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ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

BM: Behavioral Manifestations

CRC: Convention on the Rights of the Child
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MB: Non-marital Births
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US: United States


YCTC: Youth Correctional Training Center
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DEFINITION OF TERMS

Paternal accessibility: The time fathers take with children, and engagement in child activities and institutions to facilitate the development of skills, behaviors, and attitudes that are associated with better or worse behavioral outcomes (Pleck, 1997).

Paternal parenting styles: The nature of parental responsibility encompasses standard strategies that parents adopt in bringing up children (Baumrind, 1968).

Paternal behaviors: The quality of the father-child relationship such as being sensitive, warm, close, friendly, supportive, intimate, nurturing, affectionate, encouraging, comforting, and accepting (Allen & Daly, 2007).

Behavioral development: is the psychological process by which individuals, beginning as children, learn to interact physically, mentally, and emotionally (Riddal-Leech, 2003).

Delinquent behaviors: encompasses two broad dimensions: internalizing and externalizing. Internalizing disorders are directed inward and involve behavioral deficits, such as withdrawal, isolation, and depression. Externalizing disorders are directed outward and involve behavioral excesses, such as disturbing others, verbal and physical aggression, and acts of violence (Shalini & Balakrishna, 2013).
ABSTRACT

The study investigated the relationship between paternal involvement and adolescent delinquency. The three dimensions of paternal involvement investigated were paternal accessibility, paternal behaviors, and paternal parenting style. A mixed-method research design has guided the study. A census sample of 71 respondents was drawn from YCTC Juvenile Prison (male) and Kamae Girls Juvenile Prison (female) both of Kamiti prison. A questionnaire, drawing from multi-dimensional parenting scale, parental authority questionnaire, and the delinquency check list was used to collect data. Interviews were also used to collect qualitative data. Descriptive content analysis was used to analyze qualitative data, while descriptive and inferential statistics was used to analyze quantitative data, using STATA. Multiple regression was used to establish the relationship between paternal accessibility (presence and absence), paternal parenting behaviors, and paternal parenting styles on adolescent delinquency. The study found that more nearly half of the respondents grew up without a father figure because parents were either divorced, deceased, not living together, or unmarried. Further, the adolescents exhibited delinquency problems, including engagement in delinquent roles, substance abuse, parental defiance, and assaultiveness. The multiple regression results indicate a statistically significant relationship between authoritarian parenting style and the development of delinquent behaviors (p=0.002). The relationship between permissive style (p=0.372), and authoritarian/flexible style (p =0.138) was not statistically significant. There was no significant relationship between paternal accessibility (p=0.126) and paternal behaviors (p=0.688) and adolescent delinquency. The study recommends the strengthening of child-inclusive interventions for single-parent families to deal with the issue of absent fathers, as well as the expanded role of male models both in the extended family, and social institutions, such as the church, to offer a father-figure presence and guide children from single-parent families.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Introduction

This chapter presents background to the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, research questions, assumptions of the study, justification of the study, significance of the study, scope of the study, limitations of the study and delimitations of the study.

Background to the Study

The family is the first school for learning and creates the environment for a child’s behavioral formation, as it is the space where children first meet specifications for expected behavior, and are guided to become emotionally and socially competent, responsible, independent and confidence. Poor paternal parenting increases the likelihood for the development of delinquent behaviors. Paternal involvement may affect the divergent trajectories of children raised without their biological father in their home (Carlson, 2005; Demuth & Brown, 2004). Fathers’ provision of care and discipline might help to decrease problem behavior in youth due to facilitation of their sense of trust and competence, heightened expectations for proper behavior that support self-regulation, and provision of monitoring and oversight that decreases opportunities for problem behaviors (Coley & Medeiros, 2007).

Delinquency refers to illegal acts, whether criminal or not, committed by youth under the age of 18. These are activities committed by a child between the statutory juvenile court age of 10 to 18 years which if they were beyond this age would be punishable as a crime (Wambugu, Njoroge, & Komen, 2013).

From a behavior disorder perspective, delinquent behaviors encompass two broad dimensions: internalizing and externalizing. Internalizing disorders are directed inward and involve behavioral deficits, such as withdrawal, isolation, and depression. On the other hand,
externalizing disorders are directed outward and involve behavioral excesses, such as disturbing others, verbal and physical aggression, and acts of violence (Shalini & Balakrishna, 2013). Children with behavioral development problems end up engaging in delinquent behavior.

Delinquency is a universal problem that is not restricted to specific regions, cultures, or religions. Statistical data indicate that in virtually all parts of the world, with the exception of the United States, rates of juvenile crime rose in the 1990s. In Western Europe, one of the few regions for which data are available, arrests of juvenile delinquents and under-age offenders increased by an average of around 50 per cent between the mid-1980s and the late 1990s. The countries in transition have also witnessed a dramatic rise in delinquency rates; since 1995, juvenile crime levels in many countries in Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States have increased by more than 30 per cent. The number of children at risk of juvenile delinquency increased from 80 million to 150 million between 1992 and 2000. Today, young people are disproportionately represented in statistics on crime and violence, both as victims and as perpetrators, and in many developed countries violent crimes are being committed at younger ages than in the past. Moreover, there is growing concern that, in some countries, the proportion of violent crimes committed by youth has been increasing (UNODC & World Bank, 2007).

In Africa, the problem of juvenile delinquency is best captured by the rising number of adolescents in the juvenile justice system. Children born poor, with unmet health needs and/or have been victims of violence and spend time in foster care are at increased risk of ending up in the criminal justice system. Every year, approximately 87,000 youth are housed in juvenile residential placements ranging from non-secure community-based group homes to long-term confinement in youth prisons. An additional 10,000 youth are in adult jails and prisons awaiting trial or serving sentences (Campaign for Youth Justice, 2012).
In Kenya, there has been a steady increase in the number of juvenile delinquents in correctional facilities. Total juvenile arrest rates peaked in 1996 at 9,443 per 100,000 youth ages 10 to 17 and fell by one-third in 2008 (to 6,318 per 100,000). Total juvenile arrest rates peaked in 1996 at 9,443 per 100,000 youth ages 10 to 17 and fell by one-third in 2008 (to 6,318 per 100,000). The trend has since then increased with juveniles in custody having increased by over 60 percent (2008 – 2012) from 6,318 to 13,108 per 100,000, (Odera, 2013). According to Wambugu, Njoroge & Komen (2015), the high propensity for delinquency in Kenya is linked to poverty, absent parent(s) or parental alcoholism and consequent neglect of offspring(s), breakdown of family and single parent family structures, overcrowding, abusive home conditions, HIV/AIDS scourge and related orphaning or unaccompanied children.

Paternal involvement is the initiative taken by fathers as part of their responsibility for children’s psychosocial and educational development (Mo & Singh, 2008). A widely-used model by Lamb et al (1987) conceptualized paternal parental involvement in three ways. The first is interaction which is how the parent interacts with the child in feeding, playing and reading.

The second typology of involvement is accessibility, which denotes availability of the parent to the child, even if not directly involving. The third is typology is responsibility, which encompasses assuming responsibility for child care and welfare. This model will be used in the study to examine the influence of paternal involvement on adolescent delinquency (Han & Jun, 2013).

Paternal accessibility is the absence or presence of a father in the child’s upbringing. Positive paternal accessibility, that is time with children, and engagement in child activities and institutions facilitate the development of skills, behaviors, and attitudes that are associated with better behavioral outcomes. For paternal accessibility, this includes the
frequency of contact, amount of time spent together (doing things such as shared meals, shared leisure time, or time spent reading together), and the perceived accessibility and availability of the father. This can also include the amount of time fathers spend performing routine physical child care such as bathing, preparing meals, and clothing in addition to the amount of time fathers spend playing with their child, and how effective, mutual and reciprocal the play is (Allen & Daly, 2007).

Paternal behaviors and the quality of paternal-child interaction are key resources that promote child well-being. The nature of paternal parenting behaviors influences the quality of the father-child relationship. A father is defined as an involved father if his relationship with his child can be described as being sensitive, warm, close, friendly, supportive, intimate, nurturing, affectionate, encouraging, comforting, and accepting. In addition, fathers are classified as being involved if their child has developed a strong, secure attachment to them.

In this regard, Pleck (1997) has argued that it is more appropriate to refer to the benefits of “positive father involvement” (p. 67) than “father involvement” per se in examining their influence on children’s behavioral outcomes.

Paternal parenting styles or the nature of paternal responsibility encompasses standard strategies that paternal parents adopt in bringing up children. According to Baumrind (1968, 1971, 1989, & 1991) there are three main parenting styles, namely authoritative, authoritarian and permissive. The extent to which fathers are involved in either of these parenting styles relates to their investment in child upbringing. This includes the ability to be an authoritative parent by exercising appropriate control and limits while allowing autonomy, taking responsibility for limit setting and discipline, and monitoring the child’s activities. It also encompasses the degree to which he is facilitative and attentive to his child’s needs, and the amount of material support he provides to the children (Allen & Daly, 2007).
The quality of paternal parental involvement is associated with improved learning skills and educational development, social competence, and self-esteem and self-worth. This involvement is also linked to externalizing behavior and delinquency. The more extreme the parent’s circumstances are, the worse the likelihood of psychological disturbance. In the same way, depression, anxiety and other internalizing problems as a result of father-child emotional distance can lead to emotional stress and social withdrawal. Fathers with high-risk health behaviors increase the likelihood of smoking, illicit drug use, alcohol use, and sexually risky behavior among adolescents under their care. In essence, parenting is a complex and multifaceted activity and there are many specific behaviors that individually or collectively influence the behavior of the child.

Understanding the underlying factors in adolescent delinquency is therefore of utmost importance. In this regard, this study unearths the importance of father’s positive involvement in parenting and how lack of their positive involvement is linked to adolescent delinquency. In addition, the study will seek to shed light in the question of how important it is for fathers to be involved in arresting the menace of adolescent delinquency through creating an atmosphere for secure attachment with their children right from their formative years (Allen & Daly, 2007).

Statement of the Problem

While family functions have been acknowledged as an important factor in preventing delinquency, most studies have paid little or no attention to the role of fathers, with the studies available focusing on the influence of families in general (Ojo, 2012), or maternal involvement, on children’s development (Shalini & Balakrishna, 2013). There is little focus on the role of fathers in adolescent delinquency (Ramchandani et al., 2013). The problem is further compounded by the increasing absence of fathers in many Kenyan homes (Karanja,
2016). The dearth of research creates a barrier to better understanding of paternal parenting involvement beyond the narrow conception of father’s role as providers of material needs. It is for this reason that this study seeks to add to fill this gap by finding out the relationship between paternal involvement and adolescent delinquency.

Objectives of the Study

General Objective

The objective of this study was to determine the role of paternal involvement on adolescent delinquent behavior among incarcerated juveniles in YCTC and Kamae girls of Kamiti prison, Nairobi County.

Specific Objectives

1. To find out the effect of paternal accessibility on the development of adolescent delinquent behaviors.
2. To examine the effect of paternal behaviors on the development of adolescent delinquent behaviors.
3. To establish the effect of paternal parenting style on the development of adolescent delinquent behaviors.

Research questions

1. What is the relationship between paternal accessibility (father presence or absence) and adolescent delinquency?
2. Is there a significant relationship between paternal behaviors and adolescent delinquency?
3. Is there a significant relationship between paternal parenting style and adolescent delinquency?
Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to establish the relationship between paternal parenting style, paternal accessibility, paternal behaviors and adolescent delinquency.

Assumptions of the Study

The study is based on several assumptions. First, it was assumed that the respondents chosen for the study answered the questions correctly and truthfully. Second, the researcher assumed that the institutions management co-operated in providing both secondary and primary data. The third assumption was that the social and political conditions in Nairobi County would be favorable for data collection within the specified research period.

Justification of the study

The rate of negative paternal involvement in raising of children within Kenyan families continue to increase. Cases of divorce, teenage pregnancy where the girl ends up parenting the child without its father, malicious belittling of husbands’ significance in the family by the wives, and the choice of modern women to have a child out of wedlock contributes to raising children without fathers and this is equally a matter of concern. The Kenyan child is faced by a myriad of social issues ranging from radicalization and terrorism, school unrests, abortion, school truancy, insecurity, alcoholism, drug use and trafficking just to mention but a few which gives birth to juvenile delinquency, and culminates into their incarceration.

