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Abstract

The beliefs that individuals carry about their ability to succeed at particular tasks and achieve desired goals (self-efficacy) determine their approach to life. These beliefs are formed during childhood and continue into adulthood. They are influenced by a variety of factors and experiences in a person’s life. The current study examined the relationship between self-efficacy and three psychosocial factors: parenting styles, learning environments and cultural orientation. The sample comprised of 132 men and women between the age of 18 and 30 years. These were first year students at the United States International University- Africa (USIU-A). The author used self-administered structured questionnaires to collect the information and the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to analyze it. The questionnaire was made up of the Culture Orientation Scale that measured cultural constructs, the Parental Authority Questionnaire that measured the participants’ perception of the parenting style applied by their parents and the General Self-Efficacy Scale that evaluated the participants’ self-efficacy levels. Results showed that the most significant psychosocial factors that were related to self-efficacy were the authoritative parenting style of the father ($r = -.270, p < .01$), the primary level of learning ($\chi^2 (2) = 6.187, p < 0.05$) and the individualistic cultural orientation (at 95% confidence level). The research concludes that there is a relationship between parenting styles, learning environments and cultural orientation. It highlights the impact of these psychosocial factors on the development of self-efficacy. These findings have implications on parents, teachers, policy makers and the general public.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

In different social settings, some people get more attention than others and are held in high regard. In many occasions, they are not essentially the most competent people in the area; they may just be more self-confident. Albert Bandura (1997) noted that people's perceptions of their competencies had a profound influence on their capabilities. He believed that ability is not a preset element but that people behave in different ways in various situations. Those who have a level of confidence in their abilities recover from failure faster and approach situations from an optimistic perspective rather than a pessimistic one. The beliefs that a person has on their power to influence different circumstances will affect the decisions they make and how they approach challenges. These beliefs are acquired during early childhood and continue developing throughout different phases of life.

Shonkoff (2010) noted that decades of research have highlighted the importance of early experiences in brain development, learning, behavior, physical and mental health throughout life. He expressed that science has shown us that the later we invest in children, the harder the achievement of positive outcomes. Families, organizations, governments and societies benefit from positive influences in an individual’s early years. When early influences are constructive, the human system is typically healthier and more adaptive. On the other hand, negative influences may make an individual more prone to maladaptive behavior, poor health, impaired learning and a reduced life span.
In this article, we examine psychosocial influences that affect childhood development. We focus on young adults between the age of 18 and 30 years. As they transition into adulthood, they are also able to identify previous experiences in their life that have contributed to their development. These individuals have been exposed to a variety of psychosocial settings that contributed to the people they have become. The study seeks to discover how these childhood influences and different psychosocial environments contribute to the development of Self-Efficacy (SE) in young adults. We define self-efficacy as the belief that a person holds about their ability to succeed at a specific task and achieve a desired goal.

Specifically, our research focuses on establishing the role of parenting styles, learning environments and cultural orientation on the enhancement of SE in individuals. The evaluation of these three influences is based on numerous studies that reveal that family and communities play a key role in the healthy development of children (Shonkoff, 2010). We describe how these psychosocial influences play a role in cultivating SE in individuals from birth. Shonkoff highlighted the critical role of early experiences in shaping the developmental process. Based on this understanding, the study seeks to equip individuals that are engaged in human development e.g. parents and teachers with the knowledge and skills to help children develop self-efficacy from an early age.

The study was carried out in Kenya at the United States International University- Africa (USIU-A). It involved first year students. The target population was USIU-A because it has a variety of local and international students. The first year students comprise of people of different ages from various cultural backgrounds, school and families. This variety of characteristics helped the researcher to explore different factors that had potential to contribute to levels of self-efficacy as the young adults grew up.
1.2 Background of the Study

Our world is experiencing numerous changes in different aspects such as technology, culture, climate, and economic status at an increasing rate. These changes are demanding that people redefine how they live and succeed in the world. The need for creativity in problem solving and increased connections with people all over the world has become indispensable (Yeung & Johnston, 2016).

Seidman (2014) noted that economies have changed based on the way people operate and add value to their environment. People are applying more of their heads than their hands, as the use of intelligent machines increases in the environment. Human traits such as innovation, passion and cooperation are key elements that distinguish the performance of some individuals from others. According to Yeung and Johnston (2016), as work is progressively automated, the value of humans will be seen in their ability to be creative, insightful, flexible, discerning, instinctual and compassionate. Applying these essential traits requires an individual to have a healthy physical, mental and emotional state.

A key feature that influences reasoning, emotions and performance is perceived self-efficacy. This refers to the confidence that people have in their ability to execute certain actions in order to achieve a desired result (Luszczynska & Schwarzer, 2005). Self-efficacy does not inevitably mean that one is skilled at achieving certain goals. It is expressed as an individual’s conviction of his abilities that is acquired from previous affirmative experiences and thinking patterns. An individual with high self-efficacy is more inclined to participate in specific tasks (Erford & Gavin, 2012). Different studies have found significant benefits of self-efficacy. According to Erford and Gavin (2012), children with positive self-efficacy beliefs are inclined to
proceed with school and perform better in academics. They also have stronger and deeper connections with people, lower risk of depression and generally good emotional health.

Maddy, Cannon and Lichtenberger (2015) found that support from family members plays a key role in improving self-efficacy perceptions in the unemployed. This study highlighted the significance of supportive family and social relationships in managing adversities such as unemployment. Such positive relationships can motivate an individual to venture into reemployment based on the heightened confidence that they develop in themselves.

Luszczynska, Gutiérrez-Doña and Schwarzer (2005) found that across different countries, there was a positive relationship between self-efficacy and self-regulation, academic performance, life satisfaction, quality of life and positive emotions. Depression and anxiety had the greatest negative association with self-efficacy.

Bandura (1997) differentiated between self-esteem and self-efficacy by stating that self-efficacy is related to a person’s judgment of their ability, whereas self-esteem is based on their perception of self-worth. He acknowledged four principal sources of self-efficacy:

a) Mastery experiences- Previous successes help individuals to develop high confidence in their ability to perform the tasks (high self-efficacy). Failure can weaken this confidence.

b) Vicarious experiences (social modeling) - As individuals watch people who they perceive are similar to them succeed in certain tasks, they also feel confident to achieve the same tasks. This confidence is dependent on the degree to which the person can relate with the model and the model’s display of how to manage the task.
c) Social and verbal persuasion (feedback from others) – Encouragement from influential people such as teachers, parents and leaders can help one believe they are capable of performing a task.

d) Physiological states – Your mental, physical and emotional state may influence how you perceive your personal abilities. For example a person that feels anxious, stressed or depressed, may doubt their capabilities in accomplishing some tasks. On the other hand, a person that is feeling energetic or calm may experience inner harmony that leads to a great sense of self efficacy.

Steyn and Mynhardt (2008) observed that studies on self-efficacy show that mastery experience has more influence on self-efficacy beliefs than vicarious experience. On the other hand, vicarious experience affects self-efficacy perceptions more than verbal persuasion. However, they also noted that self-efficacy is influenced by other factors such as environments and personal dispositions. In line with this observation, they highlighted the need of focusing on different influencing factors when reviewing self-efficacy perceptions.

There are numerous benefits of self-efficacy in helping an individual adjust to demands in their environment. People's self-efficacy perceptions have a significant influence on their emotions, thoughts, motivations and decisions to take certain actions. These beliefs can either increase or reduce their achievements in every area of their lives. This brings out that fact that people create their own future based on their sense of self-efficacy (Tilfarlioglu & Ciftci, 2011).

For individuals to develop self-efficacy, they should first understand the sources that bring about these beliefs. It is against this background that the researcher developed interest in exploring psychosocial factors that influence the development of self-efficacy. During the first four to five years, the main influencer in a child’s life is the parent/guardian. When they grow and go to
school, teachers and peers start to play an influential role as well. As the children interact with
parents, teachers and peers, they are also exposed to cultural values.

On the basis of this knowledge, the present study will investigate the relationship between
parenting styles, cultural orientation and learning environments in helping an individual to
develop self-efficacy at different stages of their life.

1.3 Problem statement

Why are some children, adolescents and young adults more confident in approaching peers
and adults while others avoid such interactions? Why do some children step out to engage in
certain tasks while their peers hold back? Why are some people more optimistic and eager to try
out new ventures while others seek to maintain the status quo? Why are some intelligent people
at the periphery of work projects while their colleagues of lower intelligence levels are leading
the tasks? What can research teach us to assist children, adolescents and even adults to approach
life with confidence?

On a daily basis, the world goes through various changes in the area of information,
humanity and technology which leads to constant personal and social changes in the society.
“Among the types of thoughts that affect action, none is more central or pervasive than people's
judgments of their capabilities to deal effectively with changing realities” (Bandura, 1986, p. 21).
People interpret the consequences of experiences and these interpretations provide a basis on
which judgments are made. Self-efficacy is described as an individual’s perception of their
ability to affect the environment around them. These beliefs influence the person’s emotions,
thoughts and motives. Erford and Gavin (2012) believe that children develop an awareness of
self-efficacy at an early age. This perception persists all through their childhood and into
adulthood. People go through many trials and opportunities in life. Positive beliefs in their ability are an important factor in managing these challenges.

