

Predictive Potentials of Some Psycho-Socio-Personal Variables on Divorce among Couples in Ibadan Nigeria

Rotimi Adebayo Animasahun

Department of Guidance and Counselling, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria
Email: animarotimi@yahoo.com

Received 28 June 2015; accepted 18 October 2015; published 21 October 2015

Copyright © 2015 by author and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.
This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY).
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

The rate at which many marriages crash in Nigeria nowadays calls for serious attention. The effect of divorce on the couples concerned, their children and relatives is better imagined than experienced. This study therefore investigated the predictive potentials of infertility, socio-economic status, religious factor, premarital-cohabitation, sexual intimacy, age at marriage and in-law factor on divorce among couples in Ibadan. Two hundred and fifty divorcees responded to standardized instruments used to collect data. Seven hypotheses and one research question guided the study. Results showed that all the variables correlated positively with the criterion variable (divorce), and the research question revealed that the independent variables jointly contributed a total of 92.9% of the total variance for incidence of divorce. Recommendations were made to reduce the menace of divorce in Nigerian society.

Keywords

Infertility, Religious Factor, Socio-Economic Status, Pre-Marital Cohabitation, Sexual Intimacy, Divorce

1. Introduction

The dynamics of culture and human relationships have led to many influences, manifestations, happenings and occurrences in marriage stability within the African society leading to the high rate of divorce (Borgatta & Edgor, 2000). Marriage is the legal and divine cord that connects man and woman together for everlasting living (It is not a temporary affair). It is an ordained institution established by God to create an everlasting relationship between a man and a woman for companionship, pleasure, procreation and sustenance (Animasahun, 2011).

Marriage on the other hand can also be divined as an established permanent relationship between a man and a woman, based on primary and secondary agreements and backed by legal injunctions, for companionship and procreation (Stanley, 2001; Animasahun, 2013).

Marriage is considered to represent a lifelong commitment by two people based on contract and sanctioned by the state. It thus involves legal rites, responsibilities, and duties that are enforced by both secular and sacred laws. As a legal contract ratified by the state, marriage can only be dissolved with state permission (Borgatta & Edgor, 2000; Asana, 2000).

Divorce is the final termination of a marriage, canceling the legal duties and responsibilities of marriage and dissolving the bonds of marriage between husband and wife. Divorce is one of the hardest things a family can go through. In the past divorce was a taboo. People used to endure and prolong their suffering marriages to avoid divorce. This is not the case anymore. All over the world, divorce rate is on the alarming increase for which many studies have been focused (DeMaris, 2000; Animasahun, 2013, 2014). Most of these studies investigate the common causes of divorce. Many psychologists, religious authorities, behavioural scientists, sociologists, anthropologists and environmental psychologists have worked on various dimensions of marital issues but not really on causes of divorce. For instance, Animasahun & Fatile (2011) worked on marriage crisis and management, Ibokete (2000) worked on married women battering, while Olarinmoye (2001) worked on psychological and social consequences of divorce. Therefore this study is interested in investigating some psycho-socio-personal variables, which include: Infertility, Socio-economic status, Religious factor, Age at marriage, premarital cohabitation, Sexual intimacy and In-law that may predict divorce among couples in Ibadan. Each of these factors is hereby discussed:

Infertility. This refers to the situation whereby one of the couples or both is unable to generate necessary elements that could lead to reproduction or giving birth to the young ones (Benett, 2004; Mahoney & Williams, 1998). Infertility or involuntary barrenness topped the factors highlighted by Berstler and Newcomb (2008), Groom (2001) and O'Connor (2001) as being responsible for marital instability, given the societal expectation and cultural values connected with marital conflict among average Nigerians. In the same vein, Animasahun, (2014) observed that, for an African man, procreation takes priority in marriage, as a child is considered instrumental to establishing a lasting family. In Africa, the value attached to children makes barrenness a major cause of marriage instability (Isiugo-Abanihe, 1998). The birth of a child after marriage signifies a degree of spousal satisfaction which is conducive to marriage stability because the birth of a child helps to keep the family together for sustenance (Waite & Lillard, 1991).

