



African Journal of Social Work

Afri. j. soc. work

© National Association of Social Workers-Zimbabwe/Autor(s)

ISSN Print 1563-3934

ISSN Online 2409-5605

Licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-commercial 4.0 International License

Indexed & Accredited with: African Journals Online (AJOL) | University of Zimbabwe Accredited Journals (UZAJ) | SCOPUS (Elsevier's abstract and citation database) | Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) | Society of African Journal Editors (SAJE) | Asian Digital Library (ADL) | African Social Work Network (ASWNet) | Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) - South Africa | SJR | CNKI - China | Journal Publishing Practices and Standards (JPPS) | EBSCO | DOI

A model of blended family(stepfamily) formation in Ethiopia: a constructivist grounded theory

FIKRE, Kumneger and MINAYE, Abebaw

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at developing a model that describes and explains blended family formation in Ethiopia. It is part of an ongoing dissertation entitled "Family functioning experiences of blended families in Ethiopia." We employed constructivist grounded theory both as a method and result of inquiry. This theory states that knowledge is constructed out of the dynamic interaction between the researcher, participants, and the context. Accordingly, we were informed by the guiding principles, data organization and analytical tools the theory provides. We interviewed fourteen participants drawn from seven families. We developed a model that depicted the major contributing factors to blend, and the procedures partners use to form their families in the context of Ethiopia. The study identified the state partners were in, categorized as problem state and aspiration state, before blending as contributing factors. Problem state refers to the challenging situation partners were in due to several factors. Aspiration state refers to the situation of partners who were seeking for a marriage partner for the betterment of their life. The result also showed partners' decision and action of blending were influenced by community and family members involvement. We discussed the results in light of the Ubuntu philosophy, the Ukama and the Ujamaa African theories. Finally, we provided recommendations that would give insight to enhance the quality of blended family formation in Ethiopia.

KEY TERMS: aspiration state, blended family formation, constructivist grounded theory, Ethiopia, problem state, Ubuntu, ujama, ukama

KEY DATES

Received: May 2023

Revised: May 2023

Accepted: June 2023

Published: June 2023

Funding: None

Conflict of Interest: None

Permission: None

Ethics approval: Not applicable

Author/s details:

FIKRE, Kumneger; Consultant, Ethiopian Civil Service University, PhD candidate in Applied Social Psychology at Addis Ababa University, School of Psychology, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, kfkumnegerf@gmail.com phone:

+251919495557, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0041-5321>

MINAYE, Abebaw; Associate Professor, Addis Ababa University, School of Psychology, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, abebaw.minaye@aau.edu.et

Current and previous volumes are available at:

<https://ajsw.africasocialwork.net>



How to reference using ASWNet style:

Fikre, K & Minaye, A. (2023). A model of blended family(stepfamily) formation in Ethiopia: a constructivist grounded theory *African Journal of Social Work*, 13(6), 1-8.

57 **INTRODUCTION**

58 The purpose of this study was developing a model that describes and explains blended family formation in the
 59 context of Ethiopia. As a qualitative study with grounded theory design, we employed purposive and theoretical
 60 sampling. Accordingly, eight participants were selected purposively while the remaining six were selected using
 61 theoretical sampling based on identified analytical gaps. Initial coding, focused coding and theoretical coding
 62 were conducted to generate codes, themes and categories. We applied the constant comparative analysis method
 63 (CCAM) on the data to come up with a model grounded on it. CCAM is used to construct a substantive theory by
 64 constantly comparing emerging codes with existing ones and to generate categories. We used this method to
 65 develop the blended family formation model; which is grounded on the interview data. The results were presented
 66 based on the research questions followed by the resultant model and its description. Finally, we discussed the
 67 findings in light of selected African theories and provided recommendations and conclusions.

