Psychosocial Predictors of Family Values among Undergraduate Students in a South African University

Choja A. Oduaran

Department of Psychology, North-West University, Mafikeng Campus, Private Bag X 2046, Mmabatho, 2735, South Africa

ABSTRACT This study investigated the psychosocial predictors of family values among undergraduate students in a South African University. Studies have shown that family values among Africans generally vary from one family to the other, and are influenced by the values of the ethnic groups to which the individuals belong. In Africa, traditional family values and ethos have been influenced by modernization and post-modernisation ethos, and therefore, understanding psychosocial variables that determine the family values young adults hold should be valuable especially in these days of social networking processes that are partly the unintended consequences of globalization. Data was collected using a family value validated questionnaire administered on a random sample of 200 undergraduate students. All participants were randomly sampled using a table of random numbers. The validated questionnaire has four sections. The results showed that age, and combined psychosocial parameters were valid predictors of family values, but gender was not. The statistically observed dynamics in family structure and relationships are reported. Some of the results are particularly important for young adults and their parents in terms of family management and conflict issues. In conclusion, some recommendations were made in line with the study's findings.

INTRODUCTION

Family values are globally understood as organized cognitive sets of preferences that serve as the basis for how individuals wish to conduct their lives or by which they make choices, and often serve as a guide for determined action (Mindel and Habenstein 1977; Spiegel 1982; Bowen 1988, Aboim 2010). In sub-Saharan Africa, family values are largely perceived as sacrosanct, in the sense that they do not only form the bedrock for establishing community social equilibrium but actually shape the upbringing of members of a given family. In fact, each African family is normally expected to have broadly defined, largely informal sets of preferences for how every member of the family should conduct their lives in order not to bring shame and disgrace to the entire family and even the extended family (Soontiens and De Jager 2008; Bertrand and Schoar 2006). It was these prefer-

Address for correspondence:
Dr. Choja A. Oduaran
Department of Psychology,
North-West University,
Mafikeng Campus,
Private Bag X 2046, Mmabatho,
2735, South Africa
Telephone: 018-3892237,
E-mail: Choja.Oduaran@nwu.ac.za

ences that often served as guides for the kind of choice that could be made and how one may conduct himself or herself in given situations. These preferences may not be found in written sources and materials that may be read by the young ones but are palpably passed on from one generation to the other using the medium of stories, proverbs, oral poetry and songs. It is also known that in sub-Saharan Africa, the behavior of every family member is closely monitored with keen interest, and hence, Africans place a lot of emphasis on strong family values. For Africans and in support of the findings of the study conducted by Bertrand and Schoar (2006) and Max Weber (1904), quoted in Bertrand and Schoar (2006), there is only very moderate support for the idea that strong family values should be interpreted as a reflection of weak formal institutions. That could never have been the case in Africa because the survival of the extended family connections is highly valued and pursued with vigour (Weber and Lavelle 2003).

In some instances, the behavior of individual members of a family is frequently related to the values that the family cherishes and inculcates in its off-springs. Indeed, the process of enculturation of the young members of a family frequently entails the identification and deliberate informal teaching of specific values, and in

this regard, the time spent away from parents is considered as very crucial when it comes to the aspects of children, especially adolescents making independent decisions (Silva and Aminabhavi 2013; US Council of Economic Advisors 2000). It is almost commonly acknowledged that Africans' family values are rich and diverse. They are also very strong in the sense that there could be sanctions against any member of the family that may want to 'run' his or her life contrary to these values. Family values among Africans generally vary from one family to the other, but these are also partly influenced by the values of the ethnic groups to which the families belong. They are often reflected in national standards. For example, Graziano (2005) has correctly observed that in South Africa if one fails to conform to the nation's standards, he/she runs the risk of being marginalized, and that, indeed, the culture prohibits non-conformity whilst at the same time dictating rigidly what is acceptable and what is not.

Unfortunately, it is known that much of those traditional family values and ethos have been partly influenced by modernization and even post-modernism, and therefore, sustained studies on whatever variables determine the values the young ones hold in present African communities should be valuable especially in these days of social networking processes that are partly the unintended consequences of globalization and the rapid advances made in information and communication technologies (ICTs). Yet, the rich and diverse African family values in the context of the sum of variables that promote or hinder their transmission among the young ones, particularly African undergraduate students have not been exhaustively reported in the available literature. In particular, the psychosocial predictors of such values, especially among undergraduate students who could have a strong influence in families have not been reported widely in the literature. But such assumptions need to be explored and tested statistically so that one may have a valid pool of knowledge that could be developed and applied in enhancing further scholarship in this field.

In contrast to what is observed in many African communities, family research and practitioners in the West, especially in the United States, are increasingly recognizing the diversity of family values and the processes that lead to their enculturation (Constantine 1986). The literature review undertaken by Bowen (1988) does suggest that families vary greatly in their values, perceptions and needs. In congruence with what researchers in the West have come up with, it is increasingly recognized that ethnicity is a vital force in many African communities, and has become a major means of group identity in the sense that it sometimes influences the kind of choices that they make when it comes to public issues. Ethnicity has also become one of the major predictors of family pattern, values and interaction (McGoldrick 1982). Whilst the relationships between ethnicity and family patterns, values and interaction might have been studied mostly in the West, such studies have not been indicated in the literature in the developing countries, in general, and in South Africa, in particular.

