



NIGERIAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

ISSN 1116-0381

Vol. 21, No.1 March, 2022

NIGERIAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

ISSN - 1116-0381
VOLUME 21, NO.1 MARCH, 2022

EDITORIAL

This academic publication of the defunct Department of Educational Foundation has come a long way. It was almost going moribund but for the deliberate steps taken by the current Editorial Board with the cooperation of all academic staff of the former Department of Art and Social Sciences Education. Innovative article generation and peer review programs were initiated and doggedly implemented to enable to return of Nigeria Journal of Education Foundation to the vibrant academic and professionally sound contributions it had always made to the advancement of knowledge.

Improving the quality of the journal and bringing an international angle and status to it has engaged the attention of the Editorial Board. Phased in stages of achieving national and international focus has produced special editions based on selected themes. Those themes pay attention to current issues and needs engaging the attention of specialists in educational foundations in Nigeria and the rest of the world.

GENERAL

1. General Address:

Editorial papers, experiments, Philosophy and Metaphysics and Teaching Target Audience: higher level maker at Language

II. Note In preparation note the Number

i.

ii.

iii.

RIAL

efunct Department of Educational
was almost going moribund but for
current Editorial Board with the
the former Department of Art and
e article generation and peer review
implemented to enable to return of
ation to the vibrant academic and
it had always made to the

and bringing an international angle
n of the Editorial Board. Phased in
ational focus has produced special
se themes pay attention to current
ion of specialists in educational
he world.

GENERAL INFORMATION AND NOTES TO CONTRIBUTORS

1. General information

Address: Department of Social Science Education
Faculty of Education,
University of Ilorin,
PMB 1515,
Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria

Editorial Description: The journal publishes theoretical and empirical papers, results of original investigations (analytical, descriptive or experimental) in all areas of educational foundations-History, Philosophy, psychology, sociology, Comparative Education, Statistics and Methodology of Educational Research, Measurement, Evaluation and Teaching at all levels of Education.

Target Audience: Academics, students of education in institution of higher learning, general practitioners and stakeholder in education, policy maker and the general public.

Language: The journal is published in English.

II. Notes to contributors

In preparing articles for publishing in the journal, authors should please note the following:

Number of copies to be submitted

- i. One electronic copies of each article are submitted.
- ii. Authors are to include with each copy of manuscript a cover sheet that shows the title of the article, the name(s) of the author(s) and institutional affiliation(s).
- iii. The next page of the manuscript should omit the author's name(s) and affiliation(s) but should include the title of the article.

Style and format of preparation

1. Manuscript are to be typed double-space on A4 size paper not exceeding 12 pages in length.
2. All articles must be preceded by an abstract of about 100-250 words, highlighting the main thesis of paper and or the main findings as the case may be.
3. Tables and figures should be APA formatted and camera ready.
4. Every reference cited in the text must appear at the end of the paper in the 'Reference' section. The references must be arranged strictly in alphabetical order of the author(s) surname(s) and must be consistent with the current APA referencing style.

Publication fees

- i. Each contributor is to pay an assessment fee as determined and communicated by the Editorial Board.
- ii. The publication of every accepted article is subject to the author's payment of a publication fee as determined by the Editorial Board.

Complimentary copies

The author(s) of each published article will be sent one complimentary copy of the issue of the journal in which the article appears. Author(s) can order for more copies at their own expense.

Manuscript should be sent to: nijef2019@gmail.com

Printed in Nigeria by
Haytee Press and Publishing Company
No.2, Mejindadi Street, off Oja-Iya Area,
Ilorin, Kwara State
08038282074

Prof. I. C.

Prof. A.

Dr. Muh

Dr. A. S.

Dr. Dorc

Dr. Amin

Dr. Eliza

CONSU

Emeritu

Prof. C.

Prof. R.

Prof. A.

Prof. O.

Prof. F.

Prof. A.

Prof. H.

Prof. Bo

Prof. Ad

Prof. Y

Dr. P.K

paper not
50 words,
ings as the
eady.
the paper
ed strictly
must be

EDITORIAL BOARD

- | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| Prof. I. O. O. Amali | - Editor-in Chief / Chairman |
| Prof. A. Yusuf | - Managing Editor |
| Dr. Muhinat B. Bello | - Member |
| Dr. A. Saidu | - Member |
| Dr. Dorcas S. Daramola | - Member |
| Dr. Aminat O. Aburime | - Member |
| Dr. Elizabeth O. Uyanne | - Member |

CONSULTING EDITORS

mined and
the author's
ial Board.

