A Cross Sectional Analysis Of Familial Life And Drug Addiction In Swat Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan

Basit Ali, Ph.D Scholar, Department of Sociology, Abdul WaliKhan University Mardan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Email: Basitswat76@gmail.com

Dr. Ahmad Ali, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Abdul WaliKhan University Mardan,Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Email: Hasnainaup@gmail.com

Dr. Hussain Ali, Assistant Professor , Department of Sociology, Abdul Wali Khan Universit,Mardan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Email: hussainali@awkum.edu.pk

Dr. Sana Ullah* , Lecturer Department of Sociology, University of Malakand, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Email: sana_871@yahoo.com

Zatoon Bibi, Ph.D scholar, Department of Sociology, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa , Pakistan. Email: Zara.khan94@ymail.com

Abstract

The objective of this research article "A Cross sectional analysis of familial life and drug addiction in swat Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan" is to explore familial factors' contribution to drug addiction and its consequences on other family members in the area. This study is based on a conceptual framework comprising of independent variable familial life, dependent variable effects of drug addiction on other family members and background variables were age, monthly income and educational level. Simple frequency for prevalence, chi square for association, multi-variate for spuriousness along "Kendall T^b" for strength and direction of the association. A high prevalence was found in favor of given statements against drug addiction, highly significant (P = 0.000) and positive (T^b = 0-1) except"good relationships with family members and parental separation where (T^b = - 0-1" with effects of drugs addiction on other family members along with non-spurious and positiveresults by controlling age, education and monthly income of the respondents were found in the study.

Keywords: Cross sectional; Familial; Drug; Addiction; consequences; other family members

1. Introduction

The family plays an important role in the shaping of social and psychological behavior. The family has multiple roles such as binding all its members together, fulfilling family needs and helping in resolving familial conflicts and also external as well. Familial ties among members have a strong influence on children in disapproval of drugs. Similarly, loss of connection with parents can lead the young one to be engaged in risky behavior like drug addiction and violence etc. Parents are serving as role models for their children and they imitate parents and instructors. The type of family structure influences the socialization of their members according to Pergamit (2001) those children who are living with single parents are more likely to be addicted to drugs while Malik, Nawaz, et al., (2012) those who are living with their parents for a long time have a long distance from drugs although young's whose parents were addicted were found addicted of substances.The attitudes, values, and actions of children can be influenced powerfully by families. Parents and family members guide youth in their socialization through the desired lines and aspire to ensure compliance with social expectations. It is important to remember that socialization is often not scheduled; children watch what adults say and do. As they are rising, they are prone to follow positive as well as negative patterns adopted by their parents. Those socialized by their parents in bar culture during family gatherings prefer to drink alcohol later in their lives (Gitahi&Mwangi, 2007).

After the completion of primary socialization in the family the children are then influenced by peers largely(Barnes, 1992). Another familial sacred relation is marriage or committed tie which is also influenced by drug misuse and addiction. Some studies regarding drugs and marital bond are; a close spouse, with a drug-use disorder, causes stress and friction in the relationship (Marshall, 2003), substance usage is currently the third major factor to induce divorce (Amato &Previti, 2003), opioid addicted show a higher divorce rate than normal (Moos, Brennano, Fondacaro& Moos, 1990), alcohol is a cause of tension for partners in marital therapies (Halford&Osgarby, 1993) and Collins, Ellickson, & Klein (2007) most of the longitudinal research studies declared that regular use of substance is a predictive indicator of eventual divorce in all age group people.Similarly, couples with both persons who have an alcohol use disorder AUD history could be affected more by women's alcohol problems than their husbands' (Cranford, Floyd, Schulenberg, &Zucker, 2011).Analysis into the assault and alcohol trend of partners in dating, cohabitation, and married couples in group surveys showed that the incidence of men reporting IPVs (Intimate Partner Violence) against women is 24% and the number of women reporting IPV against men is 37% (Caetano et al.2005). Heavy drinks have been observed regularly, consistently associated with increased male/female IPV prevalence although less empirical evidence confirms the relationship of heavy beverages with women and men, several recent studies have shown that a correlation has been positive (Stuart et al., 2006). According to research from Malik (2003) the major cause of opioid addiction issues accompanied by social stigma and relationship tensions are negative feelings such as frustration, anguish and depression while the continuous supportive familial relationships helpis a single source to help them.

