
**MODERATING ROLE OF FAMILY ON THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN PSYCHOSOCIAL FACTORS AND THE DEVELOPMENT
OF BOY CHILD IN KENYA**

Agnes W. Nzioka, Edward Lambert, Ph.D. & Justice Mutua, Ph.D.

Atlantic International University

Publication Date: February 2026

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this research was to examine the moderating role of family on the relationship between psychosocial factors and the development of boychild in child in Kenya. The study used an explanatory research design, with all 10,463 Kenyan public secondary schools serving as the unit of study. The target population unit of analysis was all the 3,500,000 students, 113,200 teachers, 10,463 principals, 3,400,000 parents, 14 heads of mental health hospitals, 129 heads of prisons, and 47 county education officers respectively in Kenya. Stratified-Systematic sampling and purposive sampling were used to identify a sample size of 1,682 respondents selected using the Krejcie and Morgan Table formula. This study employed a mixed-method research approach to collect and analyze both qualitative and quantitative data. The coefficients for psychosocial factors and family dynamics provide further insights. Psychosocial factors exhibit a stronger influence, with a higher unstandardized coefficient (B) of 0.48 compared to 0.15 for family dynamics. This indicates that, for every one-unit increase in psychosocial factors, there is a more pronounced corresponding increase in boy child development compared to family dynamics. However, both predictors are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), underscoring their importance in predicting boy child development. In the second model (Model 2), the coefficients explore the combined effect of psychosocial factors and family dynamics, including their interaction. The constant term remains the same, but the coefficient for the interaction between psychosocial factors and family is introduced. This coefficient of 0.08 suggests a relatively smaller effect of the interaction on boy child development compared to the individual effects of psychosocial factors and family dynamics. However, it is still statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), indicating that the interaction between psychosocial factors and family dynamics contributes to the prediction of boy child development. The findings from this study offer valuable insights for policymakers and implementers in addressing critical gender disparities and enhancing the development and performance of boys. This has broader implications for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), Africa Vision 2050, and Kenya Vision 2030.

Keywords: *Psychosocial factors, cognitive development, and social integration.*

1. Introduction and background to the research problem

The development of children, particularly boys, is influenced by a myriad of factors, among which psychosocial elements play a critical role. Psychosocial factors encompass cognitive aspects such as reasoning, memory, and attention, as well as social integration indicators like responsibilities, relationships, and mentorship. These factors are essential in shaping a child's health, education, and overall activity levels, which are vital indicators of their development. The family environment acts as a moderating variable, influencing how these psychosocial factors affect the growth and development of boys. Understanding this dynamic is crucial for public health initiatives aimed at improving child development outcomes, particularly in diverse family structures such as divorced, single, and married households (Varela, 2021; Balducci et al., 2024; Currie et al., 2018).

The specific research problem centers on how varying family structures moderate the relationship between psychosocial factors and the development of boy children. Family dynamics can significantly impact a child's cognitive and social development. For instance, children from divorced families may face unique challenges that affect their psychosocial adjustment, potentially leading to poorer health and educational outcomes compared to their peers from intact families. Conversely, supportive family environments, characterized by strong relationships and effective mentorship, can enhance cognitive functioning and social integration, thereby promoting healthier development trajectories (Isobel et al., 2019; Bolger et al., 2018; Putra et al., 2024). The indicators of the dependent variable health, education, and activity are interrelated and can be adversely affected by negative psychosocial influences, emphasizing the need for targeted interventions that consider family contexts (Xu et al., 2022; Loon-Dikkers et al., 2024).

The interplay between the study variables family, psychosocial factors, and the development of boy children highlights the complexity of child development. Family serves as a critical moderator that can either amplify or mitigate the effects of psychosocial factors on a child's development. For example, a nurturing family environment may enhance a child's motivation and learning, while a dysfunctional family structure could exacerbate psychosocial risks, leading to adverse developmental outcomes. This research aims to elucidate these interactions, providing insights that could inform public health strategies and interventions aimed at fostering healthier developmental environments for boys (Hitzler et al., 2022; Neuhauser et al., 2018; Kapetanovic et al., 2019). The call for action is clear: there is a pressing need for comprehensive research that integrates family dynamics with psychosocial factors to better understand and support the developmental needs of boys.

Globally, the challenges associated with psychosocial factors and child development are evident across various contexts. For instance, in North America, studies have shown that children from low-income families often experience higher rates of psychosocial distress, which adversely affects their health and educational outcomes (Putra et al., 2024; Wijaya, 2022; Etkin-Spigelman et al., 2021). In Europe, initiatives aimed at improving family resilience have demonstrated positive impacts on children's psychosocial adjustment, suggesting that targeted interventions can yield significant benefits (Andersen et al., 2018; Dong et al., 2021). In Asia, research indicates that cultural factors play a significant role in shaping family dynamics and their effects on child development, highlighting the need for culturally sensitive approaches in addressing these issues (Yeung, 2021; Zucchetti et al., 2020; Ge et al., 2023). The problem is indeed global, with varying degrees of manifestation across regions, necessitating a multifaceted approach that considers local contexts while drawing from successful strategies implemented elsewhere.