In the 19th century, scholars of family sociology, culture and anthropology studied small societies throughout the world (Tylor 1889; Krober 1909; Malinowski 1927; Murdock 1949, 1981; Level-Strauss 1949, 1969). The analysis showed the diversity of structures and functioning and their relationships to cultural features. The in-depth description of the relationship types to kinship patterns and cultural features has been the cultural anthropology's major contribution to the study of families. Kinship terminology is a formal and highly complex taxonomic system that composes primarily settlement patterns, marriage, the family, incest taboos, residence, rules of descent, kinship terminology, kin relations and inheritance (Levison and Malone 1980). Unfortunately, the relationships between such correlates and family values seemed not to have been studied in a sustained manner, especially among undergraduate students. Yet, this segment of society should be playing a major role in family values and relationships by virtue of the fact that they are expected to soon graduate and eventually contribute to family values debates, change and influence in ways that have not been clearly understood. To that extent, this present study would have made significant contributions to the pool of knowledge that is gradually developing in Africa.

There have been so many debates about family values. The old family values emphasize the father's role in presiding over their families in love, righteousness and their responsibility for providing the basic necessities of life and protecting the family. During that period, mothers

are primarily responsible for the nurture of their children. This good old-fashioned extended family system in most of the traditional African families has helped in the transference of family values from one generation to another.

In reality, family life has changed dramatically over time. In America, about seventy-one percent of mothers work for pay outside the home and three quarters of all Americans disagree that women should return to their traditional roles in society. The older men show great unease over women working out of home and blame it not on rising cost of living but on families opting to become more materialistic (Fredrick County Office, The Washington Post 2011). With the increase in education among the families, changes in family values may not only be attributed to women working outside home, but the effect of the wide circles of different people from different cultures with whom they interact. These changes are bound to affect individual lifestyle and ultimately, the family values. Although there may be no specific literature to back this up, South Africa cannot be totally screened from the impact of globalization. Many South Africans are acquiring Western education, and apart from the effect of the apartheid system, families are leaving their homes of origin for cities where interactions are bound to affect their culture and ultimately, their value system. The new social networks, which are being created due to migrations are bound to have an influence on the family as socialization processes, which could have an ultimate effect on the original values held by an individual.

There have been very few studies on families in South Africa. In those studies, emphasis was placed on migration, gender and patterns in movement (Warren 1998; Soontiens and De Jager 2008). In her review of advances in family scholarship that has direct implication for family life education, for example, Arcus (1995) reported that emphasis seemed to have been placed on the issues of feminism and family strengths and resiliency. In a way, family strengths and resiliency must be part of family values that could be more closely related to some of the issues one seeks to examine in this study.

The literature available to the researcher focused mainly on longevity and relationships, the importance of parental role in development, strong families, tidy houses, and children's values in adult life. Some of the studies sought to

find if families were overtly 'chaotic', 'crowded' and 'unstable' (Flouri 2009). The study conducted by Flouri (2009), for example, demonstrated that after adjustments for controls related to mother's liberalism, authoritarian parenting and educational attainment, family's social class and material disadvantage and child's ethnicity and gender, general ability and adult educational attainment, it was found that residential mobility and untidiness were negatively related to authoritarianism, and support for racism, and family cohesiveness was positively and overcrowding negatively related to authoritarianism (Flouri 2009). Some other studies were geared towards exploring cultural differences in family, marital, and gender role values among immigrants and majority of community members.

Skolnick (2010) has been interested in family values in the era of economic recession, and the outcomes of the review have been instructive in some ways. In most of these studies, the major emphasis is on cultural and moral decline. Most of them look through both the cultural and economic lens as the current predicament of families (Munroe 2013). Culture in this context should be understood as the physical and subjective cultures in which people live (Kagitcibasi 2007), and the artefacts that were included here are having a sense of preservation or resilience, even if it is what Ungar (2004) and Malindi and Theron (2010) have described as 'hidden resilience', frequency of communication, assistance with homework and pleasant environment. Despite the growing interest in understanding diversity in family norms and interaction among family scientists, neither models of family functioning nor self-report measures of family related outcomes have tended to account for variations in the normative values of families (Bowen 1988). However, none of these studies has paid close attention to the psychosocial predictors of family values especially among undergraduate students studying at the frontiers of merging cultures in South Africa.

In his work, Salami (2011) used completed measures of self-esteem, emotional intelligence, stress, and social support as predictors of psychosocial factors of adjustment among first year students of a college of education in Nigeria. A major implication from his study shows the need for college authorities to employ counselors that will design youth development programs that would consist of counseling intervention pro-

grams, which would consider their ages, needs and challenges. Also, it was recommended that colleges should develop programs that would foster self-esteem and emotional intelligence among the students, as well as provide relevant architecture, staffing and policies of hostels and lecture rooms that will facilitate stress management and development of new peer networks for students living away from home.