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Emeritus Prof. J.O.O Abiri | - University of Ilorin |
| Prof. C.O Daramola | - University of Ilorin |
| Prof. R.A. Lawal | - University of Ilorin |
| Prof. A.G.A.S. Oladosu | - University of Ilorin |
| Prof. O.E Abdullhai | - University of Ilorin |
| Prof. F.A.O. Olasehinde Williams | - University of Ilorin |
| Prof. A.A. Jekayinfa | - University of Ilorin |
| Prof. H.O. Owolabi | - University of Ilorin |
| Prof. Bolanle O. Olawuyi | - University of Ilorin |
| Prof. Adams O.U. Onuka | - University of Ibadan, Ibadan |
- Nigeria

e sent one
the article
pense.

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Prof. Yusuf A. Mustapha | - University of Jos, Jos |
| Dr. P.K. Effrim | - University of Education,
Winneba, Winneba, Ghana |

in Nigeria by
ng Company
Oja-Iya Area,
Kwara State
08038282074

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Impact of Community Education on Drug Abuse for Sustainable Community Development in Ilorin South Local Government Area <i>OLAWUNI, Abiodun Olufemi, Ph.D & OLAWUYI, Olayinka Praise</i>	1
Influence of Peer Pressure on Adolescents' Sexual Adventurism in Ghana <i>Sylvia Eyiah-Bediako, Joshua Adebisi Omotosho, Stephen Doh Fia, Josephine Anterkyi Bentil, Joy Olive Boye, Kyeremeh Tawiah Dabone,</i>	16
Evaluation of the Implementation of Basic Technology Curriculum in Public Junior Secondary Schools in Ibadan Metropolis <i>Adetayo Janet Oyebola & Popoola D. Abeni</i>	30
Effects of Instruction in Mechanical Accuracy on Full Stop and Correct Syllabification in Composition Writing by Students in College of Education Billiri, Gombe State <i>ANYEBE, Mar. O., Ph.D, SULAIMAN, Jamila, & BAKO, Victoria Nati</i>	46
Comparative Study of Resource Availability and Utilization in Private and Public Universities in Edo State: Implication for Educational Planning <i>Chukujindu Joyce Okafor PhD, & Olubukola Ojo</i>	60
School Facilities and Students' Academic Performance in Public Secondary Schools in Zone C Senatorial District of Benue State, Nigeria <i>Florence Onyemowo Akpakwu PhD, Mtile Simon Terver, & Prof. Margaret Uga Oluwole</i>	77

Factors Res
Students of
<i>Lateef Omo</i>
.....
Teachers'
Their Job E
Zone
<i>Ategwu Pa</i>
.....
Education:
<i>Kenn-Akla</i>
.....
Relationsh
and Acade
Gombe St
<i>Dr. Samue</i>
.....

or Sustainable ment Area nka Praise1 Adventurism in phen Doh Fia, wiah Dabone,16 Technology ls in Ibadan30 ll Stop and udents in KO, Victoria Nati46 ilization in Private n for Educational60 ormance in Public ct of Benue State, rver,77	✓ Factors Responsible for Cohabitation among Youths as Perceived by Students of University of Ilorin <i>Lateef Omotosho Adegboyega & Lukman Fasasi</i>89 Teachers' Information and Communication Technology Usage and Their Job Effectiveness among Secondary Schools in Ogoja Education Zone <i>Ategwu Patrick Ogar, Amos Paul Imeh & Uyimse Felicia Unyekeme</i>108 Educational Supervision: A Panacea for Teachers Productivity <i>Kenn-Aklah F.U</i>124 Relationship Between Senior Secondary Schools Students Motivation and Academic Achievement in Shongom Local Government Area of Gombe State <i>Dr. Samuel Alfayo Boh</i>138
---	--

FACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR COHABITATION AMONG YOUTHS AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS OF UNIVERSITY OF ILORIN

By

Lateef Omotosho Adegboyega

adeghoyega.lo@unilorin.edu.ng

Department of Counsellor Education,

University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria

and

Lukman Fasasi

fasasilukman100@gmail.com

Department of Educational Psychology,

Federal College of Education (Technical), Asaba, Nigeria

Abstract

Cohabitation is an intimate sexual union between two unmarried partners, who share the same living quarter for a sustained period of time. Hence, the study investigated factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin. The research design that was adopted for the study is the descriptive survey method. The population for this study comprises all the 44,566 undergraduates at the University of Ilorin, while the target population for the study comprises 24,935 students of the selected Faculties. A total of 200 students constitutes the sample of this study. The instrument used for collection of the relevant data for this study was a 20-item structured questionnaire entitled: factors responsible for cohabitation among youths. The instrument was validated with a reliability coefficient of 0.65 after a test re-test using PPMC at 0.05 alpha level. The findings of this study revealed that reducing occurrence of loneliness, improving the academic performance of the cohabitants, it is morally acceptable, it encourages peer reading/study, it goes against the spiritual principle of purity among others are the common factors responsible for cohabitation.