Parental substance use will weaken a child's wellbeing and render children's needs subordinate to a parent's drug dependency (McKeganey, Barnard, & McIntosh, 2002). Children will either mentally or physically be ignored in periods of serious parental drug abuse i.e. lack proper clothing and remain unfed. Similarly, according to Shulman, Shapira, &Hirshfield (2000) 83% of children with opioid use sufferedfrom psychiatric or dietary problems. Family finances may also be wrongly redirected towards drug usage, disinhibited conduct, challenges of having suitable role models for adults (Sims &Iphofen, 2003).Traumatic experiences in adolescence, such as childhood abuse are related to substance use disorder and initiation of early drug use, long-term complications with substance use and lifelong addiction and risky habits (De Bellis, 2002, Ducci et al., 2009, O'Connell et al., 2007; Arria et al., 2012). Teenagers who found their parents to be of strong, intimate, and independent types were less likely to start drugs (O'Byrne et al., 2002; Hyatt et al., and Collins, 2000).

The family is one the basic source of children's socialization and up-bringing; it provides support and continuity to the human race. It protects the weaker members and relieves them from tension and other psychological disorders. Further, the family fosters the social values in young ones during socialization for making them responsible members of society. Rapid technological changes have weakened the family sense of belongingness which has reversed implications for individuals and society. One of these weaknesses is marginalization to drug addiction which is very common today. In light of the discussion above this piece of work is designed under main objective to explore familial factors' contribution to drug addiction and its consequences on other family members. Similarly, a conceptual framework comprises of independent variable familial life, dependent variable effects of drug addiction on other family members and background variables were age, monthly income and educational level were taken as background variables and was further proceeded through devised material and methods as below;

2. Material and methods

The research population consists of all those people who are taking drugs like Cannabis, Cocaine, Heroin, Ice or methamphetamine. According to NawayJwand rehabilitation center there were about 6000 illicit drugs users in district Swat which constituted the population for this study. Simple random sampling techniques have been used for data collection. Asample size of 375 was calculated by Yamane (1973) devised formula at 0.05% confidence level however a pre-tested interview schedule was used for data collection based on independent variable ("familial life", dependent variable "effects of drug addiction on other family members' (EDAFM) and background variables i.e. age, monthly income and educational level. The collected data was been coded and entered to Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and appropriate statistical tests been carried out for getting desired results at univariate for prevalence, bivariate Chi-Square χ^2 at (P = <≤ ≥> 0.05) confidence level for association and (Kendal's T^b± 0-1) for determining strength and direction of the association. Moreover, multivariate analysis wascarried out for spurious and non-spurious relationships at bi variate level. The analyzed data has been tabulated,

interpreted and supported with relevant literaturein section results and discussion given below;

3. Results and Discussions

3.1 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Familial Aspects of Drug Addiction

Family is one the basic units of society. It is based on the marital tie of male and female along with blood and affinal relations. The role of family is very important in shaping the personality of an individual. Family works on all rounds for the fulfillment of economic, social, psychological and biological needs which is based on the division of labor within the family as well as society. In table 3.1, it has been noted that the majority of the respondents i.e. 58 % strongly affirmed that their relationship with family is good, 66% of the respondents agreed with the statement that they are spending less time with family members while 55% of the respondents had communication gaps with others. On asking about more addicts in the family, 39% and 23% were agreed and strongly agreed respectively. As per asked statement about parental negligence and attitudes, 59% and 61% respectively put responsibility on parents, 55% blamed practice of late marriage, 54% blamed faction and feuds, more than 50% are making parental separation responsible while 58% accused the open use of other family member although more than 50% said that none of the family member involved in drug smuggling. The above results are in line with the work Shek (2002) the separation between parents and behavioral issues, Malik and Nawaz (2012) parents and other family members indulge in drugs and Lester (2010) worked that family relation has a strong negative association with substance use.

