

## **Influence of Societal and Government Policies Ecological Factors on Risk Taking Behaviour among Secondary School Students in Kajiado North Sub-County, Kajiado County, Kenya.**

Joseph Theuri<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Boniface Njuguna Mwangi<sup>2</sup> & Waweru Muriithi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Africa Nazarene University, Department of Counselling Psychology, Box 53067 Nairobi*

<sup>2</sup>*Research Coordinator-Africa Nazarene University, Box 53067 Nairobi*

<sup>3</sup>*Nakuru Extra Mural Centre, University of Nairobi, Box 1120 Nakuru*

Corresponding Author: [joseph@gmail.com](mailto:joseph@gmail.com)

---

**Abstract:** This study set to determine influence of societal and government measures ecological factors on risk taking behaviour among adolescents in secondary schools in Kajiado North Sub-County, Kajiado County. The area has numerous ecological factors that could influence the behaviour of adolescents. Since the area is home to a lot of the working population of the adjacent Nairobi City County, people from various backgrounds have immigrated there. As such, the societal values held by the inhabitants of the area are not easy to define. In this context, adolescents are prone to indulge in risky behaviours such as drug abuse, unprotected sex, and gang behaviour among others that could impact their lives negatively. This study adopted the Problem Behaviour theories. The study adopted the descriptive survey design. The study is also cross-sectional in nature. Data was collected from 267 students and 15 principals sampled using stratified proportionate sampling and total population sampling techniques. These were sampled from the 15 public secondary schools in Kajiado North Sub-County. Data from students was collected using questionnaires while the principals were interviewed. Pretesting of the questionnaires was undertaken to establish their reliability and validity. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyse the data. Data from interviews was analysed thematically and the findings obtained used to verify those from students' questionnaires. The findings obtained show that societal influence and government measures influence risk-taking behaviour in adolescents. The study recommends that members of the society who engage in sexual relationships with students and those who sell alcohol to students should be identified and punished as per the existing law. The government should strengthen its programs (in schools and in the mass media) to guide students.

**Keywords:** Adolescent, Ecological Factors, Government Measures, Risk taking behaviour, Societal Influence.

Date of Submission: 09-11-2017

Date of acceptance: 30-11-2017

---

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Risk taking behaviour (RTB) is the tendency to engage in behaviour that has the potential to be harmful or dangerous (Ochieng, 2013). As adolescents approach 14 years, they get into a special developmental stage. Herein, they are prone to the highest risk for a myriad of social problems. In this stage, most adolescents are prone to fall prey to dangerous activities including but not limited to casual sex, smoking, gang behaviour, drug abuse, and stealing, unwarranted physical fights among others as pointed out by Kauppi (2015). The community also plays a central role in checking irrational and risky behaviour among the youth. Zulu, Eliya, Doodoo and Ezeh (2002) argue that the risk behaviour that youth in Africa tend to engage in is precipitated by poor structures for averting such behaviour. In many African families for example, there is breakdown of the social support system that protects and guides adolescents as they grow towards adulthood. In this context, it is often hard to protect teenagers from indulging in risky behaviour because there is absence of measures aimed at controlling such behaviour.

A survey undertaken in Nairobi, Kenya by UNICEF (2005) showed that young people are often left alone in communities that are faced with violence. This means that these youth do not have social support at the societal and family level in most cases. Most of these youth in areas such as urban informal settlements are prone to engage in risky behaviour such as gang membership, aggressiveness and violence towards others, substance abuse, stealing, early sexual debut and unwanted pregnancies among others. This shows that the ecological context in which an adolescent finds themselves has paramount importance in the behaviour they

adopt. The role of the government in averting risky behaviour can also not be underestimated. Kruger (2010) found out that adolescents who live in extreme poverty and in slums are likely to engage in various risk-taking behaviours. Such adolescents engage in behaviour such as unprotected sex, crime, substance abuse among others. The government can play an important role in shaping the behaviour of these adolescents by offering financial help to these adolescents and employing teachers who understand the challenges they face.

