

The Effect of Parenting Style, Communication Patterns and Self-Efficacy on Adolescent Participation in Family Decision-Making

Megawati Simanjuntak

Department of Family and Consumer Sciences
Faculty of Human Ecology
IPB University
Bogor, Indonesia
mega_juntak@apps.ipb.ac.id

Risda Rizkillah

Department of Family and Consumer Sciences
Faculty of Human Ecology
IPB University
Bogor, Indonesia
risdarizkillah@apps.ipb.ac.id

Abstract— Adolescence is the period between childhood and adulthood where many different developmental tasks must be completed. One of the tasks in adolescent development is to make decisions that in the process, involve parents. This study aims to analyze the influence of parenting style, communication patterns and self-efficacy on adolescent participation in family decision-making. The research design used was a cross-sectional study design. The population of this research was teenagers from grade 10 to grade 12 who attended SMAN X Bogor City and SMAN Y Leuwiliang, Bogor Regency. Sampling in this study was carried out randomly in groups (random cluster sampling) with 323 samples. Data were obtained by self-administered using a structured questionnaire consisting of a Robinson, Mandleco, Olsen, and Hart (1995) parenting styles questionnaire, communication patterns by Ritchie and Fitzpatrick, a self-efficacy questionnaire sourced from Bandura and adolescent participation in family decision-making. The results showed that the sample self-efficacy included in the moderate category, parents in urban and rural areas had a high authoritative parenting style. Family communication patterns were still low. Adolescent participation in family decision-making belongs to the moderate category. Conformity orientation communication patterns had significant negative influences on adolescent participation in decision-making. Parents have an essential role to improve the ability of children in decision-making. Parents begin to involve children in making decisions and build balanced family communication patterns with the children and parents' orientation.

Keywords: *adolescent participation in decision-making, communication patterns, parenting style, self-efficacy*

I. INTRODUCTION

Adolescence is synonymous with the period when individuals begin to get to know themselves. Physical changes due to hormonal changes are the most noticeable changes that occur (Keenan & Evans, 2009; Ruffin, 2009; Stang & Story, 2005). According to Piaget's theory of cognitive development, adolescents operate at the level of formal operations, which means that their ability to think increases abstractly, as does the ability to think and to plan for the future. Deductive reasoning and inductive reasoning develop where specific topics can be transformed into broad generalizations. The combination of deductive and inductive reasoning and the ability to think abstractly is one reason why conflicts arise between adolescents and their parents or other authority figures (Stang & Story, 2005; Hook, 2009).

Family is one of the factors that influences children's development because the family is the first place for children to be educated and raised (Megawangi, 2009). Children interact with the family and the surrounding community. The theory underlying this research is the

Bronfenbrenner ecological theory. The ecological theory puts forward environmental factors, with the influence of environmental systems on development (Santrock, 2012). Environmental systems that affect child development include five environments, namely microsystems, mesosystems, ecosystems, macrosystems, and chronosystems.

There is a direct relationship between cognitive and emotional changes on adolescents and their developing capacity to participate in decision-making. Stage five of Erikson's psychosocial development involves identity versus role confusion, where the formation of identity is an important task that must be mastered, in this case, including decision-making about relationships and careers (Hook, 2009; Bester, 2007; Graf, Mullis, & Mullis, 2008). The involvement of children in decision-making does not necessarily occur in all families. If parents do not open up opportunities for children to participate, children will not be able to express their opinions when making decisions. Children can only express their opinions if they get support from adults. Along with the development of children into adulthood, the ability of children to make decisions must be trained.

There is a growing global trend towards the recognition of the rights of children and young people to participate in matters that affect them (Unicef, 1999). Recognizing children's rights to be heard can be interpreted as acting in the best interests of the child by giving their sole responsibility for making decisions or exaggerating the desired level of autonomy (Britto, Sawyer, Drew, & Yeo, 2007). Generalizations about children are somewhat problematic because they are not a homogeneous group (Pufall & Unsworth, 2004). It cannot be assumed that all children are responsible for decision-making or that participation benefits all children, regardless of the situation (Coyne & Harder, 2011; Stegenga & Ward-Smith, 2008; Zwaanswijk et al., 2007).

