaps bring it into other social circles to allow for others to interact with it as well. However, to respect all opinions, there was one last perspective that I found important to cover on this topic.

Son Boerman (16) follows a social science class and they do cover topics such as discrimination. However, besides learning some facts here and there, the remainder is dedicated to what his teacher wants to instill in their students. He was frustrated with how his teacher would push an anti-racist agenda, as he disagrees with some points that the teacher makes and believes that these lessons can become too exaggerated. He also stated that there is never room for a discussion and that the only way to succeed in that class is to parrot what the teacher says, which to him feels like he is losing his right to his opinion. Son Boerman feels that he would be branded a racist in his classroom if he were to express his more conservative opinions. When I asked him if he talks about what he learned at school with his family when he gets home, he said that he does at least discuss it sometimes. Even though I did not see eye to eye with him on most of the topics in our conversation and that I am personally glad to hear that most classrooms are becoming more progressive, I did want to

stress that one of my core beliefs is that everyone should feel comfortable with expressing their opinion, regardless of what that opinion may be.

By comparing how students were taught between two different generations, the power discrepancy of whiteness has been made clearer. Returning to the thoughts of Harris, I do believe that what happened in the past, especially the unconscious segregation of the national student body through racial bias, resulted in whiteness again establishing itself as a fact or a given (1993) in Dutch society and that it is still haunting the present. What must be praised is the rising amount of contemporary teaching staff that encourage active learning, as they are simultaneously shattering the objective lens. That same lens was and still is used to erase people of color's histories by reducing their stories to mere facts and figures. Their histories were appropriated through whiteness and it is "[t]hrough this entangled relationship between race and property [that] historical forms of domination have evolved to reproduce subordination in the present" (Harris, 1993, p.1714).

Having displayed a variety of perspectives on a multitude of topics related to racism awareness, whiteness, white privilege, and white supremacy, it remains essential to return once more to the intersectional dissection of the Dutch, White, middle-class family. These families hold on tight to their Dutch identity, yet do not fully grasp what it represents. Where they categorize their Dutch identity as primarily being their nationality, Davis and Nencel "unproblematically fit the normative representation of Dutch identity as 'white'" (2011, 470). These American scholars can merge with the 'we' group in Dutch society as they too are 'unmarked', unlike those "stereotypical 'problem' immigrants who are ostensibly so in need of integration" (Davis & Nencel, 2011, p.471). Garner alludes to the pristine 'unmarked' status donned by White, middle-class people who are deemed worthy to be granted the full privileges of whiteness, unlike the partial benefits White people from lower-income households receive (2006). Yet to him, "whiteness [i]s a 'filled, rather than empty category' .

. . . in that it denotes ostensible absence but actual presence” (Garner, 2006, p.259). This presence can be felt, to my personal belief, it can come from the exposure to foreign knowledge and a subsequent introspection. Leaving the reins in the hands of these Dutch, White, middle-class families is the key to this process, as an established pillar of white supremacy is left with the privilege to decide whether to remain rigid and supportive to the systems that perform the ‘othering’, or choose to reimagine, reshape, and redefine themselves.

Returning to Intergenerational Solidarity

This final section is dedicated to exploring intergenerational solidarity between the family members. To do so, I will once again return to my theory and think with the appropriate authors. Komter and Vollebergh brought forth the importance of family members still requiring constant interaction for their well-being (2002). The other author I am returning to is Szydlik and his theories on intergenerational solidarity in conjunction with not only outer influences, such as cultural or political aspects to society but also conflict and its benefits (2008). In terms of outer influences, I will focus on my participants’ answers related to the Black Pete discussion and apologizing for the Dutch colonial past. In terms of conflict, I will mainly delve deeper into the moments where constructive conflict took place.

