INSTITUTIONAL CARE FOR CHILDREN. A SURVEY OF RESIDENTIAL CHILD CARE INSTITUTIONS IN NAIROBI

BY

JAMES NGUNGU NJAGU

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS(in Sociology) AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI.

1995

DEDICATION

To Ann my wife, Carol Leah my daughter and njagu junior my son
for their encouragement and moral support.

This Thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university

----
JAMES NGUNGU NJAGU

This Thesis has been submitted with my approval as the University Supervisor.

DR. MAURI YAMBO

ABSTRACT

This study investigates some of the major factors which influence institutionalization of children in Nairobi, and the impact of institutionalization on their lives.

The study is based on the hypothesis that personal vulnerabilities such as being orphaned, abandoned or neglected must harmonize with other factors to cause institutional placement. The major argument was that personal vulnerability does not automatically lead to institutional placement and not all orphaned, abandoned and neglected children are institutionalised.

A sample of 210 respondents was interviewed, 140 of these were institutionalized children while 70 respondents were not institutionalized despite sharing similar characteristics with the institutionalized. The institutionalized were drawn from six children's homes while the uninstitutionalized were drawn from three primary schools. Six administrative officers from the six children's homes were also interviewed.

The key instrument of data collection was the interview schedule, which was used in both groups. However, unstructured interviews were also administered to key informants.

(i)

The study found that the majority of the institutionalized children never had or had inadequate social support from relatives. Besides, most of them hailed from impoverished socio-economic backgrounds, hence their parents could not afford for them some of the basic needs.

It was further found that institutionalised children saw some apparent benefits such as guaranteed clothing, education, food and infinite supply of friends and playmates. Therefore, institutions acted as rescue centres and a relief from some of their immediate problems. As such, 77.5% of the institutionalised preferred being in institutions to being in their previous homes. However, the age at institutionalization and the parental background of the respondents were found to have some significant influence on the attitude and integration of the respondents in the institution.

It was concluded that children's homes should act as crisis intervention centres incases of extreme poverty, neglect, abandonment and being orphaned. It was recommended that to control the population in institutions only the needy and desperate children should be institutionalized. To ensure this, it was recommended that only social workers should refer children to institutions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Through the years thoughtful people have observed that the family has been losing some of its roles. Many analysts have reported that the family has not been performing effectively some of the tasks traditionally entrusted to it such as production, education and protection (Goode, W. J. 1964). The family was obliged to ensure that protection and discipline was accorded to all children. The African extended family system provided for primary group care for orphaned, neglected or deprived children. These were children without parents but traditionally they were not defined as orphans because the tribe, the clan, the extended family offered the children the care they needed. Not only the parents, but even the larger family group assumed responsibility for the rearing of children.

Today, some of the family roles have been taken over by institutions. Urbanization and rural urban migration have led to disintegration of the extended family.

In view of the foregoing, institutionalization of children emerges as a practice that is inconsistent with the African customary practices. Child care homes seem to emerge as places for accommodating and taking care of children who for one reason or another, cannot continue with normal family life (Kadushin, 1980:390). The fact that these homes exist is indicative of some abnormalities within the African societies or family which had

1

always provided care for the children (UNICEF,1989). The purpose of this study is to examine the residential institutions for children in Nairobi and see how well they provide for children's physical and intellectual growth and how their services can be improved.

It was the concern of this study to find out the reasons that lead to institutionalization of children and the effect this has on them. There are three factors that form the basis of this study.

Studies have been carried out in an attempt to understand factors that lead to institutionalization of children and evaluations have been made of institutionalization as form of child care. Most of these studies have been done by western scholars such as Kadushin (1980), Goldfarb (1943), Simonsen (1943), and Bowlby (1952), and have tended to suggest that background factors such as destitution, absence of parents or relatives to provide care and poverty among others are the primary proximate determinants of institutionalization. Some of these claims, however, have remained unsupported by empirical evidence .

In any case, even if there was complete evidence in support of these contentions, the above factors stated as leading to institutional care would only be true regarding western societies on which the findings are based. As a matter of fact, Western and African societies are considered as different and as having

2

diverse social, political, economic and environmental patterns so that whatever happens in the west may not necessarily be applicable to Africa. This means that findings based on studies carried out in the west cannot be generalized and used in application to Kenya. Thus there is need to undertake such a study to determine whether or not the same factors in western societies are present in Kenya and if they are show the pattern through which they manifest themselves in Kenya.

Secondly, there are a number of studies which have been carried out in Kenya by scholars such as Onyango (1984), Bwibo (1982) and Muga (1971) among others on issues related to children. Such studies cover themes such as delinquency , child health, child labour, and problems of child abuse and neglect. However, these have not had the same focus as the current study and only a few have some distance bearing on the problem being addressed as will be seen later. These studies, including reports by the child welfare society of Kenya which are not based on any empirical study, seem to agree with western scholars that destitution is the primary factor leading to institutional care.

Besides merely mentioning destitution and delinquency these scholars have also gone ahead to attribute it to a much emphasized social change and disintegration of the African extended family though without elaborating on the patterns or dynamics of the destitution that leads to institutionalization of children. As such it is argued in this study that the issue of

3

institutionalization of children has not been adequately addressed.

Thirdly, there is an unresolved debate or controversy about the effects of institutionalization on children. Whereas some scholars have contended that institutional care adversely affects children Bowlby (1952) , Kemp (1976) Elkin (1962), others contend that institutional care actually provides solution to some of the problems that beset the children within their natural environment (Kadushin,1980: 289) and that institutional care provides children with happiness and meaning in life which they were deprived wherever they came from. In view of these its important to investigate and find out how institutional life affects children and how children's homes perform as alternatives to family care.

The major concern of this study was to find out the causes and effects of institutionalization as a form of child care in selected homes in Nairobi . In order to do these the study set out to:

1. Investigate the factors that lead to the establishment of the homes.

2. Investigate the factors that lead children to institutional life.

3. Find out the impact of institutional life on children.

4

4.   Compare life within different homes and see how
well they act as alternatives to family care.

1.2 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

This study was carried out in and around Nairobi. The
institutions covered were those that catered for children in
difficult circumstances and hence the children and officials of
these institutions were the respondents. The study covered both
public and private institutions.

There were two major limitations of this study. In seeking to
find out the actual factors leading to institutional care, the
current study used the institutionalized children as the unit of
analysis. The aim was to try and adduce background information
about the children from themselves. This could have been more
adequately achieved if the same information could have been
sought from any surviving relatives or parents of the children.
This would act as a check against any possible misinformation or
lack of information. However, this was not possible due to
constraints of time, finances and personnel. Besides, this would
have created an additional problem of selecting an appropriate
sampling method and size assuming that the parents or relatives
were traceable.

5

In trying to assess the effect of institutionalization on children, there was need for a study where, possibly the life prior to institutionalization of each child could be studied . This would be followed by other studies immediately after commencement of institutional care and after some years of institutionalization. However, this study was done during one visit due to some of the constraints mentioned above.

The stated limitations notwithstanding the current study is seen as significant in so far as it seeks to give certain information and make recommendations for the sake of those who are currently involved with child care with the aim of improving the child care standards in the existing homes, and identifying a better way of providing this care.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. INSTITUTIONAL CARE IN KENYA

For the first time in the history of Kenya, the problems of children "Juveniles" in need of care and protection was legally tackled in a 1953 report of the committee on young persons and children. The committee submitted some recommendations to the government for approval. These covered concepts like care and protection, delinquency, vagrancy, legitimacy, adoption, custody and maintenance. The committee recommended that the proposed ordinance should recognise and define voluntary homes to include orphanages and other homes or institutions supported wholly or partly by voluntary contributions for the care and maintenance of children needing a home. It was also to provide for supervision of children already in institutions. The report argued and quite rightly that the prevention of juvenile vagrancy depended more upon social and economical reforms than upon legislation. It stressed the point that juvenile vagrants are best treated at least in the first instance as being in need of care rather than as delinquents. Consequently, "Juvenile vagrants should not be associated with delinquents either in remand homes or in reformatories, as is the case many times in Nairobi where these type of children are put into remand homes or in approved schools" (Government of Kenya, 1953:4). Quite often children who are institutionalised do not need protection or discipline. Their parents or guardians need some financial assistance to maintain the children in their homes, where they will attend local schools and socialise with other children of their age.

7

This study,in which the reasons for institutionalisation are a major concern, seeks to determine:-

(a) If children in institutions really need protection;and,

(b) The means through which they ended up in institutions.

In 1982, there was a total of 5191 children in institutions registered under the Children's Department,Ministry of Home Affairs. On the method of referral, it was found that majority were referred by parents and police. Most of the children referred by police were those from Urban areas. Those referred by parents were mostly from rural areas. The major reasons were poverty and socio-economic problems (Muturi, M, 1984:11). Most of the children in the institutions have their parents, relatives and therefore there are alternatives other than institutionalisation.

Another study was done in 1961 and a report was published called "A survey of problems of child welfare in Kenya" The report was the outcome of the effort of various organisations especially interested in child welfare activities . The report suggested that institutions should be established for children who are orphaned and neglected. The survey found that the principal causes of neglect were "increasing lack of understanding by parents of the need of children in a situation of rapid social change and especially the decline of authority and responsibility of traditional institutions such as the clan; Poverty, dislocation of family life and parental control, broken homes,

divorce, prostitution and increase of unmarried mothers" (Onyango and Kayongo Male, 1987:16).

These appeared to be the main factors responsible for the neglect of children. The survey made the following recommendations:-

(a) Build more special institutions in Urban areas to provide for physical care of orphans.

(b) Build more places of safety throughout Kenya(Government of Kenya, 1961:54). This particular recommendation had considerable influence on the increase of residential institutions for child care in Nairobi from 1960 to the present day.

The report called for more training centers, clubs, hostels, equipment, more health workers and children officers and a closer coordination for all who are working in the field of child care. Its from this background that residential institutions for child care have been established in Kenya and mostly in Nairobi.

Muga (1971) found that there were 1171 children in approved schools. Returns kept at children's department in 1985 showed that there were 108 voluntary homes for child care and 9 approved schools.

Table 1:Institutions in kenya

Types of institutions	number of institutions	Number of children
Approved schools	9	1984
Remand homes	10	354
Voluntary homes	108	9150

SOURCE:Children's Department,Ministry of Home Affairs ANNUAL REPORT1985.

This shows that most of the children in institutions are not delinquents, this poses some questions such as: what are these other factors apart from delinquency that lead children to institutionalization? Which is the dominant reason for institutionalization. Is there a difference in terms of age, sex and family background among children in these institutions?

In Kenya, the first institutions for child care were approved schools meant for children who were delinquents. Today,it appears that most of the institutionalized children are not delinquents. Some of them have their parents and relatives. This study seeks to find out the reason for institutionalization and the criteria used in determining who should be institutionalized. The study will also answer the question, where do they come from? Do they all come from Urban areas?

Muga(1971) found that boys were more prone to institutionalization than girls. Rainer(1976) found that the highest percentages of girls in institutions were orphaned while most of the boys in institutions were delinquents. Most girls

10

came from rural areas while boys came from urban areas (Rainer, 1976:106). This cannot apply in the institutions today because street girls are also seen in urban areas just like boys. In conclusion, it should be tested in this study whether there is any relationship between sex,age,residential area and the reason for institutionalization. It is therefore hypothesized that institutionalization is related to:

      (a) age

      (b) sex

      (c) residential area

      (d) Socio - economic background

2.2 FACTORS LEADING TO INSTITUTIONALIZATION

It has been suggested that certain personal characteristics of the children influence or determine their institutional placement. In a study by Rainer (1976),it was concluded that delinquency and physical disability are among some personal factors that lead to institutionalization of children. Others have associated institutionalization to abandonment, neglect, child abuse and poverty by parents and relatives (FABIO, 1959:17). Kadushin (1980) and Onyango (1984) observed that parental related factors were dominant reasons for institutionalization.These factors included parental disability, unemployment, unmarried mothers and broken homes as the major reasons.

11

Institutional care is appropriate in many of the situations in which the child must be removed from his own home and be placed under substitute care for some indefinite period. Such a drastic change is necessary when the childs own home presents deficiences so serious that it can not provide the child with minimally adequate, social, emotional and physical care. It involves for the child, not only temporary total separation from his own family and adjustment to a new home but also change of location, change of school and change of peer and sibling group. (Kadushin,A. p.318).

Oxley (1977) argues that an institution is also appropriate for the child whose behaviour makes him difficult to live within a normal family setting. If the child is very aggressive and destructive, he can not live satisfactorily in the family. Furthermore the community might find it difficult to tolerate his behaviour.

The Us bureau of census contends that, only children who are dependent, neglected, handicapped and emotionally disturbed should be committed to institutions. The bureau has defined institutions as "homes covering orphanages, receiving homes or shelters which provide temporary care primarily to children whose homes have been broken by illness, desertion, death and social crises".

12

HAZEL (1976) a member of the council of Europe's Co-ordinated research group which examined the use of substitute care in seventeen different countries, summarized her experiences by noting that "in all industrialized and developing countries there are children who can no longer remain in their own home with their parents because society is no longer willing to tolerate their conduct or because their parents are ill, separated, have dissapeared or have neglected or ill treated their children".

Muga (1971) also notes that children in low socio-economic status are more prone to institutionalization. These are children who are born of poor parents such that its difficult to offer them with the very basic needs such as food, shelter and education.

It is important to know that even in case of all the mentioned circumstances, institutional care is not the only answer. Not every child in such circumstances is liable to institutional care. Oxley (1977) contends that institutional care is supposedly contraindicated for infants and very young children. Such children are too young to profit from group living and require the more intensive and mothering relationship that are more likely available in family setting.

Ideally, then, institutional placement is offered the child after some considered assessment of the situation. Ideally, the child should not end up in an institution simply because more desireable alternatives such as adoption by relatives are not

13

available. Institutional care should be treatment by default (Shulman, 1954, p.319).

HYLTON (1964) argues that variety of services should be offered in an attempt to retain the child in the community. Placement should not be sought lightly or offered as a reflect. Institutional care should not be the first choice but a followed attempt to deal with the problem in the community.

In view of the foregoing, it is evident that children with strong social relations such as relatives, can easily be rehabilitated outside institutions. Its therefore concluded that children without or with inadequate social relations are more prone to institutionalization. Oxley argues that institutional placement should be made only after prolonged services to the child in a real home environment.

Therefore, neglect abandonement, abuse and all the other difficult circumstances must harmonize with other factors to qualify for institutional placement. Such situations will not automatically lead to institutionalization.

Child care was traditionally rested upon the extended family. An understanding of why the family can no longer carry out this function effectively will also illuminate the reasons as to why the children have to be committed to institutional care.

14

There is a feeling among scholars on studies related to the family that although the extended family traditionally played the role of caring for the children, there has been a decline in performance of this role (Onyango, 1984). This change has been attributed to the disintegration of the family which has in turn been seen as caused by social change.

There is ample evidence that urbanization has disintegrated the family. Most abandoned, neglected and abused children are found in urban areas. Migration has led to single parenthood, unemployment and all this has led to suffering of children who can not be offered food, shelter and even clothing.

By way of conclusion to the discussion regarding the family, I wish to contend that disintegration of the family alone is not a reason adequate enough to explain or justify institutional care for children. Lack of family support only becomes crucial when the children are not able to get other means of subsistence eg through relatives, grandparents and friends. My contention is that children from broken families or who are delinquents or orphaned have some relatives who could offer alternative means of survival and will not be necessarily liable to institutional care. Having said this, I wish to hypothesize that disintegration of the family will lead to institutionalization of children who come from low income households.

15

In one 1963 study in America, interviews were held with children who were institutionalized. The principal reasons for institutionalization fell into two major groups:-

(i) child-related difficulties

(ii) parent-related difficulties.

The largest percentage of children required institutionalization because of parent-related difficulties. It is well known that the emotional bond between parents and the child presumably provides the bridge across which pass parental ideas and expectations (Mackinley, 1958:57).

The parent related difficulties identified by scholars in America included broken homes (Burt, 1947). Burt defined a broken home as one in which both or one parent is absent owing to death, desertion, separation, divorce or commitment to a career . A complete family that consists of a father, mother and their children is vital for development of a socially adjusted individual (Goode,1964:62). A study done in 1923 by the united states bureau of census reported that 56% of the children came from broken families. Gluecks in 1962 found that out of 1966 cases of delinquents, 48% came from broken homes. Burt (1925) did a study on delinquents and non-delinquents from the same culture, age, social status and living in the same area. Broken homes accounted for 61.3% of the families of delinquents and 25.1% of non-delinquents. Institutional care is appropriate in many of the situations in which the child must be removed from his own home and be placed under substitute care for some indefinite period.

Parent related difficulties are the major reasons for institutionalization of children (Kadushin, 1980:631).

Almost all the studies done in America imply or show that parent-related difficulties and especially in broken homes were the dominant reasons for institutional care of children. Studies in Kenya show that child related difficulties such as delinquency, physical disabilities are some of the major reasons for institutionalization. On parent-related difficulties unemployment and consequently poverty are some of the reasons.

Studies done in Kenya have not tried to show which are the dominant reasons: parent-related or child-related difficulties. This study seeks to establish the dominant factor for institutionalization in different institutions for effectiveness in correction and rehabilitation. This study will examine whether the case in Kenya is similar to that of America. It will therefore be tested whether parental reasons dominate and if they dominate which is the major aspect of parental related difficulty that is dominant.

Studies done in Kenya indicate child abuse and neglect which is caused by early parenthood, unemployment, large families and poverty as the major reasons for substitute care for children (see Onyango, 1984 and Anppcan 1991). Children who live in the streets have been found to come from large families (Kanene, 1989:2).

Studies done in most parts of the world have continuously blamed the family for many problems related to children. Rainer (1976) claims that there are also external factors that lead to institutional care. To find out the truth of the matter in Kenya, this study tries to find out whether parent or family related difficulties dominate as factors creating a need for institutionalization. At this point,its hypothesized that parent related difficulties as compared to child-related difficulties dominate as the major reasons leading to institutionalization of children. This will lead to a comparison of both parent and child related-difficulties to see which one dominates.

2.3 EFFECTS/IMPACT OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION ON CHILDREN

In considering previous studies dealing with effects of institutionalization on children, a dual pattern seems to emerge. There are those scholars (among them Kadushin(1980), Heywood (1959), Sjolund(1978) who view institutional care rather positively and as a remedy on problems that beset the children in society. On the other hand, there are scholars like David and Appel,(1961), Bowlby,(1952),(Elkin),(1952), Simonsen,(1947) Goldfarb, (1952) and Obers(1950), who view institutional care rather negatively and see it as adversely affecting development of children. Retardation is associated with early commitment, whereas children diagonised as schizophrenic tend to have been institutionalized at a later age (Elkin,1962:61).

