Family Healthiness and its Determinants in a Multicultural Context: Case Study of Yaounde, Cameroon

Adda KISONI KAHAMBU[1], Lawrence NTAM NCHIA[2*]

[1]*Ph.D. Student, University Institute of International Development, Mokolo, Far North Cameroon.*
[2]*Senior Lecturer, Department of Sciences of Education, Higher Teachers' Training College Yaounde, University of Yaounde 1, Cameroon.*

*****Corresponding Author:** *Lawrence NTAM NCHIA, Senior Lecturer, Department of Sciences of Education, Higher Teachers' Training College Yaounde, University of Yaounde 1, Cameroon*

Abstract: *Cameroon is considered as Africa in miniature because of its bilingualism and multiculturalism. This once "triangle of peace" is currently been challenged by several securities, sociocultural and political crisis over the past years. A cross sectional research design on a purposeful sampled of 814 respondents was done using FACES IV & the Circumplex Model questionnaire developed to investigate the current state of health of families and the parameters which may influence them.*

Descriptive statistics revealed that overall the families were very connected emotional; flexible in terms of leadership and organisation; feel good about their family communication and are satisfied with most aspects of their family. A positive strong correlation was established between these four main constructs. The healthiness of these multicultural families were determined by three parameters only: Religion, language and level of education. Gender, age, and socioeconomic status of respondents had no influence.

These results reflect the impact of religion, colonial languages and education on family healthiness and consequently on peace in Cameroon. These findings would enable us to develop constructivist strategies to overcome identified obstacles for a desired conceptual change in families, an effective strategy for the achievement of SDG3 (ensure healthy life and wellbeing for all at all ages) and SDG16 (promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development) well as enhance her vision of becoming an emergent state by 2035.

Keywords: *Family Health; Peace; FACES IV, Circumplex Model, Multiculturalism, Cameroon*

1. INTRODUCTION

In the face of socio-political crisis and armed conflict that has rocked Cameroon over the past six years, one of the slogan promoted by government to promote peace and unity in diversity is concept of «living together» or «vivre ensemble». The question most Cameroonian have been asking is how to realise and promote this concept of living together. It is just a political slogan or can it be realised? Which citizenship values are needed to promote such a desired peaceful nation? Is it possible for peace and unity to be realised in a multi-cultural and ethnic society like that of Cameroon?

This desire to reinstate a peaceful nation in Cameroon via inclusive dialogue and negotiation has motivated this research to study the basic unity of society, the family, where these competences are linked via family flexibility. Knowledge of the determinants of a healthy family and a vivid description of how this concept is perceived and lived within the families can go a long way to develop strategies to build a peaceful nation in Cameroon.

The family is the structure and functional unit of society and requires to be in good health for its members to learn to love themselves, feel supported, secured and cope with challenges to achieve their full potentials. Healthy family, according to Lin (1994) is where there is commitment, togetherness, appreciation, good communication, spiritual well-being and coping with crisis and stress. This healthy family produces responsible citizens. The African family charters, the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) recognize the family institution as a foundation of society and thus societies are encouraged to strengthen this institution. The African Charter further urges states to take care of family health and morale (Organization of African Unity - OAU, 1982).

Healthy families are vital for the well-being of their members, their communities as well as for the social stability of a society (Aharoni, 2009). Beerel (2009) posits that families are sub-systems of a nation and if there is a healthy family system, there will be a healthy state and a healthy national system. Psychosocial competences such as effective communication, negotiation skills, empathy, decision making, self-awareness, problem solving, coping with stress and emotion, as well as creative and critical thinking skills, needed for good citizenship and good governance are nurtured and experienced within the family. Thus are research questions:

- To what extent are families healthy in a multicultural and multi ethnic context like Cameroon to ensure a peaceful nation?

- Which factors determine family healthiness in the Cameroon context?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Oslon (2011) designed the latest version of Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (FACES IV), a family self-report assessment designed to assess family cohesion (emotional bonding that family has towards one another) and family flexibility (quality of leadership, organisation, role relationship and negotiation occurring within family). This family assessment tool is useful for research and clinical work with families. Its scores can be used to assess family dynamics, plan the treatment and determine the impact of family therapy provided. The importance of concepts of cohesion and flexibility have been defined in various ways, both conceptually and operationally, by researchers and theorists to include various aspects of family functioning. There is consensus on the importance of cohesion and flexibility in understanding couple and family and consequently communities and nations (Barber & Buehler 1996; Doherty & Hovander, 1990; Werner, Green, Greenberg, Browne & McKenna, 2001).

This scale has been tested and validated in areas in America, Europe and Asia by several studies but none has been carried out in Cameroon or Africa, thus creating a knowledge gap in literature to be filled.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study is a non-interventional descriptive and analytical cross sectional study as it only seeks to describe, analyse and quantify variables. The FACES IV & the Circumplex Model questionnaire developed and validated by Oslon (2010) was used with permission to collect data. The instrument was modified to suit our context by dropping 13 question of unbalanced scales with low consistency and we ended up using 49 variables instead 62 as shown on table 1 below.