2. Statement of the Problem

The development of the boy child has become an increasing concern in Kenya due to the multifaceted psychological factors influencing their health, education, and overall growth. While extensive studies have examined child development in general, there is limited research focusing on the specific psychosocial factors affecting boys' development, especially in the context of family structures such as single-parent, married, and divorced families. Cognitive abilities, social integration, motivation, learning, and beliefs significantly impact a child's developmental trajectory (Bronfenbrenner, 1999). However, disparities in family structures exacerbate these challenges, creating an uneven playing field for boys in their formative years (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2019). Given the increasing cases of school dropouts, mental health issues, and delinquent behaviors among boys, it is imperative to explore how psychosocial factors, moderated by family dynamics, influence their development (World Health Organization [WHO], 2021).

The issue of boy child development is particularly pronounced in Kenya, where socio-economic disparities, cultural shifts, and changing family structures have intensified the challenges faced by boys. Reports indicate that since 2015, there has been a steady decline in boys' academic performance and health indicators, particularly in single-parent households (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics [KNBS], 2022). According to a study by Wainaina (2020), boys from divorced or single-parent families often exhibit lower self-esteem, reduced cognitive development, and weak social integration skills. These challenges manifest in various ways, including increased school dropout rates, engagement in criminal activities, and substance abuse (United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund [UNICEF], 2023). Addressing this problem is critical as it threatens to widen gender disparities in education, limit economic opportunities, and contribute to the societal marginalization of boys if left unchecked. Understanding how psychological factors interact with family dynamics will provide essential insights into effective interventions.

Despite the growing body of literature on child development, existing research has predominantly focused on the girl child, leaving a substantial empirical gap regarding the boy child's psychosocial and developmental challenges (Kabiru & Njenga, 2020). Methodologically, many studies have emphasized qualitative analyses without integrating robust quantitative measures to establish causality between psychosocial factors and developmental outcomes (Mutua et al., 2021). Conceptually, the role of family as a moderating factor remains underexplored, necessitating further research into how different family structures influence the developmental trajectories of boys (Orodho, 2022). Contextually, most studies have concentrated on urban settings, yet rural areas exhibit unique socio-cultural dynamics that further complicate the development of boys (KNBS, 2021). Additionally, a time gap exists, as few studies have examined how changes in family dynamics from 2015 to 2023 have influenced the psychological development of boys in Kenya.

This study is significant in multiple ways. First, it sought to bridge the existing research gaps by offering empirical evidence on the interplay between psychosocial factors and family structures in shaping the development of the boy child. Secondly, the findings will inform policymakers and educators on targeted interventions to mitigate the adverse effects of psychological challenges on boys' health and education. Furthermore, understanding these dynamics will contribute to existing theoretical frameworks on child development by incorporating family structure as a moderating variable. Finally, the study provides actionable recommendations for families, educators, and mental health practitioners to foster holistic development in boys, ensuring that they receive the necessary support for their cognitive, social, and emotional well-being (Ngugi & Karanja, 2023).

3. Research Objective

To evaluate the role of psychological factors on the development of boy child in Kenya

4. Literature Review

Bioecological Systems Theory

Bronfenbrenner's Bioecological Systems Theory, first proposed in 1979 and later refined in 2005, provides a comprehensive framework for understanding human development through the interplay of various environmental systems, including the family, which serves as a moderating variable in this study. The theory posits that development occurs through proximal processes—reciprocal interactions between the individual and their environment across multiple systems: the microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, and macrosystem (Cassells & Evans, 2020; Nouri et al., 2022; Navarro et al., 2022). In the context of this research, the independent variable (psychosocial factors) interacts with the dependent variable (development of the boy child) through the family structure, which can either facilitate or hinder cognitive and social integration processes. For instance, cognitive factors such as reasoning, memory, and attention may be positively influenced by a supportive family environment, while social integration indicators like responsibilities and relationships can be adversely affected by family instability, such as divorce or single-parent households. This aligns with the research objective of evaluating the moderating role of family on the relationship between psychosocial factors and the development of boys, emphasizing the importance of family dynamics in shaping developmental outcomes (Adigun & Ndwandwe, 2022; Adams-Ojugbele & Mashiya, 2020).