18

The proponents of institutionalization see it as providing the children with what their immediate original parents could not give them. In institutions, it would seem that their well being is enhanced when they are placed within an interpersonal environment of a congregate setting (Peterson, 1985:390).

When one recalls some of the factors given as leading to institutional placement of the children, one can appreciate the .implied positive effects of institutional care. If children can get from the institutions certain basic requirements which lacked in their places of origin, then institutional care would seem to provide a better alternative to them. If this is so, then it can be rightly asserted as Kadushin (1980) says that institutional care enhances the well - being and development of children. There are other scholars who see institutional care as only having negative impacts on children.

Goldfarb (1952), for example, did a study on institutionalized children with regard to personality disturbances. He found out that "the institutionalized children present a history of aggressiveness, destructible, and uncontrolled behaviour". Normal patterns of anxiety and self inhibition are not developed. Human relationships and identifications are limited and relationships are weak and easily broken (Goldfarb, 1952:36). Kemp also collected information on prostitutes in Copenhagen and he found that 1/3 of them had not been brought up at home but had spent

19

their childhood under institutionalization and foster home (Quoted by Bowlby, 1952:35).

Such Scholars see institutionalization as a process of depersonalization especially given that the children in such homes are subject to patterned ways of living where every one does the same thing to the extent that there is no room for one to assert one's individuality or discretion (Tibbits, 1952:171). The institutionalized children are further portrayed as isolated from the rest of society suffering from maternal deprivation, damage of one's dignity and loss of emotional attachment (Bowlby, 1954).

As was shown in the initial Chapters, children's homes in Kenya are managed by different organisations and others by the government. It is the contention of these study that the different managements will reflect difference in degrees of discipline, protection, treatment and rehabilitation. To effectively assess the impacts of institutionalization on children, different homes (institutions) are compared and contrasted.

consequence

Another impact of institutionalization that has been suggested is lack of family intimate relationship. Goldfarb concluded that the institutionalized children seem to be abandoned by members of their families, it may be true that family relations among the institutionalized children either improve or decline with

20

institutionalization. However, no study in Kenya has been done to verify this. Simonsen, 1947 compared a group of 113 children aged over four years almost all of whom had spent their whole lives in one or some of the different institutions, with a comparable group who lived at home and attended nurseries. The mothers of these children were working and their homes were often very unsatisfactory. Even so the average DQ[1] of the family children was normal, 102; while that of the institutionalized children retarded, 93 (Simonsen, 1947:19).

In Kenya, a study done on street children in 1991 by ANPPCAN found that 105 of them had been once or twice in institutions (ANPPCAN, 1991:32). The major question in this study is whether institutions are shaping or harming children.

From the brief discussion on literature relating to the impacts of institutionalization on the children, an important fact that emerges is that there is no agreement as to whether institutional care affects children positively or negatively. The two divergent views can be summarised as follows:-
Whereas one group sees institutionalization as counterproductive instead of rehabilitating children placement is seen in the latter case as not only alienating the children from the rest of the community, but even from their own selves.

---

[1] N.B (DQ - The development quotient is concerned with the general, physical and mental development of which intelligence is only a part. A DQ of 90-100 represents average development).

Given these differing views, one may not be able to assert categorically that institutionalization invariably has either negative or positive impacts on children of the two opposing views. It would be a little presumptuous for one to point at one view as definitely true, to the exclusion of others.

In order to strike a balance between these two views, the study proposes that a truly objective assessment of the impacts of institutionalization on the children must take into consideration the following:-

(i) Age at institutionalization

(ii) The environment where the child was prior to institutional placement

(iii) The new environment in which the children are trying to adjust (within the institutions). The essence of this is to see how one environment differs from another.

It can be expected that if, for instance, in their previous environments, the children suffered certain deprivations which they are able to get within the institutions, then to such children institutional care will definitely be a relief and a solution to some of their previous problems. If this is so, then it can be asserted that institutionalization enhances the well being of the children who come from poor parental backgrounds. But such a statement is only based on the assumption that the new environment is actually an improvement over the previous one.

In considering the impact of institutionalization on children, its important to note that its difficult to establish a direct cause-effect relationship between the factor of institutionalization and any observable characteristic traits of the children. The reason for this is that there may be certain intervening factors which unless identified, may lead to wrong conclusions e.g:-

   (i) Behaviour which can be attributed to the previous history and environment of the institutionalized persons.

   (ii) Behaviour attributed to conditions prevailing in the institutions.

In concluding this discussion, we can say in summary and by way of hypothesizing that:-

   (i) The impact of institutionalization on children will depend on their pre-institutional background (background can be social, economic and physical).

   (ii) The impact of institutionalization of children will depend on the environment within the institution (environment can be both social and physical).

2.4 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

STRUCTURAL FUNCTIONALISM

The functionalist perspective has had a long and controversial part to play in the development of sociological theory (Morgan

D.H.J. 1975,p 17). The juxtaposition of the words 'family' and 'function' appears almost inevitably irrespective of the degree of committment or otherwise to an overall functionalist theory of society (Goode ,1982).

A distinction can be made between two major contexts in which the functional approach has been developed. The first identified largely with Durkheim and Parson, is that of a general macro theory of society. The concern is with developing some model of a society or a social system and examination of the way in which the various parts or levels are linked together. The problem is the problem of order seen largely from a perspective which emphasizes consensus and intergration. At a very general level it may be said that functionalism in this context is concerned with the relationship between 'parts' and 'wholes'. The second context in which functionalism has developed is as a mode of inquiry.

These two contexts are of course interdependent. A functionalist approach to a particular problem derives, directly or indirectly from a wider theory. But a functional approach or orientation can also to some extent exist independently of an assent to an overall functionalist theory. Thus we may ask, what are the functions of the family without necessarily committing ourselves to a funtionalist model of society as a whole or to the assumption that everything has a function.

24

Functionalism and the family;

The simplest statement about the functions of the family is that the family is a universal institution and must therefore perform some universal functions. (Murdock G P, 1949). A slightly more sophisticated and reversed version of this assumption is that there are certain basic functional pre-requisites that must be met if the society is to survive and the institution of the family is unequaly or best able to meet this functions. This version does imply however that it might be possible for other institutions to fulfill some or all these functions at least at some stages in the future.

These rather simplistic perspectives are opposed by another functionalist orientation which recognizes that the family can loose some of its functions or that the functions can change. Thus the institution of the family is not inextricably bound up with some universal and necessary functions.

Proponents of functionalist school of thought see a family as having some definate functions. Coser(1965) comes up with a list of the "main functions of the family" such as; reproduction, economic activities, socialization of the young which includes imposition of social norms, bestowing of social identity to its members. In these tasks the family ensures the victory of the social over the biological.

25

Parsons (1965) whose approach to the family is functional counters those critics who argues that the family is facing dissolution and a loss of function by arguing that we are witnessing a process of change rather than one of dissolution. Thus the family was once an economic unit of production and consumption as well as a residential unit; with the industrial revolution the production function was taken out of the home into a specialized factory. The functions that now the family performs on behalf of the society are more indirect. To understand the functions of the family we must look specificaly at the ways in which it functions on behalf of the individual as a member of society.

The family is not, therefore, facing dissolution but has become stripped down two essential functions. Its most important function is that of the socialization of the child. This is functional both for the individual personalities of the children and for society as a whole. Parsons account of the socialization process is the most detailed and the most complex part of his overall functional analysis of the family. He notes that the socialization function of the family operates on behalf of both the social system and the personality system. It is for this reason that in his analysis of the socialization process, parsons does not confine himself to cultural or social as parts of socialization but also devotes much space to a more or less freudian approach of psycho-sexual development.

Second, this socialization function is the _prime_ responsibility of the nuclear family. This would be true in all cultures but, argues Parsons, the modern nuclear family is heavily specialized in this direction.

Third, Parsons sees importance of the fact that the nuclear family is typically a small group and says that smallness is ·important in that it contributes to the frequency and intensity of the interaction within the family system.

We are now in a position to examine some of the main elements in Parsons analysis of the socialization process. Parsons argues that the process of Socialization is somewhat a kin to the process of therapy. A patient enters into a relationship with a therapist. This relationship passes through several stages, permisiveness, support, denial of reciprocity and manipulation of rewards. In very general terms its essential for a patient to enter into a relationship with the therapist and yet, if he is to benefit from the therapy, to pass through this stages and severe his relationship with the therapist at the end. (Parsons, 1965, P. 215). He at one level seems to extend the theories of G. H. MEAD when he says that socialization is an interactive process between the mother and the child whereby the child learns to identify with the mother and internalize her values.

In this study, the subjects are children who have been moved out of their families due to various reasons and are being brought up

in children homes. The functionalist school of thought stresses that the family have some specific functions. One of the functions of the family and the most important is <u>socialization</u>. The major question in this study is how effective are institutions in playing some of the prime functions of the family such as socialization? Can any difference be noted interms of socialization, interaction and identification between these children brought up in institutions and those ones brought up at home? How effective is socialization that is done in a group by a surrogate mother?

Referring to the socialization model by parsons, socialization is the prime responsibility of the family, its effective in small families. The institution or a children's home is a totally different environment from an ideal home where children are socialized in a big group. The study seeks to compare the process of socialization in the home with that one of an institution and see whether there is any difference in terms of personality development.

The functional approach of the family striked the researcher to find out whether institutions can play the roles of the family and how effectively.

28

2.5 HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses are tested in this study:-

H_1 Institutionalization is directly related to:-

(a)Age

(b)Sex

(c)Residential area (area of origin)

H_2 Children who have low socio-economic status and lack social support are most likely to be institutionalized.

H_3 Parent related difficulties mostly contribute to the institutionalization of children more than the child related difficulties.

H_4 The impact of institutionalization depends on:-

(a) Age at institutionalization

(b) Socio-economic background of the children and life prior to institutionalization.

(c) Physical and social environment of the home.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1. Area of Study

This study was conducted within Nairobi Province. The population studied was obtained from residential child care institutions which are found within Nairobi. Nairobi was chosen because it is the Capital City of Kenya and has been known to harbour children from all parts of the country. Studies done in the past show that Nairobi leads in the list of towns with many abandoned, neglected and delinquent children (ANNPCAN, 1991:14). The number of parentless children in the streets of Nairobi and those abandoned elsewhere is increasing rapidly and it has been observed that many of them come from within the slums of Nairobi. This made the study in Nairobi an eye opener to the situation in other urban areas. The other reason for choosing Nairobi as a site for this study was that its the town with the highest number of residential institutions for child care.

Nairobi province is bordered on all sides by three provinces namely:- Central, Eastern and Rift Valley provinces. It has an area of 648 square Kilometer with an approximate population of 2.5 million people (Kenya population census 1979). The city has a heterogeneous population comprising at least each of the Kenyan ethnic groups. The city of Nairobi can be divided into three major areas which are: the industrial area (towards the South and East of the city), Central Business District (CBD) and the residential areas. The study will cover different parts of the city where child care institutions are found.

3.2. Sources of Data

For this research, both the primary and secondary sources of data were used. Primary data was obtained by interviewing children and staff in their respective institutions and also officers from children's department under the Ministry of Home Affairs. To supplement this data, records from the institutions and children's department were reviewed. This formed the secondary sources of data. A control group of children who are not institutionalized but share same characteristics were also interviewed.

3.3. Sampling Procedure

The target population in this study was the institutionalized children. These are children of diverse ages who have been committed to the care of children homes due to certain reasons which the study seeks to find out. In Kenya children homes are categorized into two; (i) Voluntary children homes, (ii) Public or Government owned approved school. For this study only children homes but not approved schools were included in the sample. Approved schools are for normal children but who are delinquents, who go there for discipline but not for care or treatment. For this reason they were not included in the sample. Only children homes which cater for children aged over five were included in the sample because children under this age could not answer the questions and therefore were not interviewed.

In Kenya there are 103 voluntary children homes which are gazetted under cap 141, laws of Kenya. Today 6 are closed due to various reasons but 97 are in operation. (Annual report, children's department 1991: 17 - 24). Voluntary children homes gazetted under cap. 141 laws of Kenya are scattered within all towns in Kenya. Since the study was concerned with children homes in Nairobi, only children homes in Nairobi were included in the sample. Sampling was done at two levels. Because it was very hard to visit all homes, a sample of homes was selected and further sampling was done to get the respondents in the chosen homes.

Within Nairobi there are 14 homes which are registered with children's department (Ministry of Home Affairs) . A sample of 6 homes was selected out of the 14 homes (42%). To get the 6 homes simple random sampling was done where the names of all the 16 homes were written in pieces of paper and the reseacher selected six papers randomly. Further sampling was done in the homes. In every home a list of all the children who are aged between 8-16 was prepared and this provided the sampling frame.A sample of 1/3 of the total population was taken.From the sampling frame ,K was determined and every Kth item was interviewed (N/n = K).
Administrators in these homes were the key informants. In addition to this sample it was imperative to select a control group of about half the size of the experimental group. This comprised children who were not in institutions but shared certain characteristics with the institutionalized ones.

The rationale for having a control group was that if institutionalization was to be considered as a variable in this study, then certain uninstitutionalized children had to be included. Otherwise as long as the sample contained only institutionalized persons, institutionalization would remain a constant and not a variable. Secondly, the use of a control group would further strengthen the findings and validity of the study. With the control group it will be possible to do the comparisons and to see the actual differences between those children who ended up in institutions for child care and those who remained within their natural environments despite sharing the same broad characteristics.

In selecting a control group, purposive sampling was done. This was because it was impossible to prepare a sampling frame from which to draw the desired sample. It was also important to include in the sample only those children with certain characteristics and this could not have been left to chance. A sample of 70 was selected for the control group. The main criteria used was:-

1.   Proximity: The control group was selected from among children living in their homes but within the community or residential area where most children in institutions were found to come from. This was done in order to control for cultural diversity between the experimental and the control

group.   Residence was also controlling for socio-economic status.

It was found that most of the children in institutions came from Nairobi (75%) and were found to come from the slums of Nairobi mainly Mathare and Kibera.   90% of those in Mama Fatuma were found to come from Eastleigh. Due to the above   reasons the control group was collected from the three areas ie. Mathare, Kibera and Eastleigh. Because it was very hard to get them in their homes, schools neighbouring these areas were visited and purposive sampling was done with the help of the teachers to get the respondents. Only children who were orphaned, single parented, semi-orphaned were included in the sample.

Three schools were therefore visited to get a control group of 70 children namely:-

1.   Pumwani Primary school in Eastleigh

2.   Shadrack Kimalel Primary school in Kibera

3.   Mathare Primary School neighbouring Mathare

Other characteristics such as socio-economic status of parents in terms of income and occupation which could not be controlled still provided vital information and bases for comparing and contrasting the two groups.

2.   Sample size: The percentage of those included in the
        sample from each community had to be the same with the
        one drawn from homes.

Table 3.1 Distribution of respondents (control Group)

School   Residential Area   No. of respondents

·1. Pumwani primary   Eastleigh   18

2. Kimalel primary   Kibera   30

3. Mathare primary   Mathare   22

        Total   70

--Table3.2   Homes/Institutions visited and the distribution of
sample.

Institution	total no. of children interviewed	Total no. of children in the institution	%
1.Barnados home	23	104	16.4
2.Dagorreti children home	25	78	17.9
3.sos village	30	173	21.4
4.Mama ngina	19	51	13.6
5.Edelvale home	18	60	12.9
6.Mama Fatuma	25	121	17.9
Total	140	587	100.0

When sampling children, the following factors were considered:-

1. Age: – Only children between 8 – 16 years were included in
    the interviews. The decision was based on the fact that
    children under 8 years are incapable of giving reliable
    answers to interviewers. Children over 16 years are not
    classified strictly anymore to be children. Age was the main
    factor that influenced sampling.

2. Children were excluded if they had physical or mental
    conditions so extreme that they could not reply
    intelligently.

At Dagoretti Children's Home only normal children were included
in the sample. SOS children's home produced the highest
percentage of the respondents (21.4%) while Edelvale had the
lowest (12.9%). The notable difference in the number of
respondents between the institutions, can be explained in terms
of differences in the total number of children in the institution
and their ages. Suffice here to state that Edelvale children's
home is the least populated of the six institutions that
constitute the sample of the study, while SOS children's home has
the highest number of children.

The second reason why SOS children's home produced a higher
percentage of respondents was because most of the children there
were over eight years and therefore could be interviewed.
Although Dr. Barnados children's home has a high population most
of the children were below the age of eight and therefore could
not be interviewed.

3.4   Description of institutions chosen

(i)   Dagoretti Children Center

This home is approximately 15 kms. from the center of Nairobi in the Dagoretti corner.   It is one of the earliest residential institutions in Nairobi established in 1953.   Its main purpose is to meet the emotional and physiological needs of the handicapped and abandoned children.   There is a total of 206 (male 133, female 78, able 78, disabled 128) children there.   The main reason for putting up this institution here was to meet the great need to care for handicapped and malnourished children from the Kiambu area.

The objectives are:-

1.   Promote the welfare of undernourished children.

2.   To rehabilitate the handicapped and abandoned children and provide education services upto Std. 7.

Buildings:

There are six blocks of buildings there, all of permanent structure and fairly `well maintained.   The sleeping places are dormitory type.   They are overcrowded and lack sufficient baths and washing facilities.   They care for children of different types i.e. malnourished children, abandoned children, mentally and physically handicapped as well as for deaf children.

The staff/child ratio in this home is 1:3.   There is only one trained nurse.

Sources of income: the sources of income are partly from private individuals. Red Cross and the Local Government.

(ii) Dr. Barnados (Thomas Barnados House)

    This home was founded in 1961.   It is approximately 5 kms. from the city center on the road to Ngong near Wilson Airport. There are 104 children in this home. 48 girls and 56 boys.

Buildings: The buildings are well maintained. There are four main blocks of buildings: office blocks, block for older children, dormitories. The children are grouped in a family way, each family having a house mother with the bigger boys having a house father. The ages of these children vary from infants to 16 years old.   The home was founded to meet the great need for abandoned children in Nairobi after emergency had ended.   Over 65% of the children are orphans and semi orphans.

The purpose of this home is to care for orphans and abandoned children in Kenya irrespective of race, religion or colour. The general objectives are:-

    (i) Provide residential care for orphaned and abandoned
         children.

    (ii) Educate them from 1 - 8.

    The staff children ratio is 1:4

    Main source of Income: Dr. Barnados Home in Britain.