Socio-economic status. This refers to the level of income that individual earn at a particular period of time (Amato & Previti, 2003). This could be the total amount of money earn daily, weekly, monthly orb yearly. Gurman & Peter (2002) addressed the question of how mechanization and the factory system influence family life in modern society. He maintained that the biggest single influence on the families of skilled workers was the size of the wage the head received at work and the resulting standard of living which it permitted. Such a family never experienced poverty because the head income which was a “family wage” was high enough to keep the whole family at a passable living standard without the wife and children having to work. The fact that money was not a problem to the family kept the family intact. However, the family of unskilled labour suffers poverty and inadequacies when they try to pattern their style of living to that of the family of skilled labours. This situation offers a good ground for factors that impede marriage stability to multiply (Bougheas & Yannis, 2009).

Religious factor. This refers to differences in the belief and activities of individual couples (Dunkins, 2000). In the modern African society, the multiple institutions, increase in knowledge, civilization, exposure to necessary information, multi-ethnicity, high evangelization of poly religious faith and tenets are all having dominating influence on marriage. The modern society is a re-evolvement of ancient African societal values, norms, beliefs and practices which has also absorbed other cultural and traditional values, norms, beliefs, practices which are foreign. Among these are Christianity, Islam and their multifarious denominational beliefs and practices which often scatter marriage in a situation whereby the husband’s belief negates that of the wife (Broman, 2002).

Premarital cohabitation. This refers to the living together of couple before they were legally conjugated (Bramlett & Moshar, 2002). This practice, which is very rampant today, is not in line with the norms and values of the Nigerian society. The choice of partner is made by the individual where he/she is studying or working, and eventually, they begin to live together, engage in sexual deal and possibly begin to procreate children. The practice often lack the essential steps and stages in the establishment and solemnization of a marriage, whereby both the primary and secondary agreements as well as the legal injunctions are well observed before establishing

a marriage (Animasahun, 2013). Such practice is regarded as an imported idea from other sources that are beyond the African concept of marriage (Animasahun, 2014). This issue has been found to be a significant factor and cause of divorce in modern African society. This factor is strongly connected with wrong pillars of marriage which refers to situation whereby a couple's relationship is firmly established and based on certain selfish and covetous factors such as lust, beauty/handsomeness, talent, fame, status, position, wealth etc. (Animasahun, 2013, 2014), which are often ephemeral. Unfortunately, most modern relationships are established on these. Broth and Johnson (1998) reported that what most young individuals consider most now include: educational status, beauty/handsomeness and religious involvement as necessary conditions to decide their marriage partners. Almost in the same vein, Miller, Yorgson, Sandberg, & White (2003) as well as Broman (2002) that evidence gathered shows that family background and ethnic origin which were of considerable importance in traditional marriage practice have been replaced by love/lust and affection between partners. Hence, these wrong pillars of marriage may not last, and such marriages built on them may collapse.

Sexual intimacy. Sexual intimacy refers to not just the emotional force of the male's own feelings of entitlement but to a more pervasive attitude of ownership and control toward social relationships with intimate partners. Engaging in legal satisfactory sexual deal is one of the major reasons for entering into marriage (Mahoney & Williams, 1998; Mahoney, Williams, & West, 2001; Animasahun, 2013, 2014). However, many women resist their spouse's sexual demands in a variety of ways, such as: arguing, protesting, abusing or fighting back (Bachar & Koss, 2001, Bennet, 2004). Rogness (2002) and Bergen (2006) contends that many men consequently rape their wives in order to derive maximum sexual satisfaction. Some women consequently defy men's control by exiting a relationship through a form of emotional separation, which is taken to be a woman's denial or restriction of sexual relations and other intimate exchanges, obtaining a separate residence, and/or starting or completing a legal separation/divorce (Bentler & Newcomb, 2008). This situation often makes men to engage in wife beating, rape, and other forms of male-to-female victimization (Raphael, 2001). Hence, marriages fail and separation/divorce sets in as a result of lack of sexual intimacy and satisfaction (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2002).

In-law factor. This refers to a situation whereby negative roles, interruption, poke nosing, negative attitude, behaviours, wrong advice and over-dependency syndrome of in-laws can disrupt a marital union. Every family needs independence, privacy and confidentiality to keep going. However, when these rights are blocked or denied, a marriage may hit the rock (Animasahun, 2013, 2014).