To a very significant extent these social ills could be traced back to dysfunctional families where the child grew without proper parental guidance. It is for this reason that this study aimed at finding out the connection between paternal parental involvement and the collapse of social morals and values among adolescent children, hence juvenile delinquency. The study aims at benefiting the Kenyan society but to a large extent it is aimed at benefiting
male parents by raising awareness among fathers to encourage them in taking part in parenting through positive involvement. This would go a long way in fighting these social vices by having fathers get back to their rightful place within their families.

In addition, the findings benefit the Kenyan society by encouraging positive involvement of fathers in physical, psychological, and spiritual guidance of adolescents for better behavioral development outcomes.

Significance of the study

The study generated new research evidence that can inform government and school policies, provide insight to scholars and researchers, and provide up-to-date evidence on the effect of paternal involvement that can be utilized by family therapists.

The study is equally important for government policy because juvenile delinquents’ rehabilitation system has ramifications for the future life and wellbeing of the young inmates. The study provides insights that can be used to improve counselling, education, vocational training work and community development as a way of helping the adolescents to deal with delinquent behaviors.

Adolescents are school-going children. Delinquency is related to truancy, indiscipline, drug abuse, and can lead to poor academic performances. It can also lead to fights with other children. This thesis looks into the underlying risk factors in adolescent delinquency and provides evidence that can be used by parents, teachers, and the school administration to develop structures that support children with behavioral development problems, including the development of suitable behavior modification techniques for different socio-cultural contexts.
On the same breath, the study also informs family counsellors dealing with situations where paternal parental involvement is an underlying risk factor in adolescent behavioral maladjustment and to provide ways of improving the performance of both parents in bringing up the child.

Scope of the study

This study was carried out within Nairobi County and the target population was selected from Kamiti juvenile prisons for both boys and girls. The reason for choice of this target population is to have diverse views since deviant behaviors and child’s maladjustment is well represented by the population. In terms of respondents, the scope of the study was limited to juvenile delinquents in YCTC and Kamae juvenile prisons of Kamiti prisons in Nairobi County, and did not include administrators, parents, or family members, since responses from the adolescent delinquents was adequate to answer the research questions.

Limitations of the study

In this study, paternal involvement is restricted to the conceptualization put forward by Lamb et al (1985) as: engagement (or interaction), availability and responsibility. As such, the scope is limited to examining the relationship between paternal accessibility/availability, paternal behaviors in interacting with the child, and parental parenting style. While there are many other factors that affect delinquency development, or the effect variability in the effect of paternal development on delinquency develop, the scope of the research was limited to only the three dimensions of paternal involvement. The respondents of this study are limited to incarcerated juveniles only because having a provision for parents and other opinion leaders like counselors and teachers was seen to be cumbersome, wide and time consuming hence the reason to avoid other respondents.
Further, the responses to the study depended on self-reporting. There is a possibility of bias and inaccuracy as respondents may not give accurate responses. Moreover, the time for data collection is minimal, and there was no time to go back and collect additional data in case of either low response rates or low-quality responses.

Delimitations of the study

To eliminate biases and inaccuracies associated with self-reporting, the questionnaire was standardized to eliminate ambiguities and ensure that it aligned with the objectives of the research. Standardization helped to reduce or eliminate internal and external validity issues. The researcher put into place stringent time management measures to ensure that adequate and high-quality responses were obtained before the commencement of data analysis.

In view of the above, this research therefore seeks to establish the relationship between paternal involvement and adolescent delinquency, by focusing on three dimensions: paternal accessibility (presence or absence of the father), paternal parenting behaviors, and paternal parenting style and their influence on behavioral outcomes. This chapter provides a background to the study, statement of the problem, objectives, research questions, scope, and the significance of the study.

Chapter summary

This chapter covered the introduction of this study which was guided by the main objective of the study which was to determine the role of paternal involvement on adolescent delinquent behavior among incarcerated juveniles in YCTC and Kamae girls of Kamiti prison, Nairobi County. It consisted of the introduction, Background to the study, Problem statement, objectives, assumptions, justification, significance of the study, scope of the study and delimitations of the study.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This section presents a critical review of existing research on the relationship between paternal accessibility (absence and presence of fathers), paternal parenting behaviors, and paternal parenting styles on the development of adolescent delinquency based on the research objectives.

Paternal Accessibility (Absence and Presence of Fathers) and Adolescent Delinquency

According to Bates & Taylor (2013), 60% of children born during the 1990s will spend a significant portion of their childhood in a home without their father, 70% of juvenile delinquents come from fatherless homes, 63% of youth suicides come from fatherless homes, 85% of children with behavioral disorders come from fatherless homes and 71% of high school dropouts come from fatherless homes in America.

The number of fathers who are absent has increased very rapidly in the 1990s, and is still increasing (Karanja, 2016). The factors surrounding father absence includes but not limited to non-marital births and relationship breakdowns. When marriage relationships turn sour, mothers are left with their children while the husbands opt out of the relationship. Many teenage girls are impregnated and they end up parenting the child without the father (Karanja, 2016).

At the same time, fatherlessness in Kenya is also being caused by a myriad of social and societal expectations that are placed on the man. The man is expected to always provide for his family in all aspects and little consideration is given to his economic status. When the man weighs the options of either withstanding the pressure and stick to his family or succumbing to pressure and opt out, the latter is often seen as the easier option.

According to Demuth and Brown (2004), social development of a child is a lifelong affair that continues from childhood to adulthood. It’s during the early child development that
the child learns and adapts to various societal values through interaction and therefore the nature of paternal involvement at this stage may result to a child’s low esteem, development of truancy behaviors and other anti-social behaviors especially for the boy child since there is no presence of a man role model in the family. There is need for parental emotional warmth to children and absence may breed children with serious emotional imbalances. Parental emotional presence to children involves availing quality time, being passionate and expressing keen interest to their needs and being present to them by providing the necessary warmth, tender care and love; protecting them from emotional and psychological pain and being kind and supportive to them. Fathers would therefore come in handy to provide these emotional needs of children.

Dunifon (2009) studied the association between father absence and familial antisocial characteristics in the US. Results showed that 60 % of families where the father lives at home presented less antisocial symptoms on the part of the mother, father and child than families with an absent father. The study concluded that antisocial behavior, by any member of the family and especially adolescents, was more likely to happen if the father was absent or non-participatory.

According to Leyton (2010) children who do not interact with their fathers end up having problems related to their sexual identity, difficulties recognizing limits and learning the rules of social interaction. Leyton further relates fatherlessness to a child’s difficulty in internalizing a symbolic father capable of representing the moral instance of an individual. Such failure can manifest in a number of different ways, including an increased tendency to engage in delinquency. Children with absent fathers display more antisocial behaviors than children whose fathers were present in their home, even after controlling for the effects of paternal antisocial behavior and presence of stepfathers (Pfiffner, McBurnett, & Rathouz, 2001).
Santrock (2008) in his longitudinal research in New York on how lack of paternal presence affects the life of the girl child found out that, adolescent girls who lacked proper fatherly attention in their earlier years were never stable in their relationships and most of them moved from one boyfriend to another. Santrock’s research further established that, this laxity in character and instability in sexual relationships could lead to other forms of misbehavior. The review of 36 studies from around the world concluded that father’s love is at least as important to youngsters as that of their mothers. Fatherly love is therefore key to development and fathers ought to be motivated more to become involved in caring for their offspring.

A study by Lines (2012) found that children need to see their father and receive his support, approval and loving care to feel very special. This means not just seeing him but experiencing genuine interpersonal warmth, love and encouragement in place of sympathetic discipline and punishment. This research seeks to find out whether deviant and antisocial tendencies amongst some incarcerated children within the Kenyan juvenile prisons point out to child’s psycho-emotional impairment due to dysfunctionalities of families as a result of negative paternal involvement.

According to Roh & Yang (2013) most of the social ills and heinous acts are mostly carried out by teenagers as early as when they are at the age of 12 years. This research will further sought to investigate whether these perennial social ills have got something to do with negative paternal involvement in parenting. The aspect of paternal absence in general has been written about but very little has been done to narrow it down to fathers’ physical, social, spiritual and emotional absence or presence. Fathers’ presence in the aforesaid aspects in a family is a key fundamental component in shaping the psychosocial life of their children. It is for this reason that this research sought to establish the impact paternal involvement would
have on the formation of adolescent’s delinquent behavior and how that can be felt by the larger society.

Karanja (2016) noted that the more actively involved and interested a father is in his child care and education, the more intellectually developed the child is. This is because when the father is involved, he tends to provide better economic support for the child. Children with better economic support have access to more educational resources and have better opportunities to learn. Some fathers spend a good deal of time with school age children helping them with studies. This level of commitment has an impact on child’s academic success (Karanja, 2016).

Connee, Mullis & Mullis (2000) asserts that children who live without their fathers are, on average, more likely to choose deviant peers, have trouble getting along with other children, be at higher risk for peer problems, and be more aggressive while the child with a present father is more companionable and responsible as an adult. Children who experience fathers’ absence from home at various points during childhood are more likely than other children to display internalizing problems, such as sadness, social withdrawal, and anxiety, as well as externalizing problems, such as aggression, impulsivity, and hyperactivity.

Devault and Dubeau (2015), established that four and five-year-old boys scored higher in mathematics tests when fathers encouraged skills like counting and reading. It was also revealed that the level of a father’s involvement in his child’s academic studies predicted success later in life. Karanja (2016) established that the influence fathers have on their children’s intellectual development is not limited specifically to helping with schoolwork. Fathers can have a positive influence on their children's thinking skills by participating in social activities and sports as well.
Roh and Yang (2013), established that when fathers are supportive to their children, the children have fewer problems at school such as excessive absence or poor exam results. Even when fathers provide only limited attention, warmth and affection and are not around all the time, their children benefit from their influence in terms of adjusting to new experiences, having stable emotions and knowing how to get along with others.

Radl, Salazar & Cebolla-Boado (2017) reported that four out of ten children in the United States are fatherless. Consequently, scholars have long sought to understand the historical and social factors that contribute towards father absence. For instance, Dobbs, (2014), isolates one major historical event that occurred in American society, i.e. the feminist movement, and links it to father absence. The feminist movement of the 1960s “spurred the death of the traditional male and created massive confusion about the present and future role of men in American society” (Radl, Salazar & Cebolla-Boado, 2017).

Fitzgerald (2016) examined the number of American children living in fatherless homes and what effects fatherlessness has on these children. This study found that approximately 19 million children in the United States are fatherless.

Fitzgerald, (2016) terms fatherlessness a “social disaster” and elucidates how the deleterious effects of fatherlessness are intertwined with income and gender roles. In line with other scholars, Fitzgerald, (2016) finds that “income is relatively strongly associated with child well-being, and children living with two parents benefit from higher average household income and lower poverty rates than children in other family arrangements.

Ramchandani, Domoney, Sethna, Psychogiou, Vlachos & Murray (2013) asserts that although research in recent years has increasingly explored the role of fathers in children’s development, it has been relatively neglected in terms of early child development. Evidence suggests that mothers and fathers interact differently with their children from an early age,
with fathers spending a higher proportion of their interacting time in play than mothers do, and fathers’ style of interaction being more physically stimulating and unpredictable than mothers.

Kubrin & Desmond (2015) reported that adolescents living in intact families are less likely to engage in delinquency than their peers living in fatherless families are. Compared to peers in intact families, adolescents in fatherless families are more likely to engage in delinquency. This relationship appears to be operating through differences in family processes like parental involvement, supervision, monitoring, and parent-child closeness—between intact and non-intact families (Kubrin & Desmond, 2015).

A study using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health explored the relationship between family structure and risk of violent acts in neighborhoods. The results revealed that if the number of positively involved fathers is low in a neighborhood, then there is an increase in acts of teen violence. The statistical data showed that a 1% increase in the proportion of single-parent families in a neighborhood is associated with a 3% increase in an adolescent’s level of violence. In other words, adolescents who live in neighborhoods with lower proportions of single-parent families and who report higher levels of family integration commit less violence (Kubrin & Desmond, 2015).

A study conducted in the U.S using a sample of 1,409 rural southern adolescents (851 females and 558 males) aged 11 – 18 years, investigated the correlation between father absence and self-reported sexual activity. The results revealed that adolescents in father-absence homes were more likely to report being sexually active compared to adolescents living with their fathers (Ng-Knight, 2015).
Being raised by a single mother raises the risk of teen pregnancy, marrying with less than a high school certificate, and forming a marriage where both partners have less than a high school certificate (Ng-Knight, 2015). Children with low or no positive paternal involvement are at greater risk of suffering physical, emotional, and sexual abuse, being five times more likely to have experienced physical abuse and emotional maltreatment, with a one hundred times higher risk of fatal abuse; a recent study reported that preschoolers not living with both of their biological parents are 40 times more likely to be sexually abused.