                            Private organizations such as C.C.F &

                            Royal club etc.

(iii) SOS children's village

This village is one of the outstanding and unique institutions in Nairobi, built in 1972. It is a small village with 15 family houses and the youth hostel. Each house comprises a family with a house mother and approximately 8 - 10 children.

The overall administration and direction is under a director and his assistant. Its general goal is to provide orphaned and abandoned children from Kenya with a new home. 90% of the children are orphans and semi-orphans.

The total number of children residing in this home is 173. 70 are males 103 are female.

The staff child ratio is 1:5.

Sources of Income:

1. Municipal Council

2. Overseas donors

3. Local organizations.

Buildings: - Cottage type.

(v) Mama Ngina Children's Home

The home belongs to the child welfare society. It is 5 Kms from the city center, just off the road to Mombasa. The home cares for 51 boys and girls. It was built to cater for the ever increasing number of babies and children found abandoned in the streets of Nairobi. Its main purpose therefore is to care for orphans and children from broken families and to find foster parents for these children. 75% of the children are orphans and

39

semi-orphans.   Great efforts are made to find foster parents and
the home is placing 20 children per year with foster parents.

Buildings: -   The   home   is   a   one block   unit   of   permanent
structure.   It is dormitory type.

(v)   Edelvale

This institution is   approximately 12 kms   from the city   center,
off   the Outering road.   It was   established in 1959.   It is an
institution   which looks   exclusively   after girls   aged   8 - 16
years.   It was established by the sisters of Our Lady of Charity.
The   purpose is to help   girls facing moral   and social problems.
At Edelvale, girls live   in groups of   15 in four self   contained
cottages each with a group mother.

    The home is staffed by a community of the Sisters of Charity
together with four employed house mothers.

    Funds for maintenance comes mainly from regular fund raising
efforts.   Some children   are sponsored by   individuals or firms,
those   committed   through   the   court   are   maintained   by   the
children's department.

Buildings: -   It is a cottage type institution system much like
SOS village.

It is   presently catering for 60   girls.   There are   7 members of
staff.

(vi)   Mama Fatuma: This   home is in Eastleigh just off Eastleigh
2nd   avenue.   It   was   started   in   1966   by   Kenya   Women's
Organization.   It caters   for 63 boys   and 58 girls.   Today the
home is run by an individual (Mama Fatuma).

40

Its main objectives are:-

(i)   To care for orphaned children

(ii) To care for children from disadvantaged children.

Their source of income is: - Private Individuals.

Buildings: The building they are using is a former residential house comprising 4 rooms; kitchen, dining room and toilet.

3.5 Problems Encountered in the Field

At the beginning general problems arose due to the fact that some of the administrators were suspicious of the interview as well as the motive behind the interview.   After explaining and personal discussions with the administrators, this matter was completely solved and we received every cooperation from the staff.

Of a different nature were the problems reported in getting information on touchy subjects such as parental background, who brought you here, a good number of children could not remember anything about their parental background or life prior to institutionalization.   This was because some of them were institutionalized when very young. Others were not truthful in their answers to those questions, almost all of them wanted to create an impression that they had no parents.   This was solved by consulting each and every file for any child being interviewed.   The file contained the following information.

1.   Name

2.   Tribe

3.   Place of origin

4.   Parental background

5.   Year admitted

6.   Reason for admission

7.   Life history before institutionalization.

This made the interviews take a longer time than anticipated.

The third problem was availability of children for interviews. This research was conducted from October to early January. This was because almost all children in institutions are schooling and therefore they could only be interviewed during weekends. This problem made the research take longer period than expected. The research took 12 weeks while it was expected to take 5 weeks.

Unwillingness of children to answer questions was a major problem. This forced the researchers to look for alternative children every time.

3.6 Methods of Data Collection

Four methods were used for data collection. These included interviews of sampled respondents, observation, key informant interviews and review of documentary materials.

(1) Structured Interviews

The interview schedule was the major tool for data collection. This method was selected because most of the respondents were not competent enough to respond to written questions. This method was found advantageous because it gave

room for checking any misunderstanding of a question, probing and also provided an opportunity for making observations. The interview schedule had both open and closed ended questions. The questions mainly revolved on areas considered as cardinal to the research such as personal characteristics of respondents background information about parents, life prior to institutionalization, life in the institution, and reasons for institutionalization among others. These questions provided the basis for testing of the research hypothesis. There were two sections (Experimental vs Control group).

(ii) Observation:

In these study observations were simultaneously carried out with other methods. The choice of this method was based on the fact that, given the exploratory nature of this study, the method would facilitate observation of significant features of institutional care which were little known. It would allow for first-hand perception of what actually takes place in the homes, rather than relying entirely on questions.

There were several things that did not need any questioning such as the physical set up of the institution, daily activities and arrangements of structures in the institution among others.

(iii) Secondary Data

Secondary data refers to the documented information available about the subject of research. In the institutions personal files for the interviewed children were reviewed to counter-check

43

on the information given earlier. The personal files contained personal information ie. age, sex, place of birth, year of institutionalization, life prior to institutionalization and reasons for institutionalization among others (case history). Those supplemented the information they gave. In all institutions except Mama Fatuma there was documented information about the history of the institution, year started, objectives, daily activities among others. This supplemented the information given by key informants.

(iv) Key informant interviews

Interviews were conducted with certain key informants. These included officials from the children's department within the Ministry of Home Affairs, Administrators of these institutions and a section of mothers who care for children. These interviews were both structured and unstructured. The aim of key informant interviews was to obtain information about management of the homes, objectives, performance of the home and any other relevant information on the topic.

In cases where interviews were not structured, field notebooks were used. They were used to record any observation or information that was not covered in the questionnaire. Notebooks thus supplemented interview schedules.

44

3.7. <u>HYPOTHESES AND OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF VARIABLES</u>

There are four main hypotheses in this study.

The operational definitions of the key variables of the hypotheses form the subject of this section.

H_1 Reason for institutionalization is directly related to age, sex and residential area.

Dependent variable:-Reason for institutionalization

Independent :- sex, age and residential area.

H_2 Children who have low socio-economic status and lack social support are most likely to be institutionalized.

Dependent variable:-   Institutionalization

Independent variable:-   Socio-economic   status,   social support.

H_3 Parental related difficulties mostly contribute to the institutionalization of children more than child related difficulties.

Dependent variable:-   Institutionalization

Independent variable:-   Parental   difficulties,   child related difficulties.

H_4 The impact of institutionalization on children will depend on : (a) age at institutionalization

            (b) Socio-economic background of the children

(c) Life prior to institutionalization.

Dependent: Impact of institutionalization

Independent: Life prior to institutionalization, age and Socio-
                economic background of the children.

DEFINITION OF VARIABLES

Institutionalization:- This was used to refer to the act of
committing a child to the care and supervised routine of a home
for child care. A child who lives in such a home for shelter ,
care, protection, discipline was considered as institutionalized
(institutionalization and institutional care here are used as
synonyms).

The reasons for institutionalization were measured using the type
of need e.g whether one was institutionalized for treatment,
protection, care or discipline.

Age: Years since birth at the time of institutionalization

Sex: Whether male or female

Residential area: where the child was living before
                institutionlisation whether rural or urban.

Socio-Economic Status:-

Socio-economic status is used to represent the social and
economic position that the children held prior to
institutionalization. Indicators for socio- economic status

46

included family background in terms of size, occupation of parents, income, residence and level of formal education of parents and marital status of parents.

SOCIAL SUPPORT:

The word social support is used to refer to any social relations and forms of assistance received from such relation that the child had before institutionalization. Social relations considered include relatives and parents of the children. To measure social support, questions were asked concerning:-

1) Frequency of contact that he or she had with the social relation prior to institutionalization.

2) Frequency, amount and type of care or support that the children received from social relation. If there is no social relationship that the child had and if the child had relatives who were not taking care then he or she would be considered as lacking social support.

Parent related difficulties

These are difficulties related to the family such as : broken homes, prostitution , single parenthood, divorce, abandonment, abuse, mother or father sickness and poverty.

Child related difficulties

These will include delinquency, physical disabilities of children, dropping out of school and child sickness.

Impact of Institutionalization

These refer to the positive or negative effect of institutionalization on children. It refers to the benefits or deprivations that the children experienced within the homes. The indicators used includes degree of integration within the homes and the attitude of children towards the same.

3.8 Methods of data analysis

In analysing the data, the following statistical tools have been employed:

a) Descriptive statistics

b) Inductive statistics

In this study, both descriptive and inferential statistics have been calculated using a computer. Specifically the study use the Statistical Package for social sciences (SPSS) program in computing all the statistics.

a) Descriptive statistics

These statistical tools perform the first function of statistics. They afford condensed and summarised description of units in regard to enumerable or measurable characteristic (Hagood 1969). They are thus summarising measures that are used to condense raw data into forms which supply useful information efficiently. Descriptive statistics used in this study include: Mean, Range and standard deviation .

b) INFERENTIAL STATISTICS

In contrast with descriptive statistics, inferential statistics deals with methods of drawing conclusions or making decisions about populations on the basis of samples. The inferential statistical tools that are used by this study are: (i) Cross tabulation (ii) measures of association (iii) Chi-square (iv) Regression analysis.

(1) Measures of association.

A measure of association indicates how strongly two variables are related with each other. The measures of association used in this study are contingency coefficient (c), pearson product moment coefficient (r). Correlation measures the direction and strength of relationship between two variables. It indicates whether the relationship is negative or positive and whether its weak or strong. The correlation coefficient (r) helps in calculating the percentage of variance explained in the dependent variable due to change in the independent variable. This value is given by the square of the correlation coefficient (r^2).

(2) Chi-square

This is a test of statistical significance which helps us to determine whether a systematic relationship exist between two variables. It measures whether something observed differs significantly from something expected.

(3) Regression analysis

49

Regression analysis is used to predict the exact value of one variable from knowledge of another. It helps to answer the question of how much an increment in one variable produces an increment in another. The study applies two closely related techniques of regression analysis, namely multiple regression and stepwise regression. Stepwise regression allows a researcher to determine from among the set of independent variables, that which best explains the dependent variable. Through its application the study is able to determine the individual contribution of each predictor in explaining the dependent variable while taking into account interrelationships among the predictors.

A PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS ON FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE INSTITUTIONALIZATION,BACKGROUNDS OF THE INSTITUTIONALIZED CHILDREN AND THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARDS INSTITUTIONS.

4.1.0: BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INSTITUTIONALIZED CHILDREN

This chapter presents and discusses the findings of the study, using descriptive statistics such as the measures of central tendency which include the mean, mode and median. Simple tables and percentages are also used to make the discussion more elaborate. Rigorous analysis of data and testing of hypotheses will be the subject of the next chapter.

4.1.1: Individual attributes of respondents in the institutions.

As stated before, the 140 respondents interviewed were from six children's homes in Nairobi.

This study shed some light on the individual attributes of the interviewed children. Some of the major attributes such as sex and age, religion, place of birth, and residential area are discussed here.

TABLE 4.1 Distribution of respondents by sex:

Sex	Number of respondents	%
Male	67	48.6
Female	73	51.4
Total	140	100.0

Of the total sample of 140 cases, 51.4% were female while 48.6% were males. It was found that in all institutions the number of girls and boys admitted was almost equal. Among the institutions visited five out of six were mixed, one was not. Edelvale children's home admitted female children only. This is the reason why female respondents are many.

Age ranged from 8 years to 16 years with a mean of 12 years. However the modal age was 14 years.

4.1.2. Place of birth of the respondents

Among the interviewed children 30% lived in Nairobi prior to institutionalization,10% could not tell where they came from, 10.7% came from Muranga and 20.7% from Kiambu. The findings show that 61.4% of the respondents came from the three neighbouring areas, Nairobi, Muranga and Kiambu. The other districts had only 26%. This finding supports the casual observation made in the field that the majority of the children in institutions come from Nairobi and areas neighbouring Nairobi.

Some of the reasons that could be attributed to this difference are that Nairobi being the capital city of Kenya attracts many adults who come for employment. Often they bring children along and some of them later abandon them because they cannot afford to bring them up. The finding supports Onyango's contention that Nairobi leads in the list of towns with many abandoned, neglected and delinquent children(ANNPCAN, 1991:14).

52

Due to problems of unemployment and high standards of living in Nairobi most parents can no longer afford the basic needs of their children. As Umbima (1989) argues,the parents of most abandoned children are to a large extent under-employed or unemployed. Due to such kind of problems in Nairobi and areas neighbouring it most children find themselves in children homes. Table 4.2 below shows the districts where children came from.

Table 4.2. <u>Distribution by place of birth.</u>

District	No. of respondents	%
Muranga	15	10.7
Kiambu	29	20.7
Nairobi	42	30.0
Machakos	5	3.6
Turkana	3	2.1
Mombasa	3	2.1
Kisumu	7	5.0
Kitui	4	2.9
Kajiado	4	2.9
Narok	2	1.4
Kakamega	3	2.1
Meru	5	3.6
Nyeri	2	1.4
Marsabit	1	.7
Non Kenyan	1	.7
Don't know	14	10.0
Total	140	100.0

10% of the children could not tell about their place of birth. This was because most of them were abandoned and institutionalized when very young and they don't know who were their parents or where they came from. Districts which are far from Nairobi are represented by five or less children.

53

4.1.3: <u>Ethnic background of the children.</u>

From the study's findings 61.4% of the respondents were Kikuyus and 12.1% were Kambas. The rest of the ethnic groups were represented by less than 4 children. The reason why there are so many Kikuyus in these homes is that most of the hinterland of Nairobi is Kikuyu country. Furthermore,the Kikuyu ethnic group is the largest in Kenya.In Nairobi they outnumber any other ethnic group;living nearby they come to Nairobi in search of employment, training, business and trade.

The fact that the Kikuyu are over-represented in the sample does not necessarily mean that they have a higher propensity to be institutionalized.The table below shows the distribution as per ethnic background.

Table 4.3: <u>Ethnic backgrounds of the interviewed children.</u>

Ethnic group	Number of respondents	%
Kamba	17	12.1
Kikuyu	86	61.4
Luo	10	7.1
Luhya	6	4.3
Maasai	5	3.6
Kisii	1	0.7
Meru	5	3.6
Non Kenyan	3	2.1
Taita	2	1.4
Turkana	3	2.1
Somali	2	1.4
Total	140	100

54

4.1.4: Residential area of the respondents prior to institutionalization.

The study attempted to find whether a child came from rural areas or from urban areas. Sixty four percent claimed that they came from an urban area while only 34% came from rural areas. The findings support Kadushin's (1976) contention that children in urban areas are more prone to institutionalization as compared to their counterparts in the rural areas. The study found that the majority (64%) of the respondents were living in Nairobi before they were institutionalized. An attempt was made to find out which parts or estates of Nairobi the children came from. Table 4.4 shows the distribution of children in Nairobi.

Table 4.4: Distribution of respondents in Nairobi.

Estate	No. of respondents	%	valid %
Mathare	32	22.9	36.4
Huruma	1	0.7	1.1
Kibera	17	12.1	19.3
Githurai	6	4.3	6.8
Kariobangi	5	3.6	5.7
Eastleigh	20	14.3	22.7
Kawangware	1	0.7	1.1
Korogocho	5	3.6	5.7
Don't know	1	0.7	1.1
N/A	52	37.1	MISSING
Total	140	100.0	100.0

Most studies cited in the literature are of the view that children in institutions are from poor parents. Such studies include Rainer(1976), Muga(1971), Kadushin (1980) and Onyango (1984). This study tried to look for evidence to prove the validity of the above claim by asking the respondents where their

homes were in Nairobi. In Nairobi there are estates for the middle class and low income earners, high residential areas for high income earners and the slums for lowest or zero income earners.

The study shows that 60% of the respondents came from the slums such as Mathare (36.4%), Kibera(19.3%),Kawangware(0.7%),and Korogocho(5.7%).The rest came from low income estates such as Githurai, Huruma and Eastleigh. Their residential areas suggest that their parents were low income earners or they never had any source of income. The finding thus confirms that in low income estates children are more likely to be institutionalized.

4.2.0: PARENTAL BACKGROUND OF THE INSTITUTIONALIZED CHILDREN.

Under normal circumstances children are supposed to be brought up in a family situation. The respondents were children who were.no longer in their families but in an institution. This study sought to know about the parental background of the children and find out why they were not in their families. Under this section, aspects such as marital status, parents alive, family size, socio-economic status of parents in terms of occupation, ownership of property and level of education attained by parents is examined.

56

4.2.1: Parental background of the respondents.

Table 4.5: Parents alive.

Parents alive	No. of respondents	%
Both	26	18.6
Mother only	40	28.6
Father only	13	9.3
Neither	52	37.1
Don't know	9	6.4
TOTAL	140	100.0

From table 4.5, it is clear that more than half of the respondents never had both parents and therefore were not in a typical African family situation. According to Burts definition, then 74.7% from the study came from broken homes. Burt (1947) defines a broken home as one in which both or one parent is absent owing to death, desertion, divorce or commitment to a career.

The above data show that only 18.8% had both parents. For those who had both parents, 54.8% claimed that parents had separated. The data indicate that when 37% were orphaned, majority of the rest (28.3%) had their mothers only. The findings seem to agree with Burt (1947) and Kadushin (1980) who observed that parental related difficulties such as broken homes, orphanage and poverty were dominant reasons for institutionalization. 9.4% were semi-orphaned, that is they had lost their mothers. Left with their fathers only they suffered rejection and ended up in institutions. 6.5% did not know whether their parents were alive

57

or not because they had never seen them since birth. Most children were sons and daughters of single and widowed mothers.

4.2.2: <u>MARITAL STATUS OF PARENTS OF THE RESPONDENTS.</u>

As was expected, most parents of the respondents were single. Of the 80 respondents who claimed that they had parents only 10 cases had parents who were married.Among the institutionalized,28.6% had parents who were single, 21.4% were divorced cases, 29.8% were widowed and 8.33% never knew about the marital status of their parents.

The above findings help to support Onyango's (1984) observation that most of the abandoned children were from single parents. Rainer (1976) contends that children from single parents and divorced families are more prone to institutionalization because their families are not stable. The table below shows the marital status of respondent's parents.

Table 4.6. <u>Marital status of parents.</u>

Status	No. of respondents	%
Married	10	11.9
Single	24	28.6
Divorced	18	21.4
Widowed	25	29.8
Don't know	7	8.3
TOTAL	84	100.0

4.2.3: <u>Socio-economic status of the parents of the respondents.</u>

This section deals with the socio-economic backgrounds of the parents of the children in institutions. Kayongo-Male and Onyango (1984) argue that the family background in which the child is brought up determines whether a child should be institutionalized. They observe that children who are institutionalized are sometimes under difficult circumstances such as poverty, sickness and deprivation of basic needs.

