Utrecht University

MECYS
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT
S I N T   M A A R T E N

The 'Pedagogical Climate' in St. Maarten

An explorative study on the child-rearing styles of parents and the 'village' in St. Maarten

Utrecht University: Faculty Social Sciences

Master Youth, Education and Society

Pedagogy and International Development (PID)

Master thesis

Student:	H. Rikkert
	5753406
Supervisor Utrecht University:	dr. R. A. van 't Rood
Second Assessor:	dr. P. Baar
Internship Organisation:	Department of Education
	Ministry of Education, Culture, Youth and Sports
	St. Maarten
Supervisor Internship Organisation:	A. Uche-Roosberg Msc.
Date:	August 21th, 2018

Abstract

This study is an attempt to describe and analyse the general pedagogical climate in St. Maarten. The pedagogical climate contains the parenting style(s) of the parents, how the environment plays a role in guiding the children and what the culture and beliefs are around child-rearing. A mixed-method design was used to examine the pedagogical climate. Questionnaires were distributed among parents ($n = 143$), teachers ($n = 65$), employees of children's foundations ($n = 8$) and sport associations ($n = 9$). Interviews were held with governmental entities ($n = 9$), priests ($n = 2$), heads of primary schools ($n = 16$) and coaches of sports organisations ($n = 3$). The results show a lot of different parenting styles under the participants: 37.1% of the parents has a clear authoritative parenting style and 10.5% has an authoritarian parenting style. Most teachers have a combination of the authoritative and authoritarian style. Furthermore, there is a gap between the home and school culture. Parents have to work in order to live; therefore, the children receive little structure and quality time at home with the parents.

   Key words: youth, children, parenting styles, teachers, primary schools, culture, child-rearing, beliefs and norms, St. Maarten.

Samenvatting

Deze studie is een poging om het algemene pedagogische klimaat in St. Maarten te beschrijven en te analyseren. Het pedagogisch klimaat behelst de opvoedingsstijl(en) van de ouders, hoe de omgeving een rol speelt bij het opvoeden van de kinderen en wat de cultuur en de overtuigingen zijn rond het opvoeden van kinderen. Een *mixed-method* ontwerp werd gebruikt om het pedagogisch klimaat te onderzoeken. Vragenlijsten werden gehouden onder ouders ($n = 143$), leerkrachten ($n = 65$), werknemers van stichtingen voor kinderen ($n = 8$) en sportverenigingen ($n = 9$). Interviews werden gehouden met overheidsorganisaties ($n = 9$), priesters ($n = 2$), hoofden van basisscholen ($n = 16$) en coaches van sportorganisaties ($n = 3$). De resultaten laten veel verschillende opvoedingsstijlen zien onder de participanten. 37.1% van de ouders heeft een duidelijke autoritatieve opvoedingsstijl en 10.5% heeft een autoritaire opvoedingsstijl. De meeste leraren tonen een combinatie van de autoritatieve en autoritaire stijl. Verder is er een kloof tussen de thuis- en schoolcultuur. Ouders moeten werken om te kunnen leven, daarom ontvangen de kinderen thuis weinig structuur en quality time.

   Sleutelwoorden: jeugd, kinderen, opvoedingsstijlen, leraren, basisscholen, cultuur, opvoeding, waarden en normen, St. Maarten.

Abbreviations

CoG	Court of Guardianship
CPO	Community Police Officer
CPS	Collective Prevention Services
DC	Department of Culture
DE	Department of Education
DS	Department of Sports
DY	Department of Youth
MAC	Methodist Agogic Centre Foundation
MECYS	Ministry of Education, Culture, Youth and Sports
SDA	Seventh-day Adventist
SKOS	Stichting Katholiek Onderwijs St. Maarten
SPCOBE	Stichting Protestants Christelijk Onderwijs Bovenwindse Eilanden
SSSD	Student Support Services Division
YMD	Youth and Moral Department

General information St. Maarten

St. Maarten is a Caribbean island of 87 square kilometres. The northern section, Saint Martin, is French territory while the southern section, Sint Maarten, is an autonomous country within the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The latter section is 34 square kilometres and Philipsburg is the capital (Nuffic, 2015). The population is 40.535 residents (Department of Statistics St. Maarten, 2017), however there are many undocumented who have not been registered (Unicef, 2013).

The main economic drive of St. Maarten is primarily built around tourism and secondary around public administration and governance (Unicef, 2013). The average income per capita is relatively high. However, there is a very uneven distribution of income as 22% of the population is without income and 75% of the St. Maarten households live under the poverty line. The unemployment rate is 11% (De Wit, 2015). 43% of the population is lower educated, 41% is middle educated and 16% is higher educated (Department of Statistics Sint Maarten, 2017). Furthermore, religion is an important part of everyday life as 90% of the citizens are religious; 41.9% has a Protestant religion, followed by the Roman Catholic religion with 33.1% (St. Maarten, 2011).

St. Maarten has a multicultural community due to a long history of migration. The majority of the population consists of immigrants, with the majority born in the Dominican Republic (12.4%) and Haiti (9.2%) (Department of statistics, 2011; Unicef 2013). Many immigrants do not have a legal status and are described as 'undocumented' immigrants. They do not have residence- or work permits (Nienhusser, 2013). Undocumented children under the age of 18 are required to attend school (Compulsory Education report, 2015). They comprise between 10% and 15% of the school-going population (De Wit, 2015)

The education system in St. Maarten is divided into nursery, primary, secondary and tertiary education. There are three different types of schools in St. Maarten: government owned (public schools), government subsidized, and non-subsidized schools (private schools). There are six public primary schools and eleven subsidized primary schools, managed by four religious school boards: Stichting Protestants Christelijk Onderwijs Bovenwindse Eilanden (SPCOBE), Seventh-day Adventist (SDA), Methodist Agogic Centre Foundation, (MAC) and Stichting Katholiek Onderwijs St. Maarten (SKOS) (State of Education Report 2012-2014, 2015).

Introduction

"*I live with my mother, stepfather, and younger brother… I don't have a good relationship with my stepfather. He always hits me without asking why I did something. My mother doesn't do anything. He went to the church to talk about it, and now mostly he just curses at me when he's angry. It makes me feel bad.*" (Unicef, 2013)

In 2013, Unicef has done research on the status of the children and adolescents in St. Maarten. This research, commissioned by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF-TACRO), has found several aspects that possibly may deteriorate the situation of the children in St. Maarten.

Firstly (a), many persons become a parent at an early age and many are not prepared for this role (e.g. teenage mothers). There is a lack of institutional support whereby many parents are unable to handle their own problems, let alone those of their up growing children. Many children in St. Maarten get raised in less structured families as single-parent households account for 15 percent of de population (Department of statistics, 2011). The mothers are therefore often fully responsible for the (economic) wellbeing of their children (Unicef, 2013).

Furthermore (b), there is a big wage gap between males and females and the costs for basic needs are very high. Therefore, mothers must work multiple jobs to meet the needs of their family and therefore could lack in spending time with their children. This means that children may be left home alone or in childcare centres, which may cause situations where children are not getting the right care and potentially are at risk (Unicef 2013).

Another risk that is highlighted in the research of Unicef (2013) is (c) domestic violence. Violence is believed to be a common phenomenon in St. Maarten. There are no official numbers on domestic violence due to a culture of silence, which means that victims often choose to not report (Unicef, 2013). Violence within homes is more widespread in less structured households (DoStatisics 2012). Also, disciplining through corporal punishment is not only still used at home, it is also used in some schools (Unicef, 2013).

The report of the Division for Education Innovations states that one of the factors that fosters or maintains youth problems is the used parenting style. This report however, is based on the parenting styles of Caribbean parents, not the parents of St. Maarten (Dekker and Kleijn, 2012). When looking at the parenting styles in the Caribbean the authoritarian parenting, low on warmth and high on control, is the dominant parenting style (Grantha-

McGregor, Landman, & Desai, 1983; Brown & Johnson, 2008; Samms-Vaughan, Williams, & Brown, 2005). Research shows the practices of physical punishment and public humiliation as a common method of discipline in the Caribbean (Smith & Moseby, 2003; Brown & Johnson, 2008). These potentially harmful practices can encourage behavioral problems with children and according to Smith and Mosby (2003), it could create a vicious cycle of violence and authoritarian parenting.