In a similar study, Afolabi (2014) on psychosocial prediction of prosocial behavior among a sample of Nigerian undergraduates, found that individual contributors to prosocial behavior and religiosity mediated the relationships between life satisfaction, perceived social exclusion and prosocial behavior. He also found that undergraduates residing in rural areas are more prosocial than those living in the city, and that cultural/ethic differences significantly influence prosocial behavior. A list of common predictors of postpartum depression (PPD) as marital status, social support, perceived support and enacted or received support (Yim et al. 2015). In this work, Yim et al. (2015) further called for integrative research to tackle the complex challenges of PPD.

Objective of the Study

Based on the foregoing, this study aimed at investigating the psychosocial predictors of family values among undergraduate students.

The main objective this study sought to achieve is as follows:

Determination of the effect of psychosocial parameters on family values.

Hypotheses

Three sets of psychosocial predictors of family values were examined. The hypotheses were built around these predictors.

The Main Research Hypothesis

Selected psychosocial factors do predict the family values held by undergraduate students. *Sub-hypotheses:*

The sub-hypotheses are stated as follows:
1. *Gender should predict the family values held by undergraduate students.*
2. *Age should predict the family values that individual undergraduate students hold.*
3. *Combined psychosocial parameters ascribable to undergraduate students may predict the family values they hold.*

In this study, gender, age, and combined psychosocial parameters are taken as the independent variables and then family values, as a concept, was taken as the dependent variable.

Investigating the psychosocial predictors of family values would enable researchers to appreciate the changes that occur in the individual as a result of the influences of selected variables. Such an understanding would be of value to a variety of interest groups. For example, educators may find this kind of study as very relevant to determining the role that psychosocial predictors play in building and inculcating family values, and how this might influence academic performances on the part of learners. In a way, therefore, this study would help in the establishment of properly directed educational and counseling strategies if need be.

It is also hoped that the findings from the study may help in developing effective counseling programs for different cultures in the society since it might reveal the individual differences in values, which normally fuel conflicts. One would say that the findings of this research could be of particular benefit to the United Nations (UN) as it plans peace programs and interventions, especially in Africa.

Furthermore, this study might point the way forward in subsequent studies that may lead to the development of models of counseling that are relevant to divergent cultural groups that come together in one setting.

During the last decade, a lot of studies have been carried out on how to link child behavior to family lifestyle and family values (Soontiens and De Jager 2008; Bertrand and Schoar 2006). It is common knowledge that the discussion of values in cultures that differ, such as the case in South Africa could imply a great degree of ambiguity and could generate culturally infused interpretations that are capable of inducing suspicion and even mistrust.

The researchers also probably know that a lot of existing studies on the subject tend to explore the link between environment confusion and lack of family stability with child adjustment

in areas of psychosocial adjustment and cognitive development. The mechanism through which environment confusion relates to academic underachievement or psychosocial maladjustment in children still remains unclear. However, a lot of socioeconomic factors have become a major area of interest (Flori and Mesnager 2011). In this situation, environmental confusion with socioeconomic factors is related to family size, poverty, parenting stress and lack of proper nutrition. It is also assumed that children can develop helplessness as a result of environmental confusion caused by socioeconomic factors (Flori and Mesnager 2011). It has been argued that child helplessness may lead to academic underachievement and a belief that they would be incapable of influencing their environment or learning new skills. The assumption that through socialization process individuals and family share the values and perception of the majority society and institution is also being constantly challenged by the numerous models that have tried to explain that variation in the values and perceptions of individuals and families from different cultural groups despite socialization influence from the dominant culture (Bowen 1988).

In recent years, a new generation of social scientists has revived the study of culture and its links to poverty. Inner-city family patterns are more of the product of social class or restricted opportunity than of an inherited culture unique to African Americans. Bad economy among Whites is a recipe for family troubles similar to those of the families in the ghetto (Skolnick 2010). It is clear that family values may be fading, but there is a family crisis which has very little to do with moral decline but much more with political and economic threats that confront the wellbeing and stability of all families. Economic transition has disrupted existing family patterns and political ideas. There had been radical calls for women's liberation and sexual freedom, and all these have contributed to the crisis in the family and value changes, which have yielded gradually to the change in process.

Household density, which is a major aspect of culture is viewed as both indicator of low socioeconomic status and a stressful situation associated with high morbidity and mortality risks (Melki et al. 2004). The household, to a great extent, contributes to shaping individual personal social positions, identities, grievances and political decision-making especially in crowded households. Since the household connects its members to local social context via daily interactions in the communities, the community provides distinct grievances, resources, networks and traditions of activists (Meyer and Lobao 2003). The tendency to move away and try to avoid their childhood experience is possible, and when these happen, individualism may develop that can influence the individual's value system.

The researchers may therefore propose that three basic theories are relevant here, and these include the *social exchange theory*, *Kagitchibasi's model of family change* and *the Feminist theory*.

