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ABSTRACT

The main of this study was to investigate the relationship of home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone, Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya. The study was guided by three specific objectives of the study: to examine the home environment (household factors and parental and family factors) of parents of preschool children, to determine the level of psychosocial development of preschool children and to establish the relationship between home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya. Quantitative method was used because it provided the fundamental connection between empirical observation and mathematical expression of quantitative relationships. Moreover, correlation design was preferred because of its ability to establish the relationship between variables i.e. independent variable (home environment) and dependent variable (psychosocial development). A total target at 378 respondents; the minimum sample size of 190 was obtained using Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table for determining sample size from a give population. To ensure validity of instruments, the instruments were developed under close guidance of the supervisor. After designing the questions, the researcher conducted a pre-tested. This helped to identify ambiguous questions in the instruments and contributed to re-align the questionnaires to the objectives. The questionnaires were given to the supervisor to judge the validity of questions basing on to the objectives. The researcher administered one type of questionnaire to all the participants. As well the researcher used Cronbach’s alpha. The composite reliability takes into account that indicators have different loadings and can be interpreted in the same way as Cronbach’s α (that is, no matter which particular reliability coefficient is used, an internal consistency reliability value above .70 is regarded as satisfactory, whereas a value below .60 indicates a lack of reliability). To achieve objective one, the researcher used both frequency and percentage and means and standard deviation. This is because some items under household and parental and family factors are categorical while others are numerical. Therefore, the researcher used this analysis tools to achieve this objective. To achieve objective two of the study, the researcher used means and standard deviation to find out the extent of child development. This is because the variable (psychosocial development) are Likert scaled and numerical in nature. Items of travelling distance from home to important facilities and media use, these are numerical and thus their relationship with psychosocial development was analysed using correlation and simple linear regression analysis. Finding showed that the null hypothesis was rejected this is because the r value was .287 and the sig. was .004 of which was less than 0.05. This implies that there were a relationship between home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children among primary school children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya. 70% of psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya was caused by household, parental and family factors such as house environment, family size, and types of house, parenting education, income; space and playing materials. The psychosocial development of children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya is high. The level of cognitive development, social development, and emotional development are all high among preschool children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya. As well, there were a relationship between home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children among primary school children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya. Seventy percent of psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya and this was caused by household, parental and family factors such as house environment, family size, types of house, parenting education, income; space and playing materials factors. It was recommended to improve on the accessibility to media to preschool children. According to social learning theory, children learn more by observing and imitating what they hear and see and fathers should get involved in the development of children. Thus, using media can be one way of teaching children especially videos and TV as well as newspapers.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The chapter presents the background of the study, conceptualized as historical, theoretical, conceptual and contextual perspectives. This was followed by statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, and research hypotheses, scope of the study and significance of the study.

1.1 Background of the Study
The background of the study presents historical, theoretical, conceptual and contextual perspectives.

1.1.1 Historical Perspective
The stage of life from conception to age five is a period of experience-based brain development and as a critical stage for the programming of neurobiological pathways that can affect health, learning and behaviour during the entire life cycle (Tinajero and Mustard, 2011). The early years of life are also seen as one of the world’s most significant social determinants of health (WHO, 2008) and as a time when social environments and experiences get under the skin (Hertzman and Boyce, 2010). A life trajectory refers to the course that development can take as a result of the gene-environment interaction. In this interaction epigenetic effects which is activation or deactivation of gene function. Epigenetics is also referred to as the biological processes which modify the products produced from deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) without modifying DNA (Mustard, 2011). Experiences such as nutrition, stimulation, stress and teratogens can activate epigenetic processes. Various studies have proven that adverse early experiences can have a long-lasting effect on an individual’s health (coronary heart disease, non-insulin dependent diabetes, obesity, ageing, memory loss, mental health, substance abuse and premature death), learning (school achievement and school dropout) and behaviour (autism, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and antisocial behaviour) throughout the life cycle (Tinajero, and Loizillon, 2012).
Early experiences through the sensing pathways set how different parts of the brain develop and function. During the early years of life there is constant interplay between the developing sensing pathways, the L-HPA pathway (limbic system-hypothalamus-pituitary-adrenal gland axis), gene function and the immune system. The L-HPA pathway and the hormone cortisol play a central role in the programming of neurobiological pathways. All sensing pathways play a major role in brain development. The sense of touch particularly in the early stages of life seems to play a crucial role in the development of the brain and the biological pathways (Mustard, 2006). Early experiences affect the formation of synapses among neurons. Children develop in sequential stages (development in earlier stages affects development in later stages). The sensing pathways develop before the language pathways, which develop before the higher cognitive function (Mustard, 2011). The most sensitive period for the development of the sensing pathways is during the first few months of life and that the most sensitive period for the development of language pathways is around the third trimester of the first year and extends beyond the fourth year of life (Thompson and Nelson, 2001). This evidence supports the need to implement high-quality early child development programmes during the early stages of life.

During the course of life, there is a potential development ceiling that can be heightened, depending on the quality of early experiences (Hertzman, 1999; Hertzman and Boyce, 2010). Early experiences also shape population gradients in health, learning and behaviour. The development of the brain and the biological pathways can be influenced by biological risk factors (e.g. malnutrition, infectious diseases and, teratogens), social risk factors (e.g. caregiver sensitivity and responsiveness) and contextual risk factors (e.g. maternal depression) (Walker et al., 2007). It is estimated that around 200 million children under five years of age in developing countries are not reaching their developmental potential (Grantham McGregor et al., 2006). The most prevalent developmental risk factors worldwide include insufficient cognitive stimulation, linear growth retardation and iodine- and iron-deficiency anaemia, which affect approximately 20% to 25% of children in developing countries (Walker et al., 2007), Kenya inclusive.
1.1.2 Theoretical Perspective
This study was based on both psychosocial development theory formulated by Erik H. Erikson (1902–1994) and family system theory stated by Murray Bowen's in 1974. Erikson's theory describes development across the life span. His eight stages cover the psychosocial tasks that all individuals face from infancy through old age. Erikson's theory addresses issues about how personality develops and how people acquire their identity and role as a member of society (Sokol, 2009). Erikson's emphasis on the psychosocial, reminds us that the ego aspect of personality is actively involved in developing skills and attitudes to be a productive, responsible citizen (Sclafani, 2005). Erik Erikson's Theory of Psychosocial Development is made up of 8 stages which are infant stage (0 to 8 years), early childhood (2 to 3 years), preschool (3 to 5 years), school-age (6 to 11 years), adolescent (12 to 18 years), young adult (19 to 40 years), middle adulthood (40 to 65 years) and maturity (65 to death) (Fleming, 2004, Sclafani, 2005, Boeree, 2006). Erikson's theory, sometimes referred to as “the stages of man,” is based on a belief that individuals form self-images (an identity) from both self-perceptions and others' perceptions. His is one of the few psychosocial theories to account for a person's place in history; everyone must accept responsibility for their individualized outcome that results from person-environment relationships. The main concern of this study will be preschool (3 to 5 years). This theory is presented as a series of stages, each having a dilemma or crisis to be resolved. This theory relates factors that affect child development which are conceptualized as home environment in this study. This therefore makes this theory relevant to this study.

Bowen's focus was on patterns that develop in families in order to defuse anxiety. A key generator of anxiety in families is the perception of either too much closeness or too great a distance in a relationship. The degree of anxiety in any one family will be determined by the current levels of external stress and the sensitivities to particular themes that have been transmitted down the generations. If family members do not have the capacity to think through their responses to relationship dilemmas, but rather react anxiously to
perceived emotional demands, a state of chronic anxiety or reactivity may be set in place (Kerr and Bowen, 1988).

The main goal of Bowenian therapy is to reduce chronic anxiety by facilitating awareness of how the emotional system functions; and increasing levels of differentiation, where the focus is on making changes for the self rather than on trying to change others. Eight interlocking concepts make up Bowen's theory. This paper will give an overview of seven of these. The eighth attempts to link his theory to the evolution of society, and has little relevance to the practice of his therapy. However, Wylie (1991) points out in her biographical piece following Bowen's death that this interest in evolutionary process distinguishes Bowen from other family therapy pioneers. Bowen viewed himself as a scientist, with the lofty aim of developing a theory that accounted for the entire range of human behaviour and its origins. Emotional Fusion and Differentiation of Self, triangles, nuclear Family Emotional System, couple Conflict, symptoms in a Spouse, symptoms in a Child, family Projection Process and emotional Cutoff and multi-generational Transmission Process.

1.1.3 Conceptual Perspective

The dependent variable of the study was psychosocial development of Preschool children. Psychosocial development, according to Sclafani (2005), refers to the interaction of both psychosocial and social forces over the development of individuals across the life span. It is in the domain of socialization influences. Psychosocial development is also defined as the development of the personality, including the acquisition of social attitudes and skills, from infancy through maturity. In this study, the emphasis was on preschool. Children continue to grow up, they like to explore and do things on their own. Children can learn new things introduced in school and are expected to practice these lessons in real life. They know that they can accomplish these tasks on their own, but if they fail to do so and end up asking for assistance from others, they may feel a sense of guilt (Fleming, 2004, Sokol, 2009). In this study, psychosocial development was conceptualized in terms of
cognitive, social and emotional development. Cognitive development, sometimes called intellectual development or cognition in this study referred to as a process people use to gain knowledge. Language, thought, reasoning, and imagination. Identifying colors and knowing the difference between each one are among many are examples of cognitive tasks. Language and thought are a result of cognitive development. These two skills are closely related. Both are needed for planning, remembering, and problem solving. As children mature and gain experience with their world, these skills develop. Social and emotional development is about how children learning to relate to others (social development) and feelings and expression of feelings (emotional development). Trust, fear, confidence, pride, friendship, and humor are all part of social and emotional development. Other emotional traits include timidity, interest, and pleasure. Learning to express emotions in appropriate ways begins early. Caregivers promote this learning when they positively model these skills. A person’s self-concept and self-esteem are also part of this area. As children have success with all skills, confidence flourishes. This leads to a healthy self-concept and sense of worth.

Home environment refers to the factors related to where the child lives – that affect psychosocial development of preschool children. Home environment are factors that emerge from the surroundings where learners come from in terms of both relationships and what surround him/her. And thus, these can be termed as environmental and interpersonal relationships factors (Field, 2007; Gerhardt, 2004; Greenspan & Shanker, 2004; Shanker, 2008; Blair & Diamond, 2008). The home environment is thus conceptualized in terms of household factors such as housing (type, number of rooms, number of household members, organisation, income of parents, and access to media among others). Housing deals with whether a child have space to play and explore and whether such a child is free from injury and contaminations among others. Regarding income of the parents, this deals with whether parents have enough money to provides adequate clothing, adequate nutrition, provide fresh fruits and vegetables, among others. This was also conceptualized in terms of parental and family factors such as education of mother and father, occupation of father, child care givers when mother is absent,
opportunities and play materials, playing space, access to media, and chores discipline among others (Kumar, Aggarwal, Kaur and Iyengar, 1997; Shanker, 2004; Shanker, 2008). So basically, home environment was conceptualized as household factors, parental and family factors.

1.1.4 Contextual Perspective
Uasin Gishu County is one of the 47 counties of Kenya, located in the former Rift Valley Province. The city of Eldoret (capital and largest town in the county) is the county's administrative and commercial centre. Uasin Gishu is located on a plateau and has a cool and temperate climate. It borders Trans-Nzoia County, Kenya. Its name comes from the Illwuaasin-kishu Maasai clan. The land was the grazing area of the clan. They surrendered the land to the colonial government in the Anglo-Maasai agreement of 1911, and were subsequently pushed towards Trans Mara. The plateau that they once occupied was then registered in its Anglicised version, Uasin Gishu (KIRUGA, 23 July, 2013). Uasin Gishu County has three main regions namely Eldoret North, Eldoret South and Eldoret East, which are further subdivided into six constituencies - Soy, Turbo, Kapseret, Kesses, Ainabkoi and Moiben. Uasin Gishu County is home to 894,179 people as per the 2009 National Statistics, representing 50% male and 50% female. It is largely a cosmopolitan region, with the Nandi people of indigenous Kalenjin communities having the highest settlement. Apart from Kalenjin sub tribes, other communities with notable presence in the county especially in urban settlements include Luhya, Kikuyu, Luo, Kamba, Kisii among others. Although traditionally pastoralists, modern Kalenjin communities are mainly large scale wheat and maize farmers earning the county a name for being Kenya’s bread basket. Dairy farming is also done in large scale in most parts of the county. Various food and horticultural crops also do well in the highly arable land. In this context, therefore this research study was to establish the relationship of home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone, Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Evidence tells us that a person’s life successes, health and emotional wellbeing have their roots in early childhood. When children are helped and provided with better environments, homes, schools, better nutrition, health care among others, children thrive throughout school and their adult lives (Hertzman & Boyce, 2010, Biedinger, 2011). The quality of a child’s earliest environments and the availability of appropriate experiences at the right stages of development are crucial determinants of the way each child’s brain architecture develops. Caring and supportive environments that promote optimal early childhood development greatly increase children’s chances of a successful transition to school (WHO, 2008, Mustard, 2011 and Tinajero & Loizillon, 2012). This, in turn, promotes children’s chances of achieving better learning outcomes while at school and better education, employment and health after they have finished school.