Ojo (2012) noted that broken homes are one of the causes of delinquency in Kenya. The study was carried out at Kamiti Youth Correctional Training Center (Y.C.T.C) and the findings showed that most of the boys were from dysfunctional families. Some boys had been orphans without guardians before their arrests, others had single or divorced parents, and some had parents in major differences, others parents’ or guardians were alcoholics who could not offer good parenthood. For example, among the 55 randomly sampled youth, 7 had parents who had separated, 6 youths’ mothers had died, 14 were fatherless (fathers either died or were unknown to them having been born out of wedlock), while 8 had no parents at all; were either total orphans or never knew both their parents having been abandoned when young.

Omboto et al. (2012) also carried out a study at Kamiti Youth Correctional Training Centre (Y.C.T.C) to assess the effectiveness of the solutions and prevention measures, as well as identify the factors causing criminality among the youth and juvenile delinquency. In the study which sampled 55 inmates aged between 17 and 21 years, the findings showed that parents must take responsibility for childcare until they are adults and able to take care of their own lives. This involves not only providing material needs but also moral guidance.
In 2006, approximately 13% of Canadian families and 22% of families in Quebec included biological fathers who lived apart from their children (Statistics Canada, 2007). According to Statistics Canada (2008), over half of children (51%) from low-income families have two parents living in the household. Given the percentage of 30 fathers who are present in low-income households and the influence they have over their children, it is important to investigate paternal socioeconomic status in a low-income population. This is especially true as there is an association between income and paternal parenting practices (Bates & Taylor, 2013).

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) recognizes that children have the best chance of developing their full potential in a family environment. The primary responsibility for their care rests upon their parents and legal guardians, who are entitled for support from the government in raising their children. The Convention has 54 articles that cover all aspects of a child’s life and set out the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights that all children everywhere are entitled to. They are Non-discrimination (article 2), Best interest of the child (article 3), Right to life survival and development (article 6), Right to be heard (article 12) (UNCRC, 2016). The Children Act (Cap. 586), Laws of Kenya PART III, spells out parents’ responsibility to their children. The Act notes that parents should provide of adequate diet, shelter, clothing, medical care, and education and guidance.

In Kenya, children with a high likelihood of delinquency include victims of poverty and tribal clashes, absent paternal parent(s) or parental alcoholism and consequent neglect of offspring(s), breakdown of family and single parent family structures (Wambugu, Njoroge, & Komen, 2013). As such, paternal involvement remains the greatest influence on the development of delinquent behaviors.
In this regard, the study is an extensive examination of the underlying paternal involvement factors behind juvenile delinquency, in the face of rising cases of youth criminality.

Incidences of adolescent delinquency have been on a steady increase, (Kariuki et al., 2015). There has been an increase in crime reports involving young people as well as violence, riots, and unrests in educational institutions (Omboto et al., 2012; Kariuki et al., 2015). There has been an increase of juveniles in custody, by over 60 percent (2008 – 2012) from 6,318 to 13,108 per 100,000 (Odera, 2013).

The family environment is a dominant determinant of adolescent delinquency, and the risk factors associated with the family environment are poor parent-child relationship, lax or harsh discipline, poor monitoring and supervision, low paternal parental involvement, antisocial parents, broken homes, low socioeconomic status, abusive parents and family conflicts (Shader, 2002). In Kenya, the high propensity for delinquency is linked to poverty, absent parent(s) or parental alcoholism and consequent neglect of offspring(s), breakdown of family and single parent family structures, overcrowding, abusive home conditions, HIV/AIDS scourge and related orphaning or unaccompanied children (Wambugu, Njoroge & Komen, 2015).

**Paternal Behaviors and Adolescent Delinquency**

Paternal parenting is a complex and multi-faceted activity. There are many specific behaviors that individually or collectively influence the behavior of a child. Fathers are caretakers, concerned about their child’s safety and want their child to grow up to be happy, healthy and responsible. Fathers think that they should guide their children in every venture whereas adolescents think that parent and more so their fathers should not interfere in their affairs as they are mature enough to take care of everything. This causes conflict between them and give birth to frustration in children.
Adolescents can be strongly influenced by their fathers. The quality of father - adolescent relationship is perhaps the most important single determinant of adolescents’ attitude and behavior. More often than not, the paternal parents’ attention is focused on the satisfaction of the needs of whole family and a very little attention is paid towards the growing needs of the adolescents due to which their behavior becomes problematic.

Paternal parents are sometimes not able to understand this kind of problematic behavior and rebellious attitude of their children and feel helpless when they are confronted with their assertion of independence. Susan (2008) reported that parents are vitally important throughout a child’s life as source of love and security, as teachers and as role models but they are particularly important in the earliest years. Paradis, Reinherz, Giaconia, Beardslee, Ward and Fitzmaurice (2009) found the impact of family. Arguing and physical violence is long standing, with implications for adult functioning years later.

Fathers have been involved in an aggressive act in public environments more often than women because women are not as comfortable displaying this behavior out in the community (Frieze & Li, 2010). In contrast mothers typically display relational aggression, which is similar to indirect aggression because it is more passive (Rhys & Bear, 1997). It has been seen that young girls tend to model their mother’s behavior, who attempt to display little or no signs of overt aggression.

Johal and Kaur (2015) examined the relationship between aggression of adolescents and their paternal parenting behavior. A sample of 155 adolescent students (80 Boys and 75 Girls) was taken from the different Senior Secondary schools of District Gurdaspur affiliated to CBSE. Aggression was measured by Aggression Scale (Pal & Naqvi, 1983) and Parental Behaviour was measured by Multi-Dimensional Parenting Scale (Chauhan & Khokhar, 1997).
The results show that there is significant positive correlation between aggression among adolescents and deviant paternal parental behavior. Findings of the study revealed that parents show more deviant parenting towards girls in comparison to boys in some of the dimensions. The results also throw some light on gender differences in aggressive behavior of adolescents (Johal & Kaur, 2015).

Wang et al. (2014) did a cross-sectional survey of 589 Chinese adolescents to determine whether paternal parenting behaviors are directly or indirectly (through self-esteem and school adjustment difficulties) associated with adolescent depressive symptoms and problem behavior. Using structural equation modeling, the study results showed that school adjustment difficulties fully mediated the relations between two paternal parenting behaviors (paternal punitiveness and paternal monitoring) and adolescent problem behavior and partially mediated the relation between maternal monitoring and adolescent problem behavior.

Adolescent self-esteem partially mediated the relations between maternal punitiveness and adolescent depressive symptoms and fully mediated the relations between parental support and adolescent depressive symptoms. Paternal parental love withdrawal was not significantly related to any adolescent adjustment when other parenting practices were controlled. The findings highlight the interactions between family and school contexts in adolescent development.

Liu (2003) investigated the relationship between paternal parental behaviors and children's psychological well-being in the contexts of family and community and the intermediate role that paternal parental behaviors play in linking children's and other familial characteristics with children's mental health in a sample of 2000 children in rural northwest
China. The results of the study show that paternal parental behaviors influence children's developmental trajectories.

Pressley (2013) examined the influence of paternal parental behavior on adolescent problem behavior. The behaviors studied included paternal parenting variables such as rigid, smothering and lack of discipline parenting, family visitation as possible variables effecting adolescent recidivism and behavioral issues. The study did not find any significant relationship between visitation and recidivism. The study did not find a relationship between family characteristics and recidivism of juveniles held at Texas prison.

Poduthase (2012) examined 34,327 cases of adolescent delinquency in India through a comparative analysis of the paternal parent-adolescent relationship among adolescents who have engaged in delinquent behavior and those who have not. The results indicated that paternal attitudes and behaviors likely contributed, directly and indirectly, to adolescent behavior. The adolescents with delinquent behavior were living in a family where parental fights were common, where the father was alcoholic and/or abusive, and where the adolescents experienced severe parental punishment from their childhood.

Kivuvi (2011) carried out a study to determine the factors underlying juvenile delinquency development among pupils in Machakos Rehabilitation School. Using a sample of 25 purposively selected boys, the results showed that the boys exhibited general disobedience and rudeness to authority and displayed temperamental behavior. The findings also showed a link between delinquency and economic status. The problems leading to delinquency were identified as peer pressure and emotional problems from home.

Kariuki et al (2015) examined the relationship between adolescents’ perception of their paternal parent’s behaviors and their involvement in non-illegal and minor illegal delinquent behaviors in secondary schools.
The results indicated a significant positive relationship between high level inter-parental conflicts and adolescents’ involvement in non-illegal delinquent behaviors and generalized delinquency. However, inter-parental conflicts were not found out to be significantly related to adolescents’ involvement in minor-illegal delinquent behaviors.

*Paternal Parenting Style and Adolescent Delinquency*

According to Baumrind (1971) parenting styles are strategic interactions between the parent and child. Baumrind classified parenting styles into authoritative, authoritarian, permissive and disengaged, constructs which are linked to the dimensions of demandingness and responsiveness. Demandingness denotes the expectation of parents for mature behavior from their adolescent children by setting and consistently enforcing reasonable rules and standards for their behavior. Responsiveness refers to parental warmth and demonstration of physical affection towards the child. Authoritarian parents attempt to shape, control and evaluate the behavior and attitudes of children based on absolute sets of standards, respect for authority and obedience.

Authoritarian parents are more likely to use harsher forms of punishment and are less responsive to the children. Authoritative parents encourage verbal give and take, explain the reasons behind demands and discipline, and expect the child to be independent and self-directing. Thus, authoritative parents are both demanding and responsive. Permissive parents are more likely to give way to the child’s impulses, desires and actions. Permissive parents are less demanding and more responsive and could be indulgent while disengaged parents are neither demanding nor responsive and could be termed as neglectful parents (Gerima, 2005).

Syeda and Najma (2015) investigated the emotional and behavioral problems in adolescents associated with father parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, & permissive).
The results showed authoritative upbringing of father was established as most optimum style with significant negative relationship with problem behaviors while authoritarian and permissive parenting for mother and father separately as well as together was associated with different problem behaviors. The findings also showed that paternal authoritative parenting predicted lower level of problems and authoritarian and permissive styles are significant predictors of emotional and behavioral problems.

According to Steinberg et al. (1994) there are behavioral and emotional problems that are linked to paternal parenting style. Authoritative parenting style is proved as positive parenting as compared to other styles. The most significant finding in present research is relationship between authoritative upbringing and emotional behavioral problems. Authoritative father has significant negative link with problem behaviors while authoritarian and permissive paternal parenting is linked with some of the problems.

Regression analysis also revealed that parenting styles are significant predictors of problem behaviors in adolescents. Authoritative parenting is most significant predictor of lower level of all problems addressed in this study. Previous researches also documented such relationship.

Meteyer and Jenkins (2009) also agree that authoritative paternal parenting is a combination of support and autonomy which actually aids the positive outcomes like self-regulation. Authoritative paternal parenting is associated with positive outcomes and with least trends of internalizing problem behaviors. In present research, all problem behaviors have significant negative association with both authoritative father and mother.

These results became more obvious when both parents joint authoritative style was analyzed. Joint parenting style appeared more influential. Authoritative paternal parenting is linked significantly with lower level of problems.
When fathers have authoritative style of parenting then positive outcomes are usually enlarged, while authoritarian paternal parenting has been linked to negative behavioral outcomes such as aggression, internalizing and externalizing disorders, and lower levels of emotional functioning.

Nelson, Hart, Young, Olsen and Jin (2006) explored the concept of paternal parenting styles may have different meanings in western and Asian cultures. Paternal authoritarianism may be perceived as interfering in western cultures but in Asian cultures as parental love and care. These findings can also be explained in the view that Pakistan is an Islamic country and religion also has effect regarding parenting in addition to social and cultural factors. Islam teaches to respect parents in any condition and this is considered as to be second only to God.

To obey parents is considered as good quality of children. Due to this value system, parental authoritarianism is acceptable and considered normal but within these acceptable patterns of authoritarian parents, findings of present research indicated that authoritarian parents are linked with problem behaviors although not significantly.