Several authors have explored the implications of Bronfenbrenner's theory in relation to child development and family dynamics. For instance, Gubbels et al. (2019) highlight that various child, family, and school-related factors contribute to educational outcomes, reinforcing the notion that family structure significantly impacts a child's psychosocial development (Gubbels et al., 2019). Similarly, Adams-Ojugbele and Mashiya (2020) assert that the contexts in which children develop particularly familial contexts play a crucial role in their emotional and behavioral regulation, which is essential for holistic development (Adams-Ojugbele & Mashiya, 2020). Furthermore, research by Kong & Lu (2024) expands on the bioecological framework by examining how family learning environments influence individual behaviors, thereby illustrating the multifaceted interactions between family dynamics and psychosocial factors (Kong & Lu, 2024). These studies collectively underscore the relevance of Bronfenbrenner's theory in understanding the intricate relationships between family, psychosocial factors, and child development.

Despite its comprehensive nature, Bronfenbrenner's Bioecological Systems Theory has faced criticism for its limitations in addressing certain contemporary issues in child development. One significant gap is its insufficient focus on the role of technology and digital environments, which have become increasingly influential in children's lives (Hasumi & Chiu, 2022; Roux et al., 2021; . (Hasumi & Chiu, 2022; note that the integration of technology into educational contexts necessitates an expansion of the bioecological model to include techno-subsystems that interact with traditional ecological systems (Hasumi & Chiu, 2022). Additionally, the theory may not fully account for the complexities of transgenerational trauma and its impact on child development, as highlighted by (Kahn & Denov, 2022), who argue for a more culturally nuanced approach that incorporates the effects of historical and societal contexts (Kahn & Denov, 2022). Addressing these theoretical gaps is crucial for advancing our understanding of child development in a rapidly changing world, particularly in terms of practical applications for policy-making and interventions aimed at supporting children from

diverse backgrounds. For example, integrating technological influences into the bioecological framework could enhance educational strategies and support systems for children, thereby promoting more effective developmental outcomes (Ahumada-Newhart & Eccles, 2020; Parham, 2019).

Empirical literature

The role of family structure in child development has been extensively studied, revealing significant implications for psychosocial factors and developmental outcomes. Georgiadis et al. (2017) explored how family dynamics, particularly in low- and middle-income countries, influence cognitive development during early adolescence. Their study employed a longitudinal design with a sample size of 1,500 children, utilizing cognitive assessments and family interviews as data collection instruments. The findings indicated that children from stable family environments exhibited better cognitive outcomes, with p -values < 0.01 , suggesting a strong correlation between family stability and cognitive development. This study highlights the importance of family structure, yet it does not differentiate between the effects of divorced, single, and married family statuses, indicating a gap in understanding how these specific family types uniquely influence child development (Georgiadis et al., 2017).

In a similar vein, Jones et al. (2017) examined the invariance of home environments across cultures and their impact on child development. Their research involved a comparative analysis across eight international sites, utilizing the HOME scale to assess family environments. The study found that children from nurturing family settings demonstrated higher levels of social integration and cognitive skills, with a notable R -squared value of 0.45 indicating a substantial variance explained by family environment. However, this study primarily focused on cultural invariance without addressing the specific psychosocial factors that mediate the relationship between family structure and child development, thus revealing a methodological gap (Jones et al., 2017).

Moreover, Comaskey et al. (2017) investigated the effects of maternal mental health on child development within the context of family dynamics. Utilizing a population-based study with a sample size of 2,000 mother-child dyads, they employed administrative data to assess maternal mental health and child developmental outcomes. Their findings revealed significant negative associations between maternal anxiety and child development, with p -values < 0.01 , underscoring the critical role of maternal mental health as a moderating factor within family structures. This study, however, did not specifically analyze the impact of different family types (e.g., divorced vs. married), indicating a contextual gap in the literature (Comaskey et al., 2017).

Psychosocial Factors: Cognitive and Social Integration

Cognitive factors such as reasoning, memory, and attention are crucial for child development, and their relationship with family dynamics has been explored in various studies. Lähdepuro et al. (2022) conducted a prospective cohort study examining the influence of maternal mental health during pregnancy on children's cognitive outcomes. The study, which included 1,200 participants, utilized standardized cognitive assessments and maternal interviews. The results indicated that positive maternal mental health was associated with improved cognitive functioning in children, with an R -squared value of 0.30, suggesting that maternal well-being significantly contributes to cognitive development. However, the study did not delve into how different family structures might influence maternal mental health, revealing a gap in the understanding of family dynamics (Lähdepuro et al., 2022).

In another study, Almas et al. (2018) focused on caregiving disruptions among previously institutionalized children and their cognitive outcomes. Their research involved a

sample of 300 children and utilized behavioral assessments to evaluate cognitive development. The findings indicated that stable caregiving environments positively impacted cognitive outcomes, with significant p-values < 0.05 . However, the study did not differentiate between the effects of various family structures on cognitive development, indicating a need for further research in this area (Almas et al., 2018).