The Global Risks Report (2016) highlights some of the worldwide challenges as illicit trade, employment instability, man-made environmental catastrophes, natural disasters, social instability, theft, food and water crises. Additional challenges faced by human beings include traumatic events, financial strains, relationship disputes, poor physical and mental health, poor academic and work performance. These trials and challenges affect the degree of wellness in people’s lives. Inability to manage them leads to negative effects such as crime, substance abuse, suicide ideation, anxiety, delinquency, depression and other maladaptive ways of coping.

Brown, Joscelyne, Dorfman, Marmar, and Bryant (2012) found that self-efficacy is a significant element that lies behind healthy ways of living and emotional well-being. Low self-efficacy as well as beliefs that one’s life is beyond control and unpredictable are perceptions that are connected to poor mental health. Effective human functioning is enabled by a person’s belief in their ability to control their thoughts, feelings and actions.

Benight and Bandura (2004) reviewed the evidence from studies that revealed that high levels of self-efficacy contribute to people’s ability to cope with adjustments in life. People who believed in their capacity to handle difficult situations were less susceptible to the negative effects of traumatic events. Luszczynska, Benight and Cieslak (2009) believed that people with high self-efficacy applied action-oriented survival strategies which resulted in better management of the controllable challenges that developed from traumatic experiences.

The study done by Brown et al. (2012) revealed that self-efficacy plays a key role in regulating anxiety and hyperarousal after tough experiences. They also found that people who had high efficacy levels before trauma occurred were more likely to behave favorably following
hostile experiences. Lennings and Bussey (2016) found that children’s confidence in their ability to handle parental conflict was linked with healthier psychological outcomes.

The need to be healthy, live longer and reach the highest potential is a common desire held by people all over the world (Yeung and Johnston, 2014). Self-efficacy helps people to apply some behavioral regulation over the value of their health. Peoples' perceptions of their ability to self-regulate, affects their commencement of managing health habits, organizing the resources they need to succeed and enduring the effects of habit changes (Bandura, 1995).

Shoji et al. (2014) stated that people are able to cope with environmental demands more effectively when they analyze the situation from a positive perspective. Bandura, Caprara, Barbaranelli, Gerbino, and Pastorelli (2003) stated that personal self-efficacy was attached to the choices that people make, their ability to persevere in stressful environments and maintain resilience in tough situations.

Based on these studies, it is evident that the development of self-efficacy is critical for the effective functioning of individuals. This insight thereby leads to the question “how is self-efficacy developed?” Numerous studies that have been done in previous years showed the positive effects of self-efficacy on post-traumatic recovery (Benight & Bandura, 2004), memory for hostile experiences (Brown et al., 2012), managing parental conflict (Lennings & Bussey, 2016), academic achievement and good emotional health (Erford & Gavin, 2012). However, few studies have been published to investigate psychosocial factors that contribute to the development of self-efficacy. To help people in the world acquire this key trait, they need to possess the knowledge and understanding of how it is developed.

Bandura (1997) believed that family is the principal foundation of the development of self-efficacy. He expressed that parents provide the initial social environment in children’s lives
through modeling behavior and giving verbal feedback that shapes the child’s perception of themselves. Parents also expose the child to cultural and social values and patterns. As the children grow up, they note the differences in their competence levels when they interact with others. In addition to parents, they include peers and other associations such as teachers as their primary influencers.

With this awareness, this study was developed to educate people on how self-efficacy is related to our psychosocial environment. The paper will explore the factors that contribute to self-efficacy development by focusing on parenting styles, cultural orientation and learning environments as potential risk or protective agents. The research seeks to respond to the following questions; what is the relationship between parenting style, cultural orientation and learning environments as pertains to the development of self-efficacy? Other than parenting styles, cultural orientation and learning environments, are there any other psychosocial factors that contribute to the development of self-efficacy?

This study will give people insight on the current self-perceptions that they hold and enable them to acquire information on how to control some aspects of their life. Parents, educators, friends, managers and psychologists may be equipped with the knowledge of how to cultivate self-efficacy in the lives of the people around them. In learning the importance of self-efficacy and understanding the depth of the power they hold, they can deliberately pursue this achievement. In this study, we make a case for why self-efficacy matters, and provide an outline to help people in the society to develop it.

1.4 Purpose of the Study

The aim of the current study was to examine psychosocial factors that contribute to the acquisition of self-efficacy beliefs during childhood as explored in young adults between the age
of 18 and 30 years. The study aimed at exploring how these factors influenced the development of self-efficacy. It focused on establishing the relationship between parenting styles, cultural orientations and learning environments in the advancement of self-efficacy beliefs in young adults.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

a) To establish the relationship between parenting styles and self-efficacy.

b) To determine which cultural orientation (individualistic or collectivistic) is the greater determinant of self-efficacy.

c) To establish the correlation between learning environments and self-efficacy.

1.6 Research questions

a) What is the relationship between parenting styles and self-efficacy?

b) Which cultural orientation (individualistic or collectivistic) is the greater determinant of self-efficacy?

c) What is the correlation between learning environments and self-efficacy?

1.7 Research hypotheses

a) The authoritative parenting style is the main contributing factor to the development of self-efficacy.

b) Students from individualistic cultures have higher self-efficacy than those from collectivistic cultures.

c) Progressive learning environments contribute to higher levels of self-efficacy than traditional learning environments.
1.8 **Significance of the study**

According to the census done in Kenya in 2009, the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (2010) reported that around 43% of the entire population in Kenya was below the age of 15 years. These young people of today will form the leaders, fathers, mothers and work force of tomorrow. If they are given the right support and opportunities, they hold a key role in building a more productive future for themselves and their societies (Maguire, 2007). The achievement of this successful future is dependent on the general well-being of the people that are playing a role in building it.

In 1976, Dr. Bill Hettler developed the Six Dimensions of Wellness where he described different components that make up optimum health (wellness). Many people define good health in terms of the physical state of well-being that is absent for illnesses. Hettler extends this definition by stating that wellness includes our personal and social experiences. He believes that wellness is achieved by equally attaining balance in the physical, emotional, intellectual, spiritual, social and occupational areas of an individual’s life (Hettler, 1976).

Self-efficacy influences an individual’s performance in these different areas. It is a fundamental construct that lies behind healthy operations and emotional wellness (Brown et al., 2012). A study done by Siu, Lu and Spector (2007) revealed that self-efficacy beliefs were positively associated with cognitive and physical well-being. This will affect how a person engages his mental abilities, interacts with different people and carries out physical activities. In general, life satisfaction is a function of self-efficacy and additional factors such as personality (Strobel, Tumasjan & Spörrle, 2011).

Previous studies have shown numerous benefits of self-efficacy. This study may help people to understand the concept of self-efficacy and appreciate its effects on behavior. It will
provide awareness on how different individuals and environments influence the acquisition of these beliefs. This knowledge may support the development of strong self-efficacy by strengthening protective factors and reducing risk factors in different settings. This study is specifically important to the groups of people highlighted below, as they are key influencers of human development. They play a significant role in the mental, social, psychological, emotional and development of individuals from conception up to adulthood.

1.8.1 Parents

As earlier stated, parents form the first social environment of the child. They interact with the child from pre-natal to post-natal stage. They are the main people that interact with the children during their formative stages and hence hold a great level of power in shaping their thoughts and opinions. This study may provide knowledge to parents on how to shape the beliefs of their child to help them attain success in life. It is critical that the parents understand how their child’s sense of self-efficacy is formed, sustained and also how it can be weakened.

1.8.2 Teachers

This study may create awareness on the sources of self-efficacy and help teachers to understand their role in fostering it. Teachers are in a position to recognize students with low self-efficacy early and in turn intervene to help them enhance their confidence. Due to frequent interactions with the students, teachers can increase the mastery experiences by exposing the student to activities that they can excel in. They also interact with students in different settings such as sports, academics and other recreational spaces. This provides an opportunity for verbal persuasion as the teacher speaks to the child and helps them counter self-doubt as they perform different activities.
1.8.3 Psychologists

As psychologists become aware of the factors that contribute to self-efficacy development through this study, they are able to provide more relevant and effective services to their clients. This knowledge will guide their selection of therapy techniques and influence the type of support they offer their clients. Psychologists may be more equipped to address individuals who approach them with self-efficacy concerns.

1.8.4 Students

The study sought to help students to appreciate the benefits of self-efficacy in life. It helped to raise students’ awareness on some of the factors that have contributed to their self-efficacy. This understanding may help them to see the role of their external and internal environment in determining the outcome of some activities. With this knowledge, they may be better equipped to select their social environment to accommodate people that will build their self-efficacy.