The social exchange theory assumes that human actors seek to obtain reward (tangible and intangible) and attempt to avoid cost (tangible and intangible). Thus, human behavior is not random, but purposive and goal directed. The pursuit of these goals brings actors into interdependence with one another. In other words, the realization of the actor's preference depends on the simultaneous reaction of others to these preferences or goals. Based on their exchange, actors either perceive their associations as fair or unfair (Bowen 1988). For Africans, it is commonly believed that culture plays a significant role in facilitating this social exchange. For in Africa, culture tends to be based on strong family ties, which according to Max Weber's 1904 essay, may sometimes impede economic development (Bertrand and Schoar 2006).

The Kagitchibasi's model of family change (2007, 2010) is based on three types of families, namely, the traditional family characterized by overall material and emotional interdependent, the individualistic model based on independence, and a dialectical synthesis of the two, involving material independence but emotional/psychosocial interdependent. The assumption of modernization theory is a shift from the former model of family interdependence to the latter model of family independent with socioeconomic development. The emerging pattern is that family change is a major development in the world. The extended family system has material, psychosocial and emotional interdependent realms. The eco-cultural theory provides the framework relating Kagitchibasi's model of family change to cultural features of societies in the study. Beyond this model, it is commonly reported that

intergenerational relations between adolescents and their parents as well as the process of socialization and culture are frequently implicated in the family values that people hold (Kwak 2003; Phinney et al. 2000).

The feminist theory probably developed from the work of family therapists. Feminist therapy itself developed in a grassroots manner in response to challenges and the emerging needs of women beginning from the late 1800s, and the central focus in the movement seems to have been built around consciousness raising among women. At the time of the emergence of the movement, feminists voiced their dissatisfaction with the limiting and confining nature of traditional female roles (Corey 2005). The feminist movement has made all believe that the traditional theories that assumed that men should be perceived and accepted as the 'norm' no longer holds true in scientific research, and that, indeed, social arrangements rooted in one's biologically based gender should no longer be tolerated. The feminist theorists argue that it could no longer be assumed that because of biological gender differences men and women should pursue different directions in life so far as they have almost the same abilities and opportunities. Indeed, Worell and Remer (2003) have gone down being critical of the traditional theories, which they describe as being far too andocentric (that is, using male-oriented constructs to draw conclusions about human nature, including female nature), gendercentric (proposing two separate paths of development for women and men), *heterosexist* (that is, viewing heterosexual orientation as normative and desirable and devaluing lesbian, gay male and bisexual orientation), deterministic (that is, assuming that personality patterns and behavior are fixed at an early stage of development) and having an intrapsychic orientation (that is, attributing behavior to internal causes, which often leads to blaming the victim and ignoring the sociocultural and political factors in operation in the environment wherein the individual subsists) (Worell and Remer 2003; Corey 2005). The major criticism of the traditional theories is that they contain elements of bias and therefore have clear limitations for counseling females and members of marginalized groups.

Worell and Remer (2003) have since suggested the constructs of the feminist theory as being gender-fair, flexible-multicultural, interaction-ists and lifespan oriented. Under this construction, the gender-fair approaches explain the differences in the behavior of women and men in terms of socialization processes rather than on the basis of one's 'innate' nature, and thus avoiding stereotypes in social roles and interpersonal behaviour (Corey 2005). On the other hand, the flexi-multicultural perspective uses the concepts and strategies that apply equally to individuals and groups regardless of age, race, culture, gender, ability, class and sexual orientation (Corey 2005). The interactionist perspective contains concepts that are specific to thinking, feeling, and behavior dimensions of human experiences and explains contextual and environmental factors (Corey 2005). Then, the lifespan perspective generally assumes that human development is a lifelong process and that personality patterns and behavioral changes can occur at any time rather being fixed only at during early childhood (Corey 2005). What this amounts to is that whatever family values any individual holds may not be *andocentric, gendercentric, deterministic, and due to intrapsychic orientation.*

The study was conducted in one of the three campuses of a South African university. The campus selected is located in one of the provincial capitals of South Africa. It shares borders with the Republic of Botswana, and it is also a gateway to people traveling to Zimbabwe and Zambia. By its geographical location and political status, it attracts a number of people from different cultural backgrounds. For example, the fact that a public university is located there, helps attract to it a number of students and staff from different cultures, even cultures from outside South Africa.

The fact that this study has used this site as its context does suggest that the findings may not easily be extrapolated to undergraduate students at other universities in South Africa. But whatever weaknesses that apply to this study may easily be reduced in importance by the fact that the findings emanating from it could contribute profoundly to the clear understanding of the problem as well as contributing to the pool of knowledge in the area.

METHODOLOGY

The research approach in this study is quantitative, while the design was a cross-sectional survey. To assess the relationship between psy-

chosocial parameters and family values, block regression coefficients was utilized. Each of the predictors of family values for both genders were entered as a block using regression analysis

Variables

The main variables of interest in this study were the independent and the dependent variables. The dependent variable is held to be family values, and the independent variables are held to include gender, age, and combined psychosocial parameters. Since the dependent variable cannot be manipulated, the researcher studied the changes the independent variables would have as a result of differences existing within the categories chosen in the sample.

