

ARE FAMILY VALUES AND TRADITIONS PREDISPOSING FACTORS FOR INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT AMONG LITERATE EMERGING ADULTS?

Taofik Olatunji Bankole^{1*}, Timothy Olumide Okunoye², Oyeronke Christiana Paramole³, Abiodun Oluwaseun Oyeboode⁴, and David Olumide Akintunde³

¹ Department of Public Health, Osun State University, Nigeria

² Instructional Design and Community College Leadership, Mississippi State University, United States

³ Faculty of Education, Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria

⁴ Department of Social Sciences and Humanities, Federal Polytechnic, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

***Corresponding author:**
Taofik Olatunji Bankole
olatunji.bankole@unosun.edu.ng

Received: 8 December 2024

Revised: 28 May 2026

Accepted: 8 June 2026

Published: 10 August 2026

Citation:

Bankole, T. O., Okunoye, T. O., Paramole, O. C., Oyeboode, A. O., & Akintunde, D. O. (2026). Are family values and traditions predisposing factors for individual development among literate emerging adults? *Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences Studies*, 26(2), 535–551.
<https://doi.org/10.69598/hasss.26.2.275069>

The impact of family formation or systems remains critical to the proper transition from childhood to adulthood. In fact, the extent to which a youth will fit into their immediate society largely depends on the values and virtues instilled in them by their parents while growing up. The study was retrospective and adopted a quantitative cross-sectional research design to investigate the influence of family values and traditions on individual development. Using the infinite sampling method, a total sample size of 386 was derived. The convenience sampling method was used until the target sample size was reached. The outcome variable was individual development, which was measured on the basis of whether the respondents conformed to family values and traditions in their choice of career path, societal norms, and values. The explanatory variables were contextualized into family values and family traditions. The descriptive and inferential analyses were performed using SPSS version 25. The results revealed that 76.2% of the educated emerging adults admitted that their family values influenced their personality development. Additionally, 77.1% of the respondents reported that family traditions contributed to their individual development. The results of the ANOVA revealed that family values ($F = 10.15$; $p < 0.001$; $F = 3.26$; $p < 0.05$; $F = 5.34$; $p < 0.05$) and family traditions ($F = 13.07$; $p < 0.001$; $F = 14.85$; $p < 0.001$; $F = 14.68$; $p < 0.001$) were significantly associated with individual development. The results further revealed that family values and family traditions contributed approximately 9.9% and 22.1%, respectively, to personality development among the respondents. The study concluded that the family plays a significant role in raising of children who grow into adults, which not only conform to the norms and values of society but also contribute positively to the sustainability of societal development in general.

Keywords: Individual development; family values; family traditions; emerging adults; literate

1. INTRODUCTION

The family is perceived and assumed to be one of the props and dynamics that fundamentally define the nature of society. It is the child's first and most influential social system and provides him or her with the most influential social training, situation, or experience. The family is the primary agent of socialization; no other agent of socialization is as central to the child's overall development as the family (Crocetti, 2026; UK Essays, 2017; Jeynes, 2002). Therefore, how an individual is identified with an ethnic group, culture, religion, social class, and gender, whether male or female, has their origins in the family (Anggraini et al., 2024; Tomčíková et al., 2015; Jeynes, 2002). The child not only learns covert behaviour but also learns acceptable social behaviours, ethics, morality, and economic values. Additionally, how children relate to adults, how men relate to women, and how they learn to regulate their aggressiveness while cultivating competitiveness are functions of how they are brought up (Rohner et al., 2020; Adamsons & Pasley, 2016; Palkovitz et al., 2014; Tomčíková et al., 2015).

The family functions in diverse capacities, ranging from identity formation to economic values, the provision of love and security. Therefore, the value system of every family, which in some contexts is also referred to as "family tradition," forms the basis of children's aspirations later in life, as it relates to their personal development and career pursuits later in life (Hung et al., 2026; Geldhof et al., 2014; Grusec & Davidov, 2007). Family values are those learned character traits within a traditional family unit, typically characterized by high moral standards and discipline (Grusec & Davidov, 2007). Specifically, family tradition encompasses the ideas of how an individual wants to spend their life, which are habitually passed down from erstwhile generations (Bussey & Bandura, 1999; Adamsons & Johnson, 2013). In fact, family tradition helps to define behaviour in several status quo, influences decision-making among emerging adults, and solidifies bonds within the family (Jessee & Adamsons, 2018). Family values are related to the role and functions of the family and family attitudes toward assured practices and accomplishments in the community on the basis of the past records of the concerned family and its predecessors (Jessee & Adamsons, 2018; Bandura, 1999; Conger, et al., 2010; Green & Piel, 2010).

The family and its values have remained important phenomena within society. It has continued to play a major role in various decision-making processes, such as economic and personality development, as well as other practices and choices, such as types of jobs, wages, and career opportunities, and levels of financial attainment found within the family, which also strongly depend on family values (Bussey & Bandura, 1999; Jeynes, 2002; Conger et al., 2010). However, in the last few decades, in many developed economies, several changes have transpired in relation to women's participation in paid employment in the formal sector, dwindling birth rates, increasing divorce and cohabitation rates, and the erosion of family values; the family, as an institution, is at the core of most economic and social behaviour (Benson et al., 2006; Bojar, 2005; Bandura, 1977). Strong family ties have been identified as key factors that influence the extent of women's participation in formal employment, reduce fertility, increase home production, and reduce risk pooling among household members, thereby helping influence both civic engagement and political participation (Bandura, 1999; Alesina & Giuliano, 2007; Amato, 2005). Conversely, the role of family values in shaping preferences for welfare assistance and affecting an individual's perspective on education has been less extensively investigated (Doğanülkü et al., 2026; Friedrich & Schütz, 2025; Mackova et al., 2019; Amato, 2005; Banyard & Grayson, 2000).

Another value that is strongly emphasized within family values is "family tradition," which includes family history, the vicissitudes of previous generations, respect for one's ancestors, and care for one's place of repose (Adamsons & Johnson, 2013; Adamsons & Pasley, 2013; Amato, 2005). Family values, which are also related to dependence on family adherents for a set of norms of mutuality within the couple and between parents and children, are likely to influence the need and desire to resort to society and the welfare state for protection (Adamsons & Pasley, 2013; UK Essays, 2017). Strong family ties subsequently provide a form of social insurance; thus, where family values are stronger, demand for welfare support and state intervention could be lower (McLeod, 2025). Individuals who are concerned with the decline of family values reject these insights and insist that living arrangements are essential to the concept of the family and that proper families are constituted by particular types of blood and conjugal relations (Shehata & Zaki, 2024; Jeynes, 2002; McLeod, 2025). Importantly, individuals whose lives do not fit these models often defend themselves with the same family-based rationale (Shehata & Zaki, 2024; Alesina & Giuliano, 2007).

In a human context, a family is a group of people affiliated through consanguinity, affinity, or co-residence, and in most societies, it is the principal institution for the socialization of children. The primary function of the family is to perpetuate society, both biologically through procreation and socially through socialization (Jeynes, 2002; Bandura, 1977). The family functions to prepare the child for socially acceptable behaviour and influences their attitudes and sense of meaning in life (Bojar, 2005; Banyard & Grayson, 2000).

In line with the focus of this study, family values entail a set of values related to the family as a social institution in its broadest sense. On the other hand, creating a 'perfect' family has not been an easy task over time, as the family is also subjected to various dynamics within society, such as gender roles, social class, ethnic background, and family educational attainment (Rohner et al., 2020; Mackova et al., 2019; Bussey & Bandura 1999, UK Essays, 2017).