As there has been done no research previously on the topic of parenting styles in St. Maarten, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Youth and Sports (MECYS) of St. Maarten is highly interested in this topic, including the community that guides the children and the child-rearing culture (the Pedagogical Climate). Therefore the research question is as follows: How is the general pedagogical climate in St. Maarten? This question is divided in the following sub questions:

1. How do parents of children aged 3-12 years raise their children?
2. How is the pedagogical climate in the direct environment of the children, in terms of school, sports and children's foundation?
3. What are the cultural aspects and beliefs around child-rearing?

Theoretical Framework

To examine the parenting style of the parents and the community in St. Maarten multiple models are used. Firstly, in order to distinguish the important different environments, the *Ecological Systems Theory* (Bronfenbrenner, 1977) is used. Furthermore, the *Parenting Styles* model of Baumrind (1966) is used to research the parenting styles. To examine the environment the *Developmental Niche* (Super & Harkness, 1986) and *Educational civil society* (De Winter, 2009) is used.

Social Ecological Systems Theory

Bronfenbrenner (1977) describes four different levels of the Social Ecological Systems Theory to analyse how the environment and a child interact with each other; microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem and macrosystem. The microsystem shows the direct environment in which a child lives. This includes the direct relationships, for example, family and peers. The mesosystem shows the connection between microsystems that have a direct influence on the child. For example the interaction between parents and teachers. The exosystem does not influence the child directly but has an indirect influence on the child's life. For example, the home environment can be influenced by events at the parent's work. The macrosystem describes the culture, norms and beliefs of the society and the legal system in which the child lives. This includes the overall culture and the socioeconomic status of the region.

Parenting styles

Baumrind describes three types of adult control of children: permissive, authoritarian and authoritative (Baumrind, 1966). Later a fourth type joined, 'neglectful', and the theory evolved into categories of parenting styles. The parenting styles are determined by the degree of warmth and control towards the child (O'Connor & Scott, 2007). Authoritative parents score high on warmth with a high level of control; authoritarian parents score low on warmth and high on control; permissive parents are warm but score low at control; and neglectful parents score low on warmth and control (O'Connor & Scott, 2007).

Authoritarian parenting has been linked to lower academic performance (Shumow, Vandell, & Posner, 1998), depression, anxiety, cognitive problems and substance abuse (Lempers, Clark-Lempers, & Simons, 1989; Smith, Springer, & Barrett, 2011). Children who

experience permissive parenting are more likely to act out behaviorally (Shumow, Vandell, & Posner, 1998) and show narcissistic tendencies (Uji, Sakamoto, Adachi, & Kitamura, 2014), while adolescents who have experienced authoritative parenting appear to have lower levels of depressive symptoms and higher levels of achievement and competence when compared with other adolescents (Liem, Cavell, & Lusting, 2010; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darnling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994). Authoritative parenting could also develop an increased sense of self efficacy and self-worth (Steinberg et al., 1994).

Developmental Niche

The Developmental Niche is a framework of three components that show how culture can shape the development of the child (Super & Harkness, 1986). Firstly, the physical and social settings of the child's life are taken into account; with whom the children spend their days and how their household and individual environments are organized. Secondly, the culturally regulated customs of child care and child-rearing matter; the inherited and adapted ways of raising, educating and taking care of the child. And thirdly, the psychology of the caretakers is part of the framework. This includes the cultural specific parental ethno-theories of child-rearing and development of children (Camilleri, & Malewska-Peyre, 1997).

Educational civil society

The educational civil society means the 'joint activities of citizens around the rearing of children'. When the educational civil society is functioning well, the citizens are willing to share the responsibility around child-rearing and educating children in their own social network and in the public domain. Parents, family members, teachers, sports coaches and others are involved in the upbringing and the process of growing up (Van Dijk & Gemmeke, 2010; Van der Klein, Bulsink, & Van der Gaag, 2012). Both the formal and informal networks are included, in the public and private domain (Van der Klein et al., 2012). Social support is one of the core values of the educational civil society because of the potential of exchange of advice, direct assistance and support between people which could make raising children or growing up as a child easier (De Winter, 2009).

Method

First the research design is explained, thereafter the procedure and the participants are presented. Furthermore, the measuring instruments are discussed and finally the data analysis is explained per sub question.

Design

The explorative character of the research is shown in the research design through the Social Ecological Systems Theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). The main focus is on the microsystem, the parents. However, the mesosystem and macrosystem were also examined to achieve a more holistic view of the pedagogical climate. To increase the internal validity and reliability of the research a mixed method design was used (Abowitz & Toole, 2009; van Yperen & Veerman, 2008). Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used in terms of interviews and (partly oral) questionnaires. The field research was conducted between February and May 2017.

Participants and procedure

To request cooperation of the participants for the research an official letter was sent from the department of Education (DE) signed by the acting head of the DE. This was sent to all school boards of primary schools (subsidised and public), children's foundation and the governmental entities: Court of Guardianship (CoG), Community Police Officer (CPO), Youth and Moral department (YMD) Collective Prevention Services (CPS), Students Support Services Division (SSSD), departments of Culture (DC), Youth (DY) and Sport (DS). Afterwards, contact was made and visits for conducting interviews and the distribution of questionnaires for parents was arranged. Furthermore, the Minister of MECYS requested for cooperation of all parents through social media, e-mail, the official debriefing and a press release (Government of St. Maarten, 2017c). The sport associations were contacted by telephone to ask for cooperation with this research, after the contact information of all sport associations was acquired by the DS. Finally, the interviews with the priests were planned by the DE.

To assess the micro environment, parents ($n = 165$) were interviewed about their parenting styles through a questionnaire. The questionnaires were mainly given to the school children to be filled in at home (50.2% return-rate) and through an email that was send to all

civil servants. Furthermore, to increase the quantity of lower educated parents, participants were sought at the post office, the library and on the boardwalk of Philipsburg. The questionnaires were read by a local person, under surveillance by the researcher, and filled in by the researcher. This was done to minimise missing values and to increase the number of (lower educated) parents.

Parents were excluded from the research based on background factors ($n = 20$) and statistical outliers ($n = 2$). Exclusion criteria were younger or older children than between the age of 3 and 12, attending a school on French St. Maarten, or the parent barely having any contact with the child due to living elsewhere. Based on extreme scores on the authoritarian scale ($Z = 4.523$ and $Z = 4.732$) two cases were excluded. After exclusion of cases the remaining participants were $n = 143$.

The questionnaire was filled in in different ways: through schools ($n = 98$), on the boardwalk ($n = 30$) and via a digital questionnaire ($n = 15$). No significant difference was found that could show there was an impact of the way parents filled in the questionnaire and the parenting styles. Authoritarian, $F_{(2, 140)} = 0.344$, $p = .709$, $\eta^2 = 0.004$. Authoritative, $F_{(2, 140)} = 0.222$, $p = .801$, $\eta^2 = 0.003$. Permissive, $F_{(2, 140)} = 0.338$, $p = .714$, $\eta^2 = 0.004$.

Less than half of the participants were born in St. Maarten or St. Martin (39.9%). Furthermore, 10.5% were born in Jamaica and 8.4% were born in Guyana. In total 58.2% of the parents were living together (married or unmarried), 36.4% was a single parent (single, divorced or widowed). Of the parents, 32.2% were lower educated, 26.6% were middle educated and 37.8% were higher educated, according to the indicators of OECD (2012). Most of the questionnaires were filled in by the mother (71.3%), but also fathers (24.5%) and guardians (4.2%) filled in the questionnaires. Further background characteristics of the parents can be found in Appendix A.

The participants were asked about the reliability through control questions. The questions were answered through a five-point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. 84.8% of the participants ($n = 138$) thought the questions were easy. 84.0% of the participants thought the questions were clear. With the items combined, the scale 'reliability' showed that 81.3% of the participants thought the questionnaire is reliable and 1.4% thought it was unreliable.

To assess the mesosystem the following participants were interviewed or were asked to fill in a (partly oral) questionnaire: primary school teachers ($n = 67$), primary school head-

managers ($n = 16$), heads of sport associations ($n = 12$) and employees from the children's foundations ($n = 8$).

