

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

**“It’s because they are my kids and I love them”: The impact of family and community
substance use on children and families**

Meghan K Ford^{1,3}, Ryan Truong², Bruce Knox³, Susan Bartels^{4,5}, Colleen Davidson⁵, Michele
Cole³, Logan Jackson³, Eva Purkey³, *Imaan Bayoumi³

1. Department of Psychology, Queen’s University, Humphrey Hall, 62 Arch Street, Kingston, ON, K7L 3N6, Canada
2. School of Medicine, Queen’s University, 80 Barrie Street, Kingston, ON, K7L 3N6, Canada
3. Department of Family Medicine, Queen’s University, 220 Bagot Street, Kingston, ON, K7L 5E9, Canada
4. Department of Emergency Medicine, Queen’s University, 76 Stuart Street, Kingston, ON, K7L 4V7, Canada
5. Department of Public Health Sciences, Queen’s University, 62 Fifth Field Company Lane, Kingston, ON, K7L 3N6, Canada

*Corresponding Author
E-mail: bayoumi@queensu.ca (IB)

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

Abstract

Background: Substance use disorders (SUD) significantly impact the physical, social, and mental health of individuals, their families, and the wider community. Parental substance use can lead to long-term social and health problems for children. Examining resilience and its determinants among families directly affected by SUD (e.g., having a parent who misuses substances) or indirectly exposed to substance use (e.g., living in a community impacted by drug use) may uncover valuable insights to support families addressing SUD. The existing literature does not adequately address substance use within the context of families with young children and community resilience. The current study aims to enhance our understanding of the daily impact of family member substance use (direct substance use) or exposure to substance use within the community (indirect substance use) on children and families through qualitative interviews.

Methods: The present study was a qualitative secondary analysis. Families were recruited within the Kingston, Frontenac, Lennox, and Addington area during 2022 and 2023 with a focus on maximum variation. Families were eligible to participate if they: 1) included at least one adult caring for a child under 18; 2) had a history of adversity; 3) were interested in participating; and 4) could consent to all parts of the study. Arts-based qualitative methods and community based participatory methods were employed. Participating families created a visual timeline, participated in a focus group discussion, and an individual interview. The qualitative transcripts were then analyzed following reflexive thematic analysis.

Findings: Six families (12 adults, 4 children) were included in the secondary analysis. The analysis generated four themes: (1) How children affect resilience in families affected by SUD; (2) Service needs of parents with SUD to enhance family resilience; (3) The role of social

43 support in family resilience; and (4) How perceptions of safety and trust challenge community
44 resilience. The main limitation of this study was a small sample size.

45 **Conclusions:** The study highlights the significant impact of family and community on the
46 resilience of individuals affected by SUD. It emphasizes the importance of developing addictions
47 services and social environments that are supportive of families with young children. These
48 spaces should be designed to be substance-free, inclusive, and welcoming to children.

49 Additionally, there is a need to improve service navigation and address the barriers to care
50 commonly experienced by individuals affected by SUD.

51 **Keywords:** Substance use disorder, CBPAR, Adverse childhood experiences, Community

52

53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75

Background

Over 20% of Canadians will meet the criteria for having a substance use disorder (SUD) in their lifetime (1). Substance use disorders are linked to a wide range of physical, psychological, economic, and social difficulties, placing a substantial burden on individuals, their families, and society (2). SUD can also have significant impacts on families with young children. Exposure to parental substance use, classified as an adverse childhood experience, can lead to a myriad of short and long-term difficulties for children and adolescents (3, 4). These challenges span various domains, including emotional, behavioural, physical, cognitive, academic, and social aspects (5-7). For example, parental substance use has been associated with greater attention and conduct difficulties at school, inconsistent attendance, higher chance of school drop out, and poorer academic performance in children (8). In a study examining long term effects of parental substance use, perceived adult marijuana use was predictive of adolescent substance use (5). Moreover, parental substance use has been associated with increased risk of child injuries and somatic and psychiatric illness in early childhood (9). Families with individuals affected by SUD may face social isolation due to stigma, family instability, and financial and relationship difficulties (10). Far less understood is the process, barriers and facilitators of addressing SUD for families with young children, which may differ from those of individuals without dependents, since these families will also account for the physical, emotional and psychological wellness of their children as well as of themselves.

Deficit-based research can stigmatize and pathologize populations in need (11, 12). Strength-based research supports the identification and promotion of existing resilience within structurally oppressed communities, including individuals and families impacted by SUD (11, 12), and leads to the recognition of the importance of the unique strengths and abilities

76 individuals have and can leverage to overcome adversity. However, strength-based approaches
77 are under-explored in the field of SUD and resilience, particularly where families with young
78 children are concerned (13).