Population and Sampling

The population consisted of first year students in the campus. The total number of enrolled undergraduate (contact) students in the campus of the university where this study was carried out was 9,450. Of this figure, the first year undergraduate (contact) students were about 2,000. In estimating the sample size needed from this population, the researcher used the model by Yamane (1967),

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(a)^2}$$

Where N is the population of the first year students, and 'e' is the margin of error, in this case 0.071, suggested by 'science buddies', is used[1]. Hence, the sample size, n, is given as 200. It was from that figure that the researcher took a random but convenient sample by applying the random sampling technique. They used a convenient sample of two classes with a population of more than two hundred students. It was assumed that within the two classes, it would be possible to get the required sample. The campus lecture class periods were used because it was convenient to get a large number of students at a single location. The choice of the first year university students was based on the fact that it is convenient, and that it would bring on board the diverse cultures.

Measurements

A family value validated questionnaire was used to collect the data. The questionnaire has four sections. Section one consists of questions on participant biography. Section two consists of 18 questions, which are based on the family values. Section three consists of 27 questions based on relationships. Section four consists of 11 questions based on emotional distance.

Ethical Consideration

Usually, studies involving human subjects must require the determination of appropriate ethical consideration. The researchers considered certain ethical issues that needed to be complied with when dealing with people, as samples, in a study. According to Leedy and Ormond (2005) and De Vos (2001), most ethical issues fall under four categories, namely, protection from harm, informed consent, right to privacy and honesty with professional colleagues. These four categories were considered in this study.

The researcher refined the data collection instrument during a pilot study. Participants were observed during the pilot with the sole aim of assessing any instances of discomfort, uneasiness and anxiety when completing the questionnaire. The participants were assured that the end product of the study would be the intellectual property of the researcher and no distribution of the research outcomes was intended. The fact that participants were not allowed to write their names or those of their families or even make a hint that could be linked to a particular person helped in dispelling any fears and anxieties.

The participants were informed through a covering letter from the researcher that their participation in the study was purely voluntary, and they could choose to either continue with the study or withdraw if they felt prejudiced in any way during the data collection process or the during the administration of the study questionnaire. The participants were assured that the study would be purely used for academic purposes and would remain confidential and no commercial distribution of the research report was intended.

The researcher assured the privacy of participants through the permission letter from the institution studied and the covering letter accompanying the distribution of the questionnaire. The participants were assured that the responses would be treated with the strictest confidentiality. Most participants were at ease par-

ticularly with the realization that the questionnaire did not make any inference to an individual person or family and their physical locations.

This study confined itself to the host institution's Code of Ethics, especially the rules and regulations governing the conduct of research. Each questionnaire was accompanied by the permission letter bearing the institution's official logo and a covering letter from the researcher to the participants wherein the purpose of the study was explained.

Data Analysis

The data gathered in this study was analyzed with Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 18. Descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviation were used to describe the demographic information of participants. Regression analysis was used to measure the psychosocial predictors of family values. The level of significance was set at 0.05.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher sought to explore how a number of independent variables could predict family values.

Hypothesis 1: Gender and Family Values

The researcher sought to know how gender determines the way undergraduate students perceive family values. When the data was subjected to a statistical analysis, the researcher has the results presented in Table 1.

The chi-square analysis shows that gender is not a predictor of family values (Pearson Chi $_{(2, 4)}$ = 1.750, P=.626, N=194) in the context of this study. The data could be further subjected to the test of standard deviations. In doing so, the researcher states first of all the means of male and female undergraduate students with their mean differences and then, the significance would be judged based on whether or not the p-value (sig. 2 tailed) is higher or lower than .05. Doing so, the results are shown in Table 2.

The values reported in Table 2 are further confirming the position in Table 1.1.1. What the values seem to be saying is that there is no significant difference in family values held between male and female undergraduate students. Although there was a mean difference of 0.14755 between male (95.6122) and female (5.4647) students, this difference is not significant. The conclusion is based on the P-value (sig. 2 tailed) of 0.067, which is greater than 0.05. In essence, one could say that although male undergraduate students have a higher sense of family values, the difference is not high enough to say that they really have a higher sense of family values. In other words, it was just a matter of chance. The standard deviations (.54817 and .56599) showed that there were reasonable levels of agreement in the responses of both male and female undergraduate students. Hence, the distribution of the ranking of family values across the genders did not significantly differ, and one may therefore say that family values cannot be predicted based on gender as such. The findings here seem to confirm the views held to the effect that gender may not be a good predictor of the concepts

Table 1: Chi-square tests on gender and family value

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-square	1.750[a]	3	.626
Likelihood Ratio	1.754	3	.625
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.479	1	.224
N of Valid Cases	194		

a. 4 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.98.

Table 2: Standard deviation on gender as a predictor of family values

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
Family values	Male	98	5.6122	.54817	.05537
	Female	96	5.4647	.56599	.05777

Table 3: ANOVA age and family values

Model		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4.069	1	4.069	12.816	.001[a]
	Residual	33.018	104	.317		
	Total	37.087	105			

and strategies of certain cultural artefacts, including family values (Corey 2005:346; Worell and Remer 2003).

