

Relationship Between Family Functioning And Deviant Behavior Among Youth At Kamiti Youth Correctional And Training Centre, Kiambu County, Kenya

Margaret Gikuhi¹, Rev. Dr. Tucholski, Dr. Phyllis Muraya

¹(Institute of Youth Studies)

²(Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Kenya)

Abstract: Increase in the number of youth admitted in correctional facilities is alarming as evidenced in consulted studies worldwide. The facilities are noted as focusing more on treating behavior change rather than the root causes leading to deviant behaviors. This study therefore sought to establish the relationship between family functioning and deviant behaviors among youth at Kamiti Youth Correctional and Training Centre, Kiambu County, Kenya. The study was guided by Social Learning Theory as the theoretical framework

Materials and Methods: Quantitative Research Method was used. The study employed a correlational survey design to determine the relationship between the study variables. Using systematic random sampling technique, a sample size of 132 male aged between 15 and 24 were selected from a target population of 200 participants using Cochran's formula. Data was collected using a researcher-generated socio-demographic questionnaire and standardized instruments namely, Intimacy, Conflict, Parenting Style (ICPS) and the Deviant Behavior Variety Scale (DBVS). The scales were piloted before use and found to be reliable. Cronbach's alpha for ICPS was ($\alpha = .723$) while that of DVBS was $\alpha = .729$. The data was analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics

Results: The findings showed that half of the respondents were between 17 – 18 years at 50% ($n = 66$) as compared to other age brackets. The difference in distribution of participants' age and levels of deviant behaviors was insignificant ($p = .382$). The intimacy and parenting subscales were dominant in this study. Level of intimacy was high at 65.9% ($n = 87$). Controlling parenting style was at 59.8% ($n = 79$) as opposed to democratic parenting style at 40.2% ($n = 53$). The study also found that 75% ($n = 99$) of the participants were presenting with low levels of deviant behavior as compared to 25% ($n = 33$) of participants who were presenting with high levels of deviant behaviors. There was a significant relationship of ($p = .044$) between the intimacy subscale of family functioning and level of deviant behaviors. A negative correlation of ($r = -.175$; $p = 0.05$) was found between intimacy and level of deviant behavior. Regression analysis confirmed that levels of intimacy had higher probability of predicting levels of deviant behavior (AOR: 1.78; 95% CI: 641-4.957) compared to parenting style (AOR 1.14; 95% CI: .408-3.198) and levels of conflict (AOR: 1.16; 95% CI: 468-2.873).

Conclusion: The study concluded that there was a significant relationship between intimacy and deviant behaviors among the youth at Kamiti Youth Correctional and Training Centre, Kiambu. This means the youth at Kamiti Youth Correctional and Training Centre had high levels of intimacy which lowered their levels of deviancy.

Key Word: Family Functioning, Intimacy, conflict, Parenting Style, Deviant Behavior

Date of Submission: 02-08-2023

Date of Acceptance: 12-08-2023

1. Introduction

The rise in deviant behavior among the youth in prisons gave credence to this study. The researcher needed to know whether there was a relationship between family functioning and deviant behavior among the youth at Kamiti Youth Correctional and Training Centre, Kiambu County, Kenya.

The family is the first environment within which individuals interact (De Souza, 2013). The caregivers as well as the young members of the family interact through specific behavior patterns. These patterns include the ability by the family to meet the needs of its members (Gaumon et al., 2013). This enables the family to effectively cope with the stress and problems that arise in life. Additionally, functioning family relationship reduce youth delinquency (Eichelsheim, 2010). In contrast, poor family functioning occurs within families that have high levels of conflict, disorganization, and poor behavior control (Dai & Wang, 2015). This could affect various other aspects of an individual's life.

From providing a vibrant demographic dividend to domestic economies, to their influence on socio-cultural norms and institutions at large, contribution by the youth in the society cannot be underestimated (Balwanz, 2012). It is therefore important to learn about the problems that lead to their deviant behaviors.

Deviance according to Berger et al (2015), is a departure from what society expects. This idea is reinforced by statistical analysis and reveals socially accepted behavior that falls into a normal distribution curve. Deviant behaviors are outliers to the normal distribution curve. In order to avoid any conceptual uncertainty, it is helpful to define 'deviant behavior', as used in this study. In addition to formal law-breaking such as property destruction, shoplifting, fighting, vandalizing, robbing, using drugs and other offenses, deviant behavior likewise means any kind of behavior which is viewed as inappropriate or unacceptable by the community. This according to Goode (2016) entails behaviors for which the youth can be punished by the criminal justice system.