79 Resilience, commonly defined as the ability of the individual to positively adapt to
80 significant adversity (14), is a dynamic process in which various protective factors interact to
81 achieve positive outcomes despite hardships such as growing up with parents struggling with
82 SUD or in a community with substantial substance use (14-16). Family resilience refers to the
83 inherent strengths and adaptive capacities within a family's functioning that enable them to
84 withstand and recover from adversity (17). Todman and McLaughlin (18) highlight the
85 importance of being aware of and ensuring the presence of protective factors not just in
86 children's immediate home environments but also beyond to address parental substance use and
87 implications for children. This includes considering the child's immediate home environment and
88 family relationships, extended family, social networks and neighbourhood, community resources
89 and service provision, and the broader political system (18). Examining resilience and its
90 determinants among families directly affected by SUD (e.g., having a parent who misuses
91 substances) or indirectly exposed to substance use (e.g., living in a community impacted by drug
92 use) may uncover valuable insights to support families dealing with SUD.

93 Further research is needed to better support families impacted by SUD. The current study
94 aims to enhance our understanding of the impact of family member substance use (direct
95 substance use) or exposure to substance use within the community (indirect substance use) on
96 children and families through qualitative interviews and to describe factors supporting family
97 resilience in those affected by substance use.

98 **Methods**

99 ***Study Design***

100 The present study was a secondary analysis of a more extensive qualitative multiple-case
101 study entitled, “Engaging Families to Build Healthy Communities”. The primary study employed
102 arts-based methods and qualitative interviews to explore the concept of family and community
103 resilience in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, specifically for families who self-described
104 themselves as resilient and having experienced adversity. The study was led by Innovations for
105 Community Resilience, Equity, and Advocacy (I-CREAtE), a community based participatory
106 action research (CBPAR) team composed of four academic researchers with health equity
107 research portfolios, four community researchers from diverse backgrounds and lived experiences
108 of resilience and adversity, a project coordinator, research staff and students. Supporting the
109 research team is a Community Advisory Board (CAB) with representatives from 15 regional
110 health and social services agencies, including municipal government, as well as community
111 members. The entire research team was involved in the primary project's design, implementation,
112 and knowledge translation, with ongoing guiding support from the CAB. This present study was
113 a secondary analysis of the data to explore the ways in which substance use affected families.

114 ***Participants and Setting***

115 Recruitment for the primary study occurred from January 2021 to March 2023. Families
116 in the Kingston, Frontenac and Lennox and Addington (KFL&A) area were invited to participate
117 in the primary study. Participants were recruited with a focus on maximum variation (family
118 composition, ethnocultural). Inclusion criteria included families (1) with at least one adult
119 providing care for a child under the age of 18; (2) with one or more member(s) self-identified as
120 having a history of adversity (e.g., physical, emotional or sexual abuse, poverty, food insecurity,
121 racism, discrimination, poor housing, homelessness); (3) who believed that their family or

122 household member(s) would be interested in participating in a project that created social change,
123 and (4) were able to consent to all components of the study.

124 Study recruitment was supported through partnering organizations and community
125 members of the CAB. CAB members used passive recruitment methods, such as flyers and social
126 media posts, as well as active recruitment methods such as word of mouth with the people they
127 served. Participants were invited to complete a screening questionnaire which asked about the
128 inclusion criteria and to list their demographics to achieve maximum variation (examples of
129 demographic variables included immigrant or refugee status, single-parent mother or father,
130 urban or rural, parent of a child with disability, and languages spoken among others). The project
131 coordinator conducted the consenting process.

132 ***Data Sources***

133 The primary study involved several research activities: (1) the development of a visual
134 timeline and subsequent family group discussion and (2) individual interviews with each family
135 member over twelve years of age. During the visual timeline activity, families were asked to map
136 their experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic, highlighting facilitators and barriers to family
137 and community resilience (19). Families were then interviewed by a community and academic
138 researcher. Approximately one week later, individual semi-structured interviews with each adult
139 family member and consenting child(ren) over the age of 12 years were completed to build on
140 issues covered in the family timeline. These individual interviews aimed to elucidate additional
141 information that family members may not have felt comfortable disclosing in the presence of
142 other family members. Interviews were completed in-person or virtually based on family
143 preferences. All interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Interviews lasted
144 between one and two hours in length.

145 ***Ethical Considerations***

146 Ethics approval was obtained from the Queen's University Health Sciences and Affiliated
147 Teaching Hospital Research Ethics Board (FMED-6810-21; 6034297). Each participating family
148 completed an informed consent process with the project coordinator using a plain language letter
149 of information. To maintain confidentiality, participating families were assigned a participant
150 code by the project coordinator who maintained the master linking log to participant codes in a
151 locked folder. Verbal consent was obtained by members of the research team prior to each
152 subsequent interview to ensure voluntary participation. Child(ren) over the age of 12 who
153 completed their own interviews did so with consent from their parents, their own assent and were
154 offered the option of having a parent present for the interview. Families received \$50.00 CAD
155 for each hour spent associated with data collection. Children aged 12-18 years old who
156 participated in all data collection activities were also entered into a draw for one of three \$50.00
157 CAD gift cards.