The teachers and employees of the children's foundations received the same questionnaire. It was taken orally to reduce the possibility of different interpretation of the items and to minimise missing values. The data file has been checked on extreme scores and two outliers were found ($Z = 3.18$ and $Z = -3.12$). These cases were excluded from the data file and the remaining teachers were $n = 65$.

In total 40% of the teachers were from St. Maarten, 9.2% from Suriname and 7.7% from Jamaica. 4.6% of the participants were male and 95.4% were female.

The children's foundations that participated were: The New Start for Children Foundation and the I Can foundation. These foundations foster children that are unable to live with their parents or direct family. Children are assigned through the CoG. Three of the employees of the children's foundations came from Guyana and the rest was from Curacao, Jamaica, St. Kitts, St. Maarten and Trinidad. Most employees were lower/middle educated (87.5%) and one employee (12.5%) was higher educated.

The coaches of different sport associations ($n = 3$) were available for a structured interview and the heads of the sport associations ($n = 9$) were available to fill in the digital questionnaire. The primary school head-managers had a semi-structured interview.

Finally, to research the culture around child-rearing in St. Maarten, semi-structured interviews were held with representatives of the abovementioned governmental entities ($n = 8$). Only SSSD was included through a group interview with all employees. Finally, semi-structured interviews were held with Priests ($n = 2$) from the Baptist and SDA church.

Measuring instruments

The parent questionnaire was based on the Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ) from Robinson, Mandleco, Roper & Hart (2001) based on the Parenting styles model of Baumrind (1971). The PSDQ measures three styles: 'authoritarian parenting style', 'authoritative parenting style' and 'permissive parenting style'. The answers were measured through a five-point Likert-scale from 'never' to 'always' that measures the extent to which parents show certain behavior.

Changes were made to the questions through feedback from five local employees of the DE. To make the questionnaire more culturally appropriate the questions were presented

to the parents sorted on topic. Also, five of the 63 items of the PSDQ were excluded from the questionnaire: 'I disagree with my child', 'I tell my child what to do', 'I demand that the child does things', 'I spoil my child' and 'I use physical punishment as a way to discipline'. These questions were deleted as they were considered culturally inappropriate (too western or too direct) or too difficult. At the end of the questionnaire there were four open questions about the needs of parents to possibly improve their parenting style and three control questions to check the reliability of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was to be filled in anonymously. The questionnaire can be found in Appendix B.

The questionnaire of the teachers and employees of the foundations were derived from the parents' questionnaire and was used to measure how often they show behaviors of a specific guiding style. From each scale between two and three questions were selected to receive a total of 20 questions. The questionnaire was concluded with four open questions and three control questions for reliability. This questionnaire can be found in Appendix C.

Semi-structured interviews were held with the abovementioned representatives of the government entities, priests and head-managers of the primary schools. The topics varied per type of participant. All interviews were semi-structured with fixed topics. However, to get more insight in their (professional) opinion, some answers were further explored. The topic lists can be found in Appendix D.

Data analysis quantitative data

Research question 1. The results were analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics 24. To assess the internal consistency of the styles, Cronbach's alfa was used, with preferably a Cronbach's alfa higher than .7 as this is 'acceptable' (Allen, Bennett, & Haritage, 2014). The Cronbach's alfa of the construct 'authoritarian parenting style' was .84 and therefore acceptable. The Cronbach's alfa of the construct 'authoritative parenting style' was .82, but increased to .90 when item WI3 was deleted ('I praise when my child is good'). The Cronbach's alfa of the construct 'permissive parenting style was .69. The item-total would increase to .74 if the respective items SC1 ('I appear confident about my parenting abilities'), SC3 ('I set strict well-established rules for my child') and FT4 ('I carry out discipline when my child misbehaves') were deleted. The remaining items were merged into one scale.

The means per construct were calculated. For the scales authoritarian and permissive parenting the cut-off point of 2.00 ('once in a while') was set, as a mean score corresponding

to more than 'once in a while' (2.00 or higher) was considered quite permissive or authoritarian. For the scale authoritative parenting style the cut-off point was set on a score of 4.00 ('very often'), as a mean score that is below 'very often' was considered as having a lack of warmth and authoritative control. These cut-off points were used so parents could be classified as a specific or a combined parenting style.

In the analysis of the background factors and the parenting styles, the assumption of homogeneity of variance was checked through Levene's statistic, if the assumption was not violated the analysis was continued. Post hoc analyses of Turkey has been used, also when group sizes were unequal, Gabriel was used as this test has a greater statistical power.

Research question 2. The underlying structure of the questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale was subjected to principal axis factoring with a varimax orthogonal rotation, as there was no high correlation expected for the items. After a reduction of four items, a two-factor model was seen. One factor measures an authoritative guiding style and the other measures an authoritarian guiding style. This two-factor model explained a total variance of 32.52%, which can be considered moderate. The outcome of the factor analysis can be found in Appendix E.

The construct 'authoritative guiding style' was .70. and thus merged into one scale. The Cronbach's alpha of 'authoritarian guiding style' is .51, which is weak but acceptable for an explorative study (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006), therefore the remaining items were merged into one scale.

In the analysis of the background factors the assumption of homogeneity of variance was checked through Levene's statistics. If the assumption was not violated the analysis was continued. As with the analysis of the parents, Post hoc analyses of Gabriel were used. After analysing the guiding styles of the teachers and employees of the children's foundations there was a t-test to see if there is a statistical difference between the guiding styles of these groups of participants. Afterwards the employees of the foundation and the cases that were 'missing' ($n = 3$) were not further included nor mentioned in the analysis.

Quantitative analysis

The analyses of open questions were done in Excel, where answers were categorised per theme per question. Interviews were transcribed and analysed through open coding.

Themes and codes were made with the research questions in mind. Furthermore, axial coding was used to identify the important codes for this study (Boeije, 2005).

Results

First the results of sub question one are presented, wherein the parenting styles of parents are shown as well as relevant differences between the outcomes. Subsequently the results of sub question two, the quantitative results of the teachers and employees of the children's foundations, will be presented including the qualitative results from the same participants and the relevant information received from the interviews with sport associations and head managers of primary schools. Finally, the results of the interviews with the governmental departments and Priests are presented.

Research question 1

The results of the separate parenting skills show that 66.4% of the parents score high on the authoritative parenting scale ($M = 4.15$, $SD = 0.50$), 38.5% of the parents score high on the authoritarian parenting scale ($M = 1.89$, $SD = 0.50$) and 28.7% of the parents score high on the permissive parenting scale ($M = 1.76$, $SD = 0.41$). Some parents score high on multiple styles, therefore parents were classified in a specific parenting style, see table 1. 37.1% of the parents has a clear authoritative parenting style, 10.5% has a clear authoritarian parenting style and 3.5% has clear permissive parenting style. So, 51.1% of the parents has a distinctive parenting style.

Table 1.

Frequency and Percentage of the Parenting Styles of Parents

Parenting styles	Frequency	Percentage
Clear authoritative	53	37.1%
Clear authoritarian	15	10.5%
Clear permissive	5	3.5%
Authoritative and authoritarian	16	11.2%
Authoritarian and permissive	10	7.0%
Authoritative and permissive	12	8.4%
All styles	14	9.8%
No style	18	12.6%
Total	143	100%

School boards. A one-way between groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to investigate if there was a difference between school boards. Only the ANOVA of the permissive parenting style was statistically significant, $F(6, 136) = 2.622$, $p = .019$, $\eta^2 = 0.104$. Post hoc analyses with Gabriel ($\alpha = .05$) showed parents whose children go to a public school ($M = 1.95$, $SD = 0.49$) score higher on permissive parenting than parents whose children go to SKOS ($M = 1.62$, $SD = 0.45$). The school board attributes 10.4% of the variability on permissive parenting style, which can be considered a medium effect. The effect size was $d = 0.52$, what can also be considered medium.

Level of Education. Furthermore, a one-way between groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to investigate if the level of education of parents has an impact on the parenting styles. The ANOVA of authoritative parenting style was statistically significant with $F(2, 135) = 2.992$, $p = .05$, $\eta^2 = 0.05$. However, no significant Post hoc mean difference was found. The ANOVA of authoritarian parenting style was also statistically significant with $F(2, 135) = 3.365$, $p = .037$, $\eta^2 = 0.05$. When assessing the Post hoc analyses of Turkey HSD ($\alpha = .05$), a significant mean differences was found. Lower educated parents scored significantly higher ($M = 1.99$, $SD = 0.47$) on the authoritarian parenting scale than higher educated parents ($M = 1.78$, $SD = 0.43$). The effect size of this comparison was $d = 0.40$, what can be considered as a small-to-medium effect.