Also, there were significant differences in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their faculty, gender, and level while there was no significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their age bracket. Based on the findings of the study, it was recommended that; government should support the university management in providing sufficient accommodations for the students, and parents should make sure that they are monitoring the activities of their children to avoid the danger of cohabitation.

Keywords: Factors, Cohabitation, Youths, Students.

Introduction

Students need comfortable accommodation in the universities for them to study hard and pass their examinations. The original idea of hostel accommodation was to provide a more conducive academic atmosphere for students. As a result, the first generation Universities built beautiful hostels, befitting the image of undergraduate and postgraduate students. Students' population then was within control. In some of the hostels, two or a maximum of three students occupied a room (Guardian, 2004). Abubakar (2007) noted that students are supposed to be accommodated one per room and where two or more students share a room, it often leads to conflict among them.

Nigerian University students presently live under horrible condition on campus. Their accommodation is believed to be so bad and insanitary, congested and over-crowded impeding the capability to learn effectively (Adegboyega, 2019). A room with two wardrobes, which used to be allocated to two students in the past, now accommodates six students. Yet in such arrangement, not more than 40% of the students get official accommodation (Otobo, 2002).

Okebukola (2004) opined that in some rooms in Federal and State Universities, fifteen students shared space meant for five. In some Universities, 24 students stayed in one big room originally meant for 10 students. The number of occupants rose because students frequently squat their friends or relations who would reciprocate such actions in later years.

Thus rooms are often choked up with wears, buys and beguiles, resulting in less space for chairs and desks, making the rooms inadequate for personal study. Edukugho (2006) claimed that 80% of University student population lives outside the campuses with many students becoming victims of shylock landlords and hostile communities, and persistently in bloody confrontation with host indigenes. Ten students or more living in a room is bad enough even in private hostels. Edukugho observed that students' welfare was still a far cry as many of them lived in filthy, congested hostels which denies the students their comfort and privacy. Idachaba (2007) opined that over bloated admission of students into Nigerian Universities result in acute shortage in students' accommodation which makes them live in over-crowded rooms.

According to Bacharach and Okho (2000), cohabitation is an intimate sexual union between two unmarried partners, who share the same living quarter for a sustained period of time. Cohabitation, according to Bower and Christopherson (2017), is a union of persons of the opposite sex living together but not married. An increase in the acceptability of cohabitation can be viewed as evidence of the weakening social norms related to marriage, known as de-institutionalization of marriage (Bumpass & Lu, 2012). Cohabitation was obscure and even taboo throughout the nineteenth century and until the 1970's non-marital unions have become common because the meaning of the family has been altered by individualistic social value which has progressively matured since the late 1940's (Ogunsola, 2004).

Student's cohabitation has attracted a lot of policy and academic researches and debates in recent times. Students in higher educational institutions are experiencing a critical situation in terms of higher tuition fees and other associated college costs related to facilities and services provision, especially on-campus accommodation (Aluko, 2009). A number of challenges may exist within or outside the educational institutions that predisposes students to cohabitation (Oweh, 2013; Peretomode & Ugbomeh, 2013).

However, a crucial aspect of these problems in tertiary institutions as related to this study is insufficient accommodation for students within the campus premises. In Nigeria, about two decades ago the number of

University students increased eightfold from 55,000 in 1980 to more than 400,000 in 2002; and 1,100,000 in 2021 (Agbola & Hanat, 2001; Bollag, 2002; Adegboyega, 2019).

Therefore, majority of students in second to penultimate years of studies are forced to live off-campus in communities adjoining their institutions (Onyike & Uche, 2010; Aluko, 2011; Arisukwu, 2013). Cohabitation is not limited to its prevalence but also it is extended to its widespread and increasing social acceptance and implication on individual wellbeing and academic performance (Popenoe & Whitehead, 2002).

The high cost of college fees has in some cases forced students to cohabit. According to Sassler (2004), many younger cohabiters enter into joint living arrangements as a result of financial need which may result in unstable partnerships. Studies have shown that financial distress is a salient predictor of positive aspects of relationship quality, for example, affection, love and satisfaction, (Lichter, 2006). There is evidence that educational attainment promotes positive interactions within cohabiting couples as noted by Sassler (2004).

Studies have shown that economic well-being is positively related to the odds that contribute to cohabiting. However, Onyike (2010) asserted that cohabiters are less likely to pool their income together. This may provide greater flexibility to engage in a wide range of economic arrangements, but this leaves cohabiters more exposed to fluctuations in income. Other studies have found a relationship between objective and subjective measures of financial strain and violent aggression toward female partners (Omonjo, 2014).