Table 3.1 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Familial Aspect of Drug Addiction

Section B8: Familial aspects	Response					Total
	S.A	A	N	D	S.D	
Good relationship with family members.	219 (58)	94 (25)	14 (4)	39 (10)	9 (3)	375(100)
Spending less time with family members.	63 (17)	247(66)	10 (2)	47 (13)	8 (2)	375(100)
Communication gap among family members.	89 (24)	208 (55)	14 (4)	56 (15)	8 (2)	375(100)
More addicts in family.	85 (23)	145 (39)	9 (2)	102(27)	34(9)	375(100)
Parent's negligence and drug addiction.	66 (18)	222 (59)	17 (5)	61 (16)	9 (2)	375(100)
Unfavorable parental attitudes and use of drugs.	55 (15)	228 (61)	13 (3)	65 (17)	14 (4)	375(100)
Late marriage practice and drug addiction.	51 (14)	207 (55)	13 (3)	85 (23)	19 (5)	375(100)

	S.A	A	N	D	S.D	Total
Faction and feuds in the family and drug addiction.	63 (17)	203 (54)	16 (4)	69 (18)	24 (7)	375(100)
Parental separation is the cause of addiction.	35 (9)	159 (43)	18 (5)	102(27)	61(16)	375(100)
The open use of drugs by other family members causes drug addiction.	43 (11)	216 (58)	8 (2)	77 (21)	31(8)	375(100)
Involvement of family members in drug smuggling.	23 (6)	136 (36)	8 (2)	134(36)	74(20)	375(100)

Values in each cell indicate frequency and parenthesis value show percentages. S.A, A, N, D and S.D represent strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree respectively.

3.2 Association of Familial Aspect with Effects of Drug Addiction on other Family Members

Familial issues mess up the ongoing functionality of family and society as well. The following table 3.2 is based on the association of various familial issues with EDAFM. The table exposed that good relationship among family members was highly significant (P = 0.000) and its direction and strength was as (T^b = -0.235) while spending less time with family members was highly significant (P = 0.000) and had a weak positive relation as indicated by (T^b = 0.201). Furthermore, communication gap, more addicts in family, parental negligence and unfavorable parental attitudes had a highly significant association (P = 0.000) with positive direction and strength i.e. (T^b = 0.410), weak negative (T^b = 0.090), positive (T^b = 0 .483) and positive (T^b = 0.508) respectively with EDAFM. Similarly, the association of late marriages practice and faction and feuds were also found highly significant (P = 0.000) in positive direction with a strength as shown by values (T^b = 0.511) and (T^b = 0. 423) whereas parental separation was found highly significant (P = 0.000) but in negative direction (T^b =-0.235). The use of drugs by other family members was highly significant (P = 0.000) with weak positive (T^b = 0.302) while the involvement in drug smuggling was highly significant (P = 0.000) with a weak positive direction as indicated by (T^b = 0.231)· Family plays an important role in the shaping of social and psychological behavior. Family protects its members from all such problems and serves as role models for children. The family structure and type also affects the children's socialization. According to Amato (1991) findings; children of divorced families have more chances for drug addiction; Pergamit (2001) findings reported that those children who are not living with two parents are more likely to be addicted to drugs, Shek (2002) report stated that loss of connection with parents can lead the young one to be engaged in risky behavior and parental negligence is a pull force in puberty and adulthood for substance and alcohol dependence. Boyd and Holmes (2002) have researched that women are taking drugs in parallel to their family members while Orford et al. (2001) found that substance abuse is a cause of familial conflict because each member in the family tries to stop it.

Table 3.2 Association of Familial Aspects with Effects of Drug Addiction on other Family Members