Rivers (2008) tested the relationship between paternal parenting style and academic achievement, and examined the mediating effects of motivation, goal orientation and academic self-efficacy on this relationship, in South Central Georgia. The findings showed that there is a significant correlation between paternal parenting style and motivation, and that parenting styles influence academic performance in school. Another, Shalini and Balakrishna (2013) examined the influence of perceived paternal parenting styles on emotional intelligence of adolescence. The results indicated that the father’s authoritative and authoritarian parenting style significantly correlated with emotional intelligence and fathers were perceived to be more authoritative towards girls than boys.
As a result, greater involvement of fathers and adopting an authoritative approach in bringing up emotionally intelligent adolescents is important.

Theoretical Framework

Piaget’s Cognitive-Development Theory

Jean Piaget (1896-1980) theorized that the cognitive development of children progresses through a series of stages that occur in ordered sequences at the same ages in all children, and that these stages differ in the sense of how children view and interact with the world (Nevid, 2009). In view of this, cognitive development is always in a process of revision, in that, children revise the knowledge they possess as they grow until they reach an equilibrium between the child’s cognitive structures and the nature of the physical and social world.

He divided the cognitive development process into four stages, where a stage is referred to as a period characterized by development of knowledge structures that are quantitatively similar and which can be seen as distinct modes of thought (Matsumoto, 2001). Piaget assumed that these stages: sensorimotor, preoperational, concrete operational, and formal operational stage, were universal (Shaffers, 2012).

The first stage is the sensorimotor stage, which lasts from birth to 2 years of age. During this phase, the thought processes about world are influenced by actions around the infant. Towards the end of this phase, development is characterized by an increased organization of the infant’s actions. The second stage is the preoperational stage and occurs between 2 to 7 years of age. The stage is characterized by increased ability to think using symbolic representations. This means that the infant does not only rely on actions on the world but is able to use symbols to understand their surroundings. The third stage is the concrete operational stage and occurs between 7 to 12 years of age.
During this stage, the logical character increases in the child’s thinking. The last stage is the formal operational stage, which is adolescence, and is mainly characterized by abstract thought. In this phase, thinking has moved to the possible or hypothetical elements and is no longer tied to concrete reality (Matsumoto, 2001; Keenan, 2002).

Piaget’s theory has been criticized for portraying the child as a solitary learner, with little emphasis placed on the social and cultural factors that affect the cognitive development of the child; hence it is limited in generalizability (Pressley & McCormick, 2007). Other studies have also showed that Piaget underestimated the cognitive abilities of infants, toddlers, and preschool children. Researchers note that this underestimation originated from Piaget’s focus on identifying cognitive structures (competencies).

However, Piaget failed to distinguish between competencies and performance. Children that were unable to perform certain problems were assumed to lack the cognitive structures. This assumption ignores the effect of other factors such as familiarity and motivation, which have been found to influence performance of tasks at that age (Shaffers, 2012).

Other scholars have also criticized the stage-like presentation of cognitive development by stating that acquisition of intellectual functioning is gradual and not stage-like, and there is very little consistency in a child’s performance of tasks as specified in Piaget’s theory. Further, other studies have shown that cognitive development is complex and multifaceted hence children acquire skills gradually on many content areas such as deductive reasoning, visual-spatial reasoning, mathematics, and verbal skills, and moral reasoning all the time. Even though acquisitions of these competencies may occur in small orderly steps, there is no consistency across domains (Tsethlikai, 2011).
In this study, Piaget’s theory helps in explaining the cognitive development during the adolescent phase of development, a phase conceptualized in the theory as the formal operational phase. It does not however help in explaining the influence of fathers on delinquency development, hence the need for additional child development theories.

*Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory*

Lev Vygotsy (1896-1934) theory opposed Piaget’s view of the child as a solitary learner and placed greater emphasis on the role of the environment on how children develop an understanding of the world. Notably, emphasis is placed on social interactions between the child and the knowledgeable and experienced members of the society such as parents, relatives, teachers, and peers.

In this sense, culture becomes an important influence on the process of acquiring knowledge and skills (Keenan, 2002). Therefore, while Piaget argued that cognitive development is universal, Vygotsky showed that since human cognition is inherently sociocultural, children do not develop the same type of mind all over the world, but learn in ways that enable them to interpret their environments in ways that are consistent with the underlying culture (Shaffers, 2012).

Vygotsky’s theory argues that cognitive development occurs on two different levels: interpersonal and intrapersonal. Interpersonal level refers to the interactions between the child and other people around them, while intrapersonal refers to the interactions situated at the individual level. Vygotsky’s argues that the latter occurs much later and the movement from the interpersonal to the intrapersonal is referred to as internalization (Keenan, 2002). Additionally, Vygotsky also proposed other ways of evaluating development, namely: micro-genetic, ontogenetic, phylogenetic, and socio-historical. Micro-genetic development refers to developmental changes over brief periods of time, such as weeks.
Ontogenetic development refers to those changes that occur over a lifetime. Phylogenetic development encompasses changes over evolutionary time and can be measured in terms of thousands or even millions of years, while socio-historical development encompasses changes in the culture, in terms of changing values, norms, and technologies across history (Schaffers, 2012).

The main criticism of Vygotsky socio-cultural theory is that it does not present testable hypotheses and it may not deserve being referred to as a theory, but rather a perspective that can be exploited to guide research and interpret children’s intellectual development. As a socio-cultural perspective, it emphasizes that context matters and that environment influences the cognitive development of children (Shaffers, 2012).

In this study, Vygotsky helps in understanding that cognitive development varies across cultures, and that it stems from social interactions in the environment in which a child grows. Considering that the study looks at paternal involvement and adolescent behaviours in diverse cultures in Kenya, this theory comes in handy therefore helps in explaining cognitive development differences that can be linked to the culture of the parents and child.

*Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Systems Theory*

Cultures are diverse and children grow up in this diversity and are influenced differently by developmental pathways within eco-cultural contexts (Weisner, 2002). Urie Bronfenbrenner’s ecological system approach proposed that development occurs in a complex and interactive environment that can be understood as four distinct and interrelated levels: microsystem, exo-system, meso-system, and macro-system.
The microsystem refers to the immediate environment composed of people and objects; the mesosystem are the connections across microsystems; the exo-system are the social settings that may not be experienced first-hand but which influence the child’s development; and the macro-system represents the cultures and subcultures on which the three levels are embedded. These systems evolve over time and influence the development of individuals. As such, changes in the child or changes in the ecological contexts can influence the direction of development. This temporal dimension is referred to as a chronosystem (Kail and Cavanaugh, 2010). The theory provides a rich description of the nature of the environment and the nature of environmental influences and holds that the environment dominantly affects developmental processes more than any other process.

The central idea is that environmental factors have the capacity to hinder, support, or enhance the development of how children think and understand the world, and behavior (Brown, 2012). However, while this interaction between the person and the environment exists, theories differ on the extent to which the interaction with environment influences the developmental process.

In this study, Bronfenbrenner’s ecological system approach is the main underpinning theory. This is because it not only captures the child development stage of adolescence but also incorporates the influence of different ecological contexts on the cognitive and behavioral development of the child. In this case, the ecological context is the micro-system; the family, with specific reference to the role of the father in the upbringing of the child. Since the children that will be included as respondents in the study are in juvenile rehabilitation centers, the theory also captures, additional ecological systems that affect the behavioral development of the child.
Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework shows the relationship between the independent and the dependent variables of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Intervening Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paternal accessibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Adolescent Delinquency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Availability</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Delinquent role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paternal behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Drug usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Warmth</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Parental defiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rejection</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assaultiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Autonomy support</td>
<td>• Social economic Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coercion</td>
<td>• Cultural background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paternal parenting styles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Authoritative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Authoritarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Permissive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework

Chapter Summary

The literature review presents existing research on the three dimensions of relationship between paternal involvement and adolescent delinquency. The dimensions were paternal accessibility, paternal behaviors, and paternal parenting styles. On paternal accessibility, the research looks into the relationship between paternal presence or absence and adolescent delinquency.

On paternal behaviors, the research sought to find out specific paternal parenting behaviors that individually or collectively influence the behavior of a child, and how paternal
behavior is likely to enhance adolescent delinquency. On paternal parenting styles, the study looked into how paternal parenting styles is likely to influence adolescent delinquency. The review reveals that there is a rich body of research on these relationships, however, a significant body of research is focused on parenting and adolescent delinquency.

Existing studies show that family functions are an important factor in preventing delinquency, most studies have paid little or no attention to the role of paternal parenting. For the studies available, the focus has been on the influence of families generally or maternal involvement, on children’s development, with little focus on the role of paternal parenting. The problem is further compounded by the increasing absence of fathers in many Kenyan homes. The dearth of research creates a barrier to better understanding paternal parenting involvement beyond the narrow conception of father’s role as providers of material needs.

The literature review also describes three theories on which this study is grounded. The theories are Piaget’s cognitive-development theory which presents the development of children through a series of stages that occur in ordered sequences, Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory which is premised on the view of the child as a solitary learner with emphasis placed on the child’s interaction with the immediate environment, and Bronfenbrenner’s ecological systems theory which describes how the development of a child is influenced by the ecological context. Finally, the chapter closes with the conceptual framework guiding the relationship between paternal involvement and delinquency development.

“Parenting” is nearly always operationalized using measures focused solely on mothers or on parents as a unit, failing to assess fathering independently. Beyond age and gender, and some attention to young children’s temperament, research has rarely assessed whether children’s characteristics or behaviors influence father involvement or parenting practices.
Given indications that fathers’ behaviors may be more influenced by contextual factors than mothers’, this omission is noteworthy. Some fathers, who show greater variability in involvement with their children, may be particularly influenced by child factors. Some research suggests that non-resident fathers increase their involvement when their children are adolescents. However, with greater freedom and maturity, adolescents may be better able to initiate increased contact and involvement with their nonresident fathers (Coley & Medeiros, 2007).

Chapter summary

The chapter covered a critical review of the existing literature on the relationship between paternal involvement and adolescent delinquency. More specifically it has discussed the literature on the relationship between paternal accessibility and adolescent delinquency, paternal behaviors and adolescent delinquency and paternal parenting style and adolescent delinquency.

The chapter also covered the theories that anchored this study which included Piaget’s Cognitive-Development Theory, Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory and Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Systems Theory and the conceptual framework that depicts the relationship between the variables.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter discusses the research methodology and provides a general framework for this research. The chapter presents details of the research design, target population, sample and sampling procedures, description of research instruments, validity and reliability of instruments, data collection procedures, data analysis techniques and ethical considerations while conducting the study.

Research Design

The study used a mixed-method design that includes both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The choice of a mixed method research design is justified by the fact that answering the research questions desires both the input of quantitative and qualitative data. Since mixed method design lies in a continuum with qualitative and quantitative endpoints, it satisfies the researcher’s interest in seeking causal associations and generalizations, as well as illumination, understanding, and extrapolation all at the same time (Golafshani, 2003).

Study Area

Study area chosen for this research is selected juvenile prisons for both boys and girls aged between 12 to 18 years in Nairobi County’s correctional facilities. The choice of this study area is because Nairobi is a cosmopolitan city and thus all cultures are well represented in these facilities. The researcher was able access correctional facilities as a source of data. The choice of this study area is appropriate because all the respondents have been certified as delinquent and are undergoing rehabilitation within their respective confinements.
Target Population

The target population included all adolescent delinquents in government juvenile correctional facilities in Nairobi County, notably; YCTC Boys Juvenile Prison and Kamae Girls Juvenile Prison both located within Kamiti prison.

Sample and Sampling Techniques

Sampling Techniques

Census sampling was used in the study. Census sampling refers to a nonrandom sampling technique used in quantitative research where the entire realistic population is used as the sample. Census sampling is preferred in cases where the population is not too large or if the study has unlimited resources (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). In this study, the population of adolescent delinquents in the two juvenile prisons is not large.

Sample Frame

Table 3.1: Sampling frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of respondents</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kamae (Girls)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YCTC (Boys)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection Instruments

Questionnaires

Standardized instruments were used to collect data from the respondents. The questionnaire drew from elements in the Multi-Dimensional Parenting Scale and the Parental Authority Questionnaire. Questions on paternal accessibility assessed the absence or presence of the father in parenting. To assess parenting behaviors, the study used a modified Multi-Dimensional Parenting Scale developed by (Chauchan & Khokhar, 1997).
The original scale has 56 statements covering positive and negative dimensions. The responses are rated on a 5-point Likert scale.