The programmes undertaken by the government of Kenya could influence risk taking behaviour among adolescents in numerous ways. One of the ways is through education programs that aim at checking irresponsible sexual behaviour among young people (Ministry of Health, 2005). The ministry ensures the accessibility of youth friendly services that have high level of acceptability among adolescents. These services enhance behaviour change and check risk-taking behaviour among such adolescents. The previous discussions show that there is an undeniable link between ecological factors and risk taking behaviour among adolescents. However, most of the available literature is derived from studies undertaken in other parts of world or even Africa, some of which are not current. None of the studies in the plethora of existing literature focus on Kajiado county or even Kajiado-North Sub-County for that matter. In this light, the absence of studies such as this current one may deny the county vital information on the predictors of risk taking behaviour among the adolescents who are seen in Kenya as the backbone of the society.

### **1.1 Problem of the Statement**

Adolescents are growing in ecologies characterized with fast modernization and vague boundaries among societies. In this context, adolescents are exposed to immense social problems. These social problems such as risky behaviour pose serious health issues that warrant special attention (Kauppi, 2015).

Theorists such as the Bronfenbrenner (1993) posit that the ecology in which an adolescent grows will affect his/her behaviour. School, home and societal influences in the environment determine the propensity of an adolescent to take to risk taking behaviours and vice versa. Kajiado North Sub-County is faced with numerous ecological factors that could influence the behaviour of adolescents. People from various backgrounds have immigrated into the area, resulting in the societal values in the area not being easy to define (UNICEF, 2012). Obare, Odwe and Birungi (2016) report high level of breakdown of societal values in urban areas of Kajiado County, with 60% of girls in the county being victims of early sexual debut.

Extant literature shows that societal expectations and; the measures put in place by governments could influence risk taking behaviour among adolescents. Most of the existing studies rely on desk review of existing literature. Few of these studies, except those by Kyalo (2010) and Wango (2006) use the descriptive survey design as this current study. Furthermore, the fact that none of these studies focuses on Kajiado North Sub-County means that the findings obtained may not exactly relate to the current study. This current study investigates influence of ecological factors such as societal influence and government measures on risk taking behaviour among adolescents in secondary schools in Kajiado North Sub-County.

### **1.2 Study Objectives**

The study was guided by the following objectives;

- (a) To establish the influence of society on risk taking behaviour among adolescents in Kajiado North Sub-County, Kajiado County and;
- (b) To assess the influence of government measures on risk taking behaviour among adolescents in Kajiado North Sub-County, Kajiado County.

### **1.2 Study Hypothesis**

The study formulated the following null hypotheses at 95% confidence level

**H<sub>01</sub>:** The society does not have statistically significant influence on risk taking behaviour among adolescents in Kajiado North Sub-County, Kajiado County

**H<sub>02</sub>:** Government measures do not have statistically significant influence on risk taking behaviour among adolescents in Kajiado North Sub-County, Kajiado County.

## **II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

The study was based on the Problem Behavior Theory (PBT). The theory was advanced by Jessor in 1977 (Jessor, 1977). The theory explains the adaptations to unconventional behaviour among adolescents (risk behaviours as in this study). The theory has been used to explain why students all over the world take to risk-taking behaviours such as substance use, fighting, alcohol and drug abuse among others (Ma & Shive, 2000). The theory is based on the assumption that behaviour is guided by the interaction of three systems: legal norms in the society; value system of the individual and; the relationships that one sustains in his or her environment. The societal as well as governmental legal systems and how they are enforced will influence the problem behaviour of an individual. An individual will also act based on what he or she perceives as peer,

societal and family expectations for achievements. Lastly, an individual will act based on the influence of the relationships they have. If the social relationships of an individual tolerate a particular behaviour, the individual is also likely to tolerate it and vice versa.

This theory relates to this current study. It can be conceptualized that the legal framework in which an adolescent grows in will influence their risk taking behaviour. If adolescents are strongly guided to avoid some behaviour, they are likely to shun such behaviour. In addition, what the adolescents perceive as the expectations of the society will affect their behaviour patterns. The relationships of the adolescent and what they tolerate will also determine the extent to which they will engage in problem and risk-taking behaviour.

Literature shows that the Society also plays a significant role in influencing the risk taking behaviour of adolescents as shown by the literature reviewed. However, only the survey by UNICEF (2012) and the article by Kyalo (2010) focus on Kenya. The study by Kyalo focused on Murang'a County while UNICEF focused on slum areas in Nairobi. Although Kyalo used the descriptive survey design as is the case with this current study, UNICEF used mixed research methods. This means that the two may not explicitly cast light on the subject under investigation. This underlines the importance of this current study. Furthermore, it is evident that the measures put in place by the government could influence risk taking behaviour among the youth. This is evidenced in the survey by Kruger (2010), the survey by Kong Census and Statistics Department (2009) as well as the studies of Palmgreen (2001) which shows that government measures positively influence behavioural choices among teenagers. Regrettably, only Wango (2006), in the study on policy and practice in guidance and counseling in secondary schools undertaken more than 10 years prior to this current study focuses on Kenya. This necessitates current studies on the role being played by the government in checking risk-taking behaviour among adolescents. This underlined the importance of this current study.