158 ***Secondary Data Analysis***

159 Data for the secondary analysis included all interviews where participants discussed
160 experiences and perceptions of substance use in data collection activities. In total, the data for 10
161 families were screened, read, and re-read to determine if there was sufficient data for this study.
162 Transcripts were then explored for discussion about experiences and perceptions of substance
163 use and implications on family resilience. Six families were included in the secondary analysis
164 after the screening process.

165 Qualitative data were analyzed following a reflexive thematic analysis approach (20)
166 using NVivo 14 (QSR International, 1999) software. Reflexive thematic analysis was chosen due
167 to its flexibility that offered the possibility for an inductively developed analysis that captured

168 both latent and semantic meanings that was informed by critical realism. The theoretical
169 flexibility of reflexive thematic analysis ensured the data analysis captured the lived experiences
170 of children and families impacted by substance use while also locating these experiences within
171 the wider sociocultural context. The six phases of reflexive thematic analysis were undertaken to
172 explore patterns of meaning across the dataset. One author (RT) familiarized themselves with the
173 data by reading the interview transcripts, listening to the corresponding audio files, and then
174 coding all transcripts. A proportion of the initial coding was completed by two authors (RT and
175 AS) to engage in reflexivity and analysis-enriching discussions to ensure a more comprehensive
176 appreciation of the data. The primary coder (RT) coded the remaining transcripts and engaged
177 with the I-CREAtE research team throughout the familiarization, coding, initial theme
178 generation, theme refinement, and writing process to ensure a thorough understanding of the data
179 (20).

180 **Results**

181 Six participating families (12 adults, 4 children) were included in this analysis. One
182 family that was lost to follow up did not complete all research activities, but did not request that
183 their data be removed (despite being given the opportunity). Their data were included in this
184 analysis per the original protocol.

185 The six families were diverse in terms of family size (two to five members), composition
186 (lone parent female led families, two parent families, and families with biological and fostered
187 children), and child age (infancy to adolescence). Distinctive attributes within individual families
188 included sexual and gender diverse individuals, domestic and sexual abuse survivors, previously
189 unhoused individuals, individuals with learning and developmental disabilities, recent
190 newcomers, Indigenous peoples, and racialized families. All six participating families were

191 directly or indirectly impacted by SUD in their direct family or communities where they lived. In
192 terms of socioeconomic status, families included those on social assistance, financially secure
193 households, individuals with high school level education, and those pursuing or holding a
194 professional degree such as engineering or law.

195 **Themes**

196 Four themes were generated in the analysis of interviews: 1) How children influence
197 resilience in families affected by SUD; (2) Service needs of parents with SUD to enhance family
198 resilience (3) The role of social support in family resilience; and (4) How perceptions of safety
199 and trust challenge community resilience.

200 ***Theme 1: How Children Influence Resilience in Families Affected by SUD***

201 Children were described as a source of resilience for families with adults recovering from
202 SUD. Parents described children as anchors to their commitment to sobriety as they expressed a
203 commitment to be present and caring for the wellbeing of their dependents. For example, one
204 mother said:

205 *“What’s keeping us together is our children. That’s why I haven’t given up on my kids or*
206 *chosen to go drink a bottle or use up all their money on drugs it’s because they are my*
207 *kids and I love them” (Family 048).*

208 Several parents in the study noted their children as a source of hope for the future
209 wellbeing of their family. While all parents described aspirations for their children, parents with
210 an experience of substance use were explicit in their desire for their children to break out of the
211 cycles of poverty and substance use that they experienced. One mother shared:

212 *“I don’t want to continue the cycle of abuse, addiction. You know having to live on the*
213 *system where you stay poor and continue, you know to find other means as you know*
214 *selling drugs, being incarcerated, ending up in treatment facilities” (Family 047).*

215 Parents reported that their commitment to sobriety was intrinsically tied to their dedication to
216 caring for their children, a commitment that would be compromised if they relapsed or failed to
217 shield their dependents from an environment involving drug use.