The problems of deviant behavior among youth are a challenge for many countries (Bocar, 2014). In the USA, for example, a study carried out by Mulatie (2014) found that about 3.2 million youth under the age of 18 were arrested in 2009 while in 2010, more than 70,000 youth were detained in correctional centres (Wilderman, 2010). Similarly, a study done in India indicated that 42,508 youth were arrested and taken to courts in 2012 (Ojo, 2012). This enormous rise in the level of crime by the youth has stimulated interest among scholars and the current study seeks to contribute that discourse to prevent the youth from graduating into criminal tendencies in adulthood.

In Africa, there is proof of increasing law-breaking among the youth. A study by Nwankwo (2010) on prevalence and predictors of deviant behavior among youth in Owerri Municipal, South East Nigeria, found that deviant behaviors exist among the youth. Crimes registered were: 312 (68.7%) cultism, smoking 61 (13.4%), truancy 56(12.3%), alcoholism 13(3%) and drug abuse 12(2.6%) These behaviors were found to be significantly associated with the respondent's gender, parenting style and the respondents' parents economic status.. The study recommended that parents should endeavor to bear children they can comfortably cater for morally, economically, socially and psychologically. He further echoes that this increase in deviant behavior is largely a youth-related phenomenon.

In South Africa, Bradshaw (2015) states that the rampant menace in schools takes the form of bullying. This has both short and long term effects. In Tanzania, Dodoma Municipality, the same is confirmed by Ndibalema (2013) who found physical bullying to be apparently the leading deviant behavior among the youth

In Kenya, about 57% of crimes reported to the police are committed by youth (Institute of Economic Affairs Youth Compendium, 2011). Furthermore, mass media reports have equally highlighted an upsurge in youth delinquency in all forty seven (47) counties of Kenya (NCRC, 2016). These increased incidences of youth delinquency across the country is becoming a matter of grave concern among the general public and security agencies in particular, and it points towards missing information on how to curb this problem. In conclusion, it is important to note that if this continues unabated, the position shall be as stated by Finn et al (2016) that many Kenyan youth will ultimately be recruited into the rank of armed robbers, rebels and kidnappers, while their female colleagues will end up as sex workers.

Kamiti Youth Correctional and Training Centre has reported cases of reoffending. (Kenya Prisons Statistic, 2014). According to the Kenya Prisons statistics, data has gone up from 60% to 80% between 2002 and 2017. The challenge in correctional facilities is that they emphasize more on behavior modification and not on the root causes leading to youth delinquency. Understanding the possible connection between deviant behaviors by the youth and their family functioning can catalyze policy changes that can help our society improve. Hence, the researcher seeks to bridge this gap by examining the relationship between family functioning and deviant behavior among the youth at Kamiti Youth Correctional and Training Centre, Kiambu.

11. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK – SOCIAL LEARNING THEORY

Social Learning Theory recognizes that people learn by observing how others behave; including the rewards they receive (Aker 1985). The theory suggests that conforming and/or nonconforming behavior occurs prior to the onset of any acts of delinquency or law violation and that deviant tendencies have already developed (Akers, 2009). This is based on the functions of previously learned patterns of behavior within the family that made them more attracted by and/or attractive to other deviant associations (e.g., friendships, circumstances, and preferences).

According to Olson (2009), the developmental process leading to delinquency begins during early childhood with maladaptive parent-child interactions that actually reward the child for antisocial behavior. As a child ages and spends more time outside the home, those negative behaviors learned at home will likely appear in other settings. In school, the child's antisocial disposition may interfere with learning and often will result in the child being disliked by peers. The child's antisocial tendencies further drift them toward peers and social settings that reinforce their deviant behaviors (Bandura, 1977).