1.9 Limitation and Delimitations

The researcher expects to come across some challenges as they carry out the study. The study will target a population of people from different regions which may lead to a language barrier or misunderstanding of questions while filling in the questionnaire. To overcome this barrier, the researcher will self-administer the questionnaires and inform the participants of her availability to clarify any details and answer any question that they may have as they fill in the questionnaires.

Another possible limitation would be the possibility of participants giving information based on their desired outlook of themselves and their environments rather than the real situations. To manage this challenge, the researcher will emphasize the aspect of confidentiality.
that will be maintained when reviewing the date. They will also highlight the importance of the participants’ sharing honest and authentic information to the study.

1.10 Operational definition of terms

**Parent:** The main caregiver of a child. In this study, the term also applies to any legal guardian of a child as seen in the case of orphans, adopted children or children raised in a shelter.

**Self-efficacy:** An individual’s beliefs in their ability to perform a task successfully.

**Cultural Orientation:** The degree to which an individual or a country hold individualistic or collectivistic values.

**Individualistic Culture:** A social framework that gives priority to the individual, their independence, values and decisions. The person defines themselves according to “I”.

**Collectivistic Culture:** A social framework that gives priority to the in-group. The individual is just a member of the group. The group has its own values, thinking and decision making processes. The person defines themselves according to “we”.

**Learning Environment:** The social system of a learner that is made up of external relationships, a physical setting and an organization culture.

**Young Adult:** Male or female between the age of 18 and 30 years.

**Mastery Experience:** Previous successful performances that have potential to influence future behavior.

**Pedagogies:** Teaching strategies that influence where and how teachers conduct classes, how they set up the physical environment for learning and their use of technology.

1.11 Chapter Summary

This chapter reviews the basis of the study and highlights the motivation behind it. It helps different stakeholders to understand their role in the development of self-efficacy in the
society. The following chapter will assess the literature review as well as theoretical framework of the self-efficacy as associated with parenting styles, cultural orientation and learning environments.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

A person’s belief in their ability to accomplish and succeed at a task (self-efficacy) will influence the activities they pursue and engage in as well as those that they will avoid. These self-beliefs affect every part of people’s lives—the decisions they make, whether they have optimistic or pessimistic thoughts, their ability to motivate themselves and endure stressful situations, their capacity to self-regulate and correct wrong actions and perceptions (Bandura, 1986). Sources of information that build efficacy in children are family, peer and school experiences (Erford & Gavin, 2012).

This literature review covers areas of research associated with three different psychosocial influences that create self-efficacy beliefs - Parents, Learning environment and Cultural Orientation. We review studies that explore the relationship between these three influences and self-efficacy perceptions. Finally, we highlight and expound on the theories that provide a foundation for understanding self-efficacy and its application.

The information presented in this chapter is gathered from historical literature (journals and books) that provided a critical foundation of the information obtained. In addition, the researcher collected information from journal abstracts, peer reviewed journals with a time lapse of 10 years (2006-2016), psychology books and reports from different organizations. The journals were retrieved from EBSCOhost Online Research Databases, Sage Publications and PsycARTICLES®.
2.2 Development of Self-Efficacy

Bandura (1997) suggested that environments provide structures that influence self-efficacy beliefs. If the environment offers supportive settings that have potential to increase self-efficacy beliefs, then people are in a better position to shape their beliefs positively.

Pastorelli et al. (2001) postulated that the family is the main foundation of efficacy beliefs in children. Responsive parents offer a variety of mastery experiences that help children to gain competence in different areas. They also noted that teachers play a significant role in forming children’s intellectual efficacy. Teachers’ evaluation of performance affects how the children assess their abilities. Acknowledging the role that teachers and parents play in the formation and advancement of children’s confidence guides behavior towards nurturing and cultivating these essential self-beliefs (Usher & Pajares, 2008). Oettingen & Zosuls (2006) noted that family and school environments provide sources of efficacy assessment. They believe that identifying how cultural values influence these major societal structures may explain the varying levels of self-efficacy across cultures.

The development of self-efficacy in young people is very critical. Tam, Chong, Kadirvelu and Khoo (2012) highlighted the fact that self-efficacy influenced adolescents personal beliefs in their ability to restraining their behavior and prevent them from engaging in misconduct. They noted that the inability of young people to cope with life’s challenges may lead them to engage in risky behavior and encourage defiance towards parental authority. The capability to employ self-efficacy not only influences young people’s conduct but also has a significant impact on their general well-being.
2.3 Culture and Self-efficacy

Culture exposes its influence on efficacy beliefs by shaping the institutions in which people exist. This mainly includes the family, school and community (Oettingen & Zosuls, 2006). Families and schools are central institutions that display cultural values and are important agents in transmitting cultural values from one generation to another (Hofstede, 1986). Bornstein (2012) describes culture as a set of unique patterns of philosophies, values and actions that guide daily behavior and are shared by a group of people. According to Santrock (2012), a cultural group can be as large as a continent or are small as a town. Bornstein states that cultures differ from one another and they define people’s thoughts, feelings and actions. These beliefs and mannerisms are passed on from one generation to another and guide how parents care for their children.

Two major cultural dimensions that have been widely studied as the principal structures of culture are individualism and collectivism (I-C). Yoon (2010) mentioned that psychologists who keenly studied cultural effects on people’s psychological functioning agreed on the importance of these two dimensions. Triandis (1994, 1995 and 2001) has conducted many studies on individualism and collectivism. He states that individualism exhibits cultural practices that encourage independence, whereas collectivism promotes interdependence. In relation to values, evidence shows that collectivists hold traditions and conformity in high regard, whereas individualists are more inclined to self-satisfaction and self-direction.

In addition to these discoveries, Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, and Gelfand (1995), found that there are two components of I-C: vertical and horizontal. The horizontal component focuses on equality while the vertical one gives emphasis to hierarchy. Collectively, these components
produce four constructs: vertical individualism (VI), horizontal individualism (HI), vertical collectivism (VC), and horizontal collectivism (HC).

Cozma (2011) described HI people as those who are highly self-reliant but not interested in competing with others whereas VI individuals value autonomy but are also competitive and strive to be the best in a group. Those with HC see themselves as being interdependent and similar to others in a group while those with VC see themselves as part of a group that is comprised of different people, some with more status than others. Hartung, Fouad, Leong and Hardin (2010) measured I-C among 323 undergraduate college students and investigated whether these constructs influenced career choices and work values. The results of their study displayed no significant association between cultural orientation and career choices. One explanation for these results was the presence of acculturation that had likely occurred due to the students living in the United States. In the review of their study, Hartung, Fouad, Leong and Hardin summarized HI, VI, HC and VC descriptions by explaining that individualists see themselves as autonomous and distinct from others (VI) or equivalent to others (HI). Collectivists perceive themselves as inter-reliant and either distinct from others (VC) or similar to others (HC).

The theory of I-C proposes that when personal and group ambitions are different, collectivists will lower their personal aspirations and interests in favor of those in their groups, whereas individualists will take action that is aligned to their personal interests and agenda (Triandis, 2001). Suyawen Hao (2015) highlighted the fact that individualists are judged as “good” when they display strength, initiative, uniqueness, self-confidence and independence as opposed to collectivists who appreciated when they are altruistic, reliable, generous and supportive within their social institutions.
I-C is one of the cultural dimensions discussed in Hofstede model (Mooij & Hofstede, 2010). The model ranks countries level of I-C in comparison to each other. Individualism is seen in countries such as the United States (highest scoring country), Australia, United Kingdom, Netherlands and New Zealand. Collectivism is mainly found in Asia, Africa and Latin America countries such as Russia, Japan, Nigeria, Greece, Guatemala (lowest scoring country), Indonesia, India and China. With a low score of 25, Kenya is also considered a collectivistic society.

**Figure 2.1: Differences between Collectivist and Individualist Cultures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individualism</th>
<th>Collectivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People take care of themselves and their immediately family only</td>
<td>People are expected to be loyal to theirs groups. This includes nuclear and extended family, caste)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I” mentality</td>
<td>“We” mentality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to a private life</td>
<td>Privacy can be “overrun” the groups that one belongs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged to speak one’s mind</td>
<td>Priority is giving to maintaining harmony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenses led to guilt</td>
<td>Offenses led to shame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language with the word ‘I’ is important</td>
<td>Avoid language with the word ‘I’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim of education is “how to learn”</td>
<td>Aim of education is “how to do”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks outweigh relationship</td>
<td>Relationships outweigh tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.1 Parenting Culture and Self-efficacy

The culture that parents are brought up in determines the approach they use to raise their children. A study done by Harwood, Schoelmerich, Schulze and Gonzalez (1999) observed that mothers were more likely to apply child rearing practices that corresponded to either individualistic or collectivistic cultural constructs. Results showed that European American mothers placed more importance on socialization and childrearing approaches that were in accordance with the individualistic orientation. On the other hand, Puerto Rican mothers emphasized on strategies that were collectivistic. Specifically, European American mothers were more inclined to say that they would offer their children opportunities where they could learn for themselves whereas Puerto Rican mothers most likely stated that they instructed their children through direct parental authority. For example European American mothers would use proposals (rather than instructions) and other indirect means to guide their children’s behavior while Puerto Rican mothers used more direct methods, such as demands and restrictions. Harwood, Schoelmerich, Schulze and Gonzalez noted that European American mothers focused on parenting strategies that enhanced the child's sense of independence and personal choice while the Puerto Rican mothers focused on directly guiding the child's learning experiences, thus emphasizing the child's appreciation of interpersonal responsibility.