Paradoxically, in the family environment, children can either get protection or be exposed to risks for their development. Reported risk factors are often associated to low socio-economic status and weak family ties, which could impair their ability for problem solving, language, memory and social skills. Poor quality of stimulation is seen among those children whose main caregiver are single and among those deprived of father’s involvement in their lives.

Despite the this case, in Uasin-Gishu County, there are evidences of low child development, explained by poor household environments and other parental and family factors such as income of the parents, occupation of parents, among others. Having a partner negative affected the quality of stimulation in the family environment, which is associated to their positive effect on mother’s performance. Also, being third and over in the birth order in the family and living with other children younger than two yielded lower home scores. Thus, this study intended to investigate how these home environments (household factors, parental and family factors) affect the psychosocial development of children.
1.3 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship of home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone, Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya.

1.4 Objectives of the Study
The study was guided by three specific objectives of the study

1. To examine the home environment (household factors and parental and family factors) of parents of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya
2. To determine the level of psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya
3. To establish the relationship between home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya

1.5 Research Questions
1. What is the home environment of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya?
2. What is the level of psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya?
3. Is there a significant relationship between home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya?

1.6 Null Hypotheses
HO: There a no significant relationship between home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya

1.7 Scope of the Study
The scope of the study was presented in terms of geographical scope, content scope and time scope.
1.7.1 Geographical Scope
The study was carried out in Uasin Gishu County. Uasin Gishu County is one of the 47 counties of Kenya, located in the former Rift Valley Province. The city of Eldoret (capital and largest town in the county) is the county's administrative and commercial center. Uasin Gishu is located on a plateau and has a cool and temperate climate. This area borders Trans-Nzoia County, Kenya. Moi’s bridge zone where this study was carried has 30 schools (12 public schools and 8 private schools) whereby the researcher dealt with four schools from public preschools. This is because public preschools would easily contribute to provide the information required for data collection.

1.7.2 Content Scope
The study focused on home environment (household factors and parental and family factors) of parents of preschool children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya, and the level psychosocial development which include cognitive, social and emotional development of preschool children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya. The study also established the relationship between home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya.

1.7.3 Time scope
This study was conducted within a period of ten months. That is from August 2017 to June 2018, the researcher developed and improved the quality of the research proposal and developed and evaluated the research instrument. In February up to April, the researcher collected data. Analyses of data were done in May and results and research report were presented in June 2018.

1.8 Significance of the Study
It is stressed the importance of this study matter, though scarcely investigated within the national collective health, since the World Health Organization has given careful consideration to the issues concerned here. The role of early family stimulation to mental health condition of children aged between five and 14 years has already been underlined in previous population-based studies conducted by Bastos and Almeida-Filho1 in the 80’s
(Tsao L., 2002). Thus, the findings of the study will benefit the following stakeholders: For education officers, the findings of the study will serve as a baseline information for the county education officers to sensitize parents of the importance of home environment to the psychosocial development of their children. For head teachers and teachers, the findings of the study will help them in understanding of how environment affects children and thus will endeavor to ensure hygienic, safe environment to facilitate learning and psychosocial development. Parents will also benefit in this study as well. Change of attitude and knowledge from this study may help parents in teaching children their children and providing appropriate requirements such as toys or their substitutes. This would help children grow cognitively. The four schools, where the study was conducted will also benefit from this study in a way that identifying the school requirement needs to foster child development will be availed. The schools in Uasin Gishu may use this study to help develop favourable school environment to foster child development.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction
In this chapter, the researcher presents the theoretical review, conceptual framework and the related studies.

2.1 Theoretical Review
This study employed both psychosocial development theory formulated by Erik H. Erikson (1902–1994) and family system theory stated by Murray Bowen’s in 1974. Erik Erickson’s theory of psychosocial development (1902–1994). Erikson's theory defines development across the life span of a human being. His eight stages cover the psychosocial tasks that all individuals face from infancy through old age. Erik Erickson’s theory of psychosocial development involves eight stages of development in which each stage builds upon the previous.

Erickson’s theory describes how the impact of social interactions and experiences shape individuals throughout their lifespan (Erickson, 1968). Erik Erickson, a world famous psychologist, developed a list of widely used developmental stages (1950). He suggests that everyone, regardless of geographical location, will go through eight psychosocial stages during their lifetime. People pass through these stages independent of whether they have achieved a resolution. Unresolved conflicts or difficulties are passed on to later stages, which can make their outcome more challenging. Erikson's theory has been described as a continuum of crises faced over the course of human development. A new crisis or dilemma emerges as people grow and confront new psychosocial tasks and responsibilities. Crises may be seen as opportunities from which to grow and attain positive outcomes, or as misfortunes that can lead to a failed, negative resolution. From each stage, a desired psychosocial attribute may be acquired (Giesbrecht, 1998 and Erikson, 2000). Most data and research interest have been given to stages I, V and VII. In stage I, basic trust versus mistrust, infants, in interactions with their caregivers, learn
about the world. They must decide whether there is love and security, leading to a basic trust, or whether their needs are not met and the world is unpredictable, leading to fear and mistrust. This stage corresponds to an entire literature on the importance of attachment as a basic task of infancy. Attachment quality becomes a foundation for all future relationships the person will have over his or her life. The work of Mary Ainsworth is important to note here. She first described the various types of attachment outcomes that emerge as a result of the parent-infant interactions over the first years of life. So called secure or insecure attachments underlie the concept of trust versus mistrust (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall, 1978 and Sclafani, 2005).

Bowen's research led him to suggest that varying degrees of fusion are discernible in all families. 'Differentiation', by contrast, is described as the capacity of the individual to function autonomously by making self-directed choices, while remaining emotionally connected to the intensity of a significant relationship system (Kerr and Bowen, 1988). Bowen's notion of fusion has a different focus to Minuchin's concept of enmeshment, which is based on a lack of boundary between sub-systems (Minuchin, 1974). The structural terms 'enmeshment' and 'disengagement' are in fact the twin polarities of Bowen's 'fusion'. Fusion describes each person's reactions within a relationship, rather than the overall structure of family relationships. Hence, anxiously cutting off the relationship is as much a sign of fusion as intense submissiveness. A person in a fused relationship reacts immediately (as if with a reflex, knee jerk response) to the perceived demands of another person, without being able to think through the choices or talk over relationship matters directly with the other person. Energy is invested in taking things personally (ensuring the emotional comfort of another), or in distancing oneself (ensuring one's own). The greater a family's tendency to fuse, the less flexibility it will have in adapting to stress (Kerr and Bowen, 1988).

Bowen developed the idea of a 'differentiation of self-scale' to assist in teaching this concept. He points out that this was not designed as an actual instrument for assigning people to particular levels (Kerr and Bowen, 1988). Bowen maintains that the speculative
nature of estimating a level of differentiation is compounded by factors such as stress levels, individual differences in reactivity to different stressors, and the degree of contact individuals have with their extended family. At one end of the scale, hypothetical 'complete differentiation' is said to exist in a person who has resolved their emotional attachment to their family (i.e. shifted out of their roles in relationship triangles) and can therefore function as an individual within the family group.

In the second stage, autonomy versus shame and doubt, Erikson states that children begin to acquire a sense of independent, self-directed behavior, often evidenced by the “terrible 2s” and use of the word, “no.” Children who are overdisciplined or otherwise discouraged to be autonomous will develop shame and doubt about their new abilities (Sclafani, 2005). The third stage, initiative versus guilt, is characterized by the toddler's need to learn and acquire self-control against the backdrop of developing many new abilities and skills. Initiative refers to the burgeoning autonomy and independence that leads to exploring all parts of their world. Guilt and unworthiness result when the toddler holds himself back because of over-control of his impulses and fantasies. Stage IV is termed industry versus inferiority.

This stage is marked by school-age children who are gaining abilities in a wide variety of tasks—projects with which they make things, learn to use tools, and gain a variety of skills. Inferiority and inadequacy result if the child does not master age-appropriate abilities and feels inadequate. In stage V, identity versus role confusion, teens face decisions about their future role in life and who they are. This is a crucial stage in determining overall quality of life and may be associated with great turmoil. The need for appropriate role models and influences, as well as experiences, is obvious (Kids Health, 2001). James Marcia has written about four possible identity outcomes—achievement, moratorium, foreclosure, and diffusion. Marcia's work has extended, modernized, and elaborated on Erikson's fifth stage. According to Marcia, a positive outcome, identity achievement, occurs after the teen has had opportunities to explore options and has committed to a set of values or goals. A teen or young adult who is still experimenting
without any commitments is said to be in a moratorium or holding pattern. One who commits to a set of values without challenge or exploration has reached foreclosure. Finally, a person who lacks direction because of lack of exploration and commitment is said to be diffused. Failure to resolve these identity questions can result in a rebellious, disorienting outcome related to acting out and experimenting with risky behavior (Marcia, 1980).

In the sixth stage, intimacy versus isolation, Erikson states that the healthy individual needs to share himself and commit to another. At one time, this meant marriage, but a contemporary take would refer to any long-term intimate, committed relationship. Intimacy with another completes a person and adds to who they are. Failure to achieve intimacy leads to loneliness. In stage VII, generatively versus stagnation, the middle-age adult attempts to give back to the next generation what they will need to develop successfully. Marriage and parenthood are the important life events to be managed. Generativity refers to nurturant, supportive behaviors such as child rearing, caring for others, and productive, meaningful work such as community service.

The generative adult wishes to create something of lasting value. Generatively refers to caring behaviors to guide the next generation—mentoring, teaching, and parenting. If one does not engage in these behaviors, the result can be self-absorption and an emotionally impoverished existence, which Erikson termed stagnation. Stagnation is an empty feeling, referred to as an absence of meaningful accomplishment. The final stage, ego integrity versus despair, is the time when an individual looks back on a complete lifetime and prepares for death. A person with ego integrity attains total self-hood, a sense of a life well lived. Despair results if a person obsesses over all their loss of roles as they age. As can be seen by this review, Erikson's theory captures the process of socialization over the lifetime. His theory remains influential as a source of insightful descriptions of the course of human development. Other important psychosocial variables also affect personal growth and psychosocial well-being.
According to Sclafani (2005), there are other psychosocial developmental variables. These include; Altruism or prosocial behavior is a key process related to psychosocial development. Altruism and prosocial behavior as used here are synonymous; these terms refer to behaviors that benefit another without an expected reward in return. Both are rooted in empathy, the ability to comprehend another person's emotional status and be able to identify and feel the way that another person feels. Behaviorally, empathy refers to a person responding emotionally in support of the other. (Sympathy, a different characteristic, refers to feelings of concern for another's situation.) In childhood, prosocial behavior is usually associated with sociable, competent children who are also able to regulate their emotions. Parenting and role models play a key role in the development of prosocial behaviors and attitudes. Parents who are warm and responsive and show sympathy lay the groundwork for appropriate responses in their children.

These responses persist into the teen years and beyond. Self-control refers to an individual's capacity to resist an impulse to engage in socially disapproved or unacceptable behavior (Sclafani, 2005). It is an essential characteristic for citizenship, morality, and positive social relations. Self-control first emerges in infancy as seen by compliance behaviors. In early childhood, comparable to Erikson's stage II, children learn to obey adult commands and to comply with authority. Appropriate, warm and responsive parenting will create an environment in which the toddler wants to please the adults. In doing so, the child acquires a positive, eager spirit of cooperation within the development of autonomy and self-directed behavior. Self-control has been found to be stable throughout childhood and adolescence. Authoritative parenting, coupled with appropriate modeling, tends to produce the best outcome—good frustration tolerance, control of emotions, and low impulsivity. In adulthood, these traits are associated with success across every facet of life—in family and peer relationships, at work and in career achievement, and overall life satisfaction.