This theory maintains that deviant patterns of behavior will persist (or desist) depending on the continuity (or discontinuity) of the person's patterns of associations, definitions, and reinforcement (Bandura, 1977). In this study, the principles of observational learning, modeling and imitation were used as a guide in understanding the influence of family functioning on deviant behavior. Moreover, this study addressed how family intimacy, conflict and parenting styles influenced the institution of behavior, reinforcing it and hence sustaining it. The quest was to address the relationship between family functioning and deviant behavior. It is on account of this that the theory argues that children fail to learn law-abiding behavior if their parents provide antisocial models/or fail to react to their transgressions in an appropriate, consistent manner. Hence, the theory sought to develop an accurate link that describes how young people generally acquire and retain behaviors, while specifically focusing on deviant behaviors among these youth.

However, SLT leaves out the aspect of the child's accountability in the behavior focusing more on how their environment influences their behavior. It does not also explain for instance, how two children growing up in the same family under the same parents, will have one entering into deviant behavior while the other remains stable. Notwithstanding these weaknesses, the theory was relevant, accurately capturing the predicted variables posited herein.

III. METHODOLOGY

The research was carried out at Kamiti Youth Correctional and Training Centre, Kiambu County which admits youth offenders from all parts of Kenya. Quantitative Research Method was used. The study was guided by Social Learning Theory as the theoretical framework. The study employed a correlational survey design to determine the relationship between the study variables. Using systematic random sampling technique, a sample size of 132 male aged between 15 and 24 were selected from a target population of 200 participants using Cochran's formula. Data was collected using a researcher-generated socio-demographic questionnaire and standardized instruments namely, Intimacy, Conflict, Parenting Style (ICPS) and the Deviant Behavior Variety Scale (DBVS). The participants completed a researcher-generated demographic questionnaire providing information regarding age, education level, parents' marital status and number of siblings in the family. The scales were piloted before use and found to be reliable. Cronbach's alpha for ICPS was ($\alpha = .723$) while that of DVBS was $\alpha = .729$. Intimacy, Conflict, Parenting Style (ICPS) is a 30-item family functioning tool used to measure intimacy (high versus low), conflict (high versus low) and parenting style (controlling versus democratic). To score the instrument, all value items responses were summed up in each subscale to get the mean score. Participants who scored below the mean were classified as having experienced low levels of intimacy/conflict while those who scored above the mean were classified as having experienced high levels of intimacy/conflict in their families. Similarly, participants who scored below the mean and above the mean were classified as having democratic and controlling parents respectively. The Deviant Behavior Variety Scale (DBVS) comprises of 19 items of a variety of deviant actions such as thefts, drug and alcohol drinking, and other risky behaviors among youth. The mean of the total score of the participants was calculated. Participants who scored below the mean were classified to present with low levels of deviant behaviors whereas, participants who scored above the mean were classified as having high levels of deviant behaviors. SPSS version 21 was used for data analysis. The data was analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The collection of data followed a series of steps to ensure strict observation of ethical conduct. Permission was obtained from Tangaza University College Ethics Committee (TUCREC), National Committee for Science Technology and Innovation, Prisons Headquarters and the respondents.

IV. FINDINGS

The demographic information of the respondents is presented in the first section, while the second section presents the research findings according to the research objective which was to examine the relationship between family functioning and deviant behavior among the youth at Kamiti Youth Correctional and Training Centre, Kiambu, Kenya.

Table 1: Socio-Demographic Characteristics

Variables	Frequency	Percent
Distribution of participants' age		
15-16 years	37	28.0
17-18 years	66	50.0
19-20 years	22	16.7
21-22 years	5	3.8
23-24 years	2	1.5
Participants' level of education		
None	12	9.1
Lower primary	17	12.9
Upper primary	46	34.8

Secondary College	56 1	42.4 .8
Marital status of the parents		
Married	41	31.1
Divorced	15	11.4
Separated	25	18.9
Single-never married	30	22.7
Widowed	21	15.9
Numbers of siblings in participant's family		
Only child	5	3.8
Two siblings	12	9.1
Three siblings	40	30.3
Four and more siblings	75	56.8

Relationship between Dominant Aspects of Family Functioning and Deviant Behaviors

Inferential statistics namely, Fisher's Exact Test, Pearson Correlation and Binary Logistic Regression Models of Statistics were utilized to examine the relationship between the dominant aspects of family functioning and deviant behavior.

The Fisher's Exact Test was used to measure the relationship between the two variables. Fisher's Exact Test is a statistical test used to determine if there are nonrandom associations between categorical variables. The test measured the statistical relationships between the subscale of family functioning and the levels of deviant behaviors among the participants.

