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ABSTRACT

Numerous studies on the role of family on drug use have reported that belonging to a single parent family correlates with drug use (Crano & Hemovich, 2009). The causal relationship has not been unequivocally established, yet studies continue to associate single parent families with drug abuse. There is very little research on factors associated to single parent families which increase students’ vulnerability to drug use. There is a gap on how single parent families increase the risk of drug use among students. To fill this gap, the current study introduced two variables (low self-esteem and perceived absence of parental monitoring) as mediators in the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students. The current study sought to examine psychosocial challenges (low self-esteem and parental monitoring) mediating the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary schools students in Nairobi County using Individual Psychology and Operant Conditioning learning theories. This study sought to ascertain whether Adlerian concept of compensation for feelings of inferiority (elsewhere termed as low self-esteem) had an impact on drug use and whether parental monitoring had an impact on drug use among students from single parent families through Skinner’s concept of negative reinforcement. The correlational research design was employed for the study. The target population was secondary school students in Nairobi County. Stratified sampling technique was used to select 8 schools (public/private; boys and girls). Stratified random sampling was used to select 384 respondents for the study from every class/form. One questionnaire was used to collect data on drug use, single parent families, self-esteem and parental monitoring from students. The second questionnaire was used to collect data on psychotherapy and prevention of drug use from counselors, chaplains and teachers. Content and construct validity were established by ensuring that there were adequate items to measure the variables. Expert opinion was also sought. Reliability was established through the test-retest method. The site for pretesting was selected from secondary schools in Ongata Rongai, Kajiado County. Cronbach’s alpha test on the questionnaires for students and for teachers, chaplains and counselors yielded coefficients of .880 & .713 respectively. Data was analyzed with the help of SPSS Version 20. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze data. Chi square and multiple regression statistical tests were used. Thematic analysis was used for qualitative data. Research findings indicated a significant relationship between single parent families and drug use. A significant relationship between low self-esteem and drug use; and between perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use, among secondary school students from single parent families also emerged. Further, low self-esteem and perceived absence of parental monitoring had a mediating effect on single parent families and drug use.

These findings may be useful to counselors, teachers, parents and government and non-governmental agencies. They may also be useful to single parents in terms of prevention and seeking for treatment for their secondary school going children.
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OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

Drugs: Both illicit and legal substances which are used for purposes other than medicinal use as prescribed by a physician will be termed as drugs.

Drug use: Any use including experimentation and regular use with or without dependency will be termed as drug use.

Single parent families: This will refer to families headed by one biological parent (either male or female) for a period not less than one year.

National Schools: Schools ranked the highest among public schools. They are characterized by high academic performance and also charge higher fees as compared to other public schools.

Extra-County Schools: Schools ranked on the second tier of public schools.

County Schools: Schools ranked on the third tier of public schools.

Self-esteem: In this research will mean the subjective evaluation of one’s worth; the self-evaluation of one’s own importance.

Parental Monitoring: Parent’s awareness of the whereabouts and activities of their secondary school going youth.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

The role of families in adolescent substance abuse has been the subject of investigation by many researchers. The causal relationship between single parent families and drug use has not been unequivocally established yet studies continue to associate single parent families with drug use. While these studies continue to shed light on many issues pertinent to adolescent substance use, there is the danger of subjecting adolescents from these families to social profiling which would further compound the challenges with which youth from these families have to wrestle.

In U.S.A daughters living with single fathers recorded a higher rate of drug use than those living with single mothers (Crano & Hemovich, 2009). Still in the U.S.A research found that the absence of the biological father increased the likelihood to smoke regularly among secondary school students (Antecol, Bedard & Eric, 2001). According to these studies, gender has a bearing on drug use among students from single parent families. The current study incorporated gender to measure its effect on the study variables.

In South Africa a strong correlation was reported between secondary school students who were raised by single parents and smoking cigarettes by black and
colored students, alcohol abuse by coloreds and bhang use by females (Flisher, Parry, Evans, Muller, & Lombard, 2003). In this study race appears to have an impact on drug use in single parent families. The current study was conducted within one race therefore making race a constant.

Another focus of studies on drug use among secondary school students from single parent families is on the reason underlying single parenthood. In Kenya, a study conducted in Kajiado found that youth from male-headed families reported higher use as compared to those headed by single mothers. Single families resulting from separation had the highest number of drug abusers while those from never married single families reported the lowest rates of drug abuse (Chege, 2015). The current study also captured circumstances leading to single parenthood to determine their influence on the variables under study.

Gitonga (2013), in a study that focused on self-esteem among secondary school students from single parent families, found that students who lived longer in single parent homes scored lower in self-esteem. Parental neglect was significantly related to low self-esteem among secondary school students. This was especially true for physical neglect and child abuse by fathers. Duration lived in single parent families was also associated with low self-esteem (Mwaura, 2016). In the proposed study low self-esteem was incorporated as a mediating variable.

In a study on self-esteem and initiation of substance use among adolescent in British Columbia, Richardson, Kwon & Ratner (2013) reported that self-esteem
was negatively correlated to initiation to substance use. In boys the association between self-esteem and drugs was not as strong as in girls. While this study has linked low self-esteem with drug abuse among adolescents it does not give suggestions as to what contributes to low self-esteem. The current study sought to find out whether family type influenced self-esteem.

Maldonado & Pendrao (2008) in their study on Self-esteem, self-efficacy, consumption of tobacco and alcohol in secondary students from urban and rural areas in Mexico found that self-esteem was strongly correlated to the amount of alcohol and cigarettes taken regularly. Consumption of alcohol and tobacco was more prevalent in the urban than in the rural areas. The current study was conducted in an urban area due to the high rate of drug use as was reported in this study.

One of the areas of interest among researchers with regard to single parent families and drug use is the effect of parental monitoring. Previous research has reported that parental monitoring has a relationship with drug use among secondary school students from single parent families (Camp, 2012). Perceived absence of parental monitoring, it was assumed in the current study, contributed to drug use among secondary school students from single parent families.

In Tanzania a study found that parental factors such as lack of parental care, lack of supervision and monitoring were associated with poor academic performance, poor attendance, dropping out of school, and problem behavior among secondary
school students from single parent families. The study also found that negative outcomes among students from single families were caused a number of interrelated factors (Mrinde, 2014). The current study attempted to examine psychosocial challenges (low self-esteem & perceived absence of parental monitoring) mediating the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students.

1.2 Statement of Problem Study

Previous research has focused on examining the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students. The question begs; what makes secondary school students from single parent families more prone to drug use as compared with those from two parent families. There is a gap on what factors in single parent families tend to increase the risk of drug use among secondary school students from these families. A valid question that requires investigation is whether the higher rate of drug use in secondary school students from single parent families is as a result of inadequate parental practices or because of individual psychological factors (such as self-esteem) in the students. To fill this lacunar, the current study proposed to examine two psychosocial challenges (low self-esteem & perceived absence of parental monitoring) mediating the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students. Research associates single parent families with low self-esteem (Mwaura, 2016) as well as
lack of parental monitoring (Mrinde, 2014) and drug use among secondary school students.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine psychosocial challenges (low self-esteem and perceived absence of parental monitoring) mediating the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students in Nairobi County.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

This study sought to examine the following objectives:

1. To determine the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students.

2. To establish whether there is a relationship between low self-esteem and drug use among secondary school students from single parent families.

3. To find out whether there is a relationship between perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use among secondary students from single parent families.

4. To explore possible strategies for prevention of drug use among secondary school students.
1.5 Research Hypotheses

H₀₁: There is no relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students.

H₀₂: There is no relationship between low self-esteem and drug use among secondary school students from single parent families.

H₀₃: There is no relationship between perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use among secondary school students from single parent families.

1.5.1 Research Question

Which possible strategies can be explored for prevention drug use among secondary school students?

1.6 Assumptions of the Study

In this study, the researcher espoused the following assumptions:

1. The researcher assumed that secondary school students from single parent families are more likely to use drugs.

2. The researcher assumed that if the levels of self-esteem rises there may be a reduction in the rate of drug use.

3. The researcher assumed that if parental monitoring is enhanced there will be considerable reduction in the rate of drug use.
1.7 Justification and Significance of Study

This study was prompted by a gap on the association of single parent families with drug use among secondary school students. Literature review has shown that a causal relationship between single parent families and drug use may be impossible to establish. It is to fill this knowledge gap that this study proposed examine psychosocial challenges that may have an impact on the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary students from single families. The study hoped to establish if low self-esteem and perceived absence of parental monitoring mediate the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students. The findings were expected to help counsellors, parents and students to understand the psychosocial challenges underlying drug use. The study, it was hoped, would bolster research in drug use among secondary school students from single families. This study, it was envisaged, would contribute to the research on theoretical models explaining the role of self-esteem and parental monitoring on drug use among secondary school students. Suggestions were made to government and nongovernmental agencies which may be useful in developing programs aimed at mitigating the challenges of single parenting by increasing resiliency and social support for these families.
1.8 Limitations of the Study

The researcher anticipated challenges in getting information on single parent families because of fear of social profiling. The researcher used questionnaires to collect data. Questionnaires engender confidentiality and anonymity in collection of data which help to eliminate prejudice and stigma on respondents.

1.9 Scope of the Study

The study was carried out in secondary schools in Nairobi County and included both private and public schools. The study employed the correlational research design and used both quantitative and qualitative data analysis. The participants were selected randomly from each school. A simple random sample was drawn from each class-form one to form four. The study sought to provide information pertinent to drug use and did not discuss or evaluate the merits and demerits of certain family types or gender roles.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter contains a review of literature on the study on psychosocial challenges mediating the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students. It also includes a theoretical framework, a review of related studies, a summary of literature review and a conceptual framework.

2.2 Theoretical Framework
This research study investigated psychosocial challenges mediating the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students using Individual Psychology theory and Operant Conditioning. Individual Psychology was developed by Alfred Adler (1870-1937). One of the main tenets of this theory is inferiority complex which Adler believed develops in children because they are little, helpless and dependent on others. Striving for significance and superiority arises from our effort to compensate for the feelings of inferiority by gaining mastery in certain abilities. Adler believed that problems develop not only because of heredity and environment but also because of our interpretation of our experiences. Faulty interpretation affects internal logic which may influence behavior (Corey, 2009).
This study attempted to find out whether drug use by students with feelings of inferiority (low self-esteem) could be an attempt to compensate for their feeling of worthlessness.

Students from single families may feel excluded and unfairly treated and this may hinder the natural striving for superiority. This increases the feelings of inferiority which may lead to overcompensation by turning to drugs.

Operant conditioning was founded by B. F. Skinner (1904-1990). He viewed behavior as controlled by consequences which may be either negative or positive (Staddon and Cerutti, 2003). Positive punishment refers to the use of aversive stimuli after the undesirable behavior while negative punishment is the withdrawal of a reinforcing stimulus to reduce the occurrence of the behavior being eliminated (Corey, 2009). This study sought to find out whether operant conditioning has an effect in preventing drug use among secondary school students. Parental monitoring of students’ behavior may deter drug use through the concept of reinforcement and punishment. If students anticipate a negative response if their parent/s found out that they had used drugs they are likely to abstain from drug use. The student may keep away from using drugs to avoid a negative reaction from his or her parent/s when the latter find/s out. Parental monitoring may serve as negative reinforcement against drug use.
2.3 Review of Related Literature

This section contains a review of related literature according to the study objectives. It also includes the conceptual framework and a summary of literature review.