Table1. *Summary of Constructs, Dimensions and Variables Used in Study*

S/N	Constructs	Dimension (FACES IV Scales)	Variables	NO. ITEMS
1	Balanced Family	**Cohesion**	COH 1 to COH 7	07
		Flexibility	FLEX 1 to FLEX 7	07
2	Problematic or unbalanced Family	Disengaged	DIS 1 to DIS 4	04
		Enmeshed	ENM 1 to ENM 3	03
		Chaotic	CHO 1 to CHO 4	04
		Rigid	RIG 1 to RIG 4	04
3	Communication		COM 1 TO COM 10	10
4	Family Satisfaction		SAF 1 to SAF 10	10
TOTAL				**49**
Cronbach's Alpha (Reliability Test)				**0.90**

Multiple Likert-type question responses were summed together (interval data) and were analyzed using Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA).

Two parallel independent translations of the questionnaire were made into French from the original English, and compared with another by a third person. A back-translation by an independent person from the translated French version was compared to the original English version to ensure homogeneity.

A purposive sampling was used to sample 814 respondents in Yaounde representing the linguistics, and multicultural groups in Cameroon. The participants were recruited from university settings, small and middle size enterprises, and community cultural associations from the ten geographic regions of Cameroon were contacted and informed about the purpose of the present study. Respondents filled out

the questionnaire anonymously in the presence of a researcher, who immediately collected them to ensure high returns. The questionnaire was coded in an excel file and a multivariate analysis was performed using SPSS version 23.

The Excel Spreadsheet obtained from FACES automatically Stored and Scored data. It took each item response and sum them for each of the six FACES IV scales. The Total Raw Score was converted into Percentage Score using the Percentile Conversion Chart. The percentile score for the following six scales were provided: Balanced Cohesion, Balanced Flexibility, Disengaged, Enmeshed, Rigid & Chaotic. The Excel program also created a Cohesion Ratio,Flexibility Ratio, Total Circumplex Ratio scores, Cohesion dimension and Flexibility dimension. It equally sums the 10 items in the Family Communication and Family Satisfaction scales and provided a Total Raw Score and percentile score for these two scales.

To arrive at the mean percentile score, the 814 respondents answer the items of each of the construct or Dimensions were added. The sum of these items gave us the Raw Score. The raw scores were then converted to percentile using the percentile conversion chart for FACES IV test and interpreted accordingly. For example, for the cohesion dimension (COH1 to COH 7), the expected minimum score (814 x 1 for 7 questions) if all disagreed with the proposition was 5,698 and the expected maximum score 40 700 (814 x 5 for all 7 questions) if all selected strongly agree as response was 28,490 as shown in table 2a and 2b below.

Table2a. *Conversion of cohesion raw scores to percentile*

Respond options	Code	Value	Score	Raw Score	Percentile
Strongly disagree	1	7	814 X 7	5,698	20
Disagree	2	14	814 X 14	11,396	40
Neutral	3	21	814 X 21	17,094	60
Agree	4	28	814 X 28	22,792	80
Strongly agree	5	35	814 X 35	28,490	100

Table2b. *Interpretation of Cohesion percentile scores for 814 respondents*

Raw Score range	Score range for 814	Percentile	Level
7 to 18	5,698 to 14,652	16 to 35%	Somewhat connected
19 to 28	15,466 to 22,792	36 to 65%	Connected
29 to 35	**23,606 to 28,490**	**68 to 85%**	**Very connected**

Similar procedures were used to generate and interpret percentile for flexibility, communication and satisfaction dimension of our instrument;

The following formulae were used to calculate dimensional scores as developed in literature.

- Cohesion Dimension Score = Balanced cohesion + (Enmeshed – Disengaged)/2

- Flexibility Dimension Score = Balanced flexibility + (Chaotic – Rigid)/2

4. RESULT

4.1. Respondents' Demographic Characteristics

Table3. *Demographic Data of Respondents*

Item	Modality	Frequency (%)
Language (P0)	English	260 (31.9)
	French	554 (**68.1**)
Sex (P1)	Male	385 (47.3)
	Female	429 (**52.7**)
Level of education (P3)	Primary	39 (4.8)
	Secondary	193 (23.7)
	High school	252 (**31.0**)
	Graduate	246 (**30.2**)
	15-25 years	184 (**22.6**)
	26-35 years	312 (**38.3**)
Age group (P2)	36-45 years	185 (22.7)
	46-55 years	89 (10.9)

	Above 56 years	44 (5.4)
Religion (p7)	Christianity	641 (**78.7**)
	Islam	92 (11.3)
	Traditional Religion	81 (10.0)
Profession (P8)	Student	236 (**29.0**)
	Self-Employed	314 (38.8)
	Civil Servant	156 (19.2)
Region of Origin (p4)	Adamawa	23 (2.8)
	Centre	158 (19.4)
	East	55 (6.8)
	Extreme North	40 (4.9)
	Littoral	69 (8.5)
	North	33 (4.1)
	North West	159 (19.5)
	South	55 (6.8)
	South West	76 (9.3)
	West	146 (17.9)

From table 3 above, most of the respondents are francophone (68.1%). Most of the respondents are educated as 61.2 % have at least Advanced Level and 30.2% had university degree. The respondents are mainly youth (60.9%) the active population of the nation between15 and 35 years old.