Other salient factors also constrain family values, such as broken marriages or divorces, polygamy, low-income status, parental mental stress, and domestic violence (Zambelli et al., 2025; Jessee & Adamsons, 2018; Theunissen et al., 2017; Tomčíková et al., 2015; Adamsons & Pasley, 2013; Palkovitz et al., 2014; Conger et al., 2010; Amato, 2005). In this context, family values include social values, civic values, work values, religious values, and general values such as honesty, positive attitudes, trustworthiness, quality time spent together, and compassion (Mackova et al., 2019; Green & Piel, 2010; Bussey & Bandura, 1999). Despite the fact that it is generally regarded as a "value in itself," few studies have explored the contextual factors that influence individual development among youth in Osun State, Nigeria. Hence, this study addressed this limitation by exploring the underlying variables within the context of family values and family traditions that could influence individual development, specifically among educated emerging adults across the Ile-Ife communities in Osun State, Nigeria. To address the aim of this study, the following research questions are considered necessary: how is individual development perceived by emerging adults? To what extent do family values and family traditions influence individual development among literate emerging adults in Ile-Ife communities, Osun State, Southwest Nigeria?

To address the aim of this study, the following research questions are considered necessary:

1. How is individual development perceived by emerging adults?

2. To what extent do family values and family traditions influence individual development among literate emerging adults in Ile-Ife communities, Osun State, Nigeria?

Additionally, to validate "answers" to the aforementioned research questions, the following null hypotheses were tested in this study:

1. H01: There is no significant statistical association between family values and the individual development of literate emerging adults in the studied communities.

2. H02: There is no significant association between family traditions and individual development among literate emerging adults in the studied communities.

3. H03: Family traditions and family values are not significantly associated with individual development among literate emerging adults in the studied communities.

2. THEORETICAL APPROACH

In accordance with McLeod (2025), Bandura conducted his prominent experiment, popularly known as the Bobo doll experiment, to understand patterns of behaviour through social learning theory, and the corresponding behaviours were learned by individuals who shaped their own behaviour according to the behaviours exhibited by their models. According to Bandura (1977), as cited by Larson (2000), behaviour is learned from the environment through the process of observation. Social learning theory began with Albert Bandura, who opined that behaviourism alone is not sufficient to explain all aspects of learning is involved and that behaviour and the environment interplay with each other. The vicissitudes he then detected in a child's behaviour after the child had observed an adult display aggression prompted him to use social learning theory. Social learning theory indicates that people can learn new behaviours simply by observing other individuals. A general contention states that much of the development of human cognition is explained by the interplay of internal personal factors in the form of cognitive, affective, and biological events; behaviour; and environmental variables (Zittoun & Gillespie, 2025; Lamanna et al., 2012). According to Bandura (1977) and Banyard and Grayson (2000), it was believed that direct reinforcement could not account for all types of learning and that people could learn new information and behaviours by watching other people. The application of social learning theory to family studies has proven itself beyond doubt to be a relevant theoretical framework, upon which this study could stand.

Aside from the fact that we live in a world of observation and exhibition, each of us also displays these traits to a large extent. Humans like to watch and be watched, and by watching, they learn. Social learning is not a new term for psychologists, and it is still gaining more momentum in the world of "learning," even outside the psychological realm. Social learning theory views the course of human development on the basis of children's socialization experiences and the acquisition of self-regulation. Their development of personal features, such as dependency and aggression, as well as their skills in academics, sports, arts, or professions, is believed to have emerged from learning experiences embedded within the social milieu of their family, peers, gender, and culture. Notably, observers can acquire lasting attitudes, emotional reactions, and behavioural

flexibility toward other people, places, or things that have been associated with modelling. To a reasonable extent, family traditions and values may influence individual development among emerging young adults. Hence, this study is underpinned by social learning theory, as propounded by Bandura (1999).

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1 Study area, research design and data sources

The study was retrospective and adopted a quantitative cross-sectional research design. Primary data were sourced through the administration of a well-structured questionnaire among literate emerging adults (aged 18–24 years) who were currently residents of Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria. The face-to-face method of administering questionnaires was adopted in this study. The choice of Ile-Ife as the study area was informed by several significant academic, social, and cultural factors. Only literate emerging adults who had lived in Ile-Ife for at least 5 years were considered eligible to participate in this study.

3.2 Sampling technique and sample size

The simple random sampling technique was used to obtain a total sample size of 386 respondents from an infinite population. The Cochran formula for an infinite population was used since the total population of the study area was unknown. Using the infinite Cochran sample size method, a total sample size of three hundred and eighty-six (386) respondents was derived. The convenient sampling method was used until the target sample size was reached. The convenience sampling method was adopted in this study because issues related to family traditions, family values, and individual development are personal and experience-based. Hence, eligible individuals who were reachable and obliged were more likely to provide honest and detailed data. The Cochran sample size formula is expressed as $n = (Z_{\alpha/2})^2 * (P(1-P))/(e)^2$, where $P = 0.5$, (the standard estimated value for unknown prevalence); n = the desired sample size; $Z_{\alpha/2} = 1.96$ (95% confidence limit of the survey results); and $d = 0.05$ (margin of error).

Substituting the values

$$N = (1.96)^2 * (0.5) * (0.5) / (0.05)^2$$

$$n = (3.8416) * (0.25) / 0.0025$$

$$n = 384$$

Adjusted for 10% nonresponse

$$N = 384 + 38$$

$$n = 422$$

Among the 422 administered questionnaires, 386 were completed and returned. Hence, a total of 386 questionnaires were retrieved, processed, and analyzed. On the other hand, the sample size of 386 was considered appropriate for the study of family values, traditions, and individual development because it provided statistically reliable estimates for the target population (literate emerging adults) at a 95% confidence level with a 5% margin of error. The Cochran sample size formula (Cochran) adopted in this study is commonly used in behavioural, biomedical, and social science research involving large populations. Importantly, the use of a sample size of 386 in our study was justified because it ensured adequate statistical precision, improved the representativeness of the study population, and enhanced the reliability and generalizability of findings related to family traditions, family values, and individual development within the Ile-Ife community.

3.3 Research variables

The outcome variable was individual development, which was measured on the basis of whether the respondents conformed to family values and traditions in their choice of career path and their conformity to societal norms and values. Hence, the concept of “individual development” as operationalized in the present study was restricted to family influence on the choice of career path (courses studied, currently being studied, or intended to study in tertiary institutions). The explanatory variables were contextual factors and were broadly categorized into family values and family traditions. The component analysis technique was adopted to derive a threshold point by aggregating sevenfold questions structured in a Likert-scale format. Hence, respondents who fell below the threshold point were classified as having retrospective personal development that was influenced by family values and traditions, whereas respondents who reached at least the threshold point were classified otherwise. Importantly, a set of questions employed as explanatory variables differed from those used to generate the outcome variable of the study. All explanatory variables that were employed in this study were captured in relation to how they influenced individual development.

