

Full Length Research Paper

Effects of Parental Abandonment and Strife on Youth Drug Use

Stephen Ndegwa* and Winnie Waiyaki¹

Department of Psychology and Counselling, Daystar University, Kenya

Tel. no.: 0722 596 073. Email address: ngarisnn@gmail.com

Key words: Parenting, abandonment, strife, youth drug use

Abstract

Parenting behaviour is a major contributor to youth behaviour, and has been shown to precipitate maladaptive behaviours among the youth. Parents have been shown to play a major role in the way children turn out to be later in life. When parents behave negatively, children are likely to behave the same ending up with problematic behaviours. Studies have shown that negative parental practices have produced young people involved in sexual promiscuity, poor academic performance and substance abuse. However, little has been studied on the effects of parental abandonment and strife between parents on youth negative behaviours in Kenya. This study therefore aimed to investigate the effects of parental abandonment and strife on drug use among youth at a Kenyan University. Using the descriptive research design (cross-sectional) the sample size of 407 respondents was selected at 80% power and 10% effect size using stratified random sampling techniques. The Alcohol Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) and researcher-generated socio-demographic questionnaire were used to collect data from the respondents. Inferential statistics using ANOVA analysed the data on the Statistical Package for Social and Sciences (SPSS) version 23. The results indicated that respondents who felt rejected at home ($p=0.0001$), those with parents who did not spend much time with them ($p=0.048$) and those who felt displeased with their parents' behaviour ($p=0.0001$) were statistically associated with substance use. It is concluded that parental behaviour may have a negative influence on youth drug use. The study recommends that parents be made aware of the effect of their actions in abandoning children and in poor conflict management so as to forestall problematic behaviours in their children's later life.

*Corresponding Author: Stephen Ndegwa

Introduction

Parents have been shown to play a major role in the way children turn out to be, later in life. For instance, when parents behave negatively, children are likely to behave in the same way, and end up with problematic behaviours later in life (Carlson, 2012). There are several ways in which youth behaviour is affected by parental practices. Parental involvement and monitoring of children have been reported to be preventative measures against drug use among adolescents (Rusby, Light, Crowley, & Westling, 2018). On the other hand, parents exhibiting neglectful behaviour have been associated with worse substance use among adolescents (Berge et al., 2016). There is therefore a higher likelihood of prevention of drug use among the youth if parents are able to be more involved and monitor the behaviours of their children. Nevertheless, monitoring alone does not guarantee drug-free children because there are other factors that can influence the use of drugs among adolescents. Such factors include: being away from parents; peer use; media influence; and, accessibility to drugs (Ndegwa, Munene, & Oladipo, 2017).

Since parental behaviour impacts children from birth to adulthood, this study aimed to find out the impact of parental abandonment and strife, specifically on youth behaviour. Parental abandonment has been defined as consisting of “any act of commission or omission that results in harm, potential for harm, or the threat of harm to a child (0–18 years of age) even if harm was unintentional” (Lamont, 2010). In addition, parental abandonment, which has also been referred to as neglect, is considered as a form of child abuse, which impacts on behaviour not only among children and adolescents, but also extends to young adults and adults. These behaviours include: substance abuse; suicide; reckless sexual behaviour; and, intergenerational neglect, where survivors of neglect perpetuate it to their children.

Abandoned or neglected children grow into adolescents and young adults with feelings of rejection. Such feelings could influence them to engage in drug and alcohol abuse as a way of coping, which would predispose them to other mental health issues (Lamont, 2010). Additionally, child neglect predisposes individuals in early adulthood and adulthood to personality disorders (Smailes, Cohen, Brown, & Bernstein, 2001), which make it more difficult to help such an individual. In another study, it was noted that children who grow up in a home where the biological parents are not present, especially their father, are at a greater risk of abusing alcohol and other drugs (Hoffmann, 2002).

Furthermore, Mandara and Murry (2006) reported the impact of father-absence on adolescent boys. Boys who come from a home without their biological parents, especially their father, were more likely to use drugs than boys who came from a home where their father was present. Consequently, parental involvement can be a protective factor against adolescent substance use. Similarly, it has been shown that the psychological effects of neglect in childhood have a prevalence rate of 59% among university students in Kenya (Mbagaya, Oburu, & Bakermans-Kranenburg, 2013).