2.3.1 Relationship between Single Parent Families and Drug Use among Secondary School Students

Crano and Hemovich (2009), in their Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) conducted on data from a survey carried out in 2004 in the United States of America found that adolescents living with one parent only recorded a higher rate of drug use as compared to those from intact two parent families. Daughter’s living with single fathers recorded a higher rate of drug use than those living with single mothers. There was no correlation, however, between the gender of single parent and drug use by sons (Crano & Hemovich, 2009). The findings that girls parented by single fathers had a higher rate of drug use may be a reflection of inadequate interaction between father and daughter. For example, it may be more difficult for a father to search his daughter’s room than it is for a mother to frisk her son. This study did not, however clarify whether this was the case. The current study focused on parental monitoring which may vary in relation to gender of single parent and student.

A study comparing profiles of problem behaviors in children from single and dual parent families conducted in India found that children from dual parent families
had fewer problems than those from single parent families. Children from single father families were more likely to have problem behaviors as compared to those from single mother families. More girls than boys and more rural than urban children from single families recorded higher rate of problem behaviors (Ganesha & Venkatesan, 2012). While this research found differences in the susceptibility to problem behaviors among children of single parents with regard to gender of both parent and child; area of residence, it did not specify the problem behaviors.

A study conducted on the challenges single parented children faced in attaining secondary school education in Tanzania found that single parent families were associated with a number of challenges including drug use (Mrinde, 2014). Though the study found an association between single parent families and drug use the findings could not be tested for significance because the researcher used qualitative data.

A study carried out in Nairobi to investigate challenges of single motherhood and its effect on children found that being in a single mother family exposed children to a number of challenges including but not limited to drug abuse (Kamunde, 2005). While this study provided great insight into the plight of single motherhood it did not include single fathers which may offer more insight into single parenthood.

A Correlational study conducted in Kajiado County on the relationship between family structure and drug abuse found that youth from single parent families were more likely to abuse drugs than those from two-parent families. Youth from male-
headed families reported higher use as compared to those headed by single mothers. Single parent families resulting from separation had the highest number of drug abusers while those from never married single parent families reported the lowest rates of drug abuse (Chege, 2015). The study, however, did not focus on psychosocial issues which may explain the higher prevalence of drug abuse among youth from single parent families.

2.3.2 Self-esteem and Drug Use among Students from Single Parent Families

Boden, Fergusson, & Horwood (2010) in a study carried out in New Zealand found weak associations between self-esteem and later life outcomes. Family factors were associated with low self-esteem and drug dependence. One of the limitations of this study is that it did not describe the family factors and how they correlate with low self-esteem and drug dependence.

In Canada Yang & Schaninger (2010) found that single parent and blended families had a greater influence on self-esteem in teens which mediates the association between parenting and drinking. The study was however conducted on only alcohol which is a legal drug there is need for a study including illegal drugs.

Uba, Yaacob, Talib, Abdullah, & Mofrad (2013) in their study in Nigeria found that self-esteem had a mediating role in the relationship between peer substance use and drug abuse among adolescents. The study however did not provide an explanation as to what influences self-esteem in adolescents. The current study
proposed that psychosocial challenges (low self-esteem) mediate the relationship between single parent families and drug use. It was hypothesized in the current study that single parent families may influence self-esteem which predicts drug use among students.

Wild, Flisher, Bhana & Lombard (2004) in their study in South African adolescents found that self-esteem had the strongest correlation with high risk behaviors including substance abuse in adolescents. Further research on social and psychological variables that mediate the impact of single parent families on adolescent drug use would provide more precise predictions aiding in formulating intervention strategies.

Kamunde, 2005 in a study in Nairobi reported that children from single-mother families suffered psychologically. The study also found that children from single-mother families exhibited negative outcomes such as drug abuse and crime among others. The study relied on qualitative data which may not be generalized. The findings that there was stigma about being a single mother-child suggests that there could be self-esteem issues which the current study sought to investigate.

Kimani (2016) in a study in Nakuru, Kenya found that students who lived longer in single parent families were likely to score lower in self-esteem, discipline and interpersonal relationships than those who lived for shorter periods in single parent families. The study however did not define indiscipline which could include drug use, a variable that has generated a lot interest among researchers.
2.3.3 Perceived Parental Monitoring and Drug Use among Students from Single Parent Families

Choquet, Hassler, Morin, Falissard & Chau (2007) in their study reported a negative correlation between parental control and substance abuse. The correlation was stronger for girls than for boys. Similar results were reported for parental control for both single parent families and intact families. The researchers concluded that parental control is critical for any family structure. The study however had only one question to measure parental control which may be insufficient to measure parental control. More items may be needed to measure the variable exhaustively. Parental monitoring has often been operationalized in terms of parental knowledge of the child’s whereabouts. The current study included questions on whom the student had been with, the source and use of money, inspection of the student’s room, access to student’s mobile phone by parents and monitoring through making phone calls while away by parents.

Hemovich, Lac and Crano (2011) in a study conducted in USA reported that secondary school students from dual parent families were more closely monitored than youth from single parent families. The study found that both parental warmth and parental monitoring had a significant relationship to drug abuse among youth. The study however did not explain the differences in parental monitoring between the two family types.
Ugwuoke and Duruji (2015) in a study conducted in Nigeria reported that there was a significant association between family instability and juvenile delinquency. Inadequate parental monitoring supervision was correlated with increased delinquency. The researcher suggested as an explanation for this association that broken families face disruptive transitions and role conflicts. Broken families which often times result in single parent families may also have similar behavior outcomes as dysfunctional families. Some single parent families cannot be termed as broken families such as the never married and widowed parents. There is need to structure the study variables to capture specific parameters to increase the accuracy of inferences and relevance of the research to intervention and prevention of the problem.

Kimani (2010) in his study in Nakuru-Kenya found that children from single parent families (both male and female-headed) were likely to smoke marijuana more than those from intact families. Parental absence (either mother or father) increases the likelihood of juvenile delinquency. The study did not investigate how the absence of a parent impacts on parenting in single parent families.

Nyaga and Mwai (2016) in their study conducted in Kenya reported that parental monitoring played an important role in preventing drug abuse among adolescents. They however found that there was no significant effect on behavior between students who lived with biological parents and those who did not live with biological parents. The study indicated that some students lived alone because they
were orphaned. The findings of the study go against other studies that reported that family structure had an effect on the behavior of adolescents. It not is clear how parental monitoring would be a significant protective factor against substance abuse even with the absence of both parents as is the case with total orphans. It seems that this study may need to be replicated to test whether the findings are supported by empirical evidence.

Khasakhala (2012) found that youth who perceived their parents as under protective recorded a significant difference with regard to alcohol dependence. Third born children were more likely to abuse drugs. The study found that perceived maternal rejection was a significant risk factor increasing the vulnerability of youth to substance use disorders. Although family structure was measured the analyses on study variables was not captured in the study. Inclusion of youth without substance abuse disorder would also help enrich the study by giving vital insight into possible protective factors against drug abuse.

2.3.4 Strategies for Preventions of Drug Use in Single Families

A study in USA Conger & Cutrona, et al (2011) found that an optimistic attitude and life stressors had an influence on children and the quality of parenting. The current study sought to find out ways in which single parents can overcome psychosocial challenges to prevent drug use.
Velleman, Templeton, & Copello (2005) in their study in the United Kingdom found that families have played an important role in preventing drug abuse among the youth. Single parent families have unique challenges and resources which call for further research so as to identify specific strategies of intervention.

A study in Nigeria proposed establishing family education on drugs, counselling centres for drug control with qualified professionals, designing curricula on drugs education, among others (Fareo, 2012). Family education on drugs needs to capture the diverse family background to include single parent families.

UNODC (2004) in guidelines published in South Africa proposed the involvement of both youth and parents in prevention programs. Evidence based and accurate message on dangers of drug abuse as well as short and long term dangers are to be incorporated. Single parents might feel overwhelmed with parenting responsibilities and would benefit from programs that help prevent more problems such as drug use.

Rhodes, Ndimbii, Guise, Cullen, & Ayon, (2015) in a study carried out in Kenya proposed an approach that provides free access to drug treatment, alleviating poverty and increasing food security and removing the social stigma that is attached to drug addiction. The study however did not include prevention and the deployment of resources to help students to acquire education, life skills and improve their welfare rather than concentrating efforts at rehabilitation only.
Simatwa, Odhong’, Juma & Choka (2014) in their study in Kisumu-Kenya recommended free rehabilitation, education on drug abuse among other interventions. There were no specific recommendations for prevention of drug abuse among students from unique backgrounds such as single parent families.

2.4 Summary of Literature Review & Theoretical Framework

Literature on self-esteem and drug use among students from single parent families provides an explanation for the association between single parent families and drug use. Research on the association between self-esteem and drug use has however not been conclusive. The current study proposed to find out whether self-esteem mediates the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students with an aim of providing further evidence to support or disprove the conclusion that self-esteem has an effect on drug use.

One of the studies found that children from single parent families faced social stigma which predisposes them to low self-esteem (Wild, Flisher, Bhana & Lombard, 2004). The levels of social stigma may vary across different segments of society. With varying levels of stigma, students from single parent families might record higher or lower levels of self-esteem. There is a gap on levels of self-esteem among youth from different racial, ethnic, economic, and religious groups. Nairobi where this study was conducted is cosmopolitan and thus data obtained will help determine these differences.
Other studies on single parent families and drug use focused on parental practices. Literature seems to support the hypothesis that single parent families are likely to be lacking in parental monitoring which increases the risk of drug use among secondary school students. One possible explanation for lack of parental monitoring could be absence of a spouse to help shoulder the parental responsibility. Time spent at work by the single parent may also reduce surveillance which may provide students with more freedom to indulge into drugs.

While there could be other explanations, there is however a possibility single parent families predispose secondary school students to drug use through absence of parental monitoring. It is to fill this gap this study proposed to find out whether perceived absence of parental monitoring mediates the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students.
2.6 Conceptual Framework

Fig. 2.1: Psychosocial challenges mediating the relationship between single parent families and drug use

The independent variable was single parent families. The dependent variable was drug use. Low self-esteem and perceived absence of parental monitoring were mediating variables. Literature review seemed to support the hypothesis that belonging to a single parent family increased the risk of drug use among secondary school students. This study proposed two psychosocial variables (low self-esteem and perceived absence of parental monitoring) as possible mediators in the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students. It was expected, in light of literature review, that low self-esteem and
perceived absence of parental monitoring mediate the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter contains the research design, study variables, site of study, target population, the sampling technique, research instruments, validity and reliability. It also includes pilot study, data collection procedures, data analysis and presentation, and data management and ethical considerations.

3.2 Research Design

The study employed the correlational research design. Since establishing a causal relationship in social sciences is not possible, correlation has been relied upon to measure the relationship between variables (Howell, 2010).

3.3 Study Variables

In this study the independent variable was single parent families which was conceptualized in terms of gender of the single parent and circumstances leading to single parenthood; that is, divorced, separated, widowed, and the never-married. The dependent variable was drug use which was conceptualized in terms of one-time use, two or more times use, regular use and those unable to stay without the drug.
The study included two mediating variables: Low self-esteem which was determined using the Rosenberg test and perceived absence of parental monitoring was measured by assessing the parents’ knowledge of the whereabouts, the associates and activities of their secondary school going children.