Therefore, adjusting to hostel life is easier when expectations are realistic. Many students come into the hostel believing that their roommates will be their friends for life, while the roommates, on the other hand, may see the room only as a place to sleep, since they already have a social network. This leads to hurts, confusion and tension (Hepatica 2001). This study, therefore examine the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin.

Research Question

This research question was raised and answered in the study:

- What are the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin?

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated and tested in the study:

1. There is no significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of gender.
2. There is no significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of age bracket.
3. There is no significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of level.
4. There is no significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of faculty.

Methodology

The research design that was used for the study is the descriptive survey method. Survey method is used for descriptive, explanatory and purposes and is therefore most appropriate for this study since the nature of the study entails sourcing for data and analyzing the data to determine the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths.

The population for this study comprises all the 44,566 (Unilorin Bulletin, 2021) undergraduates at the University of Ilorin, while the target population for the study comprises 24,935 students of the Faculties of Arts, Education, Life Sciences, Physical Sciences, and Social Sciences. Simple random sampling technique was used to select 200 respondents across five (5) faculties.

The instrument used for collection of the relevant data for this study was a 20-item structured questionnaire entitled; factors responsible for cohabitation among youths. The instrument was developed by the researchers, and it is divided into two (2) sections: A and B. Section A elicits the personal data of the respondents while section B deals with factors responsible for cohabitation among youths. The instrument was validated with a reliability coefficient of 0.65 after a test retest using PPMC at 0.05 alpha level. The items in the instrument were structured in a way that they expressed support for cohabitation practices. The instrument was thus formatted on a four (4) point Likert-type scale for scoring the items. Allotment of points is as follows:

Strongly Agree	(SA) 4 points
Agree	(A) 3 points
Disagree	(D) 2 points
Strongly Disagree	(SD) 1 point

The data collected were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The hypotheses postulated in the course of the study were tested using t-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistics. The t-test was used for testing of hypothesis 1 while hypotheses 2, 3, and 4 were analysed using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) at 0.05 level of significance.

Results

Answering of Research Questions

Research Question: *What are the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin?*

Table 1: Mean and Rank Order on the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths

Item No.	Factors responsible for cohabitation	Mean	Rank Order
3	Reducing occurrence of loneliness	3.50	1 st
15	Youths see it as a natural step in the dating process	3.40	2 nd
14	It creates room for youths to spend more time together	3.40	2 nd
13	It gives the youths a foretaste of sexual intercourse	3.40	2 nd
12	It goes against the spiritual principle of purity	3.40	2 nd
6	It encourages peer reading/study	3.40	2 nd
5	It is morally acceptable	3.40	2 nd
4	Improving the academic performance of the cohabitants	3.40	2 nd
11	It is convenient for cohabitants to live together	3.30	9 th
8	preparing cohabitants to get married later in life	3.30	9 th
7	preparing youths for future marriage	3.30	9 th
16	Cohabitation is the best means for mate selection	3.30	9 th
1	saving cost of accommodation	3.30	9 th
2	Helping youths to monitor their partners thereby securing their relationship	3.30	9 th
20	It occurs when there is lack of parental attention and supervision	3.20	15 th
19	Peer influence encourages cohabitation	3.20	15 th
18	Lack of conducive hostel facilities tend to encourage cohabitation	3.20	15 th
17	The desire for intimacy and sexual intercourse is provided regularly in cohabitation	3.20	15 th
10	It is a good way to test relationship prior to marriage	3.20	15 th
16	Cohabitation is the best means to select marital partner	3.20	15 th

Source: (Author's field work, 2021)

Table 1 presents the mean and rank order of the respondents on the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin. The table indicates that items 3 which states that "reducing occurrence of loneliness" ranked 1st with a mean score of 3.50. Item 15, 14, 13, 12, 6, 5 and 4 which state that "Improving the academic performance of the cohabitants, it is morally acceptable, it encourages peer reading/study, It goes against the spiritual principle of purity, It gives the youths a foretaste of sexual intercourse, It creates room for youths to spend more time together, It creates room for youths to spend more time together, Youths see it as a natural step in the dating process" ranked 2nd with a mean score of 3.40. Ranked 9th are item 11, 8, 7, 16, 1 and 2 which states that "It is convenient for cohabitants to live together, preparing cohabitants to get married later in life, preparing youths for future marriage, Cohabitation is the best means for mate selection, saving cost of accommodation, helping youths to monitor their partners thereby

tion
er

securing their relationship" with a mean score of 3.30. On the other hands, item 20, 19, 18, 17, 10 and 16 which state that "It occurs when there is lack of parental attention and supervision, Peer influence encourages cohabitation, Lack of conducive hostel facilities tend to encourage cohabitation, the desire for intimacy and sexual intercourse is provided regularly in cohabitation, it is a good way to test relationship prior to marriage, Cohabitation is the best means to select marital partner" ranked 15th with a mean score of 3.20. Since all the twenty items in the questionnaire ranked above the mid-mean score of 2.50, then it can be suggested that all the items in the questionnaire are factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin.

Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis One: There is no significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of gender.

Table 2: Mean, Standard Deviation and t-test Analysis of difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their gender

Gender	N	Mean	SD	df	Cal.t-value	p-value	Decision
Male	90	3.44	.36	198	20.03	.000	Rejected
Female	110	3.21	.24				

Source: (Author's field work, 2021)

As shown on table 2, male had mean score of 3.44 with standard deviation .36, while female had mean score of 3.21 with standard deviation of .24, the calculated t-value was 20.03 while its calculated significance value is .000 of df 2/198 at alpha level of 0.05. On this basis, the null hypothesis was therefore rejected. This means that there is a significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their gender. The reason was

that the calculated significance value (.000) is less than 0.05 alpha level (0.05).

Hypothesis Two: There is no significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their age.

Table 3: ANOVA summary of difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their age

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	P-value	Decision
Between Groups	.20	2	.20	1.92	.17	Not Rejected
Within Groups	20.71	197	.105			
Total	20.91	199				

Source: (Author's field work, 2021)

Table 3 shows an F-value 1.92 with calculated significance .17 at 0.05 alpha level. Since calculated significance .17 is greater than 0.05 alpha level, hypothesis is thus not rejected. This implies that there is no significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their age.

Hypothesis Three: There is no significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of level.

Table 4: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) showing difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their level

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	Cal. F-ratio	p-value
Between Groups	5.51	3	1.84	23.40*	.000
Within Groups	15.40	196	.08		
Total	20.91	199			

*p<0.05

Table 4 shows an F-value 23.40 with calculated significant .000 at 0.05 alpha level. Since calculated significance .000 is less than 0.05 alpha level, the hypothesis is thus rejected. This implies that there is a significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their level. In order to determine the mean value(s) that caused the significant difference observed in the ANOVA results of Table 8, the Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT) was used as a post-hoc test. The results of the DMRT procedure are displayed in Table 5.

Table 5: Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT) Showing difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their level

Duncan Groupings	N	Mean	Group	Level
A	20	3.10	1	300 level
B	30	3.12	2	400 level
C	90	3.30	3	200 level
D	60	3.54	4	100 level

Table 5 shows the Duncan Multiple Range Test indicating the significant difference noted in the ANOVA on Table 8. Group 1 (300 level) with a mean score of 3.10 slightly differed from Group 2 (400 level) with the mean score of 3.12 but significantly differed from Group 3 (200 level) with a mean score of 3.30, and also significantly differed from Group 4 (100 level) with a mean score of 3.54. All the groups differed from one another but the significant difference noted was as a result of Group 1 (300 level). Hence the significant difference noted in the ANOVA on table 4 was a result of respondents who are in 300 level thus, the hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis Four: There is no significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their faculty.

Table 6: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) showing difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their faculty

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	Cal. F-ratio	p-value
Between Groups	3.40	4	.85	9.50*	.000
Within Groups	17.51	195	.09		
Total	20.91	199			

*Significant, $p < 0.05$

Table 6 shows an F-value .85 with calculated significant .000 at 0.05 alpha level. Since calculated significance .000 is less than 0.05 alpha level, the hypothesis is thus rejected. This implies that there is a significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their faculty. In order to determine the mean value(s) that caused the significant difference observed in the ANOVA results of Table 8, the Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT) was used as a post-hoc test. The results of the DMRT procedure are displayed in Table 7.

Table 7: Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT) Showing the Differences in the Respondents Factors Responsible for Cohabitation among Youths Based on Age

Duncan Groupings	N	Mean	Group	Faculty
A	30	3.23	1	Life Sciences
B	20	3.25	2	Physical Sciences
B	20	3.25	3	Social Sciences
B	90	3.25	4	Education
C	40	3.60	5	Arts

Table 7 shows the Duncan Multiple Range Test indicating the significant difference noted in the ANOVA on Table 8. Group 1 (Life Sciences) with a mean score of 3.23 slightly differed from Group 2, 3 and 4 with the mean score of 3.25 but significantly differed from Group 5 with a mean score of 3.60. All the groups differed from one another but

the significant difference noted was as a result of Group 1 (Life Sciences). Hence the significant difference noted in the ANOVA on table 6 was a result of respondents who are in Faculty of Life Sciences thus, the hypothesis is rejected.