Participation refers to the right of children to express their views on matters that affect them and so that their views are followed up accordingly. While there is an increasing emphasis on social work practices regarding children's rights to participate, less attention is given to the best ways to support children's participation (Kenna, Brady, & Forkan, 2018). Children need the opportunity to learn how to participate in decision-making in specific periods and various situations. The ever-changing context of the lives of children in society today shows that the child's competence to participate in decision-making must continue to be re-evaluated (Alderson, 1993).

Based on the results of Indonesian Adolescent Reproductive Health Survey or *Survei Kesehatan Reproduksi Remaja Indonesia* (SKRRI) in 2007 on adolescent girls and boys aged 15-19 years who have not married, there are several problems faced by them in Indonesia influenced by internal and external factors. Factors originating from within individuals, among others, psychological and social problems faced, immature emotions, lack of self-control, low decision-making abilities and are not accustomed to maintaining efforts to achieve goals. These come from outside the individual, including family problems, negative influence from peers and negative influences from the community. Factors in individuals that can influence decision-making include emotional maturity, personality, intuition, and age (Noorderhaven, 1995).

The study shows that children and parents make some decisions themselves, and even if they disagree with the decisions made, some decisions are reconsidered (Hallstrom & Elander, 2004). To let children participate in decision-making can be seen as a step in child development (Noorderhaven, 1995). In other words, children have adequate understanding and intelligence to fully understand what is proposed. The standard is that adolescents can understand and store information for the decision, use the information and consider various factors related to the decision (British Medical Association, 2001). That is, in certain circumstances, even small children are able to be involved in the decision-making process. However, it is usually professionals who can judge a child's maturity to make decisions (Koocher & DeMaso, 1990; Beauchamp & Childress, 2001).

Youth participation, in decision-making in the context of home school, shows that families disagree about the role that allows children to participate in decision-making (Van der Merwe, Van der Merwe, & Yates, 2016). Views on their participation in decision-making vary from children who are decision-makers to children who do not have the rights to participate. Many studies examine the influence of children in family decision-making which emphasizes that children at least influence the decisions for buying various products and some even report that children have a significant role in family on purchasing decisions (Ahuja, Capella, & Taylor, 1998). As the role of children in family decisions increases, so does the need for studies that include children (Foxman, Tansuhaj, & Ekstrom, 1989).

Furthermore, there is a study which examines parents' perceptions of their children's participation (5-13 years) in the process of making family decisions when buying 14 different product categories (Martensen & Gronholdt, 2008). Based on the findings, children have a strong influence on the family's decision-making process, especially for products that are relevant to them (such as cereals, juices, soft drinks, and cellphones). The influence of children is various according to the stages of the subdivision and children who are the initiators who influence subsequent decision-making more than non-initiators. The older the age of the child, the influence will be even more significant, but gender does not contribute significantly to the perception of parents about the influence of children. Based on the description above, this research aims to analyze the influence of parenting style, communication patterns, and self-efficacy on adolescent participation in family decision-making.

II.METHODS

This research used a cross-sectional study design with locations chosen purposively with consideration of differences characteristic in SMAN Y Leuwiliang, Bogor Regency (rural) and SMAN X Bogor, Bogor City (urban) that would represent adolescents in the two regions. The study was conducted from July to November 2019. The research population was high school adolescents aged between 16 to 18 years or grades 10 to 12. The population in the study was 720 participants. Sampling in this research was carried out randomly in groups (random cluster sampling). For each school, three science classes will be randomized (about 30 children

per class from grades 10, 11, and 12) and three social classes (about 20 children per class from grades 10, 11, and 12), so the number of samples was 150 participants per school. Thus, the total sample of the two schools was 300 participants. Criteria, for sample, were adolescents aged 16 to 18 years or grades 10 to grade 12, have mothers, and were willing to be sampled. If there were children who did not have a mother, the number of samples added from other classes through randomization in the class. However, in the process of collecting data, the number of participants who became respondents increased to 323, which was divided into two regions, from SMAN Y and SMAN X, totaling 197 students and 126 students.