The practice ranges of religion: Christians (78.7%); Islam (11.3%) and traditional (10%). Respondents also have a variety of profession: students (29%); Self'-employed or economic operators (21.5%); civil servants (19.2%).

Table4. *Typology of Families of Respondent*

Type of Family Background You Grew Up (P6)	Monogamous Nuclear Family	372 (**45.7**)
	Polygamous Nuclear Family	185 (22.7)
	With An Uncle Or Aunt	72 (8.8)
	With A Step Father/Mother	50 (6.1)
	With My Mother Alone	79 (9.7)
	With My Father Alone	36 (4.4)
	With Elder Brother/Sister	20 (2.5)
Marital Status (P9)	Single	424 (**52.1**)
	Cohabitation	59 (7.2)
	Married (Monogamy)	257 (31.6)
	Married (Polygamy)	45 (5.5)
	Divorced	16 (2.0)
Type of Marriage for those married (P10).	Traditional marriage alone	57 (16.5)
	Traditional and Legal (court marriage)	150 (43.5)
	Traditional, Legal, and Religious Marriage	138 (**40.0**)
Current relationship status (p12)	Single, never married	386 (47.4)
	Single, divorced	37 (4.5)
	Single, widowed	27 (3.3)
	Married, first marriage	246 (30.2)
	Married, not first marriage	36 (4.4)
	Living together	63 (7.7)
	Separated	19 (2.3)
Current living arrangement (P13).	Alone	152 (18.7)
	With Parents	171 (21.0)
	With Partner	87 (10.7)
	With Others	72 (8.8)
	With Children	74 (9.1)
	With Partner and Children	258 (31.7)
No of children you have (P11).	None	367 (45.1)
	1	107 (13.1)
	2	84 (10.3)
	3	115 (14.1)
	4	81 (10.0)
	5	33 (4.1)

	ABOVE 5	27 (3.3)
Number of siblings you grew up with (P5)	None	58 (7.1)
	1-3	210 (25.8)
	4-6	302 **(37.1)**
	7-10	180 (22.1)
	>10	64 (7.9)

As far as family characteristics are concerned, table 4 revealed that, 52.1% of the participants were single and 37.1% were married. Of those married 40% did so traditionally, legally and religiously; 43.5% both traditionally & legally; and 16% only traditionally. Regarding participants' current living arrangement only 18.7% were living alone, 29.8% with parents/guardians and the majority with spouse & children. In terms of family structure, the majority of the families consisted of two biological parents (45.1%). Regarding participants' current living arrangement only 18.7% were living alone, 29.8% with parents/guardians and the majority with spouse & children. In terms of family structure, the majority of the families consisted of two biological parents (45.1%).This tendency and range of this descriptive statistics is in accordance with the Cameroon 2018 demographic and health survey data (DHS, 2018).

4.2. Overall Descriptive of Main Constructs

4.2.1. Family Cohesion

The general mean percentile score of 68.41 is interpreted from the FACES IV score (table 2b) to indicate that the families of the respondents are very connected. They have a very strong emotion bonding towards one another.

The strong emotion bond or family cohesion can be observed or experienced during some events like marriage, funeral rites, birth celebrations, promotion and success of different kind. The local language (mother tongue helps to enhance this togetherness in addition to the wider African conception of family which consider your cousins, nephews and nieces as siblings and your aunty and uncles as parents as expressed in Mandela and Cartwright (1961).

Table5a. *Family Cohesion*

Code	Statements	Mean	Std. D.	Mode	Sum	Percentile
COH1	V1.Family members are involved in each other's lives.	3.4	1.4	4	2792	68.53
COH2	V8. Family members feel very close to each other.	3.3	1.3	4	2702	66.32
COH3	V16. Family members are supportive of each other during difficult times.	3.6	1.3	4	2955	72.53
COH4	V24. Family members consult other family members on important decisions.	3.5	1.2	4	2809	68.95
COH5	V32. Family members like to spend some of their free time with each other.	3.3	1.3	4	2683	65.86
COH6	V37. Although family members have individual interests, they still participate in family activities.	3.6	1.2	4	2925	71.80
COH7	V43. Our family has a good balance of separateness and closeness.	3.3	1.2	4	2646	64.95
Mean percentile score						**68.41**
Conclusion on Level of Cohesion: families of respondents are **VERY CONNECTED from percentile scores.** N.B. The overall Mode is 4 which indicate respondents AGREE with family cohesion statements.						

More importantly, the concept Ubuntu which means "I am because we are" defines best the spirit of cohesion. None exists for himself but because others exist. A human being is a person because he is in relationship with others and he cannot exist as an island. A healthy person is the person who belongs and is accepted as person in his community with his self-differences (Battle, 2009, p. 8; Newman, 2011).