In the literature it was found that most of the institutionalized are son's and daughters of poor people. To verify this, data was collected on socio-economic status of parents. To measure the socio-economic status the study investigated on:-

       (a) Occupation of parents.

       (b) Ownership of property

       (c) Level of education attained.

       (d) Family size

(a) <u>Major occupation of parents</u>

The study found that for those respondents who had mothers, 61.5% were not in any gainful employment, while those who had fathers, only 46.2% of them were employed.

Farming, hawking, watchman and carpentry were found to be the major occupations of fathers as reported by the respondents. The study found that 25.64% were hawkers, 12.82% were farmers and 20.51% were watchmen. Only 2.56% were teachers, drivers and cleaners, 5.13% were cooks. 0.7% were teachers in primary schools.

As for mothers, 24.6% were found to be hawkers, 4.3% were housewives, 4.6% were barmaids and 4.6% were beggars in the streets of Nairobi. For those who were on employment, only one was a teacher (0.7%), 9.3% were secretaries and 4.6% were casuals while 7.7% were cleaners.

An attempt was made to categorize paren'ts occupations as either wage employment or self employment. While 46.2% of fathers were found to be in wage employment, only 32.3% of the mothers were wage earners.

The self-employment activities in both cases (mother and father) were dominated by farming and hawking. For those mothers who were on wage employment the dominant occupations were cleaners, barmaid and casuals. For the fathers the dominant occupation is watchman.

From the above data, it is notable that a higher percentage of women was engaged in self employment activities than men. Since the major self-employment activity is hawking it can be logically inferred that most of the parents are low income earners. These data suggests that most of these parents belonged to the low socio-economic class.
A significant finding to note is that almost one third of the mothers were unemployed, this clearly explains the precarious socio-economic status of the families of these children. Table 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9 show the occupations of parents.

Table 4.7: <u>Employment status of parents.</u>

	Mother	%	Father	%
Employed	21	32.3	18	46.2
Unemployed	40	61.5	19	48.7
Don't know	4	6.2	2	5.1
TOTAL	65	100.0	39	100.0

Table 4.8. <u>Occupation of mothers.</u>

Occupation	No. of respondents	%	valid%
Teacher	1	6.7	1.5
Secretary	6	4.3	9.3
Cleaner	5	3.6	7.7
Shopkeeper	1	0.7	1.5
Barmaid	3	2.1	4.6
Cook	1	0.7	1.5
Casual	3	2.1	4.6
Hawker	16	11.4	24.6
Beggar	3	2.1	4.6
Farmer	11	7.9	17.0
Housewife	6	4.3	9.3
Cloth-dealer	4	2.9	6.3
Blacksmith	1	0.7	1.5
Carpenter	1	0.7	1.5
Don't know	3	2.1	4.6
N/A	75	53.6	N/A
TOTAL	140	100.0	100.0

Note:N/A=Those children who had fathers only or had no parents.

Table 4.9. <u>Occupation of fathers.</u>

Occupation	No. of respondents	%	valid %
Teacher	1	0.7	2.56
Secretary	1	0.7	2.56
Cleaner	1	0.7	2.56
Driver	1	0.7	2.56
Watchman	8	5.7	20.51
Shopkeeper	1	0.7	2.56
Carpenter	3	2.1	7.69
Cook	2	1.4	5.13
Hawker	10	7.2	25.64
Farmer	5	3.6	12.82
Blacksmith	1	0.7	2.56
Carpenter	1	0.7	2.56
Don't know	4	2.9	10.26
N/A	101	72.2	N/A
TOTAL	140	100.0	100.0

NOTE:NA=Respondents who never had fathers.

4.2.4 <u>Ownership of property by parents of the respondents.</u>

The respondents were asked about the property their parents owned. Property here includes local resources like land, livestock, investments such as rental houses and any other resource that can enable somebody to generate some income. The responses are seen in table 4.10 below.

Table 4.10: <u>Property status of parents.</u>

Property status	No. of respondents	%	valid %
owned property	28	20	40.6
Did not own	41	29.3	59.4
N/A	71	50.7	N/A
TOTAL	140	100.0	100.0

Note:N/A=Had no parents.

Only 40.6% of the respondents claimed that their parents owned any property. Of those who reported that their parents owned property, most (67.9%) only owned small pieces of land below 3 acres and 10.7% owned livestock only. Only 14.3% claimed that their parents owned over 3 acres.

Since most parents did not own property or assets a very high percentage were reported to rely on cheap activities like hawking and being employed as cooks and watchmen. For those who had land, they were practicing peasant farming.

Bearing in mind that most of the children were from single and divorced mothers, this could be the reason why majority of them never owned anything. For those who had fathers they at least owned a small piece of land at home.

The impression that one gets from the findings in tables 4.7, 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10 is that the majority of the children seem to have rather poor economic backgrounds.The majority of the parents were not employed, they depended on hawking and peasant farming for subsistence and had very little property.

4.2.5:- Education background of the parents.

In this study, the level of education attained was considered as an indicator of socio-economic status of parents. It was found that 32.2% of mothers were completely illiterate (had never been to school) while 43.6% of the fathers also had never been to

school.   For those (67.7%) mothers who had been to school
majority had less than 12 years of education (79.5%), for fathers
also 77.3% had less than 12 years of education. This explains
why most of the parents were unemployed. The tables below show
the levels of education attained by parents of the
institutionalized children.

Table 4.11 The level of formal education attained by parents.

(a)MOTHER

No. of yrs in school	respondents	%	cumulative%
1 - 4 (yrs)	7	15.9	15.9
5 - 8 (yrs)	12	27.3	43.2
9 - 12(yrs)	16	36.4	79.5
13+	2	4.5	84.1
Don't know	7	15.9	100.0
TOTAL	44	100.0	
(b) Father			
1 - 4 (yrs)	1	4.5	4.5
5 - 8 (yrs)	8	36.4	40.9
9 - 12(yrs)	8	36.4	77.3
13+	1	4.5	81.8
Don't know	4	18.2	100.0
TOTAL	22	100.0	

4.2.6: Family size of the respondent's parents.

The number of children per family was found to be normally
distributed with a Kurtosis value of 0.712 and a standard
deviation of 1.396. The modal size was 4 (29.4%). The maximum age
was 8.00 and the minimum was 1.000 giving a range of 7.000.
57.9% of the families considered had 3 - 6 children.

even in case of low social status one does not automatically become liable to institutional care. Scholars like Gelfand and Olsen (1980:110) see an interaction between personal vulnerability and loss or inadequacy of social support as ultimately the most likely to bring about institutional placements.

Social support stems from social contacts or relationships such as with friends, parents or relatives (McGranghn, 1979:321 - 322). Therefore, this section tries to examine whether children in institutions had relatives who could have been an alternative to institutional placement. The study sought to find out the nature of help they got from relatives and who the relatives are.

In the next chapter this variable will be compared between the experimental and the control group and test whether lack of social support could lead to institutional placement. Table 4.12 below presents the findings on social support from relatives.

Table 4.12. Whether respondents had relative's or not.

RESPONDENTS		%
Had relatives	95	67.9
Had no relatives	28	18.6
DON'T KNOW	13	9.3
NO ANSWER	6	4.3

It was found that 67.9% had relatives, 18.6% never had relatives and 9.3% did not know whether they had relatives or not. For those who had relatives 40.9% have uncles, 38.2% claimed they had

aunts, 5.9% cousins, 11.3% grandmothers and 3.8% had
grandfathers.

Although 67.9% had relatives it came out from the findings that
only 43.4% of them received assistance from them, 56.6% were not
being assisted in any way.

The reason why these children were not being helped by relatives
could be attributed to distance and occupation.   Most of the
relatives were out of Nairobi.   Only 35.3% were in Nairobi while
others were as far as Mombasa.

4.3.1: Type of assistance given by relatives.

However 43.4% claimed that they were getting assistance from
their relatives.Among the reasons that led the children to
institutions were poverty reflected by lack of fees, orphanage
(lack of parents) therefore they needed accommodation and
parental care.   In this section the study tried to enumerate the
type of assistance that was offered by relatives.Table 4.13 below
shows the type of assistance offered.

66

Table 4.13: Type of assistance offered to respondents by relatives.

Type of assistance	No. of respondents	%
Food	19	44.2
Clothes	14	32.6
Fees	2	4.7
Uniforms	1	2.3
Accommodation	7	16.3
Shelter	0	0.0
Everything	0	0.0
TOTAL	43	100.0

Although most children needed accommodation because they had no parents, of the 43.4% who were being assisted by relatives only 16.3% were accommodated by them. Almost all the respondents cited lack of fees and uniforms as a reason for not attending school and therefore they were institutionalized. Only 4.7% assisted the children with fees. Most relatives (44.2%) gave the respondents food and clothes (32.6%). The type of assistance will be compared with the control group and see whether there is a difference. What most respondents needed was fees, uniforms and accommodation.

4.3.2: Relative's occupation.

To asses whether the relatives were in a position to assist the children, the study tried to find out their nature of occupation. Only 19.6% of the relatives were on wage employment. 55% were on self employment and 25.4% never knew about their relatives occupation.

For those who were on self employment, farming and hawking were
the major occupations. 42.3% of the relatives were farmers while
9.2% were hawkers. On wage employment barmaids, watchmen and
teachers were major occupations. 4.2% of the relatives were
barmaids, 3.5% primary school teachers, 2.8% were watchmen, 2.1%
secretaries, 2.1% doctors and 0.7% a lecturer.

The above finding shows that majority of the relatives were also
low income earners and they could not have afforded any
assistance to the respondents. Only 19.6% were on wage
employment. The nature of the occupations of majority of
relatives such as barmaids, watchmen, cleaners show that they
were members of the low income bracket. Their support to the
children was minimal. Table 4.14 below shows the distribution of
relatives occupations.

Table 4.14. Occupation of relatives.

Occupation	No. of respondents	%
Driver	2	1.4
Secretary	3	2.1
Lecturer	1	0.7
Hawker	13	9.2
Teacher	5	3.5
Farmer	60	42.3
Watchman	4	2.8
Barmaid	6	4.2
Nurse	3	2.1
Businessman	5	3.5
Don't know	36	25.4
Hotel waiter	1	0.7
Doctor	3	2.1
TOTAL	142	100.0

Note:The number of respondents is not constant because some had

     more than one relative.

68

The findings support Gelfand's and Olsen's (1980) contention that loss of social support combined with other factors is most likely to bring about institutional placement.

4.4.0 Respondent's life prior to institutionalization.

In order to have an objective assessment of the impacts of institutionalization on children, the study took into consideration the kind of life that the respondents led prior to institutionalization. It can be expected that if for instance in their previous environments, the children suffered certain deprivations which they are able to get within the institutions, then to such children institutional care will definitely be a relief and a solution to some of their previous problems.

To attain this the study tried to find out where the respondents were staying before institutionalization, who they were staying with, reasons why they left their previous places of origin, whether they were going to school before institutional placement, reasons for not attending or dropping out of school and the major problems experienced prior to institutionalization.

4.4.1 Where the respondent's were staying before institutionalization.

63.8% of he respondents were staying at their places of origin. Due to various problems such as poverty, orphanage and separation of parents they left their places of residence. 27.9% were staying in the streets where they ate and slept because their

69

parents could not afford shelter for them or they had no parents. 44.3% were staying with their parents while 35% were staying with relatives and mostly grandmothers. Only 20.7% claimed that they were staying alone in the streets. The findings show that majority had been deprived of basic needs such as food and shelter, therefore they considered institutional placement as a solution to some of their immediate problems.Most of the orphaned children were staying with their relatives who later took them to institutions.

4.4.2 Reasons why the respondents left their previous places of
      residence.

The table below shows reasons that made respondents leave their previous places of residence before they were institutionalized.

Table 4.15: Reasons for leaving previous place of residence.

Reason	No. of respondents	%
Parents died	47	34.4
Separation of parents	14	10.2
Civil war	1	0.7
Poverty	23	16.8
Got lost	2	1.5
Mothers sickness	14	10.2
Father beating	14	10.2
Mistreatment by mother	3	2.2
Parents imprisoned	4	2.9
Don't know	5	3.5
Abandoned	10	7.3
Sick	2	1.5
TOTAL	140	100.0

Table 4.15 shows that most children were living in their normal families with their parents (44.3%) and they were living at their

70

places of origin (63.8%). Due to various reasons that the children could not have avoided they could not have lived at home any longer and they ended up in institutions. 34.3% claimed that they lost both their parents and had nobody to care for them. 16.8% claimed that their parents were so poor to afford the basic needs for them such as food, shelter and clothing. 2.9% had their parents imprisoned and left at the mercy of nobody. 10.2% were victims of parents separation, while 10.2% were children of sick mothers, For those who claimed that their mothers were sick they all mentioned mental sickness and blindness.

4.4.3: Education of respondents before institutionalization.

Most of the children in institutions claimed that they were attending school (60.4%) but due to calamities such as poverty, death of parents and separation of parents they had to drop out of school. 72.8% cited the reasons for dropping out of school to be lack of fees, 14.4% mentioned lack of uniforms and 1.6% teacher beating.Table 17 below shows the reasons why children were not attending or had dropped out of school.

71

Table 4.16: Reasons for not attending or dropping out of school.

Reason	No. of respondents	%
Lack of fees	91	72.8
Lack of uniforms	18	14.4
Teacher beating	2	1.6
Others	14	11.2
TOTAL	125	100.0

Others: These are reasons such as age, sickness.   15 respondents
did not answer this question.

The above findings show that prior to institutionalization 100%
of the respondents were not attending or had already dropped out
of school.   The study sought to know what the respondents were
doing after dropping out of school or immediately before
institutionalization.   According to the findings of the study
12.3 of the sample reported that they had been employed as
housemaids or houseboys and 45.5% were loitering in the streets
of Nairobi as parking boys and girls, 42.3% were staying at home
helping their mothers.

The findings seem to support Goldfaub's (1943) observation that
institutional placement is a solution to most of the problems
experienced by the children prior to institutionalization. Most
(90%) of the respondents claimed that they experienced a lot of
problems and deprivations prior to institutionalization.

Lack of shelter (36.3%), lack of food (31.1%) and not schooling
(16.4%)were found to be the major problems that the respondents
experienced before institutionalization.   Bearing in mind that

the above mentioned problems are over after institutionalization, majority of the respondents take institutional placement as a relieve to some of their problems.

4.5.0 Institutionalization of children.

This section concentrates on the institutionalization of children. The study seeks to find out who referred or took the children to institutions and what were the reasons.

Table 4.17:Agents who referred children to institutions

Agents	No. of respondents	%
Parents	21	15
Relatives	53	37.9
Came alone	3	2.1.
Police	49	35.0
Dont know	2	1.4
children's department	4	2.9
Others	8	5.7
TOTAL	140.0	100.0

NOTE:Others=Good samaritans,church organizations.

On the question of how the respondents got institutionalized, the findings indicate that majority of the respondents were referred to the institutions by relatives (37.9%), 35% were referred by police while 15% were taken by their own parents. Due to the fact that most of them were orphans, they might have been staying with their relatives after death of their parents. Only 2.1% took themselves while 2.9% were referred by the children's

73

department.   There   were others   (5.7%) who   were taken   by good

samaritans.

It is noteworthy that   for example at Mama Ngina   children's home

60% of the children were brought in by police, the same holds for

Barnados.   One reason for   this is that these   homes care mainly

for abandoned and homeless children who are mostly taken from the

streets   by   police. At   SOS   children's   home   all children   are

referred by   children's department, after having   been brought to

their attention by relatives or social workers.   Most males were

referred or taken   by police   (38%), while 36.1%   of the   females

were taken by relatives.

A   notable   relationship   was   noted   between   the   reason   for

institutionalization and   the agents who took   the respondents to

institutions.

From the   findings it came out clearly that most of the abandoned

(78.2%) were brought in by police and the rest could not remember

who took them. 60.4% of the orphaned were brought in by relatives

and only 6.5% by   police. 50%   of those   who   came from   poverty

stricken homes were brought up by parents.

The   above findings   show that   there is a   specific relationship

between   the reason   for institutionalization   and the   method of

referral. Most of the children referred by police were those from

urban   areas.   Those referred   by parents were   mostly from rural

74

areas.   The findings of this study disagrees with an observation made by Muturi (1984:11) that majority of the institutionalized children are referred by parents and police. From the findings of this study only 15% are referred by parents.   37.9% are referred by relatives while only 50% are referred by parents and police.

4.5.1 Reasons for admission.

"A bad home is better than a good institution", but as mentioned in the literature, there may be something worse than a bad home and that is no home.   The study enquired about the major reasons that led to institutionalization of the respondents. The table below shows the responses.

Table 4.18: Reasons for admission of respondents to institutions.

Reason for admission	No. of respondents	%
Abandoned	23	16.4
Orphaned	48	34.3
Semi-orphaned	28	20.1
Imprisoned parent	4	2.9
Parental sickness	8	5.7
Broken home (separation)	15	10.7
Sickness	3	2.1
Poverty stricken	10	7.1
Delinquency	1	0.7
TOTAL	140	100.0

From the above findings its clearly shown that 54.4% were either orphaned or semi-orphaned. Semi-orphaned meaning one parent was

75

dead, 34.3% were completely orphaned. 16.4% were victims of abandonment while 10.7% were victims of broken homes due to separation and divorce, 7.1% came from poverty stricken homes. 5.7% mentioned parental sickness. For those who had sick parents, it was either mental or blindness. 2.9% were victims of parental imprisonment.

The above findings seem to agree with studies done in America by Burt (1947) and Kadushin (1980). These scholars identified parental related difficulties as the major causes for institutionalization of children. The difficulties identified by them in America included broken homes (Burt 1947). Burt defined a broken home as one in which both or one parent is absent owing to death, desertion, separation, divorce or commitment to a career.

In this study there were reasons such as orphaned 34.5%, semi-orphaned 20%, broken homes due to divorce 10.7%. This shows that 65% of the respondents were institutionalized due to problems related to their parental background.

Institutional care is appropriate in many of the situations in which the child must be rewarded from his own home and placed under substitute care. Such situations are like the ones outlined above.

4.6.0 Life in the institution

In order to know the impact of institutional care, the study tried to compare life prior to institutionalization and life in the institution. When asked to compare life before and life after institutionalization 76.45 indicated that life was better in the institution as compared to home, only 15.9% claimed that life was better before and 4.3% claimed that life in the institution was boring. Some of the reasons given by the 76.4% included availability of basic needs such as food, clothes and education.