### **III. METHODOLOGY**

This study was carried out in Kajiado North Sub-County. The site for the study was selected owing to its special characteristics. In recent years, the area has attracted a myriad of worker populations seeking housing from the congested adjacent Nairobi City County (UNICEF, 2012). There are 15 public schools in the area. The huge influx of people from various ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds informs the choice of the area for the study since the variables under investigation were expected to affect adolescents considerably. Furthermore, there were fast growing towns in the area as well as growing number of youths from the surrounding higher education institutions. The study adopted the descriptive survey design. In this design, the researcher collected data through interviewing or administering questionnaires to sample of individuals. The design has an interesting attribute in that it studies the relationship between variables is described and generalizations principles or theory that has universal validity developed (Kahn, 1993). In assessing the influence of ecological factors on risk taking behaviour among adolescents; this was identified as a suitable design. The design was also cross-sectional because it is a point in time study.

The study targeted students and principals from the 15 schools the county. At the time of the study, there were 12478 students in these schools (MoEST, 2016). Only Form 3 students (which number 2706) were targeted (Ministry of Education, Kajiado County, 2016). This was for purposes of narrowing down the study in scope. Furthermore, these students were targeted due to the fact that by the time they reach this class, they are able to understand the factors influencing their behaviour considerably. The study used proportionate sampling to obtain the study sample (10% Form 3 students from each school) and simple random sampling. Proportionate sampling ensures that units from each main group are equitably included in the study (Jankowicz, 2005). As such, a proportionate number of students from each school selected was selected. The simple random sampling techniques used to select students from each school was specifically rotary to select students. In this case, the students were presented with a basket of shuffled up pieces of paper written "yes" or "no". Those who chose "yes" were the ones who were selected to participate in the study. Total population sampling (census) was used to select the principals of each of the 15 public secondary schools. These were selected as the key informants due to their role as the main school administrators.

The population of the study was divided into 15 strata (corresponding to each of the 15 public schools). Only 10% of students in Form 3 per school were targeted. This agrees with Kothari (2004) who points out that 10-30% of accessible population is representative of the whole population. On their part, all principals of the 15 schools were sampled. This makes sample size of 290 students and 15 principals. The researcher employed two types of research instruments: self-administered structured students' questionnaire and principals' interview guide.

Pre-testing was conducted to assist in determining accuracy, clarity and suitability of the research instrument. This included a pilot study targeting 20 students and 2 principals drawn from 2 schools in Nairobi City County. The sample of 20 is informed by the work of Kothari (2004) which mentions that 10% to 30% of the study sample is adequate for pilot studies. Nairobi City County was chosen because it borders and faces similar challenges as Kajiado North Sub-County due to its urban nature. Furthermore, many inhabitants of

Kajiado North Sub-County work or study in Nairobi. It is thus assumed that behavioural patterns in two areas are correlated.

Mugenda and Mugenda (2008) point out that reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results after repeated trials. The data obtained from the pilot study was used to ascertain the appropriateness and relevancy of the questionnaire to the study. Cronbach’s alpha, a reliability coefficient which varies from 0 to 1 whereby a value of 0.7 or less indicates unsatisfactory internal consistency reliability (Malhotra, 2004), was used to test the reliability of items in the questionnaires.

Upon pretesting the questionnaire, the Cronbach’s alpha values obtained were as follows (societal influence=0.837; government measures=0.792 and; risk taking behaviour=0.747. As such, the questionnaire was deemed reliable for use in data collection. In order to ensure the validity of the instrument, internal and external validity tests were carried out. Face validity was assessed by finding out the ease with which the respondents answer the research questions. In this case, any ambiguous questions were adjusted to make them easy to understand and answer. Cooper and Schindler (2003) point out that content validity offers adequate investigation of the study questions. The questionnaire was also presented to the supervisors for review and their input on the constructs of the research was used to improve the questionnaire.