Table 2: Fisher's Exact Test showing Relationship between Family Functioning and Deviant Behaviors

variables	Total	Range of deviant behaviors		Fisher's exact	
		Lower numbers	Higher numbers	Value	Sig.
Levels of intimacy					
Low level	45 (34.1)	29 (22.0)	16 (12.1)	4.057	.044
High level	87 (65.9)	70 (53.0)	17 (12.9)		
Levels of conflict					
Low level	65 (49.2)	47 (35.6)	18 (13.6)	.495	.308
High level	67 (50.8)	52 (39.4)	15 (11.4)		
Parenting styles					
Democratic	53 (40.2)	37 (28.0)	16 (12.1)	1.272	.307
Controlling	79 (59.8)	62 (47.0)	17 (12.9)		

As shown in Table 2, a high level of intimacy of 53% (70) was associated with a low level of deviant behaviors of 22% (29). The Fisher's Exact Test shows a significant relationship of (p = .044). This implied that high levels of intimacy lowered deviant behaviors in this study.

Concerning the levels of conflict and the level of deviant behaviors, there was a difference between participants that experienced high level of conflict at 39.4% (52) with low level of deviant behaviors at 35.6% (47). The Fisher's Exact Test of (p = .308) indicated no significant relationship between levels of conflict and numbers of deviant behaviors.

Similarly, there was higher frequency of controlling parenting style lowering number of deviant behaviors at 47% (60) as opposed to democratic parenting style at 28% (37) lowering the number of deviant behaviors among the participants. The implication is that the association was insignificant (p = .307). This means that parenting style was not associated to the levels of deviant behaviors in this study.

Table 3: Pearson Correlation of subscale of Family Functioning and Levels of Deviant Behaviors

	Intimacy	Conflict	Parenting	Deviant. Beh.
Intimacy	-			
Conflict	.027	-		
Parenting	.356**	.090	-	
Deviant. Beh	-.175*	-.061	-.098	-

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 presents the Pearson Correlation Test showing levels of relationship between the subscale of family functioning and deviant behaviors. As indicated in Table 3, there was a strong positive correlation at 2-tailed between levels of intimacy and parenting style (r = .356; p = 0.01). Positive correlation is a relationship between two variables that move in the same direction. In other words, a positive correlation exists when one variable decreases, the other also decreases and as one increases, the other likewise increases. Therefore, a

strong positive correlation between levels of intimacy and parenting style implies that when levels of parenting style increased, level of intimacy similarly increased. Also, this study found a negative correlation between intimacy and level of deviant behaviors ($r = -.175$; $p = 0.05$). A negative correlation means that the two variables move in opposite direction. This suggests that as level of intimacy increased, the level of deviant behaviors decreased.

Relationship between Subscale of Family Functioning and Socio-Demographic Characteristics on Levels of Deviant Behaviors

Binary Logistic Regression is the statistical technique used to predict the relationship between predictors that is, the independent variables and predicted variable which is binary dependent variable. It was generated with adjusted odds ratios of 95% confidence interval.

Table 4: Relationship between Subscale of Family Functioning and Socio-demographic Characteristics on Levels of Deviant Behaviors.

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I.for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
Parenting styles (1)	.133	.525	.065	1	.799	1.143	.408	3.198
Levels Intimacy (1)	.578	.522	1.229	1	.268	1.783	.641	4.957
Levels of Conflict1)	.149	.463	.103	1	.748	1.160	.468	2.873
Age			2.872	4	.580			
15-16 years (1)	-.612	1.754	.122	1	.727	.542	.017	16.885
17-18 years (2)	-.737	1.743	.179	1	.672	.479	.016	14.568
19-20 years (3)	-.602	1.807	.111	1	.739	.548	.016	18.933
21-22 years (4)	.980	2.034	.232	1	.630	2.665	.050	143.437
Q2Education			.915	4	.922			
None (1)	-24.019	40193.696	.000	1	1.000	.000	.000	.
Primary lower (2)	-23.211	40193.696	.000	1	1.000	.000	.000	.
Step 1 ^a Primary upper (3)	-23.631	40193.696	.000	1	1.000	.000	.000	.
Secondary (4)	-23.839	40193.696	.000	1	1.000	.000	.000	.
Q3PMstatus			5.026	4	.285			
Married (1)	-.333	.693	.231	1	.631	.717	.184	2.786
Divorced (2)	-1.806	1.265	2.037	1	.154	.164	.014	1.962
Separated (3)	-.279	.765	.133	1	.715	.757	.169	3.386
Single-n-married(4)	.575	.686	.703	1	.402	1.778	.463	6.826
Q4Siblings			5.957	3	.114			
Only child (1)	.253	1.199	.045	1	.833	1.288	.123	13.493
Two siblings (2)	1.110	.722	2.367	1	.124	3.035	.738	12.483
Three siblings (3)	-.856	.599	2.039	1	.153	.425	.131	1.376
Constant	22.980	40193.696	.000	1	1.000	9554213848.785		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: ParentRecoded, IntimacyRecoded, ConflictRecoded, Q1Age, Q2Education, Q3PMstatus, Q4Siblings.