When I began asking my participants about their thoughts on the Black Pete discussion, all my participants mentioned that they expected this topic to surface. The answers among participants ranged wildly, from changing the appearance of Black Pete to keeping him untouched and unchanged. I had also asked every participant to share the emotions that the character evoked in their childhood. Almost all participants did not have any issue with the character; most of the parents recall Black Pete acting as the jolly sidekick who would liven up the party. They often added that children do not think of racism or a

master/servant relationship when looking at Saint Nicholas and his trusty helper. Most children also agreed with their parents' statements.

A solid example of this type of thinking can be seen with the Alberts family. As a teenager, mother Alberts always saw the holiday as a time where everyone was happy and the atmosphere was cozy. She never saw it as the way it is being stigmatized in the present. The big challenges to Black Pete a decade ago did not affect mother Alberts to change the way she would raise her children with that tradition. Son Alberts felt that the holiday was focused on fun when he believed in Saint Nicholas. When he got older, he could tell that as society was discussing alternative versions for the character, the essence of Black Pete, the joy for the children, began to fade away as it all became so politicized. Slightly more than half of the respondents roughly felt this way, but there were others, like mother Jansen, who placed an emphasis on the discussion surrounding the character of Black Pete to have gone on for far too long and that the character's looks need to be updated immediately.

When it came to the topic of apologizing for the Dutch colonial past, I was met with a resounding 'no' from the majority of the children and some of the parents. It mostly came down to it being a useless gesture that would not solve anything and that they were not the ones who performed those vile acts during the slave trade.

This can be seen with father and daughter Smits' responses. Daughter Smits had doubts about apologizing because people can overreact to this topic. She believes that this was a thing of the past and if everyone has to start doing this for every mistreatment of the past, then it just becomes too much to bear. Father Smits does acknowledge that the Dutch are very proud of their Golden Age and what came with it, and even though he finds it disgusting what happened to the slaves, it was just one of the ways people traded back then and so it seems a bit futile to apologize for that now.

What I noticed most was that despite trying to explain to the children that this apology would be performed by their prime minister and not by them personally, they still insisted that the gesture was not worth the worry as the enslaved who suffered were all long gone. There was one particular interaction however with the Boerman family, whereby mother Boerman (55) tried to put it into a more relatable perspective for her children to grasp it. To her children, the Dutch slave trade was an event of the distant past and therefore an apology is irrelevant. Mother Boerman on the other hand told her children to try to see it from the perspective of the victims. Daughter Boerman (20) pointed out in return that neither the slave owners nor the enslaved of that era were still alive to give and receive apologies respectively.

After hearing this, mother Boerman believes that the understanding behind what such an apology would entail varies per generation. She has empathy for the descendants of slavery while her children feel that this apology is demanding a personal toll. After discussing this point further with son Boerman, he has come to understand it better, but he still feels that it is pointless, an apology is merely words. Mother Boerman disagreed with her son as she understands the impact of present-day discrimination which originated many decades ago. Being half German, she is carrying the emotional pain felt by her German mother, who fled to the Netherlands right after the Second World War, and noticed that there still is some form of hatred towards the Germans. She believes that the descendants of the enslaved also feel as if they are seen as less worthy by society. Since mother Boerman did not press her mother's feelings towards her children as they grew up, they are now showing a disconnect from what she is trying to make them feel.

As seen with my discussion with the Boerman family, discussions spawned amongst most family members through their disagreements. To repeat the thoughts of Szydluk, intergenerational solidarity, or this idea of total agreement among family members, should not be the end goal for families to achieve, as this solidarity precisely can act as a tool to

measure the fluctuating intergenerational conflict of a family (2008). This is where the power of constructive/productive conflict shines, as it allows for foreign knowledge to be absorbed into the family and be bounced back and forth amongst each other whilst maintaining a level of mutual respect between all family members. One of the families that demonstrated a strong level of constructive conflict was the Alberts family when we were discussing the invisibility of racism in the Netherlands and the power behind white privilege.

Son Alberts thinks that racism should be more visible, especially in the media, but not as much as in the United States. He believes that if racism would make the headlines every day, that other stories do not get their proper share of the spotlight. Mother Alberts reacted to his thoughts by saying that it is important that it is featured so prominently, as it should always be remembered. She believes that we live in a more open society and that the Dutch media should place more emphasis on highlighting racial issues.