In this study, the target group will be the third stage who are preschoolers aged 3-5 years. According to Erik Erikson’s Psycho-Social Stages of Development preschooler learns to initiate tasks and grapples with self-control. During the preschool years, children begin
to assert their power and control over the world through directing play and other social interaction. Children who are successful at this stage feel capable and able to lead others. Those who fail to acquire these skills are left with a sense of guilt, self-doubt and lack of initiative (Sokol, 2009). Around age three and continuing to age five, children assert themselves more frequently. These are particularly lively, rapid-developing years in a child’s life. According to Bee (1992), it is a “time of vigor of action and of behaviors that the parents may see as aggressive.” During this period the primary feature involves the child regularly interacting with other children at school. Central to this stage is play, as it provides children with the opportunity to explore their interpersonal skills through initiating activities. Children begin to plan activities, make up games, and initiate activities with others. If given this opportunity, children develop a sense of initiative and feel secure in their ability to lead others and make decisions.

Conversely, if this tendency is squelched, either through criticism or control, children develop a sense of guilt. They may feel like a nuisance to others and will, therefore, remain followers, lacking in self-initiative. The child takes initiatives which the parents will often try to stop in order to protect the child. The child will often overstep the mark in his forcefulness, and the danger is that the parents will tend to punish the child and restrict his initiatives too much. It is at this stage that the child will begin to ask many questions as his thirst for knowledge grows.

If the parents treat the child’s questions as trivial, a nuisance or embarrassing or other aspects of their behavior as threatening then the child may have feelings of guilt for “being a nuisance”. Too much guilt can make the child slow to interact with others and may inhibit their creativity. Some guilt is, of course, necessary; otherwise the child would not know how to exercise self-control or have a conscience. A healthy balance between initiative and guilt is important. Success in this stage will lead to the virtue of purpose. Preschools Child’s development of the cognitive and social skills needed for later success in school and life after school may be best supported by a parents, school and environment (Bornstein and Tamis-Lemonda, 1989). Responsiveness of parents - an aspect of supportive parenting described across different theories and research
frameworks (e.g. attachment, socio-cultural) as playing an important role in providing a strong foundation for children to develop optimally (Ainsworth, et al, 1978, Grusec & Goodnow, 1994). Parenting that provides positive affection and high levels of warmth and is responsive in ways that are contingently linked to a young child’s signals (“contingent responsiveness”) are the affective-emotional aspects of a responsive style. These aspects, in combination with behaviours that are cognitively responsive to the child’s needs, including the provision of rich verbal input and maintaining and expanding on the child’s interests, provide the range of support necessary for multiple aspects of a child’s learning.

Acceptance of the child’s interests with responses that are prompt and contingent to what the child signals supports learning, in part, by facilitating the child’s development of mechanisms for coping with stress and novelty in his or her environment. (Ainsworth, et al, 1978). With repeated positive experiences, a trust and bond develop between the child and parent that in turn allow the child to ultimately internalize this trust and then generalize their learning to new experiences. This sensitive support promotes the child’s continued engagement in learning activities with his or her parent (Maccoby & Martin 1983, Landry, 2014). Thus, these affective-emotional behaviours communicate the parent’s interest and acceptance, fostering self-regulation and cooperation, critically important behaviours for effective learning to occur. From a socio-cultural viewpoint, cognitively responsive behaviours (e.g. maintaining versus redirecting interests, rich verbal input) are thought to facilitate higher levels of learning because they provide a structure or scaffold for the young child’s immature skills, such as developing attentional and cognitive capacities.

Responsive behaviours in this framework promote joint engagement and reciprocity in the parent-child interaction and help a child learn to assume a more active and ultimately independent role in the learning process (Landry, 2014). Responsive support for the child to become actively engaged in solving problems is often referred to as parental scaffolding, and is also thought to be key for facilitating children’s development of self-regulation and executive function skills, behaviours that allow the child to ultimately

This theory is very relevant to this study because it highlights the needs of children such as care, better environment, nutrition among others as such are vital for their development. Thus, this study applied this theory and test the extents of psychosocial development of these children based on cognitive, social and emotional development and examine the effect of home environment (household factors and parental and family factors) on psychosocial development of preschool children.

2.2. Conceptual Framework
A conceptual framework represents the researcher’s synthesis of literature on how to explain a phenomenon. It maps out the actions required in the course of the study given his previous knowledge of other researchers’ point of view and his observations on the subject of research (Regoniel, 2015). It is the researcher understands of how the particular variables in his study connect with each other. In this study, the conceptual framework was developed based on literature review from Institute for Human Services (2007) and Kumar, Aggarwal, Kaur and Iyengar (1997) and Erik Erickson’s theory of psychosocial development (Erickson, 1968). The conceptual framework is shown in the figure 1 below.
Figure 1: Conceptual Framework Showing Relationship between Home environment and Psychosocial Development

**Source:** Developed based on literature from Ohio Institute for Human Services (2007) and Kumar, Aggarwal, Kaur and Iyengar (1997)

Figure 1 above shows the interconnections between the home environment (household factors, parental and family factors) and how they relate to the psychosocial development of preschool children. Household factors were conceptualized based on literature presented in and Kumar, et al. (1997). This was conceptualized in terms of Type of dwelling, No of rooms in the house, whether the house is electrified or not, organisation of the home, home environment, number of adults in the house (15+ years). Others include
number of children in the house, distance from home to health center, hospital, nursery, primary school, income level of parents whether it is high or low, access to media (TV, Radio, Newspaper), who does the story telling, who takes out the children and who teaches children at home (father or mother or coach). According to this conceptual framework, the researcher suggests that they a significant positive effect on the psychosocial development of children. Thus, the interconnection is shown by an arrow from left to right.

The parental and family factors were conceptualized as mother’s education, father’s education, occupation of the father. Others include childcare when mother is absent, provision of appropriate play opportunities and materials, play space, access to TV, radio, cinema, books, doing simple chores at home and strictness of discipline. This was perceived to affect psychosocial development of preschool children. The arrow moves from left to right showing the parental and family factors positively affect psychosocial development of preschool children. These constructs were developed based on Kumar, et al. (1997).

The dependent variable which is psychosocial development conceptualized in terms of Cognitive Development with items on whether child is ego-centric, child has magical thinking, child understands time, child can put events in sequence, can separate fantasy from reality, has accurate memory, and leave out important facts, Social Development with construct on play (cooperative, imaginative, take turns in games, experiment with social roles), whether the child wants to please adults, development of conscience, curious about his and other’s bodies and no sense of privacy and Emotional Development with items on whether the child is curious, self-directed in many activities, understands concepts or right and wrong, self-esteem reflects opinions of significant others, and increasing ability to control emotions, less emotional outbursts. These will make up the items that will be used to measure the psychosocial development of preschool children (Institute for Human Services, 2007).
2.3 Related Studies
Children’s development is influenced by a wide range of biological and environmental factors, some of which protect and enhance their development while others compromise their developmental outcomes (World Bank, 2009). Child development is affected by different factors, among which include poverty; housing, education, attachment, parenting styles and social networks. The factors that affect psychosocial development of preschool children will be conceptualized in terms of household factors, parental and family factors and school factors. Different studies have been done and they are reviewed below.

2.3.1 Home Environment of preschool children
Home environment refers to aspects of people’s domestic lives that contribute to their living conditions (Vandivere, Hair, Theokas, Cleveland, McNamara, Atienza, 2006). Such factors may be physical, psychosocial conditions due to parenting styles; social circumstances or wider cultural patterns of life related to the location (urban or rural). On the other hand, according to Dictionary.com a home is a place of residence or refuge and comfort. It is usually a place in which an individual or a family can rest and be able to store personal property. Home can also be as a physical locale, as may be perceived to have no physical definition--instead, may relate instead to a mental or emotional state of refuge or comfort.

A socio-economic investigation was carried out using a pre-coded standardized questionnaire on sociodemographic profile, socio-economic status and family organization. The Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment Scale (HOME Inventory) was used for assessing the quality of family environment in the first five years of life. The HOME Inventory version applied in the study for the age group zero to three years comprised 45 items filled out based on observations and answers given during the household interview with the child’s mother or other surrogate caregiver.

The six HOME subscales included the following: emotional and verbal responsiveness of the caregiver; avoidance of restriction and punishment; organization of physical and
temporal environment; appropriate play materials and games available; caregiver’s involvement with the child; opportunities for variety in daily stimulation. The Bayley Scale for Infant Development was applied separately to assess children’s mental development. The items for the different ages were applied and assessed according to the scale’s instructions for use. Gross scores were converted using the respective age tables and yielded the Mental Development Index (MDI).

Data was collected from households by a team of psychologists and psychology students. Interviewers applied psychological measure instruments and carried out interviews with the main caregiver, which was the child’s mother in 94% of cases. First, the study population was described according to gender, age and child’s birth order in the family; main caregiver’s schooling, age and marital status; number of children under five in the household, father’s involvement and working mother. In univariate analyses, the differences between HOME Inventory means were tested using t-Student test. The quality of stimulation in the family environment, measured through the overall HOME Inventory score, was included as the main independent variable and the child’s cognitive performance, measured through the Bayley scale was included as the dependent variable, and both were used as continuous variables.

The normal distribution of variables was assessed using the Shapiro-Wilk test at 5% significance level. Multiple regression with normal errors, based on the backward method, was used to estimate the association between the overall HOME Inventory score and MDI, adjusting for potential confounders. Variables that showed a statistical significance below 20% were included in the multiple regression model. Interaction was assessed through partial F-test, comparing full and reduced regression models. STATA software, version 7.0, was used in all data analysis at 5% significance level.

Ngorosho (2011) defined home environment as a setting which contains social and cultural knowledge and skills that are important for children’s growth and development. According to the author, social knowledge and skills provide children with education and
life skills that enable them to interact actively with other people in the community. Whereas cultural knowledge and skills provide children with language, technology and strategies which enable them to participate functionally in social experiences and activities. The researcher later conceptualized home environment as the immediate social environment of the child and thus refers to it as the ecology of child development. According to Obeta (2014; p. 141) a home is a “place where one lives permanently, especially as a member of a family or household. It is a place of residence or refuge. A home is not a mere transient shelter. Its essence lies in the personalities of the people who live in it.” Obeta defined home environment as the surroundings where a child lives. It is both internal and external conditions that affect the growth of a child or organism. Bonci (2008) reviewed and annotated the importance of home environment and families in general towards learning. The author note that despite the fact that child’s learning is complex, and that parents are teachers and role models and thus creating a better home environment is paramount, parents are still not aware of their roles and what importance good home environment could play. The researcher further notes that home environment has impact on language skills development and educational achievement of children. Also, socio-economic status of parents, education, family size, parental behavior and attitude, involvement affect children (Bonci, 2008). Thus, the home environment is not only made up of building (house) but also better communication environment where children enjoy their parents and ability to have basic needs of the child. Egunsola (2014) investigated the influence of home environment on academic performance of senior secondary students in Adamawa State, Nigeria. The researcher used ex-post facto and correlation survey design and collected data from a sample of 9000 students using a multistage random sampling techniques. A questionnaire of 40 items was used to collect data on home environmental factors and students’ academic achievement. The results from the study showed that parent’s education, occupation and home location significantly correlated to child’s academic achievement while parent’s income moderately relates to academic achievement. Based on these findings, the researcher recommended that home environment is vital for a child to perform well in class.
Dietzman (2002) observes that home environment is important for child growth and learning. The researcher observes that at home, different traditions are build and behaviors are monitored and installed to children. Such activities such as chores, daily routine activities, and praise to children all build warmth to the child, motivate them and lead them towards success in life. Thus, according to the researcher a child achievement in school can be related to home environment. Obeta (2014), in the study carried out in Abia State, Nigeria, investigated factors that affect the academic performance of students. The study employed survey research design and data were collected using structured questionnaires from a sample of 200 respondents from both junior and senior secondary school students and their parents were drawn through simple random sampling technique from secondary schools in the study area. The finding of the study revealed among others that none provision of adequate educational material by parents and attitudes of some parents towards the education of their children as well as the socio-economic status of the student’s family, all affect the students’ academic performance. Thus, the study emphasized that parents be oriented towards their responsibilities towards academics of their children.

Ilomo and Chawanga (2015) examined the influence of home environment on students’ academic performance in the selected secondary schools in Arusha Municipality, Tanzania. The areas of concentration were parents and students, social demographic factors, and other related factors. The research design used to collect data was descriptive survey, which employed questionnaires in collecting relevant data for the study. The sample size of 160 students, where forty (40) students were randomly selected from each selected secondary school was used. The findings revealed that there was no direct relationship between home environment and students’ academic performance in schools. The results shown the following percentages: tuition fee 71.9%, demographic factors 70.7%, and other factors including teaching and learning materials, infrastructure, home structures, electricity, peer group, home mass media and location had an average of 64.7% thus making the tuition fee the leading factor.
In a cross-sectional survey, 3746 children aged less than 6 years residing in 47 randomly selected villages of district Ambaja (India), were studied to find out the environmental risk factors influencing psychosocial development by Kumar, Aggarwal, Kaur, and Iyengar, 1997). A culture appropriate test battery comprising 67 test items was administered, and psychosocial development score of each child was computed by scoring each test item passed as 1 and failed as 0. Logistic regression revealed that per capita income, education of mother, nutritional status of the child, number of rooms and environmental hygiene in the house, presence of a high school within easy travel distance, availability of a caretaker when mother is busy, child attending a nursery households having access to newspaper, child having toys or toy substitutes, TV, books, storytelling by the mother were found to have a significant association with psychosocial development of preschool children. Such a study have not been carried in Kenya, and specifically Uasin Gishu County, where this study was carried out.