Statements	Response	Familial Issues			Total	Statistics χ^2, P & T^b
		More effects	Moderate effects	Less effects		
Good relationship with family members.	S.A	202 (54)	12 (4)	5 (1)	219(58)	χ^2 =107.491
	A	49 (13)	19 (5)	26 (7)	94 (25)	P =0.000
	N	4 (1)	5 (2)	5 (2)	14 (4)	T^b=-0.235
	D	36 (10)	3 (1)	0 (0.0)	39 (10)	
	S.D	5 (2)	4 (1)	0 (.0)	9 (2)	
Spending less time with family members.	S.A	46 (13)	13 (3)	4 (2)	63 (16)	χ^2 =33.598
	A	209 (56)	21 (5)	16 (5)	246 (65)	P =0.000 T^b=0.201
	N	6 (2)	1 (.3)	3 (1)	10 (3)	
	D	27 (8)	8 (2)	12 (3)	47 (12)	
	S.D	7 (3)	0 (.0)	1 (.3)	8 (2)	
Communication gap among family members.	S.A	77 (20)	10 (3)	2 (1)	89 (23)	χ^2 =146.415
	A	190 (50)	11 (3)	7 (2)	208 (55)	P =0.000 T^b=0.410
	N	5 (2)	8 (2)	1 (1)	14 (3)	
	D	19 (5)	12 (3)	25 (7)	56 (15)	
	S.D	5 (2)	2 (.5)	1 (.3)	8 (2)	
More addicts in family.	S.A	75 (20)	10 (3)	0 (0.0)	85 (22)	χ^2 =25.925
	A	117 (31)	10 (2)	18 (5)	145 (38)	P =0.000 T^b=0.090
	N	5 (2)	3 (1)	1 (.3)	9 (3)	
	D	79 (22)	12 (3)	11 (3)	102 (27)	
	S.D	20 (5)	8 (2)	6 (2)	34 (9)	
Parent's negligence and drug addiction.	S.A	54 (14)	12 (4)	0 (0.0)	66 (17)	χ^2 =150.805
	A	209 (55)	7 (2)	6 (2)	222 (59)	P =0.000 T^b=0 .483
	N	4 (1)	9 (3)	4 (1)	17 (4)	
	D	26 (8)	12 (3)	23 (6)	61 (16)	
	S.D	3 (1)	3 (1)	3 (1)	9 (3)	
Unfavorable parental attitudes and	S.A	45 (12)	9 (3)	1 (.3)	55 (14)	χ^2 =150.547
	A	215 (57)	10 (3)	3 (1)	228 (60)	P =0.000

use of drugs.	N	7 (2)	5(2)	1 (.3)	13 (3)	T^b=0.508
	D	25 (7)	14 (4)	26 (7)	65 (17)	
	S.D	4 (.7)	5 (1)	5 (1)	14 (3)	
Late marriage practice and drug addiction.	S.A	46 (12)	5 (2)	0 (0.0)	51 (13)	χ^2 =189.570 P =0.000 T^b=0.511
	A	201 (54)	6 (2)	0 (0.0)	207(55)	
	N	1 (.3)	10 (2)	2 (.5)	13 (4)	
	D	36 (10)	20 (5)	29 (8)	85 (22)	
	S.D	12 (3.2)	2 (0.5)	5 (1.3)	19 (5.1)	
Faction and feuds in the family and drug addiction.	S.A	54 (14)	9 (3)	0 (.0)	63 (16)	χ^2 = 126.100 P =0.000 T^b=0.423
	A	190 (50.7)	9 (2.4)	3 (0.8)	202 (53.9)	
	N	6 (2)	7 (2)	3 (1)	16 (4)	
	D	30 (8)	14 (4)	25 (7)	69 (18)	
	S.D	15 (4.0)	4 (1.1)	5 (1.3)	24 (6.4)	
Parental separation is the cause of addiction.	S.A	30 (8)	5 (1)	0 (0.0)	35 (9)	χ^2 = 88.933 P =0.000 T^b=-0.235
	A	151 (40)	7 (2)	1 (.3)	159 (42)	
	N	8 (3)	9 (2)	1 (1)	18 (4)	
	D	61 (17)	15 (4)	26 (7)	102 (27)	
	S.D	46 (12)	7 (2)	8 (2)	61 (16)	
The open use of drugs by other family members causes drug addiction.	S.A	46 (12)	13 (3)	4 (2)	63 (17)	χ^2 =57.619 P =0.000 T^b=0.302
	A	209 (55)	21 (6)	16 (4)	246 (65)	
	N	6 (2)	1 (.3)	3 (1)	10 (2)	
	D	27 (7)	8 (3)	12 (3)	47 (12)	
	S.D	1 (.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (.3)	
Involvement of family members in drug smuggling.	S.A	77 (21)	10 (3)	2 (1)	89 (23)	χ^2 =43.939 P =0.000 T^b=0.231
	A	190 (51)	11 (3)	7 (2)	208 (55)	
	N	5 (2)	8 (2)	1 (.3)	14 (4)	
	D	19 (5)	12 (3)	25 (7)	56 (15)	
	S.D	5 (2)	2 (.5)	1 (.3)	8 (3)	

Values in each cell indicate frequency and parenthesis value show percentages. S.A, A, N, D and S.D represent strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree respectively. In the last column chi square a significance at 0.05% confidence and ± 0-1 strength and direction.