Cooper and Schidler (2003) point out that construct validity is the extent to which a set of measured items actually reflect the theoretical latent construct that the items are designed to measure. Construct validity was ensured through the operationalization by setting the questions in the questionnaire based on the reviewed literature and the operationalized definition of the study variables. Content validity was used to find out if the instrument would answer all the research questions. Furthermore, factor analysis was be used to test construct validity whereby the right coefficients from the data was obtained and the results use to make adjustments, corrections, and additions to the research instrument.

The data collected using questionnaires was analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24. Descriptive statistics such as: frequencies, percentages and means were conducted. Furthermore, inferential statistics (Multiple Regression Analysis) were used to test the relationships between the independent and the dependent variables.

Data from principals was analysed thematically. Herein, the responses were organized in themes and categories that emerge. These were reviewed and the emergent meanings drawn and applied to answer initial research questions and issues as posited by Miles and Huberman (1994). These findings were used to support the findings from students’ questionnaires.

#### IV. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

In order to ascertain both the composite and relative influence of the two independent variables in this study on the dependent variable (the level of risk taking behaviour among secondary school students), multiple regression analysis was conducted. Each of the two variables (societal influence and influence of the government policies) was hypothesized to be a predictor of dependent variable. However, the two hypotheses were stated in the null form and tested at 95% confidence level.

**Table 1: Multiple Regression Model Summary**

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.688 <sup>a</sup>	.474	.470	.85171
a. Predictors: (Constant), Government Measures, Societal Influence				
a. Dependent Variable: Risk-Taking Behaviour				

According to Table 1, the multiple correlation coefficients R had a value of 0.688. Multiple R is the correlation between the observed values of independent variables and the value of dependent variable predicted by the multiple regression models. Therefore, the value of R (0.688) meant there was a relatively strong correlation between the predicted and observed values of the level of risk taking behaviour. As such, multiple R is a gauge of how well the model predicts the observed data.

The coefficient of determination R<sup>2</sup> which is the proportion of variance in the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent variables was found to be 0.474 implying that 47.4% of variance in the level of risk taking behaviour was explained by societal influence and, influence of the government policies. Further, the Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> value of 0.470 means that 47% of variance in the level of risk taking behaviour among secondary school students can be accounted for by the population the sample was taken from.

**Table 2: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)**

ANOVA <sup>b</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	171.868	2	85.934	118.463	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	190.782	263	.725		
	Total	362.650	265			
a. Predictors: (Constant), Government Measures, Societal Influence						
b. Dependent Variable: Risk-Taking Behaviour						

Table 2 shows the analysis of variance (ANOVA) output. The *F*-ratio in the ANOVA table tests whether the overall regression model is a good fit for the data. That is, the ANOVA shows whether the model, overall, results in a significantly good degree of prediction of the outcome variable. The table shows that the two independent variables could statistically and significantly predict the dependent variable,  $F = 118.463$ ,  $p < 0.05$  and that other variables not included in this model may have accounted for the remaining variance. In other words, the regression model was a good fit for the data.

**Table 3: Regression Coefficients**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.714	.207		3.447	.001
	Societal Influence	.021	.039	.024	.533	.004
	Government Measures	-.697	.045	-.687	-15.366	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Risk-Taking Behaviour						

Table 3 reveals the relative contribution of the two independent variables to the dependent variable, expressed as beta weights. The negative values of the effects of influence of the government policies shows that increase in the influence of this variable leads to decrease in risk taking behaviour among secondary school students. The positive value of the effect of societal influence implies that the level of risk taking behaviour among secondary school students is actually determined by positive reinforcement of these this variables. The significant t-test values ( $P < 0.05$ ) obtained for each of the two independent variables shows that all the variables can be fitted in the regression model adopted by this study. The  $\beta$  values indicate the individual contribution of each predictor to the model if the effects of all other predictors are held constant. In other words, the  $\beta$  values show the relationship between the level of risk taking behaviour and each predictor. Thus, when government policies increase by one unit, the level of risk taking behaviour decreases by  $-0.687$  units ( $\beta = -0.687$ ) while holding the societal influence constant. Similarly, when societal influences increases by one unit the level of risk taking behaviour increases by  $0.024$  units ( $\beta = 0.024$ ).