3.4 Data analysis

Data were retrieved, entered into and exported from an Excel data spreadsheet to SPSS (SPSS version 25 for Windows, SPSS, Inc., Chicago, IL). The data were sorted and cleaned, and all the statistical analyses were carried out. Three levels of analysis were performed: univariate, bivariate, and multivariate. Univariate analysis was performed using the appropriate statistics, percentage distributions, mean scores, and standard deviations. The weighted aggregate scores for family traditions and family values in relation to individual development were generated through the adoption of component score analysis. At the bivariate level of analysis, the unadjusted one-way ANOVA statistical tool was used to determine the level of contribution of each of the explanatory variables (adjusted R^2), while the F statistic was also used to establish the level of significance between individual development and the explanatory variables of the study. Rank-ordered logistic regression was used at the multivariable level of analysis to determine the statistically significant associations between a set of multiple explanatory variables (family value-related variables and family tradition-related variables) and the outcome variable (individual development). This is with the goal of addressing the primary objective of the study. The respondents' current educational status was the "grouping variable" for the rank-ordered logistic regression. The face-to-face method of administering questionnaires was adopted in this study. The unit of analysis was a literate emerging adult who had at least a senior school certificate and who was either in a higher institution of learning, a recent graduate, or intended to study at a tertiary institution. The inferential statistical results revealed that a p-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Respondents' perception of individual development

The results of the study according to the perceptions of the respondents regarding individual development presented in Table 1 specifically indicate that the average literate emerging adult perceives that it is very true that family is important in an individual's life (4.68 ± 0.71). The results further show that half (50.7%) of literate emerging adults in the 22 to 24-year-old age group perceive that family is important in an individual's life, whereas two-thirds (66.7%) of literate emerging adults in the same age group perceive that this is not true for them. Moreover, the results specifically indicate that the average literate emerging adult in the Ile-Ife community perceives that it is true that, outside the home, an individual will think more of their family (4.33 ± 0.91), always look forward to connecting with family (4.39 ± 0.87) and will have developed a love for family members right from childhood (4.36 ± 0.82). The results further show that more than one-third (37.9%) of literate emerging adults who perceive that an individual thinks of their family when one is away from home are respondents in the 22–24 years age group, whereas three of every five respondents (60.0%) in the 18–19 years age bracket perceive that it is not true at all that emerging young adults look forward to connecting with their families.

Additionally, the results indicate that the average literate emerging adult perceives that it is true that family truly plays a major role in decision-making (4.02 ± 0.99). On the other hand, more than two-thirds (70%) of the respondents who perceive this assertion as not true are literate emerging adults in the 22–24-year age group, whereas one-third of those who perceive it as not true at all are respondents within the 18–19 years age group. The results presented in Table 1 specifically indicate that the average literate emerging adult is indifferent to whether an individual will have the kind of family he or she comes from later in life (3.75 ± 1.17). The results further indicate that 22.2% of the respondents who perceive that it is not true that they would like to have the kind of family they came from later in life are literate emerging adults in the 20–21-year age group, whereas approximately one quarter (26.4%) of those who perceive that it is true are respondents in the 18–19-year age group. Approximately one-third (31.0%) of the respondents who perceived that it was not true that family had nothing to do with their course of study at school were literate emerging adults aged 18–19 years. The results also indicate that two out of five respondents (40.0%) who perceive that family has nothing to do with their course of study in tertiary institutions are literate emerging adults in the 22–24 years age group.

4.2 Family values and individual development

The results of the study, according to the distribution of respondents by family values and individual development, as presented in Table 2, specifically indicate that, on average, literate emerging adults sometimes allow their families to make decisions for them (2.17 ± 0.98). The results further show that while two of every five respondents (40.7%) who rarely allow their families to make decisions for them are emerging literate adults in the age group of 22–24 years, nearly half (48.5%) of their colleagues who frequently allow their families to make decisions on their behalf were those in the age group of 18–19 years. On the other hand, the results specifically indicate that the average literate emerging adult frequently believes that the family plays

an important role in issues related to education (3.90 ± 1.28). Moderately, approximately one-third (32.3%) of the respondents in the 20–21-year age group also share this assertion. Moreover, the results specifically indicate that the average literate emerging adult sometimes does not see anything wrong with being obedient to a parent's view at the expense of their own preferences (2.90 ± 1.31). In addition, the results indicate that more than one-third of the respondents in the 20–21-year (37.8%) and 22–24-year (35.1%) age groups have the same assertion. Furthermore, the results specifically indicate that the average literate emerging adult rarely comes to school as a result of the value that the family places on education (2.0 ± 1.42). The outcomes also indicate that approximately one quarter (26.1%) of the respondents in the 18–19-year age group and approximately 31% of those in the 20–21-year age group never agreed with the assertion that literate emerging adults only come to school because their families value it.

As shown in Table 2, the results of the study specifically indicate that literate emerging adults rarely feel comfortable with their course of study because they only accepted it to please their parents (1.76 ± 1.19). Similarly, the results of the study specifically indicate that the average literate emerging adult rarely derives satisfaction from their course of study in a tertiary institution since the choice was imposed on them by their father (1.62 ± 1.07). The results further show that more than two-fifths (44.4%) of the respondents in the 18–19-year age group admitted that their fathers had the final say regarding their course of study in school. Similarly, the results of the study specifically indicate that, on average, literate emerging adults rarely admit that they do not find their course of study interesting but rather want to satisfy their parents' interests (1.59 ± 1.10). In addition, the results show that approximately half (48.0%) of the respondents in the 22–24-year age group and one in every four (25.0%) of their colleagues in the 18–19-year age group sometimes and frequently do not find their course of study interesting.

The outcome of the study also specifically indicates that an average literate emerging adult rarely learns some aspects of their course of study from their parents (2.22 ± 1.41). The results further show that fewer than a quarter (23.7%) of the respondents in the 18–19 years age group admitted that they always learned aspects of their studies from their parents. Correspondingly, the results specifically indicate that the average literate emerging adult frequently believes that they are doing well in school largely because of the support received from their family (3.60 ± 1.39). The results further show that while approximately one-third (34.7%) of the respondents in the 18–19-year age group always believe that they are succeeding in their studies due to the support received from their families, more than two-fifths (44.9%) of their colleagues in the 22–24-year age group rarely believe this. In summary, more than three-quarters (76.2%) of the respondents admitted that family values have no influence on their personal development.

4.3 Family traditions and individual development

The results of the study presented in Table 3 specifically indicate that the average literate emerging adult admits that it is true that they assist other students whenever they can because it is a family tradition to do so (4.02 ± 1.06). In contrast, two-thirds (66.7%) of the respondents in the 22–24-year age group maintain that this is not true for them. The results further show that, on average, literate emerging adults in the studied community posit that their family traditions teach them to treat everyone equally irrespective of their social background (4.26 ± 0.93). Specifically, approximately 40% of the respondents in the 22–24-year age group consent to the general assertion, whereas one in every five (20.0%) of the respondents in the 18–19-year age group and their colleagues in the 20–21-year age group admit that this is not true for them. It could also be specifically deduced from the study that the average literate emerging adult affirms that it is true that they are aware of how their behaviour impacts that of others (4.27 ± 0.83). Similarly, the results indicate that, on average, literate emerging adults in the studied community admit that their family traditions have shaped them in terms of how to get along with other students irrespective of how different they are from them (4.03 ± 0.91). In line with the general assertion, more than one quarter (28.7%) and nearly two out of every five (37.8%) respondents in the 18–19-year and 22–24-year age groups, respectively, affirm this. Moreover, the results specifically indicate that the average literate emerging adult admitted that, for them, their family tradition taught them that individuals could learn valuable things from other cultures (4.31 ± 0.82).

The results further specifically indicate that, on average, literate emerging adults in the studied community admit that it is true that they get along easily in the school community because of their family background (4.32 ± 0.90). Thus, while one-third of the respondents in the 18–19-year-old group (35.4%) and those in the 20–21-year-old group (33.9%) affirm that it is true for them, more than two-fifths (43.8%) of their colleagues in the 22–24-year-old group admit that it is very true for them that family traditions have taught them to show respect to people, irrespective of their backgrounds. Additionally, the results specifically indicate that, on average, literate emerging adults affirm that it is true for them that their family traditions have shaped them in terms of how to get along easily with others in the school community (3.93 ± 1.05). On the other hand, while approximately 43% of the respondents in the 22–24-year age group admitted that the general assertion was true for them, half (50.0%) of the respondents in the 18–19-year age group admitted that it was not true

for them. Furthermore, the results specifically indicate that literate emerging adults in the studied community admit that it is very true for them that their family traditions have taught them to welcome and appreciate honest individuals around them (4.52 ± 0.80). In summary, the results of the aggregate assessment of family traditions and individual development presented in Table 3 show that more than three-quarters (77.1%) of the respondents admit that their family traditions influence their individual development. Accordingly, individual development among literate emerging adults in the studied community is revealed to be influenced by family traditions.