Promoting this value of Ubuntu in our educational system could be a great significance to enhance peace in a family, community and nation at large.

Disengaged (Extreme Cohesion)

Table5b. *Family disengagement*

Code	Statements	Mean	Std. D	Mode	sum	Percentile
DIS1	V3. We get along better with people outside our family than inside.	2.7	1.3	2	2172	53.31
DIS2	V26. Family members are on their own when there is a problem to be solved.	2.5	1.3	1	2007	49.26
DIS3	V34. Our family seldom does things together.	2.8	1.3	2	2266	55.62
DIS4	V45. Family members know very little about the friends of other family members.	2.9	1.3	2	2377	58.35
Mean percentile score						54.14
Conclusion: families of the respondents are **moderately disengaged** in terms emotional bonding towards family members. Mode value of 2 indicates they DISAGREE with the family Disengaged statements						

The families of the respondents are moderately disengaged(table 5b) and moderately enmeshed(table 5c) in terms emotional bonding towards family members. They do not get better with people outside their families (DIS1& ENM2), care little about friends (DIS4) and always do things together (DIS3 & ENM1). These attitudes will certainly promote tribalism which is an obstacles to good governance and a peaceful society.

Enmeshed (Extreme Cohesion)

Table5c. *Family enmeshment*

Code	Statements	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mode	sum	Percentile
ENM1	V4. We spend too much time together.	3.0	1.3	4	2457	60.31
ENM2	V27. Family members have little need for friends outside the family.	2.6	1.2	2	2133	52.36
ENM3	V39. We resent family members doing things outside the family.	2.8	1.2	2	2275	55.84
Mean percentile score						56.17
Conclusion: families of the respondents are **moderately enmeshed** in terms emotional bonding towards family members						

The overall Cohesion Dimension Score of 69.4%[(Balanced cohesion + (Enmeshed – Disengaged)/2] concluded that families in Yaoundé are very connected as interpreted from table 2b above. This is a very good sociocultural aspect necessary to promote solidarity, unity and peace if these emotion bond and love is extended to the wider community and nation.

4.2.2. Family Flexibility

Table6a. *Family Flexibility*

Code	Statements	Mean	Std. D	Mode	sum	percentile
FLE1	V2.Our family tries new ways of dealing with problems.	3.3	1.2	**4**	2725	66.89
FLE2	V9. Parents equally share leadership in our family.	3.2	1.3	**4**	2634	64.65
FLE3	V17.Discipline is fair in our family.	3.3	1.2	**4**	2724	66.86
FLE4	V25. My family is able to adjust to change when necessary.	3.5	1.2	**4**	2821	69.24
FLE5	V33. We shift household responsibilities from person to person.	3.1	1.2	**4**	2495	61.24
FLE6	V38. We have clear rules and roles in our family.	3.3	1.2	**4**	2676	65.68
FLE7	V44. When problems arise, we compromise.	3.2	1.2	**4**	2588	63.52
Mean percentile score						**65.44**
Conclusion on Level of Flexibility: Families of respondents are **FLEXIBLE.** They are averagely and not very flexible in terms of leadership and organization from the percentile scores of 65.44. The overall Mode is 4 which indicate respondents AGREE with family flexibility statements.						

According to Oslon (2011), Family flexibility is concerned with leadership, organisation, relationship and negotiation within the family. The average flexibility reported in families in Yaounde could be due to the patriarchal system of family governance that attribute the position of leadership and authority to men, which could be misused in case of male chauvinism and dictatorship in and era of democracy and equity and will negatively influence peace and healthiness within the family. The father as head of the family is the breadwinner, while the mother is expected to provide support to the family (Lamb, 2004). If he fails to play his role, his authority is reduced.

The fact that the families in Cameroon are averagely flexible rather than been ideally very flexible is an indicator of an obstacle to good governance, equality and equity in leadership and good negotiation skills. Much training and education is necessary in this domain of family life to promote a peaceful family and nation.

The families of the respondents are moderately chaotic (table 6b below) and moderately rigid (table 6c)in terms of quality and expression of leadership and organization, role relationship and negotiation as shown on the tables below. They are highly organised (CHA1, 2 & 3, RIG 3), with strict rules and punishment for breaking them (RIG 2). Leadership and role relationship are well spelt out

CHAOTIC (Extreme Flexibility)

Table6b. *Family Chaotic Level*

Code	Statements	Mean	S. D	Mode	Sum	Percentile
CHA1	V6. We never seem to get organized in our family.	2.6	1.3	2	2083	51.13
CHA13	V13. It is hard to know who the leader is in our family.	2.6	1.4	2	2147	52.70
CHA3	V31. It is unclear who is responsible for things (chores, activities) in our family.	2.6	1.3	2	2147	52.70
CHA 4	V42. Our family has a hard time keeping track of who does various household tasks.	2.7	1.3	2	2183	53.58
Mean percentile score						52.53
Conclusion: families of the respondents are **moderately chaotic** in terms of quality and expression of leadership and organization, role relationship and negotiation. The overall Mode of 2 indicates respondents DISAGREE with family Chaotic statements						