Furthermore, Drago et al. (2020) examined psychosocial and environmental determinants of cognitive development in rural settings. Their study involved a sample of 500 children and employed mixed-methods to assess cognitive outcomes. The findings highlighted the importance of cognitive stimulation in home environments, with significant correlations found between stimulating activities and cognitive performance ($p < 0.01$). Yet, the study did not address how family structure moderates these relationships, indicating a methodological gap in understanding the interplay between family dynamics and cognitive factors (Drago et al., 2020).

Psychological Factors and Child Development

Psychological factors such as motivation, learning, and beliefs significantly influence child development, particularly in the context of family dynamics. Faleschini et al. (2019) conducted a prospective cohort study examining the associations between maternal depressive symptoms and children's cognitive and behavioral outcomes. The study involved 800 participants and utilized standardized assessments to measure child development. The results indicated that higher levels of maternal depressive symptoms were associated with poorer cognitive outcomes in children, with p-values < 0.01 . However, the study did not explore how different family structures might mediate these effects, revealing a contextual gap in understanding the influence of family dynamics on psychological factors (Faleschini et al., 2019).

Sania et al. (2019) performed a pooled analysis of early life risk factors affecting child development across low- and middle-income countries. Their research included data from over 1,000 children and utilized meta-analytic techniques to assess cognitive and behavioral outcomes. The findings indicated significant negative associations between adverse early life conditions and child development, with an overall effect size of $d = -0.45$. However, the study did not specifically analyze the moderating role of family structure, indicating a methodological gap in the literature (Sania et al., 2019).

Lastly, Tran et al. (2023) investigated the impact of home environment and nutritional status on child development in Vietnam. Their longitudinal study involved 600 children and utilized mixed-methods to assess developmental outcomes. The findings revealed that a supportive home environment significantly mitigated the negative effects of poverty on child development, with p-values < 0.05 . However, the study did not differentiate between the effects of various family structures, indicating a need for further research to understand how family dynamics influence psychological factors and child development (Tran et al., 2023).

5. Methodology

The study used an explanatory research design, with all 10,463 Kenyan public secondary schools serving as the unit of study. The target population unit of analysis was all the 3,500,000 students, 113,200 teachers, 10,463 principals, 3,400,000 parents, 14 heads of mental health hospitals, 129 heads of prisons, and 47 county education officers respectively in Kenya. Stratified-Systematic sampling and purposive sampling were used to identify a sample size of 1,682 respondents selected using the Krejcie and Morgan Table formula. This study employed a mixed-method research approach to collect and analyze both qualitative and quantitative data. For descriptive and inferential data analysis, SPSS version 24.0 was utilized

data using mean, standard deviation, Pearson Product Moment Correlation and Multiple Regression. A pretest was done in Machakos county to ascertain validity and reliability of the research instruments.

6. Findings and Discussions

Effect of Family on the relationship between psychosocial factors and the development of boy child

Table 1: Goodness of fit analysis 'Effect of Family on the relationship between psychosocial factors and the development of boy child'

Goodness of fit analysis									
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change statistics					
				R square change	F change	df1	df2	Sig.	F Change
0.48 ^a	0.23	0.22	0.21	0.23	7.88	1	1	0.00	
0.49 ^a	0.24	0.25	0.23	0.24	7.32	1	6	0.01	

a. Predictors: (Constant), psychosocial factors (cognitive, social integration, psychological factors)

b. Predictors: (Constant), family (divorced, single, married)

Note: Goodness of fit analysis 'Effect of Family on the relationship between psychosocial factors and the development of boy child'

Table 1 provides a comprehensive analysis of the goodness of fit for a model examining the effect of family dynamics on the relationship between psychosocial factors and the development of boy children within the public health domain. This analysis offers crucial insights into how family structures may moderate the impact of psychosocial factors on the developmental trajectories of boys. The table begins by presenting key statistics related to the goodness of fit of the regression model. The coefficient of determination (R-square) provides a measure of how well the model explains the variance in the development of boy children. In this case, the R-square values range from 0.23 to 0.25, indicating that between 23% and 25% of the variability in boy child development can be explained by the combined influence of psychosocial factors and family dynamics. These values suggest a moderate-to-strong relationship between the predictors and the outcome variable.

The adjusted R-square values provide a more conservative estimate of the model's goodness of fit by adjusting for the number of predictors and sample size. The adjusted R-square values range from 0.22 to 0.25, indicating that between 22% and 25% of the variability in boy child development can still be explained by the model, even when accounting for its complexity. The standard error of the estimate reflects the average distance between the observed values of boy child development and the values predicted by the model. The relatively low standard errors suggest that the model provides a reasonably accurate representation of the relationship between psychosocial factors, family dynamics, and boy child development. The change statistics provide additional insights into how the inclusion of family dynamics influences the model's explanatory power. The R-square change and F-change values indicate the extent to which the addition of family predictors improves the model's ability to predict boy child development beyond the psychosocial factors alone. The significant F-change values ($p < 0.05$)

suggest that the inclusion of family dynamics significantly enhances the model's explanatory power.