Number of children. Spearman's rho indicated the presence of a significant weak negative correlation between the number of children and authoritative parenting style, $r_s = -.21$, $p = .011$, two-tailed, $n = 142$. This indicates that the more children the parents have, the less authoritative parents score.

Parenting styles. Furthermore, spearman's rho was used to indicate a correlation between the three parenting styles. There was a significant weak negative correlation between authoritative parenting style and authoritarian parenting style ($r_s = -.23$, $p = .006$, two-tailed, $n = 142$) and permissive parenting style ($r_s = -.18$, $p = .034$, two-tailed, $n = 142$). This indicates that parents that score higher on authoritative parenting style, score lower on authoritarian parenting style. Also, parents that score higher on authoritative parenting style, score lower on permissive parenting style. There was also a significant weak positive correlation between permissive parenting style and authoritarian parenting style ($r_s = .35$, $p < .001$, two-tailed, $n = 142$). This indicates that parents that score higher on permissive parenting style, score also higher on authoritarian parenting style.

Marital status. Furthermore, a one-way between groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to investigate if the martial status of parents has an impact on the parenting styles. The ANOVA of authoritative parenting style was statistically non-significant, $F(5, 137) = 2.19$, $p = .059$, $\eta^2 = 0.08$, as well as the ANOVA of authoritarian parenting style, $F(5, 137) = 2.05$, $p = .075$, $\eta^2 = 0.07$.

Research question 2

When looking at the separate guiding scales, 70.6% of the participants score high on the authoritarian guiding scale ($M = 2.28$, $SD = 0.49$) and 71.9 % of the participants score high on the authoritative guiding scale ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.36$). The participants were classified in four groups, see table 2. Of the participants, 31.5% has a clear authoritative guiding style. 9.6% has a clear authoritarian guiding style. More than half of the participants has both styles.

Table 2

Frequency and percentage of the guiding styles of the teachers

Guiding styles	Frequency	Percentage
Authoritative	12	16.9%
Authoritarian	15	21.1%
Both styles	39	54.9%
Neither styles	5	7.0%
Total	71	100%

The *t*-test was statistically significant for the authoritarian guiding style. Teachers ($M = 2.33$, $SD = 0.48$) scored higher, with an estimate of 0.43, 95% CI [0.05, 0.80] on the authoritarian guiding scale, than workers at the children's foundation ($M = 1.89$, $SD = 0.39$). This indicates that teachers are more authoritarian than the workers at the children's foundation, t(70) = 2.294, $p = .025$, two-tailed. The effect size was $d = 0.91$, what can be seen as a large effect. No significance has been found between the two groups for authoritative guiding styles, t(71) = -.336, $p = .738$, two-tailed.

Classes. A one-way between group analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used if there was an impact of the classes (early stimulation, cycle 1, cycle 2, mixed classes) on the guiding styles of teachers. The ANOVA of authoritative guiding style was significant, $F(4,$

59) = 2.589.26, p = .046, η^2 = 0.150. However, no significant Post hoc mean difference was found.

School boards. A one-way between groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to investigate if guiding styles of the teachers differ between the different school boards, however no significant mean differences were found for the authoritarian guiding style, F (4, 59) = 1.294, p = .283, as well as the authoritative guiding style, F (4, 59) = 1.134, p = .349.

Qualitative results

Employees of the children's foundations

Many open questions were not answered by the employees of the foundation. One aspect that stood out within the remaining results was that there is a lack of professional workers and a lack of professionalization within the foundations as none of the employees receive training or workshops.

Teachers

The teachers mention that their role is beneficiary in guiding the children on several aspects. They mention that they are a role model and as such they show the standards, morals and values in practice. Furthermore, they are available for communication and conversation with the children, about issues that can bother the children. The main element that teachers want to improve themselves in, is to have more knowledge about behavioral and learning difficulties and how to properly guide children with those difficulties. Only 15.5% of the teachers mentions that they receive workshops to improve their guiding style. Hence most teachers mention that they would like more courses, workshops or seminars about a topic that is applicable for the class they teach. Furthermore, the teachers would like extra support from the parents so that the school culture and home culture can collaborate in guiding the children and set the same standards and values for the children.

Sport associations

The SMMAFE mentions that playing sports helps to form the character of the children and they learn basic ethics. Both SXM BJJ and Little League mention foremost that children learn discipline and respect through their sports. "*They also learn to interact respectfully with adults and their peers.*" The children learn how to be in control and to solve problems in difficult situations and to stay calm in both defeat and victory. Furthermore, the children learn to motivate each other and encourage each other. Other sport associations also

mention that playing sports enhances confidence, self-control, conflict avoidance and how to speak up for themselves. However, the coaches do not receive pedagogical training. Furthermore, two sports associations, Pony baseball and softball and Netball association, mention that playing sport is a good opportunity for the students to represent their country, travel abroad and perhaps become a professional.

Head-managers primary schools

Eleven head-managers mention that parents are partially involved with the school and their children's education. Not all parents come to all the meetings but if something has happened with (one of) their child(ren) most of the time the parents are available for a conversation. One head-manager mentions that their parents are doing great: "*Parental involvement is outstanding… there is lots of communication with them.*" However, two head-managers mention a great lack of involvement of parents within the school life and the overall life of the children: "*Parents can't pick them up. There are some lash-key children who walk to their home … and take care of themselves… they don't help with homework.*"

The teachers play an important role in the lives of the children. "*They are their second mom and dads.*" Seven head-managers mention that there is some sort of discrepancy between the home culture and the school culture. "*Children have to be taught certain morals and values that are not being taught by the family.*" "*Children receive consistency at the school, something that they often don't have at home.*" Two head-managers try to close that gap and increase the connection with parents by house visits. Furthermore, twelve head-managers mention that their teachers teach the children social and life skills, the right values and morals and how to show respect. "*The way they dress, how they speak and communicate. Sometimes you see anger, teachers have to try to teach skills to change the attitude from being aggressive.*" "*Students learn household skills, some of these life skills are too fancy for their home environment.*" Five head-managers also mention that the teachers talk with the children about what is going on in their lives, as parents do not always have the time for it. "*Children talk with their teachers about how they feel and why they react in a certain way ... There is not so much dialog at home.*" Six head-managers mention that their teachers go beyond their duty, for example by providing breakfast or arrange backpacks and school uniforms if the old backpacks and uniforms are worn down and parents cannot provide new items.

Results research question 3

      Parenting in St. Maarten. The overall parenting style in St. Maarten is authoritarian according to the CoG. "*The focus is on that children need to listen, follow instructions and do what is expected, instead of sit down and talk about problems*." The DY and the YMD agree; they mention that children are often blamed because adults actually are quick in labelling before getting to know the situation. However, the DY also mentions that the parents lack guiding themselves. "*They don't know how they could achieve more warmth in their relationship*."

      The cases that the CoG sees contain mainly permissive or authoritarian parents. Also the discipline method of parents is not what the CoG agrees with. "*They believe if a child doesn't listen, they will be warned once or twice but then they will get licks*." The DY mentions that parents lack in teaching children, especially teaching respect. The YMD elaborates on that by saying that parents do not have a lot of control, especially now regarding technology. "*It has gone beyond the scope of the parents… They think that the children go to sleep when they go to bed, but they use technology* [e.g. smartphones]." The SDA church elaborates that children are not only at night busy with their phone, also during the day children are online and always in contact with each other. CPS mentions that through technology the standards and morals of the society are lowered. The SSSD mentions that parents are not as engaged as they should be and are not letting their children express themselves. However, the SSSD also mentions that the parenting styles of parents do not need improvement.

      Another factor that is seen is that some parents are not open. *"Some parents are not open. Talking about their problems, they feel it as judging."* (CoG). The CoG also mentions that Western societies are more open, more comforting and show more love and affection in public than is done in Caribbean countries. CPS mentions that every parent goes through the similar problems with their children, however the parents never talk about it with each other. The DC explains that St. Maarten is a very reactive society, the citizens are not open and not proactive in stepping up and taking care of their problems, they are not actively seeking help.