Hypothesis 2: Age and Family Values

The researcher hypothesized that *age should predict the family values that individual undergraduate students hold.* The data analysis revealed that ***age*** statistically predicted, to some extent, family values ($R^2=.11$, $F_{(1,105)}=12.816$, $P=.001$). The R^2 shows that only eleven percent of the variation in family values was explained by age. That is, age determines family values. Given $P=.001$, which is less than .05, one could say that family values are determined by age. It seems that the younger students were more likely to have higher family values than the older ones as shown in the unstandardized coefficients indicating negative values. The model indicated that as age increases by one year, family values decrease by .048 (4.8%) that is the meaning of -.048 Unstandardized Coefficients B that is in Table 3. Since the sign is negative (-.048), it means as family values increase, age decreases. This means that younger people have higher family values.The P-value (Sig.) of .001 in Table 2.1 shows that age is a significant predictor of family values. The P-value is the same in Table 4. The reason why they are the same is that there is only one variable used to predict family values. If they were two, they are likely going to be different in that the P value in Table 2.1 should show that if two variables can predict family values and each of the two variables would have had separate P value to tell if each one is significantly predicting family values.

The R square value is a measure of the percentage of the variations in family values explained by age. That means that there are other variables that would explain the remaining eighty-nine percent. R square ranges from 0 to 1 or zero percent to one hundred percent, and it is a measure of the predictive ability of the model. If R^2 is one hundred percent (1), it means that no other variable explains family values apart from age. If it is zero percent (0.00), age does not in any way explain variations in family values other variables do. In the case of this study with eleven percent (0.11) variations in family values explained by age, it means that although age is a significant ($P=.001$ which is less than .05) predictor of family values, it accounts for only a little (11%) variations. It could mean that other variables that could account for the remaining variations that have not been accounted for in this study.

Hypothesis 3: Combined Psychosocial Parameters and Family Values

The researcher hypothesized *that combined psychosocial parameters ascribable to each undergraduate student may predict family values.*

To determine the outcomes here, the researcher used step-wise regression, and the results are indicated in Table 5.

Table 3.1 shows that with different *models,* there are different R squares. Model 1 has only one variable (age) to predict family values. The R square for Model 1 is .11 (or 11%) as reported above. Then for Model 2, R square is 16.9 percent and so on till one gets to Model 5 with R square of 36.1 percent. Model 2 has two vari-

Table 4: Coefficients age and family values

Model		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	6.550	.291		22.473	.000
	age (in years)	-.048	.013	-.331	-3.580	.001

ables and so on till Model 5 with five variables. The researcher observed that as they add more predictor variables, the R square value increases meaning that the predicting power increases. In essence, the efficiency of predicting family values is highest with Model 5 with five variables because while Model 1 is eleven percent efficient in predicting family values, Model 5 with five variables is 36.1 percent efficient. What this means is that, out of the many variables used, the best number of variables that could be used to predict family values are age (in years), preservation, assisted homework, frequency of communication, and pleasant environment. The researcher could as well add another 24 variables that have not been reported to have Model 6 but what this result is saying is that it will not be profitable or very useful to add to the predictor variables because it will not add enough efficiency to justify the addition. Hence, in statistical terms, the researcher say that Model 5 is the parsimonious model.

The researcher also subjected this finding to further analysis using ANOVA to determine the strength of the results. Table 6 illustrates this point. These are the variables used in each model. Model 1 used only one variable (age), Model 2 used two (age and preservation), up till Model 5 using five variables. The P value of each of the variables in the model is seen in the column with 'Sig.' at the extreme right. What Table 3.2 is saying is that, when all the variables

in Model 1 are put together, the P-value is .001 (in this case there is only age so the P-value for age in Table 3.2 will be the same as the P-value in Table 1.3.3). However, from Model 2, there is more than one variable, so in Table 3.2, there is only one P-value. So, Table 3.2 is saying that, in Model 2 for example, when age and preservation are used to predict family values, the joint P-value is .000. What it means is that the two variables are significant predictors of family values and each of them is also a significant predictor of family values but age is a stronger predictor because its own P-value (.000) is lower than that of preservation (.008) but both are less than .05. Although, it is possible to have Model 6, the

Table 5: Model Summary

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate
1	.331[a]	.110	.101	.56346
2	.411[b]	.169	.153	.54695
3	.506[c]	.256	.234	.52009
4	.554[d]	.306	.279	.50468
5	.601[e]	.361	.329	.48688

a. Predictors: (Constant), age (in years).b. Predictors: (Constant), age (in years), preservation.c. Predictors: (Constant), age (in years), preservation, assisted homework.d.Predictors: (Constant), age (in years), preservation, assisted homework, frequency of communication.e. Predictors: (Constant), age (in years), preservation, assisted homework, frequency of communication, and pleasant environment.

