

Risk Factors of the Anti-Social Conducts of Young People 17 to 24 Years of the Kenya Commune

BUPE KABESA Dieudonné¹, LUTA MULUBWA Antoinette²

Abstract: *Today the misbehavior of young people has become a widespread phenomenon in all the major cities of the world and opens a gap of reflection for scientists around the world and especially in the field of education, which is why our study aims to identify Risk factors underlying the anti-social behavior of young people to propose appropriate solutions that would contribute to the decline of the phenomenon observed in this environment. Based on the survey method supported by the questionnaire and interview techniques, we reached 106 respondents, including 86 boys and 26 girls aged between 17 and 24 years. We have come to the conclusion that: Most of the young people met with anti-social acts (Vandalism, public disorder, manifestation, the consumption of psychotropic substances, sexual immorality ...); many of these young people are boys from disadvantaged families whose parents do not have formal, well-paid (resourceful) jobs. These parents would not be a good model for the education of their children, because they would give themselves to the consumption of psychotropic that situation would lead to the lack of supervision of children by their parents.*

Keywords: Risk factors, anti-social behaviors and youth

1. Introduction

In the past, education had a collective and social character, which was not only the responsibility of the family, but also of the clan, the village, the ethnic group ... the individual defined himself according to the community and that is in the social group that the child is learning: he is also subject to collective discipline. The child being considered as a common good, it is to the education of all. It can be sent, advised, corrected or punished by any adult in the village.

Today, the so-called "modern" education introduced with colonization and the mass media seems to discard true values, all educational agents (family, school ...) seem to desert their educational mission and family education leaves room for education. Diffuse education that we observe on everything in large cities where true values have given way to antisocial behavior (vandalism, foul language, thuggery, rape, theft, sexual immortality ...).

According to Leblanc (1994, p.43), the antisocial behavior of young people is a social problem that every society faces. In Quebec, as elsewhere, young offenders have many victims and cost taxpayers large sums of money.

As the commune of Kenya is a commune in the city of Lubumbashi, the young people of this group, especially those aged between 17 and 24, are not so spared from antisocial behavior. These young people would give themselves especially to vandalism, foul language, thuggery, theft, sexual immortality .

According to Leblanc (1994: 44), when anti-social behaviors appear in childhood or early adolescence, the problem is even more worrying since today's offenders will be the criminals of tomorrow.

This approach is mainly devoted to the risk factors of antisocial behavior of young people aged 17 to 24 in the commune of Kenya, which is why we asked ourselves the following question: What are the risk factors at the basis of the emergence of anti-social behavior among 17 to 24 year olds in Kenya?

This is the question we will try to answer throughout this study.

This work aims to identify the risk factors underlying the emergence of anti-social behaviors of young people in order to suggest possible solutions. This study interests parents on the one hand because the will of these parents is to see their children become useful for themselves and for society. On the other hand, researchers in psychology, education and other scientific fields will use our results to expand or guide their scientific work.

To verify our hypothesis and achieve the objectives of our study, we used the survey method to identify the risk factors underlying the anti-social behavior of young people from 17 to 24 in order to propose appropriate solutions. Non-directive questionnaire and interview techniques were used as data collection tools. For data processing, the non-parametric chi-square statistical test was used.

2. Theoretical Frame

This part is essentially devoted to the presentation of theoretical elements related to this study.

Adolescence

Adolescence is a period of development particularly sensitive to the appearance and aggravation of various problems of adaptation, including deviant behavior. Several studies have shown that these behaviors usually appear in early adolescence and peak in their prevalence at the end of high school and decrease rapidly in early adulthood. This general trajectory, often called the "age-crime curve", is a relatively stable and widespread phenomenon in different societies. Piguero et al (2003, p.26).

More specifically, for the majority of individuals, anti-social behaviors usually appear in mid-adolescence, between the ages of 13 and 16 years. Leblanc (1989, p.39).

However, although they are less numerous, some young people manifest these behaviors earlier than 12 years of age. Moffet (1993, p.39).