      Mother and father role. Multiple respondents mention that the fathers are often absent in the lives of the children and the (single) mother has to raise the children and needs to work to provide for them. "*Most social issues I come across are social issues that have to do with the home environment where a single mom has to raise the children without the*

father, and that the children have no father figure." (CPO). Therefore, the Baptist church provides training and is encouraging fathers to be included in the lives of their children, especially in the early beginning. The CPO mentions that the mother has to do both parts; what the mother normally does and what the father is supposed to do. The YMD further explains that the mother is everything: "*The doctor, the nurse, the teacher, she will give structure, she teaches values, morals, she makes sure that the children are up and ready for school*." The CoG agrees and explains the role of the father: "*If the father has a role, it is mostly on a distance, they are not really that actively involved as the mother with the day-to-day stuff that is going on*." The SSSD elaborates that fathers are more laid back and will refer questions of children towards their mother. However, the father is often also the disciplinarian whereas the mother will often argue more with the child before disciplining.

"*Parents work in order to live.*" Another issue that parents face is the amount of time they can spend with their children. "A *lot of time goes into working to provide the basic needs.*" (CoG). Parents have to work multiple jobs to provide for their family, and the government entities see a lack in quality time between parent and child. "*Even if they could be better, they can't due to the circumstances*." (DY). The DS elaborates by explaining that because of the lack of time, children themselves cannot engage in sports. "*Parents that work often can't take the children to the field or facilitation*." However, the CoG notes that not the quantity of care but the quality is important; how parents use the time they have with their child.

Children. The YMD and the CPO mention that the main problem with the youth is anger. They explain that there is a lot of structure in school but they lack structure in their home environment. They have too much freedom and parents are not involved in their lives, while the children often just need somebody that listens to them. The SDA church mentions that the teachers and the schools are not a problem, often the problem is at home, however the school is the place the children "*lash out*". The CPS and the SDA mention that the values are lowering, the way they dress and behave. "*There is a roughening of the children into criminal behavior*." (CPS). The DS mentions the positive influence sports can have on children: "*Sports encourages the children to learn about discipline. It can be a positive outlet for children. … They learn life lessons with sports.*" The department further explains that the children can talk to others and therefore are not restricted to talk to their parent or teacher. Furthermore, they learn about winning and losing and how to cope with setbacks.

Conclusion and Discussion

The objective of this research was to gain insight in the general 'Pedagogical Climate' of St. Maarten, as no research has been done to examine how children are being raised in St. Maarten. This research provides insight how parents raise their children, aged three through twelve. Additionally, this research examines how important stakeholders are in the environment of the children, this includes teachers, sports associations and children's foundations. Finally, this study offers insight in the culture and beliefs of St. Maarten about child-rearing.

The results of the first sub question show a lot of differentiation in parenting styles between the parents of St. Maarten. Parents were classified into a specific parenting style or a combination of styles, see table 1. The largest group was the clear authoritative parenting style with 37.1%, however 10.5% of the parents have a clear authoritarian parenting style. This can be considered a substantial amount, as multiple research clearly shows the negative impact of authoritarian parenting on children: depression, anxiety, cognitive problems and substance abuse (Lempers, Clark-Lempers, & Simons, 1989; Smith, Springer, & Barrett, 2011). Of the parents, 3.5% has a clear permissive parenting style. However when including the permissive related parenting styles (authoritarian & permissive, authoritative & permissive) it appears that 18.9% of the parents shows a permissive (related) parenting style, this can also be seen as a considerable amount. The results of the interviews with governmental entities show that the authoritarian parenting style is the main parenting style of St. Maarten. The in-depth answers, however, show a permissive or even a neglectful parenting style.

A notable result shows that lower educated parents are more authoritarian than parents that are higher educated. Furthermore, the parents whose children go to public school are more permissive than parents whose children go to a school from the schoolboard SKOS.

The second sub question included the guiding style of the environment of the children. The results of the teachers and children's foundations questionnaire show that the majority (54.9%) has both guiding styles, see table 2. This shows that the participants are warm and affectionate but also setting strict rules and boundaries without rebuttal. This is also evident

in the different interviews with head-managers; teachers have time and have dialog with children and give structure towards the children.

A noteworthy result is the difference between the teachers and the employees of the children's foundation, as teachers are more authoritarian than the workers at the children foundation. This shows that both the teachers and the employees give warmth and authoritative structure, however the teachers offer more structure and set boundaries without the children's rebuttal. This could be related to the setting of the children. In schools the children are expected to conform to the rules without rebuttal, whereas within the homes of the children's foundations the children have free time, live with approximately twenty other children and a strict structure is not always necessary.

Furthermore, the interviews with the teachers, head-managers and sport associations show that both the teachers as well as the coaches teach children certain ethics, morals and values that parents often lack to teach their children. Teachers want more communication with the parents to decrease the gap between the school and the home culture and to increase the standards and values that they teach towards the children. When looking at the Educational Civil Society, this research shows there is a lack in the connection between the parents and the environment. As there is not a lot of communication about raising the children, they do not share the responsibility or offer support and therefore the Educational Civil Society cannot function well (De Winter, 2009; Van Dijk, & Gemmeke, 2010). However, the environment around the children, the teachers and the coaches are involved in the children's life and are willing to offer more support to parents and children.

Furthermore, there is a lack of pedagogy-related training for the teachers, the employees of the children's foundations and the coaches. This can be due to the fact that pedagogical guiding skills transcend the profession as a teacher or a coach, and therefore if they receive training it is often to increase their didactic skills or coaching skills.

The third and last sub question is about the culture and beliefs of child-rearing in St. Maarten. As described above, the qualitative results show that the parents have an authoritarian parenting style, but there are also signs of permissive or neglectful parenting. Furthermore, the interviews mention that the mother has to be 'everything' and provide for 'everything' as mothers are often solely responsible. However, mothers do not have the time for child-rearing as they have to work multiple jobs to make ends meet. The interviews also

indicate that not only mothers but also two person households have to work a lot and do not have a lot of time with their family. When looking at the framework of the Developmental Niche (Camilleri, & Malewska-Peyre, 1997), the culturally regulated customs of the child care show that children are often by themselves, parents do not have time to educate or raise them. Children have a lot of freedom, have access to the internet and they learn values through technology. Therefore, many participants mention that the quality of the time they have, should have the focus. So, how the parents use the small amount of time to raise their children. This leads to another notable result that came out of the interviews. Parents lack the know-how to achieve more warmth in their relationship. St. Maarten does not have an open society where people are open about their struggles. The parents that need help are often not actively seeking help. Parents do not talk among themselves about the issues they face. Social support is one of the core aspects of the Educational Civil Society (De Winter, 2009). It gives direct assistance, exchange of advice and especially support in dealing with parenting issues.

A participative intervention can be used to strengthen the Pedagogical Climate in St. Maarten as it takes into account difficulties that parents face, for example illiteracy, lower education or time restrain, while strengthening the learners social and cognitive competitions, capacity to act and educating them through different perspectives. Participative interventions for parents would empower the parents, give insight into themselves and their environment and parents could direct their own lives on the basis of self-defined goals (Van Tilburg, 2009; Van 't Rood, 2016).

Strengths and limitations

This study has shown to be highly socially relevant as youth, parenting issues and a lack of respect of the society was a highly discussed subject in news and politics during the field research (Government of St. Maarten, 2017a; Government of St. Maarten, 2017b; SMN News, 2017; StmaartenNews.com, 2017). Furthermore, there has not been any research about the parenting style of the island, therefore this study could function as a foundation for future research.

The schools provided a lot of cooperation with this research, all public and subsidised schools cooperated in one or more parts of the research. Also, the children's foundations were very cooperative as well as the governmental entities. However, many parents were not used

to filling in questionnaires and often the language of the questionnaire was perceived as too difficult, as many of the participants spoke a Caribbean-English dialect or a foreign language. To receive a better reflection of the society and to include more people, participants were sought on the boardwalk of Philipsburg. (Lower educated) participants were actively involved in the research as those parents were more difficult to reach through internet, social media and schools. Through face-to-face contact with a local person and reading the questions out loud, steps were taken to include more parents. However, only a small percentage of the parents in St. Maarten were able and willing to fill in the questionnaire, therefore the results of the questionnaire cannot be generalized for the whole of St. Maarten.