218 ***Theme 2: Service Needs of Parents with SUD to Enhance Family Resilience***

219 While families described children as a source of resilience, parents facing addiction
220 highlighted several challenges in navigating services needed to maintain their sobriety, which
221 they argued hindered their families' overall resilience. For example, families with young children
222 struggled with arranging positive and healthy childcare while they received treatments or
223 attended addictions treatment related activities (e.g., attending a 12-step substance use program).
224 Most addictions services are adult-oriented, and parents struggled with balancing their needs
225 with their children’s needs including needs related to timing (during child routines such as
226 bedtime, homework time, etc) or exposure to inappropriate content. When accessing addictions
227 services, one mother shared ongoing moral distress related to her child being exposed to stories
228 of substance use due to lack of access to childcare:

229 *“It can do more damage than good to drag your kids out to a church basement [at] 7*
230 *o’clock at night, which is prime bath, jammie, reading, snuggles time. No. I’m bringing*
231 *them out in the cold to sit on a chair [...] and watch their iPad while everybody talks*
232 *about how miserable addiction is” (Family 047).*

233 A lack of access to childcare was an additional stressor for parents seeking sobriety as
234 they strived to use supports while keeping their children safe. For example, one father shared the

235 challenges of accessing addictions services without transportation or childcare, necessitating that
236 parents rely on and trust in community services, or even commercial services like taxis, to
237 support them during times of need.

238 *"The staff and that [at the methadone clinic] are good, but it's not really a place to really*
239 *like have my kids around [...] that's why every time we go we kind of just take a cab and*
240 *then we can leave the kids, because we know a lot of the drivers for [taxi company]"*
241 *(Family 048).*

242 These challenges also included navigating social programming, including mental health and
243 addiction services. For example, one father noted the importance and value of having access to
244 mental health workers who served as navigators to supportive resources and programming:

245 *"She helped us by connecting us with supports, helping us get lawyers, help at the table with*
246 *us, sat down and talked with us for our mental health to figure out what was going wrong,*
247 *what we needed and how to access it, where to access it, when to access it. Like she went*
248 *above and beyond her job. Ok like she is what a mental health support worker is supposed to*
249 *do"(Family 040).*

250 ***Theme 3: The Role of Social Support in Family Resilience***

251 Parents impacted by substance use disorders described a sense of belonging as a critical
252 challenge when maintaining relationships with family, friends, and their local community.
253 Families shared that they struggled to maintain relationships both with people who never
254 struggled with SUD and those who were actively using substances. This sometimes led to
255 profound feelings of social isolation which had important mental health implications for parents,
256 but also for children by limiting their opportunities for socialization. Moreover, families noted
257 the difficulties with maintaining any relationship during the COVID-19 pandemic and associated

258 restrictions. Parents addressing addictions disclosed that people who never struggled with SUD
259 may not understand or respect their sobriety journey. For some adults, this lack of understanding
260 elicited feelings of judgement and lack of support, which stressed their sobriety. For example, a
261 mother shared:

262 *“The people in my bubble weren’t struggling with addiction, so they didn’t see an issue*
263 *with showing up on a random Tuesday with drinks to share while letting our children,*
264 *[...] play together outside.” (Family 047)*

265 Parents remarked that maintaining relationships with people who were currently using
266 substances may challenge their ongoing efforts to be abstinent. Some parents described old
267 friends actively trying to compromise their sobriety. Parents also described the challenges and
268 isolation of not being able to rely on family or friends for childcare if these family members or
269 friends were actively using substances, which directly impacts children. For example, one parent
270 noted not being able to go to their parents’ house (their children’s grandparents), because they
271 were actively using substances:

272 *“my parents are still in active addiction. So even going up there man it’s hard sometimes*
273 *to see and like I don’t like seeing them like that, but that’s her grandparents, right. So we*
274 *never go inside. We always just stand in the parking lot and they come out and they’ll see*
275 *them. But even then, like the people that come there and stuff too, it’s just not a good*
276 *environment. That’s why we only ever stay for maybe 5 or 10 minutes” (Family 048).*

277 Maintenance of relationships may be further complicated as adults addressing addiction
278 balance their guilt for abandoning their friends who currently use substances in order to maintain
279 their own sobriety and to protect their children from an unhealthy environment associated with
280 substance use. For example, one father shared their struggle with finding positive friends:

281 *“People want to come over and hang out, But it’s like – we can’t really do it because we*
282 *don’t know half the time if they’ll be high when they come over here” (Family 048).*

283 Despite challenges in finding a positive community of support, families with adults who
284 had these connections repeatedly described how forms of trust and close community were
285 important and helped them feel confident in their recovery. Among the parents in recovery,
286 sponsorship, religious groups, counselling, and supportive family/friends were described as vital
287 to their wellbeing.