In order to have direct comparison and better insight into the importance of predictors, the standardized  $\beta$  values that do not depend on the units of measurement of variables are used. The standardized beta values give the number of standard deviation that the level of implementation will change as a result of one standard deviation change in the predictor. Accordingly, Table 3 shows the society ( $\beta = 0.024$ ) has the highest influence on risk-taking behaviour. This was followed by government policies ( $\beta = -0.687$ ). In order to test the study's hypotheses, the t statistic that tests whether a B value is significantly different from zero ( $H_0: \beta = 0$ ) is considered. It is evident from table 4.3 that the level of societal influence ( $\beta = 0.024$ ,  $t = -0.533$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and; government policies ( $\beta = -0.687$ ,  $t = -15.366$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) made a significant contribution or influence to risk taking behaviour. Thus the two null hypotheses were rejected since two the independent variables had significant relationship with the dependent variables.

## V. DISCUSSION

### 5.1 Societal Influence on Risk Taking Behaviour among Students

The study examined the level to which students agreed to a number of Likert scale type statements regarding societal influence on risk taking behaviour among students.

When presented with the statement, "I consider the society to have clear standards of how I should behave e.g. dressing, who to relate with" the students agreed to a moderate extent (mean of 3.3). This shows that

although the society has some standards on how students should behave, the standards were not strong enough; this could thus not totally control risk taking behaviour among students. This concurs with Wolfe et al. (2006) who argue that the behaviour of teenagers is a reflection of what happens in the society.

The students were presented with the statement “the society does not care how one lives and so I can do as I wish”. Herein, the students agreed to a little extent (mean of 2.0) with the statement. This shows that the society had some level of care on how students lived and this could influence their behaviour. These findings partially agree with De Angelis (2010) who argues that the society could give guidance to adolescents to pursue their goals and to behave responsibly. The students also agreed to a little extent (mean of 1.4) with the statement that, “nothing is ever done to colleagues who do bad things in the society”. This shows that the society had some form of corrective measures for students who did bad things in the society. These findings agree with Pace and Zappulla (2011) who argue that social bonds and commitment to prescribed social norms in a conventional society could control antisocial activities and vice versa.

When presented with the statement, “there is a lot of alcohol and substance abuse in the community and one is not discouraged from taking it”, the students agreed to a little extent (mean of 2.0). These findings show that even if there was a lot of alcohol and substance abuse in the community, students were discouraged from taking it to a great extent. These findings concur with those of Kyalo (2010) who argues that drugs and substance abuse among students in high schools is intertwined with societal tolerance and that the level to which the society condemns the practice of availing such drugs to students would check the abuse of such drugs among students. The students agreed to a moderate extent (mean of 2.9) that “there are instances of sexual relationships between adults and school going children in the society”. The prevalence of this behaviour means that the society contributed to students’ propensity to engage in risk taking behaviour. These findings echo the report by Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS, 2015) that points out that societal values determine the kind of behaviour adopted by people. This further supports the report that 15% of women aged 20 to 49 had their first sexual relations by age 15, 50% by age 18, and 71% by age 20 (KNBS 2015). The fact some members of the society were having sexual relationships with these students strengthened the veracity of these KNBS statistics.

When presented with the statement, “The society does not have places where we can get advice on the consequences of certain behaviour”, the students agreed to a little extent (mean of 2.0). This shows that there were indeed places where students could get such help. This agrees with Wolfe et al. (2006) who found out that societal fabric is also important in checking risky behaviour among adolescents. If students were engaging in risky behaviour, it can thus be concluded that such places were not very effective. Lastly, the respondents agreed to a little extent (mean of 2.0) that their society was a sure defense line against all forms of negative risky behaviour. This shows that the society was not very effective in protecting students from all forms of negative risky behaviour. The findings also show that societal values were weak and were not able to protect children from negative risky behaviour. This disagrees with Tsang and Leung (2005) who argued that the collective contribution of everyone in the societies formed a sure defense line against all forms of negative risk-taking behaviour among adolescents.