RIGID (Extreme Flexibility)

Table6c. *Family Level of Rigidness*

Code	Statements	Mean	Std. D.	Mode	Sum	Percentile
RIG2	V5. There are strict consequences for breaking the rules in our family.	3.0	1.3	4	2434	59.74
RIG2	V20. Our family has a rule for almost every possible situation.	3.0	1.2	4	2481	60.90
RIG3	V28.Our family is highly organized.	3.1	1.3	4	2540	62.35
RIG4	V46. Once a decision is made, it is very difficult to modify that decision.	2.8	1.3	2	2242	55.03
Mean percentile score						59.50
Conclusion: families of the respondents are **moderately rigid** in terms of quality and expression of leadership and organization, role relationship and negotiation. The frequent Mode of 4 indicates respondents AGREE with family Chaotic statements						

The overall Flexibility Dimension Score of 61.94%[(Balanced cohesion + (Enmeshed – Disengaged)/2] indicates that families in Yaoundé are Flexible as interpreted from table 2c above.

4.2.3. Family Communication Skills

Table7. *Family communication skills*

Code	Statements	Mean	S. D.	Mode	Sum	Percentile
COM1	V7. Family members are satisfied with how they communicate with each other	3.2	1.2	4	2629	64.5
COM2	V14.Family members are very good listeners	3.3	1.2	4	2717	66.7
COM3	V23. Family members express affection to each other	3.5	1.2	4	2833	69.5
COM4	V30. Family members are able to ask each other for what they want	3.3	1.2	4	2670	65.5
COM5	V41. Family members can calmly discuss problems with each other	3.5	1.2	4	2830	69.5
COM6	V47. Family members discuss their ideas and beliefs with each other	3.4	1.2	4	2781	68.3
COM7	V48. When family members ask questions of each other, they get honest answers.	3.4	1.3	4	2776	68.1
COM8	V51. Family members try to understand each other's feelings.	3.5	1.1	4	2842	69.8
COM9	V52. When angry, family members seldom say negative things about each other.	2.9	1.3	2	2331	57.2
COM10	V35. Family members express their true feelings to each other.	3.2	1.3	4	2638	64.8
Mean percentile score						**66.4 %**
Conclusion: Family members feel good about their family communication and have few concerns.						

The overall Mode is 4 which indicate respondents AGREE with family communication statements. From table 7 above, we can conclude that since the general overall percentile for the 814 respondents is 66.4 %, a high level of communication, interpreted by our study to mean family members feel good about their family communication and have few concerns.

The quality of communication determines the quality of relationship. For every relationship to stand, it needs authentic communication. Authentic communication is the ability to go within, to accept one's most heartfelt, innermost feelings and emotions and to use that ability as a springboard to accepting the other as they truly are (Portelance, 1995).

4.2.4. Family Satisfaction Scale

Table8. *Family satisfaction skills*

Code	Statement	Mean	S.D.	Mode	Sum	Percentile
SAF1	V56. The degree of closeness between family members	3.0	1.1	3	2478	60.8
SAF2	V57. Your family's ability to cope with stress.	3.1	1.1	3	2510	61.6
SAF3	V58. Your family's ability to be flexible.	3.1	1.1	3	2516	61.7
SAF4	V59. Your family's ability to share positive experiences	3.2	1.2	3	2599	63.8
SAF5	V60. The quality of communication between family members.	3.1	1.2	3	2507	61.5
SAF6	V61. Your family's ability to resolve conflicts.	3.0	1.2	3	2478	60.8
SAF7	V62. The amount of time you spend together as a family.	3.0	1.2	3	2448	60.1
SAF8	V63.The way problems are discussed.	3.0	1.1	3	2405	59.0
SAF19	V64. The fairness of criticism in your family.	2.9	1.2	3	2326	57.1
SAF10	V65. Family members concern for each other.	3.4	1.3	3	2735	67.1
Mean percentile score						**61.4%**
Conclusion: Family members are satisfied with most aspects of their family. The overall Mode is 3 which indicate respondents are generally satisfied with family.						

From table 8 above, the general overall percentile for the 814 respondents of 61.4 % is high, thus we can conclude that respondents' family members are satisfied with most aspects of their family. However the ideal is to improve upon family satisfaction to very high levels.

Botha & Booysen (2014) opined that People who live in balanced family where the level of attachment and adaptability is positive feel more satisfied and happy. This means that in dysfunctional family the degree of attachment is less pronounced and people feel isolated and frustrated and the well-being of the family is at stake. Such a Balanced family is a source of emotional, influential and material support which make individual to integrate social life because they feel satisfied (Besley, 2005).

4.3. Bivariate Correlations with Summated Likert Scales

Very strong positive correlation between: Cohesion and flexibility at Pearson r = 0.66 p= 0.00; Cohesion and communication at Pearson r = 0.71 p= 0.00; Flexibility and communication at Pearson r = 0.63 p= 0.00; and communication and family satisfaction at Pearson r = 0.53 p= 0.00. Moderate positive correlation between: Cohesion and family satisfaction at Pearson r = 0.44 p= 0.00; flexibility and family satisfaction at Pearson r = 0.47 p= 0.00. Thus developing any of these dimension will do a long way to enhance healthy families and peaceful nation.