The literature indicated significantly that negative behaviour patterns on the part of parents predicted negative behaviours on the part of the children in their adulthood. Relevant to this study were the numerous studies that demonstrated that parental neglect and conflicts are likely to predispose children and adolescents to psychosocial difficulties (Grynych & Fincham, 1990; Reynolds, Houston, Coleman & Harold, 2014). A parental conflict is considered a disagreement that leads to a greater or lesser interaction of the parents with their children (Barthassat, 2014). Whenever there is conflict between parents, it is likely to affect the children negatively and at times parents are not aware of such effects. However, different studies focused on children receiving these effects, and unfortunately, very few studies have focused on early adulthood and thus the need for this study. The objectives of this study were therefore to determine the effect of abandonment and strife among youth.

Methodology

The research approach in this study is descriptive where respondents' characteristics are described as per the results of the study. The design is appropriate because the study aimed to determine the likely behaviours, values, attitudes and other effects that might have resulted in the lives of the students as affected by their parents. The results were analysed using ANOVA to establish the effect of the parental behaviours on the youth drug use. The population for this study was the undergraduate students in one of the Private Universities in Nairobi, Kenya who were approximately 4000 in number.

A total of 407 undergraduate students were recruited into the study using stratified random sampling techniques. The representative sample size of 407 was around 10% of the general population. Gay (1983), as quoted by Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), has pointed out that a sample size that is 10% of the population is enough to generate a generalized representation of results. The population was divided into homogenous, mutually exclusive subgroups, called strata, and a sample selected from each stratum. The population in this study was divided into two campuses; then subdivided further into five strata as per the various schools/faculties in the University. The modified Alcohol Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) and researcher-generated sociodemographic questionnaire were used to collect data from the respondents. The Statistical Package for Social and Sciences (SPSS) version 23 was used to analyse the collected data.

Ethical considerations, to ensure that the research process did not cause physical, emotional, mental and psychological or any other harm to respondents, were taken into account (Babbie, 2008). The students were given an opportunity to consent to the study, and none of them was coerced or lured into participating against their wish. Respondents were assured of confidentiality and anonymity, both verbally and in writing. Data collected was stored in safe and secure locations. Respondents were debriefed by the researchers and issues arising were dealt with in a therapeutic manner. They were also informed that the findings would be shared via peer-reviewed journals and with the funding agency in particular. Institutional approval was obtained from the Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academics Affairs of the University, and ethical approval from the same University Ethics Board.

Results

This section provides the results of the survey from the analysis done on the obtained data. Table 1 provides the frequency of responses according to the questionnaire used in the study.

Table 1: Questionnaire Responses of the Respondents

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	168	41.3
Female	239	58.7
Total	407	100.0
Age		
18-25	382	95.7
26-33	14	3.5
34-41	3	.8

Total	399	98.0
Missing	8	2.0
Respondent's Sponsorship Status		
Privately Sponsored	350	86.0
Government Sponsored	55	13.5
Total	405	99.5
Missing	2	.5
Respondent's Marital Status of Parents		
Married	220	54.1
Separated	21	5.2
Single	127	31.2
Divorced	29	7.1
Polygamous	3	.7
Blended	5	1.2
Total	405	99.5
Missing	2	.5
Respondent's Family Relationship Status		
Close	325	79.9
Distant	52	12.8
Conflicting	30	7.4
Total	407	100
Respondent's Parent/Caregiver's Relationship		
Close	314	77.1
Distant	55	13.5
Conflicting	38	9.3
Total	407	100
Respondent's Rejected at Home		
Yes	51	12.5
No	355	87.2
Total	406	99.8
Missing	1	.2
Respondent's Growing up Experience		
Unwanted/excluded	39	9.6
Unloved/unaccepted	41	10.1
Alienated	64	15.7
Others	3	.7

Missing	260	63.9
Respondent's Primary Caregiver		
Mother	253	64.7
Father	57	14.6
House-help	4	1.0
Both Father and Mother	77	19.7
Total	391	96.1
Missing	16	3.9
Respondents Suffering at Home		
Yes	355	87.2
No	51	12.5
Total	406	99.8
Missing	1	.2
Respondents Financially Neglected		
No	334	82.1
Yes	71	17.4
Missing	2	.5
Total	407	100
Respondents Emotionally Neglected		
Yes	116	28.5
No	281	69.0
Missing	10	2.5
Total	407	100
Respondent's Witnessing Parents Fighting		
Yes	114	35.4
No	263	64.6
Respondents' Affected by Parents' Conflict		
Yes	139	34.2
No	249	61.2
Missing	19	4.7
Respondents who went to Boarding Primary School		
Yes	212	52.1
No	195	47.9