From the multiple regression analysis results, the significant Standardized Beta Coefficient ( $\beta=0.024$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) shows that increase of Societal Influence 1 unit would lead to increase in risk taking behaviour by 0.024 units. The opinions of principals on societal influence on risky taking behaviour among adolescents were also sought through interviews. The findings obtained show that the society guides the behaviour of students. In some instances, societies that tolerate risk taking behaviour encourage students to do so. Evidently, adoption of risk behaviour is more in societies that have a lot of alcohol abuse. It also came out clear that the presence of poor ethical standards in the society leads to immense risk taking behaviour. In some instances, conflicting cultures in societies (when parents come from different tribes) makes it hard to avert risk taking behaviour in some societies. Lastly, findings show that modern influences in the society led to erosion of societal values and increases risk taking behaviour among adolescents. These findings echo those of Hull (2014) and Luginaah and Baxter (2014) that show that the breakdown of old value systems and modernity have lowered behavioural expectations for young people in many societies.

## **5.2 Influence Of Government Policies On Risk Taking Behaviour Among Students**

The study also assessed the level to which students agreed to a number of likert-scale type statements regarding the influence of government measures on risk taking behaviour among students.

When presented with the statement that, “The government supports education programmes on how to avoid drug abuse” the students agreed to a great extent (mean of 3.7). This shows that the government played a crucial role in checking drug abuse in schools through antidrug use education programmes. This agrees with the Population Council (2016) that health care support and education by governments are important since they can lead to improved capacity by the youth to take the right life decisions.

To the statement, “the government employs teachers with counselling experience to guide us in the right direction”, the students agree to a great extent (mean of 3.7). This shows that the government put some efforts to control risk-taking behaviour among students by employing teachers with counselling experience who

could guide these students. These findings are in agreement with the study by Wango (2006) that shows that the government of Kenya employs psychological counsellors who play crucial roles in guiding young people in the right direction. As in the case with the previous statement, the students agreed to a great extent (mean of 3.7) that “guidance and counselling teachers control negative risk taking behaviour among adolescents in schools”. This shows that the effort by the government to employ guidance and counseling teachers played a key role in controlling negative risk taking behaviour among adolescents in agreement with the study by Wango (2006) that was of a similar opinion.

When presented with the statement, “the government gives financial help to students who are from poor backgrounds”, the students agreed to a moderate extent (mean of 3.4). This shows that there was limited financial support to students from poor backgrounds. This was a precarious situation since these students could easily engage in unwanted sexual behaviour in the bid to gain financial favours. This is in line with Kruger (2010) who found out that adolescents who live in extreme poverty are likely to engage in various risk-taking behaviours such as unprotected sex, crime, substance abuse among others. To the statement that “the government employs teachers who understand the challenges we face and check risky behaviour we undertake”, the students agreed to a great extent (mean of 3.6). This shows that the teachers employed by the government played a crucial role in guiding students as they faced numerous challenges that could contribute to their risk taking behaviour. This buttresses the position of Kruger (2010) who argues that the government can play a key role in shaping the behaviour of adolescents through financial help and employment of teachers who understand the challenges faced by these adolescents.

The respondents agreed to a great extent (mean of 3.5) that “the government is engaged in numerous programs on risky sexual behaviour and HIV”. These findings show that the government had put in place tangible solutions aimed at addressing risky sexual behaviour. These findings agree with Wango (2006) who points out that the government puts in place measures such as health awareness programs that influence the risk taking behaviour of adolescents. These interventions are vital since they could guide students to be careful hence reducing the consequences associated with risky sexual behaviour. Further, the students were presented with the statement, “the government supports sex education in our school.” To this, they agreed to a moderate extent (mean of 3.3). These findings partially agree with Wango (2006) who points out that the government puts in place measures such as health awareness programs (which include sex education) that influence the risk taking behaviour of adolescents. This shows that there was average support of such education in the schools; a scenario that could lead to rampant risky sexual behaviour among students.

Lastly, the respondents were presented with the statement, “the government runs anti-drug programs through the radio, TV and newspapers”. The findings obtained show that tendency to agree to a moderate extent (mean of 3.4). This shows that although the government ran various such programs, as pointed out by Wango (2006), they were not accessible to a large proportion of students. As such, the efforts to address drug abuse through these programs could be met with mixed results. The significant Standardized Beta Coefficients ( $\beta = -0.687$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) obtained from the multiple regression analysis shows that decrease of Government Measures by 1 unit would lead to increase in risk taking behaviour by  $-0.687$  units. The principals were interviewed in the bid to find out their opinions on the subject under investigation. According to the principals interviewed, the government has programs (in schools and in the mass media) that guide students. Herein, there are radio and television broadcasts on the dangers of alcohol and drug abuse as well as the dangers of risky sexual behaviour. In addition, it trains principals to handle risk taking behaviour. Further, the government employs teachers who guide and counsel students in the right direction. Lastly, the government includes subjects on risk taking behaviour in the curriculum. These findings agree with Wambua (2013) who is of the position that the government plays a critical role in determining the risk taking behaviours of children.