Billings (1979), Bradbury & Finchan (1990) found that the act of divorce caused by in-laws directly affects the structure of a network by removing or altering an existing tie. However, it was found that additional children in the family improves the prospect of marital stability in spite of challenges from in-laws (Heaton, 2000), but as children get older the risk of divorce rises until the youngest child left home (Waite & Lillard, 2001).

Nevertheless, many times in-laws could be beneficial to marriage stability. For instance some researchers working on effect of in-laws on marriage found that social networks and other emotionally supportive social ties from in-laws provide protective inoculation from severe social stressors and even disease (Booth, Johnson, White, & Edwards, 1995). Other work has shown that people receiving help from in-laws experienced less distress (though the effect was reversed when the aid came with advice) (Dehie, Larson, & Landers, 2001). Supporting this, Erbert & Duck (1997), Erbert (2000), and Halford, Nicholson, & Sanders (2007) found in-laws to be health-promoting and provide a sense of belonging and intimacy, and also help people to be more competent and self-efficacious.

Age at Marriage. Marriage has been found to be an institution essentially reserved for the matured individuals mainly because of the responsibilities attached (Animasahun, 2013, 2014). Hence, Animasahun (2013) advocated for the following areas of maturity: chronological, physical, emotional, economic, social, financial and spiritual). Marriages contracted during the teens are known to be highly unstable because there is a greater likelihood of mistaken expectations in the case of such marriages (Booth & Edwards, 1995; Groom, 2001; Bentler & Newcomb, 2008). At very young ages people often have inadequate self-knowledge and are uncertain about their own future prospects and potentials. They are also prone to misjudge the characteristics and likely trajectories of their partners. Hence, the discovered incompatibility could influence the risk of dissolution of the marital union (Animasahun, 2013). Stanley, Markman and Whitton, (2002) also found that young marriages are less likely to survive.

On the other hand, Heaton & Albrecht (1991) and Becker (2007) found that a woman who could not find a suitor in her late twenties or thirties may revise her expectations downward and settles for a match that is far

from the optimal (e.g. a partner who differs substantially in religion, race/ethnicity, age, and/or education. If so, the result would be a union with low gains from marriage and correspondingly high likelihood of eventual dissolution as a result of poor match effect (South, 2001; Stutzer & Frey, 2003).

Based on the literature submission here, this study purported to investigate the predictive potentials of some psycho-socio-personal variables on divorce among couples in Ibadan, Nigeria. To this end, seven hypotheses were formulated at 0.05 level of significance and one research question generated to guide the study.

2. Research Hypotheses

- 1) There will be no significant relationship between infertility and couples' divorce.
- 2) There will be no significant relationship between socio-economic status and couples' divorce.
- 3) There will be no significant relationship religious factors and couple's divorce.
- 4) There will be no significant difference between age at marriage and couple's divorce.
- 5) There will be no significant difference between premarital cohabitation and couple's divorce.
- 6) There will be no significant relationship between sexual intimacy and couple's divorce.
- 7) There will be no significant relationship between in-law and couples' divorce.

3. Research Question

What is the joint contribution of psycho-socio-personal variables (infertility, socio-economic status, religious factors, age at marriage, premarital cohabitation, sexual intimacy, and in-law) to the prediction of divorce among couples?

4. Research Design

The research design in this study was a descriptive design of the ex-post type. It ascertained the predictive potentials of some psycho-socio-personal variables (infertility, socio-economic status, religious factors, age at marriage, premarital cohabitation, sexual intimacy, and in-law) on divorce among couples. However, it was a carefully observed and recorded information as it naturally occurred at the time the study was conducted without any manipulation.

5. Population

The population for the study comprises of all divorced couples in Ibadan, Nigeria.

6. Sample and Sampling Techniques

The sample for this study comprises of two hundred and fifty (250) participants who were selected using purposive and convenience sampling methods. Purposive in the sense that only divorced individuals were used and convenience in the sense that divorced individuals in different offices who created time in responding to the questionnaires in the selected offices were used. On the whole, total numbers of participants were two hundred and fifty consisting both men (117) and women (133), with age ranged between 21 and 59 with a mean of 40 years.

7. Instrumentation

7.1. Socio-Economic Status Scale

Salami's (2000) Socio-Economic Status Scale (SES) was used to measure the couples' socio-economic status. It has 12 major items measuring occupational type, educational status, type of residence, possessions and Parental occupation and residence type as well as social status of the couples. The test retest reliability of the scale was given as 0.73.