Table 1 presents the frequency of social-demographic characteristics of 407 respondents. The frequency of female respondents was slightly higher (239, 58.7%) than male respondents (168, 41.3%). This is because there are more female students than male students in this University. The age distribution was grouped into three: respondents aged 18-25; aged 26-33; and aged 34-41 respectively. The frequency of respondents aged 18-25 was higher (382, 95.7%) than those aged 26-33 (3.5%) and 34-41 (0.8%). This is because most undergraduate students are usually between 18-25 years. In terms of respondent's sponsorship status, the proportion of those who were privately sponsored was higher (86.0%) than that of those who were government-sponsored (13.5%), which could be a result of the University being a private one.

The marital status of the respondents' parents shows that respondents whose parents were married were higher (220, 54.1%), compared to separated (21, 5.2%), or single (127, 31.2%). Respondents' family relationship status shows that distribution of close family relationship was higher (325, 79.9%) as opposed to distant (52, 12.8%) and conflicting family relationship (30, 7.4%). Similarly, respondents' parent/caregiver's relationship status was grouped into three categories. The frequency of close parent/ caregivers status was higher (314, 77.1%), than distant (55, 13.5%) and conflicting (38, 9.3%). The frequency of respondents who did not feel rejected at home was higher (355, 87.2%) as opposed those who felt rejected at home (51, 12.5%).

Further, respondents growing up experiences were grouped into four categories; the unwanted/excluded were 39 (9.6%), unloved/unaccepted were 41 (10.1%), alienated were 64 (15.7%) and others were just 3 (0.7%). It is noted that the majority did not respond to this enquiry (63.9%). The respondents' primary caregiver was mother (253, 64%) followed by father (57, 14.6%), which is common in the Kenyan scenario. The number of those who indicated that they were suffering at home was significantly higher (355, 87.2%) than those who declined (51, 12.5%). Respondents who felt financially neglected were seen to be fewer (17.4%) than those who felt otherwise (82.1%). Respondents who responded 'Yes' to emotional neglect were 116 (28.5%), compared to 'No' response (281, 69.0%). Respondents who witnessed their parents fighting were 114 (35.4%) compared to those who did not (263, 64.6%). The results indicated that 139 of the respondents (34.2%) were affected by parents' conflict while 249 (61.2%) were not affected. Higher percentage of the respondents went to boarding school (52.1%) compared to those who went to day school (47.9%).

Association of Parental Abandonment and Drug Use

Table 2 provides the distribution of respondents' responses according to the ASSIST results.

Table 2: Distribution of key Questionnaire Responses and Tobacco Products Use

Variables	Total	Low	Moderate	High	² statistics	Df	Sig
Age							
18-25	382(95.7)	311(77.9)	65(16.3)	6(1.5)	1.844	2	.764
26-33	14 (3.5)	13 (3.3)	1 (0.3)	0 (0.0)			
34-41	3 (0.8)	2 (0.5)	1 (0.3)	0 (0.0)			
Gender							
Male	168(41.3)	129(31.7)	35(8.6)	4(1.0)	5.888	1	.053
Female	239(58.7)	205(50.4)	32(7.9)	2 (0.5)			

Marital Status							
Married	220(54.3)	175(43.5)	41(10.1)	4 (1.0)	18.235	5	.051
Separated	21 (5.2)	17 (4.2)	3 (0.7)	1 (0.2)			
Single	127(31.4)	109(26.9)	18 (4.4)	0 (0.0)			
Divorced	29 (7.2)	25 (6.2)	4 (1.0)	0 (0.0)			
Polygamous	3 (0.7)	3 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)			
Blended	5(1.2)	3 (0.7)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)			
Respondent's Primary Giver							
Mother	253(64.7)	211(54.0)	37(9.5)	5 (1.3)	6.475	3	.372
Father	57 (14.6)	41 (10.5)	15 (3.8)	1 (0.3)			
House help	4 (1.0)	3(0.8)	1 (0.3)	0 (0.0)			
Both mother and father	77 (19.7)	65 (16.6)	12 (3.1)	0 (0.0)			

Table 2 presents distribution of key questionnaire responses of the respondents and tobacco products use. In terms of age characteristics, respondents aged 18-25 had highest percentage (95.7%) compared to other age categories. Out of 382 respondents (95.7%) who use tobacco products, 311 (77.9%) of them scored low, 65 (16.3%) scored moderate, while 6 (1.5%) scored high. However, the distribution of respondent's age was statistically insignificant ($p=0.764$). The frequency of tobacco products use was higher among female gender (239, 58.7%) compared to their male counterparts (168, 41.3%). A higher percentage of female respondents scored low using ASSIST (50.4%), while male respondents also scored low (31.7%) in tobacco product use. The distribution of respondent's gender was significantly distributed ($p=0.053$).