Asked whether they had ever thought of running away only 19.7% answered in the affirmative. They cited reasons such as beating and missing their parents. 72.9% claimed that they can't run away and gave reasons such as nowhere to go (62.3%), no parents (10.1%), no home (20.3%) and can't trace home (7.2%).

On the issue of whether they would like to leave the institution 37.1% claimed that they would like and gave reasons such as mistreatment (28.9%), missing home (7.9%), boredom (21.1%) and missing parents (13.2%). 28.9% claimed that they were mature and therefore they no longer needed institutional care. However the majority (57.7%) claimed that they would not like to leave the institution. They gave reasons such as no home (58.9%), parents are poor (8.9%), comfortable (26.8%) and 5.4% claimed that they can't trace their home. The findings show that most of the

77

respondents were comfortable and had no alternative but those who had parents claimed that they were missing them.

The study tried to find out what the respondents were offered in the institution that they never got at home. They mentioned clothes (37.5%), food (22.1%), schooling (11%) and shelter (37.5%). 8.1% could not answer the question because they had not had a home before. The findings support Rainer's (1976) argument that in their previous environments the majority of the children in children's homes had suffered certain deprivations which they are able to get within the institutions, then to such children institutional care will definitely be a relief and solution to some of their previous problems. The findings also indicate that institutionalization enhances the well being of the children who come from poor parental backgrounds. This is because the findings indicate that the new environment (institutionalization) is an improvement over the previous one (prior to institutionalization).

4.7.0: ATTRIBUTES OF THE UNINSTITUTIONALIZED RESPONDENTS.

This section concentrates on the 70 respondents who constituted 33.3% of the sample and who formed the control group of the study. An attempt is made here to present and discuss their major characteristics. The findings of this section will be compared with those of the control group where appropriate.

78

4.7.1: Age and sex of the respondents.

Just as in the experimental group all of them were aged between eight and sixteen years. The mean age was twelve while the modal age was fourteen years. Of the total sample of the control group 50% were female and 50% were males.

4.7.2: Tribal and Religious affiliation of respondents.

Just like in the experimental group, majority of the respondents were Kikuyus (47.1%) and Luos (15.7%). They were affiliated to three major religions, i.e. moslems 24.3%, catholics 24.3% and protestants being the majority 51.4%.

4.7.3: Parental background of the respondents.

Of the total sample 34.3% had no parents while 38.6% had only mothers. Only 18.6% had both their parents while 8.6% had fathers only. Among the ones who had both parents only 15.4% of the parents lived together. 84.6% were not living together due to reasons such as divorce and separation. On the marital status of parents only 4.3% had married parents. Just like in the experimental group, the majority (28.6%)had widowed parents. They had lost one of their parents. 20% were sons and daughters of divorced parents while 11.4% were from single mothers.

This study tried to control for age, sex and parental background to find exactly why some were institutionalized and others not despite sharing some demographic and parental characteristics.

4.7.4: Socio-Economic status.

The study tried to find out about the socio-economic status of the parents of the control group to compare it with the experimental group. As in the experimental group occupation of parents, ownership of property, education and family size were also used here as indicators of socio-economic status.

(a) Occupation of parents.

79.5% of the respondents reported that they had mothers who were on wage employment, while 20.5% were self employed. The major occupations for those mothers who were on wage employment were secretaries (22.6%), clerks (16.1%) and teachers (9.7%). 12.9% had mothers who were nurses. For those who were self employed farming was the major occupation and 50% were housewives and 25% were business women.

As for fathers 84.2% were employed and 10.5% were unemployed. 5.3% could not tell about their fathers' occupation. The major occupation of fathers who were employed was drivers (31.3%) and 25% were primary school teachers, 12.5% were cleaners while 12.5% were clerks and 6.3% were casuals while 12.5% were messengers. For those who were in self employment hawking (50%) and business (50%) were the major occupations. A significant point to note is that unlike in the experimental group majority of the respondents in the control group had parents who were employed. The above variable will be analyzed deeply in the next chapter.

(b) Ownership of property.

Property here includes local resources like land, livestock, investments such as rental houses and any other resource that can enable somebody to generate some income. Of the total sample 63.8% claimed that they had parents who owned property. Of those who reported that their parents owned property 56.7% claimed that their parents had over three acres of land and only 6.7% claimed that their parents owned less than three acres of land. 26.7% claimed that their parents owned a rental house and 10% mentioned animals. This finally shows that the parents had some resources that they could use to provide their children with the basic needs.

TABLE 4.19 Parents property status.

Property status	No. of respondents	%
owned property	30	63.8
Never owned	17	36.2
N/A	23	missing
Total	70	100.0

Note:N/A= Respondents had no parents.

Table 4.20 Type of property owned.

Type of property	No. of respondents	%
Land over 3 acres	17	56.9
Land below 3 acres	2	6.7
Rental house	8	26.7
Animals	3	10.0
N/A	40	missing
TOTAL	70	100.0

Note:NA=had no parents or parents never owned property.

c) Education background of parents.

The level of education attained was seen an indicator of socio-economic status. It was found that 97.5% of the mothers had formal education and only 2.5% were illiterate. 100% of the respondents who had fathers claimed that they had formal education. For those mothers who had formal education 71.8% had attained 9-12 years of education. This means they had secondary school education while only 7.7% had 1-4 years of education. 5.1% had mothers who had more than thirteen years of education and 2.6% could not tell about their mothers' levels of education. 57.9% of the fathers had 9-12 years of education while 36.8% had 5-8 years of education and 5.3% had more than thirteen years of education. The lowest level of education for fathers was standard five.

The above findings explain why the majority of the parents of the respondents in the control group were on wage employment and therefore they could afford to stay with their children.

(d) Family size

The number of children in a family was found to be distributed with a Kurtosis value of 3.518 and a standard deviation of 1.190. The modal age was 1(46.5%). The mean age was two. The maximum age was seven and minimum was one giving a range of six. The findings show that most of the children came from small families. 91.1% had families with a maximum of three children. Only 9% came from families with more than three children.

The study also enquired about the number of employed brothers/sisters as a way of assessing the socio-economic status of the family. The findings indicate that 59.3% were in school and 28.4% were in wage employment, 3.4% were in business while 6.8% were staying at home. This shows that 28.4% could benefit from the usual assistance that is given by one's employed brothers/sisters. In the next chapter socio-economic status of both groups will be compared to test H_3.

4.8.0: <u>SOCIAL SUPPORT.</u>

In this section the study sought to find out whether the respondents had relatives and whether they got any type of assistance from their relatives. 98.6% of the sample had relatives and majority of the relatives were uncles (40.9%) and aunts (38.2%). 11.3% had grandmothers, 3.8% had grandfathers while 5.9% had cousins. 69.9% of these relatives were reported to be in Nairobi while 11.3% were located in Kiambu. The rest were spread in different parts of the country. 85.5% of the respondents reported that they were being helped by their relatives while 14.5% claimed that they never got any assistance.

For those who were getting assistance from relatives 18.6% indicated that they were staying with their relatives and got everything from them. This means that the relatives saved them from institutional placement, 15.3% were being assisted with school fees, 11.9% school uniforms, 25.4% clothes, 16.9% food,

11.9% were being accommodated by their relatives. The below data shows that the level of social support from relatives was high.

Table 4.21 Type of assistance got from relatives

Type of assistance	no. of respondents	%
Food	10	16.9
clothes	15	25.4
Fees	9	15.3
Uniforms	7	11.9
Accommodation	4	6.8
Shelter	3	5.1
Everything	11	18.6
N/A	11	missing
TOTAL	70	100.0

4.8.1: Occupation of relatives.

Occupation of relatives determines whether they can assist and the nature of assistance. 52.5% of the relatives were employed. They reported occupations such as secretaries (13.5%), 10.3% were lecturers, 13% were secondary school teachers while 4.3% were drivers, 5.4% had relatives who were doctors. Other occupations mentioned included mechanic (1.1%), policeman (1.1%), shopkeeper (1.1%), messenger (2.7%).

For those who were not in wage employment farming (15.7%), business (16.8%) and hawking (65%) were the major occupations. The above findings indicate why most of the relatives were in a position to assist the respondents.

84

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 **AN ANALYSIS OF FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF CHILDREN, THEIR BACKGROUND AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS INSTITUTIONALIZATION**

This chapter attempts to examine and interpret the relationship among the major variables of the study. More complex statistical tools than simple descriptive statistics are applied to achieve this goal. The relationship between nominal and/or ordinal level variables are examined and interpreted through the application of the following inferential statistics: chi-square (χ^2) and contingency co-efficient (c). While chi-square will be applied to test the statistical significance of such relationships, the other two statistics will be used where appropriate to measure the strength of such relationships. Also the control and experimental group will be compared.

Some nominal and ordinal scale variables have been transformed into dummy variables. This makes it possible to include such variables in the computation of complex statistics such as Pearson product moment correlation co-efficient r and r^2. While r measures the strength of simple correlation between variables measured at or above interval scale, r2 measures the explained

86

variations in such relationships. The study also makes use of multiple R and R² which assists in predicting or explaining the dependent variable from the knowledge of independent variables.

Many studies cited in chapter two hold the view that children are institutionalized due to various reasons. Such studies include Muga (1971), Fabio (1959) and Republic of Kenya (1961). The studies argue that the reasons for institutionalization differ in terms of sex, age and where children come from. Onyango (1984) and Muga (1971) argue that majority of the abandoned and poverty stricken children are mostly found in urban areas.

The above view is opposed by a second "school of thought", represented in particular by studies by Rainer (1976) and Kadushin (1980), which argues that the children who are neglected and poverty-stricken are usually from rural areas, are mainly female and are institutionalized even at the age of 10. Umbima (1980) found that most of the abandoned are mostly boys and they are institutionalized at very early ages.The above contrasting views form the basis of the study's first hypothesis (HI).

5.1.0:HI Institutionalization is directly related to age, sex and residential area.

Table 5.1 below relates the reasons for institutionalization and age of children at institutionalization.

Table 5.1 Reasons for institutionalization and age at institutionalization

Reasons for institutionalization	Age at institutionalization			
	0 - 5	6 - 10	11+	Row Total
ABANDONED	19 (82.6) [35.2]	4 (17.4) [7.0]	0 (0) [0]	23 (17.0)
ORPHANED/SEMI ORPHANED	23 (31.9) [42.6]	34 47.2) [59.6]	15 (20.8) [62.5]	72 (53.3)
PARENT-RELATED DIFFICULTIES (parents imprisoned, sick, divorced and poverty stricken	12 (30.0) [22.2]	19 (47.5) [33.3]	9 (22.5) [37.5]	40 (29.6)
COLUMN TOTAL	54 (40.0)	57 (42.2)	24 (17.8)	135 100.0

χ 2 = 21.62485   Df = 4   Significance = 0.0002
Contingency coefficient = 0.37157

Note:(Figures in brackets represent row percentages and figures in []represent column percentages. 5 observations were missing (could not answer)

Data from the above table show that there is a relationship between the reasons for institutionalization and age at institutionalization. Some (42%) of the respondents were institutionalized at the age bracket 6-10. Of the total number of respondents who mentioned abandonment 82.6% were institutionalized when they were between 0-5 years. Only 17.8% of the respondents were institutionalized when they were over 10

years, and the majority (62.4) were either orphaned or semi-orphaned.

The contingency co-efficient (0.37157) indicated a moderate degree of association between age at institutionalization and reasons for institutionalization. The chi-square test of significance tentatively shows that the relationship is significant at 99.98% confidence level.

This supports the hypothesis that why the respondent is institutionalized is directly related to age at institutionalization. This also supports an observation made by the researcher (all infants who were in the institutions were cases of abandonments and being orphaned at birth).

Other scholars like Muga (1971) observed that boys were more prone than girls to abandonment and institutionalization. The table below sheds some light on reasons for institutionalization and sex.

In table 5.2 below an attempt is made to show whether sex determines the reason for institutionalization. The findings show that female respondents were more likely than male to have parent related difficulties (65%),while the majority of the orphaned and semi-orphaned were boys (55.3).

89

Table 5.2   Reasons for institutionalization and sex

REASONS FOR INSTITUTIONALIZATION	MALE	FEMALE	ROW TOTAL
ABANDONED	11 (47.8) [16.4]	12 (52.2) [16.7]	23 (16.5)
ORPHANED/SEMI-ORPHANED	42 (55.3) [62.7]	34 (44.7) [47.2]	76 (54.7)
PARENT-RELATED DIFFICULTIES (poverty, imprisoned, sick, divorced	14 (35.0) [20.9]	26 (65.0) [36.1]	40 (28.8)
COLUMN TOTAL	67 (48.2)	72 (51.8)	139 (100.0)

χ^2 = 4.113 Df = 2   Significance = 0.1158
Contingency coefficient = 0.17345.

Note: Figures in brackets   represent column percentages and
figures in [] represent row percentages.

Despite the above tentative observations, the chi-square test
shows that the relationship was only significant at 88.6% level
of confidence which is below the study's acceptance level of
confidence (95%).

Rainer (1976) and Kadushin (1980) argue that majority of the
children   who are neglected and poverty stricken came from rural
areas while Umbima (1989) argues that children in urban areas are
more prone to abandonment and therefore institutionalization.

Table 5.3 relates reasons for institutionalization and residential area.

Table 5.3   Reasons for institutionalization and where (rural or urban) respondents came from.

REASONS FOR INSTITUTIONALIZATION	RESIDENTIAL AREA		
	Rural	Urban	Row Total
ABANDONED	5 (23.8)	16 (76.2)	21 [16.8]
ORPHANED/SEMI ORPHANED	26 (38.2)	42 (61.8)	68 [54.4]
PARENT RELATED (imprisonment, poverty, sickness, divorce)	13 (6.1	23 (63.9)	36 [28.8]
COLUMN TOTAL	44 (35.2)	81 (64.8)	125 [100.0]

$\chi^2 = 1.48226$ Df = 2   Significance = 0.4766

Contingency coefficient = 0.10825

Note: 15 observations were missing. (They did not know where they came from).Figures in brackets represent column percentages and [] represents row percentages.

Table 5.3 tries to relate the reasons for institutionalization and whether the respondents came from rural or urban areas. The findings show that 64.8% of the respondents were staying in urban areas before institutionalization. This supports Onyango's (1984) observation that children in urban areas are more prone to institutionalization than their counterparts in the rural

91

areas. Seventy six percent of the abandoned stayed in urban areas,as did 61.8% of the orphaned and 63.9% of those who had parent-related difficulties. In all cases it was found that the majority lived in urban areas before institutionalization. Only 35.2% stayed in rural areas and the majority (59.1%) were orphaned while only 23.8% were abandoned.

The chi-square test for significance indicates no notable significance. The relationship between the reasons for institutionalization and residential area indicates no significant relationship at 95% confidence level.Therefore the hypothesis that residential area is directly related to reasons for institutionalization is rejected at 95% level of confidence.

Therefore, it can be concluded that of the three independent variables (age, sex and residential area) - it is only age which is significantly related to reasons for institutionalization. As indicated by the values of contingency coefficient there is a higher degree of association between reasons for institutionalization and age at institutionalization (c=0.37157), than between the former and sex (c=0.17345) or residential area (c=0.10825).

92

5.2.0   <u>H3 Parent-related difficulties mostly contribute to the</u>
         <u>institutionalization of children more than child</u>
         <u>related difficulties</u>

In the study, parent-related difficulties included such as broken homes, prostitution, divorce, single parenthood, parental sickness, abandonment, poverty and unemployment.Child-related difficulties include child sickness, delinquency, dropping out of school and disobedience to parents.

Scholars like Kadushin (1980), Burt (1947) identify parent related difficulties as the major reasons for placing children in institutions. The Gluecks (1962) and Kanene (1989) hold a contrary view that most of the institutionalized children are sick, disobedient to parents, school dropouts or run away from homes. They claim that the majority are deviants.The testing of H2 is intended to resolve the controversy and to get the true picture in Kenya.

Table 5.4 Reasons for   institutionalization

Reasons for institutionalization	Number of respondents	%
ABANDONED	23	16.5
ORPHANED	48	34.5
SEMI-ORPHANED	28	20.1
PARENTS IMPRISONED	4	2.9.
PARENTS SICK	8	5.8
BROKEN HOME(divorced)	15	10.8
SICKNESS	3	2.2.
POVERTY STRICKEN	10	7.2
TOTAL	139	100

The above findings support the view of scholars who argue that parent-related difficulties are the dominant reasons for institutional placement.Out of the total number of respondents interviewed, only 3 (2.2%) mentioned child related difficulties (sickness); while 2.9% were placed in institutions because their parents had been imprisoned. The rest, 94.9%, mentioned parent-related difficulties. Some 34.5% were completely orphaned and 20.1% were semi-orphaned.

The findings also agree with studies done in America by Burt (1947) and Kadushin (1980) who identified parent-related difficulties as the major reason why children required institutionalization. Burt identified broken homes as the dominant reason. A study done by the United States Bureau of Census in 1923 reported that 56% of the children came from broken families. Using the above definition of a broken home, 82% of the respondents in the present study came from broken homes.

The findings support the hypothesis that parent-related difficulties are the dominant reason that lead to institutional placement. Therefore, the findings confirm H3. This is evidenced by the smaller percentage of respondents who mentioned child related difficulties (2.2%) as compared to 94.9% who mentioned parental related difficulties.

5.3.0   FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE INSTITUTIONALIZATION

To say that abandonment or being orphaned causes institutional placement of the children does not mean that abandonment, neglect or being orphaned will automatically or necessarily do so. It is likely that not all children experience the same effects of being orphaned or abandoned, and that not all who are orphaned, poverty-stricken or abandoned go in for institutional care. On the other hand, it is probable that there are others who are taken for institutional placement without any manifested traits of neglect, abandonment, or sickness. If such a possibility exists, then it can be said that abandonment, being orphaned or sickness does not necessarily lead to institutional care.

There must be some intervening factors. Muga (1971) notes that children in low socio-economic status are more prone to institutionalization. Other scholars note that even with low socio-economic status one does not automatically become liable to institutional care. Gelfad and Oslen (1980:110) see an interaction between personal vulnerability and loss or the inadequacy of social support as ultimately the most likely to bring about institutional placement. To verify this, the study compares both the socio-economic status and social support of the experimental and control group to test H2.

H2:Children who have low socio economic status and lack social support are most likely to be institutionalized.

