

# Supplementary Material

## **Comparing Attachment Networks during Middle Childhood in Two Contrasting Cultural Contexts**

### Sophia Daphne Becke\*, Stephan Bongard

\* Correspondence: Sophia Daphne Becke: becke@psych.uni-frankfurt.de

	Camer	oonian sample of the Nseh N = 171	in sample of Bad Nauheim N = 108		
Age category	Ν	%	N	%	
Younger peers	30	17.6	3	2.8	
Same-aged peers	54	31.6	38	35.2	
Older peers	24	14.0	7	6.5	
Adults	63	36.8	60	55.5	

**Supplementary Table 1**. Distribution of age categories in both settings

*Note*. Percentages relate to the individual setting

#### Supplementary Table 2. Distribution of gender categories in both settings

	Can		n sampl Íseh = 171	e of the	C	German sample of Bad Nauheim N = 108			
		emale icipants	Male participants			emale icipants	Male participants		
Gender	N	N %		%	N	%	Ν	%	
Female attachment figures	58	59.8	36	48.6	37	71.2	25	44.6	
Male attachment figures	39	40.2	38	51.4	15	28.8	31	55.4	

*Note*. Percentages relate to each gender of participants in each setting.

	Camer	boonian sample of the Nseh N = 171	Germa	In sample of Bad Nauheim N = 103
Residential category	N	%	N	%
Shared residence	61	35.7	38	36.9
Shared neighborhood	59	34.5	10	9.7
Shared town	28	16.4	32	31.1
Out of town	23	13.4	22	21.3
Abroad	-	-	1	1.0

Supplementary Table 3. Distribution of residential categories in both settings

Notes. Percentages relate to the individual setting

Individuals with an exclusive institutional tie were excluded from the analysis since children were not able to identify their residential category.

### Supplementary Table 4. Distribution of duration categories in both settings

		bonian sample of the Nseh N = 171	Germa	man sample of Bad Nauheim N = 108	
Duration category	N	%	N	%	
Since birth	162	94.7	73	67.6	
Since early childhood	7	4.1	17	15.7	
Since middle childhood	-	-	17	15.7	
Less than 1 year	2	1.2	1	0.9	

*Note*. Percentages relate to the individual setting



## Supplementary Material

		nger peers		ne-aged peers	Older peers Adults		Total			
		<i>n</i> = 3	-	n = 38		<i>n</i> = 7	n = 60		N = 108	
Functional category	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Socio-emotional assistance	-	-	14	36.8	2	28.6	17	28.3	33	30.5
Consistency	1	33.3	8	21.1	2	28.6	19	31.7	30	27.8
Harmonization	1	33.3	11	28.9	-		10	16.7	22	20.4
Education	-	-	2	5.3	3	42.8	9	15.0	14	13.0
Instrumental assistance in distress	1	33.3	3	7.9	-		5	8.3	9	8.3

Supplementary Table 5. Distribution of categories of perceived functionality across age categories for the German sample of Bad Nauheim

*Note*. Percentages relate to the individual age groups

Supplementary Table 6. Distribution of categories of perceived functionality across age categories for the Cameroonian sample of the Nseh

	Younger peersSame-aged $n = 24$ $n = 44$			0	-		Adults		Total	
			n = 21		<i>n</i> = 45		<i>N</i> = 134			
Functional category	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Nutritional care	4	16.7	9	20.5	11	52.4	22	48.9	46	34.3
Kinship	11	45.8	10	22.7	-	-	13	28.9	34	25.4
Everyday instrumental assistance	3	12.5	10	22.7	8	38.1	8	17.8	29	21.6
Affection	6	25.0	15	34.1	2	9.5	2	4.4	25	18.7

Notes. Percentages relate to the individual age groups

For the Cameroonian sample, children stated perceived functionality for 134 individuals.