4.4 Results of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) showing the influence of family values and family traditions on individual development

As presented in Table 4, the results of the analysis of variance indicate that individual development is significantly influenced by family values. Specifically, the outcomes show that family value plays a significant role in the choice of education ($F = 10.15$; $p < 0.001$), the decision to be in school ($F = 3.26$; $p < 0.05$), the course of study in school ($F = 5.34$; $p < 0.05$), the derivation of comfort in the course of study ($F = 2.99$; $p < 0.05$), the derivation of pleasure in the course of study ($F = 2.59$; $p < 0.05$), the lack of interest in the course of study ($F = 4.01$; $p < 0.01$), the learning of some new things in the course of study ($F = 2.57$; $p < 0.05$) and the attainment of progress in the course of study ($F = 7.31$; $p < 0.001$). Thus, the outcomes of the study indicate that there is a significant association between family values and the individual development of literate emerging adults in the Ile-Ife community. Furthermore, the results of the study specifically show that family values contribute approximately 10% to individual development among the studied population. Correspondingly, the results presented in Table 4 also indicate that family traditions significantly influence individual development.

Equally, the results specifically reveal that family traditions significantly influence the desire to provide help ($F = 13.07$; $p < 0.001$); treating others equally ($F = 14.85$; $p < 0.001$); attaining excellence ($F = 14.68$; $p < 0.001$); developing behaviors that impact others ($F = 12.07$; $p < 0.001$); the ability to cope with others regardless of diverse background status ($F = 9.50$; $p < 0.001$); cultural assimilation ($F = 9.00$; $p < 0.001$); showing respect to others regardless of diverse background status ($F = 9.26$; $p < 0.001$); easy integration into the school lifestyle ($F = 6.60$; $p < 0.001$); and developing a welcoming, as well as an appreciative, attitude towards honest individuals ($F = 12.14$; $p < 0.001$). Consistently, the results of the study show that family traditions and individual development are significantly associated. Additionally, the outcomes of the study clearly reveal that family traditions contribute approximately 22% to individual development among literate emerging adults in the Ile-Ife community.

4.5 Results of rank-ordered logistic regression showing association between family values/traditions and individual development

The results of the rank-ordered logistic regression linking family values and family traditions to individual development, as presented in Table 5, show a likelihood ratio chi-square of 94.18 with a p-value of 0.000, which is an indication that the fitted model as a whole is statistically significant in relation to the null model with no predictors. Specifically, the results of the rank-ordered logistic analysis show that conforming to family wishes in decision-making ($z = 2.66$; $p = 0.008$), adhering to family views ($z = 2.63$; $p = 0.000$), choosing to study ($z = 2.39$; $p = 0.017$), deriving comfort from the course of study ($z = 3.02$; $p = 0.003$), lacking interest in the course of study ($z = 2.38$; $p = 0.017$), learning new things from the course of study ($z = 2.07$; $p = 0.039$), and making progress in the course of study ($z = 2.17$; $p = 0.00$) are statistically associated with family values, controlling for family traditions. Similarly, from these results, we anticipate increases of 0.47, 0.62, 0.22, 0.2, 0.28, 0.12, and 0.33 in the log odds of indecision, obedience to family views, the choice to study, the derivation of comfort from the course of study, a lack of interest in the course of study, learning of some new things from the course of study, and progress in the course of study when literate emerging adults conform to family values. Invariably, the outcomes of the rank-ordered logistic regression clearly indicate that individual development among literate emerging adults in the Ile-Ife Community is significantly associated with family values.

The rank-ordered logistic regression relating family traditions to individual development indicates that the ability to assist others ($z = 4.75$; $p = 0.000$), the ability to treat others equally ($z = 4.41$; $p = 0.000$), the attainment of excellence ($z = 4.34$; $p = 0.000$), developing the behaviour to impact others ($z = 3.99$; $p = 0.000$), the ability to cope with individuals of diverse backgrounds ($z = 2.03$; $p = 0.042$), the ability to learn from diverse cultures ($z = 2.85$; $p = 0.004$), respecting others despite their diverse background status ($z = 2.52$, $p = 0.012$), easy integration into the school lifestyle ($z = 2.34$, $p = 0.019$), and developing a welcoming and appreciative attitude towards honest individuals ($z = 2.12$, $p = 0.024$) are statistically associated with family traditions, controlling for family values. Additionally, from these results, we expect increases of 0.82, 1.04, 1.02, 0.88, 0.31, 0.63, 0.53, 0.34, and 0.53 in the log odds of assisting others, treating others equally, attaining excellence, developing behaviour to impact others, coping with individuals of diverse backgrounds, learning from diverse cultures, respecting others despite their diverse background status, integrating easily into the school lifestyle

and developing a welcoming and appreciative attitude towards honest people among emerging adults with family traditions. Thus, the results consistently indicate that family traditions are significantly associated with individual development in the studied community.

Table 1: Percentage distribution of respondents by perceptions of individual development

Variables	Age of respondents in years (n = 386)			
	18-19 (%)	20-21 (%)	22-24 (%)	Total
Family is important in an individual's life				
NTAA	2 (3.3)	1 (16.7)	3 (50.0)	6
NTFM	1 (33.3)	0 (0.0)	2 (66.7)	3
NUT	3 (33.3)	2 (22.2)	4 (44.4)	9
TRM	14 (19.7)	21 (29.6)	36 (50.7)	71
VTFM	93 (31.3)	94 (31.7)	110 (37.0)	297
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	4.68±0.71			
Outside the home, it is necessary to think of one's family				
NTAA	2 (33.3)	0 (0.0)	4 (66.7)	6
NTFM	5 (31.3)	2 (12.5)	9 (56.3)	16
NUT	6 (19.4)	10 (32.3)	15 (48.4)	31
TRM	35 (28.2)	42 (33.9)	47 (37.9)	124
VTFM	65 (31.1)	64 (30.6)	80 (38.3)	209
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	4.33±0.91			
I always look forward to connecting with my family because I enjoy their company				
NTAA	3 (60.0)	1 (20.0)	1 (20.0)	5
NTFM	2 (16.7)	2 (16.7)	8 (66.7)	12
NUT	8 (24.2)	12 (36.4)	13 (39.4)	33
TRM	30 (26.1)	36 (31.3)	49 (42.6)	115
VTFM	70 (31.7)	67 (30.3)	84 (38.0)	221
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	4.39±0.87			
I have loved family members since I was young				
NTAA	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	1
NTFM	3 (30.0)	1 (10.0)	6 (60.0)	10
NUT	15 (30.6)	15 (30.6)	19 (38.8)	49
TRM	27 (23.7)	38 (33.3)	49 (42.9)	114
VTFM	68 (32.1)	64 (30.2)	80 (37.7)	212
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	4.36±0.82			
Families truly play a major role in my decision-making				
NTAA	3 (33.3)	1 (11.1)	5 (55.6)	9
NTFM	3 (15.0)	3 (15.0)	14 (70.0)	20
NUT	18 (25.0)	24 (33.3)	30 (41.7)	72
TRM	44 (31.9)	43 (31.2)	51 (36.9)	138
VTFM	45 (30.6)	47 (31.9)	55 (37.4)	147
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	4.02±0.99			
Later in my life I would like to have the kind of family I came from				
NTAA	5 (27.8)	4 (22.2)	9 (50.0)	18
NTFM	11 (25.6)	8 (18.6)	24 (55.8)	43
NUT	27 (31.0)	26 (29.9)	34 (39.1)	87
TRM	28 (26.4)	42 (39.6)	36 (33.9)	106
VTFM	42 (31.8)	38 (28.8)	52 (39.4)	132
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	3.75±1.17			
My family has nothing to do with my course of study at school				
NTAA	18 (31.0)	15 (25.9)	25 (43.1)	58
NTFM	17 (21.5)	27 (34.2)	35 (44.3)	79
NUT	24 (31.6)	21 (27.6)	31 (40.8)	76
TRM	26 (30.6)	25 (29.4)	34 (40.0)	85
VTFM	28 (31.8)	30 (34.1)	30 (34.1)	88
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	3.17±1.38			