2.3.2 Psychosocial Development of preschool children
Psychosocial relates psychosocial and social behavior of an individual or psychosocial development of the individual in relation to his or her social environment. Meyer (2013) in UNHCR’s mental health and psychosocial support for Persons of Concern: Global Review defines *psychosocial as the* field of humanitarian response emphasizing the close connection between psychosocial aspects of experience and wider social aspects of experience, inclusive of human capacity, social ecology, and culture and values. According to online essay, psychosocial development is development on a social realm in relation to how one develops their mind, maturity level, and emotions over the course of one’s life. The rate of development depends on different factors such as biological processes as well as environmental factors. Thus psychosocial development in this study meant child’s psychosocial development in terms of social, cognitive and emotional development. Rao, Sun, Wong, et al (2014) defined *cognitive development* as advances in mental processes associated with perception, memory, reasoning, problem-solving, language-learning and other aspects of brain development that occur with increasing age. Damon E. Jones et al. (2015) observes that social and emotional development involves several interrelated areas
of development, including social interaction, emotional awareness, and self-regulation. Below are examples of important aspects of social and emotional development for young children.

Liu and Stein (2013) observes that feeding is quintessential for child growth and development. Feeding especially is offered by parents and other caregivers and acts as a source of social interaction through both verbal and non-verbal communication. Thus feeding a baby provides opportunity for child’s psychosocial development and opportunity to learn and grow. Thus, feeding affects not only children’s physical growth and health but also their psychosocial and emotional development. The feeding relationship is affected by culture, health status and temperament. Again, through feeding, the social relationship between parents or caregivers and child is developed thus develops social development (Liu et al, 2013).

Kumar, Aggarwal, Kaur & Iyenger (1997) carried out a study on factors influencing psychosocial development of preschool children in a rural area of Haryana, India where a cross-sectional survey was employed, 3746 children aged less than 6 years residing in 47 randomly selected villages of district Ambala (India), were studied to find out the environmental risk factors influencing psychosocial development. A culture appropriate test battery comprising 67 test items was administered, and psychosocial development score of each child was computed by scoring each test item passed as 1 and failed as 0 was used. Logistic regression revealed that per capita income, education of mother, nutritional status of the child, number of rooms and environmental hygiene in the house, presence of a high school within easy travel distance, availability of a caretaker when mother is busy, child attending a nursery, households having access to newspaper, child having toys or toy substitutes, TV, books, story-telling by the mother were found to have a significant association with psychosocial development of preschool children.

Pem (2015) investigated factors affecting early childhood growth and development in Bhutan. The researcher observes that on global scene, more than 200 million children under five years fail to reach their potential in cognitive and social development due to poverty, poor health, malnutrition, and deficit care. The researcher identified factors
contributing to growth and developments at early childhood as nutrition, parent’s behaviors, parenting, social and cultural practices, and environment. The researcher investigated how these factors affect child growth and development in 1000 days of child development from conception to 2 years. The researcher observes that if these problems are not taken into consideration, they may adversely affect the child development.

Dos Santos, dos Santos, Bastos, et al. (2008) outlined the determinants of early cognitive development: hierarchical analysis of a longitudinal study. The study described the relationship between anthropometric status, socioeconomic conditions, and quality of home environment and child cognitive development in 320 children from 20 to 42 months of age, randomly selected from 20,000 households that represent the range of socioeconomic and environmental conditions in Salvador, Bahia, Northeast Brazil. Child cognitive development was assessed using the Bayley Scales for Infant Development, and the Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment Inventory (HOME) was applied to assess the quality of the home environment. Anthropometric status was measured using the indicators weight/age and height/age ratios (z-scores), and socioeconomic data were collected through a standard questionnaire. Socioeconomic factors were found to have an indirect impact on early cognitive development mediated by the child’s proximal environment factors, such as appropriate play materials and games available and school attendance. No independent association was seen between nutritional status and early cognitive development.

2.3.3 Relationship between Home Environment and Psychosocial Development

Thus far, we have reviewed the concepts: home environment and psychosocial development, which are all in line with the first two objectives of the study. This section review literature on objective three of the study showing relationships between Home Environment and Psychosocial Development. Home environment was conceptualized as household factors and family and parental factors. So the literature was reviewed in regard to these constructs and their respective sub constructs.
Household Factors and Psychosocial Development of Children
Household related factors include type of dwelling, number of rooms in the house, whether the house is electrified or not, organisation of the house, home environment, number of adults in-house, number of children in the house, income of the parents, distance from residence to essential facilities such as hospitals, access to TV, radio and newspapers, among others. Such factors have an effect on child development for the impact on health, nutrition, diseases, access to education among others for the child. In this section, we review some of these effects on child development.

Housing and Psychosocial Development of Children
According to Vandivere, Hair, Theokas, Cleveland, McNamara, Atienza (2006) families want to live in homes and neighborhoods that will get their children off to the best possible start. High housing costs in many parts of the country complicate housing decisions, as families must weigh tradeoffs among cost, housing quality, and location. Poor and low-income families likely face the most significant constraints on their housing choices. To make matters worse, poor or low-income children tend to fare worse in other areas such as health or cognitive development. According to Harker (2006), housing affects the physical health of a child because of increases children’s risk of ill-health and disability by up to 25 percent during childhood and early adulthood. The researcher observes that bad housing is linked to debilitating and even fatal, illnesses and accidents. Diseases such as meningitis, tuberculosis (TB), asthmatic, among others. Long-term effects of the disease include deafness, blindness, and behavioral problems. Harker also highlights that housing has effects on mental health, such as such as anxiety and depression. On education, housing affects children’s ability to learn at school and study at home. Children in unfit and overcrowded homes miss school more frequently due to illnesses and infections among other effects.

The availability of stimulating materials determines the home environment (e.g., books, toys, helping teacher), but also through joint time (e.g., attending the library or the museum) (e.g., see Garrett, Ng’andu, and Ferron, 1994). Besides these, the environment
within the family offers special learning conditions for the child and can thus positively improve the development (see Wolf, 1987, Schmidt-Denter, 1995). Especially for young children the home environment is important (Luster, and Dubow, 1992, Farkas, and Beron, 2004), and concrete activities, as, for example, reading aloud are very stimulating (Haveman and Wolfe, 1994, Sch¨oler, Hasselbach, Sch¨afer, Dressler, and Engler-Th¨ummel, 2005). So far it could be shown that a stimulating environment can affect the development even stronger than the socioeconomic origin (Espy, Molfese and DiLalla, 2001). Since disadvantaged children often suffer of worse home environments, a lot of federal programs try to compensate for disadvantages in home environments, for example, Head

**Income of Parents and Psychosocial Development of Children**

There is a voluminous body of literature to support the theory that family poverty adversely affects children's health, intellectual capabilities, academic achievement, and behaviour (Weitzman & Lee, 2017). The neurocognitive effects of lead poisoning, of failure to thrive, and possibly, of iron deficiency and other early health problems in children appear to be largely or totally irreversible. All of these factors build a strong case for instituting effective primary prevention strategies. Moreover, underprivileged children with low birth weight (Smith, Brooks-Gunn, Klebanov, 1997) and lead poisoning (Bernier, A., Carlson, S. M., & Whipple, N., 2010) appear to suffer from greater cognitive impairments than do low birth weight, lead-poisoned children from more economically privileged families. Indeed, these findings may apply to the effects of other chronic conditions as well.

Poverty has been shown to be independently associated with lower IQ (Brooks-Gunn & Duncan, 1997) early school failure, school retention, suspension, and dropout (Byrd, Weitzman, 1994) increased rates of behaviour problems (Duncan, Brooks-Gunn & Klebanov, 1994) and lack of access to mental health services when faced with behaviour problems. To date, associations between poverty, diminished intellectual capabilities and academic achievement have been more robustly demonstrated than have associations
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between poverty, increased rates of behaviour problems and mental health problems (Brooks-Gunn, et al, 1997). Also, long-term poverty is more damaging than short-term poverty, and poverty that occurs during infancy and preschool years appears to be more damaging than poverty experienced later in childhood. Recent studies suggest that growing up in poverty leadsto systematic changes in brain development. These changes involve the prefrontal cortex and affect so-called executive functions, such as self-regulation, planning, and emotional control (McCormick, et al. 2006).

Biedinger (2011) observes that, families’ economic situation is determined by their educational background, so parental education seems to be the most important factor to explain developmental outcomes. Previous research has shown that there exist developmental differences of children from different social classes (e.g., see Ermisch, 2008). Feinstein (2003) finds with data of the British Cohort Study that children are already stratified by social class in a standard test of intellectual and personal development at 22 months and this stratification even becomes more extreme in later years. He also finds that having a low rank at an early age does not matter greatly for a child’s future position in the distribution unless the child is low SES as well. As a result he argues that controlling for SES, the preschool score, still matters. Nonetheless, as well as influencing early ability, family background plays a tremendously important role in determining the continued ability development of UK children. These differences even rise through the years (Feinstein, 2003). He concludes that this leads to a strong advantage of early intervention programs. However, these programs are supposed to be very expensive. According to Biedinger (2011), children in higher income families achieved better scores. The limited access of families of lower SES to economic resources sets up conditions and creates barriers that limit the educational achievements of children born in such families (Bradley and Corwyn, 2003, Craig, 2006 and Brooks-Gunn, Han, and Waldfogel, 2002). Overall, the results show a marked difference in children from advantaged versus disadvantaged backgrounds and that inequalities in cognitive achievements are already established in early years (Biedinger, 2011).
Pregnant women living in poverty may experience poor health, restricted diet, and exposure to toxins and environmental pollutants, all of which can have a direct effect on fetal development. Children living in poverty are more likely to experience developmental delays than children from higher socio-economic backgrounds because they are disproportionately exposed to a wide range of risks (Walker et al., 2007, World Bank, 2009). These include: inadequate nutrition; poor sanitation and hygiene; exposure to infection and illness; lack of access to health care; inadequate housing or homelessness; inadequate child care; exposure to violence, neglect and abuse; increased maternal stress and depression; institutionalization; and inadequate stimulation (Grantham-McGregor et al., 2007, Walker et al. 2011, Pem, 2015).

Despite heightened international efforts to bring more attention to poverty and human development, the most vulnerable children are still the most invisible. These children, aged zero to three, do not show up in mortality records, but poverty and hunger are negatively affecting their development. They survive while living in poverty during the most critical stages of cognitive, social and emotional development. Any sustained interruption to their nutrition or to their care, if not treated early, can result in irreversible damage to their development. As impoverished young children grow, they will be less likely to succeed in school and more likely to provide inadequate parenting. This will perpetuate the cycle of poverty and poor human development. The result is the perpetuation of another generation in poverty (Meisels and Shonkoff, 2000). Undernourished and poorly developed children who are at risk in those first 3 years of life are at the heart of the grinding social inequalities that drive poverty and truncate human development (Sadat, 2013). Beyond nutritional deficiencies, high rates of infectious and diarrheal diseases due to poor sanitation and toxins in water supplies have devastating effects on the development of young children. Some infections such as malaria can directly cause neurological and cognitive damage, while others have indirect effects through poor nutrition, where loss of nutrients can lead to apathy, poor absorption, and less uptake of micronutrients. The relationship between poverty and child development is not only dramatic in developing nations, it is also a major concern in developed nations.
where there are pockets poverty, and health disparities related to race/ethnicity, gender, income, and education (de Onis, Frongillo, Blössner, 2000, Chilton, Chyatte, Breaux, 2007)

**Care Giving and Psychosocial Development of Children**
Stimulating home environments and relationships are vital for nurturing the growth, learning and development of children (Walker SP et al., 2007, World Bank, 2009). The quality of child-caregiver interaction may be compromised when a child has a disability. Several studies have shown that there are differences in parent-child interaction when a child is disabled—mothers or caregivers of children with disabilities usually dominate interactions more than mothers or caregivers of children without disabilities.