Socialization of the adolescent

Bariaud and Rodriguez (1987, p.127), the transition from the state of infantile dependence to the state of affective and social autonomy of the adult is negotiated first in the family environment. It is in this context that psychoanalysis, from S. Freud, situates the adolescent crisis, triggered by the awakening of the impulses that causes sexual maturation. According to this approach, at the time of puberty, in a repetition of the child sexual period, reactivates the oedipal situation. The transient disturbances and maladjustments of the adolescent resulting from the conflict between a relatively strong ca and a relatively weak ego. Are conceived as normal and even necessary for further balanced development. The outcome of the crisis is marked by the abandonment of old parental identifications, the elaboration of new defense mechanisms and the reinforcement of the autonomous activities of the self that lead, among other things, to a diversification of relations with others. Whichever approach is taken, it is clear that, in adolescence, the child must abandon the mode of relationship that he had with his parents so far, and build another one in which autonomy and the identity of the partners will be fully recognized.

The identity of the teenager

Bariaud and Rodriguez (1987, p.128), the reshaping of identity is a major issue of this period: the adolescent must assimilate and integrate into self-representations the set of physical, psychological and relational changes they make. the object. It must also be inserted in a personalized temporal perspective, recognize itself in a past that is its own and finds the certainty of self-continuity and, being aware of the transitory nature of the present, relates to a future that it can try to build.

Theories on the antisocial behavior of young people

Antisocial behavior is a general term that refers to many similar behaviors that are manifested by young people. These behaviors can be placed on a continuum ranging from statutory offenses, ie behaviors perceived by adults as problematic or at risk (eg alcohol consumption, sexual conduct at risk), serious offenses included in the criminal code (eg theft, fraud, rape murder). White (2003, p.46).

Thus although the concept of antisocial behavior encompasses various different behaviors, since many of them tend to manifest simultaneously in the same individuals, they can be empirically empiricalized by a latent dimension or factor. This latent dimension is sometimes called delinquency, general syndrome of deviance, syndrome of externalization. Jessor (1977, p.28).

The antisocial behavior of young people is a social problem that every society faces. When anti-social behavior occurs in childhood or early adolescence, the problem is even more worrying as today's offenders will be the criminals and parents of tomorrow. White (1994, p.43).

Risk Factors for Antisocial Behavior

Several risk factors related to the development of antisocial behaviors of young people have been identified by the researchers. In fact, risk factors can be grouped into five (5) distinct categories: individual, family, school, peer, community and societal. Tanner-Smith et al (2013p, 102).

Among family factors, the low socioeconomic status of parents is a classic risk factor for antisocial behavior. This is a major postulate of several criminological theories. Agnew (2009, p.67).

Several studies have found that adolescents from lower socio-economic backgrounds are at higher risk of developing antisocial behaviors. Another important family factor is parents' anti-sociality. Indeed, several studies have confirmed that youth who have a parent who participates in antisocial activities such as: crime or alcohol or drug abuse are significantly more likely to exhibit antisocial behavior in their turn. Marray and Farrington (2010, p.37).

Family structure is also a risk factor associated with the development of antisocial behavior. Living in a single-parent or other stepfamily as opposed to living in a nuclear family with two biological parents increases the risk of adjustment problems. This is explained by the correlation between family structure and the presence of difficulty in the non-nuclear family. Bakker (2012, p.48).

In addition, several studies have shown that weak family supervision of youth activities is a predictor of participation in antisocial behavior. Indeed, the lack of parental supervision increases the likelihood that the young person will demonstrate antisocial behavior. Parental anti-sociality is also a recognized risk factor for antisocial behavior. Several studies have shown that having a brother or sister with delinquent behaviors increases the risk of delinquent behavior. With respect to peer factors, associating with antisocial peers is also a robust risk factor for antisocial behavior. Rutter et al (1998, p.23).

It has been shown that being associated with delinquent peers during adolescence is the most important predictor of antisocial behavior. Agnew (2009, p.14).

In addition, peer pressure is also considered a risk factor for youth anti-social behavior. Day and Wanklyn (2012, p.68). It should be noted that the cumulative risk behavior behavior, being exposed to many of these factors increases the risk of participating in antisocial behavior. Rutter (1979, p.52).

3. Methodological Framework

In this part, the study population being infinite, we will present the study sample, the method and the techniques used.

Study sample

At this level, the stratified simple random sampling method allowed us to extract 106 subjects from the population, including 80 boys and 26 girls.

Table 1: Sample

age / sex	17 years old	18 years old	19 years old	20 years old	21 years old	22 years old	23 years old	24 years old
Male	3	5	8	10	11	9	19	15
Female	1	2	4	8	2	4	3	2
Total	4	7	12	18	13	13	22	17

The figures in the table above represent the sums of young people by age and sex whose level of study varies between two and four years of post-primary study.