5.3.1   THE EFFECT OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND SOCIAL SUPPORT.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUNDS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Socio-economic status of the respondents as a variable had
several indicators:-

          (a) ownership of property

          (b) occupation status of parents

          (c) Level of formal education attained by parents of

               the respondents

          (d) Family size

     (a) Ownership of property

Property ownership means that there are resources that can be
used to generate income. Therefore parents who owned property
interms of land, animals, rental houses, etc were considered to
be of a higher socio-economic status as compared to their
counterparts who never owned anything.

Table 5.5: Property status of parents

     (Institutionalized)   (uninstitutionalized)

	No.	valid %	No.	Valid %
Owned property	28	40.6	30	63.8
Did not own	41	59.4	17	36.2
' N/A	79	Missing	23	Missing
TOTAL	140	100.0	70	100.0

     Note: NA (children who had no parents or they did not
               know whether their parents owned property)

96

Comparing the institutionalized and the uninstitutionalized, table 5.3 shows that 63.8% of the institutionalized children had parents who owned property. Only 40.6% of the parents of the institutionalized owned property. This could be the reason why, despite sharing similar characteristics and vulnerabilities, the uninstitutionalised remained at home. Their parents had some sources of income as indicated by ownership of property.

Table 5.6 <u>Type of property owned by parents</u>

	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP		CONTROL GROUP	
Type of property	No.	%	No.	%
Land over 3 acres	4	14.3	17	56.7
Land below 3 acres	19	67.9	2	6.7
Rental house	2	7.1	8	6.7
Animals	3	10.7	3	10.0
TOTAL	28	100.0	30	100.0

The table above sheds light on the type of property owned by parents. While 67.9% of those parents of the institutionalized who owned property claimed to own land below 3 acres, 56.7% of the uninstitutionalised owned land over 3 acres, while 26.7% owned rental houses. Comparing the type of property owned, the parents of the institutionalized owned more property, this means they had

some resources that they could use to generate income and therefore afford basic needs for their children.

This could be the reason why the uninstitutionalised remained at home while their counterparts were institutionalized. Using ownership of property and type of property owned as a measure of socio-economic status, it can be concluded that the institutionalized were in a higher socio-economic status. Therefore children whose parents had no property were more likely to be institutionalized.

(b) Occupational status of parents

Onyango (1984) observed that most of the institutionalized are sons and daughters of unemployed people in urban areas. Occupational status determines the standard of life and the economic status. The employed parents can easily afford the basic needs of their children than the unemployed.

Table 5.7: Employment Status of the parents

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP VS CONTROL GROUP

Employment status	No. of respondents	%	No. of respondents	%
wage employed	35	35.7	47	82.5
self employed	62	64.3	10	17.5
TOTAL	98	100.0	57	100.0

Note: 42 observations were missing in the experimental group.(never had parents)

98

Note: 13 observation were missing in the control group.
         (never had parents)

The findings seem to agree with Onyango's (1984)observation that
children   with   unemployed   parents   are   more   prone   to
institutionalization.   This is   because their parents might not
afford the basics for them such as schooling, shelter and food.
Being not in school and lacking food and shelter, they end up in
the streets and consequently to institutions.

Table   5.7 above   shows that   82.5% of   the parents   of the
uninstitutionalised   were   employed   while   64.3%   of   the
institutionalized   children   parents   were   not   in   any   gainful
employment.   Only 35.7%   were in   wage   employment.   The major
occupations   for the   employed   ones were   casuals, barmaids   and
cleaners (see table 9&10).   The fact that parents are employed
means that there is a possibility of affording the basic needs.
The   type   of   occupations   for   the   employed   parents   of   the
institutionalized   indicates that   they   were in   the low   income
bracket.

For the uninstitutionalised whose majority (82.5%) were in wage
employment, their major occupations were teachers, secretaries,
Nurses and drivers.   For those who were in self employment
majority   were   businessmen   and   women.   (see   section   4.7.4).
Comparing their employment and occupation status its evident that
the uninstitutionalised had parents who were in high income jobs

99

as compared to their counterparts. It can be concluded from the
above data that children who have parents who
are unemployed and in low income occupations are more likely to
be institutionalized. Despite sharing similar characteristics,
occupation and employment status of parents determine
institutionalization. As an indicator of socio-economic status
employment status of parents show that uninstitutionalised
children were in a higher socio-economic status.

(c) <u>Levels of formal education attained by parents</u>
The level of education determines the type of occupation and the
status of a person. It is therefore considered as an indicator
of socio-economic status in this study.

Table 5.8   <u>Levels of formal education attained by parents of
               the respondents</u>

       EXPERIMENTAL   GROUP   VS   CONTROL GROUP
       (Institutionalized)   (Uninstitutionalised)

Level	No. of respondents	%	No. of respondents	%
(1-4)years	8	14.3	3	5.3
(5-8)years	20	35.7	12	21.1
(9-12)years	24	42.9	39	68.4
13+	4	7.1	3	5.3
N/A	84	Missing	13	Missing
TOTAL	140	100.0 100.0		

       Note: NA (parents had no education or respondents had no
                  parents)

100

Table 5.8 tries to compare the level of formal education attained
by parents of both the uninstitutionalised and the
institutionalized.   The findings show that 73.4% of the
unisitutionalised children's parents had over 9 years of formal
education as compared to 42.5% of the parents of the
institutionalized.

The level of formal education attained in most cases determines
the type of occupation, income and living standards. Fifty
percent of the institutionalized children's parents had less than
9 years of education. As a measure of socio-economic status, the
institutionalized children's parents were inferior in levels of
formal education attained. It can therefore be concluded that
children who had parents with few years of formal education were
more likely to be institutionalized.

   d)   Family size

In this study,family size is considered as an indicator of socio-
economic status.   Large families are associated with people of
low economic status.

Table 5.9:<u>Family Size of respondents parents.</u>

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP   VS   CONTROL GROUP

SIZE	No. of respondents	%	No. of respondents	%
0 - 3	19	19.0	24	58.5
4 - 7	81	81.0	17	41.5
N/A	40	Missing	29	Missing
TOTAL	140	100.0	70	100.0

Note: NA (Did not know)

The findings in the above table show that the institutionalized children came from large families. Eighty one percent of them came from families where there were over four children. The modal family size was four children for the experimental group while it was one for the control group. Large families can be associated with poverty and mostly in urban areas. It would be easy for parents with small family sizes to afford the basics for their children. It can therefore be concluded from the data that children who come from large families are more likely to be institutionalized than their counterparts.

The discussion on socio-economic status shows that all of its indicators relate to institutionalization. Comparing both the experimental and the control group, there was a difference in percentages of all the indicators. In all cases the institutionalized were in low socio-economic status. However, the greatest difference was seen in the type of property owned by parents.

102

The type of property owned by parent seems to have been the biggest determinant on whether one should be institutionalized. While 67.7% of the institutionalized owned land below 3 acres only 6.7% of the uninstitutionalised owned the same, 56.7% owned land over 3 acres as compared to only 14.3% of the institutionalized. Occupation status of the parents was the second strong determinant of institutionalization. This is shown by the difference in proportion of the parents who were in wage employment in both cases. While 82.5% of the uninstitutionalised had parents who were in wage employment, only 35.7% of the parents of the institutionalized parents were employed. This could be the reason why they had to remain at home despite sharing similar characteristics. Family size was also a strong determinant as shown by the difference in proportions of different sizes. While 81% of the institutionalized had a family size of (4-7), 58% of the uninstitutionalised had family sizes of 0 - 3. Among the indicators of socio-economic status, ownership of property and employments status of the parents played a major role in determining whether one should be institutionalized or not.

Those who had parents who owned no or just few property and were not in any gainful employment were more prone to institutionalization. The findings show that children in low socio-economic status are more likely to be institutionalized. This supports Muga's (1971) contention and other scholars who hold the same view. The findings also support the first part of

H2 that children who have low socio ecomic status are more likely to be institutionalized. However, not all children from low socio-economic backgrounds end up in institutions. Gelfad and Olsen argue that low socio-economic status and lack or loss of social support have to harmonize to bring about institutional placement. Therefore the significance of social support in institutionalization is examined in the next section.

5.3.2   SOCIAL SUPPORT

Social support stems from social contacts or relationships such as with friends, parents or relatives (Mc. Grangh 1979: 321-322). In this study social support was indicated by the presence or absence of relatives and whether relatives assisted the respondents and the level of assistance. From the findings in the present study,it can be concluded that children without relatives are more prone to institutionalization as compared to their counterparts. While 98.6% of the uninstitutionlised had relatives, 21.5% of the institutionalized never had. Whether one has relatives or not, what is important is whether they assisted the respondents.

The study found that 85.5% of the uninstitutionalised respondents who had relatives received assistance from them while only 43.4% of the institutionalized received assistance from their relatives. While 56.5% of the institutionalized respondents did not receive any assistance from relatives only 14% of the

104

uninstitutionalised did not. This shows that those children who never received assistance from relatives were more likely to be institutionalized. Therefore it can be concluded that assistance given by relatives determines whether one will be institutionalized. Because 43.4% of the institutionalized received assistance from relatives and yet they were institutionalized, the study tries to examine the types of assistance they got from relatives.

Table 5.9: Type of Assistance from relatives

(institutionalized)   (uninstitutionalised)

Type	No. of respondents	%	No. of respondents	%
Food	19	34.5	10	12.3
Clothes	23	41.8	15	18.5
Fees	3	5.6	9	11.1
Uniforms	1	1.8	9	11.1
Accommodation (during holidays)	9	16.4	4	4.9
Shelter	0	0	17	20.9
Everything	0	0	15	18.5
TOTAL	55	100.0	81	100.0

Note: (Totals are not constant because some respondents had more than one type of assistance)

The major problems that the orphaned, the abandoned, the poverty stricken and those from separated families faced prior to institutionalization were, lack of shelter (36.3%), lack of food (31.1%) and lack of fees (16.4%). (See chapter 4) .The findings in the above table show that no relative offered shelter to institutionalized children. The majority of those who offered

105

assistance, provided them with food and clothes (76.3%),16.4% accommodated them during the holidays.Among the uninstitutionalised, 18.5% were assisted in everything by their relatives.These saved them from being institutionalized, 20.9% were given shelter by their relatives while 30.8 were assisted with food and clothes.

Comparing the type of social support between the institutionalized and the uninstitutionalised, it was found that the social support offered to institutionalized children by relatives was not adequate in that 76.8% of them were assisted with food and clothes only. Though offered food and clothes they were still vulnerable to institutionalization because thy lacked shelter and were not in school.

Despite sharing same characteristics, the uninstitutionalised had to remain at home because 18.5% were staying with their relatives where they were assisted in everything. 20.9% were given shelter and 22.2% were assisted with fees and uniforms. Being in school and staying with these relatives, they could not have been institutionalized.

From the above findings, it can be concluded that the majority of (56.6%) institutionalized children lacked social support from relatives. Although 43.3% received social support it was less

and inadequate as compared to the uninstitutionalised. Institutionalized children lacked social support and those who had it, it was less and that is why despite sharing similar characteristics with their counterparts who remained at home they had to be institutionalized.

The whole discussion on social support agrees with scholars Gelfad and Olsen that lack or loss of social support determines institutionalization. The findings support the second part of H3 that children who have a loss or lack social support are more likely to be institutionalized. The findings on the two variables indicate that personal vulnerability (abandonment, being orphaned, Poverty stricken), low socio-economic status and lack or loss of social support must harmonize to bring about institutional placement. Therefore, the findings accept H3 that children who have low socio-economic backgrounds and lack social support are most likely to be institutionalized.

5.40 IMPACT/EFFECT OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION

There are those scholars (Kadushin(1980), Heywood(1959),Sjollund, (1978) who view institutional care rather positively and as a remedy on problems that beset the children in society. On the other hand, there are scholars like David and Appel,(1961), Bowlby (1952), Elken (1952), Simonsen (1947) who view institutional care rather negatively. The proponents of

107

institutionalization see it as providing the children with what their immediate original parents could not give them.

The study tried to find out whether children were offered what they lacked at home in the institutions. It was found that institutions provided children with what their immediate original parents could not give them. In institutions their well being is enhanced. If children can get in institutions certain basic requirements which lacked in their places of origin, then institutionalization seem to to be a better alternative to them. Whereas one group sees institutionalization as counter productive instead of rehabilitating children, placement is seen in the latter case as not only alienating children from the community, but even from their ownselves. This study compared the attitude of the institutionalized children towards their respective institutions and the control group towards their homes.

TABLE 5.10:   <u>Attitude towards homes and institutions</u>

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP   VS   CONTROL GROUP

Attitude	No. of respondents	%	No. of respondents	%
Life better	107	77.5	64	91.4
Better before	22	15.9	3	4.3
Boring here	9	6.6	3	4.3
TOTAL	138	100.0	70	100.0

The above table compares the attitudes of the institutionalized towards institutions and of the uninstitutionalised towards homes. 77.5% of the institutionalized found life better in institutions as compared to their life prior to institutionalization. However 15.9% claimed that life was better at home, for those who were at home despite sharing same characteristics, majority (91.4%) claimed that life was better at home. Although its argued that "A bad home is better than a good institution", the study shows that children preferred being in institutions than at home, they gave reasons such as no home, poor parents and lack of basic needs as their immediate problems before institutionalization.

However, those who remained at home were more comfortable than those in institutions. This is shown by the small percentages of those who said life was not better at home and was boring (4.3%). Attitude towards home or institution was also measured by finding out whether one had ever thought of running away from home or institution. While 90.4% of the children who remained at home had never thought of running away, also 80.3% of the institutionalized had never thought of running away. However 19.7% of the institutionalized indicated that they had thought of running away as compared to only 9.6% of the uninstitutionalised. Although the difference is very small majority of the ones who remained at home were comfortable. Those who had never thought of running away gave reasons such as,no where to go (63.3%) no

parents (10.1%), no home (20.3%) and 7.2% said they can not trace home.

The findings show that institutions had provided a home for these children, where they were comfortable. This finding supports the scholars who view institutions as rescue centers which provide an alternative to no home or bad home. However, 42.3% indicated that they would like to leave. While 42.3% of the institutionalized wished to leave the institutions, 94.2% of the ones who remained at home indicated that they were comfortable and would not like to leave homes. However majority (57.7%) were comfortable in institutions and they never wished to leave. They gave reasons such as no home (58.9%), Comfortable (8.9%), parents poor (26.8%) and can't trace home (5.4%). This implies that children homes act as crisis intervention institutions helping children who are at risk due to being abandoned or neglected through circumstances of extreme poverty. They therefore see some apparent benefits: guaranteed clothing, education, food and an infinite supply of friends and playmates.

All in all, those who remain at home are more comfortable and only 5.8% said they wished to leave the homes. They gave reasons such as mistreatment by relatives and lack of some basic needs. Given these differing attitudes, one may not be able to assert categorically that institutionalization invariably has either negative or positive impact. In order to strike a balance

the study proposes that a truly objective assessment of impact of institutionalization on children must take into consideration the following: -

    (a)   age at institutionalization

    (b)   Environment where the child was prior to institutionalization

    (c)   The socio-economic background of the children

It can be expected that for instance, if in the previous environments the children suffered certain deprivations which they are able to get within the homes, then to such children institutional care will definitely be a relief and a solution to some of their problems. This leads to H4.

    H4:   **The impact of institutionalization depends on age at institutionalization, socio-economic background of the children and their life prior to institutionalization.**

The indicators of impact were:-

    (a)   Attitudes towards institutionalization

    (b)   Integration in institutions indicated by whether they had ever thought of running away and whether they would like to leave

111

5.4.1   Impact and Age

Table 5.11:   Attitude towards institutions and age at institutionalization

ATTITUDE	AGE AT INSTITUTIONALIZATION			
	0 - 5	6 - 11	11+	ROW TOTAL
LIFE BETTER BEFORE	7 (31.8)	14 (63.6)	1 4.5	22 17.5
LIFE BETTER IN INSTITUTION	43 (41.3)	39 (37.5)	22 (21.2)	104 82.5
COLUMN TOTAL	50 (39.7)	53 (42.1)	23 (18.3)	126 (100.0)

χ^2 = 6.10839   Df = 2   Significance = 0.0472
Contingency   Coefficient = 21503, pearsons, R = 0.03680

Note:Figures in brackets represent column percentages.

The above table shows that there is a relationship between attitude and age at institutionalization.   Those who were institutionalized when they were below six years (41.3%) found life better in institutions while those who were over six years the majority (68.1%) said life was better before.   The reason for this could be because those who were institutionalized when very young had lived at the institution for long.The only home that they know is the institution.

The chi-square test of significance shows that there is a significant relationship at 4.71% level of risk, although the relationship is significant the association between the two

112

variables is not very strong as indicated by the small values of contingency coefficient (0.21503). The reader is cautioned that the proportion is an estimate as we have one empty case or with less than five values. The findings accept the hypothesis that age at institutionalization influences attitudes towards institutions.

TABLE 5.12: <u>Attitude towards institutionalization and sex</u>

Attitude	Male	Female	Row Total
Better Before	7 (10.4)	15 (24.2)	22 (17.1)
Better in institution	60 (89.6)	47 (75.8)	107 (82.9)
COLUMN TOTAL	67 (51.9)	62 (48.1)	129 (100.0)

Note: Figures in brackets represent the column percentages. 11 observations were missing (they could not answer the questions)

χ^2 = 4.30119, Df = 1 Significance .0381
Contingency Coefficient = 0.17963. Phi = 0.18260

Table 5.12 tries to measure the relationship between attitude towards institutions and sex. The chi-square test of significance shows that there exists a significant relationship at 92.6% confidence level. Majority of the males (89.6%) said life was better in the institutions as compared to life prior to institutionalization. Only 10.4% of the males said life was better before as compared to 24.2% of the female. Although the

113

majority (82.9%) of the children said life was better in institutions, the proportion of boys who said the same was more as compared to the proportion of girls.The majority (68.2%) of those who said life was better before were female. Despite the relationship being significant,the association between the two variables is not very strong as indicated by the small values of contingency coefficient (0.20545) and Phi (0.20992).

5.42 IMPACT (attitude) AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND OF CHILDREN

The indicators of socio-economic status were ownership of property, family size, and level of formal education attained by parents.

Table 5.13   Attitude and ownership of Property

Attitude	Did not own property	Owned Property	Row Total
Better before	5 (13.2)	9 (33.3)	14 (21.5)
Life better than institution	33 (86.8)	18 (66.7)	51 (78.5)
Column Total	38 (58.5)	27 (41.5)	65 (100.0)

$X2 = 3.80197$ Significance = 0.0512

Contingency   Coefficient = 0.23507   Phi = 0.24185

(Figures in brackets represent row percentages)

The findings show that there is a relationship between attitude and ownership of property by parents. For the children whose parents never owned property, 86.8% of them found life better in the institutions while 33.3% of those who had parents with property found life better before institutionalization. This can be attributed to the fact that the majority of children whose parents had no property were poor and their children suffered from certain deprivations which were offered in the institutions.