68 **BACKGROUND**69 **Dynamics in blended families**

70 Marriage is a highly valued, respected and normative pathway to family formation and childbearing in Ethiopia.
 71 Accordingly, parents experience strong sense of accomplishment when their children got married which is referred
 72 as “ለወግ ለማዕረግ ማብቃት” literally translated as “enabling one’s child to be a respected adult/ citizen”. Families
 73 prepare wedding ceremonies to share their joy and fulfillment with the larger community. The community named
 74 this feeling of extreme joy and happiness as “አለማችንን አዩን” literally means “enjoyed life in its utmost”. Reports
 75 revealed higher percentage of married adults and small percentage of nonmarital child bearing in Ethiopia. To this
 76 effect, the World Family Map report (WFM, 2019) recognized Ethiopia as the second highest sub-Saharan African
 77 country, next to Nigeria, on the percentage (62%) of married adults in the reproductive age group (15 to 49).
 78 Similarly, the Central Statistics Agency of Ethiopia (CSA, 2016) reported, 64% of women and 56% of men as
 79 married or cohabitating. On the contrary, Gizachew, Melash, Gedefaw, and Yared (2020) reported the first
 80 marriage of a quarter of married women in Ethiopia ended in divorce, which led the researchers to conclude that
 81 Ethiopia has high rate of divorce. Likawunt and Getu (2023) identified Ethiopia as a country with high risk of
 82 marital instability. The facts on the increasing divorce rate and the high proportion of adults in marital union imply
 83 high rate of remarriage in Ethiopia which contributes to the formation of blended families.

84 Blended families are defined as families formed by the union of two adults, at least one of whom has one or
 85 more children from previous relationship. Couples forming blended families have features that make them unique
 86 from those engaging in first marriages. They have lost their former marriage/ romantic partners; the biological
 87 parent of their children is no more at home. Some have biological children who live elsewhere. According to the
 88 Africa Social Work Development Network (ASWDNet), n.d. the Individual-in-Family Theory of Africa states the
 89 family member’s well-being is influenced by the family circumstances. Njoroge and Kirori (2018) identified the
 90 dynamics in blended families negatively influenced the academic performance of children in Kenya. Moore
 91 (2021) explored the strategies parents and stepparents implemented to reduce the negative influence the new
 92 family structures on school performance of their children. According to Aemero and Lakshim (2013), stepfamily
 93 members in Ethiopia exhibited poor academic performance and problematic behavior. The societal attitude toward
 94 the stepparent-stepchild relationship is negative as portrayed in the fairy tales and idioms such as “ያልወለድኩት
 95 ልጅ ቢለኝ አባባ አፊን አለው ዳባ ዳባ።” meaning “I feel odd when my stepchild called me Dad.” and “የእንጀራ እናት
 96 ጠንከርኝ እንደ ጅማት።” meaning, stepmother is as stiff as tendon referring to the bias that she does not have heart
 97 for her stepchild(ren). This situation motivated us to construct a model that describes and explains the pushing or
 98 pulling factors of blended family formation.

99 **Research gap in blended families**

100 Researchers (Adjiwanou, Boco & Yaya, 2021; Ganong et al., 2019) have identified shortage of researches that
 101 address the complicated issues blended families face. Adjiwanou et al. (2021) indicated lack of research on
 102 stepfamilies in Sub Saharan Africa, given the high prevalence of divorce and remarriage in the region. Another
 103 study conducted on family structure transitions in four countries including Ethiopia indicated the need for a more
 104 contextualized understanding on how families are impacted by family structure transitions (Oldroyd et al., 2021).

105 Portrie and Hill (2005) asserted that blended families face unique challenges but are met with standard
 106 solutions that did not consider the multicultural context. The researchers further underlined the need to conduct
 107 qualitative researches so as to “create rich and descriptive understanding of blended families”. Yet, several
 108 families researches conducted in Ethiopia were guided by Western theories and tools which may not be adequate
 109 to uncover what contributes to the nuance in blended families in Ethiopia. We believe knowing what contributes

110 to the formation of blended families and how they are formed might help to understand their unique nature and
 111 improve the quality of blended family formation.

112 METHODOLOGY

113 As an Ethiopian woman running a blended family, I, the first author, brought to this research the knowledge that
 114 blending families and working towards their stability is a complicated task. My experience motivated me to
 115 conduct my dissertation on “Family functioning experiences of blended family members in Ethiopia: A
 116 constructivist grounded theory”. The current study is part of my ongoing dissertation. It is a qualitative study with
 117 grounded theory design and CCAM (Charmaz, 2017), similar to the larger study. Two inclusion criteria were used
 118 to select participants: 1) At least one of the marriage partners in a couple should have brought a child[ren] from
 119 former relationship. 2) The couple should have a minimum of two years experience after blending their families.