When I brought up white privilege, son Alberts pointed out that his non-White friends believe that they don't feel like they have fewer doors open in life than he does. He does hope however that this viewpoint is more reflective of Dutch society. Mother Alberts is against her son's argument since she believes that white privilege exists and that she praises that she is White and privileged, but to her, that privilege must always be recognized. She drew inspiration from her work, where her team worked on a diversity project to allow everyone to feel more comfortable, no matter who they are. The only thing is that at her workplace, you were able to count the amount of non-White people on one hand. She believes that it is not a proper representation of society. She felt the same about a predominantly White school that her son attended. It was a safe school, but not an accurate reflection of the Dutch multicultural society. Having moved her son to an international school, mother Alberts could tell that he mixed well with his non-White peers and that he did not care what skin color his friends have. She believes that we are moving towards a society that is tolerant of and equal

to all, but she is disappointed that we have not reached it yet. She then refers back to her son's comment to show that his mindset was affected by being in an international environment, making him think that since his peers have equal opportunities in class, that this applied to society. After hearing his mother explain her viewpoint, son Alberts began to understand where his perspective was clouded and began to ask more questions as a result.

These last perspectives were quite impactful for a handful of reasons, mainly demonstrating how the power of disagreement pushes conversations forward through the exposure to and confrontation with foreign knowledge and the mediation of said knowledge as the next step. What was most fascinating was the reemergence of the notion of obligation seemingly instilled in children towards their parents (Komter & Vollebergh, 2002). Whereas some children were quick to nod in favor of what their parents would say, others have made attempts to counter their parents' perspective. The latter should not be neglected as mere teenage rebellion, but rather an exercise of respect towards their parents by having the children remain steadfast with their own formulated opinion. Ultimately, using intergenerational solidarity as a measuring tool rather than a lofty ideal for families to strive towards (Szydlik, 2008) will allow families the chance for introspection, and may possibly aid in the disabling of the perpetuation of the silencing of voices and ideas alike.

Conclusion

After having analyzed a variety of family perspectives, I ask myself once more: in what ways have these Dutch, White, middle-class, families attempted to function as public spheres through their role as potential knowledge mediators with respect to institutional racism? Despite almost all families indicating that racism should be a thoroughly discussed subject, the results showed that certain families maintained a rigid nature and clung to their truths, whereas other families were open for introspection with even a few already making

plans to introduce the foreign knowledge into their other social circles (Fraser, 1990; Benhabib, 1993).

When I delved deeper into their perceptions of white privilege and the invisible systems that enforce racial disparities in society (hooks, 1992), what was most notable was the majority of participants who were unable to initially pinpoint ways in which their everyday lives were significantly improved solely through the benefits of whiteness (Harris, 1993). In terms of the impact intergenerational solidarity may have had in the discussions between parent and child, it would seem that there was a noticeable divide between the children who would let their parents be their spokespeople and the children who put more effort into engaging in the discussions through their own point of view (Komter & Vollebergh, 2002; Szydluk, 2008).

Were I to highlight a particular theoretical notion discussed in this study, then it would have to be the intersectional examination of the target demographic. This approach has enabled me to better analyze the positionality of these families through the ways in which race is interwoven with class and nationality. This was done by taking into account what their dutch identity truly represented (Davis & Nencel, 2011), how their advantage in white privilege capital compares to that of low-income households (Garner, 2006), and lastly the power they hold through whiteness. This enables them to live life comfortably whilst supporting, and therefore normalizing, the invisible systems in society that fuel white supremacy and perpetuate racial disparities (hooks, 1992; Harris, 1993).