288 ***Theme 4: How Perceptions of Safety and Trust Challenge Community Resilience***

289 Families repeatedly expressed concerns about the impact of community drug use on their
290 feelings of safety and trust in their communities. Parents expressed concerns about the physical
291 risks for their children presented by the presence of people who used substances and evidence of
292 drug use. Specifically, parents worried about used drug paraphernalia and people using
293 substances in community spaces like parks, leading parents to switch parks, or avoid parks:

294 *Partner: “You could see a park outside our house, which you think would be great for*
295 *[child]”.*

296 *Mother: “There’s needles in it.”*

297 *Partner: “But there’s needles and stuff all around it. So we actually take [child] to*
298 *another park about five minutes away, which is not a problem, of course.”*

299 *Mother: “But annoying” (Family 003)*

300 Families expressed challenges with building trusting relationships with community
301 members as a consequence of avoiding community spaces in which they perceived drug activity
302 to be occurring. Some families described a lack of trust, and a concern for potential risks in
303 specific community spaces out of fear of harm to themselves or their families. Those who

304 expressed concerns regarding community safety identified concerns regarding implications for
305 children’s freedom to play (e.g., to access parks), to engage with neighbours, or to develop their
306 independence (e.g., taking buses, or otherwise being free to move around as older children in
307 environments their parents perceived to be unsafe).

308 These fears had implications for freedom of movement and independence of youth in
309 some situations. When talking about going downtown, a youth participant shared:

310 *“I don’t think I would be allowed to do that on my own... it’s kind of sketchy. I’m sure*
311 *they’d [parents] let me go with my friends, but I don’t think without my friends they’d*
312 *let me go.” (Family 009)*

313 Families described a variety of perspectives on solutions to substance use and the
314 negative sense of community safety. Some families expressed great understanding and empathy
315 for individuals using substances who were unhoused and food insecure due to inflation, while
316 other families suggested an increase in policing might decrease “visible” substance use and
317 therefore improve their sense of community safety. Families proposed solutions such as more
318 employment agencies, a basic income guarantee, and disposal bins for drug paraphernalia in
319 community spaces. While families expressed perceived challenges with community safety,
320 particularly as it pertains to their perception of safety for their children, and trust in certain
321 spaces, all families expressed a desire to be connected to a supportive community. Specifically,
322 families noted wanting to raise their children in communities where they have trusting
323 relationships with neighbours and the broader community, where basic needs are met, and where
324 families addressing substance use have access to necessary supports to maintain their sobriety.
325 These findings highlight the importance of addressing underlying issues such as affordable

326 housing, mental health resources, poverty, and food insecurity to effectively tackle substance use
327 disorders and enhance perceived community safety.

328 **Discussion**

329 Four themes were developed in the inductive reflexive thematic analysis emphasizing the
330 experience of families in respect to substance use and the impact on community and family
331 resilience. Consistent with previous research, families with adults with active or historical
332 substance use disorders repeatedly described their children as a source of resilience and
333 motivation in maintaining sobriety. This finding is consistent with literature identifying children
334 and grandchildren as protective factors with respect to sobriety (21).

335 Although participants described the important role their children played in their sobriety,
336 they also noted the additional stressors introduced while addressing addictions that interfered
337 with family resilience, such as the need for high quality childcare while accessing
338 addictions/SUD services. The introduction of barriers at the institutional level, including stigma
339 enacted within healthcare systems, have been well-documented regarding the lack of family-
340 centered SUD programming offered (22, 23). Many SUD treatment programs are structured for
341 individual adults or couples, and do not take caregiving responsibilities and children's schedules
342 into account. Moreover, stigma can be even more challenging for caregivers with comorbid
343 substance use and mental health difficulties, and for families with low income who often have
344 limited resources, including housing, food, and employment (23). This may lead to families
345 being less likely to access important services, either due to fear of stigma, or to logistical
346 challenges unique to families with young children that are not accounted for by the health and
347 social systems. Echoing the findings of this study, Todman and McLaughlin (18) emphasized
348 that young children in families with substance use are often overlooked. To improve child

349 outcomes, there is a need for policy changes, financial resources, and educational campaigns and
350 training to invest in more family-friendly addiction services (18).

351 Adults seeking sobriety in our study struggled to access and find social services that were
352 family friendly. Our results underscore the need for system navigation for families trying to
353 navigate the complex system of addiction services. The benefits of system navigation have been
354 highlighted in previous research such as Grycznski et al. (2021), with the authors finding
355 personalized, patient navigation services for SUD patients were effective in reducing hospital
356 readmission (24). Specifically, having a navigator assist patients in a variety of ways, including
357 talking about substance use, communicating with health care providers, assisting with
358 transportation, arranging appointments, and accompanying patients, successfully reduced
359 barriers to services (24). Moreover, incorporating inclusive frameworks to care such as the
360 Integrated Strengths-Based Engagement Framework which is composed of four steps (discuss
361 client strengths and establish strength-based goals, select socio-culturally appropriate team
362 members, engage in culturally humble and affirmational care, and measure program satisfaction
363 an self-efficacy outcomes) shows promise in supporting families impacted by SUD (13). While
364 the benefits of system navigation are not unique to families impacted by SUD, the risk of
365 relapsing both to individuals and to the children and families for whom they are responsible
366 highlights the importance of assistance in finding family-centered services to support sobriety.