120 An Ethiopian proverb goes to say “የሀገሩን ሰርዶ በሀገሩ በሬ” verbatim translated as “plough the nation’s land
 121 using the nation’s ox” literally means “the problem of a nation is best solved by its own resources”, we developed
 122 a model that answers why couples blend their families in the context of Ethiopia based on the interview data
 123 collected from 14 participants. The sample selection, data collection and data analysis methods were informed by
 124 the social values of the Ubuntu African worldview which is termed as *Medemer* (Ubuntu Research Group URG,
 125 2023) in Ethiopia. We consciously demonstrated genuine, respectful, and compassionate behavior in the
 126 relationships we had with the participants. We conducted the interviews at the homes of the participants to build
 127 respectful relationships, balance the researcher-participant power relationship and better understand the family
 128 and community context. The interview was in Amharic which is a widely spoken and the day-to-day language in
 129 Ethiopia (Khupe & Keane, 2017). To benefit from the oral culture of Ethiopia, participants were asked to freely
 130 narrate the reasons behind their blended family formation and the procedures they followed to form their family.
 131 They shared us their experiences, the stories and the events that push or pull them to blend their families. Meaning
 132 making was mainly done by the participants but it was also informed by our conscious engagement in
 133 understanding the interview data and interpreting contextual descriptions. We made a comprehensive data analysis
 134 and identified core and subcategories as presented in the next section.

135 Ethical issues were seriously considered in this study. We got oral consent from each couple after explaining
 136 the purpose of the research and providing all the necessary information about the data collection process and other
 137 details. We obtained ethical approval (RefNo SoP-Eth-008/2023) from Addis Ababa University, School of
 138 Psychology, Research Ethics Committee. As social psychologists and qualitative researchers, we managed
 139 emotional disturbances interviewees encountered through providing counseling and referral services.

140 RESULTS OF THE STUDY

141 We identified “Partner’s State” as the core category that emerged from two categories, problem state and
 142 aspiration state. The former emanated from the subcategories economic challenge, struggle with child rearing,
 143 poor health and gender-based violence while the latter came from the subcategories family expansion,
 144 companionship, and dignity and respect. The state partners were in before the formation of their blended families
 145 contributed to their decision and action of blending, and the procedure they followed to blend. The categories and
 146 the model that emerged from the data are presented in this section.

147 Problem state

148 Some partners described the challenging situation they were in before blending their families. Economic
 149 challenge, struggling with child rearing, poor health condition and exposure to gender-based violence were their
 150 major challenges. Economic challenge was a shared problem while gender differences were observed in the others.
 151 Men partners associated their blended family formation with the need to get care and support for self and children.
 152 Here are reflections from the then widowed single fathers.

153 *Taking care of the little boys was very much challenging for me. That was the only reason that pushed*
 154 *me to marry another woman while I was still mourning the loss of my former wife, who died on the 16th*
 155 *day after she gave birth to our third child (C5 Husband).*

156 *My former wife died when my son was 10. I have been a good farmer all the time but I am not good at*
 157 *child rearing. My relatives and friends advised me to get married and raise my child properly (C4*
 158 *Husband).*

159 *Since I could not afford to hire a house maid, I was the one who took care of my daughter. I was*
 160 *responsible to cook and wash our clothes, I was the one who prepared her lunch box and accompany her*
 161 *to school. As a priest, my duties at church were also demanding (C1 Husband).*

162 Another participant with complicated health problem decided to get a “wife” who could support and treat him.
 163 He was living and working in the USA and experienced difficulties to overcome the life challenges he encountered
 164 there. He explained his decision: *“I decided to get a wife who can support me in generating income and treat me*
 165 *at home. It has been hard to get healthy food and my medication on time which excacerbated my health condition”*
 166 *(C2 Husband).*