To assess parenting style, the study used a modified Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) developed by Buri, (1991). The original instrument is a reliable 30-item scale, with 10 items per parenting style (authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive) and uses a 5-point Likert scale. The extent of adolescent delinquency was measured through items drawn from the Delinquency Check List (DCL) developed by Kulik, Stein, & Sarbin (1968) to measure anti-social or delinquent behaviors in boys of high school age. The original item pool consisted of 52 descriptors of delinquent behaviors ranging in severity from “mild misbehaviors” such as parental disobedience to “severely antisocial acts such as armed robbery, use of or sale of drugs. The questionnaire built from these three standard instruments incorporated selected items into a single data collection instrument. Each of the questions in the questionnaire was scored based on a 5 point Likert scale, notably; 1= strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neither Agree or Disagree, 4= Agree, and 5= Strongly agree.

Interview Schedule

The researcher also used an interview schedule. Face face-to-face interviews are often longer and richer in terms of nuances and depth when the research seeks a complete description of the experiences of the respondents. The interviews incorporated open ended questions to give the researcher the flexibility of pursuing exploratory questions. The responses from the interview schedules were used to enrich the interpretation of quantitative data.
Pilot Study

Pilot study is smaller version of a larger study that is conducted to prepare for that study. The term pilot study is used in two different ways in social science research. It can refer to so-called feasibility studies which are "small scale version(s), or trial run(s), done in preparation for the major study" (Polit, Beck and Hungler, 2001). However, a pilot study can also be the pre-testing or 'trying out' of a particular research instrument. One of the advantages of conducting a pilot study is that it might give advance warning about where the main research project could fail, where research protocols may not be followed, or whether proposed methods or instruments are inappropriate or too complicated.

The questionnaire was administered to 10% of the sample (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003) and the responses used to compute for reliability statistics as well as remove any ambiguities, unclear or incorrect phrases, and clean up the questionnaire. The proportion of the sample that participated in the pilot study was not being included in the final data collection.

Validity

Validity refers to the degree to which evidence and theory support the interpretation of test scores entailed by use of tests. The validity of instrument is the extent to which it does measure what it is supposed to measure. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), Validity is the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences, which are based on the research results.

Results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represent the variables of the study to the degree. The research instrument was validated in terms of content and face validity. The content related technique measures the degree to which the questions items reflected the specific areas covered.
**Reliability**

Reliability is the ability of a research instrument to consistently measure characteristics of interest over time. A research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials to a certain degree. If a researcher administers a test to a subject twice and gets the same score on the second administration as the first test, then there is reliability of the instrument, Mugenda and Mugenda, (2003). Reliability is concerned with consistency, dependability or stability of a test.

A pre-test was used to collect data for estimating the reliability of the instruments. This involved administering the same test twice to the same group of respondents who have been identified for this purpose. The respondents used in the pretest study were not being included in the actual data collection.

The reliability of the research instrument was tested using Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficient. Cronbach's alpha measures how well a set of items (or variables) measures a single construct. It is most commonly used in situations where the instrument has multiple Likert questions to determine inter-rater reliability. Table 4.2 shows the results of the reliability test.

*Table 3.1: Reliability Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Nunnaly (1978), Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficient above 0.7 is an acceptable reliability coefficient. In this study, the Chronbach alpha of 0.7 reported shows that the instrument is reliable and satisfactory for data collection.
Data Collection Process

Prior to the commencement of data collection, the researcher obtained all the necessary documents, including an introduction letter from the University, a permit from National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI), as well as authorization from the Kenya Prison Service authorities. The questionnaires were administered to the respondents through face to face interviews, where the researcher read out the questions and their choices to the respondents and completes the questionnaire based on respondent responses. Because the respondents had different literacy abilities the administration of the questionnaires was assisted. In other words, the researcher read out the questions and choices in the language and understanding abilities of the respondents and assisted in marking the questionnaires based on their answers.

Additionally, data was also collected using interviews to collect qualitative data and enrich the results obtained from questionnaires. The interview schedule contained questions on aspects not included in the questionnaire and which demand further probing. One of the advantages of semi-structured interviews is that they combine the flexibility of the unstructured, open ended interview with the directionality and agenda of the survey instrument to produce focused, qualitative, textual data at the factor level.

Data Analysis

Mixed-methodology requires the analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data. Qualitative data from interviews was analyzed through reading the interview transcript in its entirety in order to get a global sense of the whole; reading the interview transcript a second time - this time more slowly - in order to divide the data into meaningful sections or units; integrating the sections/units identified as having a similar focus or content and making sense of them; subjecting the integrated meaningful sections/units to a process that is known as free imaginative variation; elaborating the findings through descriptions of the essential
meanings that were discovered through the process of free imaginative variation. This was followed by revisiting the raw data descriptions again in order to justify the researcher’s interpretations of both the essential meanings and the general structure.

The final process involved carrying out a critical analysis which includes verification that concrete, detailed descriptions have been obtained from the participants; the phenomenological reduction has been maintained throughout the analysis; essential meanings have been discovered; a structure has been articulated; and the raw data has verified the results.

Quantitative data was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical measures. All the data collected was coded and entered into an Excel sheet, organized and cleaned for any inconsistencies. The statistical software STATA was used for descriptive and inferential analysis. Descriptive statistics are ways of summarizing large sets of quantitative (numerical) information such as means, modes, medians, and standard deviations and presenting analysis in tables, charts, and graphs that describe, organize, and summarize the data. Since descriptive statistics do not allow for generalizations, inferential statistics will be used to determine the relationship between the paternal involvement and adolescent delinquency.

Multiple linear regression was used to establish the relationship between paternal accessibility (presence and absence), paternal parenting behaviors, and paternal parenting styles on the development of adolescent delinquency.

Regression Model

The regression model took the form of:

\[ y = \alpha + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3 + \epsilon \]
Where:

- $y$ intercept is the endogenous variable
- $\alpha$ denotes the $y$ intercept where $x$ is zero; $\beta_1$, $\beta_2$, and $\beta_3$ are regression weights attached to the exogenous variables: $x_1$, $x_2$ and $x_3$ and $\epsilon$ is the error term.

Replacing for the variables:

$$P = \alpha + \beta_1 PA + \beta_2 PB + \beta_3 PS + \epsilon$$

Where

- $P$ denotes adolescent delinquency
- $PA$ denotes paternal accessibility
- $PB$ denotes paternal behaviors
- $PS$ denotes paternal parenting styles

Ethical Considerations in Research Involving Human Participants

The researcher explained to the respondents about the research and that the study is for academic purposes only. It was made clear that the participation is voluntary and that the respondents are free to decline or withdraw any time during the research period. Respondents were not coerced into participating in the study. The participants had informed consent to make the choice to participate or not. The researcher obtained informed consent by explaining to the respondents the information in the assent and consent forms included in the Appendix II and III respectively.

The researcher ensured that the respondents were not exposed to any form of harm either physical or psychological. To protect the privacy and confidentiality of the respondents, researcher did not collect any personal information that could be used by any third party to identify the respondents. Their privacy was protected by strict standard of
anonymity. Further, all the questionnaires collected were kept in safe storage under lock and key and only the researcher had access to the instruments. Additionally, all the data entered and analyzed in statistical softwares did not contained personal information and they were stored in password – protected computer and harddisk.

Chapter Summary

Chapter 3 presented the methodology used in the study. The research design adopted was a mixed-method approach. The study area was limited to Nairobi County. The population included two correctional facilities with adolescent delinquents: Kamiti Boys Juvenile Prison and Kirigiti Girls Juvenile Prison.

A sample of 76 respondents was drawn from the two correctional institutions, and data collected using a questionnaire adapted from the Multi-Dimensional Parenting Scale, Parental Authority Questionnaire, and the Delinquency Checklist.

The data collected was analyzed using descriptive statistics, and a linear regression model was used to establish the relationship between paternal involvement and adolescent delinquency.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Introduction

This section presents the results according to the objectives. The objectives of the study were: to determine the effect of paternal accessibility on the development of adolescent delinquent behaviors; to assess the effect of paternal behaviors on the development of adolescent delinquent behaviors; and to establish the effect of paternal parenting style on the development of adolescent delinquent behaviors. The results were analyzed using descriptive and inferential techniques and presented using tables and figures.

Background Information

Response Rate

The researcher administered questionnaires to 76 respondents. Out of these, 71 were successfully completed and proceeded to data analysis. This represents a satisfactory response rate of 93.4%.

Age

The ages of the respondents included in the survey ranged from 12 to 23 years for boys, with a mean of 17.3 years, while that of the girls ranged from 15 to 20 years, with a mean age of 16.4 years. As demonstrated by the table below, the overall mean age was 17.1 years old.

Table 4.1: Age of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17.3137</td>
<td>2.22252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.4000</td>
<td>1.23117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17.0563</td>
<td>2.02758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Academic Level**

As demonstrated by figure 4.1 below, majority of the respondents had a primary school level of education. A majority, 46.5%, was, or had dropped out of school, in Class 7-8, 20% in Class 4-6, and 5.6% in Class 1-3. 21.1% were in Form 1-2 and the remaining 3-4% were in Form 3-4.

![Academic Level of Respondents](image)

**Figure 4.1: Academic level of respondents**

**Duration in Prison**

When asked to state how long they had been incarcerated, 69% of respondents stated that they had been in prison for less than a year, 27% had been between 1-3 years, and only a comparatively small number, 4.2%, had been in prison for more than 3 years. Figure 4.2 below presents the findings.
Adolescent Delinquency

The respondents were drawn from juvenile correctional facilities and the study sought to evaluate the presence of adolescent delinquency behaviors, with regard to delinquent roles, drug usage, parental defiance, and assaultiveness. With regard to delinquent roles, the findings indicate that a majority of the respondents did not skip school without any legitimate excuse (strongly disagree, 28.2%; disagree, 21.1%), or carry a knife or other weapon (strongly disagree, 43.7%; disagree, 15.5%).

On the contrary, a majority of the respondents agreed to having sexual intercourse (agree, 46.5%; strongly agree, 7.0%). Overall, the mean value of 2.7 implies a slightly above-average level of agreement with exhibiting delinquent roles as demonstrated by table 4.2 below.
Table 4.2: Delinquent role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skipped school without a legitimate excuse?</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2.7042</td>
<td>0.9077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried a knife or other weapon?</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had sexual intercourse with someone of the opposite sex?</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to drug use and abuse, a majority had bought or drank alcoholic substances and those who had not (agree, 22.5%; strongly agree, 18.3%). Similar findings were reported for smoking or selling marijuana (agree, 36.6%; strongly disagree, 14.1%). However, only a small percentage had sniffed glue (agree, 7.0%; strongly agree, 1.4%). The mean value of 2.5, shows that the juvenile delinquents had a history of drug use and abuse as demonstrated by table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Drug Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bought or drank beer, wine, or liquor?</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>2.5399</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoked or sold marijuana to someone?</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sniffed “glue” or other substances?</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study also looked at parental defiance. A majority of the respondents noted that they had not defied their parent’s authority (strongly disagree, 54.9%; disagree, 23.9%) or shouted or cursed at their parents (strongly disagree, 69%; disagree, 22.5%). While there was also disagreement with the statement that they had gone against the parents’ wishes (strongly disagree, 38%; disagree, 22.5%), an appreciable number of juvenile delinquents did not heed the wishes and demands of their parents (agreed, 15.5%; strongly agree, 4.2%). The mean value of 1.8 implies that the level of parental defiance among the respondents was considerably low as demonstrated by table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4: Parental Defiance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defied your parents’ authority?</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.8263</td>
<td>0.7619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shouted or cursed at your mother or father?</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gone against your parents’ wishes?</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The juvenile delinquents had a history of assaultive behavior. The number of those who had not bullied, threatened or intimidated others (strongly disagree, 28.2%, disagree, 12.7%) was almost equal to those who had not (agree, 28.2%; strongly agree, 9.9%). While the majority reported that they had not taken part in robbery involving the use of physical force (strongly disagree, 40.8%; disagree, 14.1%) or weapon (strongly disagree, 42.3%; disagree, 11.3%), a moderate number had engaged in robberies involving the use of physical force (agree, 23.9%; strongly agree, 7%) and weapons (agree, 26.8%; strongly agree, 7.0%).
The mean value of 2.6 indicates that more than 50% of the respondents had a history of assaultive behavior involving bulling, threatening or intimidating others, as well as robberies using physical force and weapons. This is demonstrated by table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Assaultiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree % (N=71)</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullied, threatened or intimidating others</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>2.5540</td>
<td>1.2860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken part in a robbery involving the use of physical force?</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken part in a robbery involving the use of a weapon?</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adolescents experience biological, cognitive and social transitions of adolescent stage, but the effects of these changes are not uniform for all adolescents. While many adolescents will cope well, others will not. Each child is an individual born with a distinct personality and a set of inherited traits. They grow up in unique environments which affects them in different ways (Gachara & Wasanga, 2011). Shader (2002) notes that there is no single path to delinquency, however, the presence of several risk factors increases the likelihood of delinquency. The effect depends on the age range or developmental period during which an individual is exposed to the risk factor. Even though heredity influences development, studies have shown that the impact on adolescence is largely shaped by environmental factors, notably, the family, peer groups, and school (Gachara & Wasanga, 2011).
The risk factors associated with the family environment are poor parent-child relationship, lax or harsh discipline, poor monitoring and supervision, low parental involvement, antisocial parents, broken home, low socioeconomic status, abusive parents and family conflicts (Shader, 2002). According to Omboto et al (2013) it is the responsibility of parents to guide their children up to the time when they are in a position to stand on their own. This involves providing material needs and giving moral guidance. In essence, the role of parents is at the heart of guiding the behavioral development of children.