Discussion of Findings

The findings of this study indicated that reducing occurrence of loneliness, improving the academic performance of the cohabitants, it is morally acceptable, it encourages peer reading/study, it goes against the spiritual principle of purity, it gives the youths a foretaste of sexual intercourse, it creates room for youths to spend more time together, it creates room for youths to spend more time together, and youths see it as a natural step in the dating process are the common factors responsible for cohabitation. The above finding is in line with Ogunbamila (2013) who posited that indicated that early young adults were mostly prone to premarital sexual behaviours. Cohabitation is common among undergraduates because many of them are being free for the first time; hence, they tend to enjoy the freedom, independence and are less monitored by either their parents or guardians. Also Mustapha, Odebode and Adegboyega (2017); Adegboyega (2019) further noted that economic well-being is positively related to the odds that contribute to cohabiting. Those who choose to cohabit tend to be of slightly lower socio-economic status, more liberal, less religious and are more supportive of egalitarian gender roles and non-traditional family roles. College students who cohabit generally hold a positive attitude about the situation, reporting personal growth, deeper understanding of one's partner, deeper love, disclosing more and better sex lives. Svodziwa and Kuerten (2017) also found that college students who cohabit have higher level of general well-being and happiness. Cohabitation among individuals of opposite sex is a predisposing factor to the initiation of sexual activities (Ogunbamila, 2013).

Another finding revealed that there was a significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their gender. This finding is in agreement with that of Ola-Alani (2011) which revealed that

cohabitation is depend greatly on gender preference, and it has lasting impact on student academic achievement.

Finding also revealed that there was no significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their age. This finding is in agreement with that of Romano (2006) which revealed that age has nothing to do with the reason for cohabiting. The researcher further submitted that majority of those engage in cohabitation are higher institution student. Kezar and Moriarty (2000) study revealed that young male adults developed cohabitation zeal from the moment they have knowledge of sexual intercourse.

Furthermore, finding revealed that there was a significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their level. On the contrary, the study by Nnamani and Oyibe (2016) revealed that there was no significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among secondary school students based on their class.

Finding also revealed that there was a significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their faculty. This finding is in agreement with Musibau and Johnson (2010) whose study revealed that course of study has no significant influence on students' engagement in cohabitation.

Conclusion

The findings of this study indicated that reducing occurrence of loneliness, improving the academic performance of the cohabitants, it is morally acceptable. it encourages peer reading/study, it goes against the spiritual principle of purity, it gives the youths a foretaste of sexual intercourse, it creates room for youths to spend more time together, it creates room for youths to spend more time together, and youths see it as a natural step in the dating process are the common factors responsible for cohabitation. It was also discovered that there were significant differences in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their faculty,

gender, and
responsibility
University

Recommendation

These
and conclusions

1.

2.

3.

4.

gender, and level while there was no significant difference in the factors responsible for cohabitation among youths as perceived by students of University of Ilorin on the basis of their age bracket.

Recommendations

These recommendations are based on the summary of findings and conclusion reached thereafter.

1. There should be a regular campaign regarding the benefit and danger associated with students' cohabitation.
2. Government should support the university management in providing sufficient accommodations for the students.
3. Students should switch to cohabitation when they don't have any other option, and they should not abuse it.
4. Parents should make sure that they are monitoring the activities of their children to avoid the danger of cohabitation.

References

- Abubakar, T. T. (2007). *Cohabitation: A Deadly Trend in Tertiary Institutions*. Retrieved February 28th, 2019 from <http://allafrica.com/stories/200809.06049.html>.
- Mustapha, M. L., Odebode, A. A. & Adegboyega, L. O. (2017II). Impact of premarital cohabitation on marital stability as expressed by married adults in Ilorin. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 5(1), 112-121.
- Adegboyega, L. O. (2019). Prevalence of premarital cohabitation among teenagers as perceived by undergraduates in Kwara State, Nigeria. *Covenant International Journal of Psychology*, 4(2), 36-48.
- Adeoye, A.O., Ola, O., & Aliu, B. (2012). Prevalence of premarital sex and factors influencing it among students in a private tertiary institution in Nigeria. *International of Psychology and Counselling*, 4(1), 6-9.
- Alo, A.O.(2008). Socioeconomics determinant of unintended pregnancies among Yoruba women of southwest Nigeria. *International Journal of Sustainable Development* 1 (4), 145-154.
- Alo, O.A & Akinde, I. S (2010). Premarital sexual activities in urban society of Southwest Nigeria. *E.A journal*, 2 (1): 1-16.
- Aluko, O.E. (2011). The assessment of housing situation among students in the University of Lagos. *Africa research Review- An international Multi-Disciplinary Journal* 5 (3), 104-118.
- Anderson, K., 2000, *Marriage, Family and Sexuality: Probing the Headlines that impact your family*, Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Arisuku, V. (2013) university student cohabitation; A Regional comparison of selected attitudes and behaviour '*journal of marriage and family contexts in the united state population studies* vol. 54; 29-41
- Bello, M.O. & Ogunsanwo, B.A. (2013). The psychological consequence of cohabitation among students of Tai Solarin University of