3.4 Site of the Study

The study was conducted in Nairobi County which has the highest population in the country but is also socially and economically diverse. Students in Nairobi are more likely to access drugs in supermarkets, wines and spirits outlets. The social safety net which was provided by the extended family in the rural areas, helping nuclear families raise children, may also be lacking in Nairobi.

3.5 Target Population

The study focused on secondary school students in Nairobi County. This population group according to Erik Erickson is faced with the identity crisis. Experimentation with drugs is common during this stage. This then becomes a risk group with regard to drug abuse. This study sought to shed more light on areas of vulnerability with a view to developing prevention measures and strategies.

3.6 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

A sampling frame for public schools was established thus: national, extra-county, and county schools. Using stratified random sampling 6 schools were selected
consisting of both boys’ and girls’ schools. For national school 2 were selected, 2 Extra-County, 2 County, three of which were boys’ schools and three girls’ schools. Two were mixed secondary schools. Private schools were selected by arranging the schools alphabetically and 2 schools chosen using simple random sampling. A total of 8 schools were selected from 4 different Sub-Counties in Nairobi County. Students, both boys and girls, were chosen from every class in each school using stratified random sampling. A sample of 2 teachers, 1 chaplains and 1 school counsellor from every school that participated in the study was selected.

The sample size was 383 according to formula of Krejcie & Morgan (1970) for an estimated population of 70,000 students at 95% confidence level (MOEST, 2014).

\[
 n = \frac{X^2 \times N \times P \times (1-P)}{(M \times (N-1)) + (X^2 \times P \times (1-P))}
\]

Where:
- \( n \) = sample size
- \( X^2 \) = Chi – square for the specified confidence level at 1 degree of freedom
- \( N \) = Population Size
- \( P \) = population proportion (.50 in this table)
- \( M \) = desired Margin of Error (expressed as a proportion)

### 3.7 Research Instruments

Data for the study was gathered using questionnaires which included both structured and unstructured items. To obtain data on single parent families the questionnaire had 12 questions covering family type, reason for single parenthood, length of separation/divorce/or bereavement, the gender of single parent and whom the student resides with.
Ten questions were used to collect data on drug use. Information on whether the student had ever used drugs, reason/s for use, initial drug use, availability of drugs, friends’ drug use, suspicion of being a drug user or drug related arrests. For those who had indicated they had used drugs, a table was also provided with a column on drug type and frequency of use.

The ten-item Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem scale was used to assess the level of self-esteem of students. Each question has a statement against which the respondent checks one of four options: strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree. Some of the statements were positively phrased while others were negatively phrased.

To obtain data on parental monitoring 10 items were used. Each item had a statement on parent/s’ knowledge of the activities, whereabouts and whom the student was with. Five options were provided against each question: Always, most of the time, sometimes, rarely and never.

The questionnaire for teachers had 8 structured questions on drug use and intervention and one unstructured question.

All items in the questionnaires were constructed by the researcher except for the Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale. Questionnaires were chosen for this study because they offer confidentiality and anonymity which encourages participants to give
information without fear of stigma. Questionnaires can also be administered to a larger sample within a limited budget and time.

3.8 Validity and Reliability

Self-esteem was measured using the Rosenberg’s Self Esteem scale which has already been validated.

Content and construct validity for items measuring perceived parental monitoring was established by ensuring that there were adequate and relevant items to measure the variable. Expert opinion from the supervisor and a research consultant was also sought.

Reliability was established through the test-retest method. The site for pretesting was selected from secondary schools in Ongata Rongai, a suburb of Nairobi located in Kajiado County which has characteristics similar to those of the population in Nairobi County. Data from the pilot study was excluded from the analysis of data for the research report. Reliability refers to a measure of the degree to which research instruments yield consistent results (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003).

In this study, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients (α) were used to determine the average internal consistent (reliability) of all the items that were used to measure the specific objectives of this study. The higher the (α) coefficient, the more reliable is the construct in measuring the objectives of the study. As a rule of the thumb, the acceptable range of Cronbach alpha coefficient is between 0.70 and 0.90 or higher.
depending on the type of research. A coefficient of 0.70 or more is acceptable for exploratory or descriptive research while 0.80 and 0.90 are acceptable for basic research and applied sciences respectively. Therefore, the researcher conducted Cronbach’s alpha test using questionnaires that were obtained from the pilot study exercise. The findings were as shown in the table below.

*Table 3.1: Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficients for Multiple Likert Scale Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items/questions</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items/questions</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Cronbach analysis in the table above, Cronbach's alpha coefficients for all items under each objective of the study that were used in the questionnaire for student was 0.880 and for the items that were used in the questionnaire for teachers was 0.713. These findings generally imply that the level of internal consistency for the items that were used to measure specific objectives of this study was acceptable.
hence the items were reliable to measure the objectives of this study. This implies that the questionnaires that were used in this study (both for students and teachers) were reliable hence the findings were accurate and relevant.

3.9 Pilot Study

A sample was selected from public secondary schools in Ongata Rongai-Kajiado County to test the research tools and to refine the research procedures. According to Treece & Treece (1982) for pilot study 10% of the sample size would suffice as participants. Since our sample size is 383, the pilot study was constituted of 39 participants. The results from the pilot study were used to refine the research instruments. The sample for pilot study was excluded from the analysis of final research findings.

3.10 Data Collection Procedures

Upon authorization by the Graduate School, Kenyatta University the researcher obtained a letter from Kenyatta University Ethics Review Committee. The researcher then obtained a research permit from National Commission for Science Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). The researcher also got authorization, which authorization are attached in the appendices, from the Ministry of Education in Nairobi County and from the Sub-County Directors of Education where selected schools were domiciled. The researcher then contacted the selected schools and sought for permission from the school administration.
The researcher chose participants as stated under the section on sampling. Questionnaires were administered by the researcher and collected immediately after they had been completed. One questionnaire was issued to students to gather data on the research variables. A second questionnaire was given to school counsellors, teachers and chaplains to collect data on drug use, pertinent for developing strategies for prevention and treatment.

3.11 Data Analysis and Presentation

Demographic data was analyzed using cross tabulations and displayed through tables, charts and bar charts. Correlation between single parent families and drug use was determined using the Pearson Chi Square test. Further correlation was determined between single parent families and self-esteem as well as between single parent families and parental monitoring using the Chi Square test.

Chi Square test was chosen because the data involved categorical variables.

Correlation between self-esteem and subsequently between parental monitoring and drug use was also established using linear regression analysis. Partial or complete mediation was determined using multiple regression analysis. The conditions for mediation were established according to the criteria set by Baron and Kenny (Baron & Kenny, 1986).
3.12 Data Management and Ethical Considerations

The researcher, upon approval and receipt of an introduction letter from the graduate school of Kenyatta University, sought and received a research permit from the NCOSTI. Since the participants were likely to be under 18 years of age, the researcher got permission from the ministry of education and school administration. The participants were asked to sign assent letters before they could take part in the study. The participants were informed of the nature of investigation and their right to take part in the research voluntarily, with the freedom to withdraw at any stage without fear of consequences. A consent letter containing the above stated information was signed by all the participants. Anonymity and confidentiality was enhanced by issuing questionnaires which were filled privately and handed to the researcher upon completion.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the study findings that were obtained during the data collection exercise from the study participants. It starts by providing the response rate of the study, the demographic profile of the respondents, and finally the study findings based on the study objectives.

The objectives of the study were to determine the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students, to establish the relationship between low self-esteem and drug use among secondary school students from single parent families, to find out whether there is a relationship between perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use among secondary students from single parent families, and to explore possible strategies for prevention of drug use among secondary school students. Descriptive statistics were applied to analyze data and findings are presented in form of statistical distribution tables.

4.2 Response Rate

This study targeted a sample of 383 secondary school students in Nairobi County.

Eight schools from four sub-counties in Nairobi were selected for the study: 2 National, 2 Extra-County, 2 County and 2 private schools. Three of these schools
were boys’ schools, three girls’ schools and two were mixed schools. Participants were recruited from every class. Out a 383 questionnaires that were distributed to students, only 350 questionnaires were duly filled and returned. This means that the response rate for this was 91.4%. For generalization purposes, Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) noted that a response rate of 50% is adequate, 60% is good, while 70% and above is excellent for data analysis and drawing conclusions. Therefore, this study’s response rate of 91.4% (350) was excellent hence satisfactory enough for analysis and drawing conclusions.

4.3 Descriptive Statistics

This section presents the study findings that describe the basic features of the data that was obtained from the field. It does not provide the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable of the study. It only summarizes and describes the study findings.

4.3.1 Demographic Profile of the Respondents

The researcher sought some demographic information of the secondary school students in Nairobi County in order to understand personal factors that could influence the findings of the study. The relevant demographic information to this study includes gender, age, family composition and class of study (form 1-4).
4.3.1.1 Gender

Study findings on gender distribution of the respondents were as displayed in Figure 4.1.
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**Figure 4.1: Gender of the respondents**

From the findings shown in Figure 4.1, slightly more than half of the respondents at 51% were female while the rest at 49% were male. This implies that the findings of this study were obtained from both genders in a ratio of male to female being approximately 1:1. Therefore there was gender balance in obtaining primary data for this study hence the findings were reliable in terms of gender.
4.3.1.2 Age of students

Study findings on age of students were as presented in Figure 4.2.
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*Figure 4.2: Age of students*

From the findings in Figure 4.2 above, most (49.7%) of the respondents were 15-16 years, followed by 32.9% who were 17-18 years, then 15.1% who were 13-14 years, and a few (2.3%) who were more than 18 years. These findings imply that data was obtained from secondary school students of different age sets hence the findings were not age-biased.

4.3.1.3 Family Composition

The researcher sought to know the number of siblings that the respondents had in their respective families.
With regard to family composition the responses were as shown in Table 4.1.

**Table 4.1: Respondents’ number of siblings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of siblings</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4.1 above, majority of the respondents at 27.7% had two siblings, followed by 24.9% who had three siblings, then 16.0% who had only one sibling, 13.4% had four siblings, 4.0% had no siblings, while the rest 14% had more than four siblings.

4.3.1.4 Class of Study

The study targeted secondary school students hence by default all respondents were in the process of obtaining secondary level education. However, the researcher sought to know how far the respondents had gone with their secondary education in terms of their respective classes. Findings were as shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Respondents’ respective class in secondary school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form one</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form two</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form three</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form four</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.2 above indicate that data for this study was obtained from all classes in secondary school with majority at 35.1% being Form three, followed by
Form two at 26.0%, then form one at 23.4%, and finally form four at 15.4%. These findings imply that all secondary school students were represented irrespective of the class they were by the time this study was conducted.

4.3.2 Parenthood of Secondary School Students

This section provides a description of the findings on the parenthood of secondary school students in Nairobi County. The findings include the family type where the students are raised in, reasons for single parenthood, and the period of single parenthood.

4.3.2.1 Family Type of Secondary School Students

The researcher asked students to indicate the type of family in which they came from. Study findings were as shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Family type of secondary school students in Nairobi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both biological parents</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single mother</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single father</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings in Table 4.3 show that most (59.7%) of the secondary school students in Nairobi County came from families that had both biological parents, 31.4% came from single mother families, while 8.9% came from single father families. In total, 40.3% of secondary school students in Nairobi County came from single parent families.