Destructive patterns are significant and highly correlated between fathers and their children, as opposed to mothers and their children (Van de Rakt, Nieuwbeerta, & Apel, 2009). Van de Rakt et al (2009) established that children are directly affected by their father’s deviant behaviors, while for mothers the behavior is transmitted primarily through parenting practices. Analyzing a father’s behavior is proven to be the most critical when attempting to predict the criminal behavior of a child, especially a son (Van de Rakt et al., 2009). When behavioral problems are present in children, they are often chronic and evolve into adulthood (Van Meurs et al., 2009). These negative behaviors are often associated with a wide range of negative outcomes as an adolescent and adult, including substance abuse, poor academic outcomes, and criminality (Bailey, Hill, Oesterle, & Hawkins, 2009).

Paternal Accessibility and the Development of Adolescent Delinquent Behaviors

The study sought to determine the availability of the fathers, whether their parents were married, divorced, or deceased. The findings indicate that slightly over half of the parents were married and living together (53.5%) while 26.8% were married and not living together.

On the contrary, 16.9% of the parents were divorced and neither had remarried, 29.6% were divorced and one had remarried, and 18.3% had divorced and both had
rearrmed. These findings show that only half of the children’s parents were married and living together, implying that in many families, the young boys and girls grew up in an unstable family environment. Some did not have a father figure, either because parents were living apart, had divorced and not remarried, died, or had not married. In some cases, the presence of a father figure ceased when the children were just six months old. Almost half of the respondents had not lived under a father figure since they were five years old. These results confirm the crisis of fatherlessness and thus negative paternal parenting involvement in the Kenyan society.

Further, the survey also indicated that 9.9% of the respondents had lost their mothers, while a comparatively higher number, 23.9%, had lost their fathers. In 9.9% of the cases, both parents were deceased meaning that the respondents were orphans. In 12.7% of the cases, the parents were not married. These results show that a majority of the children did not have a father figure, either because parents were living apart, had divorced and not remarried, died, or had not married, as demonstrated in Table 4.6.

*Table 4.6: Status of parents (married, divorced, deceased)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Parents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married, living together</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married, living apart</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced, neither remarried</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced, one remarried</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced, both remarried</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother deceased</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father deceased</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both my parents are deceased</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not married</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For parents who were not living together, the study went further to determine the extent of their absence from the child’s life. From the findings, the minimum age of children when the parents separated was 6 months, while the maximum was when the adolescent was 15 years. The average age of the respondent at the time of their parent’s separation was at 8 years old. Table 4.7 is a clear expression of these findings.

**Table 4.7: Age of respondent at the time of parent separation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of child at parents’ separation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.0167</td>
<td>3.98377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As demonstrated by table 4.8 below, the respondents were also asked whether they had a father figure from the age of 5 years onwards. Only the respondents who had stated that their parents are married and living together answered in the affirmative. Therefore, of the 71 respondents who participated in the study, 53.5% had a father figure who was physically present from an early age.

Additionally, in 21.1% of the cases, a father figure was present in some of the time. In a quarter of the cases, 25.4%, a father figure was absent in the entire life of the respondent.

**Table 4.8: Physical presence of a father figure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the time</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher used linear regression analysis to determine the effect of paternal accessibility on the development of adolescent delinquent behaviors. According to the regression model, correlation coefficient (R) was (0.105) which showed that there was no
correlation. R-squared (0.0816) shows the proportion of variance in the adolescent
delinquency that is explained by paternal accessibility. Adjusted R (0.0488) shows the
percentage of variation explained by only the independent variables that actually affect the
dependent variables.

As shown by table 4.9 below, the findings also show that there is a negative, but
statistically insignificant, relationship between the years of absence of a father figure and the
development of delinquency. \((R^2=0.0816 F (1, 28) = 2.49, p =0.126)\). The null hypothesis: there is a significant relationship between paternal accessibility and adolescent delinquency is rejected.

*Table 4.9: The relationship between paternal accessibility and adolescent delinquency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.105&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.0816</td>
<td>.0488</td>
<td>.8458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. &lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1.7793</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7793</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.126 &lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>20.0318</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.7154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.8111</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>9.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.398</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of child during separation</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>.0126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Dependent Variable: adolescent delinquency

This state of paternal absence can be linked to behavioral maladaptation identified in the
juvenile delinquents. Demuth and Brown (2004) linked the social development of a child to
the presence or absence of fathers, noting that fatherlessness may result to a child’s low
esteem, development of truancy behaviors and other anti-social behaviors especially for the
boy child since there is no presence of a man role model in the family. Dunifon (2009) reiterated that the presence of fathers at home can lead to less antisocial symptoms. Leyton (2010) asserts that children who do not interact with their fathers end up having problems related to their sexual identity, difficulties recognizing limits and learning the rules of social interaction.

Roh and Yang (2013) is categorical that most of the social ills and heinous acts are mostly carried out by teenagers as early as when they are at the age of 12 years, and that most of these social ills are linked to father absenteeism in parenting.

The high number of children without fathers that has been reported in this study, associated high levels of delinquent behaviors, can be linked to what Connee, Mullis & Mullis (2000) stated: that, children who live without their fathers are, on average, more likely to choose deviant peers, have trouble getting along with other children, be at higher risk for peer problems, and be more aggressive. Such children are therefore likely to exhibit the characteristics identified in delinquent roles, drug abuse, parental defiance, and assaultiveness.

With regard to early sexual activity that has also been reported in this study, a large study using a sample of 1,409 homes in the United States reported a correlation between father absence and self-reported sexual activity. Adolescents in father-absence homes were more likely to report being sexually active (Ng-Knight, 2015).

Paternal Behaviors and the Development of Adolescent Delinquent Behaviors

The study sought to establish how fathers exhibit warmth, rejection, autonomy support, and coercion behaviors in their everyday parenting decisions of the child and how these affect the development of delinquent behaviors in children. According to the findings
on paternal warmth, nearly two-thirds of the children felt loved (agree, 4.2%; strongly agree, 56.3%), while a third (strongly disagree, 28.2%; disagree, 4.2%) did not feel a sense of paternal love. Similar findings were reported for the ability of the father to understand how the respondents were feeling without being told. Table 4.10 below clearly demonstrates these findings.

*Table 4.10: Paternal warmth*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warmth</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father let me know they love me and are glad that I’m their child</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>3.425</td>
<td>1.4981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father can tell how I am feeling without asking</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father understand me very well</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the same vein, 6 out of 10 of the respondents agreed that their paternal parent understood them very well. The mean value of 3.4, means that 7 out of 10 respondents felt loved, cared for, and understood. Still, many of the respondents harbored feelings of rejection.

Over half of the respondents thought their paternal parents did not like them (strongly disagree, 39.4%; disagree, 5.6%), and harbored feelings of not being wanted (agree, 8.5%, strongly agree, 29.6%). While 42.3% strongly disagreed with the statement that their paternal parents picked on them for every little thing, 36.2% strongly agreed with the statement. Overall, the mean value of 3.3 implies that two-thirds of the juveniles were uncertain of whether their paternal parents liked them, experienced feelings of being unwanted, and have
severally been picked on by their parents. This shows high levels of feelings of paternal rejection from the juvenile delinquents in the correctional facilities as demonstrated by table 4.11 below.

Table 4.11: Paternal Rejection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rejection</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I wonder if my parents/father like me</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>3.287</td>
<td>1.2664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father make me feel like I’m not wanted</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father pick on me for every little thing</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While 47.7% of the respondents felt trusted by their parents, 36.6% felt that they were not trusted, and 12.7% were unsure of the level of trust from their parents. Nonetheless, there was a high level of agreement with paternal expectations that they should be true to themselves (agree, 8.5%; strongly agree, 56.3%). A majority also stated that their paternal parents understood their points of view (agree, 11.3%; strongly agree, 48.7%), but a moderate number did not feel the same way (strongly disagree, 28.2%; disagree, 8.5%). The mean value for autonomy support was computed as 3.4, implying that most parents, 7 out of 10, trusted, had clear expectations from their children, and understood their points of view. Table 4.12 below demonstrates the findings.
With respect to coercion, 6 out of 10 respondents did not feel like their parents were always pushing them to do certain things. On the contrary, 5 out of 10 felt like their parents believed that there was only one way to do things, and 4 out of 10 were pushed by their paternal parents to do certain things with the only justification being, “I said so.” The mean values of 3.2 imply that 64% of the relationships between paternal parents and the children involved coercion as demonstrated by table 4.13 below.

**Table 4.12: Paternal Autonomy Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autonomy Support</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father trust me</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>3.4084</td>
<td>1.2126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father expect me to be true to myself</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father try to understand my point of view on things</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.13: Paternal Coercion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coercion</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father are always telling me what to do</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>3.2723</td>
<td>1.3024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father think there is only one right way to do things</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father say no to everything and the only reason they give is give is “Because I said so.”</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Linear regression was used to determine whether there was a link between these paternal behaviors and delinquency development. According to the regression model, paternal behaviors were responsible for 2.46% change in behavioral malformation, as shown by $R^2 = 0.0246$ in Table 4.14 below.

The findings further shows that there is a negative relationship between parental warmth ($R^2 = 0.0246$ $F(4, 66) = 0.42, p = 0.949$), autonomy support ($F(4, 66) = 0.42, p = 0.363$), and coercion ($F(4, 66) = 0.42, p = 0.569$) and delinquency development, at 95% confidence level; however, the relationships were not statistically significant. The findings also show a positive relationship between rejection and delinquency development, however, it is also not statistically significant, $F(4, 66) = 0.42, p = 0.688$, as shown in Table 4.16. The null hypothesis: there is a significant relationship between paternal behaviors and adolescent delinquency is rejected.

**Table 4.14: The relationship between paternal behaviors and adolescent delinquency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Number of obs = 71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>1.417793</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.354448</td>
<td>$F(4, 66) = 0.42$, $\text{Prob &gt; F} = 0.7967$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>56.25983</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.852422</td>
<td>$R$-squared = 0.0246, $\text{Adj R}$-squared = -0.0345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57.67762</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.823966</td>
<td>$\text{Root MSE} = 0.92327$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Delinquency | Coef.  | Std. Err. | T     | P>|t| | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|-----|---------------------|
| Warmth      | -0.00525 | 0.080921  | -0.06 | 0.949 | -0.16681, 0.156317 |
| Rejection   | 0.035762  | 0.088659  | 0.4   | 0.688 | -0.14125, 0.212775 |
| Autonomy support | -0.09349 | 0.102086 | -0.92 | 0.363 | -0.29731, 0.110334 |
| Coercion    | -0.04698  | 0.086609  | -0.54 | 0.589 | -0.2199, 0.125941  |
| Constant    | 3.094831  | 0.48556   | 6.37  | 0    | 2.12538, 4.064282  |

The findings showed that nearly two-thirds of the children felt loved, while a third did not feel a sense of paternal parental love, with similar findings for feelings of care. Further, 6 out of 10 of the respondents agreed that their parent understood them very well.
There was thus, a feeling of warmth from parents to the children. There was an adequate level of autonomy support from most parents, with 7 out of 10 parents trusting and having clear expectations from their children, and understood their points of view.

On the contrary, there were heightened feelings of rejection and coercion from the parents, with respondents stating that parents believed that there was only one way to do things and that they had to toe the line. The study did not find a statistically significant relationship between paternal behavior indicators: warmth, rejection, autonomy support, and coercion, and the development of delinquent behaviors. Other studies, such as, Susan (2008) noted that a parent is the source of love for the child, and that lack of love in early years can be detrimental to the development of the child. However, other studies agree with the findings of this study.