Another limitation of the research was socially desirable answers from the parent through the (partly oral) questionnaire. As stated before, parents in St. Maarten have difficulties opening up about issues or difficulties that they encounter, therefore, parents could present themselves better than how they are. Parents were more open about issues of society, or how 'other parents' raise their children than about their own situation. Recommendation for further research could be video-observations, as Van IJzendoorn, & Van Rosmalen (2016) mention that standardized observations are a more objective method to research behavior. Furthermore, when looking at the Developmental Niche framework of Super & Harkness (1986) this research focusses more on the culturally regulated customs of child care, however, cultural specific parental ethno-theories of child-rearing is not studied. This could give information about the knowledge and goals of parents concerning child-rearing.

References

Abowitz, D. A., & Toole, T. M. (2009). Mixed method research: Fundamental issues of design, validity, and reliability in construction research. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, *136*, 108-116. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000026.

Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child Development*, 887-907. doi:10.2307/1126611.

Boeije, H. (2005). *Analyseren in kwalitatief onderzoek*. Amsterdam, Nederland: Boom Lemma Uitgevers.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American psychologist*, *32*, 513. Retrieved from: http://psycnet.apa.org/record/1978-06857-001.

Brown, J., & Johnson, S. (2008). Childrearing and child participation in Jamaican families. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, *16*, 31-40. doi:10.1080/09669760801892110.

Browne, D. T., Odueyungbo, A., Thabane, L., Byrne, C., & Smart, L. A. (2010). Parenting-by-gender interactions in child psychopathology: attempting to address inconsistencies with a Canadian national database. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*, *4*, 1. doi: 10.1186/1753-2000-4-5.

Camilleri, C., & Malewska-Peyre, H. (1997). Human Development in Culture Across the Life Span. In Berry, J. W., Dasen, P. R., & Sarawathi, T. S. (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology. Vol. 2: Basic processes and human development*. Boston, United States: Allyn & Bacon.

Crawford-Brown, C. (1999). The impact of parenting on conduct disorder in Jamaican male adolescents. *Adolescence*, *34*, 417. 10.1111/j.1365-2214.1983.tb00304.x.

De Wit, C. W. (2015). *St. Maarten 2015 National Integrity System Assessment.* Transparency International. Retrieved from http://files.transparency.org/content/download/1916/12674/file/2015_StMaartenNIS_EN.pdf

Dekker, C. S., & Kleijn, R. (2012). *Parental involvement in the education of children on St. Maarten* (Master thesis, University of Utrecht). Retrieved from https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/251961

Department of Inspection. (2015). *Compulsory Education Report 2014-2015*. St. Maarten:
Ministry of Education, Culture, Youth and Sports.

Department of Statistics Sint Maarten. (2017). *Statistical Yearbook 2017*. Retrieved from
http://www.stat.gov.sx/downloads/YearBook/Statistical_Yearbook_2017.pdf

Government of St. Maarten. (2017a, April 28). COM PRESS BRIEFING APRIL - 26TH
2017 - PART 1 [YouTube]. Retrieved August 4, 2018, from:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fZg9UQrNYv8

Government of St. Maarten. (2017b, April 28). COM PRESS BRIEFING APRIL - 26TH
2017 - PART 2 [YouTube]. Retrieved August 4, 2018, from
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hxaiySri6Iw

Government of St. Maarten. (2017c, March 30). MINISTER JACOBS ENCOURAGES
PARENTS TO FILL OUT A PEDAGOGICAL CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE
[Press release]. Retrieved August 4, 2018, from
http://www.sintmaartengov.org/PressReleases/Pages/Minister-Jacobs-encourages-
parents-to-fill-out-a-Pedadogical-Climate-questionnaire.aspx

Grantham-McGregor, S., Landman, J., & Desai, P. (1983). Child rearing in
poor urban Jamaica. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, *9*, 57-71.
doi:10.1111/j.1365-2214.1983.tb00304.x.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate
data analysis.* London, United Kingdom: Pearson Education.

Lempers, J. D., Clark-Lempers, D., & Simons, R. L. (1989). Economic hardship, parenting,
and distress in adolescence. *Child Development*, 25-39. Retrieved from
https://www.jstor.org/stable/1131068

Liem, J. H., Cavell, E. C., & Lustig, K. (2010). The influence of authoritative parenting
during adolescence on depressive symptoms in young adulthood: Examining the
mediating roles of self-development and peer support. *The Journal of Genetic
Psychology*, *171*, 73-92. doi:10.1080/00221320903300379.

Nienhusser, H. K. (2013). Role of High Schools in undocumented student's college choice.
Education Policy Analysis Archives, *21*. Retrieved from
http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/1398

O'Connor, T. G., & Scott, S. (2007). *Parenting and outcomes for children*. York, United

Kingdom: Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Retrieved from
https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/parenting-outcomes.pdf

OECD. (2012). *Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators,* OECD Publishing.
Doi:10.1787/eag-21012-en.

Robinson, C. C., Mandleco, B., Roper, S. O., & Hart, C.H. (2001). The Parenting Styles and
Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ). Handbook of Family Measurement Techniques.
3. 319-321.

Samms-Vaughan, M. E., Williams, S., & Brown, J. (2005). Disciplinary practices among
parents of six year olds in Jamaica. *Journal of the Children's Issues Coalition*, *1*, 58-
70.

Shumow, L., Vandell, D. L., & Posner, J. K. (1998). Harsh, firm, and permissive parenting in
low-income families: Relations to children's academic achievement and behavioral
adjustment. *Journal of Family Issues*, *19*, 483-507.

Smith, D. E., Mosby, G. (2003). Jamaican child-rearing practices: the role of corporal
punishment. *Adolescence*, *38*, 369-381.

Smith, D. E., Springer, C. M., & Barrett, S. (2011). Physical discipline and socioemotional
adjustment among Jamaican adolescents. *Journal of Family Violence*, *26*, 51-61.
doi:10.1007/s10896-010-9341-5.

St. Maarten. (2011). *CIA world factbook*. Retrieved from,
https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/print_sk.html

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Darling, N., Mounts, N. S., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1994). Over-
time changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from authoritative,
authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, *65*, 754-770.
doi:10.2307/1131416.

Super, C. M., & Harkness, S. (1986). The developmental niche: A conceptualization at the
interface of child and culture. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *9*,
545-569. doi:10.1177/016502548600900409

Uji, M., Sakamoto, A., Adachi, K., & Kitamura, T. (2014). The impact of authoritative,
authoritarian, and permissive parenting styles on children's later mental health in
Japan: Focusing on parent and child gender. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *23*,
293-302. doi:10.1007/s10826-013-9740-3

Unicef. (2013). The situation of children and adolescents on Sint Maarten.

https://www.unicef.nl/media/1359112/sint_maarten_sitan_public_version__28english
_29.pdf

Van der Klein, M., Bulsink, D., & Van der Gaag, R. (2012). Pedagogische civil society voor
beginners: Hoe professionals en vrijwilligers goed kunnen samenwerken rond jeugd
en gezin. Utrecht, Netherlands: Verwey-Jonker Instituut. Retrieved August 4, 2018
from http://www.verwey-jonker.nl/doc/jeugd/Pedagogische-civil-society-voor-
beginners_2801_web.pdf

Van Dijk, M., & Gemmeke, M. (2010). De kracht van de pedagogische civil society.
Versterking van een positieve sociale opvoed- en opgroeiomgeving. Utrecht,
Nederland: Nederlands Jeugdinstituut. Retrieved from
https://www.nji.nl/nl/Download-NJi/Publicatie-
NJi/DekrachtvandepedagogischecivilsocietyNJi2010

Van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Van Rosmalen, L. (2016). *Pedagogiek in beeld* (3e ed.). Houten,
Nederland: Bohn Stafleu van Loghum.

Van 't Rood, R. (2016). *Integrating Disadvantaged Ethnicities through Adult Learning: The
THEMIS-IDEAL Handbook for Implementation*. Retrieved from http://ideal-
participation.eu/site/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Themis-IDEAL-Handbook-for-
Implementation.pdf

Van Tilburg, L. (2009). *Themis; interventie beschrijving*. Retrieved from
https://www.movisie.nl/sites/movisie.nl/files/2018-03/Methodebeschrijving-
themis.pdf

Van Yperen, T., & Veerman, J. W. (2008). *Zicht op effectiviteit. Handboek voor
praktijkgestuurd effectonderzoek*. Delft: Eburon Uitgeverij.