4.3.2.2 Reasons for Single Parenthood

The students who indicated that they came from single parent families were further asked to indicate the causes of single parenthood. The findings were as presented in Table 4.4.

*Table 4.4: Reasons for single parenthood*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes of single parenthood</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings in Table 4.4 show that 38.8% of the single parent families were as a result of death of one parent hence widowed, 38.1% were as a result of separation, 17.2% were as a result of divorce, while 6.0% of the single families were as a result of never having been married.

4.3.2.3 Duration of Single Parenthood

Students who indicated that they came from single parent families as a result of separation or divorce of the parents were further asked to specify the period their parents had been separated or divorced. The findings were as shown in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Length of separation/divorce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of separation/divorce</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years and more</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.5 indicate that the majority (74.7%) of the single parents of secondary school students as a result of divorce/separation had been separated or divorced for 5 years or more, 9.3% had been separated or divorced for 2 – 4 years, while 16.0% had been separated or divorced for approximately one year.
Students who indicated that they came from single families where one parent had passed away were further asked to indicate the duration they had been in bereavement. Their responses were as shown in Table 4.6.

**Table 4.6: Length of bereavement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of bereavement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years and above</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.6 show that most (66.7%) of the secondary school students who came from single parent families as a result of one parent passing away had been in bereavement for 5 years or more. Some (16.7%) had been in bereavement for 2-4 years while others (16.7%) had been in bereavement for approximately a year.

**4.3.3 Drug Use among Secondary School Students**

This section describes study findings on the use of drugs among secondary school students. It provides findings on whether secondary school students use drugs, type of drugs secondary school students use, reasons for using drugs, how students access drugs while at school, how the students access drugs at home, and whether students had been arrested due to drug related offenses.
### 4.3.3.1 Whether Secondary School Students use Drugs

Secondary school students were asked whether they use drugs. Their responses were as shown in table 4.7.

*Table 4. 7: Whether secondary school students use drugs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether secondary school students use drugs</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.7, more than half the secondary school students at 54.3% indicated that they use drugs while 45.7% indicated they do not use drugs.

This findings show that use of drugs among secondary school students in Nairobi is rampant hence the need for the government and relevant stakeholders to step in and control drug use by secondary school students.

### 4.3.3.2 Type of Drugs Secondary School Students Use

The students who indicated that they use drugs were asked to indicate the type of drugs they use. Drugs that the students highlighted were as shown in Table 4.8 with most students mentioning more than one drug.
Table 4.8: Type of drugs secondary school students use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of drugs abused</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhang/Shisha/Marijuana</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarette/Kuber</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khat/Miraa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.8 indicate that majority of the secondary school students at 92.6% use alcohol, some at 26.7% use bhang/shisha, 8.0% of the students use cocaine, 7.4% use cigarette/kuber, 1.7% use tobacco, another 1.7% use khat/miraa, while 1.1% use heroine. These findings show that alcohol is used by almost all secondary school students who use drugs.

4.3.3.3 Reasons for Drug Use by Secondary School

Secondary school students who use drugs were asked to highlight reasons why they use drugs. The reasons they gave were summarized in Table 4.9.
Table 4.9: Reasons why secondary school students use drugs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons why secondary school students use drugs</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to know how it feels like</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel more relaxed and happy when on drugs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends encouraged me</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretly stole the drug from a relative</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwhelmed with fear, sadness or worry without drug</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience physical discomfort without the drug</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings in Table 4.9 above, most (55.8%) of the secondary school students who indicated that they use drugs wanted to know how it feels like when one is under the influence of the drug. Some (14.2%) indicated that they felt more relaxed and happy when on drugs, 13.7% said their friends encouraged them to use drugs, 11.6% said they secretly stole the drugs from a relative and used, 2.6% said they used drugs because they were overwhelmed with fear, sadness or worry without drug, while 2.1% indicated that they experience physical discomfort.
without the drugs. These findings imply that some secondary school students were already addicted to drugs while others were not addicted.

4.3.3.4 Availability of Drugs for Secondary School Students at School

The study sought to establish how the secondary school students who use drugs accessed the drugs while in school. Therefore students were asked to explain how drugs could be accessed in school. Findings were as shown in Table 4.10 below.

Table 4.10: Availability of drugs for secondary school students at school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability of drugs for students in secondary school</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sold by students</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold by outsiders</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bought through school workers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.12 show that 27.4% of the secondary school students who use drugs access the drugs through other students who sell drugs, 26.3% access the drugs through outsiders who sell to them, while 11.6% use school workers to buy the drugs for them. The findings show that students access drugs in various ways hence the drugs are available for use.
4.3.3.5 Availability of Drugs for Secondary School Students at Home

The researcher sought to know how secondary school students who use drugs access the drugs while at home. When the students were asked, their responses were as shown in table 4.11.

Table 4.11: Secondary school students’ access to drugs at home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to drugs at home</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buying from local bars which sell alcohol and other drugs to under 18 years of age</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends give students drugs</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying alcohol from supermarkets</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members use drugs at home</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While at home, 43.7% of secondary school students who use drugs access the drugs at local bars which sell alcohol and other drugs to people who are less than 18 years of age which against the law. Other students (13.7%) indicated that they access drugs through friends at home, 6.9% indicated that they buy drugs from supermarkets, while 5.1% of the students said their family members use drugs at home hence ease of access to the drugs.
4.3.3.6 Whether Secondary School Students had Been Arrested due to Drug Related Offences

Students who indicated that they use drugs were asked whether they had been arrested for drug related offences. Their responses were as shown in Table 4.12.

*Table 4.12: Whether secondary school students had been arrested due to drug related offenses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug related arrest</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.12 show that out of the 190 secondary school students who indicated that they use drugs, 7.4% of them had been arrested due to drug related offenses. This suggests that drug use among secondary schools students is so prevalent that some of the students had been arrested for drug related offences such as using the drug, being in possession of or peddling of drugs.
4.4 Analysis of Study Variables

In this section, the study sought to establish the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students; low self-esteem and drug use among secondary school students from single parent families; and perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use among secondary students from single parent families. To achieve this, the researcher applied cross-tabulation and correlational analysis between variables/indicators of parenthood and variables/indicators of drug use among secondary school students.

4.4.1 Relationship between Single Parent Families and Drug Use among Secondary School Students

The study sought to establish whether there is a relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students. First, the researcher carried a cross-tabulation analysis between family type of secondary school students and whether the students use drugs. The findings were as shown in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13: Cross Tabulation on the relationship between Single Parent Families and Drug Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug Use</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Count</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings in Table 4.13 above shows that more than half of the secondary students (190) who participated in this study indicated that they used drugs while 160 students indicated that they did not use drugs.

Majority (126) of the secondary school students who indicated that they had not used drugs had both biological parents. Of students from single families who used drugs, 83 were from single mother families while 24 were from single father families. Cumulatively, 107 students who used drugs were from single parent families compared to 83 who were from families with both biological parents. These findings show that use of drugs among secondary school students is high and most of the secondary school students who use drugs come from single parent families. Therefore, there is a relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students in Nairobi County.
Pearson Chi Square test was carried out to test the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students. The results of the Chi Square were $\chi^2(1, n=350) = 44.396$, $p=.000$ as shown in Table 4.14.

**Table 4.14: Chi-Square Tests on the Relationship between Single Parent Families and Drug Use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>44.396(^a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction(^b)</td>
<td>42.950</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>46.031</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>44.269</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the Pearson Chi Square at an alpha of .05 were statistically significant since the p value was .000. The null hypothesis that there is no relationship between single parent families and drug use was therefore rejected. The alternative
hypothesis was adopted: there is a relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students.

4.4.2 Relationship between Low Self-Esteem and Drug Use among Secondary School Students from Single Parent Families

The study sought to establish the relationship between low self-esteem and drug use among secondary school students from single parent families. Since a third variable (low self-esteem) was introduced in the test for the relationship between single parent families and drug use a three way cross tabulation and Pearson Chi Square were conducted. Findings were as shown in Table 4.15.

Table 4.15: Cross Tabulation on Low self-esteem and drug use among students from single parent families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-esteem scores</th>
<th>drug use</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent family</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High self-esteem 15 and above</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within single parent family</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within single parent family</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within single parent family</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low self-esteem 14 and below</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within single parent family</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Parent Family</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent Family</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent Family</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent Family</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cross tabulation showed that 73.5% of students from single parent families who scored high on self-esteem used drugs while 26.5% did not use drugs which equals 25 and 9 students respectively. Majority of students (76.6% corresponding to 82 students) from single parent families who scored lower (had low self-esteem) used drugs while 23.4% (translating to 25 students) in this category had not used drugs.

Pearson Chi Square was conducted among the three variables. The findings to test the relationship between low self-esteem and drug use in single parent families were $\chi^2(1, n=350) = 5.198$, p=.023 as shown in Table 4.16.
Table 4.16: Chi Square Tests on the Relationship between Self-esteem and Drug Use among Students from Single Parent Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-esteem scores</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high self esteem 15 and above</td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>14.527&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuity Correction&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13.130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>14.688</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td>14.461</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low self esteem 14 and below</td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>5.198&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuity Correction&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.049</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>4.778</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Available only for linear-by-linear association tests.  
<sup>b</sup> This is the continuity correction and is only applicable for 2x2 tables.  
<sup>c</sup> Due to rounding, the exact value is 14.526.  
<sup>d</sup> Due to rounding, the exact value is 5.198.
The findings from the analysis between low self-esteem and drug use among students from single families was significant with a p value of 0.023 at 95% confidence level. The null hypothesis stating that there is no relationship between low self-esteem and drug use among secondary students from single parent families
was therefore rejected. The alternative hypothesis; there is a relationship between low self-esteem and drug use among secondary students from single parent families was adopted.

4.4.3 Relationship between Perceived Absence of Parental Monitoring and Drug Use among Secondary Students from Single Parent Families

The researcher sought to establish the perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use among secondary students from single parent families. The researcher coded (1), to indicate perceived absence of parental monitoring those who gave responses of no parental monitoring, very low parental monitoring and low parental monitoring as absence of parental monitoring, for those who scored 0-19. Moderate and high parental monitoring were coded (2), to indicate that there was no perceived absence of parental monitoring, for those who scored 20-40. Results for the cross tabulation of the relationship between perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use among secondary students from single families were as shown in Table 4.17.

Table 4.17: Cross Tabulation on Perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use among secondary school students from single parent families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>perceived absence of parental monitoring</th>
<th>drug use</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes single parent family</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes % within single parent family</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no Count</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% within single parent family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.0% 48.0% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103 53 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within single parent family</td>
<td>66.0% 34.0% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No single parent family</td>
<td>Yes Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 17 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within single parent family</td>
<td>71.7% 28.3% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44 90 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within single parent family</td>
<td>32.8% 67.2% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87 107 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within single parent family</td>
<td>44.8% 55.2% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total single parent family</td>
<td>Yes Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107 34 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within single parent family</td>
<td>75.9% 24.1% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83 126 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within single parent family</td>
<td>39.7% 60.3% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>190 160 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within single parent family</td>
<td>54.3% 45.7% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.17 indicate that 81 (57.45%) students from single families reported perceived absence of parental monitoring while 60 reported no perceived absence of parental monitoring. Out of 81 who reported perceived absence of
parental monitoring 64 (79.0%) used drugs while 17 (21.0%) indicated they had not used drugs. Compared to students from two biological parent families out of 75 (36.06%) students who reported perceived absence of parental monitoring 39 (52.0%) used drugs while 36 (48.0%) had not used drugs. This indicates both a relationship between single parent families and perceived absence of parental monitoring and a relationship between perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use.