Table9. *Correlation between the four different construct of family health*

		Cohesion.	Flexibility..	Communication.	Family satisfaction.
Cohesion.	Pearson Correlation	1	.661[**]	.712[**]	.483[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	814	814	814	814
Flexibility..	Pearson Correlation	.661[**]	1	.630[**]	.469[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	814	814	814	814
Communication.	Pearson Correlation	.712[**]	.630[**]	1	.529[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	814	814	814	814
Family satisfaction.	Pearson Correlation	.483[**]	.469[**]	.529[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	814	814	814	814

4.4. Group Differences

MANOVA test provided the following group difference results presented in table 10 below:

Table10. *Summary of MANOVA Test Results*

Determinant	Wilks' Lambda Value	F Value	Sig.	Partial Eta Square
Sex	0.993	1.337	0.254	-
Age	0.970	1.521	0.083	0.007
Language	0.986	8.056	**0.000**	0.038
Religion	0.952	5.033	**0.000**	0.024
Level of education	0.943	2.971	**0.000**	0.014

From table 10, there is no statistically significant difference between male and female respondents mean scores for the different family dimensions studied as Wilks' Lambda value of 0.993, F = 1.337at p= 0.254 and not significant (p > 0.05). Thus sex of the respondents does not influence the healthiness of the family in Yaounde. Males and females behave the same.

Similarly, there is no significantly difference between ages of respondents for mean scores for the different family dimensions studied as Wilks' lambda value of 0.970, F = 1.521 at p= 0.083 and not significant (p > 0.05). Thus age group of the respondents does not influence the healthiness of the family in Yaounde.

Only language, religion and level of education show statistically significant difference in terms of cohesion, flexibility, communication and family satisfaction from the multivariate Wilks' Lambda test scores with p = 0.000 (p < 0.05) for all three demographic factors.

4.4.1. Influence of Language on Family Health

Table11. *Summary of Descriptive statistics &Tests of Between-Subjects Effects*

Descriptive statistics				Tests of Between-Subjects Effects			
Family constructs	**Language (Frequency)**	**Mean scores**	**SD**	**Type III Sum of Squares**	**F Value**	**Sig.**	**Partial Eta Square**
Satisfaction	English (260)	32.042	7.9	673.037	11.785	.001	.014
	French (554)	30.092	7.5				
Communication	English (260)	34.350	6.8	481.545	11.036	.001	.013
	French (554)	32.700	6.5				
Cohesion	English (260)	21.450	4.5	439.710	20.347	.000	.024
	French (554)	19.874	4.7				
Flexibility	English (260)	20.911	4.4	517.049	28.839	.000	.034
	French (554)	19.202	4.1				

From the descriptive statistics table 11 above, Anglophone scored higher Mean scores than francophone on all four family constructs. This mean differences are statistically significant Wilks' lambda value of 0.962, F= 8.056, p= 0.000 (p<0.05).

These higher Mean scores signifies the Anglophone families have greater emotional bonds within their families (cohesion) compared to the francophone families. They are more organized and communicate better, thus higher level of family satisfaction. This could be due to their minority nature occupying just two out of the ten region of Cameroon.

Thus the language of the respondents do have an influence on the healthiness of the families in Yaounde. Developing a national language that cut across the nation might eventually enhance family cohesion and flexibility and eventually a peaceful and stable nation.

4.4.2. Influence of Religion on Family Health

Table12. *Summary of Descriptive statistics &Tests of Between-Subjects Effects*

Descriptive statistics				Tests of Between-Subjects Effects			
Family constructs	**Religion (Frequency)**	**Mean scores**	**SD**	**Type III Sum of Squares**	**F Value**	**Sig.**	**Partial Eta Square**
Satisfaction	Christianity (641)	30.53	7.9	156.383	1.352	.259	.003
	Islamism (92)	31.92	5.8				
	Traditional Religion (81)	30.72	7.2				
Communication	Christianity (641)	33.57	6.8	433.972	4.960	.007	.012
	Islamism (92)	32.62	5.4				
	Traditional Religion (81)	31.22	6.1				
Cohesion	Christianity (641)	20.69	4.8	331.385	7.611	.001	.018
	Islamism (92)	19.63	3.9				
	Traditional Religion (81)	18.74	4.4				
Flexibility	Christianity (641)	20.06	4.4	366.301	10.098	.000	.024
	Islamism (92)	19.23	3.7				
	Traditional Religion (81)	17.88	3.9				

Table 12 above reveals there is a statistically significant Mean score difference between Christians and Muslims, and traditional religious respondents for the different family constructs dimensions studied as seen from Wilks' lambda value of F = 5.033 at p= 0.000 (p < 0.05).

In terms of level of satisfaction family members have with their family functioning, there is no statistically significant higher mean scores between Muslims, African traditional religious followers and Christians at F = 1.352, p = 0.259 (P > 0.05) as indicated in the between - subject effect table above.