Table 1. Distribution of samples in each school

Grade	SMA X Bogor		SMA Y Leuwiliang	
	IPA	IPS	IPA	IPS
Grade 10	31	22	29	31
Grade 11	29	24	22	24
Grade 12	31	25	26	30
Total	91	71	77	85

Data collection was carried out by researchers assisted by enumerators. Data collected in this research were primary data which were obtained by self-administered using a structured questionnaire covering family characteristics, child characteristics, adolescent self-efficacy, parenting style, communication patterns and adolescents' participation in family decision-making. The variable of adolescent participation in decision-making as a dependent variable in this research. The independent variables in this research consisted of child characteristics, family characteristics, communication patterns, parenting styles and self-efficacy. Family characteristics include mother and father's age, mother and father's education, mother and father's employment status, income and family size. Furthermore, the characteristics of children include age and gender. Then, the parenting style questionnaire was modified from the parenting style questionnaire [26] consisting of 30 question items with cronbach's alpha 0.775, each of which 13 questions to assess the authoritative parenting style, 13 questions to assess the authoritarian parenting style, and four questions to assess permissive parenting style. The scale used was a Likert scale of 1 to 5, where: 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = always. The pattern of communication was communication that is applied between parents and adolescents consisting of two dimensions, namely conversation orientation and conformity orientation. The instrument refers to Ritchie and Fitzpatrick with 26 questions with a scale of strongly disagree to strongly agree and cronbach's alpha 0.822 (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). The self-efficacy questionnaire was sourced from Bandura using 15 question items with cronbach's alpha 0.815 (Bandura, 1982). The scale used is the Likert scale starting to be inappropriate, somewhat appropriate, appropriate, and very appropriate. Lastly, children's participation in family decision-making is who has a role in family decision-making for 15 question items with cronbach's alpha 0.715 and answer choices: 1. Child, 2. Together more dominant children, 3. Together, 4. Together more dominant parents and 5. Parents. Data collected using a questionnaire, then processed and

analyzed through Microsoft Excel and SPSS 16.0. Data processing includes editing, coding, entering, scoring, and analyzing. Data processing was done by using descriptive analysis and inference analysis (multiple regression analysis).

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 *Child characteristics*

The results found that the proportion of adolescents in rural and urban areas who participated in this study, respectively, 61.0 percent of urban adolescents and 39.0 percent of rural adolescents. The results of this study found that as many as 42.1 percent of rural adolescents and 40.2 percent of urban adolescents were the first children. The results found that 36.5 percent of rural adolescents were 16 years old and 33.3 percent of urban adolescents were 15 years old. The majority of samples from SMAN Y Leuwiliang (80.7%) came from rural areas, and samples from SMAN X Bogor (97.4%) came from cities. More than half of the rural and urban samples were in the Natural Sciences class (51.7%). The results showed that 70.3 percent of adolescents came from Sundanese. Based on sex, 60.4 percent of adolescents were female, and 39.6 percent were male. Most of the proportion of adolescents (67.8%) got an allowance of less than five hundred thousand rupiahs per month. The results showed that most social media owned by adolescents was Whatsapp (96.6%). Most teenagers had one to five close friends (42.1%).

3.2 *Family characteristics*

The results found that according to Hurlock's age characteristics, most fathers (85.1%) and mothers (65.6%) were included in the middle adulthood category. Most of the fathers worked as traders or entrepreneurs (34.9%), and mothers did not work or housewives (74.6%). The results found that most of the fathers (47.4%) and mothers (45.8%) were at the high school / equivalent level. The results showed that families from rural and urban areas were classified as small families (<4). Total family income, including >Rp. 500,000-Rp.1,000,000 per month.

3.3 *Parenting style*

Parenting style, according to Reitman, Rhode, Hupp and Altobello, (2002), is a strategy used by parents in raising their children, which includes warmth, affection, involvement, punishment and control. This research found that in general, urban and rural parents applied a high authoritative parenting style, compared to an authoritarian parenting style and a permissive parenting style. Authoritative parenting style is a style of parenting with a high level of warmth and discipline, and in this parenting style, parents open space of opinion for children about the rules that apply as input even though the opinion of the child is against their wishes (Timpano et al., 2010). The results showed that the adoption of parenting styles by parents in urban areas was better than in rural areas, but equally in the moderate category (60 - <80). The result was indicated by the average value obtained in urban areas was 62.40, while in rural areas was 60.24. Parents in urban areas had a mean value of authoritative parenting

patterns that was significantly different than in rural areas but was equally in the moderate category (60- <80). 21.4 percent of parents apply a low-categorized pattern of authoritative parenting. The pattern of authoritarian care in both rural and urban areas was categorized as low (<60), shown by an average value of 51.46. The application of the low categorized authoritarian parenting patterns was carried out by 73.1 percent of parents. The majority of parents both in rural and urban areas had a low level of permissiveness (<60), with an average value of 35.03. There were no parents who applied high permissiveness. The maximum value of permissive parenting patterns applied by parents was 75.0.