**Influence of Nutrition on Child Development**
According to Sadat (2013), the prevalence of child under-nutrition in India is among the highest in the world; nearly double that of Sub-Saharan Africa, with dire consequences for morbidity, mortality, productivity, and economic growth. The researcher reports that in India, child malnutrition is responsible for 22% of the country's burden of disease. Levels of malnutrition have declined modestly, with the prevalence of underweight among children under three falling by 11% between 1992/93 and 1998/99. Although, levels of under-nutrition in India declined modestly during the 1990s, the reductions lagged far behind that achieved by other countries with similar economic growth rates (Gragnolati, Shekar, Gupta, Bredenkamp Lee, 2013). Under-nutrition, both protein-energy malnutrition and micronutrient deficiencies, directly affects many aspects of children's development. In particular, it retards their physical and cognitive growth and increases susceptibility to infection and disease, further increasing the probability of being malnourished (Sadat, 2013). Under-nutrition also affects cognitive and motor development and undermines educational attainment; and ultimately impacts on productivity at work and at home, with adverse implications for income and economic growth. Micronutrient deficiencies alone may cost India US$2.5 billion annually (Gragnolati, et al, 2013). The global community designated halving the prevalence of underweight children by 2015 as a key indicator of progress towards the then Millennium Development Goal of eradicating extreme poverty
and hunger. Economic growth alone, though impressive, will not reduce malnutrition sufficiently to meet the nutrition target. If this is to be achieved, difficult choices about how to scale up and reform existing nutrition programs or introduce new ones have to be made by the Government of India and other agencies involved in nutrition in India (Gragnolati, et al, 2013).

Nutritional anemia is a recognized public health problem throughout the world. An estimated 30% of the world's population is anemic, with the global prevalence of anemia among 6-12 year-old children to be 36% and 77% in developing regions respectively. Iron deficiency anemia (IDA) was found to be the commonest followed by vitamin B12 and folic acid deficiencies (Gomber, Bhawna, Lal, Kela, 2003). The literature regarding the possible effects of iron deficiency on cognitive function and psycho-affective development was critically reviewed in 1976 (Pollitt and Leibel, 1976). Despite serious shortcomings in research design and measures of independent and outcome variables, considered as a group these studies suggested that iron deficiency might have adverse effects on attention, intelligence test performance, and school achievement. During the intervening years, the relevant study designs and measurements have been significantly improved (Pollitt, Saco-Pollitt, Leibel, Viteri, 1986). Iron deficiency anemia (IDA) is common across all age groups, but highest among children and pregnant, and lactating women, and affects about 2 billion people in developing countries. The consequences of IDA in pregnant women include increased risk of low-birth weight or premature delivery, perinatal, and neonatal mortality, inadequate iron stores for the newborn, lowered physical activity, fatigue and increased risk of maternal morbidity. It is also responsible for almost a quarter of maternal deaths. Inadequate iron stores as a newborn child, coupled with insufficient iron intake during the weaning period, have been shown to impair intellectual development by adversely affecting language, cognitive, and motor development. Infants with iron-deficiency anemia or other indications of chronic, severe iron deficiency have shown lower cognitive test scores than infants with good iron status (Gomber, Bhawna, Lal, Kela, 2003 and Lozoff B, Jimenez E, Smith, 2006).
Media Use and Psychosocial Development of Children
Television has the potential to generate both positive and negative effects, and many studies have looked at the impact of television on society, particularly on children and adolescents (Dietz & Strasburger, 1991 and Johnson, Cohen, Smailes, Kasen, Brook, 2002). An individual child’s developmental level is a critical factor in determining whether the medium will have positive or negative effects. Not all television programs are bad, but data showing the negative effects of exposure to violence, inappropriate sexuality and offensive language are convincing (American Academy of Pediatrics, 2001). Still, physicians need to advocate continued research into the negative and positive effects of media on children and adolescents. Television viewing frequently limits children’s time for vital activities such as playing, reading, learning to talk, spending time with peers and family, storytelling, participating in regular exercise, and developing other necessary physical, mental and social skills (Canadian Paediatric Society, 2002). In addition to the amount of time spent in front of the television, other factors that influence the medium’s effect on children include the child’s developmental level, individual susceptibility and whether children watch television alone or with their parents.

Television can be a powerful teacher (Wright & Huston, 1995). Watching some programs that are educative can teach toddlers valuable lessons about racial harmony, cooperation, kindness, simple arithmetic and the alphabet through an educational television format. Some public television programs stimulate visits to the zoo, libraries, bookstores, museums and other active recreational settings, and educational videos can certainly serve as powerful prosocial teaching devices. In some disadvantaged settings, healthy television habits may actually be a beneficial teaching tool (Wright et al, 1995). Still, watching television takes time away from reading and schoolwork. More recent and well-controlled studies show that even 1 h to 2 h of daily unsupervised television viewing by school-aged children has a significant deleterious effect on academic performance, especially reading (Strasburger, 1986).
The amount of violence on television is on the rise (Paquette, 2003). The average child sees 12,000 violent acts on television annually, including many depictions of murder and rape. More than 1000 studies confirm that exposure to heavy doses of television violence increases aggressive behaviour, particularly in boys (Johnson et al. 2002). Other studies link television or newspaper publicity of suicides to an increased suicide risk (Gould &Davidson, 1988 and Gould, Shaffer, Kleinman,. 1988). Studies have shown that such groups of children may be more vulnerable to violence on television: children from minority and immigrant groups; emotionally disturbed children; children with learning disabilities; children who are abused by their parents; and children in families in distress (Josephson, 1995 and Johnson et al. 2002). Physicians who see a child with a history of aggressive behaviour should inquire about the child’s exposure to violence portrayed on television. This affects the socio-emotional development of the child.

Some video games may help the development of fine motor skills and coordination, but many of the concerns about the negative effects of television (e.g., inactivity, asocial behaviour and violence) also apply to excessive exposure to video games. Violent video games should be discouraged because they have harmful effects on children’s mental development (Josephson, 1995, Thompson & Haniger 2001). Parents should be advised to familiarize themselves with various rating systems for video games and use this knowledge to make their decisions. The effect of violent video games on children has been a public health concern for many years. No quantitative analysis of video game contents for games rated as suitable for all audiences was made until 2001 (Thompson et al, 2001). The study concluded that many video games rated as suitable for all audiences contained significant amounts of violence (64% contained intentional violence and 60% rewarded players for injuring a character). Therefore, current ratings of video games leave much room for improvement (Wals & Gentile, 2001).

**Play and Psychosocial Development of Children**

Play is so important to optimal child development that it has been recognized by the United Nations High Commission for Human Rights as a right of every child (Office of the
United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 1989). Play allows children to use their creativity while developing their imagination, dexterity, and physical, cognitive, and emotional strength. Play is important to healthy brain development (Shonkoff, Phillips, 2000 and Tamis-LeMonda, Shannon, Cabrera, Lamb, 2004). It is through play that children at a very early age engage and interact in the world around them. Play allows children to create and explore a world they can master, conquering their fears while practicing adult roles, sometimes in conjunction with other children or adult caregivers (Flaxman, 1999 and Tsao, 2002). As they master their world, play helps children develop new competencies that lead to enhanced confidence and the resiliency they will need to face future challenges.

Undirected play allows children to learn how to work in groups, to share, to negotiate, to resolve conflicts, and to learn self-advocacy skills. When play is allowed to be child driven, children practice decision-making skills, move at their own pace, discover their own areas of interest, and ultimately engage fully in the passions they wish to pursue ((Flaxman, 1999 and Tsao, 2002) Ideally, much of play involves adults, but when play is controlled by adults, children acquiesce to adult rules and concerns and lose some of the benefits play offers them, particularly in developing creativity, leadership, and group skills (Ginsburg, 2006). In contrast to passive entertainment, play builds active, healthy bodies. In fact, it has been suggested that encouraging unstructured play may be an exceptional way to increase physical activity levels in children, which is one important strategy in the resolution of the obesity epidemic. Perhaps above all, play is a simple joy that is a cherished part of childhood (Ginsburg, 2006).

Children’s developmental trajectory is critically mediated by appropriate, affective relationships with loving and consistent caregivers as they relate to children through play (Ginsburg, 2006). When parents observe their children in play or join with them in child-driven play, they are given a unique opportunity to see the world from their child’s vantage point as the child navigates a world perfectly created just to fit his or her needs. (The word “parent” is used in this report to represent the wide range of adult caregivers
who raise children.) The interactions that occur through play tell children that parents are fully paying attention to them and help to build enduring relationships (Coolahan, Fantuzzo, Mendez, McDermott, 2000, and Fantuzzo, McWayne, 2002). Parents who have the opportunity to glimpse into their children’s world learn to communicate more effectively with their children and are given another setting to offer gentle, nurturing guidance.

Less verbal children may be able to express their views, experiences, and even frustrations through play, allowing their parents an opportunity to gain a fuller understanding of their perspective. Quite simply, play offers parents a wonderful opportunity to engage fully with their children. Play is integral to the academic environment. It ensures that the school setting attends to the social and emotional development of children as well as their cognitive development. It has been shown to help children adjust to the school setting and even to enhance children’s learning readiness, learning behaviors, and problem-solving skills (Fantuzzo, et al. 2002). Social-emotional learning is best integrated with academic learning; it is concerning if some of the forces that enhance children’s ability to learn are elevated at the expense of others. Play and unscheduled time that allow for peer interactions are important components of social-emotional learning (Coolahan, et al. 2000).

**Parental and Family Factors and Psychosocial Development of Children**

Parental and family factors cited Kumar et al. (1997) include mother’s education, father’s education, occupation of the father, child care when mother is absent, and provision of appropriate opportunities and play materials, play space, child’s access to TV, simple chores at home and strictness of discipline. The researcher lament that these factors affect child psychosocial development of children. In this section, the researcher reviews some of these factors.

**Parent’s Education and Psychosocial Development of Children**

It is assumed that educational success depends on children’s abilities in preschool age. The acquisition of these abilities is determined thereby particularly by the family. The
family’s influence is measured as the effect of education of the caretaker and by their home environment. Also within newer datasets like the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS), George, Hansen, and Schoon (2007) state that children with the most educated parents (who had degree-level or above qualifications) are on average about 12 months ahead of those with the least educated parents (who had no qualifications). In one of the studies conducted in rural population, it’s found that poor maternal education is one of the variables most often cited as having a predictive value for poor developmental outcome in children. In this study, among the fathers, majority had completed minimum 10 years of education. The results indicated that higher education among the parents had a positive effect on child development. Since, the literacy of the father and family income are interrelated, most of the families which were involved in this study were from low socio-economic class and majority of the mothers were unemployed (Sadat, Balaji, Dhaded, Goudar, 2011, and Sadat, Balaji, Dhaded, Goudar, 2011).

Studies have found out that parental education level has an impact on young children’s cognitive and language development. According to Roberts, Bornstein, Slater and Barrett (1999), parents’ level of education correlates with the cognitive development of babies between 12 months and 27 months of age. Data obtained from a study of 16,000 three-year-old children, who were assessed within the framework of the British Millennium Cohort Study (George, Hansen and Schoon, 2007), indicated that children with the most educated parents (who had degree-level or above qualifications) were on average about 12-13 months ahead of those with the least educated parents (who had no qualifications). Other studies have also shown that there exists a link between parents’ and children’s literacy levels. Several recent studies found that parents with low literacy levels, are less likely to help their children with reading and writing (Williams, Clemens, Oleinikova, and Tarvin, 2003; Parsons and Bynner, 2007); feel less confident in doing so (Williams et al., 2003); are less likely to have children who read for pleasure (Parsons and Bynner, 2007); are more likely to have children with lower cognitive and language development levels (De Coulon, Meschi and Vignoles, 2008).
Chevalier, Harmon, O’ Sullivan and Walker (2013) investigated the relationship between early school-leaving and parental education and paternal income using UK Labour Force Survey data. Using OLS (ordinary least squares) estimation revealed modest effects of income, stronger effects of maternal education relative to paternal, and stronger effects on sons than daughters. Using IV to simultaneously model the endogeneity of parental education and income, the maternal education effect disappears, while paternal education remains significant but only for daughters. In their favourite specification, which proxy for permanent income, paternal income becomes insignificant. Thus, they conclude that policies alleviating income constraints to alter schooling decisions may not be as effective as policies which increase permanent income.

d. Parent’s Occupation and Psychosocial Development of Children
Parents play an important role in shaping the adult lives of their children. They invest their time and money in activities that affect their offspring's well-being. In particular, fathers' and mothers' employment affects both the income coming into the family and the time devoted to children's development. This study aimed to measure the effects of parents having less time available for their children, because of paid employment, on their children's educational attainment, economic inactivity, mental health and early childbearing. Parents' employment patterns can have long-term consequences for their children's development. A study by Ermisch and Francesconi (2001) measured the impact on young people of having spent less time with their parents when they were young because of work arrangements. Using unique features of the British Household Panel Study, the analysis compares differences in parents' employment patterns and outcomes between 516 pairs of siblings born in the 1970s. They found out that there was strong evidence of a trade-off for mothers who were employed full-time when their children were under five. Although full-time work increased family income, less time for mothers to interact with their families tended to reduce children's later educational attainments (the analysis controlled for family income). They also found out that longer periods of full-time employment by mothers when their children were aged one to five tended to reduce the child's chances of obtaining A-level qualifications or their equivalent; increase the child's
risk of unemployment and other economic inactivity in early adulthood; increase the child's risk of experiencing psychosocial distress as a young adult and reduce the chances of daughters giving birth before the age of 21. In addition to these findings, they observed that part-time employment by mothers appeared to have few adverse effects on children as young adults.