Collectivists are inclined to assess themselves from others perception, whereas individualists tend to describe themselves from their own perspective (Triandis, 2001). Due to the fact that individualists are more self-driven, it is possible to assume that they have more positive beliefs in their ability to perform certain tasks successfully in comparison to collectivists. A cultural experiment done in East and West Berlin schools revealed a relationship between self-efficacy and I-C. Adolescents in East Berlin -a collectivistic society, had weak
efficacy beliefs in comparison to those in West Berlin - an individualistic culture (Oettingen & Zosuls, 2006).

On the other hand, we cannot presume that all collectivists are not affected by their inner state because they put more emphasis on outside information (Yu, Chen, Zhang & Jin, 2015). Thus this study explores the relationship between self-efficacy and I-C. It is intended to establish whether people from individualistic cultures have higher self-efficacy than those from collectivistic cultures.

2.4 Learning Environments

The Glossary of Education Reform (2013) defines the learning environment as the physical setting, culture and environment where students learn. In line with this definition, culture incorporates principles and traits that shape interpersonal relations and pedagogies. Students engage with their learning environment at different levels. Dunleavy and Milton (2009) discussed two dimensions of student engagement that have been reviewed in previous studies: (1) Social Engagement – being involved in the “life” of school and (2) Academic Engagement – participating in the obligations of success in school. They noted that students experience these engagements differently:

1. Behaviorally (e.g. school attendance, participation in class and extra-curricular activities, assignments and project completion)
2. Emotionally (e.g. having a sense of belonging in the classroom, sense of proficiency, interest and motivation directed towards certain tasks and topics)
3. Cognitively (Involves self-regulation and working strategically)

Malloy, Parsons and Parsons (2013) believe that students are not naturally engaged or disengaged. They are impressionable and flexible. They can easily acquire beliefs about
themselves or their external environment. Establishing a positive learning environment is central in ensuring that students participate in the education process. A positive learning environment provides an opportunity for the development of self-efficacy beliefs.

Bandura (1997) highlighted four sources of self-efficacy beliefs: (1) Mastery Experience, (2) Vicarious Experience (social modeling), (3) Verbal and Social Persuasion and (4) Physiological states. A study of German adults (age 16 –90 years) was carried out to evaluate these sources in relation to physical activity. They established that mastery experience, self-persuasion, and reduced negative physiological states were the most significant determinants of self-efficacy for physical activity in the German adults (Warner et al., 2014).

Usher and Pajares (2008) discussed different ways in which these four sources contributed to the development of self-efficacy in school settings. With regards to mastery experience they posited that when students accomplished an academic task, they judged their competence based on their interpretations of the results achieved. If they believed they had excelled, their confidence to undertake similar tasks in future would increase. On the other hand, if they believed they had failed to achieve the desired goal, they would be less confident to engage in a similar activity again.

When reviewing social modeling, Usher and Pajares (2008) noted that students were more likely to excel in challenging areas when they saw their peers conquer the same hurdles. Reassurance from trustworthy parents, teachers, and students was also seen to boost students’ confidence in their academic abilities. Finally, they also noted that the emotional states of students affected their interpretations of experiences. Negative emotional states reduced their self-efficacy while positive states raised their beliefs in their abilities.
Fencl and Scheel (2005) noted that teaching strategies (pedagogies) used in schools have an impact on students' self-efficacy. Their study revealed that pedagogies that produced positive effects on self-efficacy were those that presented an opportunity for collective learning using a comfortable and innovative approach. Tilfarlioglu and Ciftci (2011) observed that students who did not have a chance to explain themselves and regulate their own learning would not be able to be conscious of their self-efficacy. Their study revealed that there is an existing relationship between self-efficacy and students autonomy which influences academic success. They describe autonomy as a person’s ability to organize and control themselves.

Lockhorst, Wubbels and Oers (2010) identified a number of significant conditions that conversations between teachers and students must meet in order to stimulate autonomy in the pupils. First, they noted the importance of creating a respectful atmosphere that would allow a person’s nature, feelings, opinions, endowments, and aspirations to be held in high regard. A respectful environment can be established through dialogue where the teacher allows the student to initiative and creative. The teacher should also help the student to build their self-respect by guiding them to ponder on their behavior and the resulting effects. The teacher provides plenty of occasions for the student to engage in conversations and be accountable for their own development. In addition, the discussions should be more exploratory in nature as well as more reflective than instructional. Finally teachers need to promote the advancement of students’ capabilities and social skills by helping them to master the use of higher mental functions.

Students with a strong belief in their ability to control the environment are better placed in communal and educational classroom environments to maintain goal-directed conduct, take responsibility for engaging in peer relationships and adjusting their actions to sustain and develop the value of these relationships (Garger, Thomas & Jacques, 2010). These studies
highlight the fact that different factors in the school’s learning environment contribute to self-efficacy. A report done by Bascia (2014) posited that factors that influence learning environments are not isolated and they work together. He explained that a school’s environment is made up of a variety of settings such as within the classroom and outside areas e.g. halls, entertainment facilities, library and staffrooms. Constructive learning environments emphasize academic achievement but also provide a collaborative environment where taking risks and making new discoveries is valued.

Previous studies have highlighted different elements as contributors to a positive learning environment. Bascia (2014) noted that the classroom environment and teachers instruction practices have a significant effect on student learning. Additional factors that play a role in student learning include applying different teaching strategies (Hattie, 2009), tailoring learning to different individuals (Orlich, Harder, Callahan, Trevisan & Brown, 2012), setting goals and providing consistent feedback (Bascia, 2014), creating opportunities for student contribution in classroom activities (Parsons, Nuland, & Parsons, 2014) and guiding students to establish connections between different subjects (Dunleavy & Milton, 2009).

Teachers’ working environment also affects student learning. Bascia and Rottmann (2011) witnessed instruction practices and learning in primary classrooms across Canada and conducted a study of parents with children in elementary. Through this research, they identified that controllable workload and class size were significant influencers of the quality of work that teachers produced. They also noted that the presence of a cordial working environment, similar personal and organizational goals, adequate human resources, motivating professional relationships, opportunities to be learn, develop and play a part in shaping school decisions influenced student learning.
Two learning environments that have been developed in different parts of the world are (1) Traditional Learning Environments and (2) Progressive (Constructivist) Learning Environments. John Dewey, who is also known as the father of progressive education, analyzed both of these environments (Dewey, 1938). He believed that both environments have their strengths and weaknesses.

2.4.1 Traditional Learning Environments

Khalid and Azeem (2012) described the traditional learning environment as that which places more emphasis on the teacher than the student. Students focus more on covering the content they have been taught as opposed to creative thinking and engaging in innovative activities. There is little room for independent thinking and self-initiative. Teaching is mainly one-sided (from instructor to student) and it is assumed that there is a set form of information that the student needs to know. The student follows the teachers’ instruction without questioning them.

Dewey (1897) believed that traditional education fails because it disregards school as a system of social life and presents it as an environment where information is delivered, courses are taught and habits are developed. He noted that traditional learning environments place a lot of emphasis on the future – children must learn for the sake of things they will do in the future. This negates the element of learning as a life experience aimed at teaching the child to navigate through day to day living.

2.4.2 Progressive (Constructivist) Learning Environments

Students in the progressive learning environment play an active role in their learning (Khalid & Azeem, 2012). They have opportunities to take initiative and responsibility over what they learn. Teachers support them as they develop new insights. Khalid and Azeem carried out a
study to compare progressive and traditional methods of teaching English to students. The results
demonstrated that progressive teaching strategies are more effective in English communication
in comparison to the traditional method. John Dewey played a key role in discussing progressive
education. He believed that real education is generated through the activation of children’s
abilities by the demands created by their social environments (Dewey, 1897). He stated that it is
impractical to groom children to face all types of situations. Based on this understanding,
preparing a child for the future involves giving them command over themselves by training them
to exercise judgment and make use of their capabilities in different situations. The teacher assists
the child in responding to different environmental influences.