The respondents' parents' marital status was also significantly distributed ($p=0.051$). However, a higher frequency of tobacco products use was noted to be among those whose parents were married (220, 54.3%) than those whose parents were divorced, widowed or never married. The next highest value after married parents is among respondents whose parents were single (127, 31.4%). The distribution of tobacco use among respondents' primary caregivers characteristics was higher among mothers (253, 64.7%) than respondents whose primary caregivers was their father (57, 14.6%), their house help (4, 1.0%), and both their father and mother (77, 19.7%). The distribution of the use of tobacco products across respondents' primary givers were insignificant ($p=0.372$).

To determine the association between parental abandonment and tobacco use, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. Table 3 gives ANOVA statistics using each of the substance uses as dependent variables and parental abandonment as a predictor variable.

Table 3: ANOVA Statistics for Tobacco

Variables	Groups	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
I spent more time with the house help than with my parents	Between Groups	7.707	2	3.853	2.603	.075
	Within Groups	598.047	404	1.480		
	Total	605.754	406			
Growing up, my parents were absent most of the time	Between Groups	4.777	2	2.388	1.500	.224
	Within Groups	643.322	404	1.592		
	Total	648.098	406			
Did you suffer rejection at home?	Between Groups	1.722	2	.861	8.094	.0001
	Within Groups	42.872	403	.106		
	Total	44.594	405			
Participant feeling neglected financially	Between Groups	.257	2	.128	.885	.414
	Within Groups	58.297	402	.143		
	Total	58.553	404			
Feeling neglected emotionally	Between Groups	.088	2	.044	.211	.810
	Within Groups	82.018	394	.208		
	Total	82.106	396			
My parents did not spend much time with me	Between Groups	9.459	2	4.729	3.060	.048
	Within Groups	624.453	404	1.546		
	Total	633.916	406			
I feel I was sent to boarding school too early	Between Groups	3.173	2	1.586	.943	.390
	Within Groups	679.412	404	1.682		
	Total	682.585	406			
My parents behaviour led me to use drugs in order to cope	Between Groups	13.421	2	6.710	9.549	.0001
	Within Groups	283.891	404	.703		
	Total	297.312	406			

Table 3 indicates the variance in means of parental abandonment and tobacco use between and within groups. Out of all the variables, respondents who felt rejected at home ($p=0.0001$), respondents whose parents did not spend much time with them ($p=0.048$), and respondents whose parents' behaviour led them to use drugs in order to cope ($p=0.0001$), were statistically significant. Other variables were reported to be insignificant to predict tobacco use. This finding implies that the probability that youth who feel rejected at home, those whose parents did not spend much time with them at home, and those whose parents' behaviour led to the use of drugs are significantly associated with smoking tobacco products to cope. Table 4 presents the distribution of questionnaire responses and beer products.

Table 4: Distribution of Questionnaire Responses and Beer Products

Variables	Total	Low	Moderate	High	² statistics	df	Sig
Age							
18-25	382(95.7)	308(77.2)	64 (16.0)	10 (2.5)	4.043	2	.400
26-33	14 (3.5)	14 (3.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)			
34-41	3 (0.8)	3(0.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)			
Gender							
Male	168(41.3)	124(30.5)	38 (9.5)	6 (1.5)	12.336	1	.002
Female	239(58.7)	209(51.4)	26 (6.4)	4 (1.0)			
Marital Status							
Married	220(54.3)	176(43.5)	38 (9.4)	6 (1.5)	28.120	5	.002
Separated	21 (5.2)	19 (4.7)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)			
Single	127(31.4)	105(25.9)	21(5.2)	1 (0.2)			
Divorced	29 (7.2)	27 (6.7)	2 (0.5)	0 (0.0)			
Polygamous	3 (0.7)	2 (0.5)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.2)			
Blended	5 (1.2)	2 (0.5)	2 (0.5)	1 (0.2)			
Respondent's Primary Giver							
Mother	253(64.7)	210(53.7)	37(9.5)	6 (1.5)	13.463	3	.036
Father	57 (14.6)	37 (9.5)	17 (4.3)	3 (0.8)			
House help	4 (1.0)	3 (0.8)	1 (0.3)	0 (0.0)			
Both mother and father	77(19.7)	68 (17.4)	8 (2.0)	1 (0.3)			