The findings presented in Table 1 highlight the importance of considering family dynamics as moderators in the relationship between psychosocial factors and the development of boy children. By incorporating family variables such as marital status (divorced, single, married), the model provides a more comprehensive understanding of how family contexts interact with psychosocial factors to shape developmental outcomes for boys. These insights are invaluable for informing targeted interventions and policies aimed at supporting the holistic well-being of boy children within diverse family environments.

Table 2: ANOVA 'Effect of Family on the relationship between psychosocial factors and the development of boy child'

Model	ANOVAa				
	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1. Regression	12.01	2	6.00	14.65	0.00
Residual	1.64	4	0.41		
Total	13.65	6			
2. Regression	13.01	3	4.33	2.93	0.00
Residual	4.44	3	1.48		
Total	14.46	6			
a. Predictors: (Constant), psychosocial factors (cognitive, social integration, psychological)					
b. Predictors: (Constant), family (divorced, single, married)					

Note: ANOVAa 'Effect of Family on the relationship between psychosocial factors and the development of boy child'

Table 2 provides a detailed analysis of the effect of family dynamics on the relationship between psychosocial factors and the development of boy children within the field of public health, employing the ANOVA framework. This statistical technique allows for a comprehensive evaluation of the significance of various predictors in explaining the variance observed in boy child development, shedding light on the interplay between psychosocial factors and family structures. In the first model presented, Model 1, the ANOVA results demonstrate a significant relationship between psychosocial factors and boy child development. The regression model, which includes psychosocial factors and a constant term, significantly predicts boy child development, as evidenced by the high F-value of 14.65 ($p < 0.05$). This indicates that psychosocial factors such as cognitive abilities, social integration, and psychological well-being contribute significantly to the variability observed in boy child development. Additionally, the relatively low residual mean square of 0.41 suggests that the model provides a good fit to the data, with little unexplained variability. Moving to Model 2, which includes both psychosocial factors and family dynamics as predictors, the ANOVA results continue to show a significant relationship between the predictors and boy child development. The regression model, incorporating both sets of predictors and a constant term, significantly predicts boy child development, with an F-value of 2.93 ($p < 0.05$). This suggests that the inclusion of family dynamics enhances the predictive ability of the model beyond psychosocial factors alone. Despite the slightly higher residual mean square of 1.48 compared to Model 1, the overall model remains statistically significant, indicating that the combined influence of psychosocial factors and family dynamics provides valuable insights into boy child development.

The ANOVA results underscore the importance of considering both psychosocial factors and family dynamics in understanding and predicting developmental outcomes for boys in public health contexts. By incorporating family structures such as marital status (divorced, single, married), the models offer a more nuanced understanding of how familial environments may interact with psychosocial factors to shape boy child development. These findings have implications for the design of targeted interventions and policies aimed at supporting the holistic well-being of boy children, taking into account the multifaceted nature of their social and familial contexts.

Table 3: Coefficients ‘Effect of Family on the relationship between psychosocial factors and the development of boy child’

Model	Coefficients			T	Sig.
	Unstandardized coefficients	Standardized coefficients			
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1. (Constant) product Psychosocial factors	4.44	0.48		1.40	0.03
Family	0.45	0.40	0.38	1.06	0.00
	0.15	0.03	0.27	1.34	0.00
2. (Constant) product Psychosocial factors and development of boy child Product of psychosocial factors and family	5.64	0.38		1.23	0.03
	0.43	3.00	0.34	1.68	0.00
	0.08	0.11	0.13	0.76	0.00
	0.03	0.03	0.04	1.42	0.00

Model 1. Predictors: (Constant), psychosocial factors, organizational factors
 Dependent variable: Development of boy child (health, education, activity)

Note: Coefficients ‘Effect of Family on the relationship between psychosocial factors and the development of boy child’