167 Women participants’ decision to form blended families had been mainly influenced by economic challenge and
 168 their exposure to gender-based violence. They shared their feelings:

169 *The men in my neighbourhood were abusive; they tried to snatch part of my land assuming that I am*
 170 *incapable, a widowed woman who would give up to pressure (C1 Wife).*

171 *There were two men who forcefully nagged me for marriage. Especially one of them was abusive; when*
 172 *I said no, he started threatening me. He said, “if you would not marry me, I would abduct you.” (C5*
 173 *Wife).*

174 *It was the most challenging time in my life. I was not able to feed myself and my two children. The father*
 175 *of my daughter was imprisoned and that of my son was irresponsible. So, I accepted his (Husband’s)*
 176 *proposal and joined his family just the day after our introduction (C4 Wife).*

177 Aspiration state

178 *The only reason I needed marriage was to give birth; to have more children. And yet, I wanted it to be*
 179 *in a respected way...em..I did not want to have a child out of wedlock. So, I was firmly interested to get*
 180 *married and have a child from a responsible person (C2 Wife).*

181 *When my youngest child joined kindergarten and saw the fathers of his friends, he started to consistently*
 182 *ask about his father and insisted me to bring one for him. It was to satisfy his need that I got married.*
 183 *(C6 Wife).*

184 *I got married when my son was at the verge of completing high school. I was worried about being alone.*
 185 *Who is going to be by my side whenever I needed protection? (C7 Wife).*

186 The data also revealed couples with similar life experiences tend to blend their families. Accordingly, C1, C3
 187 and C7 valued the similar life challenges they encountered and believed that has motivated their decision to blend.
 188 Similarities may be described based on status before blending families such as partners in C1 were widowed single
 189 parents of their respective daughters of similar age. The partners had been struggling to balance work and life.
 190 The partners in C3 have a daughter each from their former marriages which ended in divorce. Both experienced
 191 emotional disturbances and hassles in dealing with former spouses. The partners in C7 were single parenting their
 192 children for more than twelve years. They have feelings of achievement as their children were in secondary
 193 schools at the time, they decided to get married. The couple wanted to relax and enjoy the years ahead.

194 The partners in this category were aspiring for expanding their families such as getting a child, substituting
 195 the missed parent, and getting stepsiblings to their children. The women in this state were aspiring to fulfill the
 196 desires of their children and enjoy life with a marriage partner. Some were aspiring to “regain” dignity and respect
 197 through remarriage. Accordingly, the decision of wives was mainly influenced by their desire to expand families
 198 and get companions. Here are some of their reflections:

200 *I got married just to give birth to more children. And yet, since my first child grew without a father, I did*
 201 *not want to raise another child without a father. Hence, I was firmly interested to get married and have*
 202 *a child from a responsible person (C2 Wife).*

203 *I had been single parenting my son for seven years and that was the most enjoyable time of my life. We*
 204 *were like friends. I got married when my son was at the verge of joining university. It was my son who*
 205 *initiated the idea of my marriage. I accepted his idea to avoid loneliness and to enjoy life with a partner*
 206 *(C7 Wife).*

207 Similarly, the husband in C7 was single parenting his two daughters for twelve years. He believed he had invested
 208 a lot in rearing his children alone without “exposing” them to a stepmother. He formed the current family after

209 his younger daughter turned 10. He believed by then they were already grown up to support each other and protect
210 themselves even if they encountered a harmful stepmother. His decision to get married was influenced by his
211 sense of achievement in child rearing and the desire to live for “self” in the remaining years of his life.

212 The husband in C6 was neither married nor had a child before the formation of the current family. He witnessed
213 that it was his partner’s character that influenced his marital decision. He said, *“The decision I made was odd for
214 many. She was a single mother of three and 11 years older than me. But she was a loving and caring woman.”*
215 (C6 Husband).

216 Both partners in C3, C6 and C7 were from the aspiration state and the women’s marital decision was influenced
217 by their children’s involvement.

218 **Blending procedure**

219 The result revealed most of the marriages were initiated and facilitated by the engagement of family or community
220 members. The result also identified that the time partners took to blend their families was quite short.