Figure 2.2: Differences between Traditional and Progressive Learning Environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Learning Environments</th>
<th>Progressive Learning Environments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School prepares for the “real world.”</td>
<td>School is a part of the “real world.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are inert, take in information and accept authority without question.</td>
<td>Students are initiative and active. They participate in problem solving and planners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are in-charge. They are sources of knowledge and authority.</td>
<td>Teachers are guides who nurture and promote thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are “foreigners” and detached</td>
<td>Parents are the principal educators, organizers and resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community is distinct from school.</td>
<td>Community is an extension of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions are made from a central place and systematically delivered.</td>
<td>Decisions are made by all integral groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course is determined by external</td>
<td>The course is determined by the schools mission,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures, predominantly test results.</td>
<td>values, principles and future goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning is linear-based on facts and specific skill mastery.</td>
<td>Learning is broad and open. Performance is based on demonstration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning is done through lectures, workbooks, pencil, paper and textbooks.</td>
<td>Learning is done through playing, personal experience, and social collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction is mainly based on accurate answers.</td>
<td>Instruction is based on questions and inquiries that are mainly produced by the children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects such as language and math are disconnected.</td>
<td>Subjects are integrated as children make associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills are trained separately and seen as goals.</td>
<td>Skills are connected to content and are regarded as tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment is motivated by grades</td>
<td>Assessment has many forms. It evaluates children’s projects and progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishment is founded on competition and generated from memory and the ability to recall.</td>
<td>Achievement is established through collaboration and applying learned behavior over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on product as the end goal</td>
<td>Focus on process and product as the end goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Peters (2012). Differences between Traditional and Progressive Education. Independent Schools, National Association of Independent Schools.

2.5 Parenting Styles

A study done by Lundberg, McIntire and Creasman (2008) revealed that family support directly influences the development of academic self-efficacy. They noted that a student’s
perception of parental support determined the level to which they developed academic self-efficacy. Young adults are exposed to different parenting styles based on the characteristics of their parents.

Baumrind (1971) recognized two broad elements of parenting styles: (1) Demandingness – This is associated with the level of parental control applied over children’s actions and (2) Responsiveness – This is defined by the extent of warmth and concern presented by parents towards their children. Baumrind then used these elements to classify three parenting styles:

1. Authoritarian – Parents are strict with high a degree of command. They make majority of the decisions for their children and require them to be obeyed without any questions.

2. Authoritative – Parents provide a balance of love and discipline. They provide an environment for open discussions and negotiating. They emphasize positive reinforcement for good behavior and punish bad behavior.

3. Permissive – Parents apply few regulations and give the children freedom to make their own choices. Their emphasis is on freedom over control.

As reviewed in the subsequent paragraphs, previous studies have shown that parenting styles are correlated with perfectionism, emotional intelligence and alcohol abuse in the youth.

Hibbard and Walton (2014) explored the association between parenting styles and definite aspects of perfectionism. Results signified that the authoritarian parenting style was related to more dysfunctional traits of perfectionism such anxieties about faults and skepticism of one’s capabilities, whereas authoritative parenting appeared to safeguard people from these maladaptive features. Generally, permissive parenting was associated with less emotion as pertained criticism from parents.
A study was carried out by Lee, Li and Thammawijaya (2013) to assess the influence of parenting styles on emotional intelligence of HIV-affected children living in Thailand. The research found that children who reported higher levels of stress experienced a less caring and more overprotective parenting style.

In a study to understand the relationship between alcohol expectancies and parenting styles, parental warmth, connection and monitoring were established as significant factors that played a protective role for the youth and their mindset towards alcohol. On the other hand, parenting styles that were made up of low levels of involvement and emotional support combined with the presence of unpredictable rules and harsh retribution presented risk factors, which had potential to lead to risky behaviors among adolescents (Laghi, Lonigro, Baiocco & Baumgartner, 2012).

Tam et al. (2012) examined the influence of authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles on adolescents’ self-efficacy level. The study showed that authoritative parenting style is highly connected to self-efficacy. Authoritarian and permissive parenting styles did not present any significant relationship when correlated with self-efficacy. In Kenya, no studies have been done to evaluate the influence of parenting styles in children’s development as examined in young adults.

2.6 Theoretical Framework

This study was guided by Bandura’s (1986) Social Cognitive Theory (SCT). Self-esteem and self-efficacy are two key components of this theory. Santrock (2012) highlighted that social cognitive theorists believed that people developed mannerisms, judgements, beliefs and emotions by watching and mentally engaging others’ behavior. SCT focuses on reciprocal interactions between the environment, behavior, cognition and other personal factors. These three variables
interact with each other and influence human functioning. Bandura refers to this as triadic reciprocal determinism (Bandura, 1997). SCT lays emphasis on how mental, behavioral, individual, and environmental factors interrelate to govern motivation and conduct (Crothers, Hughes & Morine, 2008).

Within the SCT lies the self-efficacy theory. According to this theory, self-efficacy beliefs help to govern the decisions that people make, their determination, resilience during challenging situations and the level of apprehension or tranquility they feel as they take part in different tasks throughout life. The basic principle behind the self-efficacy theory is that individuals are more likely to engage in activities for which they have high self-efficacy and less likely to engage in those they do not.

This research focuses on reviewing the influence of parenting styles, cultural orientation and learning environments on self-efficacy.

**Figure 2.3: Theoretical Framework**

Source: Researcher, 2016
This framework (Figure 2.2) shows the level of self-efficacy as a dependent variable influenced by various independent variables. The independent variables conceptualized to have a relationship with self-efficacy include parenting styles, learning environment and cultural orientation. This framework defines the categories of parenting styles that were analyzed in the research as authoritative, authoritarian and permissive. The elements of culture that were reviewed as independent variables are individualism and collectivism.

2.7 Chapter summary

This chapter reviews previous studies by other researchers on self-efficacy and its relationship to parenting, education systems and cultural orientation. It expounds on the cultural dimensions that the researcher focused on. It also highlights the role of parenting and school structures in fostering self-efficacy. The next chapter will discuss the research methodology applied by the researcher.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research methodology that was used to assess the relationship between parenting styles, cultural orientation, learning environments and self-efficacy. It reviews the research design, population, study location, sample size and sampling technique that was used. It also discusses the data gathering methods, research process and data analyzing strategies that were implemented.

3.2 Research Design

The research was carried out using a Correlational Research Design to describe the relationship between the variables. This method of research was selected because it enabled the researcher to ascertain whether or not the variables discussed in the study are related. The evidence gathered did not necessarily reflect a causal relationship but it led to a better understanding of the variables being reviewed and their correlation.

3.3 Study location

The current study was carried out at a private university; the United States International University -Africa (USIU-A) in Nairobi, Kenya. The university was selected because it has a variety of students from over 73 nationalities (History of USIU-Africa, 2016). This population comprises of people from different ethnic backgrounds, cultures, families and learning environments across the world. This diversity provided a good opportunity for the researcher to gather comprehensive data that encompassed the independent variables being assessed (different cultures, parenting styles and learning environment).
3.4 Population

The student population of the USIU-A is made up of undergraduates, masters, and doctoral students. The study population consisted of male and female undergraduate students (aged 18-30 years) who were currently enrolled in the first semester of their first year in the school. The researcher chose to work with first year students in their first semester of school to minimize the potential of receiving results that were based on acculturation from the school’s culture.

The study focused on young adults due to their capability and insight that allowed them to evaluate their childhood experiences based on the culture, parenting styles and learning environment that they were exposed to as they grew up.

3.5 Sample size and Sampling technique

The students in the desired population (First year students in USIU) are registered in different courses. However, they are all required to attend a common course - Strategies for University Success (SUS). Due to the large number of first year students, SUS is offered in 12 different classes. The researcher used the cluster sampling technique and collected data from 4 out of these 12 classes.

Based on information from the school’s registration department, 517 students were registered in SUS in January 2017. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) described sampling as the method of selecting a number of people for a research in a manner that these individuals represent the main population from which they were picked. They recommended an ideal range of 10% -30% of the target population when calculating the sample size. This insight informed the researcher’s decision to collect data from 132 students out of the total 517. The sample of 132 participants represented 26% of the target population.
3.6 Data collection methods

The researcher used a structured questionnaire as the instrument for collecting data. The questionnaire was self-administered in classrooms after seeking permission from the lecturers in charge. It had both open and close ended questions. The selection of the questionnaire as a research tool was based on the fact that it is a simple, time-saving method that allows anonymity of the participants. The questionnaire was made up of different components to assess the participants’ background in relation to culture, learning environment and parenting styles.

Section A reviewed the demographic information and national background of the participant and his family of origin. This section also included the Individualism and Collectivism Scale (also called Culture Orientation Scale) that measured four cultural constructs in the participants. These constructs include: horizontal individualism (HI), vertical individualism (VI), horizontal collectivism (HC), and vertical collectivism (VC). Section B assessed the participants’ perception of their childhood learning environment. Section C measured their perception of the parenting style applied by their parents, using the Parental Authority Questionnaire. Section D evaluated their self-efficacy levels using the General Self-Efficacy Scale.