Educa
Scienc
Bower. D.
policy
in Afri
West.
Chitamun,
Africar
applica
of Psyc
Crissey, S.
Expect
The Jo
Cunningham
Childre
Journal
De Van, Qu
Cohabiti
Reserve
Dempsey, K
significa
Sociolog
Ekpenyong, I
Practice
Bayelsa
Ekpenyong,
influenci
Niger D
Science,
Gault-Sherm
The effe
Religious
Joan-Nduta, M
practice
Nairobi, I

Education, Ijagun, Ogun State. *Ocean Journal of Applied Sciences* 6 (2) 1-6.

Bower. D. & Christopher. B (2008) *increasing visibility and promoting policy Action of Tackle Sexual Exploitation in and around Schools in Africa*. A briefing paper with a focus On west Africa, Dakar plan West.

Chitamun, S. & Finchilescu, G., 2003, 'Predicting the intention of South African female students to engage in premarital sexual relations: An application of the theory of reasoned action', *South African Journal of Psychology* 33(3), 154-161.

Crissey, S. R. (2005). "Race / Ethnic Difference in The Marital Expectation of Adolescents: The Role of Romantic Relationships". *The Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 67, 697 - 709

Cunningham and Thoranton (2004). "The Influence of Parents and Children's Union Transition Attitude towards Cohabitation". *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 67, 710 - 720

De Van, Qu, Ln and Brown (2003). "Family Matter: Pre - Marital Cohabitation and Marriage Stability". *Journal of Population Reserve*, vol. 22 (1), 99 - 118.

Dempsey, K. & Devaus, D. (2004). Who cohabit in 2001? The significance of age, gender, religion and ethnicity. *Journal of Sociology*, 40:157-178

Ekpenyong .N. S (2002) perceived factors influencing premarital Sexual Practice among university students in Niger Delta University , Bayelsa , Nigeria . *Canadian social Society* 163(2) ; 153 - 171

Ekpenyong, N. S. & Ekpenyong, A. S. (2016). Perceived factors influencing premarital sexual practice among university students in Niger Delta University, Bayelsa State, Nigeria. *Canadian Social Science*, 12 (11): 79-88.

Gault-Sherman, M. & Draper, S. (2012). What will the neighbours think? The effect of moral communities on cohabitation. *Review of Religious Research* 54(1) 45-67

Joan-Nduta, M. K. (2013). *Factors that contribute to the prevalence and practice of cohabitation among Kenyatta University students, Nairobi, Kenya. A Thesis Submitted to the School of Environmental*

- Studies and Human Sciences, Kenyatta University for the Award of Degree of Master of Science in Family and Consumer Sciences.*
- Kate, F. (2010). "Marriage": *Examination of the State of Modern Marriage*.
- Katz, R. (2001). Effects of migration, ethnicity and religiosity on cohabitation. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 3
- Lichter, D.T. (2006). "Marriage or Dissolution? Union transition among poor cohabiting women. *Demography*. (43), 223-240.
- Manning, W. D. & Cohen, J. A. (2012). Premarital cohabitation and marital dissolution: An examination of recent marriages. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74, 377-387.
- Manning, Wendy, D. Manuralongmore (2007). "The Changing Institution of Marriage". Adolescent Expectation to Cohabit and Marry. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 69 (3), 559 – 575.
- Martin, P., Martin, D. & Martin, M. (2001). *Young adult premarital sexual activity, cohabitation and attitudes towards marriage. Adolescence*, 36, 601-609.
- Mashau, T. D., (2006). *Unlocking the Mystery of Marriage: Issues in premarital counselling*, Potchefstroom Theological Publications, Potchefstroom.
- Mashau, T. D. (2008). *God's road map for human sexuality: Discipline your child to make sexual choices that honor God*, AcadSA, Kempton Park.
- Mustapha, M. L. A, Odebode, A. A. & Adegboyega, L. O. (2017) Impact of Premarital Cohabitation on Marital Stability as Expressed by Married Adults in Ilorin, Nigeria. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research* 5(1)
- Ofoegbu, C. I. (2002). *Human development, family behaviour parenting, marriage and counselling Skills*. Enugu: Snapp Press Ltd.
- Ogunbamila, A. (2013). Demographic predictors of premarital sexual behaviours among undergraduates. *Nigerian Journal of Applied Behavioural Sciences* 1, 68-74.
- Ogunsola, M. O. (2004). *Premarital behaviour and length of courtship as determinant of marital stability among couples in Oyo State, Nigeria*. Unpublished M.Ed project University of Ibadan, Ibadan.