Pearson Chi Square was conducted to establish the relationship between perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use among students from single parent families. The results of the Pearson Chi Square \( \chi^2(1, n=350) = 12.667, p=.000 \) were as shown in Table 4.18.

**Table 4.18: Chi-Square Tests on the relationship between perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use among secondary students from single parent families**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>perceived absence of parental monitoring</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig.</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>12.667</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuity Correction</td>
<td>11.492</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>12.863</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>12.586</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57
The findings of the Chi Square analysis with a p value of .000 at 95% confidence level were significant since the p value was less than .05. The null hypothesis suggesting that there is no relationship between perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use among secondary school students from single parent families was therefore rejected. The alternative hypothesis suggesting that there is
a relationship between perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use among secondary school students from single parent families was adopted.

4.4.4.0 Analysis of Psychosocial Challenges Mediating the Relationship between Single Parent Families and Drug Use among Secondary School Students

Further analysis was conducted to establish whether psychosocial challenges (low self-esteem and perceived absence of parental monitoring) had a mediating role on the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students. To achieve this multiple regression was carried out on each mediator in relation to the independent variable (single parent families) and the dependent variable (drug use). To test whether the expected mediation was significant, the Sobel’s mediation test was conducted.


In line with the conditions for mediation set by Baron and Kenny (1986) a linear regression was conducted between self-esteem as the dependent variable and single parent families as independent variable. First regression analysis was conducted between single parent families and self-esteem and between self-esteem and drug use. The unstandardized coefficients and standard errors were then used to calculate
significance using an online Sobel’s calculator. The results for the regression were $\beta=.658$, $SE=.039$, $p<05$ and $\beta=.290$, $SE=.053$, $p<05$ and a p value of .000 was obtained after the Sobel’s test. The results of the regression analysis are shown in tables 4.19 and 4.20.

Table 4.19: Regression between single parent families and self-esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>37.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 single parent family</td>
<td>-.658</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.670</td>
<td>-00</td>
<td>-.735</td>
<td>-.582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20: Regression between self-esteem and drug use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.853</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>24.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.701</td>
<td>2.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem scores</td>
<td>-.290</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.280</td>
<td>-00</td>
<td>-.394</td>
<td>-.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug use scores</td>
<td>-.290</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.280</td>
<td>-00</td>
<td>-.394</td>
<td>-.185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This indicates that single parent families predict drug use among secondary school students via self-esteem as a mediator.

4.4.4.2 Analysis of the Mediation of Perceived Absence of Parental Monitoring on the Relationship between Single Parent Families and Drug Use among Secondary School Students

Regression analysis was carried out between single parent families and perceived absence of parental monitoring. Further regression was done between perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use. The results for the regression were $\beta=.216$, $SE=.053$, $p<.05$ and $\beta=.212$, $SE=.053$, $p<.05$ and a p value of .004 was obtained after the Sobel’s test. The results of the regression analysis are as shown in tables 4.21 and 4.22.

Table 4.21: Regression between single parent families and perceived absence of parental monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig 95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Correlations B</th>
<th>Correlations Std. Error</th>
<th>Correlations Beta</th>
<th>Correlations Lower Bound</th>
<th>Correlations Upper Bound</th>
<th>Correlations Partial Part</th>
<th>Correlations Par Ord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Unstandardized Coefficients</td>
<td>Standardized Coefficients</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</td>
<td>Correlations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low              Upper</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.128</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.959              .129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B                 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absence of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower             Upper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parental</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td></td>
<td>.109              .315</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B                 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sobel’s test indicated that perceived absence of parental monitoring mediates the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students.
4.5 Possible Strategies for Prevention of Drug Use among Secondary School Students.

Finally the study sought to establish possible strategies that could be adopted for the prevention of drug use among secondary school students in Nairobi County. On this objective, students were asked to highlight some of the strategies they thought could be employed to help prevent drug use among secondary school students. Questionnaires were analyzed manually using thematic analysis. The themes emerging from the responses were as summarized in Table 4.23. Some students gave more than one strategy.

*Table 4.23: Strategies to prevent drug use among secondary school students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies to prevent drug use among secondary school students</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carryout awareness campaigns on drug use among students</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure proper guidance and counselling for students</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach the students on the effects of drug use</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enact strict legislations barring students from using drugs

Students who are addicted with drugs to be taken to rehabilitation centres

Create jobs for people to stop them from selling drugs to students

Have strict enforcement of rules against drug use

Government to take action against illegal drug use

Establish surveillance systems in schools to monitor students

Parents and teachers to take time to listen to students’ needs and problems

Frequent inspection for drugs in schools

Deal with students who use drugs to prevent them from influencing others

Ban the use of some legal drugs like miraa

Ensure high levels of discipline for students
Carrying out psychotherapy, detox, 12 3.4

Conduct drug tests on students 9 2.6

Individual and group mentorship of students 7 2.0

Table 4.23 summarizes the responses from students on the major strategies that could be put in place to prevent drug use among secondary school students in Nairobi County: carrying out awareness campaign on drug use among students, ensuring proper guidance and counselling for students, teaching the students on the effect of drug use, enacting strict legislations barring students from using drugs, and students who are addicted with drugs to be taken to rehabilitation centers. Other strategies include creation of jobs for people to stop them from selling drugs to students, having strict enforcement of rules against drug use, government to take action against illegal drug use, establishing surveillance systems in schools to monitor students among others as shown in the table in a descending order.

Teachers were asked to highlight some of the strategies they had used in their respective secondary schools to deal with students who were found using drugs. Their responses were as shown in Table 4.24.
Table 4.24: Strategies used by teachers to deal with students who used drugs in school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies used by teachers to deal with students who used drugs in school</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frisking of students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral to a rehabilitation centre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking legal action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings in Table 4.24, most of the teachers at 47.8% indicated that they frisk students to check for drugs, while 43.5% indicated that they do counselling for students to prevent them from using drugs. Some teachers at 26.1% indicated that they expel students who use drugs in school, 21.7% said they suspend students who are found using drugs in school, 8.7% said they referred students who use drugs to rehabilitation centers, while one teacher said they take legal action against students who take drugs. According to teachers, these strategies have helped reduce and prevent drug use among secondary school students.
Further, teachers were asked to highlight some of the prevention measures or strategies or programs they thought could be put in place to help fight against use of drugs in secondary schools. Findings were as shown in Table 4.25.

Table 4.25: Prevention measures/strategies/programmes to help fight against use of drugs in secondary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevention measures/strategies/programmes to help fight against use of drugs in secondary schools</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family counselling</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of peer educators</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased monitoring of students at home and in school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tightening of enforcement of laws against drugs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redirecting energies of students to other social activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging professional counsellors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expelling suspected drug users</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings in Table 4.25 above show that the majority of teachers at 52.2% think that family counselling is one of the best prevention measures that can be used to fight against use of drugs in secondary schools. A total of 47.8% of the teachers suggested that drug education among secondary school students is a prevention strategy that can help fight against use of drugs in secondary schools in Nairobi and Kenya at large. Some (30.4%) of the teachers thought that increased monitoring of students at home and in school and 21.7% thought that tightening of enforcement laws against drugs will help fight against drug use among secondary school students.

Another 21.7% of the teachers thought that redirecting energies of students to other social activities, 17.4% thought that engaging professional counsellors would help fight against use of drugs, while others (4.3%) thought expelling suspected drug users would help fight against use of drugs among secondary school students.

4.6 Summary of Research Findings

Descriptive statistics included gender, age, education and family composition. Family type, reasons of singlehood, duration of single parenthood and length of bereavement. On drug use, statistics included rate of drug use, type of drug used, reason/s for using drug, availability of drugs, and drug related arrests.

Out of the 350 students who participated in the study 49% were male and 51% female. Students aged 15-16 years were 49.7%, 17-18 years constituted 32.9%, 13-
14 years were 15.1% and 2.3% were above 18 years. On family composition 27.7% had two siblings, 24.9% had three siblings, 16.0% had one sibling, 13.4% had four siblings, 4.0% had no sibling, with the remainder (14%) having more than four siblings.

On education 35.1% were form three students, 26.0% were in form two, 23.4% in form one and 15.4% were form four students. In some schools, form four students were unavailable because they were either studying for an exam or sitting for one. This was in spite of the timing of the study which was conducted in term one. This notwithstanding, data was collected across all classes.

With regard to family type, 59.7% of respondents were from two biological parent families, 40.3% were from single families which was further analyzed in terms of gender of single parent showing 31.4% were single mother families and 8.9% were single father families.

A possible explanation for the small number of single father families is that men are more likely to remarry after separation, divorce or bereavement as compared to women under similar circumstances.

On reasons for single parenthood, 38.8% were widowed, 38.1% were separated, 17.2% divorced and 6.0% had never been married. Most of them (74.7%) had been separated/divorce for more than 5 years, 9.3% were separated/divorced for 2-4 years and the rest (16%) had separated/divorced for about a year.
Among those who were widowed, 66.7% had lost their spouse for more than 5 years, 16.7% had been bereaved for 2-4 years and 16.7% were widowed for approximated 1 year. According to the researcher’s definition of single parenthood those widowed or separated/divorce for a year or more fit the description and were, therefore, considered for the subsequent analyses of study variables.

The rate of drug use yielded the following results; 54.3% reported that they had used drugs while 45.7% indicated that they had never used drugs. Alcohol was the highest used drug at 92.6%, bhang/shisha at 26.7%, cocaine at 8.0%, cigarettes/Kuber at 7.4%, 1.7% used Khat/miraa and 1.1% had used heroine.

Respondents indicated reasons for using drugs. Majority (55.8%) indicated that they wanted to know how it feels like when one is under the influence of the drug, 14.2% indicated that they felt more relaxed and happy when on drugs, 13.7% said their friends encouraged them to use drugs, 11.6% said they secretly stole the drugs from a relative, 2.6% said they used drugs because they were overwhelmed with fear, sadness or worry without drug, while 2.1% indicated that they experience physical discomfort without the drugs. These findings imply that some secondary school students were already addicted to drugs while others were not addicted.

On availability of drugs at schools, 27.4% reported that drugs were sold other students, 26.3% indicated outsiders sell drugs to students, and 11.6% intimated that school workers sold drugs to students.
The researcher also sought to find out how students accessed drugs at home. Most (43.7%) divulged that local bars sold alcohol and other drugs to persons under 18 years, 13.7% disclosed that they accessed drugs through friends, 6.9% bought drugs from supermarkets and 5.1% indicated family members use drugs.

On drug related arrested, 7.4% of students who used drugs reported to having been arrested for drug related offences. This may mean that law enforcers do detect and arrest under age and illegal drug users as well as drug peddlers albeit at a very low rate.