A longer period of part-time employment by mothers when their child was a preschooler reduced the child's educational attainments, but this effect was smaller than that of full-time employment at these ages. Also they observed that the effects of fathers' employment on the outcomes studied were generally less important than those of mothers' paid work. Longer periods of work by fathers when their children were preschoolers tended to reduce the child's risk of unemployment and other economic inactivity in early adulthood; reduce the child's risk of experiencing psychosocial distress as a young adult; reduce the child's chances of obtaining A-level qualifications or their equivalent. They finally also observed that having lived in a lone-parent family during childhood was associated with lower educational achievements and also, if the lone parent family became a stepfamily, a higher risk of daughters giving birth before the age of 21.

2.4 Gaps Identified in the Literature
Based on the literature above, different studies have been carried out related to home environment and psychosocial development or both. However, none of the current studies had been done on relationship between home environment and psychosocial development. Besides this, none of the studies targeted parents of preschool children and the respondents. Contextually, none of the studies were carried out in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya. This study bridged this gap left by previous researchers.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction
This chapter presents the research design(s), target population, sample size, sampling techniques; research instrument and how its validity and reliability were ensured, how data were analysed to achieve the study objectives, data gathering procedures, ethical considerations and limitations that this study may face.

3.1 Research Design
The study adopted quantitative design. Moreover, correlation design was preferred because of its ability to establish the relationship between variables i.e. independent variable (home environment) and dependent variable (psychosocial development). Finally, the researcher used cross-sectional design because data were collected once and for all. The researcher believed that this design enabled this study to achieve the intended objectives and purpose.

3.2 Target Population
According to the Ministry of Education (2017), preschool in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya is covered by 700 primary schools. Mois-Bridge Zone, where this study was carried out, is comprised of 20 preschools (12 public and 8 private). The researcher dealt with parents from four chosen public preschools. These were chosen because they could easily provide the information for data collection basing on the objectives in this study. These preschools were coded as in school A, B, C and D for the purposes of confidentiality. In school A, there are 53 preschoolers, school B are 65 pupils, school C are 50 pupils and school D there are 40 pupils. This made a total target population of 378 respondents, assuming that the child had two parents (mother and father).
3.3 Sample Size
The minimum sample size of 190 was obtained using Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table for determining sample size from a given population. Using this table, the sample sizes from different target populations are shown in the following formula:

$$S = \frac{X^2NP (1-P)}{d^2(N-1) + X^2P (1-P)}$$

Where: 
- $S$ = Required Sample size
- $X$ = $Z$ value (e.g. 1.96 for 95% confidence level)
- $N$ = (378) Population Size
- $P$ = Population proportion (expressed as decimal) (assumed to be 0.5 (50%))
- $d$ = Degree of accuracy (5%), expressed as a proportion (.05); It is margin of error

Hence, 

$$S = \frac{1.96^2 \times 378 \times 0.5 \times (1-0.5)}{0.5 (378-1) + 1.96^2 \times 0.5 (1-0.5)} = 190 \text{ respondents}$$

3.4 Sampling Technique
The researcher used random sampling. This technique was chosen for this study due to the large population in the selected area of study and because of time constraints and other factors, the researcher opted that employing this technique enabled the researcher to give equal opportunity to all eligible respondents since it is impossible to serve all of them, it is in this way that any form of biasness was avoided.
3.5 Research Instrument
The instruments that were used in this study were researcher made questionnaire and interview guide. The questionnaire was generally divided into three sections, one on bio-data of respondents, the other on home environment (household factors, parental and family factors) and the other section on psychosocial development of preschool children in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya. Self-Administered Questionnaires (SAQs) was directed towards parents of children in preschool in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya. The interview guide had three items two of them focusing on home environment and psychosocial development respectively while the other relating both home environment and psychosocial development.

3.6 Validity and Reliability of the Research Instrument
3.6.1 Validity of Instruments
Validity is the extent to which the instruments use during the study measure the issues they are intended to measure (Amin, 2005). To ensure validity of instruments, the instruments were developed under close guidance of the supervisor. After designing the questions, the researcher conducted a pre-tested. This helped to identify ambiguous questions in the instruments and contributed to re-align the questionnaires to the objectives. The questionnaires were given to the supervisor to judge the validity of questions basing on to the objectives. After the assessment of the questionnaire, the necessary adjustments were made bearing in mind the objectives of the study. Then a content validity index (CVI) of 0.81 was measured by using the following formula,

\[
CVI = \frac{\text{Number of items rated as relevant}}{\text{Total number of items rated in the questionnaire}}
\]

\[
CVI = \frac{21}{26} = 0.81
\]
Thus, if the CVI computed is above 0.7 (i.e. 0.81), the standard Cronbach alpha, the instruments has to be considered valid. This was also in line with Amin (2005) who noted that the overall CVI for the instrument should be calculated by computing the average of the instrument and for the instrument to be accepted as valid the average index should be 0.70 or above.

3.6.2 Reliability of Instruments

Reliability is the extent to which the measuring instruments produce consistent scores when the same groups of individuals are repeatedly measured under the same conditions (Amin, 2005). The researcher administered one type of questionnaire to all the participants. As well the researcher used Cronbach’s alpha. The composite reliability takes into account that indicators have different loadings and can be interpreted in the same way as Cronbach’s α (that is, no matter which particular reliability coefficient is used, an internal consistency reliability value above .70 is regarded as satisfactory, whereas a value below .60 indicates a lack of reliability). Nevertheless, the interpretation of internal consistency reliability using composite reliability coefficient is based on the rule of thumb provided by Bagozzi & Yi (1988) as well as Hair et al. (2011), suggested that the composite reliability coefficient should be at least .70 or more. The following table shows the composite reliability coefficients of the study constructs.

Table showing the results of the Composite Reliability Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial development</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House hold factors</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental and family factors</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Computation from primary data (2018)

As shown in the above table. The composite reliability coefficient of all constructs ranged from 0.79 to 0.96, with each exceeding the minimum acceptable level of .70, suggesting adequate internal consistency reliability of the instrument used in this study (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Hair et al., 2011b).
3.7 Data Analysis
In order to achieve the objectives of the study the researcher used the following data analysis tools. First for the demographic factors of respondents, the researcher used frequencies and percentages, to show how many of different characteristics of respondent were met. To achieve objective one, the researcher used both frequency and percentage and means and standard deviation. This is because some items under household and parental and family factors are categorical while others are numerical. Therefore, the researcher used this analysis tools to achieve this objective. To achieve objective two of the study, the researcher used means and standard deviation to find out the extent of child development. This is because the variable (psychosocial development) are Likert scaled and numerical in nature. Items of travelling distance from home to important facilities and media use, these are numerical and thus their relationship with psychosocial development was analysed using correlation and simple linear regression analysis. Other constructs under home environment were multi-categorical in nature, thus to test their relationship on psychosocial development, Pearson correlation was tested at 0.05 level of significance.

3.8 Data Gathering Procedures
The following data collection procedures were implemented: Fist of all, the researcher requested for an introduction letter from the College of Open, Distance and E-Learning addressed to the administrators of the selected schools as well as parents under study for the researcher to be permitted to conduct the study. The letter contained the criteria for selecting the respondents and the requested to be provided with the list of parents.

Secondly, the researcher and his assistants requested the respondents to perform the following: (1) to sign the informed consent; (2) to answer all questions hence should not leave any item unanswered; (3) to avoid biases and to be objective in answering the questionnaires. The researcher and his assistants retrieved the questionnaires within two weeks from the date of distribution. All questionnaires retrieved were checked if completely filled out. However, 19 questionnaires were returned and uncompleted; i.e. 171 out of 190 of which gave a rate of 90%. Finally, the data collected were organized,
collated, summarized, statistically treated and drafted in tables using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

3.9 Ethical Considerations
To ensure utmost confidentiality for the respondents and the data provided by them as well as reflect ethics practiced in this study, the following were done:

1. All questionnaires were coded to provide anonymity of the respondents and to avoid embarrassing and harming respondents, especially if information got from them could be used politically or otherwise to harm the respondents.

2. The respondents were requested to sign the informed consent before participating in the research; the researcher did not use hidden mechanical devices to record the research findings.

3. All Authors used in this study were quoted in recognition of what was cited from them and referenced accordingly.

4. The research findings got from the study were generalized.

3.10 Limitations of the Study
The researcher claimed an acceptable (0.05 level of significance) 5% margin of error in view of the following anticipated threats to validity with relevance to this study, extraneous variables such as honesty of the respondents where some of the respondents are expected not to answer the truth but the researcher probed further to establish the truth when it deem necessary and for attrition/Mortality, out 190 that were distributed, only 171 were retrieved. The retrieval was 90% which was acceptable. However, time and other logical issues were abundantly available to the researcher while doing this research work. Nonetheless, the researcher used the resources available effectively and efficiently with in the period scheduled to conduct the study. The researcher overcame the limitation by assuring the respondents their information would be treated with utmost confidentiality. The researcher mitigated this by encouraging the respondents to be truthful since the results of the study if released would help them understand Home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge zone in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

4.0 Introduction
In this chapter, the findings of the study are presented in form of frequency counts, correlation coefficients and regression analyses. Logical interpretations were made in relation to the objectives of the study.

4.1 Demographic profile of respondents
Three major demographic characteristics of the respondents were considered in this study among which included gender, age and marital status. Gender was in the category of father and mother, the age of the respondents was categorized in three, that is 20-39, 40-59, and 60 years and above. The marital status of the respondent was categorized into five, which included single, married, widowed, divorced or separated. These characteristics were deemed essential as they influence the preschool children’s psychosocial development.

**Table 4.1. Frequency and percentage of demographic profile of respondents (n=171)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 +</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data (2018)
Table 4.1 indicates the demographic profile of the respondents. From the table, 86 respondents out of 171 (50.3%) were mothers and 49.7% were fathers. This implies that the majority of the respondents were mothers who mostly live with children. Concerning the age of the respondents, most of the respondents belonged to the age groups of (40-59) with 49.1% and 20-39 with 48.0%, a few respondents, that is 5% belonged to the age group of 60+. This implies that the information provided belonged to reliable age groups. For the marital status of the respondents, 125 out of 171 respondents (73.1%) were married, 25 that is 14.6% were single, 10 respondents were widowed with 5.8%, 6 respondents (3.5%) were separated while the least number of the respondents were the divorced ones with only 3.5%. This implies that marital status represented a true reflection of the population that is widely involved in the psychosocial development of children. Married participants possibly have the information about the children basing on the experience they passed through in parenting.

4.2. Home environment (household factors and parental and family factors) of parents of preschool children
According to the study’s 1st objective which aims at examining the home environment (household factors and parental and family factors) of parents of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya. The study identified house factors such as type of dwelling, Number of rooms in the house, whether house is electrified, organization of the house, Home environment while the parental and family factors included among others, the number of adults in the household, the number of children aged below 15 years and parent’s level of income. The household, parental and family factors are analyzed in tables 4.2.A, 4.2.B, 4.2.C and 4.2.D in a descriptive form using frequencies and percentages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household factors</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of dwelling</td>
<td>Hut</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mud house</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Made of bricks</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cemented</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of rooms in house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House electrified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of house</td>
<td>Quite well</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disorganized</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home environment</td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dirty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adults in household</td>
<td>&lt; 4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children (aged &lt;15 years)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents level of income</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data (2018)
Table 4.2.A indicates the households factors that include, type of dwelling, number of rooms in the house, house electrified, organization of the house, home environment, number of adults, number of children aged 15 above and parents level of income. It is indicated in the table that concerning the type of dwelling, most of the respondents that is 97 (56.7%) live in mud houses, 46 (26.9%) live in houses made of bricks, 13.5% (23) live in cemented houses while 5 (2.9%) respondents live in huts. This was due to the fact that the research was carried in a rural setting where most people are deprived from low incomes thus most cannot afford putting up permanent dwellings.