Method and techniques of research

For clarification, let's say that in our investigation, we used the survey method, having been supplemented with the following techniques:

Non-directive interview techniques and the questionnaire for data collection as well as the non-parametric Chi-square statistical test were used to test the significance of the differences observed between the results at the level of each item in the context of the distribution of data.

Frequencies with the formula:

$X = \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$ knowing that $f_e = N / K$ and $dl \square (K-1) (n-1)$, the only retained $\square \alpha 0.5$

Legend:

f_o = observed frequency

f_e = thermal frequency

X^2 = chi-square or chi-square

N = total workforce

K = number of categories

n = number of ranks

Variables retained or significant indicators of research

- Individual factors: age and sex
- Family factors: socio-economic status, parental anti-sociality, anti-siblingship, family unit and lack of parental supervision.
- Influence of friends or peers.

Search Results

To make our study more explanatory, the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the results were carried out according to all the variables or significant indicators of the research.

Results relating to individual factors

In the individual factors, we found two variables that explain the antisocial behaviors of young people: age and sex.

Table 2 : Age

Age	Fo	%
17 years old	4	3,77
17 years old	7	6,6
17 years old	12	11,32
17 years old	18	16,38
17 years old	13	12,26
17 years old	13	12,26
17 years old	22	20,75
17 years old	17	16,04
Total	106	100

In our sample, the average age is 20.5 years, 23-year-olds represent 20.75%; 20 years represent 16.32%; 24 years represent 16.04%; 21 and 17 years 3.77%

With regard to the calculated Chi-square test which is 18.08 higher than 14.07 of the table with $dl = 7$, age significantly determines the manifestation of anti-social behaviors of young people, ie young people. 23-year-olds pose more antisocial acts than others.

Table 3: Sex

Sex	Fo	%
Male	80	75.47
Female	26	24.53
Total	106	100

In our entire sample, we have 75.47% of boys and 24.53% of girls.

With regard to the Chi-square test, $X^2_{cal} 27.5$ which is greater than $X^2_{tab} 3.84$ with $dl = 1$, there is a significant difference because the boys show antisocial behaviors than the girls.

Results relating to family factors

In this section we have identified 5 variables that explain the manifestation of anti-social behavior: low socio-economic status, parents' anti-sociality, antisocial siblings, family structure and lack of supervision.

Table 4: Socio-economic status

Work of the parents	Fo	%
Resourceful	36	33,96
Driver	15	0,14
Farmer	12	14,32
Mechanic	10	9,43
trader	27	25,47
Welder	4	3,77
Male nurse	2	0,02
Total	106	100

In our entire sample, 33.96% of youth report that their fathers are resourceful; 25.47% are traders; 11.32% are farmers; 9.43% are mechanics; 3.77% are welders; 0.14% are drivers and 0.02% are nurses.

With regard to the Chi-square test, $X^2_{cal} 60.02$ which is greater than the $X^2_{tab} 12.59$ with $dl = 6$, there is a significant difference between the frequencies because the young people whose parents are resourceful are numerous compared to the others. .

Table 5: The anti-sociality of parents

In our entire sample, 33.96% of youth report that their fathers are resourceful; 25.47% are traders; 11.32% are farmers; 9.43% are mechanics; 3.77% are welders; 0.14% are drivers and 0.02% are nurses.

With regard to the Chi-square test, $X^2_{cal} 60.02$ which is greater than the $X^2_{tab} 12.59$ with $dl = 6$, there is a significant difference between the frequencies because the young

people whose parents are resourceful are numerous compared to the others. .

Table 5: The anti-sociality of parents

	Fo	%
No	8	7,55
Both	5	4,72
Father	61	54,54
Mother	32	30,19
Total	106	100

In our sample as a whole 57.54% of young people report that their fathers are taking psychotropic medication; 30.19% of young people say their mothers take psychotropic medication 7.55% none of them take it and 4.72% say they both take it.

With regard to the test, X^2_{cal} 76,41 which is superior to X^2_{tab} 7,81 with $dl = 3$, the test is significant because the young people whose fathers take psychotropic drugs are numerous.

Table 6: Family unit

	Fo	%
Yes	89	83,96
No	17	16,04
Total	106	100

In our entire sample, 83.96% of youth report that their parents are together and 16.04% of youth report that their parents are not together.

Table 7: Parental Supervision

	Fo	%
Very severe	10	9,43
Severe	37	34,91
Less severe	59	55,66
Total	106	100

Young people in our sample, 55.66% say that their parents are less severe; 34.91% are severe and 9.43% of young people say that their parents are very severe.