3.6.1 General Self-Efficacy Scale

The English version questionnaire of the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE) by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995) was used. It is a ten item instrument specifically designed to measure self-efficacy in adolescents and adults. Participants are required to indicate the level to which they agree with each statement on a 4-point Likert scale that ranges from 1 “never true” to 5 “always true”. A high score points to high self-efficacy. The complete score was calculated by
attaining the sum of the all entries. The aggregate total reaches between 10 and 40, with a higher score representing greater levels of self-efficacy.

3.6.1.1 Reliability and Validity

With regards to reliability of the scale, Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995) stated that the Cronbach’s alpha was between .76 and .90 with the majority in the high .80s. This was developed from samples from 23 nations. They also established criterion-related validity reviewed from many studies that revealed positive correlations with good emotions, enthusiasm and fulfillment at work. Negative correlations were associated with depression worry, tension, fatigue and poor health.

3.6.2 Parental Authority Questionnaire

The Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) is a self-report questionnaire that was developed by Mburi (1991). It is made up of 30 items to measure a child’s perception of their parent’s use of Baumrind's (1971) parental styles (permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative). Responses are presented on a 5-point Likert scale that range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The questionnaire generates permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative results for both parents. These results are generated based on the evaluation of the son or daughter.

3.6.2.1 Reliability and Validity

Buri (1991) presented test-retest reliabilities as follows: .81 for mothers’ permissiveness; .86 for mothers’ authoritarianism; .78 for mothers’ authoritativeness; .77 for fathers’ permissiveness; .85 for fathers’ authoritarianism; .92 for fathers’ authoritativeness. He also reported internal consistency coefficients of: .75 for mothers’ permissiveness; .85 for mothers’ authoritarianism; .82 for mothers’ authoritativeness; .74 for fathers’ authoritativeness; .87 for fathers’ authoritarianism and .85 for fathers’ authoritativeness.
When analyzing the discriminant validity of PAQ, Buri (1991) discovered that students’ opinion of their mothers’ authoritarianism was negatively associated with mothers’ permissiveness \( (r = -0.38, p < 0.01) \) and mothers’ authoritativeness \( (r = -0.48, p < 0.01) \). This trend was comparable to the students’ view of their fathers’ authoritarianism which was negatively correlated with fathers’ permissiveness \( (r = -0.50, p < 0.01) \) and fathers’ authoritativeness \( (r = -0.52, p < 0.01) \).

3.6.3 Individualism and Collectivism Scale (Culture Orientation Scale)

The Individualism and Collectivism Scale was designed by Triandis and Gelfland (1998). It is made up of 16 items that assess the four constructs of collectivism and individualism:

1) HI: Measures the level at which individuals strive to be self-reliant without the need to compete with other
2) VI: Measures the degree to which individuals value independence but are also competitive and strive to be the best in a group.
3) HC: Measures the extent to which an individual sees themselves as interdependent and similar to their group.
4) VC: Assesses the level at which an individual sees themselves as interdependent but also supports competition between their in-group and other out-groups

The items are answered on a 5-point scale that ranges from 1 = Never and 5 = Always.

3.6.3.1 Reliability and Validity

Cozma (2011) presented the reliabilities for the scales as: HI \( (a = .81) \), VI \( (a = .82) \), HC \( (a = .80) \), and VC \( (a = .73) \). This was developed from United States of America samples.
3.7 Data analysis strategies

The completed and collected questionnaires were reviewed to ensure that the data shared was comprehensive enough for analysis. Thereafter the data was coded so as to efficiently categorize the responses into specific groups. The data was then entered into Microsoft Excel and thereafter, it was transferred to Statistical Package for Social Sciences -SPSS® V24.0. Data analysis was carried out using SPSS®. Each objective was analyzed to establish the correlations scores between the variables.

3.8 Ethical issues

Before filling in the questionnaires, the participants were required to sign consent forms that gave them a brief summary of the study and a few details on what was required from them. The participants were assured of confidentiality with regards to the information they shared. The researcher assured them of a safe environment where they were free to share different opinions and experiences. To ensure that the research was done in an ethical manner, the names of the participants were withheld as they filled in the questionnaires. The data collected was stored in locked cabinets.

Participants were offered a debrief form after they have filled the questionnaires to guide them on where to go in case they experience any distressing reactions based on the questions presented in the questionnaire. They were also given the opportunity to raise any concerns or ask any questions that they may have.

3.9 Chapter summary

This chapter reviewed the methodology applied by the researcher to collect data by highlighting the research instrument and design used as well as the sampling frame that was
available. The next chapter describes how the data received from participants was analyzed and interpreted.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the study that aimed to explore the relationship between parenting styles, cultural orientations, learning environments and self-efficacy among First Year students. It reviews the characteristics of the sample and evaluates their responses to the research questions. In addition it presents the results shared by the participants.

4.2 Response rate

Out of the 132 questionnaires that were handed out to the respondents, all were filled and returned giving a response rate of 100%. This was due to the fact that the researcher handed out the questionnaires during class sessions with permission from the lecturer. This gave the students the opportunity to receive clarification on any part of the questionnaire that they did not understand. The controlled environment also allowed the researcher to collect all the questionnaires that were handed out.

4.3 Demographics

The general characteristics of the sample included Gender, Age and National Background. There were more male participants than female (Figure 4.1). Majority of the students (64.4%) were between the age of 18 and 21 years. The rest of the population was mainly made up of students who were between 22 and 25 years (12.9%) and those who were under 18 years (11.4%). The female participants who were under 18 and between age 22 and 25 outnumbered the men.

The national background was segmented into different categories that described where the participants and their parents/guardians were born, raised and current citizens. Most of the
participants were Kenyan citizens (76.5%) who were raised in Kenya (78%). 6.1% were raised in more than one country. 3.8% of the participants were raised in other collectivistic countries i.e. Indonesia, China, Zambia, Botswana, Malawi, DRC, Nigeria, Pakistan, India, Burundi, Swaziland and Iran and 3% were raised in individualistic countries i.e. USA, Belgium, Britain, France Denmark, South Africa, Canada and UK (Figure 4.2).

Figure 4.1: Gender of the Participants

![Gender Distribution](image)

Table 4.1: Age of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Under 18</th>
<th>18-21</th>
<th>22-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>Above 30</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2: National Background of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one country</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Collectivistic)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Individualistic)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean score on individualism from participants in collectivistic countries was higher (male: 31 and female: 29) than the mean score on individualism from participants in individualistic counties (27-male and 27-female. The mean score on collectivism from participants in collectivistic countries was higher (male: 33 and female 34) than the mean score on collectivism from participants in individualistic countries (26-male and 34-female). These findings reveal that participants from collectivistic countries had the highest scores on both collectivism and individualism (Fig 4.2 and Fig 4.3).
Figure 4.2: National versus Individuals Cultural Orientation - Collectivistic

Figure 4.3: National versus Individuals Cultural Orientation - Individualistic
4.4 Self-Efficacy Scores

Self-efficacy scores were interpreted based on their value. The higher the score, the higher the level of self-efficacy. Results showed that the highest score for self-efficacy (40) was achieved by a male (Table 4.3) and the lowest score (19) was achieved by a female (Table 4.4). Majority of the participants had high self-efficacy scores ranging between 33-40.

Table 4.3: Self-Efficacy Scores (Above 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SE Score</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Self-Efficacy Scores (Below 29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.4: Self-Efficacy Scores (Categories)
4.5 Research Question 1

What is the relationship between parenting styles and self-efficacy?

The relationship between authoritative mothers, permissive parents and authoritarian parents was not significantly related to participants’ self-efficacy. The only parenting style that had a significant contribution to self-efficacy was the Authoritative Father ($r = -.270$, $p < .01$).

Table 4.5: Self-Efficacy Scores (Above 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Father Authoritative</th>
<th>SE Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father Authoritative Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.270**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Score Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.270**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A chi-square test was done to confirm these results. Results revealed that there is no statistically significant relation between self-efficacy and permissive mothers $\chi^2 (2) = 3.99$, $p = .136$, permissive fathers $\chi^2 (2) = 1.27$, $p = .53$, authoritative mothers $\chi^2 (2) = 3.60$, $p = .16$, authoritarian mothers $\chi^2 (2) = 0.39$, $p =.82$ and authoritarian fathers $\chi^2 (2) = 1.39$, $p =.50$. The relationship between authoritative fathers and self-efficacy was significant, $\chi^2 (2) = 6.94$, $p <.05$.

4.6 Research Question 2

Which cultural orientation (individualistic or collectivistic) is the greater determinant of self-efficacy?

The relationship between the parents' nationality (where they were born, raised, and current citizenship) was not significantly related to the participants’ individual cultural
orientation (individualistic, or collectivistic).