221

222 **Facilitators**

223 Four partners came to know each other through facilitators who created introductory platforms, provided
224 “reliable” information, served as mediators and encouraged partners to blend their families. Partners reflected:

225 *“Since I trusted my God father, I accepted the person he recommended immediately. I believed that God
226 has accepted my prayers and gave me the life partner I wished for long. (C1 Wife)”*

227 *“As a religious person who came from countryside, I was shocked by the life style of girls and women
228 in Addis Ababa. Thanks to my friend, he got me a blessed wife (C1 Husband).”*

229 *“it was awkward to meet a to-be marriage partner in this way. My friend tried his best to set the stage
230 and help me feel relaxed (C2 Wife).”*

231 *“He was one of my mediators. My wife’s brother was not happy by the marriage fearing she would be
232 hurt as this is her third marriage. It was with the help of my relative that they accepted the marriage (C5
233 Husband).”*

234 The wives in C3, C6 and C7 described that the idea of their marriage initially came from their children. The former
235 two were divorced mothers of a single child who had been single parenting for more than seven years. Despite
236 the challenges, they marked the period they single parented as the best family time. Both reported it to be end of
237 the dysfunctional marriage they had and beginning of submitting themselves to satisfy their children’s desire. C6
238 was a widowed single mother of three children whose youngest son was a toddler when her former husband died.
239 When this son joined kindergarten, he started to “nag her to bring a father”. They shared how the children initiated
240 the idea of their marriage:

241

242 *My daughter’s childhood dream was to reconcile her father and I when she grew up. As a result, she
243 became mad when she saw me with anyone of the opposite sex whoever the person is. When she was 14,
244 her father married his third wife and she became disappointed. She even felt guilty for controlling me
245 from engaging to a new life. So, she begged me to get married and promised to accept the person as a
246 father (C3 Wife).*

247 C7 wife’s son was also against his mother’s marriage for many years assuming the man would “take” his mother’s
248 love. He used to be angry when her relatives and friends suggested her to get married. Then, when he was left
249 with a year to join university, he started to be concerned about the fate of his mother. She said:

250

251 *My son started to worry a lot about my life as he was going to leave me shortly. He felt mistaken and
252 complained to me “why did you listen to me. I was a small child to deal with such issues. You should
253 have married ignoring my irrational interests” (C7 Wife).*

254 *When my youngest child joined kindergarten and saw the fathers of his friends, he started to consistently
255 ask about his father and insisted me to bring one for him. He used to say “I am the only one without a
256 father.” It was to satisfy his need that I got married. (C6 Wife).*

257 Rapid family formation

258 All couples except C2 and C5, concluded their marriage in less than a week's time after their first introduction.
 259 The rapid family formation was catalyzed by three factors. Firstly, they trusted the information they got from the
 260 facilitator and they believed there is no need to spare time studying their partners. Secondly, they believed the
 261 situation they were in was so devastating that they badly needed a person who could reduce their burden. Thirdly,
 262 they were satisfied to get a person who can perceivably share their value system. Here are their reflections:


263 *We tested for HIV on the third day of our introduction and got married on the fifth day. Since I was afraid*
 264 *of that person (the person who had been harassing her), I did not want to delay it (C5 Wife).*

265 *She is a good person and the children were nice by then. We were happy when we pass time together.*
 266 *After few days of introduction, I just brought my luggage and started to live with them (C6 Husband).*

267 *I decided right away as he fulfilled my two preconditions. One was a person who is ready to receive the*
 268 *Holy Communion ("Kidus Kurban") with me. The second was a person who has only one daughter, just*
 269 *like me (C1 Wife).*

270 All couples except C6 established their families legally but without formal marriage ceremonies. Two couples
 271 practiced sending mediators to the woman's parents to get approval of the marriage; this is a tradition in Ethiopia.

272 *Figure 1. Blended family formation model*



284 Description of terms in the model

285 *Partners' state:* refers to the situation the members in a couple were prior to blending their families. Two
 286 categories emerged from the data based on the level of challenge or severity of the problem the partners were in;
 287 problem state and aspiration state.