With regard to the test, X^2_{cal} 34.10 is greater than X^2_{tab} 7.81 with $dl = 2$, there is a significant difference, because young people who lack parental supervision are numerous.

Table 8: Anti sociality of siblings

	Fo	%
Yes	7	6,6
No	99	93,4
Total	106	100

In our sample as a whole, 93.4% of young people say they do not have a brother who was arrested by the police or the courts and 6.6% of young people say they have a brother who has been arrested by Justice.

Results related to peer influence

Table 9: Number of Friends Taking Psychotropic Drugs

Number	fo	%
0	37	34,9
1	15	14,15
2	15	14,15
3	18	16,98
4	8	7,55
5	3	2,83
6	5	4,72
7	5	4,72
Total	106	100

Each respondent in our sample has an average of 1 friend taking psychotropic medication; 34.9% of youth report having no friends taking psychotropic medication 16.98% of young people report having 3 friends taking psychotropic medication 14.15% say they have 1 friend; 14.15% others say they have 2 friends; 7.55% say they have 4 friends 4.72% say they have 6 friends; 4.72% say they have 7 friends and 2.83% say they have 3 friends.

4. Results and Discussion

In this study, as we pointed out, we have 3 risk factors and their variables will be the subject of this part.

Regarding anti-social behavior, most of our young people admit to having participated in public disorders, the consumption of psychotropic drugs (hemp, liquor, drugs ...) at the public demonstration and have participated in acts of vandalism, as supports Leblanc (2003, p.28), antisocial behavior in adolescence is a general term that refers to several similar behaviors that are manifested by adolescents. These behaviors can be placed on a continuum ranging from statutory offenses, that is to say behaviors perceived by adults as being problematic or risk behaviors being defended by law and regulations (eg vandalism, public disorder) up to to serious offenses included in the Criminal Code.

Regarding age, 23-year-olds often pose antisocial acts (tab 2), as support Piquero et al (2003, p.46), that these behaviors usually appear at the beginning of the adolescent and peak in prevalence at the end of high school and then decline rapidly in early adulthood. This general trajectory, often referred to as the "age-crime curve", is a relatively stable and widespread phenomenon in different societies.

On the subject of sex, boys often exhibit antisocial behavior as girls (tab 3). As Agnew (2009, p.66) confirms, boys are much more likely to exhibit antisocial behavior than boys. girls during adolescence is a classic phenomenon in criminology.

The majority of the parents of our young people have the job, the resourcefulness (tab n ° 4). That is to say, they are without formal and fixed job but also a job of low income. As stated by Rutter et al (1998, p.37). According to this author, the socio-economic status of parents is a classic risk factor for antisocial behavior.

This is a major postulate of several criminological theories. Several studies have found that adolescents from lower

socioeconomic backgrounds are at higher risk of developing antisocial behavior. Farrington (1992, p.87).

For the anti-sociality of parents, the majority of our respondents have fathers who take psychotropic drugs (tab 5). As Murray and Farrington (2010, p.22) argue, adolescents who have a parent engaged in antisocial activities such as crime or alcohol or drug abuse are significantly more at risk for antisocial behavior. in their turn.

Regarding the family unit, most of our respondents have both parents together (tab n ° 6). Ace Bakker (2012, p.71). Supports the family unit is also a risk factor associated with the development of antisocial behavior. Living in a recomposed, single-parent or other nuclear family as opposed to living in a nuclear family with both biological parents not living together increases the risk of adjustment problems. This is explained by the correlation between family disunity and the presence of difficulties within the nuclear family.

Compared to parental supervision, most of our young people have low supervision (tab 7). That exposes them to manifest anti-social behavior. as can be seen from Smith and Stern (1997, p.92), weak family supervision of adolescent activities is a predictor of participation in antisocial behavior. Indeed, the lack of parental supervision increases the likelihood that the adolescent will manifest antisocial behavior.

Concerning the anti-sociality of the brothers, the majority of our respondents do not have brothers who demonstrate antisocial behavior (tab 8). As we can see with Farrington and Panter (2004, p.83), the anti-sociality of the siblings is also a factor that leads to antisocial behavior because having a brother or sister with antisocial behaviors increases the risk that the person manifest anti-social behavior in turn.