Table 4 presents the binary logistic regression to show the relationship between subscale of family functioning and socio-demographic characteristics on the levels of deviant behaviors among the participants. As shown in Table 4, the levels of intimacy had higher probability of predicting numbers of deviant behaviors (AOR: 1.78; 95% CI: 641-4.957), compared to parenting style (AOR: 1.14; 95% CI: .408-3.198) and levels of conflict (AOR: 1.16; 95% CI: 468-2.873).

Likewise, binary logistic regression revealed that participants aged 21-22 years were not at risk of exhibiting higher numbers of deviant behaviors (AOR:2.67; 95% CI:143.437). Also, participants whose parents were single-never married were 1.78 likely to exhibit lower number of deviant behaviors (AOR: 1.78; 95% CI: .463-6.826). In the same way, participants in the family with two siblings were 3.04 odd ratio likely to exhibit lower numbers of deviant behaviors (AOR: 3.04; 95% CI: .738 -12.483).

In conclusion, this study found that levels of intimacy, participants aged 21-22 years, participants from singles-never-married parents, family with two siblings, were more likely to demonstrate lower numbers of deviant behaviors compared to other categories.

Homogeneity of Variances between Subscale of Family Functioning and Deviant Behaviors

Levene’s test of homogeneity determines whether the subgroups of family functioning and levels of deviant behaviors as populations have the same distribution of a single categorical variable. The test expands for a difference in two population proportions.

Table 5: Test of Homogeneity of Variances between Subscale of Family Functioning and Deviant Behaviors

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Levels of parenting style	2.139	1	130	.146
Levels of intimacy	6.642	1	130	.011
Levels of Conflict	.201	1	130	.655

As indicated on the Table, the result of the homogeneity showed that levels of parenting style ($p = .146$) and levels of conflict ($p = .655$) were not homogenous, but levels of intimacy were homogenous ($p = .011$). This means that the subscales of family functioning and deviant behaviors as hypothesis can be tested using Analysis of variance.

Mean Equality of Variance between Subscale of Family Functioning and Level of Deviant Behaviors

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test is a type of statistical test usually used to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between two or more categorical groups. In the hypothesis testing in this study, it was assumed that the relationship between subscale of family functioning and levels of deviant behavior was not significant. The ANOVA test allowed a comparison of the two groups to determine whether the mean difference exists.

Table 6: Mean Equality of Variance between Subscale of Family Functioning and Level of Deviant Behaviors

				Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Levels of parenting style	Between Groups	(Combined)		.306	1	.306	1.264	.263
		Linear Term	Unweighted	.306	1	.306	1.264	.263
			Weighted	.306	1	.306	1.264	.263
	Within Groups			31.414	130	.242		
	Total			31.720	131			
Levels of intimacy	Between Groups	(Combined)		.912	1	.912	4.122	.044
		Linear Term	Unweighted	.912	1	.912	4.122	.044
			Weighted	.912	1	.912	4.122	.044
	Within Groups			28.747	130	.221		
	Total			29.659	131			
Levels of Conflict	Between Groups	(Combined)		.124	1	.124	.489	.485
		Linear Term	Unweighted	.124	1	.124	.489	.485
			Weighted	.124	1	.124	.489	.485
	Within Groups			32.869	130	.253		
	Total			32.992	131			

As indicated in Table 6, there was no significant difference in means between parenting style, a subgroup of family functioning and levels of deviant behaviors ($p = .263$). Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted; the implication was that there no significant relationship between levels of parenting style and deviant behaviors in this study.