The means score for Christian is statistically significantly greater than for Muslims, which is in turn greater than for traditional religion in terms of communication, Cohesion and flexibility. The strong cohesion amongst Christian compared to other religion may be linked to their inclusive nature of prayers and their less discriminating role in leadership and gender equity.

Studies have shown that religion has social effects on the unity of family, marriage, and children upbringing as it promote love for God, self and others reign (Koening, 2013, p. 69). Also, Idler (2013, p.180) said that religious has an important impact on the childbearing and childrearing that influence the health of people from early life till adulthood. Thus the Religious background of the respondents do have an influence on the healthiness of the families in Yaoundé.

4.4.3. Influence of Level of Education

Table13. *Summary of Descriptive statistics &Tests of Between-Subjects Effects*

Descriptive statistics				Tests of Between-Subjects Effects			
Family constructs	**Level of Education (Frequency)**	**Mean scores**	**SD**	**Type III Sum of Squares**	**F Value**	**Sig.**	**Partial Eta Square**
Satisfaction	Primary (39)	28.6	7.0	1047.323	4.605	.001	.022
	Secondary (193)	30.5	7.1				
	High school (252)	29.6	7.8				
	Graduate (246)	31.8	7.6				
	Post graduate (84)	32.4	8.1				
Communication	Primary (39)	31.1	6.0	650.609	3.732	.005	.018
	Secondary (193)	32.4	6.9				
	High school (252)	32.9	6.6				
	Graduate (246)	34.1	6.3				
	Post graduate (84)	34.4	6.7				
Cohesion	Primary (39)	18.2	4.6	688.403	8.048	.000	.038
	Secondary (193)	19.9	4.7				
	High school (252)	19.7	4.4				
	Graduate (246)	21.3	4.7				
	Post graduate (84)	21.8	4.9				
Flexibility	Primary (39)	18.3	4.7	527.175	7.329	.000	.035
	Secondary (193)	19.1	4.4				
	High school (252)	19.2	4.0				
	Graduate (246)	20.6	4.2				
	Post graduate (84)	21.0	4.3				

From the descriptive statistics table above, post graduates scored higher Mean scores than graduates and then advanced level holders on family satisfaction; communication; cohesion and flexibility. This mean differences are statistically significant as seen from Wilks' lambda value F= 2.971, p= 0.000 and (p < 0.05) of table 12 above. This is buttressed by the results of the test of between - subject effect of table 13 with p values less than 0.05

Thus level of education of the respondents do have a positive influence on the healthiness of the families in Yaounde. This could be understand as higher level of education is associated with more appropriation of principle of family leadership, negotiation, effective communication and thus satisfaction.

4.4.4. Influence of Type of Marriage

Table14. *Summary of Descriptive statistics & Tests of Between-Subjects Effects*

Descriptive statistics				Tests of Between-Subjects Effects			
Family constructs	**Type of Marriage (Frequency)**	**Mean scores**	**SD**	**Type III Sum of Squares**	**F Value**	**Sig.**	**Partial Eta Square**
Satisfaction	Traditional only (57)	31.40	6.7	149.862	1.423	.242	.008
	Traditional & Legal (150)	32.15	6.7				
	Traditional, legal & Religion (138)	30.71	8.2				

Communication	Traditional only (57)	32.54	7.0	66.524	.809	.446	.005
	Traditional & Legal (150)	33.74	6.2				
	Traditional, legal & Religion (138)	33.71	6.3				
Cohesion	Traditional only (57)	18.86	4.3	**155.219**	**3.712**	**.025**	**.021**
	Traditional & Legal (150)	20.31	4.2				
	Traditional, legal & Religion (138)	20.81	4.8				
Flexibility	Traditional only (57)	19.19	4.3	59.046	1.635	.196	.009
	Traditional & Legal (150)	19.66	4.2				
	Traditional, legal & Religion (138)	20.31	4.3				

From the descriptive statistics table above, there are differences in the Mean scores based on the type of marriage involved. This means difference is NOT statistically significance for family satisfaction, Communication and flexibility as indicated by the p values > 0.05 in the Test of between-subject effect.

Statistically significant mean difference scores are recorded only for family cohesion at F= 3.712, p= 0.025 and (p < 0.05) from the Test of between-subject effect, and Wilk lambda F= 2.084, p= 0.035 and (p < 0.05) from multivariate test.

There is a statistically significant Mean score difference in family cohesion in function of types of marriage. Greatest family cohesion is seen in families where couples are married traditionally, legally and religiously then to those who are married only traditionally and legally. The least cohesion is in families that have married only traditionally. This is probably because of spiritual, legal and ancestral fulfilment when marriage occurs at three levels.

Thus the type of marriage influences family cohesion or emotional bond.