Regarding the influence of friends, association with peers who exhibit antisocial behavior is a robust risk factor for antisocial behavior (tab 9). As we can see with Rutter et al (1998, p.57), who have shown that being associated with delinquent peers during adolescence is a factor that most strongly predicts antisocial behavior among youth.

In addition, according to Day Wanklyn (2012, p.78), the anti-social pressure of friends is also considered as a risk factor for youth anti-social behavior.

In the present study, the results show that some factors are not significantly related to antisocial behaviors as we can think when others are unlike what is found in the literature that we have traveled, several risk factors used as variables control were not related to antisocial behavior prospectively. At the family level, family structure was not significantly related to antisocial behavior. At the relational level, the anti-sociality of peers and peer pressure on anti-sociality were also not related to antisocial behavior. It should be remembered that those who were significant were the age, the sex, the socio-economic status of the parents, the anti-sociality of the parents and the parental supervision. The plausible explanation for these relationships is that the

stability of antisocial behavior in early adolescence accounts for much of the variance to be predicted. Of all these risk factors that are not prospectively related, the most surprising is the anti-sociality of peers. Indeed, it is a risk factor widely documented in the literature.

Vitaro, Tremblay and Bukowski (2000, p.37), inform us that it should be noted that the anti-sociality of peers disappears despite a high bi-varied correlation with antisocial behaviors and that its effect disappears only after controlling for the level. initial antisocial behavior. That being said, other studies have also found that deviant peer affiliation is not predictive of delinquent behavior when considered prospectively.

In terms of socio-economic status, this significant relationship is not surprising, as the latter is a robust risk factor for many issues.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

Here we are at the end of our work, our research remember, focused on the theme entitled "risk factors of antisocial behavior of young people aged 17 to 24 years of the Commune Kenya". A single concern was raised in this study, namely, to identify the risk factors underlying the emergence of antisocial behavior among 17-24 year olds in Kenya Commune.

Our working hypothesis stipulated that individual factors (age, sex), family (socio-economic status, anti-sociality of parents and siblings, lack of parental supervision and family unity) and the influence of friends would be associated with antisocial behavior.

This approach has two objectives:

- Determine the factors underlying antisocial behaviors (behaviors);
- Propose appropriate solutions to lower these kinds of behaviors.

To test our hypothesis and achieve our goals, we used the survey method.

For data collection, we used non-directive interview techniques and questionnaire. For data processing, the non-parametric chi-square statistical test was used. After analyzing and interpreting the results, we arrived at the following results: Most of the young people of the 23-year-old commune of Kenya pose several antisocial acts (Vandalism, public disorder, manifestation, the consumption of psychotropic substances, sexual immorality ...); most of these young people are boys from disadvantaged families whose parents have no formal job, and if they have one, it is a low-income job (nurse) and these parents are not not a good model for their children because they consume themselves psychotropic, where children miss parental supervision.

With this, we suggest that:

- The State creates training structures that can recover young people who have not had the chance to go far with studies in order to make them useful to society;

- Training by objective is organized to train young people according to the real needs of the community (agriculture, livestock farming ...);
- Jobs are created for these trained young people;
- The manufacture and import of psychotropic drugs in our country is prohibited.

References

- [1] Agnew. R (2009), Juvenile of linquency: causes and control (3rd ed.). New York, Oxford University Press.
- [2] Bakker, M et al (2012), childhood family instability and mental health problems during adolescence: A test of two mediation modelo. Journal of Clinical Child and Teen Psychology 41, 166-176.
- [3] Day, D.m and Wanklyn, S.G (2012), Determining and Defining Key Risk Factors for Antisocial and Delinquent Behavior in Children and Youth. Ottawa, public safety canada.
- [4] Smith-Tanner et al (2013), "Risk Factors and Crime", The Oxford Hand Book of Criminological Theory (89-111). New York: oxford university press.
- [5] Moffitt. T.B (1993). Adolenscence-limited and life-persisting antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. Psychological Review, 100, 674-701.
- [6] Murray, J. and Farrington, D.P (2010) Risk factors for disorder and delinquency: key finding from longitudinal studies. Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 55, 633-642.
- [7] Piquero, et al (2003). The criminal carcerparadigm. Dams M. Tonry, Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, Vol 30 (pp. 359-506) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [8] Rodriguez-tomé, H and Bariaud, F (1994), the consciousness of growing, Paris, E.S.C.
- [9] The White. M (2003), delinquent behavior of adolescents: its development and explanation. Montreal: the presses of the University of Montreal.