367 Parents also described how positive community supports have played a critical and
368 beneficial role in the sobriety journey. Many parents in this study addressing substance use faced
369 difficulties in maintaining social relationships with substance and non-substance-using friends
370 due to a lack of understanding or alignment with their sobriety goals, which had implications for
371 parenting, parent socialization and child socialization. In this study, one caregiver relapsed due to

372 their desire to provide their child socialization which involved engaging with friends who were
373 actively consuming substances (in this case drinking alcohol in a social setting) and not aware of
374 the caregiver's struggles. The findings of this study are aligned with previous literature
375 suggesting that a lack of social support creates difficulty in sobriety ultimately creating a barrier
376 to SUD treatment (25, 26). For families with young children, research emphasizes the
377 importance of social connectedness as a protective factor for children living with parental
378 substance use (18). Specifically, it is essential that children impacted by substance use develop
379 healthy relationships with individuals who understand the impact of parental substance use,
380 outside their immediate home environment (18).

381 Regarding perceptions of community safety and trust, families with and without personal
382 experience of SUD expressed concerns about the risks to their children which they perceived to
383 be presented by people using substances and substance use paraphernalia in their communities.
384 These concerns were associated with a sense of distrust towards other community members, and
385 hindered their ability to engage in a supportive and positive community environment, despite
386 repeatedly seeking it. This also led them to curtail their children's behaviour (e.g., avoiding
387 parks, not allowing youth to walk around the neighbourhood alone), which has significant
388 implications for child well-being, trust, and the development of independence. It is crucial to
389 highlight how the impact of community substance use on individuals' perception of safety can be
390 significantly influenced by stigma. The general population tends to hold significantly more
391 negative views towards individuals with SUD than those with other mental health difficulties
392 (27). This stigma can exacerbate the divide between community members who do and do not
393 struggle with SUD, reinforcing negative perceptions, and fears which may be misplaced, and
394 potentially contribute to a cycle of mistrust and isolation. At a community level, investing in

395 community educational campaigns shows promise in mitigating negative public attitudes towards
396 individuals impacted by SUD (27).

397 Lastly, families proposed solutions to assist in sobriety and build healthy and safe
398 communities. Families with adults dealing with SUD expressed the need for spaces where they
399 could distance themselves and their children from substance use paraphernalia and individuals
400 associated with active substance use. Specifically, long-term investment in community physical
401 environments, including improvement of infrastructure and outdoor spaces, is needed to address
402 crime, violence, and poverty in all communities and foster community connectedness (28). Other
403 families proposed increased social services such as employment agencies and basic income
404 guarantees as interventions that could address some of the root causes of SUD, thereby
405 enhancing individual and family well-being and improving perceived community safety.

406 Individuals who use substances face numerous obstacles to accessing health and social services,
407 including stigma, housing unaffordability, fear of child welfare services, and lack of trust in the
408 healthcare system to a greater extent than those who do not use substances (29, 30). It is
409 imperative to understand the intersecting structural conditions that individuals with SUD face in
410 seeking health and social supports. Improving long term outcomes for individuals recovering
411 from SUD and their communities remains contingent upon the wider system capacity to meet
412 their needs (31, 32). It is crucial for mental health and social services (including child welfare
413 services) to become key partners, collaborating with individuals with SUD and their families.
414 Such collaborations with individuals who use substances are needed to call for the necessary
415 policies and resources across systems to enhance outcomes for individuals and their families.

416 While this paper provides valuable insight into the unique experiences of families
417 impacted by SUD, there are several limitations to note. First, six families, but only four children

418 were included. More voices from the same community or group that each family represented,
419 including youth are needed. Additionally, the study population did not include any individuals
420 who endorsed actively using substances beyond prescribed opioid replacement therapy during
421 the study. This presents a future area of research to determine if similar themes, such as children
422 as a motivational factor for sobriety, remain consistent or are different among families with
423 members who endorse actively using substances. In addition, participants were asked to recall
424 their experiences over an extended period, potentially affecting their recall.

425 **Conclusions**

426 This study highlights the crucial role of family and community in supporting the sobriety
427 and resilience of individuals affected by SUD. For parents addressing addiction, the findings
428 suggest the need for family-friendly, strength-based addiction services, system navigation, and
429 hubs to socialize with others seeking sobriety, with an emphasis on creating substance-free and
430 child-friendly environments. In general, for families in areas with increased exposure to
431 substance use paraphernalia, the results of this study suggest a need for more engagement
432 surrounding SUD use from the community level and maintenance of environments which are
433 perceived as safe for all families. The findings emphasize the significance of prioritizing family
434 and community resilience in addressing SUD. Policymakers should carefully consider the
435 distinctive needs of families with children, impacted by SUD to provide safe, accessible
436 addictions/SUD services and alleviate some of the root causes of substance use disorders.