3.3 Association of familial aspects with effects of drug addiction on other family members (Controlling age of the respondents)

Table 3.3 showed a highly significant (P = 0.000) and positive (T^b = 0.378) association between familial issues and EDAFM by controlling the age of the respondents. Moreover, the association was highly significant (P = 0.000) and strong negative (T^b =-0.078) in age group 08-16 years, highly significant (P = 0.000) and strong positive (T^b = 0.550) in age group 17-24 year, highly significant (P = 0.000) and strong positive (T^b = 0.689) in age group 25-32 years, significant (P = 0.002) and positive (T^b = 0.485) in age group 33-40 years while a highly significant (P = 0.000) and strong positive (0.740) for the age group above 40 years. A non-spurious relationship for age groups 08-16, 17-24 and above 40 while a spurious relation for age group 33-40 on the base of significance level was found. The result declared a non-spurious relationship of above-mentioned variables. According to Foo and Tam (2012) stress and depression from different sources such as family and academics pushes a child to try drugs while Freisthler, Johnson-Motoyama&Kepple (2014) found that low parental control on children is highly associated with substance taking. Similarly, Suchman et al., (2013) reported that parental negligence indulges children in drugs.

Table 3.3 Association of Familial Aspects with Effects of Drug Addiction on other Family Members (Controlling age of the respondents)

Controlling variable (Age)	Independent variable	Dependent variable	Statistics χ^2 P & T^b
08-16	Familial aspects	EDAFM	χ^2 =0.206 P= 0.000 T^b=-.078
17-24	Familial aspects	EDAFM	χ^2 =45.613 P=0.000 T^b=0.550
25-32	Familial aspects	EDAFM	χ^2 =65.095 P=0.000 T^b=0.689
33-40	Familial aspects	EDAFM	χ^2 =12.193 P=0.002 T^b=0.485
Above-40	Familial aspects	EDAFM	χ^2 =14 .243 P=0.000 T^b=0.740
Total	Familial aspects	EDAFM	χ^2 =139.887 P=0.000 T^b=0.378

Chi square, and P values show significance at 0.05% confidence level while Tb = ± 0-1 show strength and direction

3.4 Association of Familial Aspects with Effects of Drug Addiction on other Family Members (Controlling education of the respondents)

The Table 3.4 displayed a highly significant (P = 0.000) and positive (Tb = 0.583) association between familial aspects and EDAFM by controlling education of the respondents. Similarly, the association was highly significant (P = 0.000) and positive (Tb = 0.593) in illiterates, highly significant (P = 0.000) and positive (Tb = 0.404) at primary

level, highly significant (P = 0.000) and positive (Tb = 0.456) at middle level, highly significant (P = 0.000) and positive (Tb = 0.565) at high level, significant (P = 0.003) and positive (Tb = 0.525) at secondary level, significant (P = 0.001) and strong positive (Tb = 0.651) at bachelor level. In addition to this, non-significant (P = 0.157) and strongest positive (Tb = 1.000) for M. Phil The result showed an overall non spurious relationship for illiterate, primary, middle, and high while having a spurious relationship for M.Phil level. According to Zimic andJakic (2012) family is one of the fundamental institutions which exert a continuous influence on its members therefore persons who are taking drugs are influencing other family members in such a way that they know little about the negative impacts of drugs and its related social issues such as stigmatization of family, emotional disturbance and violence in family. Similarly, according to the results Choi (2005) franked the familial environment to avoid drug addiction while Ko (2008) said that low parental support, weak familial relations and low resources are some factors which support conflicts and drug abuse in youths.

Table 3.4 Association of Familial Aspects with Effects of Drug Addiction on other Family Members (Controlling education of the respondents)

Controlling variable (Education)	Independent variable	Dependent variable	Statistics χ^2 P & T^b
Illiterate	Familial aspects	EDAFM	χ^2 =38.029 P= 0.000 T^b= 0.593
Primary	Familial aspects	EDAFM	χ^2 =30.630 P= 0.000 T^b=0.404
Middle	Familial aspects	EDAFM	χ^2 =17.969 P= 0.000 T^b=0.456
High	Familial aspects	EDAFM	χ^2 =16.737 P= 0.000 T^b= 0.565
Secondary	Familial aspects	EDAFM	χ^2 =11.789 P= 0.003 T^b= 0.525
Bachelor	Familial aspects	EDAFM	χ^2 =14.235 P= 0.001 T^b= 0.651
M.Phil	Familial aspects	EDAFM	χ^2 =2.000 P= 0.157 T^b=1.000
Total	Familial aspects	EDAFM	χ^2 =139.887 P=0.000 T^b=0.583

Chi square, and P values show significance at 0.05% confidence level while Tb = ± 0-1 show strength and direction.