Table 3 provides a nuanced analysis of the coefficients derived from regression models investigating the intricate relationship between psychosocial factors, family dynamics, and the development of boy children within the realm of public health. These coefficients offer valuable insights into the specific contributions of psychosocial factors and family structures to the developmental trajectories of boys, shedding light on the complexity of factors influencing their overall well-being. In the first model (Model 1), the coefficients elucidate the individual impact of psychosocial factors and family dynamics on boy child development. The constant term, representing the baseline level of development in the absence of predictors, is 4.44. This suggests a foundational level of development irrespective of psychosocial factors and family dynamics. The coefficients for psychosocial factors and family dynamics provide further insights. Psychosocial factors exhibit a stronger influence, with a higher unstandardized coefficient (B) of 0.48 compared to 0.15 for family dynamics. This indicates that, for every one-unit increase in psychosocial factors, there is a more pronounced corresponding increase in boy child development compared to family dynamics. However, both predictors are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), underscoring their importance in predicting boy child development. In the second model (Model 2), the coefficients explore the combined effect of psychosocial factors and family dynamics, including their interaction. The constant term remains the same, but the coefficient for the interaction between psychosocial factors and

family is introduced. This coefficient of 0.08 suggests a relatively smaller effect of the interaction on boy child development compared to the individual effects of psychosocial factors and family dynamics. However, it is still statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), indicating that the interaction between psychosocial factors and family dynamics contributes to the prediction of boy child development.

These coefficients highlight the multifaceted nature of factors influencing boy child development. While psychosocial factors play a predominant role, family dynamics also exert a significant influence. The inclusion of the interaction between psychosocial factors and family dynamics further enriches our understanding, emphasizing the need for comprehensive approaches that consider the complex interplay between individual, social, and familial factors in promoting positive developmental outcomes for boys. These findings have important implications for the design of targeted interventions and policies aimed at supporting the holistic well-being of boy children within diverse family environments, thereby contributing to advancements in public health research and practice.

7. Conclusions

The findings of this study underscore the critical moderating role of family dynamics in the relationship between psychosocial factors and the development of the boy child in Kenya. The study established that psychosocial factors, including cognitive development, social integration, and psychological well-being, significantly impact the boy child's health, education, and overall activity levels. However, family structures whether divorced, single-parent, or married moderate these effects, either amplifying or mitigating developmental outcomes.

The statistical analysis revealed that family context plays a significant role in shaping the cognitive and social integration of boys. Supportive family environments contribute positively to motivation, academic performance, and mental health, while unstable family structures can exacerbate developmental risks. Given that only 23% to 25% of the variance in boy child development is explained by psychosocial factors and family dynamics combined, other external factors may also influence outcomes, necessitating further research.

This study contributes to the understanding of child development by integrating family as a moderating variable in existing theoretical frameworks. The findings emphasize the need for tailored interventions that account for different family structures to enhance the well-being of boys and ensure their holistic development.

8. Recommendations

Based on the study findings, several recommendations are proposed. Family-centered interventions should be implemented to support boys' development by incorporating family-based approaches that strengthen parental involvement, mentorship, and emotional support, particularly in single-parent and divorced family settings. Schools should integrate psychosocial support programs tailored to boys from diverse family backgrounds to enhance resilience, academic performance, and social skills. Additionally, community-based organizations should develop mentorship and counseling programs to foster positive social integration and minimize risks associated with unstable family environments. Further research is necessary to explore other contributing factors affecting boy child development, such as socio-economic status, peer influence, and policy frameworks. In terms of practice recommendations, parental training programs should be developed to equip parents and guardians with parenting skills, emphasizing the importance of nurturing boys' psychosocial development. Schools and community centers should expand access to psychological support

services to address mental health concerns linked to family instability. Educators should receive training to identify and address psychosocial challenges that affect boys, incorporating tailored teaching strategies to enhance engagement and academic achievement. Peer mentorship programs should be encouraged in schools and communities to promote positive behavioral modeling and reduce the risk of delinquency. Regarding policy recommendations, the government should introduce family policy reforms to strengthen family support systems, including counseling services for divorced and single-parent households, to mitigate adverse developmental impacts on boys. Education policies should mandate the inclusion of psychosocial education and support systems in schools to ensure boys receive holistic developmental assistance. National mental health policies should prioritize interventions targeting children, particularly boys in vulnerable family setups, to prevent long-term psychological distress. Lastly, the government should enhance social protection programs that provide financial and emotional support to single-parent families, reducing socio-economic disparities that affect boy child development.

References

- Adams-Ojugbele, R. and Mashiya, N. (2020). Interventions supporting the integration of refugee children in the primary school life: roles of the child's contexts of development. *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.4102/td.v16i1.769>
- Adigun, O. and Ndwandwe, N. (2022). Academic resilience among deaf learners during e-learning in the covid-19 era. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, 7(2), 27-48. <https://doi.org/10.46303/ressat.2022.8>
- Ahumada-Newhart, V. and Eccles, J. (2020). A theoretical and qualitative approach to evaluating children's robot-mediated levels of presence. *Technology Mind and Behavior*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1037/tmb0000007>
- Almas, A., Papp, L., Woodbury, M., Nelson, C., Zeanah, C., & Fox, N. (2018). The impact of caregiving disruptions of previously institutionalized children on multiple outcomes in late childhood. *Child Development*, 91(1), 96-109. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13169>
- Andersen, L., Høgh, A., Biering, K., & Gadegaard, C. (2018). Work-related threats and violence in human service sectors: the importance of the psycho-social work environment examined in a multilevel prospective study. *Work*, 59(1), 141-154. <https://doi.org/10.3233/wor-172654>
- Balducci, C., Rafanelli, C., Menghini, L., & Consiglio, C. (2024). The relationship between patients' demands and workplace violence among healthcare workers: a multilevel look focusing on the moderating role of psychosocial working conditions. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 21(2), 178. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph21020178>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman.
- Bolger, A., Dunstan, D., & Kaltner, M. (2018). A conceptual model of psychosocial adjustment of foster care adoptees based on a scoping review of contributing factors. *Clinical Psychologist*, 22(1), 3-15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cp.12090>
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). *Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human development*. SAGE Publications.
- Cassells, R. and Evans, G. (2020). Concepts from the bioecological model of human development., 221-232. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000187-010>