Ogunso
of
N
Omoni
Ch
Onyike,
Stu
Tro
Onyike,
Stu
Tro
Patricia,
Cor
Lor
Popenoe
Cro
Rut
Rena, R.
(Nig
11 (4
Sassler, S
Jour
Seltzer, J
Dem
Fam
Seltzer, J
Dem
the F
Seltzer, J
Marr
62(4)
Smith, D.
Niger

- Ogunsola, M. O. (2011). The effect of premarital cohabitation on quality of relationship and marital stability of married people in Southwest, Nigeria. *African Nebula, Issue 3*, 16-24.
- Omonijo, D. O. (2014). "Social Analysis of Moral Malpractice Challenges Education Sector in Nigeria
- Onyike, J. A. (2010). "An Assessment of the Management of the Students' hostels of Tertiary Institutions' in Oweri, Imo State". *Tropical Built Environment. 1 (1): 140.*
- Onyike, J. A. (2010). "An Assessment of the Management of the Students' hostels of Tertiary Institutions' in Oweri, Imo State". *Tropical Built Environment. 1 (1): 140.*
- Patricia, M. (2000). "Marriage Lite": *The Risk of Cohabitation and Its Consequences*, published by Institute for Study of Civil Society, London. ISBN 1 – 903-306-04-7.
- Popenoe, D. (2009). *Cohabitation, Marriage and Child wellbeing: A Cross-sectional Perspective*. The National Marriage Project, Rutgers University.
- Rena, R. (2006). Premarital sex-lessons from American experience, Ilorin (Nigeria). *The Nigerian Journal of Guidance & Counselling 11 (1), 134-155.*
- Sassler, S. (2004). The Process of Entering in to Cohabiting Unions. *Journal of Marriage and Family. 66(2):491-505*
- Seltzer, J. A. (2004). Cohabitation in the United States and Britain: Demography, Kinship, and the Future." *Journal of Marriage and Family. 66 (4):921-9*
- Seltzer, J. A. 2004. "Cohabitation in the United States and Britain: Demography Kinship, and the Future." *Journal of Marriage and Family 66: 921-928.*
- Seltzer, J. A. (2000). Families formed outside of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family 62(4): 1247-1268. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01247.x*
- Smith, D. J. (2004). "Pre – Marital Sex, Procreation and HIV Risk in Nigeria". *Studies in Family Planning, vol, 35 (8): 223 – 235.*

- Smock (2001). "Cohabitation on the United States" An Appraisal of Research Themes, Findings and Implications". *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26: 1 – 20.
- Smock, P. J. (2000). Cohabitation in the United States: An Appraisal of Research Themes, Findings, and Implications. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26:1-20
- Sovodziwa . G & Kurete . t. (2017) The psychological consequences of Cohabitation among Students Tai Solarin university of Education, ijagun , Ogun State , Nigeria ;*Ozean journal Of Applied Science* 6(2) 65-70
- Stern, O. (2006). "Cohabitation and the Law" *Marriage and Family Review*, vol. 21, 141 – 168.
- Thatcher, A. (2002). *Living Together and Christian Ethics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Thatcher, D. (2000). "Marriage after Modernity". *Christian Marriage in Post Modern Time*, Sheffield Academic Press, London.
- Thoranton & Axin (2006). "Marriage and Cohabitation in Chicago: University of Chicago. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98, 628.
- Thornton, A; Axinn, W. (1992). "Reciprocal effects of religiosity, cohabitation, and marriage". *American Journal of Sociology*. 98 (3): 628-651. doi:10.1086/230051. JSTOR 2781460.
- Thornton, A; Axinn, W. (1993). "Reciprocal effects of religiosity, cohabitation, and marriage". *American Journal of Sociology*. 98 (3): 628-651. doi:10.1086/230051. JSTOR 2781460.
- Worku, S. V. & Gustaffon, S. (2006). Marriage markets and single motherhood in South Africa. *Tinbergen Institute of Discussion Paper*, viewed 11 May, 2019, from <http://www.libergen.nl/discussionpapers/06/02-pdf>.
- World Health Organization. (2001). *Sexual relations among young people in developing countries: Evidence from WHO case studies*. Geneva: WHO.
- Wu, Z., Penning, M. J., Pollard, M. S. & Hart, R. (2003). In sickness and health: Does cohabitation count? *Journal of Family Issues*, 24, 811-838.