288 *Problem state:* partners who reported experiences of hardship and severe problems including life threatening
 289 challenges were categorized in this state. The major challenges observed here were economic challenge, child
 290 rearing, poor health and gender-based violence.

291 *Aspiration state:* Partners who reported to be in a relatively stable state in terms of fulfilling their basic needs
 292 but were aspiring to expand their families and enjoy life with a partner were categorized in this state.

293 *Children or community members' involvement:* refers to ideas, advices, requests, encouragements and other
 294 services partners reportedly received from community members and their children and used the service in their
 295 decision to blend. The involvement could be initiated either by one of the partners or by the child or community
 296 member.

297 *Decision to blend:* refers to the decision couples made to live together blending their respective families.

298 *Action of blending:* The situation where couples actually merged their families and started to live as a
 299 household.

300 DISCUSSION

301 The data implied that partners mainly form blended families either to curb the challenges they faced or to get what
302 they aspired for. Here, we would like to discuss the results in light of the Ubuntu philosophy and the Ukama
303 African

304 **Family theory and the ujamaa communityhood theory.**

306 The findings revealed that partners either needed or wanted to be connected with others for their survival or
307 meaningful existence. This sense of interdependence and connectedness is in line with the Ubuntu African
308 philosophy and its maxim *a person is a person through other persons* (Mugumbate & Chereni, 2019). The
309 facilitation roles community members played in the blended family formation processes are in line with the
310 Ujamaa Communityhood Theory as communities take care of each other and work for the betterment of human
311 life (ASWDNet). Besides, the application of Ujamaa was more relevant and visible for partners in problem state
312 than those in aspiration state. These partners considered the formation of the new family as a way out from the
313 problems they used to face. Four families were established with at least one marriage partner who was in problem
314 state. The community involvement gives sense as the challenge was more severe for partners in problem state and
315 solution was beyond the capacity of the family. Whereas, Ukama was more applicable for partners in aspiration
316 state as parents were looking for life fulfillment and the role of children and other family members was critical
317 to address the desires of the family. Partners in aspiration state value family expansion, companionship, dignity
318 and respect. This can be explained in terms of the pillars of the Ukama Theory (ASWDNet) particularly value for
319 marriage, value for childbearing and value for strengthening the bond between the families involved in the
320 marriage. Partners in this state value marriage and considered it as a normative pathway to give birth and raise a
321 disciplined child.

322 The findings also revealed the perceived sense of insecurity single mothers faced as a result of being harassed,
323 threatened and disrespected by their own neighbours and abusive men in the community. This finding is against
324 the philosophy of Ubuntu which focuss on promoting humanity through values such as dignity, respect, care and
325 support (Mugumbate & Chereni, 2019).

326

327 RECOMMENDATIONS

328 Based on the findings, we suggest the following recommendations:

- 329 • In Ethiopia, particularly partners in problem state should give due consideration while deciding to form
330 blended families. They should exhaustively consider alternatives and weigh the cost and benefit of their
331 decision rather than merely focusing on solving their immediate problems.
- 332 • Social workers, counselors, social psychologists and developmental psychologists should enhance family and
333 community support systems through promoting the application of Ukama Family Theory and Ujamaa
334 Community hood Theory in the context of Ethiopia.
- 335 • The government of Ethiopia should strengthen its law enforcement mechanisms to protect single mothers and
336 their children from harassment and violence.
- 337 • The government, in collaboration with the community should provide family support services that address
338 the unique challenges of economically struggling single fathers and their children.
- 339 • Further research should be conducted to explore the reasons of blending and blending procedure play in the
340 functioning of blended families in Ethiopia.

341

342 CONCLUSION

343 Partners form blended families for two basic reasons; to mitigate the problems they faced or to fulfill their
344 aspirations. The decision to blend families was facilitated by partners' community and family members. Couples
345 with at least one partner in the problem state tend to be satisfiers while couples with both partners in the aspiration
346 state tend to be maximizers in their decision. In all the cases, the decision to blend was followed by an immediate
347 action of blending. The study developed a model that describes and explains blended family formation in Ethiopia.
348 This model was developed based on the principles and analytical tools of the constructivist grounded theory. As
349 depicted in the model, the state partners were in before blending their families contributed for the decision and
350 action of blending. Accordingly, we provided recommendations that promote positive blended family formation.