3.4 Communication patterns

The pattern of family communication is a pattern and behavior of repeated interactions that can differ between single families and extended families and is built in a short time or an extended period (Muntaha, 2011). Communication in the family that occurs between children and parents consists of two aspects, namely conversation-orientation and conformity-orientation (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). The results showed that adolescents in urban areas had significantly higher communication patterns ($p < 0.05$) than rural adolescents. Indicators of communication patterns in adolescents in urban areas who had higher achievements than in rural areas such as parents and adolescents discussed topics about politics and religion that some people disagree, parents in urban areas were better since they were able to encourage adolescents to express opinions when making a decision. The results showed that communication was not oriented to children (41.5%) in conversational orientation and not suitable for parents (65.3%) in conformity orientation.

3.5 Self efficacy

Self-efficacy is a belief about the ability possessed to regulate and carry out a series of actions needed in achieving his desires (Bandura, 1982). The results showed that 67.0 percent of rural adolescents and 57.1 percent of urban adolescents were included in the moderate category self-efficacy. The factors that can inhibit the development of adolescent self-efficacy was an unstable emotional and psychological condition (Feist & Feist, 1998). The difference in self-efficacy in rural and urban areas turned out to have a significant difference ($P < 0.05$, $R = 0.042$). Some indicators that had a higher achievement in adolescents in urban areas compared to adolescents in rural areas such as having a high target owned, high commitment to something, efforts by directing many businesses, not giving up when finding obstacles, having an optimistic view, willing to try things new things, always to develop themselves, able to overcome problems better than others and be able to think about the strengths they have.

3.6 Adolescent participation in decision-making

The participation of adolescents in decision-making is to let adolescents participate in decision-making, can be seen as a step-in adolescent's development (Alderson, 1993). The results showed that more than half of adolescents in rural areas (58.4%) and urban areas (65.9%) were in the moderate category of adolescents' participation in decision-making. That is because more than half of the samples stated that they decided on their hobbies that they liked (rural 76.1%; urban 71.4%) and the use of social media (rural 82.2%; urban 81.0%).

There were several decisions that resulted from discussions with parents but were dominated by parents, such as in rural areas in decisions about vehicle ownership (34.0%) and health services (38.1%), while in urban areas in health services (37.3%) and allowance (34.9%). Some samples in the rural stated that the decision on the amount of allowance was organized by parents only (29.9%) and in the urban stated that decisions on vehicle ownership were managed by parents only (34.9%).

3.7 Factors influencing communication patterns

From the 13 models with a backward regression method, the tenth model was chosen as the best model. The communication pattern as a composite score is the sum of the dimensions of conformity orientation and conversation orientation carried out by invoking conformity orientation. Based on the results of multiple linear regression tests, the Adjusted R Square number showed a value of 0.058, which means that the model explains 5.8 percent of the effects of child characteristics and family characteristics on communication patterns. The regression test results in Table 2 showed the factors that influence communication patterns, namely gender, mother's age, number of social media and father's work status. Gender ($B=3.147$) had a significant negative effect on communication patterns, which means that every increase in one sex score would reduce the communication pattern score by 3.147 points. The mother's age significantly negative effects ($B=0.238$) on communication patterns indicated that every increase in one mother's age score then decreases the communication pattern score by 0.248 points. This result in line with (Firdanianty, Lubis, Puspitawati, & Susanto, 2016), who tested adolescent-mother communication patterns found a significant negative relationship between mother's age and the dimensions of the topic of conversation because of the age of mothers who are getting older, the fewer topics discussed by mothers and adolescents. The number of social media ($B=0.906$) had negative effects significantly on communication patterns means that every increase in the number of social media scores then reduced the communication pattern score by 0.906 points. Adolescents in families with higher adherence sent fewer text messages with mothers than adolescents with lower adherence. Furthermore, adolescents in families with higher conversations (only mothers) and families with lower adherence have a difference regarding sending email for communication (Rudi, Walkner, & Drowkin, 2015). Father's work status ($B = 0.804$) had significantly positive effects on communication patterns means that every increase in the father's work status score then the child increased the communication pattern score by 8.040.