A study by Wang et al (2014) in China shows that behavioral maladjustment is related to parenting behaviors, especially parental punitiveness and paternal monitoring. Again, Pressley (2013) carried out a study involving inmates at Texas Prison. The researcher was interested in establishing whether parenting variables such as rigid, smothering and lack of discipline parenting had an effect on behavioral issues. The study did not find a statistically significant relationship. Nonetheless, Kivuvi (2011), in a study of delinquents at Machakos Rehabilitation School, found a link between general disobedience and rudeness to authority to peer pressure and emotional problems from home.

Paternal Parenting Style and the Development of Adolescent Delinquent Behaviors

Three parenting styles were investigated in the study: permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative/flexible. A majority of the respondents disagreed with statements on permissiveness. While 52.8% did not support the position that their father has always given them a free hand when it comes to deciding what they wanted to do, 39.4% felt that they have always left free to make up their minds.
However, 6 out of 10 of the respondents disagreed with the statement that their parents did not require them to obey rules and regulations. Similarly, 7 out of 10 respondents felt that their father directed their behaviors, activities, and desires in the family. The mean of 2.3 shows minimal agreement that permissive parenting style was practiced by the fathers. This is demonstrated by table 4.15 below.

**Table 4.15: Permissive parenting style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permissive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My father has always felt that what I need is to be free to make up my own mind and to do what I want to do, even if this does not agree with what my father might want.</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>2.3239</td>
<td>1.1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My father did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them.</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As I was growing up my father did not direct my behaviors, activities, and desires in the family.</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In most of the families, fathers employed an authoritarian parenting style. Fathers forced children to agree with their positions even if the children had different opinions at all times (agree 9.9%; strongly agree, 45.1%), they expected the children to perform whatever tasks assigned to them immediately without asking questions (agree, 9.9%; strongly agree, 43.7%). The fathers also made clear expectations and punished the children if these expectations were not met (agree, 5.6%, strongly agree, 52.1%). The mean of 3.4 implies that in 7 out of 10 cases, fathers employed an authoritarian parenting style as demonstrated in table 4.16.
Table 4.16: Authoritarian parenting style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Even if I didn’t agree with him, my father felt that it was for my own good if I were forced to conform to what he thought was right.</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>3.4366</td>
<td>1.6983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever my father told me to do something as I was growing up, he expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions.</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My father let me know what behavior he expected of me, and if I didn’t meet those expectations, he punished me.</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to authoritative/flexible parenting style, respondents agreed that fathers were instrumental in directing their activities and decisions through reasoning and discipline (agree, 12.7%; strongly agree, 57.7%). In some cases, fathers also took the opinions of the respondents into consideration when making decisions (agree, 11.3%, strongly disagree, 36.6%), but in some cases, they did not (strongly disagree, 26.4%, disagree, 8.5%).

Finally, fathers gave directions on behavior and activities, expected these directions to be followed, but remained open for listening to concerns (agree, 12.7%; strongly agree, 46.5%). The mean value of 3.5, shows that the authoritative parenting style was the most practiced, compared to authoritarian (Mean 3.4) and permissive (Mean 2.3). Table 4.17 below explains further.
Table 4.17: Authoritative/flexible parenting style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authoritative/Flexible</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% (N=71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My father directed my activities and decisions in the family through reasoning and discipline.</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>3.5399</td>
<td>1.2629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My father took my opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but he would not decide for something simply because I wanted it.</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My father gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and he expected me to follow his direction, but he was always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me.</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linear regression was performed to determine the relationship between parenting styles and the development of delinquent behaviors. The model presented in Table 4.18 below shows that paternal parenting styles are responsible for a 15.83% variation in the development of delinquency, $R^2 = 0.1583$.

The regression results indicate a statistically significant relationship between authoritarian parenting style and the development of delinquent behaviors, $F (3, 67) = 4.2, p = 0.002$. The relationship between permissive style ($R^2 = 0.1583, F (3, 67) = 4.2, p = 0.372$), and authoritarian/flexible style ($F (3, 67) = 4.2, p = 0.138$) was not statistically significant at 95% confidence level. The null hypothesis: *there is a significant relationship between paternal parenting style and adolescent delinquency* is accepted.
Table 4.18: Relationship between paternal parenting style and delinquency development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Number of obs = 71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>9.132091</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.04403</td>
<td>F( 3, 67) = 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>48.54553</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.72456</td>
<td>Prob &gt; F = 0.0088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57.67762</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.823966</td>
<td>R-squared = 0.1583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adj R-squared = 0.1206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Root MSE = 0.85121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delinquency   Coef.    Std. Err.  T   P>t  [95% Conf. Interval]  
Permissive    0.078699  0.08765   0.9  0.372 -0.09625 0.25365   
Authoritarian 0.091228  0.027815  3.28 0.002  0.03571 0.146747  
Authoritative/flexible -0.10977  0.082596 -1.33 0.188 -0.27463 0.055095  
Constant       1.969345  0.419793  4.69 0 1.131434 2.807256  

The findings showed elements of permissiveness in nearly half of the families, but fathers did not give their children a free hand to do what they wanted. Rather, they were expected to obey rules and regulations at home, and that they took the responsibility of directing the behaviors, activities, and desires in the family. There was, however, a heightened level of paternal parental authoritarianism, with fathers forcing children to agree with their positions even if the children had different opinions; expectation on children to perform whatever tasks assigned to them immediately without asking questions; and meting out punishments whenever these were not met.

The most common parenting style was authoritative/flexible. Fathers were instrumental in directing their activities and decisions through reasoning and discipline; took the opinions of the respondents into consideration when making decisions; and gave directions on behavior and activities, and expected these directions to be followed, while also offering space for flexibility.
The study found that there was a statistically significant relationship between authoritarianism and the development of delinquent behaviors. These findings are corroborated in literature. Steinberg et al (1994) noted that even though authoritative parenting style has positive outcomes compared to other styles, it also has a negative link with problem behaviors. Similarly, Syeda & Najma (2015) demonstrated that authoritative upbringing had a significant negative relationship with problem behaviors. Further, authoritative parenting was a predictor of lower level of problems, while authoritarian and permissive styles were significant predictors of emotional and behavioral problems. The positive outcomes arise from the combination of support and autonomy which aid in developing self-regulation in adolescents (Meteyer & Jenkins, 2009).

Nelson, Hart, Young, Olsen and Jin (2006) argue that different cultures place different emphasis on the parenting styles. Thus, while parental authoritarianism may be perceived as interfering in western cultures, in other cultures such as Asian, Middle-Eastern and African, it is perceived as parental love and care. However, while the value system within parental authoritarianism is acceptable, there are excesses that are linked to problem behaviors.
Chapter summary

With regard to the first objective: effect of partner accessibility on the development of adolescent delinquent behaviours, the results indicate that the availability of the fathers, whether their parents were married, divorced, or deceased was critical in the development of delinquency. The findings indicate that slightly over half of the parents were married and living together (53.5%) while 26.8% were married and not living together.

As to whether paternal behaviours affect the development of adolescent delinquent behaviours, the findings showed that rejection, autonomy support, coercion behaviours, father’s love and everyday parenting decisions of the child significantly impacted on the development of delinquent behaviours.

As to whether paternal parenting styles affected the development of adolescent delinquent behaviours, the findings revealed that permissive, authoritarian and authoritative/flexible parenting styles had no effect of the development of adolescent delinquent behaviours.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Introduction

The chapter presents the summary of the findings and implications, the conclusions drawn from the findings, and gives recommendations on research and practice.

Summary of Findings

On whether paternal accessibility affected adolescent delinquency, it was found that only half of the children’s parents were in marriage and lived together, which imply that most families, young boys and girls were brought up in unstable families. Some lacked a father figure, either because the parents lived apart, were divorced and not remarried, died, or unmarried. In some instances, presence of a father figure ceased when children were six months old. Majority of the children did not get an opportunity to live with their fathers up to the age of five years. A high number of children without fathers have been reported in this study, associated with high levels of delinquent behaviours. These findings contradict the observations of Connee, Mullis and Mullis (2000). The regression results showed the existence of a negative and insignificant relationship between years of absence of a father figure and delinquency development. These findings are consistent to Dunifon (2009) who found a negative relationship between paternal accessibility and development of adolescent delinquent behaviours.

As to whether paternal behaviours influenced the development of adolescent delinquent behaviours, the results demonstrated that fathers understood their children even without being told. Nearly two-thirds of the children felt loved while a third failed to feel a sense of paternal love. The findings revealed a negative and insignificant relationship between parental warmth, autonomy support and coercion and delinquency development.
A positive and insignificant relationship was found between rejection and delinquency development. These results are consistent to Wang et al (2014) who found that an insignificant and negatively relationship between autonomy support and coercion and delinquency development.

On whether paternal parenting style affected the development of adolescent delinquent behaviours, the findings established that most children were not of the opinion that their father always gave them a free hand upon making decisions on what they wanted to do, they felt free to make up their minds. Most of the respondents disagreed that their parents did not require them to obey any rules and regulations. They were of the opinion that their father influenced their behaviours, activities, and desires in the family. There was minimal agreement regarding permissive parenting style that was practiced by the fathers. It was established that fathers considered the opinions of the respondents when making decisions. Regression results showed that there was a statistically significant relationship between authoritarian parenting style and development of delinquent behaviours. The study found that authoritarian/flexible style was statistically insignificant. Authoritarian parenting style was widely practiced as compared to authoritarian and permissive parenting styles. Fathers were found to play a critical role in directing the activities and decisions through reasoning and discipline; they gave directions on behaviours and activities, as well as the expected directions that needed to be followed and offered space for flexibility. The findings showed that existence of a statistically significant between authoritarianism and development of delinquent behaviours. These observations are in line with Syeda and Najma (2015) who found that authoritative upbringing was significantly and negatively related with delinquent behaviours.
Conclusions

The study concludes that paternal accessibility affected adolescent delinquency. It was established that a good number of children were brought up in unstable families. Some of them lacked a father figure and in a few cases, the presence of a father ceased when most children were at the age of six months. Most of the children lacked an opportunity to live with their fathers up to the age of five years. Several children who engaged in delinquent behaviors were found to lack a father figure. The findings revealed that there was a significant and a negative relationship between the duration of absence of a father figure and delinquency development.

Nearly two-thirds of the children felt loved and a third did not feel any sense of paternal love. Fathers were able to understand the feelings of their children without being told. Majority of the parents loved their children and had clear expectations from them and understood their points of view. It was discovered that there was a negative and insignificant relationship between parental warmth, autonomy support and coercion and delinquency development. Moreover rejection was insignificantly linked to delinquency development.

Parenting style adopted by a parent was found to affect the development of adolescent delinquent behaviours. Fathers were found to influence the desires, activities and behaviours of the family. A significant relationship was established between authoritarian parenting style and development of delinquent behaviours. Authoritarian parenting style was widely practiced compared to authoritarian and permissive parenting styles.
Recommendations

In relation to paternal accessibility and the development of adolescent delinquent behaviors there is need for families to ensure stable family environment for their children. Family therapists and other professional helpers should offer psycho-education to families and fathers in particular and advocate for positive paternal parenting so as to enhance greater attachment between them and their children, hence arresting delinquent behaviours. Families need to deal with the issue of absent fathers, as well as the expanded role of male models both in the extended family, and social institutions, such as the church, to offer a father-figure presence and guide children from single-parent families.

The study further recommends that Family therapists and counselors ought to advocate for fathers’ provision of care and discipline but at the same time allowing some levels of autonomy support to their children. This will help to decrease delinquency development as a result of feeling of rejection and strained warmth between the children and their fathers. In addition, awareness is required in order to facilitate improvement of the children’s sense of trust for their father figures and self-competence.

Finally, the study recommends that there is need to emphasize the need for fathers and any other father figures on the best parenting styles which would facilitate the development of holistic growth of children. Employment of a healthy parenting style will give room for children to express themselves in a healthy manner and thus allow their fathers to tour their internal world. This will go a long way in helping the fathers arrest any development of delinquent behaviors.
Recommendations for Further Research

This study focused on paternal parental involvement and its relationship with the development of delinquency among adolescents. The findings show that even though there are associations between various elements of paternal involvement, most of the associations are not statistically significant. This means that there are other factors that also play a role in the development of delinquency in Nairobi, Kenya.