Table 6: ANOVA[f]

Model		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4.069	1	4.069	12.816	.001[a]
	Residual	33.018	104	.317		
	Total	37.087	105			
2	Regression	6.274	2	3.137	10.487	.000[b]
	Residual	30.813	103	.299		
	Total	37.087	105			
3	Regression	9.497	3	3.166	11.704	.000[c]
	Residual	27.590	102	.270		
	Total	37.087	105			
4	Regression	11.362	4	2.841	11.153	.000[d]
	Residual	25.725	101	.255		
	Total	37.087	105			
5	Regression	13.382	5	2.676	11.290	.000[e]
	Residual	23.706	100	.237		
	Total	37.087	105			

a. Predictors: (Constant), age (in years).b. Predictors: (Constant), age (in years), preservation.c. Predictors: (Constant), age (in years), preservation, assisted homework.d. Predictors: (Constant), age (in years), preservation, assisted homework, frequency of communication.e. Predictors: (Constant), age (in years), preservation, homework, frequency of communication, and pleasant environment.f. Dependent Variable: Family values.

SPSS program opined that enough variations in the dependent variable will not be explained by adding another variable so it stopped at the 5th iteration (Model 5 with five variables). In essence, the efficiency or prediction of family values will not be significantly improved by adding any of the excluded variable to Model 5 with five variables so the researchers had to stop there.

Another index worth noting is the Unstandardized Coefficients 'B' value. Since it is negative for age, it means those with high family values have lower years (age). So, the younger the individual undergraduate student the higher in family values. Also, one will notice that preservation has negative values, then those who have higher family values have lower preservation. Finally, the fifth model shows that only pleasant environment and assisted homework are positively correlated with family values. That is, the higher the family values, the higher the assisted homework (.184) and pleasant environment (.225) whereas for age, preservation and frequency of communication, the reverse is the case, that is, the higher the family values, the lower the age, preservation and frequency of communication.

After controlling for all variables in Model 5, *age* has -.046 dependency with family values or age has -.046 correlation with family values. The independent contribution of psychosocial parameters of *preservation* to family values is -.201 while that of *assisted homework* is .184, *frequency of communicating with parents* -.174 and *pleasant environment* is .225. It means that Model 5 explains the maximum possible variations (the most efficient) with the least number of predictors. The findings here seem to confirm those reported earlier by Arcus (1995) and Melki, Beydoun et al. (2004). That means that the combination of psychosocial parameters might have stronger strength in predicting the family values that are held by undergraduate students.

For all that these findings could mean, the researcher need to know and accept the fact that in this study there seems not to be significant differences in family values held by the respondents. This is so because, as already reported by Chia-Chi Cheng (2006), conflicts and tensions can emerge from different values and role expectations between generations. Fortunately, the researcher has not found such remarkable differences in this study.

CONCLUSION

This study has shown that only age, amongst all other independent variables, statistically predicted the family values held by undergraduate students. The researchers noted that younger students probably hold higher family values than older ones because the unstandardized coefficients indicate negative values. In African contexts, this finding can hardly be a surprise because of the tendency among parents to want to ensure that the younger ones are as close to the family as possible.

The results have also shown that gender does not predict how much family values any individual could hold. Again, this is hardly surprising because the pattern of inculcating family values in most African cultures is mostly gender neutral. What holds true for most African cultures is that processes and outcomes of certain roles are gendered, and that is why, for example, rites of passage may be different for males and females.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is important for one to note in this study that a combination of psychosocial parameters strongly predicted the family values held by undergraduate students. In this case, the researcher observed and recommend that a combination of age, preservation, assisted homework, frequency of communication and pleasant environment, as in Model 5, should be used as predictors of psychosocial factors in the study of family values. This is because this combination provides a stronger set of predictors of family values among undergraduate students. This also means that any clinical therapy one might want to apply in the settings should adequately incorporate these combined factors. That way, one might have more convincing outputs, and this is because Model 5, as already indicated above, is the parsimonious model in statistical terms.

NOTE

[1] "Science Buddies" is a group on the internet that provides quick knowledge on concepts. For this reference, it can be found at http://www. sciencebuddies. org/science-fair-projects/project_ ideas/Soc_ participants. shtml.

REFERENCES

Aboim S 2010. Family and gender values in contemporary Europe: The attitudinal gender gap from a cross-national perspective. *Portuguese Journal of Social Science*, 9(1): 33-58.

Arcus M 1995. Advances in family life education: Past, present and future. *Family Relations*, 14(4): 336-344.

Afolabi OA 2014. Psychosocial predictors of prosocial behaviour among a sample of Nigerian undergraduates. *European Scientific Journal*, 10(2): 241-266.

Bertrand M, Schoar A 2006. The role of family in family firms. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives,* 20(2): 73-96.

Bowen GL 1988. Family life satisfaction: A value-based approach. *Family Relations*, 37(4): 458-462.

Cheng CC 2006. *Gender Differences in Family Values: The Case of Taiwan*. Master of Arts in Sociology Dissertation submitted to the Graduate School. Arlington: University of Texas.

Constantine LL 1986. *Family Paradigms: The Practice of Theory in Family Therapy*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Corey G 2009. *Theory and Practice of Counseling and Psychotherapy*. 8th Edition. Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole.