The chi-square test of significance shows that the relationship is tentatively significant at 5.1% risk. The contingency coefficient (0.23507) indicates a slight association. It can therefore be concluded that those children who had poor socio-

115

economic   backgrounds   had   a   positive   attitude   towards
institutionalization.

5.50 CORRELATION(Measures of association between variables).

We continue to test the hypothesis that age, sex, socio-economic
backgrounds have an influence on impact.   The study uses the
coefficients to   investigate   the   strength and direction of
association between the various indicators of dependent and
independent variables.   This measure of association (correlation)
shows the direction and strength of relationship between two
variables.   It indicates whether the relationship is positive or
negative, and whether it is weak or strong(Prewitt, 1975: 135).
The pearson correlation co-efficient can take a value from -1.00
(perfect negative correlation) through 0 (no relationship between
the variables) to + 1.00 (perfect positive correlation).

        Dependent variable - impact of institutionalization on
                    respondents

        Indicators: i)Attitude (compare life before and after)

                      ii)Integration(would you like to leave and

                      have you ever thought of running away)

        Independent variables - 1.Age

                                2.Sex

                                3.Socio-economic backgrounds
                                     -ownership of property
                                     -Education level attained by
                                   parents
                                     -Family size

4. Life prior to institutionalization.

 -    where respondents were staying before staying prior to institutionalization.

 -    with whom respondents were staying with

This study uses coefficients to investigate the direction of association between the first indicator of the dependent variable (attitude) and the various indicators of independent variables.

KEY.

V 01   - Attitude (compare life before and after)

V 02   - Type of property owned by parents.

V 03   - Education level attained by parents(mother)

V 04   - Family size(nuclear)

V 05   - where the respondents stayed prior to institutionalization (home or streets)

V 06   - whether was staying alone or with parents

V 07   - Age at institutionalization in years.

V 08   - sex

Correlation matrix for hypothesis 4.

VARIABLE.	VO1	VO2	VO3	VO4	VO6	VO7	VO8
VO1	1.000						
VO2	-.302	1.000					
VO3	.119	-.401	1.000				
VO4	.152	-.101	.095	1.000			
VO5	-310	.617	-.411	.086	1.000		
VO6	.096	-.0382	.181	-.311	-.549	1.000	
VO7	-.242	-.032	.006	-.086	-.162	.351	1.000
VO8	.061	.100	.060	.128	.041	.278	-587	1000

Where the respondent stayed before institutionalization was observed to influence attitude towards institutions. A negative correlation (-0.310) was observed between attitude and where the respondents stayed prior to institutionalization (At home or elsewhere). This suggests that those who were staying at home prior to institutionalization indicated that life was better before as compared to those who stayed in the streets. This could be because those who stayed in the streets lacked almost all the basic needs, they therefore considered institutional placements as a relief to their problems. Ownership of property by parents also influenced attitude. A perfect negative correlation was observed between attitudes and whether parents owned property (-0.302). This indicates that those who had parents who never owned property found life better in institutions. The relationships show that attitude towards institutions is influenced by age, socio-economic background and life prior to institutionalization.

The coefficients indicated only slight relationships (0.119 and 0.152 respectively) between attitude and education level attained by parents and family size.

Integration of the respondents in the institutions was considered a good measure of impact. This was indicated by whether the children had ever thought of running away and whether they would like to leave the institutions.

Correlation Matrix

KEY.

V09 - Ever thought of running away

VARIABLE:	V09	V02	V03	V04	V05	V06	V07
V09	1.000						
V02	.236	1.000					
V03	.003	-.353	1.000				
V04	-.140	-.081	+.103	1.000			
V05	+245	-.629	-510	.022	1.000		
V06	.248	-4.22	.197	-.313	.657	1.000	
V07	.160	-212	.108	-.081	-401	.370	1.000
V08	.089	-.196	.037	-095	.144	-275	-5.05

The study found that there was a positive correlation between ownership of property (0.236), where the respondents were staying (0.245) and whom the respondents were staying with(0.248) and

119

whether the respondents had ever thought of running away. Those whose parents owned property majority were not properly integrated in the institutions because majority indicated that they had thought of running away. Education level attained by parents, age at institutionalization and sex slightly influenced integration. This was indicated by the small values of their coefficients. What influenced integration most was the life prior to institutionalization (0.245) and whether they were staying alone or with parents (0.2480). Those who were staying with their parents before institutionalization were less integrated in institutions. Having experienced parental love before they could not be properly integrated in the institution.

Integration of the respondents in the institutions.

V10 - whether respondents would like to leave the institution.

VARIABLE	VO10	VO1	VO2	VO3	VO4	VO5	VO6
V10	1.000						
VO1	-.053	1.000					
VO2	-.548	.353	1.000				
VO3	-.140	.081	.103	1.000			
VO4	.686	.169	-.510	.022	1.000		
VO5	-.138	-.422	.197	-.313	-.657	1.000	
VO6	-.019	-.212	.108	-.081	-.401	.370	1.000
VO7	.268	.196	.037	.095	.144	-270	-.507

There was a considerable relationship between integration (whether respondents wished to leave) and all the indicators of independent variables. There was a positive correlation between integration and sex (.268).The majority of the females indicated that they would like to leave the institutions. Those who came from large families indicated that they would not like to leave. This implies that they were more comfortable and integrated as compared to those who came from small families. In big families there are higher chances of deprivations due to economic strains. This could be the reason why they were more comfortable in institutions. The data shows that socio-economic backgrounds influenced their integration. Those who had parents with formal education and who owned property were less integrated as shown by the value of their coefficients.

In view of the low coefficients the findings are considered inconclusive. The study next employs regression analysis to continue testing the hypothesis that life prior to institutionalization, personal characteristics and socio-economic backgrounds influence impact. (attitude and integration)

5.60 REGRESSION ANALYSIS

In this section, an attempt is made to give a summary of all the factors/predictors that influence the dependent variable that were considered in H_4. On the basis of the weak relationships found in the correlation matrix, it was suggested that other

factors exist that can help to explain attitude and integration in the institutions. Regression analysis is therefore adopted for this purpose. Specifically, stepwise regression (that also entails multiple regression) is applied inorder to predict a single dependent variable from a given number of independent variables (predictors). Nie, (1970.321) points out that multiple regression as a description tool has an important use in "controlling other confounding factors in order to evaluate the contribution of a specific variable or set of variables"

Dummy variables have also been used for the variables that were measured at nominal scale level – without which regression analysis could not have been possible. Nie, H. Norman (1970:373) state that "dummy variables are most commonly used when a researcher wishes to insert a nominal variable into a regression equation. They further state that such variables are created by treating each category of a nominal variable as a separate variable and assigning arbitrary scores for all cases – depending upon the presence or absence in each of the categories. Since they have values of o and I, they may be treated as interval variables and inserted in a regression equation.

5.70 KEY FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE IMPACT (attitude and integration) IN INSTITUTIONS

Initially it had been hypothesized that age at institutionalization, sex, life prior to institutionalization and socio-economic backgrounds of the respondents influenced impact

(attitude and integration).Some of the variables were not found to have any significant relationship with the indicators of impact. Therefore some variables which proved irrelevant have been excluded and others that seemed to be good determinants were included. In regression analysis, other predictors,namely "parental background" (whether one had parents or not) and frequency of punishments are also included in the regression .equation. The rationale behind including other predictors has already been given.

Regression analysis is used in an attempt to find:-

(a) The joint contribution of the independent variables in explaining the dependent variable.

(b) The individual contribution of the independent variables in explaining the variation in the dependent variable.

The summary table of the stepwise regression analysis is given below. The predictors (independent variables) are presented in a descending order. The first predictor is the one that explains the greatest amount of the variance in the dependent variable. The last independent variable least explains the variance in the dependent variable individually.

Table 5.14   predictors of attitude

	1	2	3	4
Predictors	R	R2	% of joint explained variations	% of individual explained variations
*ownership of property by parents	0.34654	0.1201	12%	12.0
*Residence before institution alization.	0.39686	0.1576	15.8%	3.8
*parental background.	0.41218	0.1699	17.0%	1.2
Family size	0.41864	0.1752	17.5%	0.5
Age at institution alization.	0.42031	0.1767	17.7%	0.2
TOTAL				17.7

Note: predictors   with   very   small   correlation
         coefficients were   not   included in   the   stepwise
         regression equation.

    -    predictors   indicated with   * have   been converted
         into dummy variables
         "ownership of property"   owned=1
                                      did not own=0

The above table shows multiple regression and stepwise regression
between bivariate relationships.   While columns one, two and
three show multiple regression, column four indicates stepwise
regression.

124

It can be noted from column 4 that ownership of property by parents is the best predictor of attitude.The majority of the respondents who had parents who had property and had parents indicated that life was better before. Ownership of property explained 12% of the variance while operating individually ownership of property and residence before institutionalization explained 15.8% of the variations. When a third predictor (parental background) is introduced in the equation the three predictors explain 17% of the variances in attitude. Finally when all the five predictors are considered, they explain 17.7% of the variances when operating jointly.

From column 4, it can be noted that ownership of property by parents alone has the greatest explanation to the variance in attitude when operating individually. Age at institutionalization has the lowest explanation of variance with individual explanation of 0.2%.

It is therefore concluded that there are other factors that influence attitude towards institutions. It is important to note that the individual contribution of age at institutionalization in explaining the variance is minimal.We thus reject the hypothesis that attitude towards institutions depends on age at institutionalization.

TABLE 5.15:   **Relative importance of key independent variables affecting integration of respondents in the institutions (whether respondents would like to leave the institution)**

Predictors	R	R²	% of joint explained Variations	% of individual explained variances
Family size	0.068572	0.47021	47%	47%
*ownership of property by parents	0.75893	0.57598	57.6%	10.6%
*parental background	0.77066	0.59391	59.4%	1.8%
Age at instituti- onalisation	0.78297	0.61304	61.3%	1.8%
TOTAL	-	-	61.3	61.3

* = The variables that have been converted into dummy variables.

"Ownership of property" owned = 1, did not own = 0,

"Parental background", Had parents = 1
                       Had no parents = 0

The table above presents factors in the study considered as paramount in influencing integration of children in institutions. Family size emerged as relatively the major factor that influence integration. Children who had come from big families were more integrated in the homes and they indicated that they would not like to leave the institutions. In deed, this predictor explained 47% of the variation of attitude towards leaving the home while operating individually, when operating jointly with ownership of

property by parents family size explained 57.6% of the variance. In all, the four factors that the study was able to consider explain 61.3% of the variation of integration when operating jointly. This is a reasonable percentage implying that the four factors have a bearing on integration.

It is therefore concluded that socio-economic backgrounds of the children as indicated by their family size, ownership of property by their parents and parental background determined whether they wished to leave or not. Age at institutionalization explained only 1.8% of the variation.

In general the correlation between each of the four predictors and whether they would like to leave is quite strong. In concluding the discussion, it can be argued from the above findings that those children who come from big families, whose parents don't own property and those who have no parents are more integrated in the institutions. This could be attributed to reasons such as poverty at home, lack of a home and lack of parents and therefore they find institutions as a relief to their previous problems.

After testing H4, the following findings emerged as of importance to the study:-

    (a) ownership of property and age at institutionalization significantly influenced attitude towards institutions

(b) Among the predictors the study considered, ownership of
     property by parents was the best predictor of attitude
     towards institutions.

(c) There was a significant relationship between family
     size, ownership of property and integration in the
     institutions (whether would like to leave)

(d) The five predictors that the study considered explained
     61.3% of the variance in integration.

Family size best explained the variance in integration, age at
institutionalization had the lowest percentage of variance.

It can therefore be concluded that impact as measured by attitude
and integration depends mostly on socio-economic backgrounds of
the respondents parents.

CHAPTER SIX

6.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, the main findings of the study are summarised and conclusions are drawn. These help to answer questions raised in chapters one and two of this thesis. Recommendations and areas of further research are also pinpointed.

6.1 Major Attributes of institutionalized children

Among the institutionalized children, only 18.6% had both parents. The rest were orphaned (37.1%). This implies that these children had limited opportunities for being brought up in normal families. It was also found that 61.4% of the institutionalized children lived in Nairobi, Kiambu and Murang'a prior to institutionalization. For those who lived in Nairobi, 60% lived in the slums such as Mathare, Kibera and Korogocho. The average age of the institutionalized was 12 years.

6.2 SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUNDS OF THE RESPONDENTS

It was found that most of the children came from poor parents. While 61.5% of the mothers were not in any gainful employment, only 46.2% of the fathers were in wage employment. Farming, hawking and carpentry were found to be the major occupations for parents. This implies that they were low income earners as indicated by their occupations. In terms of property ownership, only 40.6% had parents who owned some property. The majority

(67.9%) owned small pieces of land below 3 acres. Most of their parents (57.5%) had attained formal education only up to primary level and that could be the reason why majority were not employed. The majority (81.%) came from big families (with 4 - 7 children). The modal size was four children and the maximum was eight.

As compared to the uninstitutionalized it was found that the institutionalized had inferior socio-economic backgrounds. Despite sharing similar characteristics, the uninstitutionalized had parents who owned property (63.8%). They owned property that could generate income,such as rental houses (26.7) animals (10%) and over 3 acres of land (56.7). The majority (82.5) of the uninstitutionalized had parents who were in wage employment. They were in occupational categories such as teacher,doctor and farmer. Comparing the two groups, it can be concluded that poverty or low socio-economic status leads to institutional placement. Most children were institutionalized because their parents were poor and could not afford some basic needs for them. The findings corroborate Onyango's (1984) observation that children in institutions are sons and daughters of poor people in urban areas.

6.3 SOCIAL SUPPORT FROM RELATIVE'S

The majority of the institutionalized respondents lacked or had loss of social support. While 67.9% of the children had relatives, only 43.4% of them received any assistance from them. For those who received any assistance, the majority (76.8%) were assisted with food and clothes only. It was also found in this study that despite being orphaned, being in poverty and in neglect, most of the uninstitutionalized were saved from institutional placement by their relatives. They provided them with food, shelter and all the other basic needs. This means that they had adequate social support. It is therefore concluded in this study that lack or loss of social support combined with personal vulnerabilities leads to institutionalization. The findings showed that relatives, if willing, can save the children from institutional placement by providing them with what they lacked at home.

6.4 Life prior to institutionalization

The study found that 63.8% of the respondents were staying at their places of origin, 44.3% were staying with their parents while 35% were staying with their relatives. Reasons why they left their homes were death of both parents (34.4%), separation of parents (16.2%) and poverty (16.8%). After such calamities respondents were deprived of basic needs such as food and shelter. Consequently, they could not stay at home, and institutional placement was a solution to some of their immediate problems. The study also found that 60.4% were attending school

but dropped out due to reasons such as lack of fees(72.8%).Lack of clothes,lack of food and shelter,and not being in school were found to be the major deprivations that the children suffered prior to institutionalization.

It can therefore be concluded that prior to institutionalization, the children lived in difficult circumstances and lacked the basic needs. Bearing in mind that the above mentioned deprivations are provided in institutions, it can be concluded that institutional placement is a relieve to some of their immediate problems. They should therefore be encouraged to intervene in cases of extreme poverty and neglection.

6.5 Institutionalization of children and their life in institutions

The majority (54.4%) were institutionalized because they were either orphaned or semi-orphaned. Parent-related difficulties were found to be the major causes of institutionalization as compared to child related difficulties. Relatives (37.9%) and police (35.0%) were the major agents who took the respondents to the institutions.In the institutions the children were offered with what they lacked at home. They were offered shelter, clothes, food and a chance to be in school. To them, institutional placement becomes a solution to their immediate problems. As a result, they had positive attitudes towards the

institutions. The institutions served as rescue centers to them and the majority (72.9%) were comfortable in the homes.

While it should be appreciated that institutions are doing a commendable job by serving orphaned and abandoned children, most of them were dormitory type except for SOS and Edelvale children homes which are cottage type. Dormitory type institutions did not create a home atmosphere. Mama Fatuma children's home, Mama Ngina and Dagoretti children's home were highly congested and exposed the children to high risk of infectious and other diseases. Given the lack of trained and adequate staff in the institutions studied, the care and supervision of children in these settings is rather poor and expose children to maltreatment of all sorts. Thus, the need to strengthen and monitor the activities of those settings.

6.6 Impact (attitude and integration) of institutionalization on children

The majority (77.5%) of the institutionalized children had positive attitudes towards institutions. Although its argued that "A bad home is better than a good institution", the study shows that institutionalized children preferred being in institutions to being in their previous homes. Due to their being deprived of basic needs prior to institutionalization and the provision of these needs in institutions, most respondents felt contented in the institutions and they did not wish to leave. It

can be concluded that institutions offer material needs that the home was not able to offer. This implies that, if children can be provided with the basic needs at home, they can not be institutionalized. Institutions seem to provide an alternative to a bad home, poor home or no home.

Although the majority were comfortable in institutions, they were not totally integrated in institutions.Many still missed their homes, and 42.3% said they wished to leave for home. Those who were comfortable and did not wish to leave gave reasons that indicated they were desperate and had no other alternatives.

Among the five predictors considered in the study, the property status of parents emerged as the best predictor (2%) of the variance in attitude towards institutions while age at institutionalization was the poorest predictor (0.2%). The five predictors were only able to explain 17.7% of the variance in attitude.

For integration in the institution, the best predictor was the size of the respondent's nuclear family (47%). The poorest predictor was age at institutionalization (18.8%). The four predictors chosen were able to explain 61.3% of the variance in integration.Those who came from small families and had parents at home were less integrated in the institutions.

Finally the study found that institutionalized children saw some apparent benefits such as guaranteed clothing, education, food and infinite supply of friends and playmates. It can therefore be concluded that children homes act as crisis intervention institutions helping children who are at risk due to abandonment, being orphaned and neglected through circumstances of extreme poverty.

6.7 Recommendations

It is rather difficult to offer prescriptions in situations where the underlying reason for family problems is poverty. The deprived economic status of the majority of the families where institutionalized children came from is more than obvious. However, the study has managed to identify certain factors that if addressed can manage to minimize the problem.

(A)POLICY

1. Social workers alone should recommend or take children to institutions. This will ensure that only very deprived and desperate children will be institutionalized. Children who have parents and relatives should not be institutionalized, rather their parents if very poor should be assisted financially at home to enable them afford the basic needs.