Table 4 presents distribution questionnaire responses of the respondents and beer products use (Tusker, Tusker Malt, Guinness, Senator, and White Cap). As regards respondents' age, respondents aged 18-25 had highest percentage (382, 95.7%) compared to other age categories. Out of 382 respondents (95.7%) who used beer products, 308 (77.2%) of them scored low, 64 (16.0%) scored moderate while 10 (2.5%) scored high as per the ASSIST ratings. However, the distribution of respondent's age was statistically insignificant ($p=0.400$). The frequency of beer products use was higher among female gender (239, 58.7%) compared to male counterpart (168, 41.3%). Higher percentage of respondents who scored low were noted among female (209, 51.4%), and that of male counterpart (124, 30.5%) in beer product use. The distribution of respondent's gender was significantly distributed ($p=0.002$).

The higher frequency of beer products use was noted to be among those whose parents were married (220, 54.3%) compared to other marital status then among respondents whose parents were single (127, 31.4%). Respondent's parents' marital status was also significantly distributed ($p=0.002$). The distribution of beer products use among respondents' primary givers was higher among respondents whose primary care givers were mothers (253, 64.7%) compared to respondents whose primary caregivers were father (57, 14.6%), house help (4, 1.0%), and both father and mother (77, 19.7%). Majority also scored low in beer product use. However, the distribution was significant ($p=0.036$). Table 5 indicates ANOVA statistics for beer products use.

Table 5: ANOVA Statistics for Beer Products

Variables	Groups	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig
I spent more time with the house help than with my parents	Between Groups	6.995	2	3.497	2.360	.096
	Within Groups	598.759	404	1.482		
	Total	605.754	406			
Growing up, my parents were absent most of the time	Between Groups	3.167	2	1.584	.992	.372
	Within Groups	644.931	404	1.596		
	Total	648.098	406			
Did you suffer rejection at home?	Between Groups	.809	2	.404	3.721	.025
	Within Groups	43.785	403	.109		
	Total	44.594	405			
Participant feeling neglected financially	Between Groups	.177	2	.089	.611	.543
	Within Groups	58.376	402	.145		
	Total	58.553	404			
Feeling neglected emotionally	Between Groups	.148	2	.074	.356	.701
	Within Groups	81.958	394	.208		
	Total	82.106	396			
My parents did not spend much time with me	Between Groups	3.766	2	1.83	1.207	.300
	Within Groups	630.146	404	1.560		
	Total	633.912	406			
I feel I was sent to boarding school too early	Between Groups	.248	2	.124	.074	.929
	Within Groups	682.336	404	1.689		
	Total	682.585	406			
My parents behaviour led me to use drugs in order to cope	Between Groups	16.189	2	8.095	11.633	.0001
	Within Groups	281.123	404	.696		
	Total	297.312	406			

Table 5 indicates the variance in means of parental abandonment and beer products use between and within groups. Out of all the variables, respondents who felt rejected at home ($p=0.025$) and respondents whose parents' behaviour was of concern to the respondents ($p=0.0001$) were seen to be significant. Other variables were not significantly associated ($P_s > 0.05$) with beer use. The ANOVA indicates that respondents who feel rejected at home and those who worry about their parents' behaviour are more likely to use beer products to withstand the distress associated with their feelings. Table 6 presents ANOVA of Khat (Miraa) products use.