Further research could compare the findings from this study and those from populations outside the correctional system. The sample used for the study was also small due to the number of people in the facilities sampled. Other studies can utilize large sample sets to generate additional insights on the phenomenon.

A study can be carried out to examine the influence of gender, socioeconomic factors, peer pressure, and substance abuse, among others, on the development of delinquency in the country. The findings obtained from this study can be compared and then a more plausible conclusion will be drawn.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Dear Respondent,
I am a postgraduate student pursuing a degree of Masters of Arts in Marriage & Family Therapy (MA MFT) in Pan Africa Christian University. I am conducting an academic research on paternal involvement in relation to adolescent delinquency development.
Your feedback will be valuable to this study and the research findings will help to determine the best interventions to arrest this problem.
Your response will be treated with utmost confidentiality and no details will be disclosed without your consent.
Your cooperation will be highly appreciated.

Thank you in advance.

Yours faithfully,

Moffat M. Kago

Mobile No: 0721663848
APPENDIX II: ASSENT FORM


INVESTIGATOR: Moffat M. Kago (Mobile No: 0721663848)
The investigator named above is the one doing the research study.

These are some things we want you to know about research studies:
We are asking you to be in a research study. Research is a way to test new ideas. Research helps us learn new things.
Whether or not to be in this research is your choice. You can say Yes or No. Whatever you decide is OK. We will still take good care of you.

Why am I being asked to be in this research study?
You are being asked to be in the study because you are one of the young people in Kiringiti/Kamiti Prisons and we wanted to talk to you about a few things about your experiences as an adolescent.

What is the study about?
The study is about how your parent (father/mother) guided you during adolescence. We want to know whether your parent (father/mother) was always there for you, how their behaviors affected you, and how their ways of guiding you affected your life until now.

What will happen during this study?
If you agree to be in this study, you will I will ask you a few questions and we will discuss for about ten minutes and then I will be done.

Will the study hurt?
The study will not hurt you. You will only be asked questions which you can reply or not reply to. You will not be forced to do or say anything that you don’t want.

What if I don’t want to be in this study?
You do not have to be in the study if you do not want to.

Who should I ask if I have any questions?
If you have any questions about this study, you or your parents can call me, Moffat M. Kago on mobile number 0721663848
**Do I have to be in the study?**

No, you do not have to be in the study. Even if you say yes now, you can change your mind later. It is up to you. No one will be mad at you if you don’t want to do this.

**Signatures**

Before deciding if you want to be in the study, ask any questions you have. You can also ask questions during the time you are in the study.

If you sign your name below, it means that you agree to take part in this research study.

Respondents Name: ………………………………………………………..
Respondents Signature:……………………………………………………..  
Date:………………………………………………………………………..

Investigators Name:………………………………………………………..
Investigators Signature: …………………………………………………..
Date:………………………………………………………………………..

Witness Name:………………………………………………………………
Witness Signature: ………………………………………………………
Date:………………………………………………………………………..

APPENDIX III: CONSENT FORM

TITLE OF THE STUDY: Relationship between Paternal Involvement and Adolescent Delinquency: A case of incarcerated juveniles in Kamae girls and Youth Correctional Training Center, Nairobi County

INVESTIGATOR: Moffat M. Kago (Mobile No: 0721663848)

Introduction

- You are being asked to be in a research study investigating the effect of paternal involvement on adolescent delinquency.
- You were selected as a possible participant because you are in Kirigiti/Kamiti Prisons of Nairobi County.
- I will read for you this form and you can ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

Purpose of Study

- The purpose of the study is to investigate the effect of paternal involvement on adolescent delinquency.
- The study is for school purposes only and will not be used for any other purpose other than academics.

Description of the Study Procedures

- If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to answer questions in the questionnaire and interview schedule.

Risks/Discomforts of Being in this Study

- There may be questions in the study that may cause discomfort.
- If you feel uncomfortable and do not want to respond, do not respond.

Benefits of Being in the Study
• The benefits of participation are that the researcher will understand the paternal factors that influenced your development as a child.
• The findings can be used to develop better ways of rehabilitating adolescents judged to be delinquent.

Confidentiality
• This study is anonymous. We will not be collecting or retaining any information about your identity.
• The records of this study will be kept strictly confidential. Research records will be kept in a locked file and all electronic information will be coded and secured using a password protected file. We will not include any information in any report we may publish that would make it possible to identify you.
• Your identity will not be disclosed in the material that is published.

Payments
• You will not receive any payment/reimbursement for participating in this study.

Right to Refuse or Withdraw
• The decision to participate in this study is entirely up to you. You may refuse to take part in the study at any time without affecting your relationship with the investigators of this study. You have the right not to answer any single question, as well as to withdraw completely from the interview at any point during the process; additionally, you have the right to request that the interviewer not use any of your interview material.

Right to Ask Questions and Report Concerns
• You have the right to ask questions about this research study and to have those questions answered by me before, during or after the research. If you have any further questions about the study, at any time feel free to contact me.
Consent

- Your signature below indicates that you have decided to volunteer as a research participant for this study, and that you have read and understood the information provided above. You will be given a signed and dated copy of this form to keep, along with any other printed materials deemed necessary by the study investigators.

Respondents Name: ..............................
Respondents Signature: ..............................
Date:......................................................

Investigators Name: ..............................
Investigators Signature: ..............................
Date:......................................................
APPENDIX IV: QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A: BIO-DATA INFORMATION

(Kindly tick where appropriate)

1. Age.
   How old are you? _______

2. Academic level.
   a) Class 1-3 [ ]
   b) Class 4-6 [ ]
   c) Class 7-8 [ ]
   d) Form 1-2 [ ]
   e) Form 3-4 [ ]

3. How long have you been in prison?
   a. Less than a year [ ]
   b. 1 year to 3 years [ ]
   c. 4 years to 6 years [ ]

SECTION B: PATERNAL ACCESSIBILITY

4. My parents are? 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married, living together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married, living apart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced, neither remarried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced, one remarried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced, both remarried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother deceased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father deceased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both my parents are deceased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If your parents do not live together, how old were you when they separated? ______ years

6. Has a father-figure been physically present in your home from age 5 to the present time?
   a. Yes [ ]
   b. No [ ]
   c. Some of the time [ ]
SECTION C: PATERNAL BEHAVIOURS

7. To what extent do you agree with the following statements? 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warmth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father let me know they love me and are glad that I’m their child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father can tell how I am feeling without asking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father understand me very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rejection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I wonder if my parents/father like me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father make me feel like I’m not wanted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father pick on me for every little thing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomy Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father trust me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father expect me to be true to myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father try to understand my point of view on things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coercion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father are always telling me what to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father think there is only one right way to do things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents/father say no to everything and the only reason they give is “Because I said so.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION D: PATERNAL PARENTING STYLE

8. To what extent do you agree with the following statements? 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permissive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My father has always felt that what I need is to be free to make up my own mind and to do what I want to do, even if this does not agree with what my father might want.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My father did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As I was growing up my father did not direct my behaviors, activities, and desires in the family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authoritarian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if I didn’t agree with him, my father felt that it was for my own good if I were forced to conform to what he thought was right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever my father told me to do something as I was growing up, he expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My father let me know what behavior he expected of me, and if I didn’t meet those expectations, he punished me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authoritative/Flexible</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My father directed my activities and decisions in the family through reasoning and discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My father took my opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but he would not decide for something simply because the I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
wanted it.
My father gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and he expected me to follow his direction, but he was always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me.

SECTION E: ADOLESCENT DELINQUENCY
9. To what extent do you agree with the following statements? 1=Never, 2=Once or twice, 3=Several times, 4=Very often, 5=Often

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delinquent Role</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped school without a legitimate excuse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried a knife or other weapon?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had sexual intercourse with someone of the opposite sex?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug usage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bought or drank beer, wine, or liquor?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoked or sold marijuana to someone?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sniffed “glue” or other substances?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental Defiance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defied your parents’ authority?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shouted or cursed at your mother or father?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gone against your parents’ wishes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assaultiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied, threatened or intimidated others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken part in a robbery involving the use of physical force?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken part in a robbery involving the use of a weapon?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. What crime were you sentenced for?
2. Do you perceive of your incarceration as justified?
3. Would you blame your parent/father for your incarceration?
4. What can you say about your relationship with your parents/father generally?
5. Did you used to go to church with your parents/father?
6. Did you grow in the countryside or the city?
7. Do you think where you were staying exposed you to bad behaviors?
8. Did you undergo any cultural rights, such as circumcision, when you were young?
9. If you did, what did they teach you during these ceremonies?
10. If you were to change some behavior in your past or your present today, what would it be, why?
## APPENDIX VI: SCHEDULE OF WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project conceptualization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report writing and submission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX VII: BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COST (Shs)</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>TOTAL COST (Kshs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laser printing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100 pages</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100 pages (4 copies)</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4 copies</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport during data collection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>18,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINISTRY OF INTERIOR & CO-ORDINATION OF NATIONAL GOVERNMENT
KENYA PRISONS

Telegram: "COMPRISONS" Nairobi
Telephone: +254 02 7227900-6
E-mail Comprisons@yahoo.com

Ref. No. PRIS 10/18/VOLV/54

PRISONS HEADQUARTERS
P.O.BOX 30175-00100
NAIROBI

Date 30/8/2017

Moffat M. Kaglo
F. O. Box 7089 -00200
Nairobi

RE: PERMISSION TO CARRY OUT A RESEARCH PROJECT AT
KAMITI YCTC AND KAMAE GIRLS PRISON

Reference is made to your letter dated 30th May, 2017 on the above subject.

Please be informed that your request to undertake a Research project on the influence
of paternal involvement on Adolescent Delinquency among incarcerated juveniles at
the above said institutions has been approved by the Commissioner General of Prisons.
The requirement for the approval includes visiting the institution, to collect data from
the inmates.

This research will be very informative to the rehabilitation programmes in the Prisons.

For the period you will carry out your research, you will be expected to abide by the
Rules and Regulations as laid down by the Kenya Prisons Service.

Upon completion of your research for 2 weeks, you will be required to submit two
copies of reports one to this office and another to the Officers-in-Charge of the said
institutions.

By a copy of this letter, the Officers-in-Charge are requested to accord you the
necessary assistance.

Thank you and good luck in your research.

SUSAN NYASINGA
PRINCIPAL SOCIAL WELFARE OFFICER,
FOR COMMISSIONER GENERAL OF PRISONS

Cc. The officer in Charge
Kamiti YCTC Prison
P.O Box 65501
Nairobi

The officer in Charge
Kamae Girls B
P.O Box 65501
Nairobi
21st July, 2017

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Dear Sir/Madam,

REF: MOFEAT MAINGI KAGO REG. NO. MFT/0315/14

Greetings! This is an introduction letter for the above named person a final year student in Pan Africa Christian University (PAC University), pursuing a Master of Arts in Marriage and Family Therapy.

He is at the final stage of the programme and he is preparing to collect data to enable him finalise on his thesis. The thesis title is “The Influence of Paternal Involvement on Adolescent Delinquency: A Case of Incarcerated Juveniles in Kirigiti and Kamiti Prisons of Nairobi County”.

We therefore kindly request that you allow him conduct research in your organization.

Warm Regards,

[Signature]

Dr. Eliam Vikuru
Registrar Academics

21st July, 2017

Where Leaders are made
NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Ref: No NACOSTI/P/17/14467/18613
Date: 17th August, 2017

Moffat Maingi Kago
Pan Africa Christian University
P.O. Box 56875-00200
NAIROBI.

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “The influence of paternal involvement on adolescent delinquency: a case of incarcerated juveniles in Kirigiit and Kamiti Prisons of Nairobi County,” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Nairobi County for the period ending 17th August, 2018.

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 MSc., MBA, MKIM
FÖR: DIRECTOR-GENERAL/CEO

Copy to:

The County Commissioner
Nairobi County.

The County Director of Education
Nairobi County.
THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT:

MR. MOFFAT MAIINGI KAGO

of PAN AFRICA CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY,
7089-200 Nairobi, has been permitted to
do research on the topic:

THE INFLUENCE OF PATERNAL INVOLVEMENT ON ADOLESCENT DELINQUENCY: A CASE OF INCARCERATED JUVENILES IN KIRIGGITI AND KAMITI PRISONS OF NAIROBI COUNTY.

for the period ending:
17th August, 2018

Signature

Permit No: NACOSTI/P/17/14467/18613
Date Of Issue: 17th August, 2017
Fee Recieved: Ksh 1000

Director General
National Commission for Science, Technology & Innovation