For the number of rooms in the house, it is indicated in the table that most respondents that is 67 (39.2%) and 60 (35.1%) live in houses with 3 and 2 rooms respectively, 21 (12.3%) live in houses with 4 rooms, 14 (8.2%) live in houses with only 1 room while a few respondents (5.3%) live in houses with more than 5 rooms. Concerning whether the respondents’ house is electrified, the results in the table indicate that 101 households have electricity in their houses with the highest percentage of 59.1, a few respondents (40.9%) indicated that they do not have electricity in their houses.

The results also indicated that the organization of the house was relatively well evidenced by a high percentage response of 76.6%, 31 respondents (18.1%) responded asserting that their houses were quite well while a few respondents (5.3%) revealed that their houses were disorganized. Regarding home environment, the results of the study revealed that a big number of respondents 161 (94.2%) have clean environment while very few respondents (10 with 5.8%) have dirty environment.

Also the number of adults in the household was a major household factor that was considered in the study, and the findings of the study revealed that households with less than 4 adults have the highest number of 94 with 55%, while those households with 4 to 6 adults were the second highest with 33.3% (57), few households were indicated to be having adults between 7 to 9 and 10 above with only 18 (10.5%) and 2 (1.2%) respectively.

Another important household factor was the number of children below 15 years of age. It is shown in the table that households with 2 children were many with a high number of 52 (30.4%) followed by those with 3 children under age of 15 years with a percentage of
26.3 (45), it was also indicated in the table that households with 4, and 5 and above children were equal in number, that is 29 households with a percentage of 17.0%, only 16 (9.4%) households have 1 child, the findings revealed.

In terms of the parents’ level of income as a key household factor, the biggest proportion of the respondents were in the middle class 108 (63.3%), 47 (27.5%) were in the low class and very few respondents (9.4%) belonged to the high class. This implies that most of the respondents are fairly financially good to help in their children’s psychosocial development.

**Table 4.2.B: Means and Standard Deviation Showing the Distance to Different Important Centers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important Centers</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health center</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td><strong>2.97</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Easy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data (2018)

Findings in table 4.2. B revealed that the respondents’ house travelling distance from the important centers is generally easy, this is indicated by an overall mean of 2.97. This is supported by the fact that the respondents’ houses were at an easy travelling distance from the primary schools being ranked the first with a high mean response of 3.15. It was also evidenced from the fact the respondents’ houses were at an easy travelling distance from the nursery schools, High schools and health centers with quite high response means of 3.11, 3.01 and 2.98 respectively. The findings also revealed that most respondents’ houses were at quite a hard travelling distance from the Hospital. This by the fact that it was ranked the last with a low response mean and standard deviation of 2.60 and 0.724 respectively.
Table 4.2.C: Means and standard deviation showing the use of different types of media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Very Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data (2018)

Table 4.2.C shows the rate of media use among the respondents that the study sampled. It is indicated in the table that respondents rarely use media in their households. This is revealed by a low response mean of 2.47. The low levels of media use among the respondents were also seen from a relatively very rare use of newspapers by the respondents. This was ranked the last with a very low response mean and standard deviation of 1.92 and 0.958 respectively. However, despite the fact that respondents rarely use media, the findings also revealed that most respondents occasionally listen to radio. This is observed from the table as it was ranked the first with a quite high mean response of 2.97. Also a few respondents rarely watch television. This is from the fact that it was ranked the 2nd with a mean response of 2.53.
## Table 4.2.D Frequency and Percentage Showing the Parental and Family Factors (n=171)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education of mother</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Just literate</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of father</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Just literate</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation of father</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artisan/Shop keeper</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care when mother busy</td>
<td>Carries the child</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leaves the child in cradle/floor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child plays alone</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Looked after by others</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of appropriate play opportunities and materials</td>
<td>Child has toys</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toy substitutes</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing space</td>
<td>Indoor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child has access to</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cinema</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Books</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table 4.2.D above shows the parent and family factors that influence the child psychosocial development. It was revealed that regarding the education of the mother, a big proportion of the mothers completed secondary level with 40.4% (69), 57 (33.3%) of the mothers completed primary level, 30 (17.5%) were just literate, very few mothers 8 (4.7%) completed university, while the rest (4.1%) are totally illiterate. Regarding also the education of the father, it was indicated that 75 (43.9%) out of the 171 respondents completed secondary level, 44 (25.7%) completed primary level, 34 (19.9%) were just literate, 12 (7.0%) completed university level while very few fathers (3.5%) were indicated to be totally illiterate. From this analysis, it can be drawn that fathers were more educated than the mothers where very few mothers had completed university as compared to the fathers and also the number of mothers who were totally illiterate were more than that of the fathers.

The results of the analysis indicated most fathers were occupationally Agriculturalists with the highest percentage of 37.4 (64). The proportion of fathers who are artisan/shop keepers was found to be 20.5% while 34 (19.9%) of the fathers in the sampled households were found to be laborers, only 27 (15.8%) in the sample were in the service sector and 6.4% were doing other activities other than the listed activities in this study.
Concerning child care when mother is busy, the findings indicated that 97 (56.7%) of the mothers leave their children to be looked after by others, 44 (25.7%) of the mothers carry the baby while doing their work, 20 (11.7%) mothers leave their children in the cradle/floor when they are doing work and only 10 (5.8%) mothers indicated that they leave their children to play alone whenever they busy with work.

The findings also indicated that 122 (71.3%) of the mothers provided their children with toy substitutes as appropriate play materials while the rest 49 (28.7%) have toys for their child play. This implies that most children have a variety of play materials that can develop them socially and emotionally.

In terms of playing space, the results of the analysis indicated that children of a greater number of respondents, that is 153 (89.5%) out of 171 play from outdoors, only 18 (10.5%) play from indoors. Children who play from outdoor are exposed to different environment which influences much their psychosocial development.

Looking at the child’s access to television, radio, cinema or books, the findings showed that 65 (38.0%) of the respondents’ children have access to radios, 57 (33.3%) have access to books, 46 (26.9%) have access to television, and only 3 (1.8%) of the respondents have children who have access to cinema. This implies that most children in the households have high access to media which increases their cognitive development.

It was also revealed that out of 171 respondents that participated in the study, 140 (81.9%) have children who can do simple chores while only 31 (18.1%) were reported not to be having children who were able to do simple chores.

Further still, it was indicated that regarding strictness of discipline, 128 (74.9%) parents were moderately strict to their children, 26 (15.2%) were reported to be very strict while only 17 (9.9%) parents were found to be least strict. This implies that most children have freedom of expression, this enables them to easily interact with their parents and other elders in the household. It was revealed according to the findings of the study that the mother mostly participates in storytelling, teaching and taking children out than the fathers. This proves the fact that most children grow in the hands of their mothers.
4.3 Means and standard deviation showing the level of psychosocial development of preschool children (n=171)

According to Sclafani (2005), psychosocial development refers to the interaction of both psychosocial and social forces over the development of individuals across the life span. It is in the domain of socialization influences. In this study, the psychosocial development of the preschool children was measured in three perspectives that is, cognitive development, social development and emotional development. Four likert scaled questions were used in the study to assess the level of psychosocial development where the respondents were asked to rate using for example, never, rarely, sometimes and always given a statement/question concerning the child’s development. The results were analyzed using the mean responses and generalization for each measure was done basing on the overall mean responses. The conclusion on the level of psychosocial development was drawn in table 4.3. Cbasing on the general mean of the three measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. Dev.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My child begins to recognize certain objects as having special qualities</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child can have a conversion of amount-quantity and length</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child recognizes meaning from a printed word</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child is curious of his or her environment</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child reads well and enjoys reading</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child wants to know answers to all types of questions</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child learns to develop learning problem skills</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child can put events or things in sequence or order e.g arranging items from smallest to biggest</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child can use and recognize symbols</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child know how to count</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Primary Data (2018)
From the results in the table above, it is revealed that there is a high level of cognitive development among the preschool children evidenced from a generally high overall mean response of 3.0. This implies that the children have a high information processing, perceptual skills, high language learning skills and other aspects of the developed adult brain. This fact is built on grounds of children beginning to recognize certain objects as having special quality as it was ranked the first with a mean response of 3.11. Additionally the high cognitive development is attributed to by the factor of the children being able to have a conversion of amount-quantity and length as it was ranked the 2nd with a mean response of 3.09. Furthermore the findings revealed that the children were able to recognize meaning from printed word. This was observed from a mean response of 3.09 interpreted as high implying that most of the preschool children of the sampled respondents were able to look at a printed word and tell the meaning of such a word. Also it is indicated from the findings of the study that the children were highly curious of their environment (mean =3.08, rank = 4). This therefore means that the children always desired (have zeal) to learn more from the environment in which they were living.

### Table 4.3.B Means and Standard Deviation Showing Social Development (n=171)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My child imitates the action of others</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child is self-assertive among his or her peers</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.338</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child is friendly</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child engages in fantasy play</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child has a sense of humor seen in practical jokes</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child loves to be independent</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child shows no sense of privacy while playing with others</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child differentiates between bad and good behaviors</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child takes turns in games</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child loves to share with others</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data (2018)
Table 4.3 shows the level of social development of the preschool children of respondents who participated in the study. The level of social development among children was measured using 10 scaled questions. According to the study analysis, it was indicated that there is a high level of social development among the preschool children. This was observed from an overall mean response of 3.13 which was interpreted as high. This fact was supported by a very high level at which the children imitate other (mean = 3.37, Sd. =0.541. rank = 1) implying that the children highly learn and acquire new skills from others. Also a high level of social development was indicated by a very high level of self-assertiveness among the children (mean = 3.35, rank =2) which is interpreted as very high implying that the children can put up self-opinions that they stand for among their peers. In addition, the findings also indicate that the children are highly friendly (mean = 3.15, rank = 3), interpreted as very high. This implies the children do share and play with their peers in the society. The findings further indicated that there is a high level of engagement in fantasy play, and also a high sense of humor seen in practical jokes among the children, this was observed from high mean responses of 3.15 and 3.14 respectively. This implies that the engaging of children in fantasy play and practical jokes helps their minds to be always active which increases their psychosocial development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My child asks a lot of questions</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child loves to control his or her emotions</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child is increasing ability to control emotions, less emotional outbursts</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child understands when someone is hurting</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child works with minimal supervision</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child can say no emphatically</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child understands concepts of right and wrong</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child can express his or her emotions such as happiness, anger, fear etc.</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child’s self-esteem reflects opinions of significant others</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child is able to control his/her anger</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.08</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data (2018)

Evidence from the findings of the study have revealed that the emotional development of the preschool children has been relatively high among the respondents who participated in the study, this is observed from an overall mean response of 3.11 interpreted as high. This high emotional development among the preschool children is supported by the fact that children often ask their parents a lot of question, this was ranked as the first with a mean response of 3.36 interpreted as very high implying that the children have a high zeal to know more every time which develops them emotionally. Also a very high level of love to control emotions among the children revealed the high level of emotion development. This is observed from the table as it was ranked the 2\textsuperscript{nd} with a mean response of 3.36 and standard deviation of 0.629 interpreted as very high implying that the children’s high love
to control emotions saves them from dangers such as fights with fellow children. Similarly a high level of children emotional development is attributed to by increasing abilities to control emotions and less emotional outbursts, a high understanding among the children when someone is hurting. This is observed from equal mean responses of 3.10 interpreted as high implying that the children’s abilities to control emotions and an understanding when someone is hurting helps them avoid provoking their elders.

In reference to the study’s second objective which aims at determining the level of psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya, it is revealed from the findings of the study in table 4.3.C that there is generally a high level of psychosocial development among the preschool children. This is observed from a general mean of 3.08. This high level is explained by a high level of cognitive development among the preschool children, a high level of social development and also a high level of emotional development among the children.
4.4 Relationship between home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya

Data manipulated by using SPSS Version 19 helped the researcher to extract the information basing on the responses of the respondents on home environment and the impacts on the development of preschool children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya as follow:

**TABLE 4.4 A. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HOME ENVIRONMENT AND PSYCHOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN IN UASIN-GISHU COUNTY, KENYA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Computed r-Value</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Decision of Ho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home environment Vs Psychological development of pre-school children</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>Significant correlation</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: **. Survey data, 2018; (0.05 level of significance)

Findings as shown in table 4.4.A by using Pearson’s correlation coefficient at 0.05 level of significance, it is evident that the null hypothesis of “no significant relationship between home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya” is rejected, thus H₀ was accepted. It is shown that the r value is .287. There is a relationship between home environment and psychological development of pre-school children among primary school children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya since the sig. .004 is less than 0.05.
Regression Analysis

Through the determination of the $R^2$, the influence of the dependent variable on the independent is noted in table.