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

Declarations

446 **Ethics approval and consent to participate:** Ethics approval and consent to participate was

447 obtained from the Health Sciences Research Ethics Board (HSREB) at Queen’s University

448 Kingston, Ontario (FMED-6810-21; 6034297).

449 **Consent for publication:** Informed, written consent was obtained from all individual

450 participants included in this study.

451 **Availability of data and materials:** The dataset is not publicly available due to privacy or

452 ethical restrictions.

453 **Competing interests:** The authors declare no competing interests.

454 **Funding:** The study was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of

455 Canada (SSHRC). Grant number: 6034834 – received by IB & EP; www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca. The

456 funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or

457 preparation of the manuscript.

458 **Authors' contributions:** EP, IB, SB, CMD, AW, RC, LJ, MC, BK conceptualized the study.

459 EP, IB, SB, CMD, AW, RC, LK, MV, BK, SCN, MG conducted the interviews and participated

460 in the analysis. RT reviewed and coded the data, and all authors contributed to the drafting and

461 editing of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

462 **Acknowledgements:** The authors would like to acknowledge the project’s Community Advisory

463 Board, who helped the authors conceptualize and bring the project to fruition. The Community

464 Advisory Board ensured that this research remained rooted in community needs and followed a
465 rigorous community-based participatory process. Finally, the authors would like to thank the
466 research participants who so willingly shared their personal experiences, who welcomed us into
467 their homes, and trusted us with their stories.

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

References

486 1. Canada S. Mental health indicators. 2014.

- 487 2. Thomas McLellan A, Cacciola, J. C., Alterman, A. I., Rikoon, S. H., & Carise, D. The
488 Addiction Severity Index at 25: Origins, Contributions and Transitions. *The American Journal on*
489 *Addictions*. 2006;15(2):113-24.
- 490 3. Felitti VJ, Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V.,
491 Koss, M. P., & Marks, J. S. Relationship of Childhood Abuse and Household Dysfunction to
492 Many of the Leading Causes of Death in Adults: The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE)
493 Study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 1998;14(4):245-58.
- 494 4. Kuppens S, Moore, S. C., Gross, V., Lowthian, E., & Siddaway, A. P. The Enduring
495 Effects of Parental Alcohol, Tobacco, and Drug Use on Child Well-being: A Multilevel Meta-
496 Analysis. *Development and Psychopathology*. 2020;32(2):765-78.
- 497 5. Ewing BA OK, Pedersen ER, Hunter SB, Miles JNV, D'Amico EJ. Longitudinal family
498 effects on substance use among an at-risk adolescent sample. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2015;41:185-
499 91.
- 500 6. Ramstedt M, Raninen, J., Larm, P., & Livingston, M. . Children with problem drinking
501 parents in Sweden: Prevalence and risk of adverse consequences in a national cohort born in
502 2001. *Drug and Alcohol Review*. 2022;41(3): 625–32.
- 503 7. Fewell CH, & Straussner, S. L. Ashenberg. *Children of substance-abusing parents :
504 dynamics and treatment*: Springer; 2011.
- 505 8. Berg L, Bäck, K., Vinnerljung, B., & Hjern, A. Parental alcohol-related disorders and
506 school performance in 16-year-olds-a Swedish national cohort study. *Addiction Research &
507 Theory*. 2016;111(10):1795-803.
- 508 9. Raitasalo K, & Holmila, M. Parental substance abuse and risks to children's safety,
509 health and psychological development. *Drugs : Education, Prevention & Policy*. 2017;24(1):17-
510 22.
- 511 10. Mardani M, Alipour, F., Rafiey, H., Fallahi-Khoshknab, M., & Arshi, M. . Challenges in
512 addiction-affected families: A systematic review of qualitative studies. *BMC Psychiatry*.
513 2023;23(1):1-19.
- 514 11. Poteat TC, & Logie, C. H. A Case for Strengths-Based Approaches to Addressing
515 Intersectional Stigma in HIV Research. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2022;112:S347-S9.
- 516 12. Silverman DM, Rosario, R. J., Hernandez, I. A., & Destin, M. The ongoing development
517 of strength-based approaches to people who hold systemically marginalized identities.
518 *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 2023;27(3):255-71.
- 519 13. Ezell JM, Pho, M., Jaiswal, J., Ajayi, B. P., Gosnell, N., Kay, E., Eaton, E., &
520 Bluthenthal, R. . A systematic literature review of strengths-based approaches to drug use
521 management and treatment. *Clinical Social Work Journal*. 2023;51(3):294–305.
- 522 14. Edwards EA. *Pathways of Resilience in Low-income Families: A Longitudinal Case
523 Study*. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing: ProQuest Dissertations Publishing; 2022.
- 524 15. Marceau K, Kimiecik, C., Ruiz, Y., McCormick, C., Toombs, A., Elias, C., Lalani, N., &
525 Wadsworth, S. M. Emerging ideas. *Families Together: Supporting family resilience during the
526 COVID-19 pandemic*. *Family Relations*. 2023;72(3):665-79.
- 527 16. Rudzinski K, McDonough, P., Gartner, R., & Strike, C. . Is there room for resilience? A
528 scoping review and critique of substance use literature and its utilization of the concept of
529 resilience. *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy*. 2017;12(1):1-35.
- 530 17. Walsh F. Loss and resilience in the time of COVID-19: Meaning making, hope, and
531 transcendence. *Family Process*. 2020;59(3):898–911.