7.2. Sexual Intimacy Scale

The Sexual Intimacy Scale developed by Tourangeau (1984) was used to measure sexual intimacy of the couples. The instrument consists of sixteen (16) sexual intimacy item responses anchored based on the four point likert scale, Strongly Agree (4), Agree (3), Disagree (2) and Strongly Disagree (1). The estimated internal

consistency was .83.

7.3. In-Law Scale

The In-laws' Relationship Rating Scale developed by Animasahun (2014) was used to measure the in-law issues of the couples. The instrument consists of 13 item responses anchored on the five point likert format, whereby 1 indicates (Very much unlike me), 2 (Unlike me), 3(Undecided), 4 (Like me), 5 (Very much like me); and the estimated internal consistency was .89.

8. Infertility, Religious Factor, Age at Marriage and Premarital Cohabitation Issues

Measurements for these four variables were determined from the demographic data that formed the section A of the questionnaire. For instance, respondents indicated by ticking the option that suited them most e.g. for infertility, respondents indicated whether they had any children at all; for religious factor, respondents indicated whether the spouse belong to his/her religion or not; for age at marriage, respondents indicated the particular age he/she got married as well as that of the spouse. Finally, only YES or No was required to know whether the couple cohabitated before marriage or not.

9. Procedure for Data Collection

The instrument was administered to the participants at their places of work with the permission of necessary authority for the exercise, and were collected back immediately by the researcher.

10. Data Analysis

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMC) was used to test the hypotheses, while Multiple Regression Statistical Analysis of SPSS software was used to answer the re4search question.

11. Result

Hypothesis One: There will be no significant relationship between infertility and couples' divorce.

Table 1 showed that there was a significant relationship between infertility and couples' divorce ($r = .669$; $P < .05$). This means that infertility influence the level of couples' divorce.

Hypothesis Two: There will be no significant relationship between socioeconomic status and couples' divorce.

Table 2 showed that there was a significant relationship between socio-economic status and couples' divorce ($r = .683$; $P < .05$). This means that socio-economic status influence the level of couples' divorce.

Hypothesis Three: There will be no significant relationship between religious factors and couples' divorce.

Table 3 showed that there was a significant relationship between religious factors and couples' divorce ($r = .858$; $P < .05$). This means that religious factors influence the level of couples' divorce.

Hypothesis Four: There will be no significant relationship between age at marriage and couples' divorce.

Table 4 showed that there was a significant relationship between age at marriage and couples' divorce ($r = .871$; $P < .05$). This means that the age at marriage influence the level of couples' divorce.

Table 1. The summary table showing the relationship between infertility and couples' divorce.

Variable	Mean	SD	N	R-cal	P	Remark
Infertility	3.304	1.759	250	.669	.000	Significant
Divorce	3.368	1.790				

Table 2. The summary table showing the relationship between socio-economic status and couples' divorce.

Variable	Mean	SD	N	R-cal	P	Remark
Socio-Economic Status	32.552	16.809	250	.683	.000	Significant
Divorce	3.368	1.790				

Hypothesis Five: There will be no significant relationship between premarital cohabitation and couples' divorce.

Table 5 showed that there was a significant relationship between premarital cohabitation and couples' divorce ($r = .685$; $P < .05$). This means that premarital cohabitation influence the level of couples' divorce.

Hypothesis Six: There will be no significant relationship between sexual intimacy and couples' divorce.

Table 6 showed that there was a significant relationship between sexual intimacy and couples' divorce ($r = .875$; $P < .05$). This means that sexual intimacy influence the level of couples' divorce.

Hypothesis Seven: There will be no significant relationship between in-law and couples' divorce.

Table 7 showed that there was a significant relationship between In-Law and couples' divorce ($r = .671$; $P < .05$). This means that In-Law influence the level of couples' divorce.

Research Question: What is the joint contribution of psycho-socio-personal variables (infertility, socio-economic status, religious factors, age at marriage, premarital cohabitation, sexual intimacy, and in-law) to the prediction of divorce among couples? The result is presented in **Table 8**.