3.5 Association of Familial issues with Effects of Drug Addiction on other Family Members (Controlling monthly income of the respondents)
A highly significant (P = 0.000) and strong positive (T^b = 0.583) association between familial issues and EDAFM by controlling income level of the respondents in table 3.5.

Along with this, the association was highly significant (P = 0.000) and positive (T^b = 0.535) for income PKR 10,000-21,000, highly significant (P = 0.000) strong positive (T^b = 0.555) for PKR 21000-31000, highly significant (P = 0.000) and strong positive (T^b = 0.670) for income level PKR 31000-40000 while significant (P = 0.001) and positive (T^b = 0.587) for income level PKR above 40,000. The result showed an overall non-spurious relationship for all income levels PKRs 10000-21000, 21000-31000, 31000-40000 and above-40000. According to Child Welfare Information Gateway (CWIG, 2011) Child maltreatment is defined as any act that results from physical and emotional harm to children which affect children in terms of drug abuse while Wall (2007) argued that it involves children in drugs in some way or other. Ford (2010) found that familial conflict in low income families most often remain unreported while Dodson (2013) pointed that low income workers are easily replaced in workplaces which puts a lot of stress and strain on workers and lead them to take drugs.

Table 3.5 Association of familial issues with effects of drug addiction on other family members (Controlling monthly income of the respondents

Controlling variable (Monthly income)	Independent variable	Dependent variable	Statistics χ^2 P & T^b
10,000-21,000	Familial issues	EDAFM	χ^2 =28.845 P= 0.000 T^b=0.535
21,000-31,000	Familial issues	EDAFM	χ^2 =77.834 P= 0.000 T^b=0.555
31,000-40,000	Familial issues	EDAFM	χ^2 =23.833 P= 0.000 T^b=0.670
Above 40,000	Familial issues	EDAFM	χ^2 =14.074 P= 0.001 T^b=0.587
Total	Familial issues	EDAFM	χ^2 =139.887 P=0.000 T^b=0.583

Chi square, and P values show significance at 0.05% confidence level while Tb = ± 0-1 show strength and direction

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

The piece of work portrayed the gloomy scenario of disorder and chaos in the structure and function of family. The study found that due to harsh parental attitudes, the communication gap among family members, especially siblings, moves their attention towards anti-social activities which is one of the major contributing factors in drug addiction. Similarly, keeping in view the joint family system of the area; bad relationship, spending less time, communication gap, parental negligence, hard attitudes, faction and feuds, parental separation and smuggling are the various effects of drug addiction which

are being felt in those families where at least one addict exists. Moreover, these effects are varying in various age, educational level and income groups. In light of aforementioned results and discussion the state, society, family and religious leaders should to pave ways to healthy recreation, employment opportunities for drug addicts with special courses in educational institutions against drugs however a comprehensive punishment and reward system to discourage drug use along with voluntary associations/ organizations to rehabilitate those who are addicts to menace burden on those families who are the victims due to any member involvement in drugs.

References

Amato, P. R., & Keith, B. (1991). Parental divorce and the well-being of children: a
        metaanalysis. Psychological bulletin, 110(1), 26.
Amato, P. R., &Previti, D. (2003). People's reasons for divorcing: Gender, social class, the life course,
        and adjustment. Journal of family issues, 24(5), 602-626.

Arria, A. M Garnier-Dykstra, L. M., Caldeira, K. M., Vincent, K. B., O'Grady (2012). Nonmedical use of
        prescription stimulants during college: Four-year trends in exposure opportunity, use, motives, and sources. Journal of American college health, 60(3), 226-234.

Barnes, J. E., &Hernquist, L. (1992).Dynamics of interacting galaxies. Annual review ofmastronomy and
        astrophysics, 30(1), 705-742.