Source: Field Survey, 2022

Note: NTAA = Not true at all; NTFM = Not true for me; NUT = Neutral; TRM = True for me; VTFM = Very true for me; $\bar{X}$ = Mean score; SD = Standard deviation; minimum = 1; maximum = 5

Table 2: Percentage distribution of respondents by family values and individual development

Variables	Age of respondents in years (n = 386)			
	18-19 (%)	20-21 (%)	22-24 (%)	Total
I allow my family to make decision for me				
NV	20 (24.5)	23 (28.4)	38 (46.9)	81
RR	62 (28.1)	69 (31.2)	90 (40.7)	221
SMT	12 (33.3)	11 (30.6)	13 (36.1)	36
FRQ	16 (48.5)	10 (30.3)	7 (21.2)	33
ALW	3 (20.0)	5 (33.3)	7 (46.7)	15
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	2.17±0.98			
I believe my family plays an important role in my education				
NV	1 (5.3)	7 (36.8)	11 (57.9)	19
RR	15 (23.4)	23 (35.9)	26 (40.6)	64
SMT	12 (40.0)	6 (20.0)	12 (40.0)	30
FRQ	26 (27.1)	31 (32.3)	39 (40.6)	96
ALW	59 (33.3)	51 (28.8)	67 (37.9)	177
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	3.90±1.28			
My aim is to obey my family's views while my own follows				
NV	7 (11.9)	21 (35.6)	31 (52.5)	59
RR	35 (30.2)	31 (26.7)	50 (43.1)	116
SMT	20 (27.0)	28 (37.8)	26 (35.1)	74
FRQ	24 (30.8)	26 (33.3)	28 (35.9)	78
ALW	27 (45.8)	12 (20.3)	20 (33.9)	59
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	2.90±1.31			
I only come to school because my family values education				
NV	60 (26.1)	71 (30.9)	99 (43.0)	230
RR	8 (19.5)	18 (43.9)	15 (36.6)	41
SMT	21 (48.8)	11 (25.6)	11 (25.6)	43
FRQ	7 (24.1)	9 (31.0)	13 (44.8)	29
ALW	17 (39.5)	9 (20.9)	17 (39.5)	43
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	2.0±1.42			
I feel comfortable with my course of study because that is what my parents do				
NV	74 (29.8)	81 (32.7)	93 (37.5)	248
RR	13 (28.9)	8 (17.8)	24 (53.3)	45
SMT	15 (32.6)	13 (28.3)	18 (39.1)	46
FRQ	5 (16.7)	12 (40.0)	13 (43.3)	30
ALW	6 (35.3)	4 (23.5)	7 (41.2)	17
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	1.76±1.19			
I find pleasure in my course of study because my father recommended it				
NV	72 (27.3)	86 (32.6)	106 (40.2)	264
RR	18 (40.0)	13 (28.9)	14 (31.1)	45
SMT	10 (25.0)	11 (27.5)	19 (47.5)	40
FRQ	8 (29.6)	7 (25.9)	12 (44.4)	27
ALW	4 (40.0)	2 (20.0)	4 (40.0)	10
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	1.62±1.07			
I do not find my course of study interesting, but that is what my parents want				
NV	83 (30.5)	88 (32.4)	101 (37.1)	272
RR	17 (32.7)	13 (25.0)	22 (42.3)	52
SMT	7 (28.0)	6 (24.0)	12 (48.0)	25
FRQ	5 (25.0)	6 (30.0)	9 (45.0)	20
ALW	1 (5.9)	5 (29.4)	11 (64.7)	17
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	1.59±1.10			
I learn some things I know in my course of study from my parents				
NV	54 (29.8)	56 (30.9)	71 (39.2)	181
RR	20 (29.4)	22 (32.4)	26 (38.2)	68
SMT	14 (31.1)	14 (31.1)	17 (37.8)	45
FRQ	16 (29.6)	15 (27.8)	23 (42.6)	54
ALW	9 (23.7)	11 (28.9)	18 (47.4)	38
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	2.22±1.41			

Table 2: Percentage distribution of respondents by family values and individual development (continued)

Variables	Age of respondents in years (n = 386)			
	18-19 (%)	20-21 (%)	22-24 (%)	Total
I believe I am doing well in my studies due to the support of my family				
NV	11 (23.9)	14 (30.4)	21 (45.6)	46
RR	12 (24.5)	15 (30.6)	22 (44.9)	49
SMT	21 (34.4)	16 (26.2)	24 (39.3)	61
FRQ	19 (22.1)	28 (32.6)	39 (45.4)	86
ALW	50 (34.7)	45 (31.3)	49 (34.0)	144
$\bar{X}\pm SD$	3.60±1.39			
Aggregate assessment of family values on individual development				
	Had influence (%)		Had no influence (%)	
Family value	92 (23.8)		294 (76.2)	
$\bar{X}\pm SD$ *(min = 1, max = 2)	1.24±0.43			

Source: Field Survey, 2022

Note: NV = Never; RR= Rarely; SMT = Sometimes; FRQ = Frequently; ALW= Always; $\bar{X}$ = Mean score; SD = Standard deviation; minimum = 1; maximum = 5; *(min = 1, max = 2)**Table 3:** Percentage distribution of respondents by family traditions and individual development

Variables	Age of respondents in years (n = 386)			
	18–19 (%)	20–21 (%)	22–24 (%)	Total
I assist other students when I can because I have learnt to do so from my parents				
NTAA	1 (6.7)	4 (26.7)	10 (66.7)	15
NTFM	8 (36.4)	4 (18.2)	10 (45.5)	22
NUT	18 (31.6)	17 (29.8)	22 (38.6)	57
TRM	40 (28.8)	45 (32.4)	54 (38.9)	139
VTFM	46 (30.1)	48 (31.4)	59 (38.6)	153
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	4.02±1.06			
I think everyone should be treated equally because I have learnt fairness from family				
NTAA	1 (11.1)	1 (11.1)	7 (77.8)	9
NTFM	3 (20.0)	3 (20.0)	9 (60.0)	15
NUT	7 (22.6)	11 (35.5)	13 (41.9)	31
TRM	43 (29.9)	42 (29.2)	59 (40.9)	144
VTFM	59 (31.6)	61 (32.6)	67 (35.8)	187
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	4.26±0.93			
What I learn from my family makes me aim for excellence				
NTAA	0 (0.0)	2 (25.0)	6 (75.0)	8
NTFM	2 (20.0)	2 (20.0)	6 (60.0)	10
NUT	12 (33.3)	8 (22.2)	16 (44.4)	36
TRM	27 (23.3)	46 (39.7)	43 (37.1)	116
VTFM	72 (33.3)	60 (27.8)	84 (38.9)	216
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	4.35±0.91			
I am aware of how my behaviour impacts others				
NTAA	1 (33.3)	0 (0.0)	2 (66.7)	3
NTFM	2 (16.7)	5 (41.7)	5 (41.7)	12
NUT	12 (29.3)	12 (29.3)	17 (41.5)	41
TRM	46 (30.7)	45 (30.0)	50 (39.3)	150
VTFM	52 (28.9)	56 (31.1)	72 (40.0)	180
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	4.27±0.83			
I get along with students who are different from me				
NTAA	1 (25.0)	2 (50.0)	1 (25.0)	4
NTFM	4 (26.7)	5 (33.3)	6 (40.0)	15
NUT	30 (35.3)	22 (25.9)	33 (38.8)	85
TRM	41 (28.7)	48 (33.6)	54 (37.8)	143
VTFM	37 (26.6)	41 (29.5)	61 (43.9)	139
$\bar{X} \pm SD$	4.03±0.91			