Likewise, levels of intimacy and deviant behavior was tested and result of ANOVA test indicated that the mean difference between levels of intimacy, a subscale of family functioning and levels of deviant behavior was significant ($p = .044$). This implied that the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted. The interpretation was that a significant relationship exists between intimacy subscale of family functioning and levels of deviant behaviors. An inferential statement can be made that levels of intimacy was influential in determining levels of deviant behavior among the participants in this study. Consequently, it was also assumed that no significant relationship exist between levels of conflict, a subscale of family functioning and levels of deviant behaviors among the participants. Findings from the One Way ANOVA test showed that the difference in means of conflict and levels of deviant behaviors was insignificant ($p = .485$). Therefore, the

null hypothesis was accepted. This suggests that levels of conflict played no significant role in determining either lower or higher number of deviant behaviors in this study.

V. DISCUSSION

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Data showed that half of the respondents were between ages 17-18 at 50% (n = 66). This is a stage where the youth are struggling with identity issues. This is in line with a study carried out by the National Authority for the Campaign Against Alcohol and Drug Abuse (NACADA, 2012). The report revealed that among the youth between 15 and 24, 11.7% abuse alcohol, Khat use 4.7%, 6.2% use and 1.5% use cannabis. This is also echoed by Erikson (1968) who posits that during this stage adolescents explore their independence and develop a sense of self as they ask the question “who am I”? He continues to state that as they transit from childhood to adulthood, they may begin to feel confused or insecure about themselves and how they fit into society. This subsequently leads to deviant behaviors.

Relationship between Dominant Aspects of Family Functioning and Levels of Deviant Behaviors

Pearson Correlation Test showed that there was a relationship between subscale of family functioning and levels of deviant behaviors. There was a strong positive correlation at 2-tailed between levels of intimacy and parenting style ($r = .356$; $p = 0.01$). This implies that when levels of parenting style increased level of intimacy also increased. Similarly, when levels of parenting style decreased, intimacy decreased. This is in line with a study done by Talib (2011) who found out that positive parenting practices during the early years and later adolescence act as buffers. The study also found a negative correlation between intimacy and levels of deviant behaviors ($r = -.175$; $p = 0.05$). This means that as the level of intimacy increased, the level of deviant behaviors decreased.. The Fisher’s Exact Test also showed that a higher level of intimacy of 53% (n =87) was associated with a lower level of deviant behaviors of 22% (n = 45). There was a significant relationship of ($p = .044$) between intimacy and deviant behaviors among the youth at Kamiti Youth Correctional and Training Centre. This is in line with a study by Hill et al (2007) who found that high levels of family intimacy are likely to lower levels of youthful crimes. This is further supported by Dishon and Patterson (2006) who examined how levels of intimacy play a crucial part in early adolescent. The study sampled 179 ethnically diverse youth. Results indicated that connectedness (father, mother, siblings) was associated with reduction in deviant behavior over time. In conclusion, the findings on the relationship between intimacy and deviant behaviors suggests that as level of intimacy in the family increased, the number of deviant behavior decreased among the youth at Kamiti Youth Correctional and Training Centre, Kiambu. This therefore implies that low level of deviant behaviors experienced by the youth at Kamiti Youth Correctional and Training Centre, Kiambu were due to the high levels of intimacy experienced in their families.

Concerning the relationship between conflict and deviant behaviors among the youth at Kamiti Youth Correctional and Training Centre, Kiambu, the findings from the Fisher’ Exact Test showed that there was a difference between participants that experienced high level of conflict at 39.4% (n = 67) with low levels of deviant behaviors and low level of conflict at 35.6% (n = 65) with low levels of deviant behavior. This is line with a study done by Cui and Fincham (2010) who found out that intra-family conflicts may establish an uncompassionate atmosphere in a home creating hostility among family members. They concluded that such families may yield more delinquents than those families that function harmoniously. This is further echoed by Farrington (2012) who found out that youth who observed intra-conflict had a higher risk of committing criminal offences than those who did not.

The researcher had also anticipated high levels of conflict in families whose youth are engaged in deviant behaviors. Nevertheless, the implication is that Fisher’s Exact Test of ($p = .308$) was insignificant. This therefore means that conflict was not associated with the number of deviant behaviors among the youth at Kamiti Youth Correctional and Training Centre, Kiambu.