Becoña, E., Martínez, Ú.,Calafat, A., Juan, M., Fernández-Hermida, J. R., &Secades-Villa, R. (2012).
        Parental styles and drug use: A review. Drugs: education, prevention and policy, 19(1), 1-10.

Biederman, J., Spencer, T., Wilens, T., Seidman, L. J., Mick, E., & Doyle, A. E. (2000). Attention-
        deficit/hyperactivity disorder in adults: an overview. Biological psychiatry, 48(1), 9-20.

Boyd, C. J., & Holmes, C. (2002). Women who smoke crack and their family substance abuse
        problems. Health Care for Women International, 23(6-7), 576-586.

Caetano, R., Field, C. A., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., & McGrath, C. (2005).The 5-year course of intimate
        partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. Journal of interpersonal violence, 20(9), 1039-1057.
Child   Welfare   Information   Gateway
https://www.childwelfare.gov/systemwide/substance/ ʃ Children and

Family Futures http://www.cffutures.org/ ʃ National Abandoned Infants

Choi, S. M. (2005). Antecedents of green purchase behavior: An examination of collectivism, environmental concern, and PCE. ACR North American Advances.

Cohen, D. A., & Rice, J. (1997). Parenting styles, adolescent substance use, and academic achievement. Journal of drug education, 27(2), 199-211.

Collins, R. L., Ellickson, P. L., & Klein, D. J. (2007).The role of substance use in young adult divorce. Addiction, 102(5), 786-794.

Cranford, J. A., Floyd, F. J., Schulenberg, J. E., &Zucker, R. A. (2011).Husbands' and wives' alcohol use
disorders and marital interactions as longitudinal predictors of marital adjustment. Journal of
abnormal psychology, 120(1), 210.

De Bellis, M. D. (2002). Developmental traumatology: a contributory mechanism for alcohol and
substance use disorders. Psychoneuroendocrinology, 27(1-2), 155-170.

DubeChildhood abuse, household dysfunction, and the risk of attempted suicide throughout the life span: findings from the Adverse Childhood Experiences Study. Jama, 286(24), 3089, S. R., Anda, R. F., Felitti, V. J., Chapman, D. P., Williamson, D. F., & Giles, W. H. (2001). -3096.

Epstein, E. E., &McCrady, B. S. (1998). Behavioral couples treatment of alcohol and drug use disorders: Current status and innovations. Clinical Psychology Review, 18(6), 689-711.

Foo, Y. C., Tam, C. L., & Lee, T. H. (2012). Family factors and peer influence in drug abuse: a study in rehabilitation centre. International Journal of Collaborative Research on Internal Medicine & Public Health, 4(3).

Ford, K. R., Hoogenboom, B. J., & Myer, G. D. (2010). Understanding and preventing acl injuries: current biomechanical and epidemiologic considerations-update 2010. North American journal of sports physical therapy: NAJSPT, 5(4), 234.

Freisthler, B.,Johnson-Motoyama, M., &Kepple, N. J. (2014). Inadequate child supervision: The role of alcohol outlet density, parent drinking behaviors, and social support. Children and youth services review, 43, 75-84.

Haase, M., &Schäfer, H. (2011).Upconverting nanoparticles. AngewandteChemie International Edition, 50(26), 5808-5829.

Halford, W. K., &Osgarby, S. M. (1993).Alcohol abuse in clients presenting with marital problems. Journal of Family Psychology, 6(3), 245.

Huver, R. M., Engels, R. C., Vermulst, A. A., & de Vries, H. (2007). Is parenting style a context for   smoking-specific parenting practices?. Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 89(2-3), 116-125.

Hyatt, A. D. (2000). Emerging infectious diseases of wildlife--threats to biodiversity and human   health. science, 287(5452), 443-449.

Ko, C. H., &McDearmon, E. L. (2008). The genetics of mammalian circadian order and disorder: implications for physiology and disease. Nature reviews genetics, 9(10), 764-775.

Malick, J., Babb, J. S., Bove, B., Godwin, A. K., & Daly, M. B. (2003, May). Communication of BRCA1   and BRCA2 results to at-risk relatives: a cancer risk assessment program's experience.