Table 2 Factors influencing communication patterns

Independent variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	59.134	6.959		8.498	0.000
Number of siblings	1.003	0.698	0.089	1.436	0.152
Gender (1 = male; 0 = female)	-3.417	1.412	-0.150	-2.420	0.016
Origin Location (1 = urban; 0 = rural)	1.560	1.429	0.068	1.091	0.276

Mother's age	-0.238	0.122	-0.124	-1.939	0.054
Total Social Media	-0.906	0.537	-0.105	-1.688	0.093
Father's Working Status (1 = working; 0 = not working)	8.040	3.748	0.133	2.145	0.033
Adjusted R ²	0.058				
F-Hitung	3.597				
Pvalue	0.002				

3.8 Factors influencing parenting style

From the 13 models with a backward regression method, the ninth model was chosen as the best model. Parenting as a composite score is the sum of the three dimensions by invoking authoritarian and permissive dimensions. Based on the results of multiple linear tests, the Adjusted R Square number indicated 0.236, which means that the model explained 23.6 percent of the influence of child and family characteristics on parenting style. The regression test results in Table 2 showed the factors that influence parenting style, namely the ethnic category, the father's education category and the mother's education category. The ethnic group category had a significant positive effect on parenting style ($B = 2.133$), meaning that Sundanese ethnic category would increase parenting style scores. In line with (Zevalkink & Riksen-Walraven, 2001) in his research on Sundanese mothers, found that the quality of Sundanese mothers' interactive behavior in a structured play environment was positively related to the quality of home behavior as an aspect of parenting. The father's education category had a significant negative effect on parenting style ($B = 3.135$), meaning that parents with higher education levels will lead to reduced parenting style scores by 3.135 points. In line with the (Whitbeck et al. 1997), the level of fathers' education and working conditions were the basis that influenced the style of care followed by economic pressures.

Furthermore, mother's education had a significant positive effect on parenting style ($B = 3.718$) means the higher mother education would increase the parenting style score by 3.718 points. In line that parental education as one of the socioeconomic factors of the family has a stronger impact on the quality of care rather than cultural factors (Zevalkink & Riksen-Walraven, 2001). Parental education level influences the aspects of control and warmth aspects, which are aspects of parenting style (Valcke, Bonte, De Wever, & Rots, 2010). (Table 3).

Table 3 Factors influencing parenting style

Independent Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
(Constant)	59.406	4.241		14.006	0.000
Number of siblings	-0.631	0.572	-0.069	-1.104	0.270
Origin Location (1 = urban; 0 = rural)	1.583	1.183	0.084	1.338	0.182

Total Social Media	-0.491	0.446	-0.069	-1.102	0.272
Ethnic categories (1 = Sundanese; 0 = Non Sundanese)	2.133	1.259	0.108	1.695	0.091
Father's Working Status (1 = working; 0 = not working)	3.326	3.090	0.067	1.076	0.283
Father's education category (1 = ≥high school and 0 = ≤high school)	-3.135	1.544	-0.146	-2.031	0.043
Mother Education Category (1 = ≥high school and 0 = ≤high school)	3.718	1.399	0.193	2.657	0.008
Adjusted R ²			0.236		
F-Hitung			12.101		
p value			0.000		

3.9 Factors influencing self-efficacy

From the seven models with backward regression method, the fifth model was chosen as the best model. Based on the results of multiple linear tests, the Adjusted R Square figure showed the number 0.145 which means that the model explained 14.5 percent of the influence of child and family characteristics on self-efficacy. Based on Table 4, the factors that influence self-efficacy were gender, father's work status, conversation orientation communication patterns and conformity orientation communication patterns. Gender had a significantly positive effect on self-efficacy ($B = 2.40$), meaning that female adolescents would increase self-efficacy scores by 2.40 points. In line with (Schmitt, 2008), that sex is significantly related to the level of self-efficacy in students.