Appendix A – Background characteristics parents

Table I

Frequency and Percentage of sort of Parents per country of Birth

Country of Birth	Mother (n = 102)	Father (n = 35)	Guardian (n = 6)	Total (n = 143)	
	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	Percent
Anguilla		1		1	0.7
Aruba	6	2		8	5.6
Barbados	2			2	1.4
Bonaire	1			1	0.7
Canada	1			1	0.7
China		1		1	0.7
Curaçao	4	4		8	5.6
Dominica	2			2	1.4
Dominican Republic	4	1		5	3.5
France	1			1	0.7
Grenada	1			1	0.7
Guyana	8	3	1	12	8.4
Haïti	1	1		2	1.4
Hong Kong	1			1	0.7
India		1		1	0.7
Jamaica	11	3	1	15	10.5
Netherlands	5			5	3.5
Philippines	1			1	0.7
Saint Martin	3	2		5	3.5
Sint Maarten	36	14	2	52	36.4
Spain	1	1		2	1.4
St. Kitts	1	1	1	3	2.1
Suriname	3		1	4	2.8
Turks & Caicos islands	1			1	0.7
USA	2			2	1.4

Table II

Individual and Family Characteristics as a Percentage of the sample

Characteristics	Mother (n = 102)	Father (n = 35)	Guardian (n = 6)	Total (n = 143)
Relationship with child	71.3	24.5	4.2	100
Marital Status[a]				
Single	27.3	4.9	0.7	32.9
Married	31.5	12.6	2.8	46.9
Divorced	0.7	2.1		2.8
Widowed			0.7	0.7
Living together	8.4	3.5		11.9
Level of Education[b]				
Primary	2.1	2.1	0.7	4.9
Secondary	20.3	6.3	0.7	27.3
College	20.3	4.9	1.4	26.6
University	27.3	9.1	1.4	37.8
Sport[c]				
No	24.5	5.6	2.1	32.2
Yes	46.9	18.9	2.1	67.8
Diagnosis[d]				
No	66.4	23.8	4.2	94.4
Yes	4.9	0.7		5.6
Religion[e]				
No	18.3	4.9		23.2
Yes	52.8	19.7	4.2	76.8
Home-cooked meal[f]				
a few times a month				
once a week				
2-3times a week	3.5		0.7	4.3
4-5 times a week	17.7	5.7	0.7	24.1
6-7 times a week	50.4	18.4	2.8	71.6
never				
Help with schoolwork[g]				
a few times a month	3.6	2.9		6.6
once a week	4.4	2.2		6.6
2-3times a week	10.2	3.6	0.7	14.6
4-5 times a week	19.7	5.1	0.7	25.5
6-7 times a week	29.9	10.2	2.9	43.1
never	3.6			3.6
Doctor[h]				
No	1.5	2.2		3.7
Yes	70.6	21.3	4.4	96.3

Note. [a]Current Martial Status? [b]Highest level of education? [c]Is your child enrolled in sports or other activities? [d]Has your child been diagnosed with a mental disorder. handicap or disability? [e]Is the family a part of a home church or religion? [f]How many days does your child eat a home-cooked meal? [g]How often do you help your children with their homework and/or projects? [h]Does your child see a family doctor when he/she is sick?

Table II

Support system of the household

Relation	Frequency
Father[a]	69
Of which ambivalent contact[b]	2
Grandparents	64
Mother[c]	34
Aunt	28
Uncle	16
Nobody[d]	11
Family	5
God mother	3
Institutions[e]	3
Nanny	3
Boyfriend of Mother	1
Foster father	1
Stepmother	1
Cousin	1
Great grandparent	1
Friends	1

Note. [A]Some participants may have wrote 'Father' to mention their own father, as the grandfather of the child. [b]The participant mentioned that the father is sometimes present in the lives of the child. [c]The mother of the child, however some participants may have wrote 'mother' to mention their own mother instead of 'grandmother'. [d]Some parents wrote down that they have no support from other in raising their children or left the question blank. [e]Parents filled in after school organisation, schools and an early stimulation organisation.

Appendix B – Parenting questionnaire

Parent Survey: Parenting in St. Maarten

Part 1. Personal Information

Date _____   Name of school _____

Country of birth _____   Gender of child ☐Boy   ☐Girl

Number of children _____   Marital status ☐Single   ☐Married

☐Divorced   ☐Widowed   ☐Living together

Highest level of education   ☐No formal education ☐Primary   ☐Secondary

☐College   ☐University

What is your relationship to the child in question?   ☐Father   ☐Mother

☐Grandmother ☐Grandfather ☐Aunt   ☐Uncle   ☐ Guardian   ☐ Other: _____

Who else is actively involved in the daily life and upbringing of the child in question? _____

_____

Is your child enrolled in sports or other activities?   ☐ Yes ☐ No If so. which?

_____

Has your child been diagnosed with a mental disorder. handicap or disability? If so. which?

_____

Is the family/child part of a home church or religion?   ☐ Yes ☐ No If so. which?_____

Does your child see a family doctor when he/she is sick? ☐ Yes ☐ No

How many days does your child eat a home-cooked meal?

☐ a few times a month ☐ once a week ☐ 2-3 times a week

☐ 4-5 times a week   ☐ 6-7 times a week   ☐ Never

How often do you help your child with their homework and/or projects?

☐ a few times a month ☐ once a week ☐ 2-3 times a week

☐ 4-5 times a week   ☐ 6-7 times a week   ☐ Never

Part 2. Parenting
Circle how often you experience the following behaviors.
1 = Never 2 = Once in a while 3 = About half of the time 4 = Very often 5 = Always

Warm & Involvement	
I know the names of my child's friends.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I am aware of problems or concerns about my child in school.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I praise when my child is good.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I comfort and show understanding when my child is upset.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I express affection by hugging. kissing. and holding my child.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I show sympathy when my child is hurt or frustrated.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I tell my child that we appreciate what the child tries or accomplishes.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I am responsive to my child's feelings or needs.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I have warm and intimate times together with my child.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I apologize to my child when making a mistake in parenting.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
1 = Never 2 = Once in a while 3 = About half of the time 4 = Very often 5 = Always	
Reasoning	

I explain the consequences of his/her behavior.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I give my child reasons why rules should be obeyed.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I emphasize the reasons for rules.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I help my child to understand the impact of behavior by encouraging my child to talk about the consequences of his/her own actions.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I explain to my child how we feel about his/her good and bad behavior.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I talk it over and reason with my child when he/she misbehaves.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I tell my child my expectations regarding behavior before he/she engages in an activity.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Democratic participation	
I take into account my child's preferences in making plans for the family.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I allow my child to give input into family rules.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I take my child's desires into account before asking the child to do something.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I encourage my child to freely express himself/herself even when disagreeing with parents.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I channel my child's misbehavior into a more acceptable activity.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Easy going	
I am easy going and relaxed with my child.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I joke and play with my child.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I show patience with my child.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I show respect for my child's opinions by encouraging my child to express them.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Discipline methods	
I guide my child by punishment more than by reason.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
When a child is disobedient. I…	
Yell or shout towards my child.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Argue with my child.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Spank my child.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Slap my child.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Grab my child.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Shove my child.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I explode in anger toward my child.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Non-reasoning	
I punish by taking privileges away from my child with little if any explanations.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I punish by putting my child off somewhere alone with little if any explanations.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I use threats as punishment with little or no justification.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I appear to be more concerned with own feelings than with my child's feelings.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
When two children are fighting. I discipline children first and asks questions later.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
When my child asks why (he)(she) has to conform. I state: because I said so/ I am your parent and I want you to. or something similar.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
1 = Never 2 = Once in a while 3 = About half of the time 4 = Very often 5 = Always	
Assertiveness	