With regard to the study variables, Pearson Chi Square analysis was conducted to test all the study hypotheses. The first objective which was to determine the relationship between single parent families and drug use. The findings indicated that there was a significant relationship between single parent families and drug use. The null hypothesis that there is no relationship between single parent families and drug use was thus rejected.

The second null hypothesis stating that there is no relationship between low self-esteem and drug use among secondary school students from single parent families was tested and a significant relationship was found. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis that there is a relationship between low self-esteem and drug use among secondary school students from single parent families.
The third null hypothesis corresponding with the third objective suggesting that there is no relationship between perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use among secondary school students from single parent families was also tested. A significant relationship was obtained indicating that there is a relationship between perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use among secondary school students from single parent families.

Regression analysis revealed association between low self-esteem and drug use and between perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use. The Sobel’s test for significance showed that both low self-esteem and perceived absence of parental monitoring mediated between single parent families and drug use.

The fourth objective was to explore strategies for prevention of drug use among secondary school students. Several strategies for prevention of drug use were suggested with most students suggesting conducting awareness campaigns on drug use and the least number suggesting group mentorship. To buttress suggestions on prevention from drug use from students, teachers were included with majority suggesting family counselling and the fewest suggesting activities aimed at redirecting energies of students to more productive activities.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This study sought to investigate psychosocial issues mediating the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students in Nairobi County. This chapter includes the discussion of research findings, conclusions and recommendations.

5.2 Discussion

This section contains a summary of research findings according the study objectives. An evaluation of the findings in relation to existing research, theory, policy and practice is also presented.

5.2.1 Relationship between Single Parent Families and Drug Use among Secondary School Students

The first objective was to determine whether there was a relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students. Findings indicated that students from single parent families (at 75.9%) are almost twice as likely to use drugs compared to their counterparts from two biological parent families (at 39.7%). The relationship between single parent families and drug use was analyzed using Pearson Chi Square and the findings yielded a significant relationship. The null hypothesis stating that there is no relationship between single
parents and drug use was rejected. The findings of this research support earlier research which reported an association between single parent families and drug use. Stephen and Udisi (2016) in their study reported that being raised in single parent families increased the risk of drug use and alcohol use among youth. Another study linked drug use among adolescents from single mother families to the lack of dispositional optimism of the mother. This study seems to suggest that mothers who were optimistic were less likely to experience negative internalizing symptoms and more likely to demonstrate positive parenting behavior. This study while supporting the findings of the current study provides a possible explanation of the association between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students. Raising adolescents can be a daunting task. To raise them single-handedly is even tougher. When a single parent is overwhelmed by social-economic challenges they are more likely to exhibit negative parenting behavior. Dispositional optimism which predicted positive parenting behavior, the study suggested, was an important resource moderating the effect of maternal stress on parenting behavior and consequently parenting outcomes in children (Conger, Cutrona, Larsen-Rife & Taylor, 2010).

Findings on gender of single parent indicated that students from single mother families were thrice (at 75.5%) as likely to use drugs compared to those from single father families (at 24.5%). The findings also suggested that the gender of the single parent had an impact on drug use. Some studies have reported that
children from single father families were more likely to have problem behaviors as compared to those from single mother families (Ganesha, &Venkatesan, 2012). Given that the study was conducted in India where households tend to be matrilineal, the absence of the mother may have a greater impact on the child than that of the mother. The study may need to be replicated in communities that have a patrilineal orientation. Another research study that found single father-headed families were at a greater risk of drug use as compared to those headed by single mothers (Chege, 2015).

A possible explanation is the difference in social dynamics in the two study sites. Social and economic factors could have a bearing on the divergence in the findings of the two studies. Social support by the extended family of the single mother and the communal ownership of land could be a protective factor for single mothers in Kajiado which might not be the case for those in Nairobi. Single fathers in Kajiado may also fail to monitor their children because of extended time away from home owing to their pastoralist lifestyle that often involves migrating with livestock in search of pasture. Mothers who generally stay at home may be more likely to keep a watchful eye on their children.

There is also a possibility that social differentials between fathers in rural settings and those in urban settings could account for the divergence in research findings on the rate of drug use among students from single father versus single mother families. Fathers in urban settings may be more likely to shoulder the extra
parental roles in the absence of the mother. The diversity of cultures and greater privacy in urban settings are likely to influence cultural stereotypes and practices. It may be easier to challenge the perceptions of gender roles where the nuclear family has less interaction with the extended families and ethnic communities. This may have an effect on the involvement of fathers in raising their children.

The current research also found that the circumstances leading to single parenthood had an impact on drug use among secondary school students. Students whose had lost a parent were more than 6 times (at 86.5%) likely to use drugs. Students whose parents divorced were almost 4 times (at 78.3%) likely to use drugs. Students from families were parents had separated ranked third with 33(64.7%). This translates to about 2 times likelihood to use drugs among students from separated families. Students whose parent had never married came last with 5(62.5%). This means students whose parent never married were 1.5 times likely to use drugs.

These finding tend to suggest that the death of a parent had the greatest impact on drug use among secondary school students. Divorce, separation and those who had never married ranked second to fourth respectively. It appears where the family structure was disrupted either by bereavement or estrangement, the risk for drug use increased. The absence of a parent seems to have had a greater impact
depending on the finality and possibly on the degree of deprivation. The finality of
death and the fact that it deprives the survivors more in terms of relationship with
the deceased may be more devastating.

Divorce, which leads to total dissolution of the marriage, takes away the possibility,
for the children, of living with both parents at the same time and place. Separation,
though it may deprive the children of the chance of living with both parents at the
same time and place, portends a possibility of reconciliation.

Those who have lived with only one parent from the outset were less likely to use
drugs. They may have challenges growing up in these families but they have not
experienced any disruption of the family structure like those whose parents died,
divorced or separated.

These findings that the death of a parent places secondary school students at a
greater risk of drug use are supported by other research studies. One study found
that bereaved youth were more likely to use drugs. The study found that functional
impairment among bereaved youth had an impact onset of drug use (Brent,
Hamdan, Melhem, Porta & Song, 2013).

On the relative effect of parental conflict as is the case with divorce and separation,
the findings of the current research have been supported other studies. Monterey
(2013) found that parental divorce had a significant effect on substance use among
youth. Youth were more likely to use alcohol before divorce. The risk of using alcohol and marijuana increased subsequent to parental divorce.

The conflict that often precedes divorce may upset peace at home as well as afford the youth chances of experimenting with drugs since they are unlikely to receive adequate attention. They may also turn to drugs to numb the pain of seeing their parents embroiled in a conflict that could lead to or has led to divorce. Youth may also be drawn into the conflict, identifying with either parent against the other. This is likely to spark hostility and possible rejection by the parent against whom the youth and other parent have formed a coalition. The parent who has formed an alliance with the youth may be less capable of exercising parental control and monitoring as this is likely to alienate the newly acquired ally.

5.2.2 Relationship between Low Self-Esteem and Drug Use among Secondary School Students from Single Parent Families

The second objective was to establish whether there is a relationship between low self-esteem and drug use among secondary schools students from single parent families. Students with low self-esteem 93(72.7%) had used drugs. This means students with low self-esteem are 2.5 times more likely to use drugs. With regard to those with high self-esteem, 97(43.7%) out of 222 used drugs while 125(56.3%) had not used drugs.
More students from single parent families had low self-esteem at 107(75.9%) out of 141 students compared to those from two biological parent families who had low self-esteem at 21(10%) out of 209 students. The null hypothesis stating that there is no relationship between low self-esteem and drug use among students from single parent families was tested using Pearson Chi Square. A significant relationship between low self-esteem and drug use emerged. The null hypothesis was rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis that there is a relationship between low self-esteem and drug use among secondary school students from single parent families. This supports previous research which suggest that there is a relationship between low self-esteem and drug use among students from single parent families (Uba, Yaacob, Talib, Abdullah, & Mofrad, 2013; Wild, Flisher, Bhana & Lombard, 2004; Yang & Schaninger, 2010; Uba, Yaacob, Talib, Abdullah, & Mofrad, 2013). These studies suggest that there is a negative relationship between self-esteem and drug use. Low self-esteem was found to predict drug use.

While low self-esteem could contribute to drug use, it can also be argued that drug use can cause low self-esteem. A longitudinal study may shed more light on the relationship between low self-esteem and drug use. This is because baseline data would record self-esteem scores before the onset of drug use as well as measure for low self-esteem after the onset of drug use. By comparing self-esteem scores before and after onset of drug use it would be possible to establish the type of relationship between the two variables with greater confidence. A possible explanation for the relationship between self-esteem and drug use is that students who have a negative
perception of themselves may constantly seek for validation from their peers. If their peers use drugs and pile pressure on them to take drugs as well, the desire for validation may increase chances of giving in. When their peers applaud them for using drugs they may feel better about themselves making them continue using drugs to maintain this false sense of self-worth.

Single parent families are perceived as less than the ideal in society and particularly in African communities with some communities even ostracizing single parents or forcing them to give their children up for adoption to relatives of their biological fathers. This is particularly so in some parts of Kenya where this study was done. Though students from single parent families are not inferior to those from two biological families, they may face social stigma. Single mothers are not synonymous with single parents as this study indicates. Out of 141 students from single parent families, 31 were from single father families. This disproportionate number compared to 110 single mothers could be a social issue. Widowers may be more likely to remarry than widows. In Africa remarrying for women may involve forfeiture of matrimonial home and property, a possibility of reimbursement of bride price to the estranged husband or his relatives in case of widowhood, and great opposition from the community which may offer other alternatives like levirate marriage. Children from such families are not insulated from the social pressure and attitudes their parents face. In the education system the fact that a surname is required for admission and registration for exams may expose the family
status of students which may further expose them to discrimination and ostracism from peers and significant others. This could be a possible explanation for higher rates of low self-esteem among students from single parent families at 107(75.9%) compared to those from two biological parent families who had low self-esteem at 21(10%).

A study conducted in Kenya found that there was no significant association between self-esteem and family type either single parent or two parent families. The study however attributed the level of self-esteem to factors such as parent-child relationship, school environment and teaching conditions (Kimani, Kinga & Muriithi, 2014). The researchers suggested that duo parents who were in perpetual conflict or were negligent or even hostile to children were likely to have a negative effect on their children’s self-esteem more than a single parent who had a good relationship with the child. The researchers, however, affirmed that the vast majority of studies arrived at a conflicting finding: that there was a relationship between family type and self-esteem among secondary school students. Since the quality of parent-child relationship seems to have an impact on self-esteem, a different finding may have been obtained if the researcher controlled for the same.

There may be need for more research to establish whether the quality of parental relationship has any moderation or mediation effect on the relationship between family type and self-esteem. It is possible that family type has an impact on the quality of parent-child relationship. It may be inaccurate to rule out a relationship
between single parent families and low self-esteem without adequately exploring the aforementioned possible explanations.

5.2.3 Relationship between Perceived Absence of Parental Monitoring and Drug Use among Secondary School Students from Single Parent Families

The third objective was to find out whether there was a relationship between perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use among secondary school students from single parent families. Out of 156 students who reported a perceived absence of parental monitoring, 103 (66%) used drugs and 53 (34%) had not used drugs. On the overall, single parent families reported higher rates on perceived absence of parental monitoring at 81 (57.4%) compared to two biological parent families at 75 (35.9%).