## **VI. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

There are a number of conclusions that can be made in relation to the influence of ecological factors on risk taking behaviour among adolescents in secondary schools in Kajiado North Sub-County, Kajiado County. The conclusions are made in line with the objectives of the study.

This study concludes that societies that tolerate risk taking behaviour encourage students to do so. Evidently, adoption of risk behaviour is more in societies that have a lot of alcohol abuse. It also came out clear that the presence of poor ethical standards in the society leads to immense risk taking behaviour. In some instances, conflicting cultures in societies (when parents come from different tribes) makes it hard to avert risk taking behaviour in some societies. It was also made manifest that modern influences in the society led to erosion of societal values and increases risk taking behaviour among adolescents.

Lastly, the government has programs (in schools and in the mass media) that guide students. Herein, there are radio and television broadcasts on the dangers of alcohol and drug abuse as well as the dangers of risky sexual behaviour. In addition, it trains principals to handle risk taking behaviour. Further, the government employs teachers who guide and counsel students in the right direction. The government also includes subjects

on risk taking behaviour in the curriculum and this can affect risk taking behaviour tremendously. The study unearths important information on how the ecology of adolescents influences their risk taking behaviours. It is thus important to investigate how each variable under investigation in this study would influence such risk taking behaviour when the other variables are controlled in further studies.

**Based On The Study Findings And Conclusions, Various Recommendations Can Be Made:**

- a) To begin with, there should be mechanisms in the society to guide adolescents. Schools, parents associations, religious bodies, school counsellors, chaplains and civil society organizations should endeavour to put a strong defense against negative influences that beset children. In this regard, counselling centers should be put in place in the society to engage adolescents in life education and other activities such as games so as to divert them from idleness during school holidays and weekends. This would go on to keep them from risky taking behaviours.
- b) Members of the society who engage in sexual relationships with students and those who sell alcohol or drugs to students should be identified and punished as per the existing law
- c) The government should strengthen its programs (in schools and in the mass media) that guide students. There should be more funding for radio and television broadcasts that guide adolescents on the dangers of alcohol, drug abuse and risky sexual behaviour.
- d) The government should also strengthen its training of principals and teachers on ways of dealing with risk taking behaviour among students.
- e) More guidance and counselling teachers should be employed so as to deal with the increasing needs for guiding students in the right direction.
- f) The government should also review its curriculum constantly so as to ensure that subjects on risk-taking behaviour remain relevant and that they are constantly strengthened.
- g) Finally, the study recommends studies on each of the two study objectives of the study since there are immense changes in the society as time goes and, this changes the environment in which adolescents grow in as time comes and goes.

**REFERENCES**

- [1]. Allen, J. P., Chango, J., Szwedo, D., Schad, M., & Marston, E. (2012). Predictors of susceptibility to peer influence regarding substance use in adolescence. *Child Development*, 83(1), 337-350.
- [2]. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [3]. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1993). *The ecology of cognitive development: Research models and fugitive findings*. In R.H. Wozniak & R.W. Fischer (Eds.), *Development in context: Acting and thinking in specific environments* (3-44). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [4]. Brown, B. (2004). *Adolescents' relationships with peers*. *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- [5]. Cooper, D.R., & Schindler, P. S. (2003). *Business research methods* (8th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- [6]. De Angelis, T. (2010). Closing the gap between practice and research. *Monitor on Psychology* (41), 6, 42-46.
- [7]. Hong Kong Census and Statistics Department (2009). *Hong Kong annual digest of statistics*. Hong Kong: Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.
- [8]. Hull, E. (2014). The social dynamics of labor shortage in South African small-scale agriculture. *World Development*, 59, 451-460.
- [9]. Jankowicz, A. D. (2005). *Business research projects* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). London: Thomson Publishing.
- [10]. Jessor, R. (1998). *New perspectives on adolescent risk behaviour* (Ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press, xii-564.
- [11]. Jessor, R., & Jessor, S. L. (1977). *Problem behaviour and psychosocial development: A longitudinal study of youth*. New York: Academic Press.
- [12]. Kauppi, S. (2015). *Behaviour change and communication: a descriptive literature review of behaviour change and communication in sub-Saharan countries*. Master's Thesis. Diaconia University of Applied Sciences.
- [13]. KNBS (2015). *Demographic and health survey 2014*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- [14]. Kothari, C.R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and techniques* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). New Delhi: New Age International (P) Limited Publishers.
- [15]. Kruger, A.H. (2010). *Risk factors and the availability of social resources as variables influencing suicidal ideation among South African and British Adolescents*. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein.