Table 8 shows that the independent variables (infertility, socio-economic status, religious factors, age at marriage, premarital cohabitation, sexual intimacy and in-law) when pulled together have significant effect on divorce among couples. The value of R (adjusted) = .965 and R^2 (adjusted) = .929, which means that the independent variables account for a whole of = 92.9% of the total variance for the incidence of divorce. The analysis of variance performed on the multiple regressions yielded an F-ratio value of 467.169 and was found to be significant at .05 level.

Table 3. The summary table showing the relationship between religious factors and couples' divorce.

Variable	Mean	SD	N	R-cal	P	Remark
Religious Factors	2.348	1.312	250	.858	.000	Significant
Divorce	3.368	1.790				

Table 4. The summary table showing the relationship between age at marriage and couples' divorce.

Variable	Mean	SD	N	R-cal	P	Remark
Age at Marriage	4.584	2.529	250	.871	.000	Significant
Divorce	3.368	1.790				

Table 5. The summary table showing the relationship between premarital cohabitation and couples' divorce.

Variable	Mean	SD	N	R-cal	P	Remark
Premarital Cohabitation	11.004	5.704	250	.685	.000	Significant
Divorce	3.368	1.790				

Table 6. The summary table showing the relationship between sexual intimacy and couples' divorce.

Variable	Mean	SD	N	R-cal	P	Remark
Sexual Intimacy	39.588	19.585	250	.875	.000	Significant
Divorce	3.368	1.790				

Table 7. The summary table showing the relationship between In-Law and couples' divorce.

Variable	Mean	SD	N	R-cal	P	Remark
In-Law	21.616	9.747	250	.671	.000	Significant
Divorce	3.368	1.790				

Table 8. Multiple regression analysis on couples' divorce data.

Multiple R(adjusted) = .965 Multiple R(adjusted) = .929 Standard error of estimate = .4767				
Analysis of variance				
	Sum of square (SS)	DF	Mean square	F
Regression	743.149	7	106.164	467.169
Residual	54.995	242	.227	
Total	798.144	249		

Looking critically at the correlation **Tables 1-7**, the strength of the relationship of each variable with divorce is clearly demonstrated. It is vividly evident that Sexual intimacy is the strongest factor for divorce ($r = .875$), followed by Age at marriage ($r = .871$), Religious factor ($r = .858$), Premarital cohabitation ($r = .685$), Social economic status ($r = .683$), In-law (.671), and lastly, Infertility ($r = .669$). The entire variables jointly have a total contribution of 92.9% to the prediction of divorce.

12. Discussion of Finding

The findings revealed that there was a significant relationship between infertility and couples' divorce. This means that the infertility influence the level of couples' divorce. This is in line with the studies of [Bennet \(2004\)](#) who found that divorce rates were strongly (and positively) associated with childlessness. This is consistent with the studies of [Groom \(2001\)](#) who found that in Africa, persistent infertility for two or more years could lead to marital instability, infidelity and sexual promiscuity. He further found that the childlessness for longer than five years could actually lead to separation and/or divorce. [Berstler and Newcomb \(2008\)](#) found that the childless couples have higher probability of separation or divorce as compared to those who have children. [O'Connor \(2001\)](#) observed that disharmony of marriage was more evident among childless couples and childless women experienced violence from their husbands.

It was further revealed that there was a significant relationship between socio-economic status and couples' divorce. This means that socio-economic status influence the level of couples' divorce. This is consistent with the studies of [Amato & Previti \(2003\)](#), who found that socio-economic status is integral to the formation and maintenance of intimate unions. Financial independence and stability are widely viewed as a prerequisite for marriage, especially for men ([Bougheas & Yannis, 2009](#)).

It was also revealed that there was a significant relationship between religious factors and couples' divorce. This means that religious factors influence the level of couples' divorce. This is consistent with the studies of [Dunkins \(2000\)](#), which established an inverse relationship between religious homogeneity and suicide rates. Marital quality is influenced by religious involvement, especially when both couples adopt the same religion and the same faith ([Animasahun, 2013, 2014](#)). Involvement in religious activities can help to produce stable marriages ([Broman, 2002](#)).

It was discovered that there was a significant relationship between age at marriage and couples' divorce. This means that the age at marriage influence the level of couples' divorce. This is consistent with the studies of [Animashun \(2013, 2014; Stanley, Markman & Whitton, 2002\)](#) who found that immaturity of couples as well as entering into marriage very late pose danger to marital stability. Expanding on this insight, [Stutzer & Frey \(2003\)](#) advanced the notion of a maturity effect on marriages contracted at an early age as standing at higher risk of disruption because they are more likely to be based on mistaken expectation at young ages whereby individuals have inadequate self knowledge and are uncertain about their own and their partner's potential trajectories.