**Table 4.4.B: Regression Analysis between Home Environment and Psychological Development of Pre-School Children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables regressed</th>
<th>Adjusted $r^2$</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Decision on $H_0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home environment Vs Psychological development of pre-school children</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>287.109</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Significant effect</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: **. Survey data, 2018; (0.05 level of significance)

Table 4.4.B indicates that there is a significant effect between home environment and psychological development of pre-school children therefore the null hypothesis is accepted and $H_1$ rejected. This shows that 70% of psychological development of pre-school children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya. This is caused by factors such as household organization, parental and family factors such as house environment, family size, types of house, parenting education, income, playing space and materials.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction
The study was guided by three specific objectives of the study, that is to examine the home environment (household factors and parental and family factors) of parents of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya, to determine the level of psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya and to establish the relationship between home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya. The findings of this study were presented based on these objectives. Conclusions were made and recommendations stated. Areas for further research were also presented.

5.1 Discussions
Based on the objectives of the study, the following were the findings of the study,

5.1.1 Home environment (household factors and parental and family factors) of parents of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya
The study found out that most of the parents with their children live in mud houses with 3 or 2 rooms at least, with electricity and well organized. The home environment in homes is relatively clean with at least less than 4 adults in each house and majorly with 2 children. Most of the parents are middle income earners. The study also found out that parents, house travelling distance from the important centers such as hospitals, health centers, and schools was generally easy, this is indicated by an overall mean of 2.97. The use of media such as newspapers, TV, Radio in households was rare. The study also found out that the mother mostly participates in storytelling, teaching and taking children out than the fathers. This proves the fact that most children grow in the hands of their mothers. This is in line with Fenson, Dale, Reznick, Bates, Thal, & Pethick, (1994) who argued that to understand the ways in which television has the potential to exert its effects on language development, it is useful to understand how language typically
develops. As well, Hart & Risley, 1995; Hoff & Naigles (2002) stated that children’s language skills rapidly unfold over the first three years of life. At 10 months, children produce about 0 to 10 words on average. At 18 months, children can say about 75 words, and at 30 months, they can say about 555 words. During this time, language acquisition is determined by the total number of words heard in children’s everyday environments and by the syntactic richness and complexity of language expressed in the home environment. Finally, Mills, Coffey-Corina, & Neville (1997) argued that whether the language skills develop over the first two years, language processing becomes more efficient and specialized in the brain. Among 20-month-old infants, for example, familiar words are processed in the left hemisphere in the parietal and temporal regions, whereas younger infants exhibited broader dispersement of activity over both hemispheres.

5.1.2 Level of psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya

In reference to this study’s second objective, the study found out that there is generally a high level of psychosocial development among the preschool children. This is observed from a general mean of 3.08. This high level is explained by a high level of cognitive development among the preschool children, a high level of social development and also a high level of emotional development among the children. This is line with Carlson, (2003) ideas who stated that parents play a crucial role in the development of executive functioning skills. Scaffolding difficult situations and responding sensitively to infants’ signals are two particularly important parental behaviors that promote EF development (Carlson, 2003). These maternal behaviors are posited to provide children with the necessary support to solve problems and gain a sense of mastery of their environment. Moreover, Bernier, Carlson, and Whipple (2010) tested whether such early caregiving behaviors (maternal sensitivity, mind-mindedness talk, and scaffolding) were related to better executive functioning skills (working memory, inhibition, and set shifting) later on. Infants were assessed at 12, 15, 18, and 26 months of age. Although there was a positive relationship among maternal sensitivity and mind-mindedness with executive function outcomes, the relationship did
not hold when the control variables (IQ, maternal education) were included. Early scaffolding behaviors, such as autonomy support (e.g., sensitivity to children’s rhythm) provided the strongest link to the development of working memory and conflict resolution, even after accounting for children’s IQ and maternal education. Such parental behaviors are posited to be important for the development of self-regulation, providing children with strategies and opportunities to practice self-control with support.

5.1.3 Relationship between home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya

Finding on this objective indicated that the null hypothesis was rejected this is because the r value was .287 and the sig. was .004 of which was less than 0.05. This implies that there were a relationship between home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children among primary school children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya. 70% of psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya was caused by household, parental and family factors such as house environment, family size, and types of house, parenting education, income; space and playing materials. This shapes Anderson, et al., (2001) investigations who stated that the early home environment is an important socialization factor that determines children’s later media habits and preferences. Additionally, Huston & Wright, (1996) stated that at home, parents teach their children how to use media and the reasons for media use through their own behaviors and habits. When parents actively coview with their children and mediate the viewing experience by labeling, questioning, and elaborating on content, children can adapt this active and cognitively engaged viewing style, which has the potential to facilitate learning from television when viewing alone.
5.2 Conclusions

5.2.1 Home environment (household factors and parental and family factors) of parents of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher made the following conclusions. Most of the children with their parents live in mud houses with majorly two to three bedrooms, electrified and well organised, clean with at least four adults. Parents in Uasin-Gishu are middle income earners, living within a travelling distance from schools, hospitals and other important centers. The access to media is rare while the mother mostly participates in storytelling, teaching and taking children out than the fathers.

5.2.2 Level of psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya

The psychosocial development of children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya is high. The level of cognitive development, social development, and emotional development are all high among preschool children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya.

5.2.3 Relationship between home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya

As well, there were a relationship between home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children among primary school children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya. Seventy percent of psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya and this was caused by household, parental and family factors such as house environment, family size, types of house, parenting education, income; space and playing materials factors.
5.3 Recommendations

Based on these findings and conclusions, the researcher made the following recommendations

5.3.1 Home environment (household factors and parental and family factors) of parents of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya

There is a need to improve on the accessibility to media to preschool children. According to social learning theory, children learn more by observing and imitating what they hear and see. Thus, using media can be one way of teaching children especially videos and TV as well as newspapers.

5.3.2 Level of psychosocial development of preschool children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya

Fathers have been found no to be so involved in the lives of preschool children in Uasin-Gishu county in storytelling, teaching, taking out among others. There is a need for fathers to get involved in the development of children. Children need their fathers at times more than their mothers especially boys. The number of people per house in comparison to the size of the house was found to be a challenge. On average, houses are of 2 to 3 rooms with an average of 4 adults and 2 children. This is a small house for these numbers of people.

5.3.3 Relationship between home environment and psychosocial development of preschool children in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya

The value of this correlation coefficient 0.287 felt under coefficient range from + 0.00 to + 0.30. Therefore, the relationship between home environment and psychosocial development is medium. Thus, the government should implement measure to curb this situation otherwise, this will lead to other issues related to health of the family and children in general.
5.4 Areas for Further Research

The researcher suggested the following areas for further study:

1. An investigation of house size and household size on growth of children
2. Child’s perspective house hold size, playing space, playing materials and their perceived growth.
3. Parenting and psychological change in households in urban areas
4. Infant’s cognitive growth and family environment in rural areas

5.5 Contribution to the knowledge

This study is backbone for the educational management as in providing information for the county education for sub-Saharan education officers to implement measures based on home environment to the psychosocial development of the children in general and understanding of how environment may people in earlier school age and thus endeavored to ensure hygienic, safe environment to facilitate learning and psychosocial development; training children and providing appropriate requirements or their substitutes for their learning appropriately.
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APPENDIX I: TRANSMITTAL LETTERS
APPENDIX II

LETTER TO THE RESPONDENTS

Dear respondent,

My name is Mrs. ALICE CHERUTO RONO. I am pursuing a Master degree in Early Childhood Development at Kampala International University. My research is titled “HOME ENVIRONMENT AND PSYCHOSOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF PRESCHOOL CHILDREN IN MOIS-BRIDGE ZONE IN UASIN-GISHU COUNTY, KENYA” and is purely for academic use. I am therefore requesting for your cooperation in answering the questions that follow. Be as honest as possible for us to have sincere findings.

Yours faithfully,

……………………….

………………………..
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APPENDIX IV

INFORMED CONSENT

I am giving my consent to be part of the research study of Mrs. ALICE CHERUTO RONO that will focus on “HOME ENVIRONMENT AND PSYCHOSOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF PRESCHOOL CHILDREN IN MOIS-BRIDGE ZONE IN UASIN-GISHU COUNTY, KENYA”. I shall be assured of privacy, anonymity and confidentiality and that I will be given the option to refuse participation and right to withdraw my participation anytime. I have been informed that the research is voluntary and that the results will be given to me if I ask for it.

Initials: ________________________________

Date______________________________
APPENDIX V

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

QUESTIONNAIRE ON HOME ENVIRONMENT AND PSYCHOSOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF PRESCHOOL CHILDREN IN MOIS-BRIDGE ZONE IN UASIN-GISHU COUNTY, KENYA

I am ALICE CHERUTO RONO a student of Kampala International University. I am conducting a study on “Home Environment and Psychosocial Development of Preschool Children in Mois-Bridge Zone in Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya. The study is mainly for academic purpose and you have been selected to participate in the study by completing the questionnaire. Your responses will be treated with confidentiality.

Thank you

Initials __________________________

PART ONE: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Please tick in the blanks provided as your response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th>MOTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age:</th>
<th>20 – 39</th>
<th>40 – 59</th>
<th>60 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Separated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART TWO: HOME ENVIRONMENT

Part 2A: Household Factors

Tick the most appropriate response

1. Type of dwelling
   _______ Hut    ______ Mud house    ______ Made of bricks    ______ Cemented

2. Number of rooms in house
   _______ 1    ______ 2    ______ 3    ______ 4    ______ 5+

3. House Electrified
   _______ Yes    ______ No

4. Organization of house
   _____ Quite well    _______ Well    _______ Disorganized

5. Nature of home environment
   _______ Clean    _______ dirty

6. No. of adults in household
   ______<4    ______ 4-6    ______ 7-9    ______10+

7. No. of children (aged <15 years)
   ______ 1    ______ 2    ______ 3    ______ 4    ______ 5+

8. House at easy travelling distance from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Hard</th>
<th>Hard</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Very easy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Health centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Media Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chance to see TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chance to listen to radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chance to read newspaper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10 Parents level of Income
_______ High   _______ Middle   _______ Low

Part 2B: Parental and Family Factors
Tick the most appropriate response

1. **Education of mother**
   ____ Illiterate   ____ Just literate  ____ Primary
   ____ Secondary   ____ University

2. **Education of father**
   ____ Illiterate   ____ Just literate  ____ Primary
   ____ Secondary   ____ University

3. **Occupation of father**
   ____ Labourer   ____ Agriculture   ____ Artisan/shop keeper
   ____ Service   ____ Others

4. **Child care when mother busy**
   ____ Carries the child   ____ Leaves child in cradle/floor
   ____ Child plays alone   ____ Looked after by others

5. **Provision of appropriate play opportunities and materials**
   ____ Child has toys   ____ Toy substitutes

6. **Playing space**
   ____ Indoor   ____ Outdoor

7. **My child has access to (Tick One of them)**
   ____ TV   ____ Radio   ____ Cinema   ____ Books

8. **My child can do simple chores**
   ____ Yes   ____ No

9. **Strictness of discipline**
   ____ Very strict   ____ Moderately strict   ____ Least strict

10. **Story telling**
    ____ Mother   ____ Father

11. **Taking out**
    ____ Mother   ____ Father

12. **Teaching**
    ____ Mother   ____ Father
## PART C: PSYCHOSOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

1 = Never  
2 = Rarely  
3 = Sometimes  
4 = Always

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My child begins to recognize certain objects as having special qualities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My child can have a conversion of amount-quantity and length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My child recognizes meaning from a printed word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My child is curious of his or her environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My child reads well and enjoys reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My child wants to know answers to all types of questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My child learns to develop learning problem skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My child can put events or things in sequence or order e.g. arranging items from smallest to biggest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My child can use and recognize symbols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My child know how to count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My child imitates the action of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My child is self-assertive among his or her peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My child is friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My child engages in fantasy play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My child has a sense of humor seen in practical jokes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My child loves to be independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My child shows no sense of privacy while playing with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My child differentiates between bad and good behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My child takes turns in games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My child loves to share with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My child asks a lot of questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My child loves to control his or her emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My child is increasing ability to control emotions, less emotional outbursts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My child understands when someone is hurting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My child works with minimal supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My child can say no emphatically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My child understands concepts of right and wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My child can express his or her emotions such as happiness, anger, fear etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My child’s self-esteem reflects opinions of significant others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My child is able to control his/her anger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your cooperation
APPENDIX VI:

TABLE FOR DETERMINING SAMPLE SIZE FOR FINITE POPULATION

To simplify the process of determining the sample size for a finite population, Krejcie & Morgan (1970), came up with a table using sample size formula for finite population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N is Population Size; S is Sample Size  
Source: Krejcie & Morgan, 1970
APPENDIX VII: THE MAP OF UASIN GISHU COUNTY

Figure 1: The Map of Uasin Gishu County

Source: https://search.yahoo.com/yhs/search