- Comaskey, B., Roos, N., Brownell, M., Enns, M., Château, D., Ruth, C., ... & Ekuma, O. (2017). Maternal depression and anxiety disorders (mdad) and child development: a manitoba population-based study. *Plos One*, 12(5), e0177065. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0177065>
- Currie, R., Anderson, V., McCarthy, M., Burke, K., Hearps, S., & Muscara, F. (2018). Parental distress in response to childhood medical trauma: a mediation model. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 25(10-11), 1681-1691. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105318770728>
- Dong, C., Wu, Q., Pan, Y., Yan, Q., Ru, X., & Ruikang, Z. (2021). Family resilience and its association with psychosocial adjustment of children with chronic illness: a latent profile analysis. *Journal of Pediatric Nursing*, 60, e6-e12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pedn.2021.02.010>
- Drago, F., Scharf, R., Maphula, A., Nyathi, E., Mahopo, T., Svensen, E., ... & McQuade, E. (2020). Psychosocial and environmental determinants of child cognitive development in rural South Africa and Tanzania: findings from the mal-ed cohort. *BMC Public Health*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-08598-5>
- Etkin-Spigelman, L., Hancock, K., Nathan, P., & Barrera, M. (2021). Sharing psychosocial risk screening information with pediatric oncology healthcare providers: service utilization and related factors. *Pediatric Blood & Cancer*, 69(2). <https://doi.org/10.1002/pbc.29456>
- Faleschini, S., Rifas-Shiman, S., Tiemeier, H., Oken, E., & Hivert, M. (2019). Associations of prenatal and postnatal maternal depressive symptoms with offspring cognition and behavior in mid-childhood: a prospective cohort study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(6), 1007. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16061007>
- Ge, Y., Xiao, Y., Li, M., Yang, L., Song, P., Li, X., ... & Yan, H. (2023). Maladaptive cognitive regulation moderates the mediating role of emotion dysregulation on the association between psychosocial factors and non-suicidal self-injury in depression. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2023.1279108>
- Georgiadis, A., Benny, L., Duc, L., Galab, S., Reddy, P., & Woldehanna, T. (2017). Growth recovery and faltering through early adolescence in low- and middle-income countries: determinants and implications for cognitive development. *Social Science & Medicine*, 179, 81-90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.02.031>
- Gubbels, J., Put, C., & Assink, M. (2019). Risk factors for school absenteeism and dropout: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 48(9), 1637-1667. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01072-5>
- Hasumi, T. and Chiu, M. (2022). Online mathematics education as bio-eco-techno process: bibliometric analysis using co-authorship and bibliographic coupling. *Scientometrics*, 127(8), 4631-4654. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04441-3>
- Hitzler, M., Bach, A., Köhler-Dauner, F., Gündel, H., & Kolassa, I. (2022). Long-term consequences of childhood maltreatment among postpartum women—prevalence of psychosocial risk factors for child welfare: an independent replication study. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2022.836077>
- Isobel, S., Goodyear, M., Furness, T., & Foster, K. (2019). Preventing intergenerational trauma transmission: a critical interpretive synthesis. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 28(7-8), 1100-1113. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.14735>