The findings further revealed that there was a significant relationship between premarital cohabitation and couples' divorce. This means that premarital cohabitation influence the level of couples' divorce. This is consistent with the studies of [Bramlett & Mosher \(2002\)](#) who found that premarital cohabitation is associated with lower marital satisfaction and higher rate of wife infidelity as well as lower commitment to the partnership ([Stanley, Whitton, & Markman, 2004](#)). Also, [Animasahun \(2013\)](#), [Miller, Yorgson, Sandberg, & White \(2003\)](#) found that marriages were more susceptible to divorce for those who cohabitated for longer period of time.

Furthermore, the findings showed that there was a significant relationship between sexual intimacy and couples' divorce this mean that the sexual intimacy influences the level of couples' divorce. Mahoney, Williams, & West (2001) found that a male partner is often emotionally disturbed if he has erectile dysfunction. Bachar & Koss (2001), Bennet (2004), DeMaris & Rao (1992), and DeKeseredy & Schwartz (2002) stressed the importance attached to sex in marriage, and found that marriages that lack intimate sexual relationship are highly susceptible to breakup.

Finally, it was found that there was a significant relationship between In-law and couples' divorce. This means that In-law influence the level of couples' divorce. This is consistent with the studies of Heaton (2000), Waite and Lillard (2001) as well as Herbert (2000) and Halford, Nicholson, & Sanders, (2007) that positive disposition of in-laws enhanced marital satisfaction and improved marital happiness, while in-laws negative disposition to a marital union lead to marriage collapse.

The result of the research question revealed that the independent variables (infertility, socio economic status, religious factors, age at marriage, premarital cohabitation, sexual intimacy and in-law) when pulled together have significant effect on the divorce among couples. The value of R (adjusted) = .965 and R² (adjusted) = .929. The analysis of variance performed on the multiple regressions yielded an F-ratio value of 167.169 and was found to be significant at 0.05 level. This further buttress the earlier findings of Abane (2003), DeMaris & Rao (1992), DeKeseredy & Schwartz (2002), Halford, Nicholson, & Sanders (2007), Animasahun (2013, 2014) who concluded that factors such as age at marriage, infertility, in-law issues, religious factor, issues related to sexual intimacy and satisfaction, premarital cohabitation and socio-economic status could destabilize marriage and pave way for divorce.

In summary therefore, the study revealed that there was a significant relationship between each of the followings: infertility, socio-economic status, religious factor, age at marriage, premarital co-habitation, sexual intimacy, as well as in-law factor, and divorce. Also, all these independent variables jointly accounted for a whole of 92.9% of the total variance for the incidence of divorce.

13. Limitations

The following limitations could be observed in the study:

- a) The study was carried out only in Ibadan metropolis, Oyo state. This could hinder the generalization of the study.
- b) Only two hundred and fifty participants were used for the study. This number does not represent the total number of divorcees in Ibadan alone, let alone Oyo state or Nigeria as a whole.
- c) The study accounted for only seven factors that could cause divorce, leaving out several other factors such as: self efficacy, emotional intelligence, tolerance, forgiveness, provision etc.

14. Suggestion for Further Study

The above limitations could guide the future researchers on incidence of divorce to use a wider scope, go beyond Oyo state, use various tribes and ethnic origins, involve larger participants, and use other factors that could cause divorce. Also, since this is a survey study, other researchers could investigate the causes of divorce experimentally.

15. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

- 1) Married couples should endeavour to establish effective intimacy among themselves, enjoy healthy sex together and relate to each other in a good manner; this will help to strengthen their marital quality in the society.
- 2) Married couples are to be enlightened on the importance of discipline and how to refrain from extra marital sexual affairs and other bad behaviours and characters that could harm the other partner or their family. This would facilitate restriction to spousal sex interest alone and enhance sexual intimacy.
- 3) The parent and guardians of married couples need to relate with the couples in a good manner and when there is misunderstanding between the couple, they should be able to settle it amicably, and do not interfere or poke nose unnecessarily in the affairs of the couple.
- 4) Counseling/marital psychologist should intensify their efforts to organize seminars/conferences on the im-

plications of these factors (infertility, socio-economic status, religious factors, age at marriage, premarital cohabitation, and in-law issues among others) on divorce among couples.