This study has the potential to expand by hosting a higher number of families as well as making it a longitudinal study, to potentially observe changes to their behavior in their everyday lives. However, I feel that as it stands, this study has met my expectations. First, it is a small-scale study set to act as an opportunity for Dutch, White, middle-class families to have potentially uncomfortable conversations about institutional racism. Secondly, this

allowed them the opportunity to act as foreign knowledge mediators through a process of knowledge interaction, introspection, and reshaping/redefining themselves. Understandably, eight families do not represent all other families in the Netherlands and I do not intend to claim that. However, considering the fact that some of my families wanted to become knowledge mediators gives me good hope that families around the country are able to push this narrative out of their homes and onto the streets in order to enact real social change.

References

- Bengston, V. L., & Roberts, R. E. L. (1991). Intergenerational solidarity in aging families: An example of formal theory construction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 856-870.
- Benhabib, S. (1993). Feminist theory and Hannah Arendt's concept of public space. *History of the Human Sciences*, 6(2), 97–114.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/095269519300600205>
- Boyce, C., & Neale, P. (2006). Conducting in-depth interviews: A guide for designing and conducting in-depth interviews for evaluation input.
- Brooks, R. A. (2020, July 17). *More than half of Black-owned businesses may not survive COVID-19*. National Geographic.
<https://www.nationalgeographic.com/history/article/black-owned-businesses-may-not-survive-covid-19>
- Daatland, S. O., & Lowenstein, A. (2005). Intergenerational solidarity and the family–welfare state balance. *European Journal of Ageing*, 2(3), 174-182.
- Davis, K., & Nencel, L. (2011). Border skirmishes and the question of belonging: An autoethnographic account of everyday exclusion in multicultural society. *Ethnicities*, 11(4), 467–488.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796811415772>
- Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy. *Social Text*, 25/26, 56–80.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/466240>

- Garner, S. (2006). The Uses of Whiteness: What Sociologists Working on Europe Can Draw from US Research on Whiteness. *Sociology*, 40(2), 257–275.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038506062032>
- Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard law review*, 1707-1791.
- hooks, b. (1992). *Representing whiteness in the black imagination* (pp. 338-346). New York: Routledge.
- Kirby, J. (2020, June 12). “Black Lives Matter” has become a global rallying cry. Vox.
<https://www.vox.com/2020/6/12/21285244/black-lives-matter-global-protests-george-floyd-uk-belgium>
- Komter, A. E., & Vollebergh, W. A. M. (2002). Solidarity in Dutch Families. *Journal of Family Issues*, 23(2), 171–188.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513x02023002001>
- Koster, M. (2021, January 14). *Waarom hebben we nog steeds witte en zwarte scholen?* NPO Kennis.
<https://npokennis.nl/longread/7762/waarom-hebben-we-nog-steeds-witte-en-zwarte-scholen>
- Krueger, R. A., Casey, M. A., Donner, J., Kirsh, S., & Maack, J. N. (2001). Social analysis: selected tools and techniques. *Social Development Papers*, 4-23.
<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.607.4701&rep=rep1&type=pdf#page=10>

- Letiecq, B. L. (2019). Surfacing Family Privilege and Supremacy in Family Science: Toward Justice for All. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 398–411.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12338>
- Op1. (2020, June 2). *Remy Bonjasky, Gerda Havertong, Gerald Roethof en Laila Frank over het protest tegen racisme | Op1*. YouTube.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_5BZebWoDBw
- RTL Nieuws. (2019, November 8). *Socioloog: “Einde van de pietendiscussie nog lang niet in zicht.”*
<https://www.rtlnieuws.nl/editienl/artikel/4914396/pieten-zwarte-pieten-onderzoek-editie-rtl-zwart-roetveeg-wenpiet-lokale>
- Szydlik, M. (2008). Intergenerational Solidarity and Conflict. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 39(1), 97–114.
<https://doi.org/10.3138/jcfs.39.1.97>
- Thomsen, I. (2020, July 16). *The research is clear: White people are not more likely than Black people to be killed by police*. News @ Northeastern.
<https://news.northeastern.edu/2020/07/16/the-research-is-clear-white-people-are-not-more-likely-than-black-people-to-be-killed-by-police/>
- U.S Census Bureau (2019). *Population Estimates, July 1, 2019, (V2019)*.
<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045219>
- van Bohemen, S., Den Hertog, L., & van Zoonen, L. (2018). Music as a resource for the sexual self: An exploration of how young people in the Netherlands use music for good sex. *Poetics*, 66, 19-29.

van den Brand, M. (2020, June 9). *Duizenden mensen voegden zich bij het Black Lives Matter-protest in Amsterdam*. Vogue.