Table 6: ANOVA Statistics for Khat (Miraa/mairungi, khat, kangeta, muguka)

Products

Variables	Groups	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig
I spent more time with the house help than with my parents	Between Groups	.213	2	.107	.071	.931
	Within Groups	605.541	404	1.499		
	Total	605.754	406			
Growing up, my parents were absent most of the time	Between Groups	2.551	2	1.275	.798	.451
	Within Groups	645.548	404	1.598		
	Total	648.098	406			
Did you suffer rejection at home?	Between Groups	.152	2	.076	.687	.503
	Within Groups	44.442	403	.110		
	Total	44.594	405			
Participant feeling neglected financially	Between Groups	1.352	2	.676	4.751	.009
	Within Groups	57.201	402	.142		
	Total	58.553	404			
Feeling neglected emotionally	Between Groups	.486	3	.243	1.174	.310
	Within Groups	81.620	394	.207		
	Total	82.105	396			
My parents did not spend much time with me	Between Groups	4.126	2	2.063	1.323	.267
	Within Groups	629.786	404	1.559		
	Total	633.912	406			
I feel I was sent to boarding school too early	Between Groups	1.327	2	.664	.393	.675
	Within Groups	681.258	404	1.686		
	Total	682.585	406			
My parents behaviour led me to use drugs in order to cope	Between Groups	9.344	2	4.672	6.555	.002
	Within Groups	287.968	404	.713		
	Total	297.312	406			

Table 6 presents the means parental abandonment using "I spent more time with the house help than with my parents," "growing up, my parents were absent most of the time," "did you suffer rejection at home," "participant feeling neglected financially," "feeling neglected emotionally," "my parents did not spend much time with me," "I feel I was sent to boarding school too early," and "my parents behaviour led me to use drugs in order to cope" variables were statistically equal to zero or associated with Khat mean values. The analysis of variance indicates that none of the variables are scientifically related except respondents who felt neglected financially ($p=0.009$) and those whose parents' behaviour was of great concern ($p=0.002$). This suggests that youth who feel financially abandoned by parents and those who feel dissatisfied with parents' behaviour are likely to resort to Khat use to cope. Table 7 depicts distribution of questionnaire responses and other drugs respondents were using.

Table 7: Distribution of Questionnaire Responses and other Drugs

Variables	Total	Low	Moderate	High	² statistics	Df	Sig
Age							
18-25	382(95.7)	371(93.0)	10 (2.5)	1 (0.3)	5.503	2	.973
26-33	14 (3.5)	14 (3.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)			
34-41	3 (0.8)	3 (0.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)			
Gender							
Male	168(41.3)	163(40.0)	5 (1.2)	0 (0.0)	1.019	1	.601
Female	239(58.7)	233(57.2)	5 (1.2)	1 (0.2)			
Marital Status							
Married	220(54.3)	216(53.3)	4(1.0)	0 (0.0)	5.143	5	.881
Separated	21 (5.2)	20 (4.9)	1 (0.2)	0 (0.0)			
Single	127(31.4)	121(29.9)	5 (1.2)	1 (0.2)			
Divorced	29 (7.2)	29 (7.2)	0(0.0)	0 (0.0)			
Polygamous	3 (0.7)	3 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)			
Blended	5 (1.2)	5 (1.2)	0(0.0)	0 (0.0)			
Respondent's Primary Giver							
Mother	253(64.7)	243(62.1)	9 (2.3)	1 (0.3)	3.673	3	.721
Father	57 (14.6)	57 (14.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)			
House help	4 (1.0)	4 (1.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)			
Both mother and father	77 (19.7)	76 (19.4)	1(0.3)	0 (0.0)			

Table 7 presents questionnaire responses of respondents and other drug use scores. Among the respondents' age categories, those within ages 18-25 had highest drug use score (383, 95.7%) and majority of them (93%) scored low in other drug use. In terms of gender distribution, female respondents had the highest frequency (58.7%), majority of them (57.2%) scored low in drug use as well. Respondents whose parents were married had the largest distributions compared to other marital status (54.3%). Similarly, respondents whose primary caregivers were mother had the highest frequency (64.7%). The distribution of all the questionnaire responses and other drug use scores were evenly distributed ($P_s > 0.05$). Table 8 depicts ANOVA statistics for other drugs respondents were using.

Table 8: ANOVA Statistics for Other Drugs Products

Variables	Groups	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig
I spent more time with the house help than with my parents	Between Groups	6.277	2	3.139	2.115	.122
	Within Groups	599.477	404	1.484		
	Total	605.754	406			
Growing up, my parents were absent most of the time	Between Groups	4.066	2	2.033	1.275	.280
	Within Groups	644.032	404	1.594		
	Total	648.098	406			
Did you suffer rejection at home?	Between Groups	1.086	2	.543	5.030	.007
	Within Groups	43.508	403	.108		
	Total	44.594	405			
Participant feeling neglected financially	Between Groups	.037	2	.018	.127	.881
	Within Groups	58.516	402	.146		
	Total	58.553	404			
Feeling neglected emotionally	Between Groups	.953	2	.476	2.313	.100
	Within Groups	81.153	394	.206		
	Total	82.106	396			
My parents did not spend much time with me	Between Groups	3.584	2	1.782	1.149	.318
	Within Groups	630.327	404	1.560		
	Total	633.912	406			
I feel I was sent to boarding school too early	Between Groups	.692	2	.346	.205	.815
	Within Groups	681.893	404	1.688		
	Total	682.585	406			
My parents behaviour led me to use drugs in order to cope	Between Groups	12.975	2	6.478	9.204	.0001
	Within Groups	284.355	404	.704		
	Total	297.312	406			