Furthermore, Tam, Chong, Kadirvelu, and Khoo (2012) in their study found that women had lower levels of self-efficacy than men, and male high school students in Malaysia tended to be more confident than girls in science and mathematics. Then, Father's work status had a negative effect on self-efficacy ($B = 5.572$), meaning that working father would reduce the self-efficacy score of 5.572 points. Self-efficacy in adolescents with working fathers was higher than with fathers who did not work. In line with Whitbeck et al. (1997), who found that work conditions and economic pressures affect the parenting style and then affect the child's self-efficacy. Conversation orientation communication pattern had a significant positive effect on self-efficacy ($B = 0.288$), meaning that every increase in conversation orientation score would increase self-efficacy score by 0.288 points. While the conformity orientation communication pattern had a significant negative effect on self-efficacy ($B = 0.077$), meaning that any increase in conformity orientation score would reduce the self-efficacy score by 0.077

points. Study about immigrant families in North Texas found that there was a significant positive relationship between self-efficacy in general and conversation orientation while a negative relationship was not significant between self-efficacy and conformity orientation (Chowdhury, 2014). The more frequent conversations between family members increase self-efficacy in adolescents (Hashemi, Kooshesh, & Eskandari, 2015). Teenage families who tend to use conformity orientation in their teenagers' views feel less given the opportunity to express their wishes, express opinions, express disapproval, or have other choices that are different from their parents' choices (Wardyaningrum, 2015).

Table 4 Factors Influencing Self-Efficacy

Independent Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
(Constant)	49.542	4.604		10.762	0.000
Gender (1 = male; 0 = female)	3.387	1.183	0.151	2.864	0.004
Origin Location (1 = urban; 0 = rural)	1.310	1.178	0.058	1.112	0.267
Ethnic categories (1 = Sundanese; 0 = Non Sundanese)	1.203	1.260	0.050	0.955	0.340
Father's Working Status (1 = working; 0 = not working)	-5.572	3.048	-0.096	-1.828	0.069
Authoritarian parenting (index)	0.009	0.046	0.012	0.194	0.846
Communication Pattern	0.288	0.041	0.383	7.085	0.000
Conversation Orientation (Index)					
Communication Pattern	-0.077	0.043	0.113	1.783	0.076
ConformityOrientation (Index)					
Adjusted R ²			0.145		
F-Hitung			0.000		
pvalue			8.828		

3.10 Factors influencing adolescent participation in decision-making

Factors influencing adolescent participation in decision-making from seven models were selected as the fifth model as the best model. Based on the results of multiple linear regression tests, the Adjusted R Square figure showed a value of 0.039, which means that the model explained 3.9 percent of the influence of authoritarian parenting, communication patterns of conformity orientation and self-efficacy on adolescent participation in decision-making. Based on Table 5, the factor that influenced adolescent participation in decision-making was conformity orientation. Conformity orientation had a significant negative effect on adolescent participation in decision-making ($B = 0.148$) means that each increase in conformity orientation score would reduce the score of adolescent participation in decision-making by 0.148 points. Orientation of conformity, then each family member had a low communication

activity (Wardyaningrum, 2015). Family members tend to be directed to adjust their opinions with other family members, build a safe atmosphere, suppress the differences, do not often raise differences and exacerbate conflict.

Table 5 Factors influencing adolescent participation in decision-making

Independent Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	27.567	4.586		6.011	0.000
Authoritarian parenting (index)	0.070	0.044	0.097	1.594	0.112
Communication Pattern Conformity Orientation (Index)	-0.148	0.037	0.228	3.982	0.000
<i>Self-Efficacy</i> (index)	-0.070	0.056	-0.073	-1.239	0.216
Adjusted R ²			0.039		
F-Hitung			5.408		
Pvalue			0.001		

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The participation of adolescents in family decision-making was in the moderate category among adolescents from rural and urban areas. The factors that influenced adolescent participation in decision-making was conformity orientation in communication patterns. The pattern of family communication in rural and urban areas was in the lack category. Conversation orientation to families in rural areas was less child-oriented while orientation of conformity in families, in rural and urban areas, was in the category that was not parents-conformity. Then, factors affecting communication patterns were gender, mother's age, number of social media and working father status. Self-efficacy of adolescents who lived in rural and urban areas was in the moderate category, most of the parents in urban areas and rural areas were applied authoritative parenting style. In addition, other factors influencing parenting style were the father's education, mother's education and ethnicity. Lastly, Factors affecting self-efficacy were gender, father's work status, conversation orientation, and conformity orientation.