Table 3: Percentage distribution of respondents by family traditions and individual development (continued)

Variables	Age of respondents in years (n = 386)			
	18–19 (%)	20–21 (%)	22–24 (%)	Total
I believe we can learn valuable things from other cultures				
NTAA	1 (25.0)	1 (25.0)	2 (50.0)	4
NTFM	3 (33.3)	2 (22.2)	4 (44.4)	9
NUT	12 (32.4)	16 (43.2)	9 (24.3)	37
TRM	47 (31.1)	45 (29.8)	59 (29.1)	151
VTFM	50 (27.0)	54 (29.2)	81 (43.8)	185
$\bar{X}\pm SD$	4.31±0.82			
I show respect for people, no matter who they are				
NTAA	1 (16.7)	1 (16.7)	4 (66.7)	6
NTFM	3 (27.3)	3 (27.3)	5 (45.5)	11
NUT	9 (24.3)	9 (24.3)	19 (51.4)	37
TRM	46 (35.4)	44 (33.9)	40 (30.8)	130
VTFM	54 (26.7)	61 (30.2)	87 (43.1)	202
$\bar{X}\pm SD$	4.32±0.90			
I get along easily in the school community due to my family background				
NTAA	6 (50.0)	2 (16.7)	4 (33.3)	12
NTFM	13 (56.5)	5 (21.7)	5 (21.7)	23
NUT	27 (31.0)	28 (32.2)	32 (36.8)	87
TRM	20 (16.5)	48 (39.7)	53 (43.8)	121
VTFM	47 (32.9)	35 (24.5)	61 (42.7)	143
$\bar{X}\pm SD$	3.93±1.05			
I welcome and appreciate honest people around me				
NTAA	1 (16.7)	1 (16.7)	4 (66.7)	6
NTFM	1 (25.0)	1 (25.0)	2 (50.0)	4
NUT	8 (30.8)	9 (34.6)	9 (34.6)	26
TRM	25 (26.3)	29 (30.5)	41 (43.2)	95
VTFM	78 (30.6)	78 (30.6)	99 (38.8)	255
$\bar{X}\pm SD$	4.52±0.80			
Aggregate assessment of influence of family traditions on individual development				
	Had influence (%)		Had no influence (%)	
Family traditions	297 (76.9)		89 (23.1)	
$\bar{X}\pm SD$ *(min = 1, max = 2)	1.77±0.42			

Source: Field Survey, 2022

Note: NTAA = Not true at all; NTFM = Not true for me; NUT = Neutral; TRM = True for me; VTFM = Very true for me; $\bar{X}$ = Mean score; SD = Standard deviation; minimum = 1; maximum = 5*(min = 1, max = 2)

Table 4: Results of the one-way ANOVA showing the relationships among individual development, family values, and family traditions

Source	Family values and individual development				
	Partial SS	df	MS	F-statistics	Prob. > F
Model	15.858	37	0.429	2.15	0.000***
I allow my family to make decisions for me	1.401	4	0.350	1.59	0.176
I believe my family plays an important role in my education	8.207	4	2.06	10.15	0.000***
My aim is to obey my family's views rather than my own follows	2.819	4	0.705	3.26	0.012*
I only come to school because my family values education	4.527	4	1.132	5.34	0.000***
I feel comfortable with my course of study because that is what my parents do	2.590	4	0.648	2.99	0.019*
I find pleasure in my course of study because my father recommended it	2.807	4	0.561	2.59	0.026*
I do not find my course of study interesting, but that is what my parents want	3.442	4	0.860	4.01	0.003**
I learn some things I know in my course of study from my parents	2.242	4	0.561	2.57	0.037*
I believe I am doing well in my studies due to the support of my family	6.076	4	1.519	7.31	0.000***
Residual	69.357	348	0.199		
Total	85.216	385	0.221		
Number of Obs			386		
Adjusted - R²			0.099		

Table 4: Results of the one-way ANOVA showing the relationships among individual development, family values, and family traditions (continued)

Source	Family values and individual development				
	Partial SS	df	MS	F-statistics	Prob. > F
Model	25.222	37	0.682	3.95	0.000***
I assist other students when I can because I have learnt to do so from my parents	10.283	4	2.571	13.07	0.000***
I think everyone should be treated equally because I have learnt fairness from family	11.492	4	2.873	14.85	0.000***
What I learn from my family makes me aim for excellence	11.382	4	2.85	14.68	0.000***
I am aware of how my behaviour impacts others	9.583	4	2.396	12.07	0.000***
I get along with students who are different from me	7.723	4	1.932	9.50	0.000***
I believe we can learn valuable things from other cultures	7.354	4	1.839	9.00	0.000***
I show respect for people, no matter who they are	9.257	4	1.851	9.26	0.000***
I get along easily in the school community due to my family background	5.523	4	1.381	6.60	0.000***
I welcome and appreciate honest people around me	9.632	4	2.408	12.14	0.000***
Residual	59.993	348	0.172		
Total	85.215	385	0.221		
Number of Obs			386		
Adjusted - R²			0.221		

Note: *Significant at $p < 0.05$, **Significant at $p < 0.01$, ***Significant at $p < 0.001$; Obs = observations; df = degrees of freedom; SS = sum of squares; MS = mean of sums

Table 5: Rank-ordered logistic regression results showing the associations between family values, family traditions, and individual development

Variable	B	Std. Err.	Z	P> z
Family values				
I allow my family to make decisions for me	0.466	0.175	2.66	0.008**
I believe my family plays an important role in my education	-0.075	0.069	-1.07	0.286
My aim is to obey my family's views rather than my own	0.615	0.170	3.63	0.000***
I only come to school because my family values education	0.224	0.094	2.39	0.017*
I feel comfortable with my course of study because that's what my parents do	0.202	0.067	3.02	0.003**
I find pleasure in my course of study because my father recommended it	0.073	0.058	1.27	0.205
I do not find my course of study interesting, but that is what my parents want	0.275	0.115	2.38	0.017*
I learn some things I know in my course of study from my parents	0.116	0.056	2.07	0.039*
I believe I am doing well in my studies due to the support of my family	0.331	0.153	2.17	0.030*
Family traditions				
I assist other students when I can because I have learnt to do so from my parents	0.818	0.172	4.75	0.000***
I think everyone should be treated equally because I have learnt fairness from family	1.042	0.236	4.41	0.000***
What I learn from my family makes me aim for excellence	1.024	0.236	4.34	0.000***
I am aware of how my behaviour impacts others	0.884	0.222	3.99	0.000***
I get along with students who are different from me	0.307	1.514	2.03	0.042*
I believe we can learn valuable things from other cultures	0.626	0.219	2.85	0.004**
I show respect for people, no matter who they are	0.525	0.208	2.52	0.012*
I get along easily in the school community due to my family background	0.338	0.144	2.34	0.019*
I welcome and appreciate honest people around me	0.529	0.250	2.12	0.034*