351 **DECLARATIONS**

352 The authors express that they do not have competing interests. We would like to thank the couples who
353 participated in this study for sharing details of their blended family formation experiences. We claimed that this
354 work is an original study funded by Addis Ababa University. Finally, we confirm that this work would not be
355 submitted to another publication unless it is withdrawn or rejected by the African Journal of Social Work.

356 REFERENCES

- 357 Adjiwanou, V., Boco, A. & Yaya, S. (2021). Stepfather families and children's schooling in sub-Saharan Africa:
358 a cross-national study. *Demographic Research*, 44 (27), 627–670.
- 359 Aemero, A. & Lakshim, H. (2013). Assessing children academic achievement as correlates with parents' marital
360 status: The case of junior high school students in Addis Ababa. *International Journal of Social Sciences*,
361 2 (2), 125-138.
- 362 Africa Social Work and Development Network (ASWDNet). (n.d). African theories of social work and
363 development. Available at: <https://africasocialwork.net/african-theories-of-social-work/#ujamaa-theory>
364 (Accessed: 22 September 2023).
- 365 Central Statistical Agency (CSA). (2016). Ethiopia demographic and health survey. Ethiopia.
- 366 Charmaz, K. (2017). The power of constructivist grounded theory for critical inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 23(1),
367 34–45.
- 368 Ganong, L., Jensen, T., Sanner, C., Russell, L. & Coleman, M. (2019). Stepfathers' affinity-seeking with
369 stepchildren, stepfather-stepchild relationship quality, marital quality, and stepfamily cohesion among
370 stepfathers and mothers. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 33(5), 521-531.
- 371 Gizachew, W., Melash B., Gedefaw A. & Yared M. (2020). Factors associated with divorce from first union
372 among women in Ethiopia: Further analysis of the 2016 Ethiopia demographic and health survey data.
373 Available at: <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0244014> (Accessed: 22
374 May 2023).
- 375 Khupe, C. & Keane, M. (2017). Towards an African education research methodology: decolonising new
376 knowledge. *Educational Research for Social Change*, 6(1), 25-37.
- 377 Likawunt, S. & Getu, D. (2023). Marital dissolution and associated factors in Hosanna, Southwest Ethiopia: A
378 community-based cross-sectional study. *BMC Psychol*, 11(1).
- 379 Moore, C. (2021). African American blended parent strategies and the influence on children's school performance
380 (PhD. dissertation). Human and Behavioral/ Social Services. Walden University.
- 381 Mugumbate, J. & Chereni, A. (2019). Using African Ubuntu theory in social work with children in Zimbabwe.
382 *African Journal of Social Work*, 9(1). 27-34.
- 383 Njoroge, M. & Kirori, G. (2018). Blended family dynamics and academic performance outcome of the child in
384 Kenya: case of Kabete Sub-County in Kiambu County. *Journal of Culture, Society and Development*,
385 41, Kenya.
- 386 Oldroyd, R., Rahman, S., DeRose, L. & Hadfield, K. (2021). Family structure transitions: Prevalence and physical
387 health effects in Ethiopia, India, Peru, and Vietnam. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*. Available at:
388 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-021-02148-2> (Accessed: 2 May 2023).
- 389 Portrie, T. & Hill, N. (2005). Blended Families: A critical review of the current research. Idaho State University.
390 *The Family Journal*, 13(4).
- 391 Ubuntu Research Group (URG). (2023). Research on the use of ubuntu in teaching, learning and practice: a survey
392 of social work and social development students, academics and practitioners. Available at:
393 <https://africasocialwork.net/ubuntu-survey/> (Accessed: 22 September 2023).
- 394 World Family Map (WFM). (2019). Mapping family change and child well-being outcomes. An international
395 report, *Institute for Family Studies*. Available at:
396 <https://ifstudies.org/ifsadmin/resources/reports/worldfamilymap-2019-051819.pdf> (Accessed: 10 April
397 2023).