This study found that family communication in rural and urban areas was not established, it was not child-oriented and it tended to be parent-oriented. In the adolescents stage, children have the task of forming identity and decision-making related to relationships and careers. Thus, parents have an essential role to assist them in improving their ability in decision-making. Then, parents begin to involve children in making decisions and build balanced family communication patterns with child and parents' orientation.

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization Centre for Early Childhood Care Education and Parenting (SEAMEO CECCEP). We thank our colleagues from the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences who provided insight and expertise that greatly assisted the research.

REFERENCES

- Ahuja, R., Capella, I., & Taylor, R. (1998). Child influences, attitudinal and behavioural comparisons between single parent and dual parent households in grocery shopping, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 48-63. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.1998.11501788>.
- Alderson, P. (1993) *Children's consent to surgery*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacymechanism in human Agency. *American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122-147. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.37.2.122>
- Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2001). *Principles of biomedical ethics*. United States of America, US: Oxford University Press.
- Bester, D. (2007). *Die effek van tuisskolling op die sosiale ontwikkeling en akademiese prestasie van die pre-adolescent* (Thesis). University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa.
- British Medical Association. (2001). *Consent, rights and choices in health care for children and young people*. London: British Medical Association
- Britto, M. T., Sawyer, S. M., Drew, S., & Yeo, M. S. (2007). Adolescents with a chronic condition: challenges living, challenges treating. *The Lancet*, 369(9571), 1481-1489. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(07)60370-5.
- Chowdhury, A. K. (2014). *The self efficacy and perceptions of communication patterns of parents with adolescent children from South Asian and Middle Eastern immigrant families in North Texas*. Denton, Texas : Woman's University.
- Coyne, I., & Harder, M. (2011). Children's participation in decision-making: balancing protection with shared decision-making using a situational perspective. *Journal of Child Health Care*, 15(4), 312-319. doi: 10.1177/1367493511406570.
- Feist, J., & Feist, G. J. (1998). *Theories of personality*. Boston: McGrawHill Companies, Inc. New York: USA.
- Firdanianty, Lubis, D. J., Puspitawati, H., & Susanto, D. (2016). Komunikasi remaja dengan ayah masih minim: studi pada siswa SMA di Kota Bogor. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga dan Konsumen*, 9(2), 124-135.

- Foxman, E.R., Tansuhaj, P.S., & Ekstrom, F.M., (1989). Family members' perceptions of adolescent's influence in family decision making. *Journal Of Consumer Research*, 15, 482-489.
- Graf, S.C., Mullis, R.L. & Mullis, A.K. (2008). Identity formation of United States American and Asian Adolescents. *Adolescence*, 43(169), 57-69.
- Hallstrom, I., & Elander, G. (2004). Children's participation in the decision-making process during hospitalization: an observational study. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 13, 367–375. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2702.2004.00984
- Hashemi, C., Kooshesh, Z., & Eskandari H. (2015). Role of family communication patterns in development of hardiness and academic self-efficacy in adolescents. *Paper presented at the Conference: Multidisciplinary Academic Conference on Education, Teaching and E-learning in Prague*. Czech Republic.
- Hook, D. (2009). Erikson's psychosocial stages of development. In: Watts, J., Cockcroft, K. & Duncan, N. (eds), *Developmental Psychology* (2nd ed). Lansdowne: UCT Publishers, 281-313.
- Keenan, T. & Evans, S. (2009). *An introduction to child development* (2nd ed). London: Sage Publications.
- Kennan, D., Brady, B., & Forkan, C. (2018). Supporting children's participation in decision making: A systematic literature review exploring the effectiveness of participatory processes. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 48(7), 1985-2002.
- Koocher, G. P., & DeMaso, D. R. (1990). Children's competence to consent to medical procedures. *Pediatrician*, 17(2), 68-73.
- Martensen, A., & Gronholdt, L. (2008). Children's influence on family decision making. *Innovative Marketing*, 4(4), 14-22.
- Megawangi R. (2009). *Menyemai Benih Karakter*. Bogor (ID): Indonesia Heritage Foundation.
- Muntaha, A. (2011). *Berpisah-menyatu dan berbagi ruang rindu di media baru dalam Ilmu Komunikasi: Sekarang dan Tantangan Masa Depan*. Indonesia: Prenada Media Group.
- Noorderhaven, N. G. (1995). *Strategic decision making*. England: Addison-Wesley.
- Pufall, P. B., & Unsworth, R. P. (2004). The imperative and the process for rethinking childhood. *Rethinking childhood*, 1-21. doi: 10.24130/eccd-jecs.196720182274.
- Reitman, D., Rhode, P.C., Hupp, S.D.A., & Altobello, C. (2002). Development and validation of the parental authority questionnaire – revised. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 24(2), 119-127.
- Ritchie, L. D., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1990). Family communication patterns: Measuring intrapersonal perceptions of interpersonal relationships. *Communication Research*, 17(4), 523-544.
- Robinson, C.C., Mandleco, B., Olsen, S.F., & Hart, C.H. (1995). Authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting practices Development of a new measure. *Psychological reports*, 77(3), 819-830. doi:https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1995.77.3.819