- [16]. Kyalo, M.P. (2010). Perception of public secondary school students on drugs and substance abuse in Murang'a County, *Sacha Journals*, 6 (5).
- [17]. Larson, R., & Wilson, S. (2004). "Adolescence across place and time: Globalization and the changing pathways to adulthood". In R. Lerner and L. Steinberg. *Handbook of adolescent psychology*. New York: Wiley.
- [18]. Larson, R., Eccles, J. & Gootman, J. A. (2004). Features of positive developmental settings. *The Prevention Researcher*, 11(2), 8-13.
- [19]. Ma, G. X., & Shive, S. (2000). A comparative analysis of perceived risks and substance use among ethnic groups. *Addictive Behaviors*, 25, 361-371.
- [20]. Malhotra, N.K. (2004). *Marketing research: An applied orientation* (4th edition) Pearson Education, Inc: New Jersey.
- [21]. Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishers.
- [22]. Ministry of Health (2005). *National guidelines for the provision of adolescent youth friendly Services (YSF) in Kenya*. M.O.H Division of Reproductive Health. Nairobi.
- [23]. MoEST (2015). *Basic educational statistical booklet*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- [24]. MoEST (2016). *Kajiado North Sub County schools census report*. Sub County Education Office.
- [25]. Mugenda, M., & Mugenda, O. (2008). *Research methods: quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Nairobi: African Centre for Technology Studies.
- [26]. Ochieng, J.A. (2013). *Risky sexual behaviour among adolescents attending public secondary schools in Nairobi, Kenya*. Master of Medicine in Psychiatry Thesis. University of Nairobi.
- [27]. Pace, U., & Zappulla, C. (2011). Problem behaviours in adolescence: the opposite role played by insecure attachment and commitment strength. *Journal of Child & Family Studies*, 20, 854-862.
- [28]. Palmgreen, P., Donohew, L., Lorch, E.P., Hoyle, R.H., & Stephenson, M.T. (2001). Television campaigns and adolescent marijuana use: tests of sensation seeking targeting. *American Journal of Public Health*, 91(2):292-296.
- [29]. Population Council (2015a). *Health and life skills curriculum for the Adolescent Girls Initiative–Kenya (AGI-K)*. New York: Population Council. [www.popcouncil.org:http://www.popcouncil.org/uploads/pdfs/2015PGY\\_AGI-K\\_HealthLifeCurriculum\\_Wajir.pdf](http://www.popcouncil.org/uploads/pdfs/2015PGY_AGI-K_HealthLifeCurriculum_Wajir.pdf).
- [30]. UNESCO (2015). *School-related gender-based violence is preventing achievement of quality education for all*. Policy 17. Paris: UNESCO. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002321/232107e.pdf>.
- [31]. UNICEF (2012). *A report card on adolescence*. United Nations. Geneva. Retrieved on 13th April from [www.unicef.org/publications](http://www.unicef.org/publications).
- [32]. Wambua, L. (2013). Gender issues affecting the girl child in Kenya. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3 (4), 125-28.
- [33]. Wango, G. (2006). *Policy and practice in guidance and counseling in secondary schools in Kenya*. University of Birmingham, United Kingdom.
- [34]. Wolfe, D. A., Jaffe, P. G., & Crooks, C. V. (2006). *Adolescent risk behaviours: Why teens experiment and strategies to keep them safe*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- [35]. Zulu, E.M., Eliya, M., Dodoo, F.N. & Ezech, A.C. (2002). Sexual risk-taking in the slums of Nairobi, Kenya, 1993 – 98. *Population Studies*, 56 (200), 311-323.

IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) is UGC approved Journal with Sl. No. 5070, Journal no. 49323.

Joseph Theuri "Influence of Societal And Government Policiesecological Factors On Risk Taking Behaviour Among Secondary School Students in Kajiado North Sub-County." *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, vol. 22, no. 11, 2017, pp. 52-60.