- Jones, P., Pendergast, L., Schaefer, B., Rasheed, M., Svensen, E., Scharf, R., ... & Murray-Kolb, L. (2017). Measuring home environments across cultures: invariance of the home scale across eight international sites from the mal-ed study. *Journal of School Psychology*, 64, 109-127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2017.06.001>
- Kahn, S. and Denov, M. (2022). Transgenerational trauma in Rwandan genocidal rape survivors and their children: a culturally enhanced bioecological approach. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 59(6), 727-739. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13634615221080231>
- Kapetanovic, S., Boele, S., & Skoog, T. (2019). Parent-adolescent communication and adolescent delinquency: unraveling within-family processes from between-family differences. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 48(9), 1707-1723. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01043-w>
- Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. (2023). *Economic survey 2023*. Government of Kenya.
- Kong, M. and Lu, Y. (2024). Learning family: concept, measurement and the effect on individuals' behaviors. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(11), 1061. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14111061>
- Lähdepuro, A., Lahti-Pulkkinen, M., Pyhälä, R., Tuovinen, S., Lahti, J., Heinonen, K., ... & Räikkönen, K. (2022). Positive maternal mental health during pregnancy and mental and behavioral disorders in children: a prospective pregnancy cohort study. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 64(5), 807-816. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13625>
- Loon-Dikkers, L., Luijk, M., Haan, A., & Steketee, M. (2024). Preprint emotional insecurity and psychosocial problems in children exposed to family violence: exploring the role of well-being at school. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/ms4jh>
- Masten, A. S. (2018). Resilience theory and research on children and families: Past, present, and promise. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 10(1), 12-31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12255>
- Moffitt, T. E. (2019). Male antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Developmental Psychology*, 55(7), 1232-1245. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000717>
- Navarro, J., Stephens, C., Rodrigues, B., Walker, I., Cook, O., O'Toole, L., ... & Tudge, J. (2022). Bored of the rings: methodological and analytic approaches to operationalizing bronfenbrenner's ppct model in research practice. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 14(2), 233-253. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12459>
- Neuhauser, A., Ramseier, E., Schaub, S., Burkhardt, S., & Lanfranchi, A. (2018). Mediating role of maternal sensitivity: enhancing language development in at-risk families. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 39(5), 522-536. <https://doi.org/10.1002/imhj.21738>
- Nouri, K., Krauss, S., Ahrari, S., Ismail, I., & Arshad, M. (2022). Pathways to positive youth development in Malaysian undergraduate co-curricular programs: a moderated mediation model of youth voice and psychological hardiness. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.886911>
- Parham, W. (2019). Hiding in plain sight: discovering the promises of multicultural sport psychology., 489-508. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000123-025>
- Putra, I., Daly, M., & Robinson, E. (2024). Psychological well-being and the reversal of childhood overweight and obesity in the UK: a longitudinal national cohort study. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/8z3vs>

- Putra, I., Daly, M., & Robinson, E. (2024). Psychosocial factors and the development of childhood overweight and obesity: a UK cohort study. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/pbvq7>
- Republic of Kenya, Ministry of Health. (2022). *National mental health policy 2022-2027*. Government of Kenya.
- Roux, T., Heinen, M., Murphy, S., & Buggy, C. (2021). A unified theoretical framework of learning theories to inform and guide public health continuing medical education research and practice. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*, 41(2), 130-138. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ceh.0000000000000339>
- Sania, A., Sudfeld, C., Danaei, G., Fink, G., McCoy, D., Zhu, Z., ... & Fawzi, W. (2019). Early life risk factors of motor, cognitive and language development: a pooled analysis of studies from low/middle-income countries. *BMJ Open*, 9(10), e026449. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-026449>
- Sroufe, L. A. (2019). Attachment and development: A prospective, longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics*, 40(2), 114-119. <https://doi.org/10.1097/DBP.0000000000000660>
- Tran, L., Nguyen, P., Young, M., Ramakrishnan, U., & Alderman, H. (2023). Home environment and nutritional status mitigate the wealth gap in child development: a longitudinal study in Vietnam. *BMC Public Health*, 23(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-15156-2>
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2023). *Human development report 2023: Beyond income, beyond averages, beyond today*. UNDP.
- United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF). (2022). *State of the world's children 2022: Children, food and nutrition*. UNICEF.
- Varela, A. (2021). The relationship between psychosocial factors and reported disability: the role of pain self-efficacy. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-736799/v1>
- Wijaya, S. (2022). The roles of parents teachers association in school-age children's psychosocial development according to Erik Erikson. *Edunesia Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*, 3(1), 45-54. <https://doi.org/10.51276/edu.v3i1.215>
- World Health Organization. (2023). *World health statistics 2023: Monitoring health for the SDGs*. WHO.
- Xu, Y., Liu, T., Jiang, Y., Zhao, X., Fei, M., Xu, G., ... & Zhao, M. (2022). Psychosocial adaptation among inflammatory bowel disease patients and associated factors: a cross-sectional study. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, Volume 15, 2157-2167. <https://doi.org/10.2147/prbm.s376254>
- Yeung, J. (2021). Family processes, parenting practices, and psychosocial maturity of Chinese youths: a latent variable interaction and mediation analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(8), 4357. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18084357>
- Zucchetti, G., Ambrogio, G., Bertolotti, M., Besenon, L., Borghino, F., Candela, F., ... & Fagioli, F. (2020). Effects of a high-intensity psychosocial intervention among child-parent units in pediatric oncology. *Tumori Journal*, 106(5), 362-368. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0300891620926226>