- Rudi, J. H., Walkner, A., & Dworkin, J. (2015). Adolescent–parent communication in a digital world: Differences by family communication patterns. *Youth & Society*, 47(6), 811-828. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X14560334>
- Ruffin, N. (2009). *Adolescent growth and development*. [Online]. Retrieved from www.ext.vt.edu.
- Santrock, J.W. (2012). *Life span development, perkembangan masa hidup*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Schmitt, N. (2007). The interaction of neuroticism and gender and its impact on self-efficacy and performance. *Human Performance*, 21(1), 49-61.
- Stang, J., & Story, M. (2005). *Adolescent growth and development*. In: STANG, J. & Story, M. (eds), *Guidelines for Adolescent Nutrition Services*. Retrieved from : http://www.epi.umn.edu/let/pubs/adol_book.shtm.
- Stegenga, K., & Ward-Smith, P. (2008). The adolescent perspective on participation in treatment decision making: a pilot study. *Journal of Pediatric Oncology Nursing*, 25(2), 112-117. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/1043454208314515>
- Tam, C. L., Chong, A., Kadirvelu, A., & Khoo, Y. T. (2012). Parenting styles and self-efficacy of adolescents: Malaysian scenario. *Global Journal of Human Social Sciences (GJHSS)*, 12(14), 19-25.
- Timpano, K.R., Keough, M.E., Mahaffey, B., Schmidt, N.B., & Abramowitz, J. (2010). Parenting and obsessive compulsive symptoms: Implications of authoritarian parenting. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy: An International Quarterly*, 24(3), 151-164. doi: 10.1891/0889-8391.24.3.151
- Unicef. (1999). *United nations convention on the Rights of the Child*. Geneva, Switzerland: UNICEF.
- Valcke, M., Bonte, S., De Wever, B., & Rots, I. (2010). Internet parenting styles and the impact on Internet use of primary school children. *Computers & Education*, 55(2), 454-464. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2010.02.009.
- Van der Merwe, A., van der Merwe, M., & Yates, H. (2016). Exploring adolescents' participation in decision-making in the home schooling context. *Social Work*. 52(3). doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.15270/52-2-515>
- Wardyaningrum, D. (2013). Komunikasi untuk penyelesaian konflik dalam keluarga: Orientasi percakapan dan orientasi kepatuhan. *Jurnal Al-Azhar Indonesia Seri Pranata Sosial*, 2(1), 47-58.
- Whitbeck, L. B., Simons, R. L., Conger, R. D., Wickrama, K. A. S., Ackley, K. A., & Elder Jr, G. H. (1997). The effects of parents' working conditions and family economic hardship on parenting behaviors and children's self-efficacy. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 291-303.
- Zevalkink, J., & Riksen-Walraven, J. M. (2001). Parenting in Indonesia: Inter-and intracultural differences in mothers' interactions with their young children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 25(2), 167-175. doi: 10.1080/01650250042000113.