<https://www.vogue.nl/cultuur/cultuur-nieuws/a32739728/black-lives-matter-protest-amsterdam/>

van der Mee, T. (2020, August 19). *Kerwin werd doodgestoken in 1983: 'Nederland verloor zijn onschuld.'* Algemeen Dagblad.

<https://www.ad.nl/binnenland/kerwin-werd-doodgestoken-in-1983-nederland-verloor-zijn-onschuld~a97eb326/?referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2F>

Vasquez-Tokos, J., & Yamin, P. (2021). The racialization of privacy: racial formation as a family affair. *Theory and Society*, 1–24.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-020-09427-9>

Walsdorf, A. A., Jordan, L. S., McGeorge, C. R., & Caughy, M. O. (2020). White supremacy and the web of family science: Implications of the missing spider. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 12(1), 64-79.

Wiederhold, B. K. (2020). Connecting Through Technology During the Coronavirus

Disease 2019 Pandemic: Avoiding “Zoom Fatigue.” *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 23(7), 437–438.

<https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2020.29188.bkw>

Appendix



CHECKLIST ETHICAL AND PRIVACY ASPECTS OF RESEARCH

INSTRUCTION

This checklist should be completed for every research study that is conducted at the Department of Public Administration and Sociology (DPAS). This checklist should be completed *before* commencing with data collection or approaching participants. Students can complete this checklist with help of their supervisor.

This checklist is a mandatory part of the empirical master's thesis and has to be uploaded along with the research proposal.

The guideline for ethical aspects of research of the Dutch Sociological Association (NSV) can be found on their website (http://www.nsv-sociologie.nl/?page_id=17). If you have doubts about ethical or privacy aspects of your research study, discuss and resolve the matter with your EUR supervisor. If needed and if advised to do so by your supervisor, you can also consult Dr. Jennifer A. Holland, coordinator of the Sociology Master's Thesis program.

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Project title: Master Thesis

Name, email of student: Michel Radosevic, 577797mr@eur.nl

Name, email of supervisor: Willem Schinkel, schinkel@essb.eur.nl

Start date and duration: 14 December 2020 – June 20 2021

Is the research study conducted within DPAS **YES** - NO

If 'NO': at or for what institute or organization will the study be conducted?
(e.g. internship organization)

PART II: HUMAN SUBJECTS

1. Does your research involve human participants. YES - NO

If 'NO': skip to part V.

If 'YES': does the study involve medical or physical research? YES - NO
Research that falls under the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act ([WMO](#)) must first be submitted to [an accredited medical research ethics committee](#) or the Central Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects ([CCMO](#)).

2. Does your research involve field observations without manipulations that will not involve identification of participants. YES - NO

If 'YES': skip to part IV.

3. Research involving completely anonymous data files (secondary data that has been anonymized by someone else). YES - NO

If 'YES': skip to part IV.