De Vos AS 2001. *Research at Grassroots for the Social and Human Service Professions*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Flori JP, Mesnager S 2011. An efficient characterization of a family hyperbent functions with multiple trace terms. Cryptology eprint Archive, Report 2011/373. From <http://eprint.iacr.org/7.J.-P.> (Retrieved on 15 November 2015).

Flori E 2009. Strong families, tidy houses and children's values in adult life: Are "chaotic", "crowded" and "unstable" homes really so bad? *International Journal of Behavioral Development,* 33(6): 496-503.

Graziano KJ 2005. Reflections from university students in a South African gay and lesbian society. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 27(2): 299-310.

Kagitcibasi C 2007. *Family, Self and Human Development Across Cultures: Theory and Applications.* 2nd Edition. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kagitcibasi C 2009. Development of Self -competence Across Cultures: A Challenge to Psychology, *Keynote presentation, XXIX, International Congress of Psychology,* Berlin, July: 20-25.

Kagitcibasi C 2010. Self and culture. *Paper presented to the Panel on "The New Emerging Markts (Beyond BRIC): Managing Global Brands and Consumbers,"* Koc University, June 22nd.

Kroeber A 1909. Classificatory systems of relationship. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland,* 39: 77-84.

Kwak K 2003. Adolescents and their parents: A review of intergenerational family relations for immigrant and non-immigrant families. *Human Development*, 46: 115-136.

Leedy PD, Ormond JE 2001. *Practical Research: Panning and Design*. 7th Edition. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Levi Strauss C 1969. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Levinson D, Malone MJ 1980. *Toward Explaining Human Culture,* New Haven, CT: HRAF Press.

Malindi MJ, Theron LC 2010. The hidden resilience of street youth. *South African Journal of Psychology,* 40(3): 318-326.

Malinowski B 1927. *The Father in Primitive Psychology.* London and New York: Routledge.

McGoldrick M 1982. Normal families: An ethnic perspective. In: F Walsh (Ed.): *Normal Family Processes.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Melki IS, Beydoun HA, Khogali M, Tamim H, Yunis KA 2004. Household Crowding Index: A correlate of socioeconomic status and inter-pregnancy spacing in an urban setting. *Journal of Epidemial Community Health*, 58: 476-480.

Meyer K, Lobao L 2003. Household, gender and political responses to economic downturn: Extending the theories of modernization. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 44(2): 159-179.

Mindel CH, Habenstein RW (Eds.) 1977. *Ethnic Families in America: Patterns and Variations.* New York: Elsevier.

Munro A 2013. *Hateship, Friendship, Courtship, Loveship, Marriae.* London: Chatto and Windus.

Murdock GP 1949. *Social Structure.* New York: Macmillan.

Murdock GP 1981. *Atlas of World Cultures.* Pittsburgh: The University of Pittsburgh Press.

Phinney JS, Ong A, Madden T 2000. Cultural values and intergenerational value discrepancies in immigration and non-immigrant families. *Child Development,* 71: 528-539.

Salami SO 2011. Psychosocial predictors of adjustment among first year college of education students. *US-China Education Review*, 8(2): 239-248.

Science Buddies. From <http://www.sciencebuddies.org/science-fair-projects/project_ideas/Soc_ participants. shtml> (Retrieved on 10 October 2014).

Silva JD, Aminabhavi VA 2013. Adjustment, self-efficacy and psychosocial competency of drug addicted adolescents. *Journal of Psychology*, 4(1): 13-18.

Skolnick A 2010. Talking about family values after "family values". *Dissent,* 96-103.

Soontiens W, De-Jager JW 2008. South African values: A reflection on its "Western" base. *African Journal of Business Management*, 2(12): 222-229.

Speigel J 1982. An ecological model of ethnic families. In: M McGoldrick, JK Pearce, J Giordano (Eds.): *Ethnicity and Family Therapy: An Overview*. New York: The Guilford Press.

The Washington Post 2011. A Woman's Place? Fredrick Official Gets An Earful For Sharing His View. 01908286, March.

Tylor EB 1889. On a method of investigating the development of institutions: Applied to laws of marriage and descent. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland,* 18: 245-272.

Ungar M 2004. *Nurturing Hidden Resilience in Troubled Youth*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

US Council of Economic Advisors 2000. Teens and Their Parents in the 21st Century: An Examination of Teen. From <http://www.whitehouse.gov/cea> (Retrieved on 10 November 2014).

Warren KB 1998. *Indigenous Movements and Their Critics: Plan Maya activism in Guatemala.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Weber J, Lavelle L 2003. Family, Inc. *Business Week*, November 10, pp. 10-14.

Weber M 1904. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Scribner's Press.

Worell J, Remer P 2003. *Feminist Perspective in Therapy: Empowering Diverse Women.* 2nd Edition. New York: Wiley.

Yamane T 1967. *Statistics, An Introductory Analysis.* 2nd Edition. New York: Harper and Row.

Yim IS, Stapleton LRT, Guardino CM, Hahn-Holbrook J, Schetter CD 2015. Biological and psychosocial predictors of postpartum depression – Systematic review and call for integration. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 11: 99-137.