5. CONCLUSION

This study revealed the family dynamics in a multicultural and ethnic setting as Yaounde. It indicates the healthiness of these families are determined by language, religion and level of education and not by age group and gender. It challenges us to carry out an in-depth qualitative analysis to investigate how these determinants influence family cohesion, flexibility and communication which are prerequisite for a peaceful country

REFERENCES

Aharoni, A. (2009). Peace, Literature, and Arts. EOLSS/UNESCO

Barber, B. K., & Buehler, C. (1996). Family cohesion and enmeshment: Different constructs, different effects. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 433-441.

Battle, M. (2009). Ubuntu: I in you and you in me. Church Publishing, Inc..

Beerel, A. (2009). Leadership and change management. Sage

Belsey, M. A. (2005). AIDS and the family: policy options for a crisis in family capital. New York: United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

Botha, F., & Booysen, F. (2014). Family functioning and life satisfaction and happiness in South African households. Social Indicators Research, 119, 163-182.

DHS (2020). Cameroon 2018 Demographic and Health Survey –Summary Report. SR266. The DHS Program

Doherty, W. J., & Hovander, D. (1990). Why don't family measures of cohesion and control behave the way they're supposed to?. American Journal of Family Therapy, 18(1), 5-18.

Idler, E. L. (Ed.). (2014). Religion as a social determinant of public health. Oxford University Press, USA

Esse, C. (2021). Construction of Social Cohesion and Living Together in the Cameroonian Public Space: Differences of Opinion versus the Emergence of a Common Sense in Discourse. International Journal of Communications, Network and System Sciences, 14(6), 75-94.https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperi nformation.aspx?paperid=111248 accessed on 13 Jan 2023.

Fiquremariam, S., & Africa, I. S. S. (2008). African Solutions to African Problems. ISS Today, 10. https://issafrica.org/iss-today/african-solutions-to-african-problems

Kamwangamalu, N., Baldauf Jr, R. B., & Kaplan, R. B. (Eds.). (2016). Language Planning in Africa: The Cameroon, Sudan and Zimbabwe. Routledge.

Koenig, H. G. (2013). Is religion good for your health?: The effects of religion on physical and mental health. Routledge.

Lamb, M. E. (Ed.). (2004). The role of the father in child development. John Wiley & Sons.

Lin, P. L. (1994). Characteristics of a Healthy Family. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ ED377097.pdf [accessed 20 August 2020]

Mandela, N., & Cartwright, J. (1961). Long walk to freedom (pp. 364-365). Royal New Zealand Foundation for the Blind.https://www.waldorfbuch.de/_files_media/leseproben/600075.pdf

Muchie, M., Gumede, V., Oloruntoba, S., & Check, N. A. (2017). The African journey to provide African solutions to African problems. Regenerating Africa: Bringing African solutions to African problems (pp. ix-xxii). Africa Institute of South Africa Development Through Knowledge, Minuteman Press, Braamfontein, South Africa.

Newman, B. (2011). Ubuntu: I in You and You in Me. Spiritus: A Journal of Christian Spirituality, 11(1), 136-138.

Olson, D. (2011). FACES IV and the circumplex model: Validation study. Journal of marital and family therapy, 37(1), 64-80.

Portelance, C. (1995). Authentic Communication: In Praise of Intimate Relationship. Psychological series. CRAM Publishers incorporate

Roman, N. V., Schenck, C., Ryan, J., Brey, F., Henderson, N., Lukelelo, N.& Saville, V. (2016). Relational aspects of family functioning and family satisfaction with a sample of families in the Western Cape. Social Work, 52(3), 303-312.

Schaffer, H. R., & Crook, C. K. (2017). The role of the mother in early social development. In Issues in childhood social development (pp. 55-78). Routledge.

Werner, P. D., Green, R. J., Greenberg, J., Browne, T. L., & McKenna, T. E. (2001). Beyond enmeshment: evidence for the independence of intrusiveness and closeness-caregiving in married couples. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 27(4), 459-471.

AUTHORS' BIOGRAPHY

Adda KISONI KAHAMBU, A Ph.D. Student, University Institute of International Development, Mokolo, Far North Cameroon. I have a master degree in international development and clinical psychology. I am a facilitator in three private universities on Conflict management, Emotional intelligence, Stress management, Human rights and Human Resources Principles and Ethical Leadership. I am a facilitator in trauma healing. I am consultant in family violence and leadership working with families and enterprises. I am a learning coach with the University Launch pad. I am a founder on the association Building Healthy Families for a Peaceful Nation. I also have an association of La Conférence des Filles for 25 years now. This association prepare young girls to better assume their academic, professional, so as to become responsible virtuous wife and mother. I organize seminars and workshop.

Dr. Lawrence Ntam Nchia, is a Senior Lecturer, pedagogue and researcher in the Department of Science of Education at the Higher Teacher Training College Yaounde, University of Yaounde 1, Cameroon. He is a specialist in Didactics of Biological Science. He research interest is in the domain developing didactic strategies to bring about conceptual and behaviour change in learners. He is interested not only in in cognitive development but also development of psychosocial competences or life skills in learners. He is equally involved in family life issues and serves as a consultant in marriage counselling and preparing youth to engage in a successful matrimony using effective communication tools, negotiation and conflict resolution skills amongst others.