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict the level of self-efficacy based on the participants’ cultural orientation (individualistic or collectivistic). Individualistic and collectivistic cultural orientation was seen to be significant predictors of self-efficacy as the model is statistically significant, p<0.05 (Table 4.6). 15% of the variance in self-efficacy is explained by the participants’ individualistic and collectivistic cultural orientation (Table 4.7). Individualistic cultural orientation is a greater determinant of self-efficacy in comparison to collectivistic cultural orientation (Table 4.8). For every unit of change in the individualistic cultural orientation, self-efficacy increases by 46% while every unit of change in the collectivistic cultural orientation increases self-efficacy by 16%.

Table 4.6 ANOVAa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>392.975</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>196.487</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1949.27</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>20.519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2342.245</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.410a</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 Coefficientsa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized B</th>
<th>Coefficients Std. Error</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>13.155</td>
<td>5.629</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivistic Culture</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic Culture</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7 Research Question 3

What is the correlation between learning environments and self-efficacy?

A chi-square test was done to examine the relationship between learning environments and self-efficacy. Results revealed that there is no statistically significant association between preschool learning environments, Preschool $\chi^2 (2) = 3.364, p = .186$ and secondary learning environments $\chi^2 (2) = 3.67, p = .16$ on the participant’s level of self-efficacy. However the relationship between primary school learning environments and self-efficacy was significant, $\chi^2 (2) = 6.187, p < 0.05$.

Table 4.9 Preschool Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>3.364$a$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>3.955</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Valid Cases 103

Table 4.10 Primary Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>$6.187^a$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>9.316</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>1.068</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Valid Cases 106
Table 4.11 Secondary Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>5.222</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>5.271</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>1.465</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-Efficacy scores were between the range of 10 and 40. The highest self-efficacy scores (above 35) were reported among the participants who went to schools that had traditional learning environment (Table 4.12).

Table 4.12 Self-Efficacy Scores based on learning environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Efficacy Score ranging from 35-40</th>
<th>Pre-school</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter focuses on the results and findings of the study. It discusses the interpretation of the results of the study based on self-efficacy scores, learning environments, cultural orientation and parenting style. The next chapter discusses the findings of the study. Based on these results, a brief conclusion and recommendations are provided.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the results and findings of the study that reviewed self-efficacy in relation to learning environments, cultural orientation and parenting styles. It reviews the role of each element and explores its relationship to self-efficacy. It also gives conclusions and recommendations.

5.2 Summary of Key findings

The aim of the study was to examine psychosocial factors that contribute to self-efficacy development by specifically focusing on parenting styles, cultural orientations and learning environments as viewed in young adults between the age of 18 and 30 years.

The first objective was to establish the relationship between parenting styles and self-efficacy. The results of the study showed that there was no significant relationship between permissive mothers and fathers, authoritarian mothers and fathers and authoritative mothers. The only significant relationship was seen by authoritative fathers.

The second objective was to determine which culture (individualistic or collectivistic) is the greater determinant of self-efficacy. The researcher began by analyzing the relationship between cultural orientations of individuals and cultural orientations of countries. Hofstede, Hofstede and Minkov (2010) categorized national culture into individualism or collectivism based on the residents’ preference for a social framework that prioritizes the individual (individualistic) or the in-group (collectivistic). In this study, the individualistic countries represented by the participants as categorized by Hofstede included USA, UK, Belgium, Britain, Denmark, France, South Africa and Canada. On the other hand collectivistic countries included
Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, Somalia, Indonesia, China, Zambia, Botswana, Malawi, DRC, Nigeria, Pakistan, India, Burundi, Swaziland and Iran. Findings from the study revealed that participants from collectivistic countries had high scores of both collectivistic and individualistic cultural orientations. With regards to self-efficacy, the results showed that the individualistic cultural orientation of people is a greater determinant of self-efficacy in comparison to the collectivistic cultural orientation at 95% confidence level.

The third objective was to establish the relationship between learning environments and self-efficacy. Findings showed that there was no statistical significance in the association between preschool and secondary learning environments and self-efficacy. However, the relationship between primary school learning environments and self-efficacy was significant. Individuals who went to schools that had the traditional learning environment were reported to have the highest self-efficacy scores (above 35 out of a maximum score of 40).

### 5.3. Relationship between Parenting Styles and Self-Efficacy

The researcher’s hypothesis was that the authoritative parenting style would be the significant contributing factor to self-efficacy in comparison to the other parenting styles. Findings showed that this hypothesis was relatively true as authoritative fathers were noted to play a significant role in the level of self-efficacy. These results were similar to those established from other studies done by Tam et al. (2012) that explored the impact of parenting styles on adolescents’ self-efficacy level.

Authoritative parenting safeguards individuals from maladaptive traits of perfectionism that may lead to self-criticism, high anxiety over failure and doubt in one’s abilities (Hibbard & Walton, 2014). It also contributes to emotional intelligence (Lee, Li & Thammawijaya, 2013) and provides a protective factor that shield the youth from risky behaviors (Laghi, Lonigro,
Key traits that lead to the protective factor found in authoritative parenting is the ability of these parents to connect and be warm towards their children while at the same time monitor their day to day life. Authoritative parents offer balance between warmth and control which is a crucial element in creating a safe environment for children.

The findings of this study also emphasize the role of the fathers in the development of self-efficacy in young people. This was validated by findings from a study done by Jeynes (2016) revealed that fathers provide a unique role to the development of children and young people across all ages. This role is connected to a child’s positive psychological, social and educational results.

5.4. Relationship between Cultural Orientation and Self- Efficacy

The researcher had expected that students with the individualistic cultural orientation will have higher self-efficacy than those from collectivistic cultures. The results of this study validated this hypothesis. These findings are consistent with other studies (Oettingen & Zosuls 2006) that found that individualistic cultural values are a greater predictor of self-efficacy in comparison to collectivistic cultural values. Cultural values determine how an individual selects and weighs information from his/her environment which in turn determines their self-efficacy judgment.

These findings could be as a result of the fact that people with individualistic cultural orientations assess their self-efficacy beliefs based on their previous personal accomplishments and their sense of autonomy. On the other hand, individuals with a collectivistic cultural orientation judge their self-efficacy based on information provided by the in-group, esteemed authority and group values. The challenge with the collectivistic approach, is the fact that self-efficacy appraisal is determined by external factors that are beyond the individual’s control. This
may lead to a more inconsistent or even low judgment of self-efficacy in comparison to the individualistic counterparts that define their self-efficacy by internal factors that are more within personal control.

5.5. Relationship between Learning Environments and Self-Efficacy

The researcher hypothesized that progressive learning environments would contribute to higher levels of self-efficacy than traditional learning environments. Findings in the study showed that the only significance between the learning environments and self-efficacy was in the primary level of education. Learning environments (traditional or progressive) in pre-school and secondary were not significantly associated with self-efficacy scores. This could be explained by the fact that the primary level is the longest in most education systems. In the main education system in Kenya (8-4-4), students spend 8 years in the primary level while in the British System students spend 6 years in preparatory.

Different studies have noted the importance of learning environments in the development of self-efficacy. Usher and Pajares (2008) found that schools provide an important environment for enhancement of mastery experiences, social modeling and reassurance which are key contributors to high self-efficacy levels. Teaching strategies (Fencl & Scheel, 2005) and discussions between teachers and students (Lockhorst, Wubbels & Oers, 2010) also influence students self-efficacy. Due to the longer duration of the primary level of education, students receive more exposure to learning environments that have the potential to influence how they view themselves.

An additional factor that may influence the significance of the primary level as a key stage for the development of self-efficacy is the fact that many of the children at this point are in the concrete operational stage (7-11 years). Inhelder and Piaget (2013) described this stage as
one that is characterized by a child’s ability to organize information towards achieving a certain goal. It is the beginning of a child’s capacity to think logically. Children’s thoughts are easily molded at this stage.

5.6. Limitations of the Study

The main limitation of this study was the fact that over 85% of the sampled participants were from African countries which represented the collectivistic cultural orientation. This led to potential imbalance in the information received as most of it was based on participants from collectivistic countries.

The study also required the participants to record information on learning environments that was based on evaluations of past experiences. The accuracy of this information may thereby have been limited by an individual’s memory and willingness to bring to mind details of their past.

5.7 Conclusions and Implications of the Study

This study has contributed to the existing knowledge on self-efficacy by highlighting the influence of parenting styles, cultural orientations and learning environments. According to this research, three significant elements are related to self-efficacy; (1) the authoritative parenting style of the father, (2) the primary level of learning and (3) the individualistic cultural orientation.

These findings have a significant implication on parents, teachers and the society that seeks to encourage the development of self-efficacy amongst individuals. The information can guide parents on the appropriate parenting style to apply to their children, the culture they need to model as well as the learning environment that they choose to expose their children to. It also
provides insight on the importance of the father’s role in the child’s development. The results of this study highlight the importance of the primary level of education to teachers. With this information, teachers can be more strategic as they develop curriculum, activities, programs and games to be applied in the primary stage of learning. The society is also made aware of the impact of the culture that is passed on from one generation to another in influencing an individual’s self-efficacy levels.