In regard to the relationship between parenting styles and deviant behaviors among youth at Kamiti Youth Correctional and Training Centre, Kiambu, the findings from the Fisher’s Exact Test showed that there was higher frequency of controlling parenting style lowering the level of deviant behaviors at 47% (n = 79) as opposed to democratic parenting style at 28% (n = 53) lowering the number of deviant behaviors among the participants. This was in contrast with many studies among them that by Baumrind (2013). According to Baumrind (2013) who did a longitudinal study examining parenting styles and substance abuse, she found that children of democratic parents demonstrated low levels of substance use than those of controlling parents who developed irresponsible behaviors that generated high levels of deviant behaviors. Nevertheless, the implication is that the Fisher’s Exact Test of ($p = .307$) was insignificant. This therefore means that parenting style was not associated to the number of deviant behaviors among the youth at Kamiti Youth Correctional and Training Centre, Kiambu

VI. CONCLUSION

This study focused on examining the relationship between family functioning and deviant behaviors among the youth at Kamiti Training and Correctional Centre, Kiambu. Youth are the future of society. From providing a vibrant demographic dividend to domestic economies, to their influence on socio-cultural norm and institutions at large, contribution by the youth in the society cannot be underestimated. Family functioning in this study was understood as activities that facilitate interaction and relationship among family members in their daily lives. They include how the family handles intimacy, conflict and parenting styles. It is in a family set-up that interactional patterns inadvertently attracts, maintains and perpetuates both delinquent and positive behavioral outcomes. The study concluded that there was a significant relationship between intimacy and deviant behaviors among the youth at Kamiti Youth Correctional and Training Centre, Kiambu. This means the youth at Kamiti Youth Correctional and Training Centre had high levels of intimacy which lowered their levels of deviancy.

VII. RECOMMENDATION

Counselors should collaborate with community workers, parents and teachers to provide the necessary support for the youth in order to help mitigate risk factors of deviant behaviors among the youth. Parents and guardians should always monitor the activities of their children at all times with the aim of curbing the negative behavior. They should also create an environment where the youth feel comfortable expressing their feelings and asking questions rather than micro-managing them. School Administrators should also provide counseling to students found with deviant behaviors rather than using extreme punitive measures such as suspension or expulsion from school for this does not necessarily reform such students. Correctional institutions ought to be remodeled to take into account the numerous factors that cause youth deviancy. They should be structured to address youth crime from a solution perspective but not from a direct approach of offenses and penalties.