Log-likelihood = -187.104

LRC (Chi 2) = 94.18

Prob. > Chi 2 = 0.000***

Number of Observations = 386

Number of groups = 5

Note: *Significant at $p < 0.05$, **Significant at $p < 0.01$, ***Significant at $p < 0.001$

5. DISCUSSION

This study examined the influence of family values and traditions on individual development among literate emerging adults across communities in Ile-Ife, Osun State, Southwest Nigeria. Empirical evidence from the study revealed that the choice of career paths among literate emerging adults was largely predisposed by the values placed on particularly courses of study by parents. For example, more than half (3.90 ± 1.28) of the respondents admitted that their parents played significant roles in their education. In fact, it was explicitly maintained by nearly half (2.0 ± 1.42) of the respondents that they were only in school to please their parents, who strongly desired this for them. There is no doubt that passions and capabilities are key factors in making career choices in life. However, our findings revealed that a significant proportion of the respondents opted for their pursuit of careers in tertiary institutions purposely to satisfy what their parents or family at large considered appropriate for them. For example, we observed that less than half of the respondents felt neither comfortable (1.76 ± 1.190) nor derived pleasure (1.62 ± 1.07) from the courses that they were studying at school. Evidence from this study supports the findings of Anggraini et al. (2024), Jessee and Adamsons (2018), and Mackova et al. (2019), who identified family arrangements and intergenerational viewpoints that play significant roles in the transition from childhood to emerging adulthood.

Apparently, family values play a positive role in individual development. We observed that no fewer than half (3.60 ± 1.39) of the respondents reported that their parents had a great deal of positive impact on their academic programs. In this context, our study empirically revealed that family values are among the core predictors of individual development across communities in Ile-Ife. Therefore, the proper transformation of emerging adults into individuals of values, characters, and adults that may conform perfectly to their immediate environment and society at large relies extensively on values shared or held by their respective families. In view of this, our findings corroborated those of Anggraini et al. (2024), Green and Piel (2010), Grusec and Davidov (2007), Benson et al. (2006), and Amato (2005), who reported that family structure and proper parental upbringing play significant roles in the development, acceptance, and integration of young adults into society.

Another key observation in this study is the establishment of a causal association between traditions and individual development. Unlike the direct link between family values and individual development among literate emerging adults in the studied communities, our empirical findings revealed that traditional values such as family histories of success, imbibed traits of goodness, and respect for others were key drivers of personality development among the respondents. For example, nearly all the respondents (4.35 ± 0.91) claimed that the pursuit of excellence in life was because their families were known for it and that they intended to sustain this tradition. Similarly, the majority of the respondents (4.26 ± 0.93) reported to treating everyone equally because they were taught to do so in their respective families.

We equally discovered that the majority (4.02 ± 1.06) of the respondents admitted to providing assistance to people in need because they were taught to render help by their parents while they were growing up. Our findings support those of Shirzad et al. (2026), Palkovitz et al. (2014), McLeod (2025), and Alesina and Giuliano (2007), who consistently argued that children who were rejected by their parents or brought up by single parents, as well as those whose parents failed to give them the best home training, were more likely to find it difficult to conform to societal norms and values. Our findings supported these earlier studies.

Moreover, the traits of respect (4.32 ± 0.90) and harmony (4.03 ± 0.91) possessed by a larger proportion of the respondents were claimed to be passed to them by their parents. In fact, nearly all the respondents appeared to uphold the virtue of honesty (4.52 ± 0.80), whereas no fewer than half (3.93 ± 1.05) of the respondents admitted that they were able to get along well with their colleagues in school because their family backgrounds had prepared them for it. Our findings were somewhat in line with those of Shehata and Zaki (2024), Crocetti (2026), Theunissen et al., (2017), UK Essays (2017), and Amato (2005), who reported that the behavioural attitudes of young adults, as well as their concerns for their peers in need and their willingness to assist those requiring help, were largely dependent on how much of these virtues were passed to them by their parents or guardians, as the case may be.

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our study clearly revealed that personality and individual development are influenced by family values and traditions. The evidence from the study clearly revealed that the family plays a significant role in helping emerging adults develop and conform to societal norms and values that would make them best suited to society and enable them to achieve their set goals in life without any regrets. On the basis of the evidence from the study, parental support should be more focused on the mentorship and guidance of their growing children, as it is related to their choice of career path and should conform to societal norms and values that

would make them acceptable and respected in their immediate societies rather than trying to convince or perhaps confuse them to follow their own paths. In fact, parental mentorship with respect to career choice should be built primarily on the strengths, capabilities, passions, and future aspiration of these young adults. Thus, literate emerging adults should be made to have their say in regard to their career pursuits in life. The family plays a major role in the formation of personality and the worldview of a child. Hence, family values and norms that could hinder children's personality development should be discarded by every parent as their children pass through the formative stage of life.

7. LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The main limitation of our study on individual development was the use of the convenience sampling method, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to the broader population. For example, since participants were chosen on the basis of accessibility and willingness to take part in the study, not every eligible member of the target population had an equal chance of being recruited to the study. Additionally, the findings may reflect the sociocultural realities of the Ile-Ife community and may not fully represent other communities with different religious, cultural, and socioeconomic contexts in Nigeria. Additionally, time and financial constraints also constituted limitations of the study. Furthermore, changes in modern social influences such as social media exposure, urbanization, and globalization may also affect family values and traditions differently across individuals, making it difficult to completely isolate the influence of family factors on individual development.

Despite the aforementioned limitations, the findings of this study have significant implications for families, policymakers, educators, community leaders, and researchers. The findings of this study suggest that strengthening positive family relationships and cultural practices may contribute to healthier individual development within the community. This study provides findings that may help parents and custodians understand the implications of transmitting discipline, respect, moral values, and cultural identity to younger generations, especially in a rapidly shifting contemporary society. Furthermore, the findings of this study may provide valuable data for educational bodies, social workers, and counsellors in developing programmes that encourage constructive behavioral development, family bonding, and formative years of mentorship. In addition, this information can support policy design. Thus, the findings of this study may be used by government agencies and community bodies to design interventions intended to preserve valuable cultural traditions and encourage family-centered social development. Additionally, this study addresses a gap in the literature and contributes to the existing body of knowledge on cultural traditions, family systems, and human development within the Nigerian and sub-Saharan African context, thereby serving as a reference resource for future researchers in similar areas. This study encourages further research on how technology, modernization, and globalization influence traditional family structures and the developmental outcomes of emerging adults in contemporary society.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors sincerely acknowledge the valuable contribution of Dr. Moses A. Adeoye in proofreading this article. His careful review and constructive language-editing suggestions substantially improved the articles readability, consistency and academic presentation. The authors accept full responsibilities for any errors that may remain.

DECLARATION

1. Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

2. Generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

The graphical abstract accompanies this study was created with the assistance of Nano Banana, an Ai-assisted image generation and editing tool. The authors reviewed and modified the generated output as necessary and accept full responsibility for the accuracy, interpretation, and presentation of the final graphical abstract.

3. Data availability statement

The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request for academic and research purposes.

4. Ethics statement

An informed consent was obtained from the participants, and permission to withdraw from the research without any damage to interests was obtained. Throughout the study, thirty-six (36) out of the four hundred and twenty-two (422) participants felt uncomfortable at one point or another, and were allowed to discontinue the interview.

5. Funding

This study received no specific financial support.