5.8. Recommendations and Suggestions for future research

In light of the findings of this study, the researcher recommends that parents should be deliberate in applying the authoritative parenting style to their children. This process would begin by the parents developing awareness of their current operating parenting style and thereafter being intentional in learning to be an authoritative parent. Both parents also need to be aware of the fact that they play a unique role in the child’s life. This study highlights the significance of the father’s role in the development of self-efficacy. With this in mind, fathers can be more conscious of the words they say and the actions they take in their child’s life. The researcher also endorses the need for single mothers, widows, divorced and separated mothers to be more purposeful in connecting and allowing their children to develop relationships with positive male role models.

The researcher proposes that education policy makers pay keen attention to the learning curriculum for primary level students. They need to willfully plan for more courses, programs and activities that mold the students’ characters positively. These activities should be geared towards helping the children to be more self-confident and self-efficacious.

An additional recommendation would be directed towards all the individuals in the society. The researcher proposes that individuals should be aware of the cultural orientation that
they subscribe to as individuals and as a society in general. This knowledge will help them to understand their behavior and to recognize the cultural beliefs that have either propelled them to succeed or led to their failure or stagnation in different ventures in life. As they are enlightened on the benefits and demerits of both individualism and collectivism, they would be better placed to understand which personal traits they need to borrow, enhance or reduce from the respective cultures.

Future studies should explore the same objectives by using a sample that has an equal number of participants’ from individualistic and collectivistic countries. Additional studies can also be done on by focusing on each objective separately. The present study was made up of a participants (age 18 to 30 years) who had to give information on learning environments based on their past experiences. Future studies can focus on children who are currently in the learning environments being evaluated.
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Hello. My name is Michelle Judy Wanjiku. I am currently a student at the United States International University –Africa pursuing a Master of Arts Degree in Counseling Psychology. I am carrying out a research study as part of my Degree program and I would like you to participate in my study. If you have inquiries, my research supervisor at USIU –Africa, Dr. Michelle Karume may be contacted by email mkarume@usiu.ac.ke or tel. 020 360 6306.

Your written consent is necessary to participate so that I can validate that you have been informed of the study and that you agree to participate. You have the freedom to decline or discontinue your participation at any time during the study if you wish to do so. All the information that will be collected in this study will be kept confidential. Your name or identity will not be given in any report or publication. A number will be assigned to all the research forms you have filled to ensure your privacy is protected. You will be asked to complete a questionnaire that will review your demographic and social background. The questionnaire poses minimal risk. However, in case you experience any negative effects, the debrief form will guide you on how to receive assistance. This is not a test, there is no deception in these questions, and there is no right or wrong answer. Simply answer the questions as honestly as you can.

The aim of this research is to examine psychosocial factors that contribute to the acquisition of self-efficacy beliefs during childhood as explored in young adults between the age of 18 and 20. The study aims at exploring how these factors influence this development. It specifically focuses on establishing the role of parenting styles, culture and learning environments in the advancement of self-efficacy beliefs in young adults.
My Consent to Participate:

By signing below, I, the respondent consent to participate in this study. I fully understand what the research study involves and what is required of me. I also understand that I am free to decline to participate in this study or withdraw at any point where I do not feel comfortable.

________________________________________  ___________
Signature of Participant                      Today’s Date

________________________________________  ___________
Michelle Wanjiku (Researcher)                Today’s Date
APPENDIX II: PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

Section A: Demographics and National Background

Instructions: Kindly tick ✓ and/or fill in the appropriate answer that applies to you

1. Gender: [ ] Male       [ ] Female

2. Age (years): [ ] Below 18    [ ] 18-21    [ ] 22-25    [ ] 26-30    [ ] Above 30

3. National Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Country of Birth (where were you born)</th>
<th>Country of Upbringing (where were you raised)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father/ Guardian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother/ Guardian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I-C Scale (Kindly tick ✓ the appropriate answer that applies to you)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I'd rather depend on myself than others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>When another person does better than I do, I get tense and provoked.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I do &quot;my own thing.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The well-being of my colleagues is important to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To me, pleasure is spending time with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Winning is everything.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>If a colleague gets a prize, I would feel proud.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Family members should stick together, no matter what sacrifices are required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Competition is the law of nature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I rely on myself; not others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>It is important that I do my job better than others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>It is important to me that I respect the decisions made by my groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>It is my duty to take care of my family, even when I have to sacrifice what I want.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I feel good when I cooperate with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Parents and children must stay together as much as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION B: Learning Environment

Out of the two learning environments described below, kindly select which **ONE** mainly describes your previous schools. Kindly tick ✓ the appropriate box that applies to you.

**Learning Environment 1**

- Teachers were sources of information and authority.
- Students were encouraged to sit down and take notes. They rarely shared their opinions.
- Teacher stood at the front during lessons.
- Teachers presented concepts as facts to memorize.
- Learning was done to achieve the next level and it was carried out through lectures, workbooks, pencil, paper, and textbooks.
- Students were encouraged to give accurate answers and mainly worked alone.
- Discussions were led by the teacher.
- Achievement was founded on competition, grades, test scores and results.
- Clear and distinct rules were applied in the classroom.

**Learning Environment 2**

- Teachers guided students in thinking.
- Students were encouraged to move around, create and experiment. They had the freedom to make choices.
- Teachers presented concepts as questions to investigate.
- Teachers sat and interacted with students as part of the learning experience.
- Learning was carried out through playing, personal experience, and social interactions.
- Students worked in groups, were encouraged to ask questions and share their opinions.
- Discussions were open-ended and collaborative. Students had the freedom to share their opinions.
- Achievement was determined by collaboration and applying learned behavior over time.
- Common sense rules of life applied to classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Environment 1</th>
<th>Learning Environment 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pre-School/Kindergarten (Age 3-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elementary/Primary (Age 7-13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High School/Secondary (Age 14-18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C: Parenting Style

Instructions: For each of the following statements, tick ✓ the number of the 5-point scale that best describes how that statement applies to you and your mother/guardian and father/guardian. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you during your years of growing up at home. There are no right or wrong answers, so don’t spend a lot of time on any one item. We are looking for your overall impression regarding each statement. Be sure not to omit any items.

1=Strongly disagree  2=Disagree  3=Neither agree nor disagree  4=Agree  5=Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MOTHER</th>
<th>FATHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>While I was growing up my parent/guardian felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Even if their children didn’t agree with them, my parent/guardian felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what they thought was right.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Whenever my parent/guardian told me to do something as I was growing up, they expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my parent/guardian discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My parent/guardian has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My parent/guardian has always felt that what their children need is to be free to make up their own minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>As I was growing up my parent/guardian did not allow me to question any decision they had made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>As I was growing up my parent/guardian directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>My parent/guardian has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>As I was growing up my parent/guardian did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>As I was growing up I knew what my parent/guardian expected of me in my family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my parent/guardian when I felt that they were unreasonable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOTHER</td>
<td>FATHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My parent/guardian felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>As I was growing up, my parent/guardian seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Most of the time as I was growing up, my parent/guardian did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>As the children in my family were growing up, my parent/guardian consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>As I was growing up my parent/guardian would get very upset if I tried to disagree with them.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>My parent/guardian feels that most problems in society would be solved if parents would not restrict their children’s activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>As I was growing up my parent/guardian let me know what behavior they expected of me, and if I didn’t meet those expectations, they punished me.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>As I was growing up my parent/guardian allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from them.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>As I was growing up my parent/guardian took the children’s opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but they would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>My parent/guardian did not view themselves as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>My parent/guardian had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but they were willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>My parent/guardian gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and they expected me to follow their direction, but they were always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>As I was growing up my parent/guardian allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and they generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>My parent/guardian has always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don’t do what they are supposed to as they are growing up.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>As I was growing up my parent/guardian often told me exactly what they wanted me to do and how they expected me to do it.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. As I was growing up my parent/guardian gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but they also understood when I disagreed with them.

28. As I was growing up my parent/guardian did not direct the behaviors, activities, and desires of the children in the family.

29. As I was growing up I knew what my parent expected of me in the family and they insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for their authority.

30. As I was growing up, if my parent/guardian made a decision in the family that hurt me, they were willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if they had made a mistake.

SECTION D: S.E

Kindly tick ✓ the appropriate answer that applies to you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MOTHER</th>
<th>FATHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Hardly true</th>
<th>Moderately true</th>
<th>Exactly true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I can usually handle whatever comes my way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III: PARTICIPANT DEBRIEF FORM

Thank you for participating in this research study. In the event that you experience any distressing effects or concerns based on the questions that have been presented to you, you are free to seek assistance from the school counseling department. If you have questions regarding the research and would like to get in touch with me, you may contact: Michelle Wanjiku on Tel: +254 724 701901

Thank you for your time and participation.
Sincerely,
Michelle Wanjiku
+254 724 701901
michelle.wanjiku@gmail.com