References

- [1]. Akers, R. L. 2009. *Social Learning And Social Structure: A General Theory Of Crime And Deviance*. New Brunswick, Nj: Transaction
- [2]. Akers, R.L.(1985). *Deviant Behavior: A Social Learning Approach*. Belmont, Ca: Wadsworth Publishing Company
- [3]. Baumrind,D.(2013).*Authoritative Parenting Revisited: History And Current Status*. In R. E. Larzelere, A.S.Morris &A. W. Harrist (Eds.) *Authoritative Parenting: Synthesizing Nurture And Discipline For Optimal Child Development* (Pp. 11-34). Washington, Dc: American Psychological Association Press. Doi:10.1037/13948-002
- [4]. Bocar, A. (2014). *Common Factors Of Juvenile Delinquents Acts*. Conference Papers-American Society Of Criminology, [https://Doi:10.2139/SSm.2191280](https://doi.org/10.2139/SSm.2191280).
- [5]. Balwanz, D. (2012). *Youth Skills Development, Informal Employment And The Enabling Environment In Kenya: Trends And Tensions*. *Journal Of International Cooperation In Education*, 15(2), 69-91
- [6]. Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, Nj: Prentice Hall.
- [7]. Berger, C., Batanova, M., & Cance, J. D. (2015). *Aggressive And Prosocial? Examining Latent Profiles Of Behavior, Social Status, Machiavellianism, And Empathy*. *Journal Of Youth And Adolescence*, 44(12), 2230-2244. [https://Doi.Org/10.1007/S10964-015-0298-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/S10964-015-0298-9)
- [8]. Bradshaw, C. 2015. *Translating Research To Practice In Bullying Intervention*. *American Psychologist*, 70(4), 322-332.
- [9]. Cui, M., & Fincham, F. (2010). *The Differential Effects Of Parental Divorce And Marital Conflict On Young Adult Romantic Relationships*. *Personal Relationships*, 17(3), 331-343.
- [10]. Dai, L. And Wang, L. (2015) *Review Of Family Functioning*. *Open Journal Of Social Sciences*, 3, 134-141. Doi: 10.4236/Jss.2015.312014
- [11]. De Souza, J., Paul, P. (2013). *Perceived Paternal Parenting Style And Social Competence*. *Journal Of The Indian Academy Of Applied Psychology*, 39(1), 103-109.
- [12]. Dishion, Tj.; Patterson, Gr. *The Development And Ecology Of Antisocial Behavior In Children And Adolescents*. In: Cicchetti, D.; Cohen, Dj., Editors. *Developmental Psychopathology: Vol 3 Risk, Disorder, And Adaptation*. New York: Wiley; 2006. P. 503-541
- [13]. Eichelsheim, V. I., Buist, K., Deković, M., Wissink, I. B., Frijns, T., Van Lier, P. A. C., Koot, H. M., & Meeus,W.H.(2010). *Associations Among The Parent-Adolescent Relationship, Aggression And Delinquency In Different Ethnic Groups: A Replication Across Two Dutch Samples*. *Social Psychiatry And Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 45, 293-300.
- [14]. Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth And Crisis*, Norton, New York
- [15]. Farrington, D. P. (2010). *Family Influences On Delinquency*. In D. W. Springer, & A. R. Roberts (Eds.), *Juvenile Justice And Delinquency* (Pp. 203-222). Sudbury: Mass, Jones And Bartlett
- [16]. Finn, M., Momani, B., Opatowski, M., & Opondo, M. (2016). *Youth Evaluations Of Cve/Pve Programming In Kenya In Context*. *Journal For Deradicalization*, (7), 164- 224.
- [17]. Gaumon,S.,&Paquette,D.(2013).*The Father-Child Activation Relationship And Internalising Disordersat Preschool Age*. *Early Child Developmentand Care*, 183(3-4), 447-463. Doi:10.1080/03004430.2012.711593
- [18]. Goode, E. (2016). *Deviant Behavior* (11th Ed.). New York: Routledge.
- [19]. Hill Ne, Bromell L, Tyson Df, Flint R. (2007). *Developmental Commentary: Ecological Perspectives On Parental Influences During Adolescence*. *Journal Of Clinical Child And Adolescent Psychology*.; 36:367-377. [PubMed: 17658981]
- [20]. Institute Of Economic Affairs (2011). *Youth Research Compendum*, Nairobi
- [21]. Mulatie ,B. (2014). *Parental Practices Of Disciplining Children: Implication For The Major Intervention*. *International Journal Of Psychology And Counseling*, 6(3), 214-249.
- [22]. Nacada (2012). *A National Survey On The Magnitude Of Alcohol And Drug Abuse, Kenya, Nairobi*. Government Printer Nairobi: Kenya
- [23]. National Crime Research Centre (2016). *Election Crimes And Offenses In Kenya*. Nairobi.

- [25]. Ndibalema, P. (2013). Perceptions About Bullying In Secondary Schools In Tanzania; The Case Of Dodoma Municipality. *International Journal Of Education And Research* Vol. 1(5).
- [26]. Nwankwo, B., Nwoke, E. U., Chukwuocha, U. M., Obbany, A. O., Nwoga, K.C., Iwuagu, U.O., & Okereke C. (2010). Prevalence And Predictor Of Antisocial Behavior: A Cross-Sectional Survey Of Adolescents In Secondary Schools In Owerri Municipal, South-East, Nigeria. *Pakistan Journal Of Socio-Sciences* 7(2)129-136.
- [27]. Olson S, Sameroff A. (2009). *Biopsychosocial Regulatory Processes In The Development Of Childhood Behavioral Problems*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [28]. Ojo, M. O. D. (2012). A Sociological Review Of Issues On Juvenile Delinquency *The Journal Of International Social Research*, 5 (21) 465- 482.
- [29]. Talib, M. B. A., Abdullah, R., & Mansor, M. (2011). Relationship Between Parenting Style And Children's Behavior Problems. *Asian Social Science*, 7(12), 195.
- [30]. Wildeman, J. (2010). The Paternal Incarceration And The Children's Physically Aggressive Behaviors: Evidence From The Fragile Families And Child Wellbeing Study. *A Social Forces Study Journal*, 89(2), 285-310.