The analysis of variance in Table 8 above indicates that none of the variables are scientifically related ($P_s > 0.05$) except respondents who felt neglected financially ($p = 0.007$) and those whose parents' behaviour was of great concern ($p = 0.001$). This implies that respondents who felt neglected financially and those whose parents' behaviour was of great concerns are likely to take other drugs to cope.

Parental Strife Influences on Drug Use among Respondents

The following data provides the results about parental conflicts and drug use among the respondents. Table 9 depicts marginal homogeneity nonparametric test between parental strife and drug use.

Table 9: Marginal Homogeneity Nonparametric Test Showing Association between Parental Strife and Drug Use

Variable	N	Mean/ Std. dev	Off- Diagonal Cases	Observed MH Statistics	MH Mean/ Std. dev.	Std. MH Statistics	Sig.
My parents behavior has led me to use drugs in order to cope	407	1.83 (1.220)	259	1041.000	708.507 (24.367)	13.646	.0001
Beer products (Tusker, Tusker Malt, Guinness, Senator, White Cap)	407	1.2064 (.46201)	274	25.000	189.500 (10.665)	-15.424	.007
Wines	407	1.2138 (.45051)	297	34.000	209.000 (10.840)	-16.144	.042
Khat (Miraa/ Irungi, Chat, Kangeta, Mugoka)	407	1.0565 (.27047)	166	496.000	339.000 (14.731)	10.658	.0001
Other drugs	407	1.0295 (.18333)	266	443.000	159.500 (13.631)	-9.678	.051

Predictors: I hated it when my parents fought

Table 9 presents the marginal homogeneity test to assess the marginal frequencies of substance use: tobacco products use, beer products use, wine product use, miraa product use and other drugs as independent variables and how these variables correspond with parental conflict. From the table above, the marginal variables like "my parents behavior has led me to use drugs in order to cope" are tested to see if a significant correlation can be established with parental conflicts using "I hated it when my parents fought" as predictor. When the observed Marginal Homogeneity (MH) statistics are marched with the standard MH statistics, the independent variables are noted to be statistically correlated (P

My parents behavior has led me to use drugs in order to cope (OMH: 1041.000; SMH: 13.646), matched with parental strife, the p level is significant ($p = 0.0001$). This implies that youth who feel dissatisfied with parents' behaviour are likely to use drugs. Table 10 presents a merged variable likelihood ratio test.

Table 10: Merged Variable Likelihood Ratio Test

Model	Model Fitting	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	Criteria	Chi-Square	Df	Sig.
Intercept Only	294.935			
Final	245.822	49.114	24	.002

Table 10 indicates that when all the substances/drugs are merged as homogeneity dependent samples, the parental conflicts are significant predictors to drug use ($p=0.002$)

Discussion

This study set out to determine how parental abandonment and strife affects drug use among the youth. The findings from this study indicated that there is significant statistical association between youth who experienced parental abandonment and strife with substance use.

Respondents who felt rejected at home ($p=0.0001$), those whose parents did not spend much time with them ($p=0.048$), and those who felt that their parents' behaviour led them to use drugs ($p=0.0001$) had significant association with tobacco products. Additionally, respondents who experienced rejection at home ($p=0.025$) and those who felt their parents' behaviour was of concern to them ($p=0.0001$) were more likely to use beer products may be able to withstand the distress associated with their feelings. Moreover, respondents who felt neglected financially ($p=0.009$; $p=0.007$) and those whose parents' behaviour was of great concern ($p=0.002$; $p=0.001$) were likely to use Khat or other drugs to cope. All these drug use problems would have been prevented if the parents were more involved in the children lives (Rusby et al., 2018). Involvement by being present could have made such respondents not to feel rejected or neglected by their parents thus preventing the risk of abusing drugs (Hoffmann, 2002). Availability by parents would also have helped them not to be affected by the parents' behaviour since the parents could have been aware of how to handle themselves appropriately. Hence, it could have resulted in less substance use (Berge et al., 2016).