- 532 18. Todman H, McLaughlin H. Understanding the Needs of Children Living with Parental
533 Substance Misuse: Perspectives from Children and Practitioners. *The British journal of social*
534 *work*. 2024.
- 535 19. Kolar K, Ahmad, F., Chan, L., & Erickson, P. G. . Timeline Mapping in Qualitative
536 Interviews: A Study of Resilience with Marginalized Group. *International Journal of Qualitative*
537 *Methods*. 2015;14(3):13-32.
- 538 20. Braun V, & Clarke, V. *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*: SAGE Publications Ltd;
539 2022.
- 540 21. Droege JR SE, Jason LA. Children’s impact on adults’ substance use problem awareness
541 and treatment optimism: The role of harm. *Journal of Drug Education*. 2015;45(3):185-94.
- 542 22. Kruk E, & Banga, P.S. Engagement of substance-using pregnant women in addiction
543 recovery. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health*. 2011;30(1):79-91.
- 544 23. Wolfson L, Schmidt, R. A., Stinson, J., & Poole, N. Examining barriers to harm reduction
545 and child welfare services for pregnant women and mothers who use substances using a stigma
546 action framework. *Health & Social Care in the Community* 2021;29(3):589-601.
- 547 24. Gryczynski J, Nordeck, C. D., Welsh, C., Mitchell, S. G., O’Grady, K. E., & Schwartz,
548 R. P. . Preventing hospital readmission for patients with comorbid substance use disorder: A
549 randomized trial. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2021;174(7):899-909.
- 550 25. Farhoudian A, Razaghi, E., Hooshyari, Z., Noroozi, A., Pilevari, A., Mokri, A.,
551 Mohammadi, M. R., & Malekinejad, M. . Barriers and facilitators to substance use disorder
552 treatment: An overview of systematic reviews. *Substance Abuse: Research and Treatment*
553 2022;16:1-11.
- 554 26. Leamy M, Bird, V., Boutillier, C. L., Williams, J., & Slade, M. . Conceptual framework
555 for personal recovery in mental health: systematic review and narrative synthesis. *British Journal*
556 *of Psychiatry*. 2011;199(6):445–52.
- 557 27. Barry CL, McGinty, E. E., Pescosolido, B., & Goldman, H. H. Stigma, Discrimination,
558 Treatment Effectiveness and Policy Support: Comparing Public Views about Drug Addiction
559 with Mental Illness. *Psychiatric Services*. 2015;65(10):1269-72.
- 560 28. Perea FC, Groman, D., Lozano, A. M. T., Koomas, A., & Martinez, L. S. S. . Urban parks
561 and community development needs: Stories through images captured by youth. *Children, Youth*
562 *and Environments*. 2014;24(1):158-72.
- 563 29. McCann V AR, Purkey E. . Exploring the impact of COVID-19 on substance use patterns
564 and service access of street involved individuals in Kingston, Ontario: A qualitative study. *BMC*
565 *public health*. 2022;22(1):571–.
- 566 30. Ramsay N, Hossain, R., Moore, M., Milo, M., & Brown, A. . Health care while homeless:
567 Barriers, facilitators, and the lived experiences of homeless individuals accessing health care in a
568 Canadian regional municipality. *Qualitative Health Research*. 2019;29(13):1839-49.
- 569 31. Butler A, Zakimi, N., & Greer, A. . Total systems failure: police officers’ perspectives on
570 the impacts of the justice, health, and social service systems on people who use drugs. *Harm*
571 *Reduction Journal*. 2022;19(1):1-13.
- 572 32. Wood JD, Watson, A. C., & Barber, C. . What can we expect of police in the face of
573 deficient mental health systems? Qualitative insights from Chicago police officers. *Journal of*
574 *Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*. 2021;28(1):28-42.
- 575