

“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)

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

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

Conclusions: The study highlights the significant impact of family and community on the resilience of individuals affected by SUD. It emphasizes the importance of developing addictions services and social environments that are supportive of families with young children. These spaces should be designed to be substance-free, inclusive, and welcoming to children. Additionally, there is a need to improve service navigation and address the barriers to care commonly experienced by individuals affected by SUD.

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

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

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

Resilience, commonly defined as the ability of the individual to positively adapt to significant adversity (14), is a dynamic process in which various protective factors interact to achieve positive outcomes despite hardships such as growing up with parents struggling with SUD or in a community with substantial substance use (14-16). Family resilience refers to the inherent strengths and adaptive capacities within a family's functioning that enable them to withstand and recover from adversity (17). Todman and McLaughlin (18) highlight the importance of being aware of and ensuring the presence of protective factors not just in children's immediate home environments but also beyond to address parental substance use and implications for children. This includes considering the child's immediate home environment and family relationships, extended family, social networks and neighbourhood, community resources and service provision, and the broader political system (18). 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 dealing with SUD.

Further research is needed to better support families impacted by SUD. The current study aims to enhance our understanding of the 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 and to describe factors supporting family resilience in those affected by substance use.

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

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

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

Data Sources

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

Ethical Considerations

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

Secondary Data Analysis

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

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

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

Results

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

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

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

Themes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Theme 3: The Role of Social Support in Family Resilience

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mother: “There’s needles in it.”

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

Mother: “But annoying”(Family 003)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Lastly, families proposed solutions to assist in sobriety and build healthy and safe communities. Families with adults dealing with SUD expressed the need for spaces where they could distance themselves and their children from substance use paraphernalia and individuals associated with active substance use. Specifically, long-term investment in community physical environments, including improvement of infrastructure and outdoor spaces, is needed to address crime, violence, and poverty in all communities and foster community connectedness (28). Other families proposed increased social services such as employment agencies and basic income guarantees as interventions that could address some of the root causes of SUD, thereby enhancing individual and family well-being and improving perceived community safety. Individuals who use substances face numerous obstacles to accessing health and social services, including stigma, housing unaffordability, fear of child welfare services, and lack of trust in the healthcare system to a greater extent than those who do not use substances (29, 30). It is imperative to understand the intersecting structural conditions that individuals with SUD face in seeking health and social supports. Improving long term outcomes for individuals recovering from SUD and their communities remains contingent upon the wider system capacity to meet their needs (31, 32). It is crucial for mental health and social services (including child welfare services) to become key partners, collaborating with individuals with SUD and their families. Such collaborations with individuals who use substances are needed to call for the necessary policies and resources across systems to enhance outcomes for individuals and their families.

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

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

Conclusions

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

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Ethics approval and consent to participate was obtained from the Health Sciences Research Ethics Board (HSREB) at Queen’s University Kingston, Ontario (FMED-6810-21; 6034297).

Consent for publication: Informed, written consent was obtained from all individual participants included in this study.

Availability of data and materials: The dataset is not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Competing interests: The authors declare no competing interests.

Funding: The study was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC). Grant number: 6034834 – received by IB & EP; www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Authors' contributions: EP, IB, SB, CMD, AW, RC, LJ, MC, BK conceptualized the study. EP, IB, SB, CMD, AW, RC, LK, MV, BK, SCN, MG conducted the interviews and participated in the analysis. RT reviewed and coded the data, and all authors contributed to the drafting and editing of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to acknowledge the project’s Community Advisory Board, who helped the authors conceptualize and bring the project to fruition. The Community

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

References

1. Canada S. Mental health indicators. 2014.

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

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