Pearson Chi Square test revealed a significant relationship between single parent families and perceived absence of parental monitoring. A subsequent analysis of the relationship between perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use yielded significant results. These findings support earlier research that reported that there was a relationship between parental monitoring and single parent families (Hemovich, Lac & Crano, 2011).

Single fathers rated higher on perceived absence of parental monitoring (64.5%) than single mothers (55.5%). These findings are supported by a study that found that family structure; two biological parents, single father and single mother
families had an impact on parental involvement. Parental involvement—parental communication, warmth, and monitoring was related to both internalizing behaviors in youth. Single fathers registered the lowest scores on parental involvement (Camp, 2012). Parental control, which is closely related to parental monitoring, was also found to be negatively correlated with drug use among youth. The study defined parental control in terms of parental supervision. In parental Supervision children are restricted in terms of activities, association and use of time. Since it is impossible to be physically present with children at all times, parents may need to set the limits and ensure that they are observed. This requires monitoring (Ugwuoke and Duruji, 2015).

Studies have also sought to make a case for a more comprehensive parenting. In another study, parental permissiveness, parental injunctive norms and parental monitoring were examined. The findings indicated that parental permissiveness and parental injunctions had a significant effect on substance use. Parental monitoring was also related with drug use but was nevertheless not a significant predictor. The researchers, admittedly, noted that acculturation differentials between parents and their children had an impact on the effectiveness of parental monitoring (Kulis, Marsiglia, Njeri, Parsai &Voisine, 2008). According to the research children of immigrants, who were the target population in this study, learned and spoke English better than their parents. This presented a challenge to parents as they were unable to communicate with their children’s English-
speaking friends or their parents and had to rely on the forthrightness of their children. This reduced the effectiveness of parental monitoring because parents were unable to countercheck the veracity of their children’s disclosure on their whereabouts.

One possible explanation for the higher rate of the perceived absence of parental monitoring among single parent families is that single parents do not have the advantage of complementing each other especially when one parent is away or unable to keep track of the activities and whereabouts of their secondary school-going children as would be the case in two biological parent families.

Parental monitoring depends on other parental practices such as norm setting, parental warmth, communication, confrontation and punishment. Secondary school students who reported perceived absence of parental had a higher rate of drug use. Students who were more certain their parent/s would find out if they used drugs and perhaps face an undesirable response may abstain from drug use to avoid the anticipated adverse consequences. However, students who were more certain their parent/s would probably never find out if they had ever used drugs may be more willing to use drugs.

Parental monitoring may not be an effective psychological deterrent unless the parents are able to consistently get accurate information as to the students’ whereabouts, company, activities and other parental monitoring parameters. If on the other hand, students are able to keep their activities and whereabouts out of their
parent’s knowledge, parental monitoring loses its utility as a psychological deterrent.

The current study, by dint of its conceptual framework, admits to the fact that there is no single factor that can sufficiently explain drug use. Parental monitoring on its own is not an adequate explanation for drug use. That notwithstanding, the findings of the current study do support the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between parental monitoring and drug use among secondary school students from single parent families.

5.2.4 Possible Strategies for Prevention of Drug Use among Secondary School Students

The fourth objective was to explore possible strategies for prevention of drug use among secondary school students. These were some of the suggestions given by secondary school students. Carrying out awareness campaigns on drug use among students, ensuring proper guidance and counselling for students, teaching the students on the effects of drug use, enacting strict legislations barring students from using drugs, and students who are addicted with drugs to be taken to rehabilitation centers. Other strategies include creation of jobs for people to stop them from selling drugs to students, having strict enforcement of rules against drug use, government to take action against illegal drug use, establishing surveillance systems in schools to monitor students. Parents and teachers to take time to listen to students’ needs and problems, deal with students who use drugs to prevent them
from influencing others, ban some legal drugs like miraa and ensure high discipline among students, psychotherapy and detoxification of addicts. Some students also suggested carrying out routine drug tests.

The researcher also sought suggestions from teachers, school counsellors and chaplains. Among suggestions given were family counselling, drug education, peer counselling, increased monitoring of students at home and in school. Other suggestions included tightening of enforcement of laws against drugs, redirecting the energies of students to useful activities, engaging professional counsellors and finally expelling drug users.

These suggestions were supported by other research studies. A case in point is a study by Simatwa, Odhong’, Juma & Choka (2014) which recommended free rehabilitation and education on drug abuse. Family counseling which was suggested by teachers and school counselors was supported by a study in the UK which underscored the importance of involving families in preventing drug abuse (Velleman, Templeton, & Copello, 2005).

Job creation was also suggested which resonates with the recommendations by a study conducted in Kenya suggesting alleviation of poverty, free rehabilitation, increasing food security among others (Rhodes, Ndimbii, Guise, Cullen, & Ayon, 2015). Even students seemed to be aware that drug use had economic underpinnings. One could argue that if drug users cannot afford to pay for rehabilitation, then they cannot benefit from such services. Similarly, drug
peddlers may brave the risks involved in selling drugs so as to eke out a living. A practical economic solution would empower both users and sellers to stay clear of drugs.

Students did not suggest expulsion as a way of preventing drug use, though teachers did. The fact that students could access drugs at home raises questions as to whether expulsion, which is thought to be like removing the bad element from the rest, is actually adequate. Most students who used drugs indicated that they were experimenting. Peer pressure is still a factor leading to drug use but it seems to be overrated. The level of awareness of the dangers of drug use among students evidenced by the suggestions they gave shows that non-traditional approaches like family counselling may be more effective. Social stigma arising from the traditional view of the importance of marriage, social and psychological adjustments like losing a parent, family breakups need to be factored into prevention programs. Focusing on students as the only ones with a problem fails to capture the entire situation since drug use may be an indicator of other social and psychological challenges. Parents may need support and sensitization. Perhaps no one needs to pontificate on the other if a comprehensive approach to prevention of drug use is to be forged.

5.3 Conclusions

This study sought to investigate psychosocial challenges mediating the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school
students in Nairobi County, Kenya. Several conclusions drawn from the findings are enumerated in this section. There is a significant relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students. Students from single mother families are at a higher risk of drug use compared to those from single father families. Students from single parent families arising from widowhood registered the highest rate of drug use while those from the never-married single parents recorded the lowest rate of drug use.

There is a significant relationship between low self-esteem and drug use among secondary school students from single parent families. There is a relationship between low self-esteem and single parent families among secondary school students. There is marginal difference between single father families and single mother families with regard to low self-esteem.

There is a significant relationship between perceived absence of parental monitoring and drug use among secondary school students. There is a relationship between perceived absence of parental monitoring and single parent families. Students from single father families recorded a higher rate of perceived absence of parental monitoring compared to those from single mother families. Both low self-esteem and perceived absence of parental monitoring mediate the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students.
A raft of strategies were suggested for the prevention of drug use among secondary school students. Among the suggestions were; creating awareness, rehabilitation, creating jobs, enforcement of laws against drug use, legislation, increased surveillance, family counselling and redirecting energies of students to more useful activities. Testing, peer counselling, increased monitoring of students both in school and at home and using professional counsellors were also suggested.

5.4 Recommendations

The following recommendations were made based on the research findings.

5.4.1 Recommendations for Policy and Practice

1. The ministry of education needs to employ and train professional counsellors who do not double as teachers or school administrators.

2. The ministry of education and school administration needs to reconsider punitive methods of dealing with drugs and embrace an approach that facilitates the recovery of the drug user as well as prevention of drug use among other students.

3. A policy of non-discrimination of students from non-traditional family formations needs to be formulated to cushion students from unfair social profiling.

4. Law enforcement agencies may need to regulate sale of drugs in supermarkets and other outlets accessible to students.
5. The national government and county governments need to pool resources together to provide free treatment for students using drugs throughout the entire Republic.

6. Family counselling for students using drugs should be explored in a bid to address psychosocial challenges arising from the unique family background of each student.

7. Counsellors and teachers need to provide support and guidance to students who may be going through difficult changes such as loss of a parent, family breakup and other psychological challenges.

8. Parents need to be sensitized on the role family plays in drug use among students.

9. There is need to develop programs that help parents acquire parenting skills and develop closer relationships with their secondary school going children.

5.4.2 Recommendations for Further Research

1. There is need for research on factors that contribute to low self-esteem among students from single parent families.

2. There is need for further research on the relationship between parenting practices and drug use among secondary school students.

3. There is need for further research on the impact of other family types such as step families, blended families, and foster families on drug use among secondary school students.
4. There is need for more research on case-sensitive approaches to treatment and prevention of drug use instead of the one-size-fits-all approach adopted from Western theory and practice of psychotherapy.
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APPENDICIES

Appendix 1: Research Questionnaire for Students

Part I: Demographic Data

Please indicate your answer in the boxes by ticking or filling in your response as will be appropriate.

1. How old are you? 13-14 □ 15-16 □ 17-18 □ 19-20 □ 21 and above □

2. Gender: Male □, Female □

3. What is your position among your siblings? First born □, Second Born □, Third born □, fourth born □, Last born □, other ...........................................................................................................

4. How many brothers and sisters do you have? ..............................................

5. Indicate your class: form one □, form two □, form three □, form four □

Part II: Data on family composition/type

Please indicate what best describes your family

1. I live with both biological parents □

2. I live with my… Father □ Mother □

3. My parents are… Separated □ Divorced □

4. If your parents are separated or divorced please indicate for how long…

   1 year □  2-4 years □  5 years and more □
5. Have you ever lost a parent? Yes ☐, No ☐

6. If your answer to number 5 is yes, how long ago did you lose your parent? 1 year ☐ 2-4 years ☐ 5 years and above ☐

7. I don’t know my biological… Father ☐, Mother ☐

8. I come from a single Father-family ☐ a single Mother-family ☐

9. If you come from a single parent family please indicate to the best of your knowledge what applies to your parent…Never married ☐ divorced ☐ separated ☐ widowed ☐

10. I live with step parents… Yes ☐ No ☐

11. If none of the above describes your family please specify…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

My entire family ☐ My grandparents ☐ with a relative ☐ any other, please specify…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
**Part III: Data on Drug use**

1. Have you ever used any of the drugs listed in question 2 below? Yes □ No □

2. If your answer for number 1 is yes, which of the drugs below have you ever taken?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of drug</th>
<th>Used once</th>
<th>Used 2 or more times</th>
<th>Use regularly</th>
<th>Can’t do without the drug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heroine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhang/Shisha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuber/Cigarette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khat/ Miraa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If you indicated that you can’t do without the drug please tick where appropriate...A. I experience physical discomfort when not under the drug □


B. I feel overwhelmed with fear, sadness or worry which lessens when I use the drug □
C. I feel more relaxed and experience happy feelings when I use the drug/s

☐

4. Which statement best explains how you used the drug the first time?

A. My friends encouraged me ☐

B. I just wanted to find out how it feels to take it ☐

C. I secretly took it from my relative ☐

5. How can you describe availability of drugs in your school? Sold by other students ☐ sold by outsiders ☐ bought through school workers ☐

6. Is it easy to get drugs at home? I don’t know ☐ I know many people who sell illegal drugs ☐ Local bars sell alcohol to youth under 18 years ☐ I have bought alcohol from supermarkets ☐ we brew alcohol at home ☐ there are many local brews near where I live ☐

7. I have friends who take drugs? Yes ☐ No ☐

8. I have been suspected of using drugs by teachers or parents? Yes ☐ No ☐

9. I have been arrested for drug related offences? Yes ☐ No ☐

10. What do you think can be done to help deal with drug abuse…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

Section IV: Data on Self Esteem
Please indicate whether the statements below describe how you see and feel about yourself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.  