2. The study observed that institutionalized children came from large families averaging seven persons.Although this is

consistent with the family pattern in Kenya, the difference arises from the fact that the majority of children in institutions are of single parents, most of whom are women with unreliable sources of income and shelter. Therefore, activities regarding population control are highly desirable.

3. The majority of the respondents had dropped out of school. This was due to unstructured school levies related to buildings, library, textbooks, fees and uniform requirements. Therefore it is highly recommended that the government and local authorities should review and come up with policies that protect children from poor families and who are orphaned from being denied their right to education. As such education should be made affordable and compulsory upto primary level, uniforms should be abolished to enable children from poor parents attain education upto primary level.

4. Fosters and adoption services should be introduced to abandoned children to reduce the population in institutions.

5. Since parental related difficulties were found to be the dominant reasons why children were institutionalized, the problems of child abuse, neglect and institutionalization should not be discussed in isolation but in conjunction with the problems of the family.

6. Children's homes should act as crisis intervention institutions helping where a child is at health risk due to being abandoned, or neglected, or through circumstances of extreme poverty for many families can claim a degree of poverty. If conditions at home improve or can be improved, the child should be restored. If a child's health is not at risk and he/she can be adequately cared for by family members (this must not be mother or father), he should not be admitted to an institution. Prospective fostering parents or institutions can foster children through sponsorship. The child fostered would communicate with the foster parents or institutions and could be assisted within his own environment. This is how C.C.F (Christian children fund) is doing at the moment others should adopt their style.

7. For future action, there is need for a situational assessment to identify and categorize the of institutionalized children and their circumstances in urban and rural Kenya. There is also a need for accurate data on the number of victims and the type of families and communities that generate them. Community based child care services should be initiated so that children can be supported in their own homes instead of being moved to institutions — this would also mobilize the community for advocacy towards protection and prevention of child abuse and neglect.

8. If a family has put itself into difficulties, for example by moving to the city, alternatives for the care of the children are sought in the rural areas. They should be encouraged to go back to the rural area rather than remaining in the slums of the city and seeking help from an institution. Within the District Focus for Rural Development (DFFRD) some of these people can be rehabilitated to a better life through counselling and follow up by extension workers and District Children Officers.

9. Because it is too easy to focus on the advantages of a children's home, many people are trying to open children's homes all over the country. While this humanitarian commitment is commendable, there should be co-ordination of activities in the homes geared towards national goals. The study recommends that children's homes should not be run by individuals but by committees to avoid exploitation of children, mistreatment and overcrowding in such homes.They should be administered by trained social workers and children officers.

(B)FURTHER RESEARCH

10. Many people are not aware that institutional life is emotionally damaging to children. They see some apparent benefits:- guaranteed clothing, education, food, and an infinite supply of friends and playmates. They do not see (because this is not visible) the disincentives to do well at school, the growing selfishness, and assumption that whatever the child wants

can be provided from the apparently infinite resources of the institution. They do not see the emotional deprivation of receiving care from paid staff, instead of the biological bond of love and the sense of belonging which is only possible in a family (even when the love is expressed in anger, unfairness and in the face of physical or material hardships). Therefore, an institution should be a last resort for a child, and those who remain there should be children who would be at risk elsewhere. The child should never be removed from the family; rather the child's environment should be strengthened through programs in health, education, community development and income producing skills.

11. A specific study should be undertaken focusing on those who have already left the institutions. This could act as a follow up study. Such a study would reveal the impact of institutional life on children personality and future life. Such a study would provide much needed data on whether institutions really help or they have harmful effects on the children's future life and behaviour.

<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>

ANNPCAN,

1991,   <u>Draft report on a study of street children in</u>

<u>Kenya</u>. submitted to FORD foundation.

BALLERS W.&

CHARLES D.

1961,   <u>The psychology of human development.</u> U.S.A.,

Winston Holt, Rinehart Publishers.

BOWLBY JOHN.

1952,   <u>Maternal care and mental health; a report</u>

<u>prepared on behalf of the world health</u>

<u>organization as a contribution to the united</u>

<u>nations,</u> 2nd edition.

BURT.C.

1947   <u>The young delinquents in london:</u>University of

london press.

1986,   <u>Criminal Justice and Children, a report on</u>

<u>workshop held at Kenya institute of</u>

<u>administration 7-11th August</u>.

DWORETZKY JOHN

1988,   <u>Introduction to child development</u> St. Paul:

East Publishing Company.

ELKIN.E.

      1962   Children and Society: the process of
                      Socialization. New York: Rainhouse Company
                      Publishers.

FABIO DALLAPE

      1988,   An experience with street children. Nairobi:
                      Mangraphic limited.

GLUECK, ELEANOR,

      1968,   Delinquents and non-delinquents in
                      perspective. Cambridge; Harvad University
                      Press.

GOVERNMENT OF KENYA (GOK)

AND UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN

FUND(UNICEF)

     1989,   Children and women in Kenya. Nairobi:
                      Mangraphics Limited.

GOLDFARB.W,

      1943,   American journal or orthopsychiatry. volume
                      13.

GOOD WILLIAM JOSIAH,

      1964,   The family Eaglewood Cliff: N.J. Practice
                      hall.

HAGOOD. J.MARGARET,

  1969,   Statistics for Sociologists. New York: Holt

        and Company.

JEAN.S.HEYWOOD,

  1959,   Children in care, the development of the

        service for the deprived child. Lowe:

        Brydone Printers.

KADUSHIN ALFRED,

  1967,   Child Welfare Services. New York: Macmillan

        publishers.

  1970,   Adopting older children. New York: Columbia

        University press.

KAYONGO MALE &

P. ONYANGO,

  1984,   Sociology of the African Family. London:

        Longman Press

KENYA MEDICAL

WOMEN ASSOCIATION

  1989,   Child abuse and neglect, selected papers from

        4th scientific seminar of the Kenya Medical

Women Association.   Nairobi: Initiative

Publishers.

LYDIAH LAMBERT,

1980,   <u>Children in changing families (A study of

adoption and illegitimacy).</u> New York:

Macmillan Press Limited.

MCKINLEY. D.,

1904,   <u>Social class and family life.</u> New York: the

free press.

MCCORD D.,

1959,   <u>Origins of crime</u>. New York: Columbia

University press.

MUGA ERASTO,

1971   <u>The background of some juvenile developments.</u>

<u>Reprint from journal of East Africa Research</u>

<u>and Development</u>s. volume one and two.

MUTURI. A.,

1984,   <u>A paper presented on the seminar on the law

as it related to children 29-30th June</u>

MOSER & KALTON,

    1958,   <u>Survey methods in social investigation.</u>

                London: Heinman education book.

NIE,H.NORMAN&

BENT.H.DALE

    1970,   <u>Statistical package for social sciences(spss).</u>

                New york:Macgraw inc.

PREWITT KENNETH,

    1974,   <u>Introduction to research methodology. East</u>

                <u>African Application (Occasional Paper No.</u>

                <u>10).</u> Nairobi: IDS.

REID BETTY,

    1973,   <u>Where and the children</u>. Mandell lexington

                books.

REPUBLIC OF KENYA

    1953,   <u>Report of the committee on young persons and</u>

                <u>children</u>. Nairobi: Government Printers.

    1961,   <u>Report of a survey on problems of child</u>

                <u>welfare</u>. Nairobi: Government Printers.

SIMONSEN K.M

    1947,   <u>Examination of children from children homes</u>

                <u>and day nurseries</u>. Copenhagen.

SJOLUND ANNE

   1978,   <u>Institutions and Children Developments</u>.

           Teakfield Limited.

UNICEF,

   1992,   <u>The state of the worlds children</u> .oxford

           university press.

WALLIS. W. ALLEN

& ROBERTS V. HARRY

   1956,   <u>The nature of statistics</u>. New york. The

           free press England.

WANJIRU S.M.

   1981,   <u>Dissertation on child socialisation in</u>

           <u>fondling institutions.</u> Nairobi

           University.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
RESEARCH ON INSTITUTIONS FOR CHILD CARE IN NAIROBI IN NAIROBI
SECTION I: To be administered to the members of
                administrative staff
                GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE INSTITUTION

1.   Name of Institution.....................................
2.   Location...
3.   Year started...
4.   What were objectives for the establishment of this home
     ....
     ....
5.   Who manages the home?..................................
     ....
8.   What is the total number of children in this home?
     Male:..
     Female:..
9.   What is the capacity of this home.
10. Details of annual enrolment?...........................

     ....

11. On employment.
            (a) Number of employees.........................
            (b) Qualifications.............................
            (c) Positions.................................

12. Sources of income to run the institution.
            (1) Government
            (2) Overseas donors
            (3) Local organizations
            (4) Local organisations
            (5) Others (specify

13. What kind of special care do you give to children?

            i)   ....
            ii)   ....
            iii)   ....
            iv)   ....

14. What are the objectives of this home?
            i)   ....
            ii)   ....
            iii)   ....
            iv)   ....

(b)   How are they implemented
     ....

....
....
....

15.   What problems do you encounter in attempt to bring up
      children?
      ....
      ....
(b)   Why do you think there are these problems?
      ....
      ....
(c)   How can they be solved?
      ....
      ....
16a. Do you have any information about children who have left
      this place?
      (1)   Yes....................
      (2)   No....................
(b)   If yes, where are they now and what do they do?
      ....
      ....
17.   Do you consider the home as beneficial or harmful to
      children?
      ....
      ....
      Explain....................................
      ....
18.   What are the priority needs in this home? Why?

19.   What problems of these children do you often have to
      address?
      ....
      ....
20.   Give any other comment about the institution
      ....
      ....

1.   Respondent number.....................................
2.   Sex...
3.   Female..
4.   Age in years..
5.   Place of birth (District, Location....................
      ....
6.   Religion..
7.   Tribe...
8.   Residential area
         1.   Rural (District, Location....................
         2.   Urban (City, Estate..........................

Background Information
9.   (a) Which of your parents is alive?
            1.   Both..
            2.   Mother only.................................
            3.   Father only.................................
            4.   Neither.....................................
            5.   Don't know..................................
      (b) If any of your parents is dead, when (Month and Year)
            Mother..
            Father..
      (c) If both parents are alive, do they stay together?
            1.   Yes.................
            2.   No..................
            3.   Don't know...........
      (d) If not, where does each of your parents stay (District,
           Location or Town Estate)
            1.   Mother..................
            2.   Father..................
10.   Is your father or mother employed
      Father: Yes..............   No................
      Mother: Yes..............   No................

      (b) If yes where: Mother..............
                          Father..............

      (c) If not what does each do?
           Mother.....................
           Father.....................

11.   Do your parents own any property? (interms of land,
      animals, house etc.)
      Yes......................   No......................
      If yes specify
      ....
      ....
      ....

12. Have your parents had any formal education?
    Mother 1. Yes........   2. No........ 3. Don't know......
    Father 1. Yes........   2. No........ 3. Don't know......

    (b) If yes, which level did they attain?
         Mother...
         Father...

13. Besides parents, do you have any relatives?
    Father 1. Yes........   2. No........ 3. Don't know......

    (b) If yes, Please specify who they are where they are, and
         what each currently does.

    _____
                          District, Location)
    Relative   Location(Town, estate)   Occupation
    _____
    1.
    2.
    3.
    4.
    _____

    (c) Do you ever receive any assistance from these
         relatives?
         1.   Yes................   No..............

    (d) If yes specify type of assistance
         ....
         ....

14. Do you have brothers sisters?
    Brothers: Yes.............   No.................
    Sisters: Yes.............   No.................
    (b) If yes how many?   Brothers......................
                             Sisters.......................
    (c) Please state what each is currently doing
         ....
         ....

LIFE PRIOR TO INSTITUTIONALIZATION

15. Prior to coming to this home where were you staying?

    1.   At place of origin................................
    2.   In this location (if not place of origin).........
    3.   In the streets..................................
    4.   Elsewhere (specify)
    (b) With whom were you staying?
    1.   Alone
    2.   With parents (mother......................
                        father......................
                        Both......................

149

3.   With relatives...............................
        (c)   Why did you leave your previous place of resident?
              ....
              ....
              ....
16.   Did you ever go to school?
        Yes................
        No.................
        (b)   If yes for how many years?.........................
        (c)   If no what were the reasons for not attending or
              dropping out of school...............................
              ....
        (d)   If you never used to go to school what did you use to
              do?...
              ....
              ....

17.   What problems did you experience immediately prior to your
        coming to this home?...................................
        ....
        ....
        ....

        LIFE IN THE HOME

18.   When did you join this institution?
        Month..........................
        Year...........................

19.   How did you get to this home?
        1.   Brought by parents
        2.   Brought by relatives
        3.   Came alone
        4.   Brought by police
        5.   Don't know
        6.   Others (specify).

20.   What were the reasons for your coming/being to this home?
        ....
        ....
        ....
        b)   How old were you? Years............................
21.   Could you please describe the activities in which you
        involve yourself daily from the time you wake up to the time
        you go to sleep at night?
        ....
        ....
        ....

22.   Are there any rules you have to follow:
        1.   Yes...............   2.   No....................
        b)   If yes specify......................................

....
c)   What happens to anybody who does not obey these
      rules..
....
23. Do you get any free time to do anything of your own choice?
     1.   Yes..............   2.   No....................
     b)   If yes, please specify what you do during your free
           time?
     Evenings...
     Saturdays..
     Sundays..

24. Do you get time to visit your friends, parents or relatives?
     Parents   Mother   1.   Yes............   2. No.........
                Father   1.   Yes...........   2. No........
     b)   If yes, how frequently do you do this? 1. every
           week.............   2.   Every month   3.   Yearly.

25. Do you receive any visitors from outside this home?
           1.   Yes .....   2.   NO .....
     b)   If yes what type of visitors do you receive?
                 . . . .
                 . . . .
     c)   How frequently do you receive such visitations?
                 . . . .
                 . . . .
     d)   Does your mother or father visit you here?
                 Mother: Yes ....   NO. ....
                 Father: Yes ....   NO. ....
           If yes, how many days in past 30 days?

26. Do you get any form of assistance from outside home?
     Yes...................   2.   No.....................
     b)   If yes, what is the nature of assistance?
           ....
27. Do you know why you are here?
     Yes...................   No.......................
     If yes (probe further)
     b)   Have you ever been punished here?
     Yes.................   No......................
     c)   If yes how many times in past 30 days and why?
     ....
     ....
     d)   What kind of punishment were you given.......
           ....
           ....
28. What kind of assistance do you get from this home?
     1...................   2..........................
     3...................   4..........................
     5...................   6..........................

b) What kind of activities are you involved in while staying at this home?

c) Are these activities of any use to you
1. Yes.........   NO........................
Explain..
....

d) Are you forced to do these activities or do you do them freely
1. forced ....   2. freely...........

29. How do you compare life before and life after joining this home?
1. life better here,   2. life better before,
3. life boring here,   4. others (specify) ......
....

b) Have you ever thought of running away
Yes.............   NO..............
Why? ....

c) Would you like to leave this place?
Yes.............   NO..............

Why?..

d) What are you given here that you never used to get at home? ....
....

30. Has anybody else in your family ever been institutionalized?

Yes..........   NO..............
If yes, who and why? ....
b) Do you miss your father/mother?
Mother: Yes.........   NO..............
Father: Yes.........   NO..............
Why? ....

31. What do you like most here?
1. Food.........   2. Staff.........   3. Friends.......
4. Education.......   5. All of them.......   6. None....
b) What do you dislike most about this home? ....
....

32. How would you describe the relationship between you and members of staff?
1. Friendly............   2. Very friendly.........
3. Unfriendly.........   4. Very unfriendly.......
b) Please explain your answer.
....
....

33. In what ways can you say that living in this home has helped you? ....
....

b)   In what ways can you say living in this home has
     adversely affected you? ....
     ....
c)   In what ways do you think institutional care can be
     improved? ....
     ....

Thank you.

SECTION III:

              To be administered to the control group.

Personal Characteristics:

1.   Respondent number...

2.   Sex..

       Male...

       Female...

3.   Age in years...

4.   Place of birth

                 District.....................................

                 Location.....................................

                 Town...

                 Estate.......................................

5.   Religion...

6.   Tribe..

7.   Residential area

Background Information

8.   (a) Which of your parents is alive?

            1.   Both......................................

            2.   Mother only...............................

            3.   Father only...............................

            4.   Don't know................................

            5.   Neither...................................

    (b) If any of your parents is dead, when (Month and Year)

                 Mother.......................................

                 Father.......................................

    (c) If both parents are alive, do they stay together?

            1.   Yes...................

            2.   No....................

             3.   Don't know............

    (d) If not, where does each of your parents stay (Rural District, Location or Town Estate)

            1.   Mother..................

            2.   Father..................

    (e) Marital Status

            1.   Married   2.   Single

            3.   Divorced   4.   Widowed

            5.   Don't know   6.   N/A

9.   Is your father or mother employed

     Father: Yes..............   No.................

     Mother: Yes..............   No.................

    (b) If yes where: Mother..............

                      Father..............

    (c) If not what does each do?

        Mother....................

        Father....................

....
....
....
15. Did you ever go to school?
    Yes...............
    No................
    (b) If yes for how many years?........................
    (c) In which class are ?
    (d) If no, what were the reasons for not attending or
         dropping out of school................................
         ....
    (e) If you never used to go to school what did you use to
         do?..
         ....
         ....
16. Do you have friends around your home area?
    1.   Yes.......................... 2. No................
    (b) If yes how frequently do you meet?
         1.   Daily................   2.   Monthly........
         3.   Yearly..............
    (c) If you don't have friends why?
         ....
         ....
         ....

    (d) Do you visit them?
         1.   Yes....................... 2.   No........
         1.   Every day   2.   Every week
         3.   Every month   4.   Every year
    (e) What do you do together with them?
         ....
         ....
         ....
17. Do you have any future plans?
    1.   Yes................ 2.   No......................
    Explain...
    (b) What do you do during your free time?..............
    (c) Could you please describe your daily routine......
         ....
18. Are you ever punished by your parents?
    Mother: Yes..................   No...................
    Father: Yes..................   No...................
19. Do you love your parents
    Mother: Yes..................   No...................
    Father: Yes..................   No...................
    Explain..
    b)   Do your parents restrict you from doing anything?
    Mother: Yes..................   No...................
    Father: Yes..................   No...................
    Explain..

156

20. Would you like to leave home and go somewhere else far form your parent.
    Yes................... No.....................
    Yes................... No.....................
    Explain (Why and where).........................
21. What kind of assistance do you get from your parents?
    Father:...
    Mother:...