5) The religious organizational leaders are to fuse into their teaching effective ways through which divorce among couples could be minimized or totally eradicated in the society.

6) Effective mode of child rearing and parenting are to be given to the married couples and parents in the society. This will help in reducing the level of poor premarital cohabitation, sexual intimacy, and in-law problems and thereby help to stabilize marital relationship in the society.

References

- Abane, H. (2003). *For Better for Worse: Social Dimension of Marital Conflict in Ghana in Gender and Behaviour*. Vol. 1, Ile-Ife: Ife Psychologia.
- Amato, P. R., & Previti, D. (2003). People's Reasons for Divorcing: Gender, Social Class, the Life Course, and Adjustment. *Journal of Family Issues*, 24, 602-626. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192513X03024005002>
- Animasahun, R. A. (2011). Influence of Marital Discord, Separation and Divorce on Poor Academic Performance of Undergraduate Students of University of Ibadan. *Nigerian School Health Journal*, 23, 79-90.
- Animasahun, R. A. (2013). *Psychology of Divorce. GCE 751 Lecture Series*. Ibadan: Department of Guidance and Counseling, University of Ibadan.
- Animasahun, R. A. (2014). Marital Conflict, Divorce and Single Parenthood as Predictors of Adolescents' Antisocial Behaviours in Ibadan. *British Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, 4, 592-602.
- Animasahun, R. A., & Femi Fatile, E. A. (2011). Patterns of Marital Instability among Married Couples in Lagos, Nigeria. *Journal of African Studies and Development*, 3.
- Asana, F. A. (2000). Problems of Marriage and Family Life in an African Context: The Perspectives of the Christian Pastor as a Counsellor. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51, 5.
- Bachar, K., & Koss, M. P. (2001). From Prevalence to Prevention: Closing the Gap between What We Know about Rape and What We Do. In C. M. Renzetti, J. L. Edleson, & R. K. Bergen (Eds.), *Sourcebook on Violence against Women* (pp. 117-142). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bennet, W. J. (2004). *Effect of Christian Values on Marital Satisfaction*. An Unpublished Masters Degree Manuscript, Social Science (Counselling), Adelaide: University of South of Australia.
- Bentler, P. M., & Newcomb, M. D. (2008). *Longitudinal Study of Marital Success and Failure*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bergen, R. K. (2006). *Wife Rape: Understanding the Response of Survivors and Service Providers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Billings, A. (1979). Conflict Resolution in Distressed and Non-Distressed Married Couples. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 47, 368-376. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.47.2.368>
- Booth, A., Johnson, D. R., White, L. K., & Edwards, J. N. (1995). Predicting Divorce and Permanent Separation. *Journal of Family Issues*, 6, 331-346. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/019251385006003005>
- Borgatta, F. E., & Edgor, A. (2000). *Encyclopedia of Sociology* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishers.
- Bougheas, S., & Yannis, G. (2009). The Effect of Divorce Costs on Marriage Formation and Dissolution. *Journal of Population Economics*, 12, 489-498. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s001480050110>
- Bradbury, T. N., & Fincham, F. D. (1990). Attributions in Marriage: Review and Critique. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 3-33. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.1.3>
- Bramlett, M. D., & Mosher, W. D. (2002). Cohabitation, Marriage, Divorce and Re-Marriage in the United States. Vital Health Statistics, Series Report 23, No. 2, Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.
- Broman, C. (2002). Thinking of Divorce but Staying Married: The Interplay of Race and Marital Satisfaction. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 37, 151-161. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J087v37n01_09
- Dehie, C., Larsen, D., & Landers, J. E. (2001). Social Support in Marriage. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 29, 307-324. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01926180126500>
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (2002). Theorizing Public Housing Woman Abuse as a Function of Economic Exclusion and Male Peer Support. *Women's Health and Urban Life*, 1, 26-45.
- DeMaris, A. (2000). Till Discord Do Us Part: The Role of Physical and Verbal Conflict in Union Disruption. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 683-692. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00683.x>
- DeMaris, A., & Rao, K. V. (1992). Premarital Cohabitation and Subsequent Marital Stability in the United States: A Reassessment. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54, 178-190. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/353285>