In American journal of medical genetics part C: seminars in medical genetics (Vol. 119, No. 1, pp. 11-   18). New York: Wiley Subscription Services, Inc., A Wiley Company.

Malik, P. K. (2003). Use of activated carbons prepared from sawdust and rice-husk for adsorption of acid   dyes: a case study of Acid Yellow 36. Dyes and pigments, 56(3), 239-249.

Malik., Nawaz, N., Nawaz, M. S., Cheema, N. M., & Khan, M. A. (2012). Zinc and iron application to   optimize seed yield of mustard. Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Research, 25(1).

Marshall, A. L., Sjöström, M., Bauman, A. E., Booth, M. L., Ainsworth, B. E., ...&Oja, P. (2003).   International physical activity questionnaire: 12-country reliability and validity. Medicine & science in sports & exercise, 35(8), 1381-1395.

Masood, S., & Us Sahar, N. (2014).An exploratory research on the role of family in youth's drug addiction. Health Psychology and Behavioral Medicine: An Open Access Journal, 2(1), 820-832.

McGoldrick, M., & Carter, E. A. (1982).The family life cycle. Normal family processes. In Normal   Family Processes.Guilford Press.

McKeganey, N., Barnard, M., & McIntosh, J. (2002).Paying the price for their parents' addiction: meeting the needs of the children of drug-using parents. Drugs: education, prevention and policy, 9(3),   233-246.

Melgosa, M., Gordillo, B., González-Miret, M. L., & Heredia, F. J. (2012).Ripeness estimation of grape   berries and seeds by image analysis. Computers and electronics in agriculture, 82, 128-133.

Moos, R. H., Brennan, P. L., Fondacaro, M. R., & Moos, B. S. (1990).Approach and avoidance coping   responses among older problem and nonproblem drinkers. Psychology and aging, 5(1), 31.

Moussavi, S., Chatterji, S., Verdes, E., Tandon, A., Patel, V., &Ustun, B. (2007). Depression, chronic   diseases, and decrements in health: results from the World Health Surveys. The   Lancet, 370(9590), 851-858.

O'Byrne, M., & Murthy, V. N. (2002).Multiple forms of synaptic plasticity triggered by selective   suppression of activity in individual neurons. Nature, 420(6914), 414-418.

Orford, J. (2001). Excessive appetites: A psychological view of addictions. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Pergamit, M. R., Huang, L., & Lane, J. (2001).The long term impact of adolescent risky behaviors and   family environment. Report submitted to Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and   Evaluation, US Department of Health and Human Services.

Pergamit, M. R., Huang, L., & Lane, J. (2001).The long term impact of adolescent risky behaviors and   family environment. Report submitted to Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and   Evaluation, US Department of Health and Human Services.

Sheikh, M., & Flanagan, E. (2001). Parental problem drinking and children's adjustment: Family conflict   and parental depression as mediators and moderators of risk. Journal of abnormal child   psychology, 29(5), 417-432.

Shek, D. T. (2002).Family functioning and psychological well-being, school adjustment, and problem   behavior in Chinese adolescents with and without economic disadvantage. The Journal of Genetic   Psychology, 163(4), 497-502.

Shek, D. T. (2002).Family functioning and psychological well-being, school adjustment, and problem   behavior in Chinese adolescents with and without economic disadvantage. The Journal of Genetic   Psychology, 163(4), 497-502.

Shulman, L. H., Shapira, S. R., &Hirshfield, S. (2000). Outreach developmental services to children of   patients in treatment for substance abuse. American Journal of Public Health, 90(12), 1930.

Sims, J., Iphofen, R., & Payne, K. (2003).The triangular treatment paradigm in dual-diagnosis clients with   a mental illness. Journal of Substance Use, 8(2), 112-118.

Stuart, C. H., Schwartz, S. A., Beeson, T. J., &Owatz, C. B. (2006). Enterococcus faecalis: its role in root   canal treatment failure and current concepts in retreatment. Journal of endodontics, 32(2), 93-98.

Suchman, L. (2013). Consuming anthropology.In Interdisciplinarity (pp. 157-176).Routledge.

Wall, D. (2007). Cybercrime: The transformation of crime in the information age (Vol. 4). Polity.

Zimić, J. I., &Jukić, V. (2012).Familial risk factors favoring drug addiction onset. Journal of psychoactive drugs, 44(2), 173-185.