PART III: PARTICIPANTS

1. Will information about the nature of the study and about what participants can expect during the study be withheld from them? YES - **NO**
2. Will any of the participants not be asked for verbal or written 'informed consent,' whereby they agree to participate in the study? YES - **NO**
3. Will information about the possibility to discontinue the participation at any time be withheld from participants? YES - **NO**
4. Will the study involve actively deceiving the participants? YES - **NO**
Note: almost all research studies involve some kind of deception of participants. Try to think about what types of deception are ethical or non-ethical (e.g. purpose of the study is not told, coercion is exerted on participants, giving participants the feeling that they harm other people by making certain decisions, etc.).
5. Does the study involve the risk of causing psychological stress or negative emotions beyond those normally encountered by participants? **YES** - NO
6. Will information be collected about special categories of data, as defined by the GDPR (e.g. racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, trade union membership, genetic data, biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a person, data concerning mental or physical health, data concerning a person's sex life or sexual orientation)?
YES - NO
7. Will the study involve the participation of minors (<18 years old) or other groups that cannot give consent?
YES - NO
8. Is the health and/or safety of participants at risk during the study? YES - **NO**
9. Can participants be identified by the study results or can the confidentiality of the participants' identity not be ensured? YES - **NO**
10. Are there any other possible ethical issues with regard to this study? YES - **NO**

If you have answered 'YES' to any of the previous questions, please indicate below why this issue is unavoidable in this study.

5. It will be a discussion having to do with institutional racism, there is no intention to cause stress or heightened emotions but they can occur naturally. I will aim to let people express their emotions but still maintain control of the situation.

6. My target group of people is the Dutch, White, middle-class family, so that is unavoidable, additionally my focus is on intergenerational relations so I must know who people are in their families.

7. As this study hinges on intergenerational relations, the children will be minors, as families with mature children will most likely live separately. Additionally, all families that participated in the study were provided a letter in Dutch describing what my research is about and what kind of conversation I would want to have with them. I asked them to send a separate email to confirm their participation as well as their parental consent for their children after they read my letter, so a formal form was not used.

What safeguards are taken to relieve possible adverse consequences of these issues (e.g., informing participants about the study afterwards, extra safety regulations, etc.).

Ensuring confidentiality of data in order to ensure freedom of speech and safety for children.

Are there any unintended circumstances in the study that can cause harm or have negative (emotional) consequences to the participants? Indicate what possible circumstances this could be.

The discussion can become heated.

Please attach your informed consent form in Appendix I, if applicable.

Continue to part IV.

PART IV: SAMPLE

Where will you collect or obtain your data?

Online through zoom

Note: indicate for separate data sources.

What is the (anticipated) size of your sample?

8 families

Note: indicate for separate data sources.

What is the size of the population from which you will sample?

No definite number on the size of the population, but I am sampling Dutch, White, middle-class families in the Netherlands.

Note: indicate for separate data sources.

Continue to part V.

Part V: Data storage and backup

Where and when will you store your data in the short term, after acquisition?

I will use multi factor authentication (for instance a code via sms) to access the stored data on the cloud. Additionally, the observations (each interview) will be encoded to increase anonymity. I will have a physical paper to decipher them which I will keep safe.

Note: indicate for separate data sources, for instance for paper-and pencil test data, and for digital data files.

Who is responsible for the immediate day-to-day management, storage and backup of the data arising from your research?

Michel Radosevic

How (frequently) will you back-up your research data for short-term data security?

After every interview

In case of collecting personal data how will you anonymize the data?

Full names will be replaced with generic family names

Note: It is advisable to keep directly identifying personal details separated from the rest of the data. Personal details are then replaced by a key/ code. Only the code is part of the database with data and the list of respondents/research subjects is kept separate.

PART VI: SIGNATURE

Please note that it is your responsibility to follow the ethical guidelines in the conduct of your study. This includes providing information to participants about the study and ensuring confidentiality in storage and use of personal data. Treat participants respectfully, be on time at appointments, call participants when they have signed up for your study and fulfil promises made to participants.

Furthermore, it is your responsibility that data are authentic, of high quality and properly stored. The principle is always that the supervisor (or strictly speaking the Erasmus University Rotterdam) remains owner of the data, and that the student should therefore hand over all data to the supervisor.

Hereby I declare that the study will be conducted in accordance with the ethical guidelines of the Department of Public Administration and Sociology at Erasmus University Rotterdam. I have answered the questions truthfully.

Name student: Michel Radosevic

Name (EUR) supervisor: Willem Schinkel

Date: 18/03/2021

Date: 18/03/2021