- Dunkins, B. (2000). *Ethnic Weddings Traditions: Customs and Cultural Differences in Ceremonies and Receptions*. A Presentation at the Association of Wedding Professionals, Washington DC: Association of Wedding Professionals.
- Erbert, L. A. (2000). Conflict and Dialectics: Perceptions of Dialectical Contradictions in Marital Conflict. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 17, 638-659. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265407500174009>
- Erbert, L. A., & Duck, S. W. (1997). Rethinking Satisfaction in Personal Relationships from a Dialectical Perspective. In R. J. Sternberg, & M. Hojjat (Eds.), *Satisfaction in Close Relationships* (pp. 190-216). New York: Guilford.
- Groom, J. (2001). What Works in Premarital Counselling. *Journal of Pastoral Counselling*, 36, 46-64.
- Gurman, A. S., & Fraenkel, P. (2002). The History of Couple Therapy: A Millennial Review. *Family Process*, 41, 199-260. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.2002.41204.x>
- Halford, K., Nicholson, J., & Sanders, M. (2007). Couple Communication in Stepfamilies. *Family Process*, 46, 471-483. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.2007.00226.x>
- Heaton, T. B. (2000). Factors Contributing to Increasing Marital Stability in the United States. *Journal of Family Issues*, 23, 392-409. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192513X02023003004>
- Heaton, T. B., & Albrecht, S. L. (1991). Stable Unhappy Marriages. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 747-758. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/352748>
- Ibokete, E. G. (2000). *Two Therapeutic Techniques in the Management of Battering among Some Married Women in Lagos Metropolis*. PhD Thesis, Ibadan: University of Ibadan.
- Isiugo-Abanihe, U. C. (1998). Extramarital Relations and Perceptions of HIV/AIDS in Nigeria. *Health Transition Review*, 4, 111-125.
- Mahoney, P., & Williams, L. M. (1998). Sexual Assault in Marriage: Prevalence, Consequences, and Treatment of Wife Rape. In J. L. Jasinski, & L. M. Williams (Eds.), *Partner Violence: A Comparative Review of 20 Years of Research* (pp. 113-162). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mahoney, P., Williams, L. M., & West, C. M. (2001). Violence against Women by Intimate Relationship Partners. In C. M. Renetti, J. J. Edleson, & R. M. K. Bergen (Eds.), *Sourcebook on Violence against Women* (pp. 143-178). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miller, R. B., Yorgason, J. B., Sandberg, J. G., & White, M. B. (2003). Problems That Couples Bring to Therapy: A View across the Family Life Cycle. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 31, 395-407. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01926180390223950>
- O'Connor, M. L. (2001). Men Who Have Many Sexual Partners before Marriage Are More Likely to Engage in Extramarital Intercourse. *International Family Planning Perspectives*, 27, 48-49. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2673807>
- Olarinmoye, E. A. (2001). *Psychological and Social Consequences of Divorce in Ibadan, with Special Reference to Yoruba Customary Law Marriage*. PhD Thesis, Ibadan: University of Ibadan.
- Raphael, J. (2001). Public Housing and Domestic Violence. *Violence against Women*, 7, 699-706. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/10778010122182677>
- Rogness, M. (2002). *Toward an Integrated Male Peer Support Model of Marital Rape in the United States*. M.A. Project, Athens: Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ohio University.
- South, S. J. (2001). The Geographic Context of Divorce: Do Neighborhoods Matter? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 755-766. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00755.x>
- Stanley, S. M. (2001). Making a Case for Premarital Education. *Family Relations*, 50, 272-280. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2001.00272.x>
- Stanley, S. M., Markman, H. J., & Whitton, S. W. (2004). Communication, Conflict, and Commitment. Insights on the Foundations of Relationship Success from a National Survey. *Family Process*, 42, 659-675.
- Stutzer, A., & Frey, B. S. (2003). *Does Marriage Make People Happy, or Do Happy People Get Married?* Working Paper, No. 143, Zurich: Institute for Empirical Research in Economics, University of Zurich.
- Waite, L. J., & Lillard, L. A. (1991). Children and Marital Disruption. *American Journal of Sociology*, 96, 930-953. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/229613>