In relation to parental conflicts, there was significant association between beer products use ($p=0.007$), wines use ($p=0.042$), Khat use ($p=0.0001$), and other drugs use ($p=0.51$) for the respondents who hated it when their parents fought. The findings of this study also indicate that parental conflicts were significant predictors of all drug use among the respondents. Marital conflicts cause stress among children, which leads them to mostly seek negative ways of coping and end up developing problematic behaviours like substance abuse (Grynych & Fincham, 1990; Reynolds, Houston, Coleman & Harold, 2014).

Conclusions

In conclusion, parenting behaviour affects children either positively or negatively. The results of this study indicate that whenever children experience abandonment and conflicts from the parents, it results in influencing them to seek for ways of coping like the use of drugs. The study recommends that awareness creation is necessary for the parents so that they can become more involved in their children's lives in order to protect them from developing problematic behaviours like substance abuse later in life.

Acknowledgements and Funding

Special thanks to students who generously gave their time and effort to participate in this study. This research was supported by a grant from the University of study.

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

- Babbie, E. (2008). *The basics of social research* (4th ed.). California: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Barthassat, J. (2014). Positive and Negative Effects of Parental Conflicts on Children's Condition and Behaviour. *Journal of European Psychological Students*, 5(1), 10-18.
- Berge, J., Sendel, K., Ojehaggen, A., & Hakansson, A. (2016). Role of parenting styles in adolescent substance use: Results from a Swedish longitudinal study. *BMJ Open*, 6, 1-9.
- Carlson, A. (2012). How parents influence deviant behavior among adolescents: An analysis of their family life, community, and peers. *Perspectives*, 4(1), 42-51.
- Daystar University. (2017, September 16). *Academics*. Retrieved from Daystar University Web site: www.daystar.ac.ke/academics.html
- Grync, J., & Fincham, F. (1990). Marital conflict and children's adjustment: A cognitive contextual framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, 267-290.
- Hoffmann, J. P. (2002). The community context of family structure and adolescent drug use. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 314-330.
- Lamont, A. (2010, April). Effects of child abuse and neglect for children and adolescents. Australian Institute of Family Studies, p. 7.
- Mandara, J., & Murray, C. B. (2006). Father's absence and African American adolescent drug use. *Journal of Divorce and remarriage*, 46, 1-12.
- Mbagaya, C., Oburu, P., & BakermansKranenburg. (2013). Child physical abuse and neglect in Kenya, Zambia and the Netherlands: A cross-cultural comparison of prevalence, psychopathological sequelae and mediation by PTSS. *International Journal of Psychology*, 48(2), 95-107.
- Mbua, A. P., & Adigeb, A. P. (2015). Parenting styles and adolescents' behaviour in central educational zone of Cross River State. *European Scientific Journal*, 11(20), 254-368.
- Mugenda, M. O., & Mugenda, A. G. (2003). *Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Nairobi: Acts Press

Ndegwa, S., Munene, A., & Oladipo, R. (2017). Factors influencing alcohol use among university students in a Kenyan University. *African Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 1(1), 102-117.

Newman, K., Harrison, L., Dashiff, C., & Davies, S. (2008). Relationships between parenting styles and risk behaviors in adolescent health: An integrative literature review. *Rev Latino-am Enfermagem*, 16(1), 142- 150.

Reynolds, J., Houlston, C., Coleman, L., & Harold, G. (2014). *Parental conflict: Outcomes and interventions for children and families*. Bristol, UK. Policy Press, University of Bristol Press.

Rizvi, S. F., & Najam, N. (2015). Emotional and behavioral problems associated with parenting styles in Pakistani adolescents. *VFAST Transactions on Education and Social Sciences*, 8(2), 6-13.

Rusby, J., Light, J., Crowley, R., & Westling, E. (2018). Influence of parent-youth relationship, parental monitoring, and parent substance use on adolescent substance use onset. *J Fam Psychol.*, 32(3), 310-320.

Smailes, E., Cohen, P., Brown, J., & Bernstein, D. (2001). Associations between four types of childhood neglect and personality disorder symptoms during adolescence and early adulthood: findings of a communitybased longitudinal study. *J Pers Disord*, 14(2), 171-187.