9. I certainly feel useless at times.  

10. At times I think I am no good at all.  

For items 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7:

- Strongly agree = 3
- Agree = 2
- Disagree = 1
- Strongly disagree = 0

For items 3, 5, 8, 9, and 10 (which are reversed in valence):

- Strongly agree = 0
- Agree = 1
- Disagree = 2
- Strongly disagree = 3

Section on Perceived Parental Monitoring

Please tick what best describes your situation.
1. My parent/s know/s where I am... Always □  most of the time □  sometimes □ rarely □ never □

2. My parent/s demand/s to know where I have come from always □  most of the time □ sometimes □ rarely □ never □

3. My parent/s know/s who I am with... Always □  most of the time □ sometimes □ rarely □ never □

4. My parent/s know/s what I am doing... Always □  most of the time □ sometimes □ rarely □ never □

5. I tell my parent/s everything... Always □  most of the time □ sometimes □ rarely □ never □

6. My parent/s call/s to find out where I am while they are away...

Always □  most of the time □ sometimes □ rarely □ never □

7. My parent/s find/s out when I give them false information about my activities...

Always □  most of the time □ sometimes □ rarely □ never □

8. My parent/s know/s the PIN to my phone...(personal identification number)to my phone Always □  most of the time □ sometimes □ rarely □ never □

9. My parents check my room...Always □  most of the time □ sometimes □ rarely □ never □

10. My parent/s ask/s how get and spend my money... Always □  most of the time □ sometimes □ rarely □ never □
Appendix 2: Research Questionnaire for School Counsellors, teachers and Chaplains

Section I: Demographic Data

Please Tick where appropriate

1. What is your line of service in this school? Counselor □ Discipline Master □ Principal □ Deputy principal □ Chaplain □ other, please state........................................................................................................................................

2. How long have you served in that capacity at this school? 1 year □ 2-4 years □ 5 years and above □

3. Please indicate your age. 20-29 □ 30-39 □ 40-49 □ 50-59 □

4. Please indicate your gender. Male □ Female □

5. What is your marital status? Single □ Married □ separated □ divorced □ widowed □

Part II: Data on drug abuse

6. Do you have any training on drug abuse? Masters Degree □ Bachelors Degree □ diploma □ certificate □ workshops and seminars □ no formal training □

7. Do you feel supported by the school management in dealing with drug abuse? strongly agree □ Agree □ disagree □ strongly disagree □

8. Have you dealt with any drug related cases among students? Never □ Rarely □ Often □ Regularly □
9. Which drug was involved? Tobacco ☐ alcohol ☐ Khat/Miraa ☐ Cocaine ☐ Heroine ☐ Marijuana ☐

10. What do you think are the common causes of drug abuse? Peer pressure ☐ media ☐ easy access to drugs ☐ family problems ☐ psychological problems ☐ absence of parental, monitoring ☐

11. Please indicate the how many of the students abusing drugs you have dealt with fit the following description: Low self-esteem ……two biological parent background ……broken family background ……single family background ……

12. Which strategies have you used to prevent or deal with drug abuse? Frisking of students ☐ suspension ☐ expulsion ☐ counseling ☐ referral to a rehabilitation center ☐ legal action ☐ Punishment ☐ any other, please explain…………………………………………………………………………………………
                                                                                     ……………………………………………………………………………………………
                                                                                     ……………………………………………………………………………………………
                                                                                     ……………………………………………………………………………………………
                                                                                     ……………………………………………………………………………………………
                                                                                     ……………………………………………………………………………………………
                                                                                     ……………………………………………………………………………………………
13. What could be done to increase the effectiveness of prevention and recovery effort from drug abuse?

14. Which prevention strategies and or programs do you think will help the fight against drug abuse? 
- Family counseling
- Drug education
- Increased monitoring of students at home and in school
- Use of peer educators
- Engaging professional counselors
- Tightening of enforcement of laws against drugs
- Redirecting energies of students to useful activities
- Expelling suspected drug users
- Any other, please specify...

Research Questionnaires formulated by the Researcher except the self-esteem scale which was constructed by Rosenberg, M., 1965.
## Appendix 3: Table for Determining Sample Size (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>Confidence = 95%</th>
<th></th>
<th>Confidence = 99%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margin of Error</td>
<td></td>
<td>Margin of Error</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>1141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>1288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>2565</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>3288</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>1734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>4211</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>4899</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>2098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>6939</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>2399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>8056</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>2520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>8514</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>2563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>8762</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>2585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>9248</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>2626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>9423</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>2640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>9512</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>2647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>9567</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>2651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>9594</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>2653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>9603</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>2654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,000,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>9603</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>2654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Copyright, The Research Advisors (2006). All rights reserved.
Appendix 4: Introduction Letter and Consent Form for Students

I am Richard Kithome, a student at Kenyatta University. I am carrying out research on psychosocial challenges mediating the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students in Nairobi County, Kenya. Information obtained in this research will be used only for this study.

Data Collection procedures

Each participant will be issued with a questionnaire. The participant shall fill the questionnaire once he or she freely chooses to take part in this study. The researcher assures you that information provided in the questionnaires will be strictly used only for this study. If you need to get clarifications on this study you are encouraged to do so. If you are unwilling to take part in the study you are free to withdraw at any stage without any fear of adverse consequences. You may also choose not to answer questions that you feel uneasy with.

Discomforts and risks and inconveniences associated with study

The study will not inconvenience you in anyway. There are no foreseen risks in participating in this study. If you feel uncomfortable with any part of the questionnaire you are by no means compelled to answer.

Benefits and provision for management of any adverse reactions
Your participation in this study is your free choice. Information that you provide shall contribute greatly to a broadening and perhaps deepening knowledge on drug use among secondary school students. If there is any need for counseling arising from this study, the researcher shall without any charge to you provide counseling.

**Confidentiality**

To ensure anonymity, information that could identify you should not be included such as name, title or other characteristics. Information gathered will be treated with utmost confidentiality and will not be shared with other persons. Questionnaires shall be kept under lock and key and disposed off at the appropriate time.

**Contact Information**

Should you have any concerns or questions you may contact

1. Dr. Wilfrida Olaly (Supervisor) on 0738683104

2. Chairman, Kenyatta University Ethics Review Committee Tel.8710901/12
Appendix 5: Assent Form for Students

I have understood the information on my participation in this study on psychosocial challenges mediating the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students in Nairobi County. I have been given an opportunity to ask questions which have been answered to my satisfaction. I have understood that my responses will not be shared with a third party. I have chosen to participate in this study voluntarily.

Signature________________________________Date_________________________________
Appendix 6: Authorization by Kenyatta University Ethics Review Committee

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY
ETHICS REVIEW COMMITTEE

Fax: 8711242/8711575
Email: chairman.kuerc@ku.ac.ke
        secretary.kuerc@ku.ac.ke
Website: www.ku.ac.ke

Our Ref: KU/ERC/ Re-Review Appr./VOL.1(54)   Date: 29th January 2018.

Richard Kyalo Kithome
Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844-00100
NAIROBI.

Dear Richard,

APPLICATION NUMBER- PKU/757/1825 “PSYCHOSOCIAL CHALLENGES
MEDIATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SINGLE PARENT AND DRUG
ABUSE AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN NAIROBI COUNTY,
KENYA.”

1. IDENTIFICATION OF PROTOCOL

The application before the Committee is with a research topic PKU/757/1825 “Psychosocial
Challenges Mediating the Relationship between Single Parent and Drug Abuse among Secondary School
Students in Nairobi County, Kenya” received on 31st October, 2017 and deliberated on the 16th of
January, 2018 and received on 25th January 2018 for re review

2. APPLICANT

Richard Kyalo Kithome

3. SITE

Nairobi County, Kenya.

4. DECISION
The Committee has considered the research protocol in accordance with the Kenyatta University Research Policy (Section 7.2.1.3) and the Kenyatta University Review Committee Guidelines AND APPROVED that the research may proceed for a period of ONE year from 26th January 2018.

ADVICE/CONDITIONS

You must include a Clinician in the Study and include an elaboration of Community benefits.

i. Progress reports are submitted to the KU-ERC every six months and a full report is submitted at the end of the study.

ii. Serious and unexpected adverse events related to the conduct of the study are reported to this committee immediately they occur.

iii. Notify the Kenyatta University Ethics Committee of any amendments to the protocol.

iv. Submit an electronic copy of the protocol to KUERC.

When replying, kindly quote the application number above.

If you accept the decision reached and advice and conditions given please sign in the space provided below and return to KUERC a copy of the letter.

DR. TITUS KAHIGA,
CHAIRMAN ETHICS REVIEW COMMITTEE

I, .................... accept the advice given and will fulfill the conditions therein.

Signature........................................ Dated this day of ...... 2018.

C.c. DVC Research Innovation and Outreach
Appendix 7: Research Permit by NACOSTI

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE,
TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Telephone: 620 400 7000;
0713 790877, 07244060245
Fax: +254-20-318249
Email: dfig9@nacosti.go.ke
Website: www.nacosti.go.ke
When replying please quote

Ref. No. NACOSTI/P/18/16946/21378 Date: 20th February, 2018

Richard Kyalo Kithome
Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844-00100
NAIROBI.

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “Psychosocial
challenges mediating the relationship between single parent families and drug use
among secondary school students in Nairobi County, Kenya” I am pleased to inform you
that you have been authorized to undertake research in Nairobi County for the period
ending 20th February, 2019.

You are advised to report to the County Commissioner and the County Director of
Education, Nairobi County before embarking on the research project.

Kindly note that, as an applicant who has been licensed under the Science, Technology
and Innovation Act, 2013 to conduct research in Kenya, you shall deposit a copy of the
final research report to the Commission within one year of completion. The soft copy of
the same should be submitted through the Online Research Information System.

Godfrey P. Kalerwa
GODFREY P. KALERWA MSc., MBA, MKIM
FOR: DIRECTOR-GENERAL/CEO

Copy to:

The County Commissioner
Nairobi County.

The County Director of Education
Nairobi County.
Appendix 8: Authorization by Ministry of Education Nairobi County

Republic of Kenya
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
STATE DEPARTMENT OF BASIC EDUCATION

Regional Coordinator of Education
NAIROBI REGION
NYAVO HOUSE
P.O. Box 7429 - 00206
NAIROBI

When replying please quote
Ref: RCE/NRB/1/14/ (34)

Richard Kyalo Kithome
Kenyatta University
P.O Box 43844-00100
NAIROBI

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

We are in receipt of a letter from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation regarding research authorization on “Psychosocial challenges mediating the relationship between single parent families and drug use among secondary school students in Nairobi County, Kenya”.

This office has no objection and authority is hereby granted for a period ending 20th February, 2019 as indicated in the request letter.

Kindly inform the Sub County Director of Education of the Sub County you intend to travel to.

Maina Nguru
FOR: REGIONAL COORDINATOR OF EDUCATION
NAIROBI

Cc:
Director General/CEO
National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation
NAIROBI

DATE: 5th March, 2017