When I ask my child to do something I expect it to be done immediately without any questions.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I scold and criticize to make my child improve.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I scold or criticize when my child's behavior doesn't meet my expectations.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Follow through	
I state consequences to my child but I never execute them.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I threaten my child with punishment more often than actually giving it.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I give into my child when the child causes a commotion about something.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I carry out discipline after my child misbehaves.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I bribe my child with rewards so I don't have to argue.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Leniency towards misbehavior	
I allow my child to interrupt others while they are speaking.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I ignore my child's misbehavior.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I allow my child decide what he/she wants to do even if want him/her to do something else.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I withhold scolding and/or criticism even when my child is disobedient.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Self-confidence	
I appear confident about parenting abilities.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I find it difficult to discipline my child.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I set strict well-established rules for my child.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I appear unsure on how to solve my child's misbehavior.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
I am afraid that disciplining my child for misbehavior will cause the child to not like me as a parents.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5

Part 3. Parenting skills

1) Do you accept parenting advice?   Yes / No   **If not. continue to question 2**.
   a) In what way do you want to improve your parenting skills? _____

   _____

   b) What are you doing to improve your parenting skills? _____

   _____

2) What is holding you back from improving your parenting skills? _____

   _____

3) What kind of extra support do you wish for. to improve your parenting skills? _____

   _____

Part 4. Last questions
Circle the answer that's most right for you. 1 = Strongly disagree. 2 = disagree. 3= neutral. 4 = agree.
5= strongly agree

The questions were easy to understand	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
The questions were clear	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
The subject of the questionnaire was interesting	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5

Thank you for your cooperation!

Appendix C- Teacher and Children's Foundation questionnaire
We are going to present statements to you. We want to assure you there are no right or wrong
answers; we are interested in hearing your honest opinion. Please feel free to say what is on your

mind. and to either agree or disagree with the statements. We might ask you more questions to get a clear understanding of your opinion.

1 = Never 2 = Once in a while 3 = About half of the time 4 = Very often 5 = Always

1. A class must be kept under control	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Discipline methods	
1. I raise my voice to get the attention of the class	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
2. When disciplining children. does physical contact provide for the desired behavior of the child?	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Non-reasoning	
1. I set down clearly defined rules which my students must obey	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
2. When two children are fighting. I discipline children first and ask questions later	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
3. When I ask my students to do something I expect it to be done immediately without any questions.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Lack of follow through	
1. I threaten children with punishment more often than I execute	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
2. I give into the child when he/she causes a commotion about something	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Lenience towards misbehavior	
1. I ignore a child's misbehavior	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
2. I withhold criticism even when children act contrary to our wishes	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Self-confidence	
1. I am confident about my guiding abilities	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
2. I am afraid that disciplining children for misbehavior will cause the child not to like me/my institution	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Warm & Involvement	
1. I encourage children to talk about his/her troubles to me	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
2. I praise children when they behave good	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
3. I give comfort and understanding when a child is upset	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Reasoning	
1. I give children reasons why rules should be obeyed.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
2. I help children to understand the impact of behavior by encouraging children to talk about the consequences of his/her own actions	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Democratic Participation	
1. I allow children to give input into rules.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
2. I encourage children to freely express him/her opinion. even when disagreeing with adults	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Good Natured/Easy going	
1. I am easy going and relaxed with children. I joke around.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
2. I show I care about my students. not only about the academic work	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5
Needs for improvement (open questions)	
In what way do you influence children around you?	
Do you accept advise so you could guide the children better?	
In what way do you want to improve your guiding skills?	
In what are you doing to improve your guiding skills?	
What kind of extra support do you wish for. to improve your guiding skills?	
Is there a difference in guiding children between school hours or during afterschool hours?	

Appendix D - Topic lists Interviews

Interview with Headmaster

1. Introduction: short presentation about the research. Introducing topic. aim and scope of research and explain the goal and scope of this meeting.

2. Introduction of headmaster

3. Start interview: Now we are going to present a few statements and questions to you. We want to assure you there are no right or wrong answers; we are interested in hearing your honest opinion. Please feel free to say what is on your mind.

- Can you tell me something about the school?
- What are the core values of the school?
- Are there afterschool activities? If yes. what are they?
- Is there a kindergarten?
- Can you tell me something about the neighborhood of the school?
- To what extend is there a cooperation between the school. community centers. other schools. churches. the police. sports clubs and the community itself?

4. Statement and questions about childrearing in school:

In what way are teachers beneficial to the upbringing of children?

In what way do teachers raise children? And how?

To what extent is there a strong sense of community; teachers. parents and other stakeholders share the responsibility of educating and socializing children.

5. Differentiate the following statements for kindergarten. primary school. afterschool activities:

In what way are children being disciplined when they misbehave?

To what extend are children involved in rule-making?

To what extend do teachers and students have time to relax. have a laugh and bond with each other?

In what way do you want to improve the guiding skills of the teachers/other professionals in the school?

What are you doing to improve the guiding skills of the teachers/other professionals in the school?

What kind of extra support do you wish for. to improve the teachers/other professionals guiding skills?

Interview with church: Baptist & SDA Church

1. Introduction: short presentation about the research. Introducing topic. aim and scope of research and explain the goal and scope of this meeting.

2. Introduction of church

3. Start interview: Now we are going to present a few statements and questions to you. We want to assure you there are no right or wrong answers; we are interested in hearing your honest opinion. Please feel free to say what is on your mind.

4. Statement and questions:
- Could you tell me something about the church and the activities that are held?
- Can you tell me something about the community?
- What kind of activities does the church provide for children?
- Can you tell me something about the neighborhood of the church?
- To what extend is there a cooperation between the church. community centers. schools. the police. sports clubs and the community itself?

5. Child rearing questions
- In what way is your church providing a nurturing environment for children?
- In what way are children being disciplined when they misbehave?
- In what way do children actively participate in the development of church activities?
- In what way do children connect and bond with the church?
- How do you learn children about the core values of the church?
- In what way do you want to improve the guiding skills of children?
- What are you doing to improve the guiding skills of the children?
- What kind of extra support would you like. to provide a more nurturing environment of the children?

Topic List Interview with Community Police

1. Introduction: Introducing topic. aim and goal of this meeting.
2. Statements: We are going to present statements to you. We want to assure you there are no right or wrong answers; we are interested in hearing your honest opinion. Please feel free to say what is on your mind. and to either agree or disagree with the statements. We might ask you more questions to get a clear understanding of your opinion.

- In what way are you active in the community?
- What kind of activities are you a part of? And in what parts of ST. Maarten are those activities?
- To what extend is there a cooperation between the community police. community centers. schools. the church. sports clubs and the community itself?

Pedagogical (knowledge)

In what way does the Community police interact with children in their community?

In what way does de Community police take part in the upbringing of the children?

Does the Community Police have an active role in guiding children?

Warmth

To what extend is there a trusting relationship between children and the Community police?

How is the Community police responsive toward the feelings of a child?

How does the Community police comforts a child when he/she is upset?

How do the community police try to form a bond with children?

Control

What does the community Police do when seeing children misbehave?

In what way do the community police punish children who misbehave (below 12)

In what way does the community police explain the consequences of the behavior of children (when they behave badly)?

Needs

In what way does the Community Police influence children?

Do you accept advise so you could guide the children better?

In what way do you want to improve your guiding skills?

In what are you doing to improve your guiding skills?

What kind of extra support do you wish for. to improve your guiding skills?

Appendix E – Factor Analysis

Table IV

Factor loadings for Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation of Guiding Styles of Teachers

Items	Loadings	
	Authoritative	Authoritarian
I help children to understand the impact of behavior by encouraging children to talk about the consequences of his/her own actions	**.76**	
I give children reasons why rules should be obeyed.	**.71**	
I praise children when they behave good	**.65**	
I show I care about my students. not only about the academic work	**.64**	
I give comfort and understanding when a child is upset	**.56**	
I encourage children to talk about his/her troubles to me	**.51**	
I set down clearly defined rules which my students must obey	.39	
I am confident about my guiding abilities	.39	
I ignore a child's misbehavior		**.70**
I give into the child when he/she causes a commotion about something		**.59**
I threaten children with punishment more often than I execute		**.50**
I withhold criticism even when children act contrary to our wishes		**.48**
I allow children to give input into rules.		**.47**
I raise my voice to get the attention of the class		**.40**
When disciplining children. does physical contact provide for the desired behavior of the child?		.36
When two children are fighting. I discipline children first and ask questions later		.35

Note. Factor loadings > .40 are in boldface.