6. Contributor Role Taxonomy (CRediT)

Taofik Olatunji Bankole: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Formal Analysis, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

Timothy Olumide Okunoye: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Writing – original draft, Validation, Writing – review & editing.

Oyeronke Christiana Paramole: Investigation, Writing – original draft, Validation, Writing – review & editing.

Abiodun Oluwaseun Oyeboade: Investigation, Writing – original draft, Validation, and Writing – review & editing.

David Olumide Akintunde: Investigation, Formal Analysis, Writing – original draft, Validation.

ORCID

Taofik Olatunji Bankole: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9366-0416>

Timothy Olumide Okunoye: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0185-262x>

Oyeronke Christiana Paramole: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3535-6026>

Abiodun Oluwaseun Oyeboade: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5578-6512>

David Olumide Akintunde: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0389-1801>

REFERENCES

- Adamsons, K., & Johnson, S. K. (2013). An updated and expanded meta-analysis of non-resident fathering and child well-being. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 27(4), 589–599. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033786>
- Adamsons, K., & Pasley, K. (2013). Refining identity theory to better account for relationship and context: Application to fathering. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 5(3), 159–175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12014>
- Adamsons, K., & Pasley, K. (2016). Parents' fathering identity standards and later father involvement. *Journal of Family Issues*, 37(2), 221–244. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X13514407>
- Alesina, A. F., & Giuliano, P. (2007). *The power of the family* (Harvard Institute of Economic Research Discussion Paper No. 2132). SSRN. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.980948>
- Amato, P. R. (2005). The impact of family formation change on the cognitive, social, and emotional wellbeing of the next generation. *Journal of Future of Children*, 15(2), 75–96. <https://doi.org/10.1353/foc.2005.0012>
- Anggraini, S., Simatupang, R., Purba, E., & Turnip, H. (2024). Perkembangan Individu Prinsip Dasar Perkembangan Individu [Individual development basic principles of individual development]. *Jurnal Trust Pentakosta*, 1(1). <https://jurnal.institutrenatus.ac.id/index.php/jtp/article/view/312> [in Indonesian]
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Bandura, A. (1999). A social cognitive theory of personality. In L. Pervin & O. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality* (2nd ed., pp. 154–196). Guilford Publications.
- Banyard, P., & Grayson, A. (2000). *Introducing psychological research* (2nd rev. ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Benson, P. L., Scales, P. C., Hamilton, S. F., & Sesma, A. (2006). Positive youth development: Theory, research and applications. In R. M. Lerner & W. Damon (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (6th ed., pp. 894–941). John Wiley & Sons.
- Bojar, H. (2005). Family values from the parental perspective. *Polish Sociological Review*, 151, 281–290. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41274932>
- Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological Review*, 106(4), 676–713. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.106.4.676>

- Conger, R. D., Conger, K. J., & Martin, M. J. (2010). Socioeconomic status, family processes, and individual development. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 685–704. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00725.x>
- Crocetti, E. (2026). Adolescent identity development processes, implications and interventions. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 5, 441–457. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-026-00569-8>
- Doğanülkü, H. A., Duru, H., Pakpour, A. H., & Griffiths, M. D. (2026). A longitudinal mediation model of career self-efficacy, decidedness, and proactive behavior. *Scientific Reports*, 16, Article 21075. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-026-51171-0>
- Friedrich, T. S., & Schütz, A. (2025). Self-esteem change during career entry. *Journal of Adult Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10804-025-09541-x>
- Geldhof, G., Bowers, E. P., Boyd, M. J., Mueller, M. K., Napolitano, C. M., Schmid, K. L., Lerner, J. V., & Lerner, R. M. (2014). Creation of short and very short measures of the five Cs of positive youth development. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 24(1), 163–176. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12039>
- Green, M. G., & Piel, J. A. (2010). *Theories of human development: A comparative approach* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315662466>
- Grusec, J. E., & Davidov, M. (2007). Socialization in the family: The roles of parents. In J. E. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research* (pp. 284–308). Guilford Press.
- Hung, M.-T., Wu, J., Hung, L.-C., Smith, C. S., & Hung L.-S. (2026). Parental emotional warmth and career choice anxiety: A chain-mediation study in China. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 17, Article 1813789. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2026.1813789>
- Jessee, V., & Adamsons, K. (2018). Father involvement and father-child relationship quality: An intergenerational perspective. *Parenting*, 18(1), 24–44. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15295192.2018.1405700>
- Jeynes, W. (2002). *Divorce, family structure, and the academic success of children*. Routledge.
- Lamanna, M. A., Riedmann, A., & Strahm, A. (2012). *Marriages, families, and relationships: Making choices in a diverse society* (11th ed.). Cengage Learning; Wadsworth.
- Larson, R. W. (2000). Toward a psychology of positive youth development. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 170–183. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.170>
- Mackova, J., Dankulincova Veselska, Z., Filakovska Bobakova, D., Madarasova Geckova, A., van Dijk, J. P., & Reijneveld, S. A. (2019). Crisis in the family and positive youth development: The role of family functioning. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(10), Article 1678. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16101678>
- McLeod, S. (2025, October 16). *Albert Bandura's social learning theory*. Simply Psychology. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/bandura.html>
- Palkovitz, R., Trask, B. S., & Adamsons, K. (2014). Essential differences in the meaning and processes of mothering and fathering: Family systems, feminist and qualitative perspective [Special issue]. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 6(4), 406–420. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12048>
- Rohner, R. P., Putnick, D. L., Molaver, A. D., Ali, S., Butt, M. M., Ibrahim, D. M., Aurino, C., Blom, M. J., Darwesh, F. H., Auricchio, S., Radha, A. H., Miranda, M. C., Adamsons, K., & Senese, V. P. (2020). Psychological maladjustment mediates the link between remembrance of parental rejection in childhood and loneliness in adulthood: A cross-cultural comparative study. *International Journal of Psychology*, 55(4), 590–600. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12621>
- Shehata, M. A., & Zaki, N. M. (2024). Relations between parental acceptance-rejection and forgiveness/vengeance as mediated by psychological adjustment among Egyptian adults. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 185(3), 181–193. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221325.2023.2292728>
- Shirzad, K., Allison, P., & Agans, J. (2026). Integrating purpose, hope, and critical consciousness with the 7C model of positive youth development: A holistic approach to understanding contribution. *Frontiers in Developmental Psychology*, 4, Article 1735122. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fdpys.2026.1735122>
- Theunissen, M. H., Velderman, M. K., Cloostermans, A. P., & Reijneveld, S. A. (2017). Emotional and behavioural problems in young children with divorced parents. *European Journal of Public Health*, 27(5), 840–845. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckx056>
- Tomčíková, Z., Veselská, Z. D., Gecková, A. M., van Dijk, J. P., & Reijneveld, S. A. (2015). Adolescents' drinking and drunkenness more likely in one-parent families and due to poor communication with mother. *Central European Journal of Public Health*, 23(1), 54–58. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21101/cejph.a3951>
- UK Essays. (2017, May 12). *The sociological definition of family*. <https://www.ukessays.com/essays/sociology/the-definition-of-family-sociology-essay.php?vref=1>

- Zambelli, M., Tse, D. C. K., Cowden, R. G., Hölzge, J., Johnson, B. R., Padgett, R. N., & VanderWeele, T. J. (2025). The psychometric network of individual flourishing across nationally representative samples from 22 countries. *Scientific Reports*, 15, Article 30206. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-15016-6>
- Zittoun, T., & Gillespie, A. (2025). Theorising human development in adult life: A complex, multidimensional, dynamic, situated model. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioural Science*, 59, Article 77. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-025-09946-z>