COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND SOCIO-EMOTIONAL EFFECTS OF LIVING APART ON NEWLYWEDS AND OLDER COUPLES IN KADUNA STATE

BY

NWOSU AMARACHI

M.ED/EDUC/01660/2008-09

DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL

AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA

NOVEMBER, 2012

COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND SOCIO-EMOTIONAL EFFECTS OF LIVING APART ON NEWLYWEDS AND OLDER COUPLES IN KADUNA STATE

BY

NWOSU AMARACHI

M.ED/EDUC/01660/2008-2009

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUATE STUDY, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD OF MASTERS OF EDUCATION (M.ED) DEGREE IN HOME ECONOMICS (FAMILY AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT) AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA.

DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

HOME ECONOMICS SECTION

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA

NOVEMBER, 2012

DECLARATION

I declared that this thesis entitled "Comparative Study on the Socio-Economic and Socio-Emotional Effects of Living Apart on Newlyweds and Older Couples in Kaduna State" has been conducted by me in the Department of Vocational and Technical Education under the supervision of Dr. (Mrs) E.E. Adamu and Prof. (Mrs) T.O Ojo. The information derived from the literature had been dully acknowledged in the text and the list of references provided. No part of this Thesis was previously presented for another degree at my university.

_____ _____

Nwosu Amarachi Date
Name of student

CERTIFICATION

This research entitled "Comparative Study on the Socio-Economic and Socio-Emotional Effects of Living Apart on Newlyweds and Older Couples in Kaduna State" meets the regulation governing the award of the Degree of Masters of Education (Home Economics) of Ahmadu Bello University and was approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

Dr. (Mrs) E.E. Adamu	***Sign***	***Date***
Chairperson, Supervisory Committee		
Prof. (Mrs) T.O. Ojo	***Sign***	***Date***
Member, Supervisory Committee		
Dr. I. M Haruna	***Sign***	***Date***
Head of Department		
Prof. A.A. Joshua	***Sign***	***Date***
Dean of Postgraduate Studies		

DEDICATION

The research work is dedicated to the Almighty God the Creator of heaven and earth. Also, in the memory of the researcher's deceased father and brother: Chief J.E. Nwosu and Mr. Patrick Nwosu, continue to rest in the bosom of the Lord, may your gentle souls rest in perfect peace. Amen.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher owes her ineffable gratitude to the Almighty God for His Divine provision, protection, guidance and knowledge throughout the course of this study. May all Glory, thanksgiving, praise, honour is ascribed unto Him forever and ever more, Amen.

The researcher unreserved, profound gratitude goes to her supervisors Dr. (Mrs) E.E. Adamu, and Prof. (Mrs) T.O. Ojo who through their patience, understanding, contribution, advice, criticism and constructive corrections made this project worthwhile. They taught the researcher not to have apathy and despair, but to have faith, to be focused and believe God would bring something out of nothing. May God Almighty continue to strengthen them the more.

Similarly the researcher acknowledge the support and contribution of the following in the Department of Vocational and Technical Education and Post Graduate Committee members in the persons of Dr. I.M Haruna, Dr. (Mrs) P.E. Onuigbo, Dr. (Mrs) E.E Adamu, Prof. (Mrs) T.O Ojo, Prof. (Mrs) E. Ike, Dr. (Mrs) S.L. Ajayi, Prof. A. Z. Muhammed, Dr. D.O. Oni, Prof. A.A Udoh, Dr. M.M Aliyu, Dr. Okeh, and Dr, S. Ndomi for their moral support, and valuable suggestions towards the accomplishment of this work.

Word of appreciation goes to my wonderful family especially my mother who gave me her love, encouragement and help at various stages of this work, May Almighty God bless and reward you all.

The researcher registers her sincere appreciation to all the eight research assistants who helped to administer questionnaires which was the major instrument of this research and to Mr. Josh, the statistician who assisted in the analysis of the data; Mr. Ndamudi Sunday Daniel, who

processes and typed the research work. Thank you for your words of advice, patience, prayers and May God bless you.

The researcher appreciates her friends, colleagues, schoolmates and friends in the Lord for their love, prayers and encouragement during the period of this study.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to compare the socio-economic and socio-emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State. Six specific objectives with six research questions were stated and four Null Hypotheses were formulated. Among the objectives were to find out the socio-economic effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples and to compare the socio-emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State. The sample size used for the study was three hundred and seventy (370) employed married men and women, consisting of 164 newlyweds and 206 older couples. Structured questionnaire was used in collecting data. A total of 380 copies of questionnaire were administered and 370 copies were retrieved. Survey research design was adopted for the study using purposive sampling technique. The population for the study was drawn from eleven (11) Local Government Areas in Kaduna State. The population for the study consisted of Eight Hundred and Forty-One Thousand Eight Hundred and Twenty-Four (841,824) employed literate married men and women. Analysis of data was done using frequencies, percentile and mean. Four Null Hypotheses were tested using two-tailed Independent T-test statistics at 0.05 level of significance. The result showed significant difference for hypotheses three (3) and four (4), while a test of no significant difference in hypotheses one (1) and two (2) were obtained. Findings revealed that the most prevalent reasons influencing living apart among couples were differences in job location and career demand. Findings also revealed that couples living apart encounter financial strain in maintaining two homes and spent more on commuting to see one another. It was also discovered that socio-emotional effects of living apart leads to emotional insecurity and causes couples to spend less time relating emotionally to one another. Findings furthers revealed that newlywed couples are negatively affected socio-emotionally compared to older couples living apart. It was also concluded that newlyweds and older couples living apart suffer socio-emotionally and financially. Among the recommendations made was the need to educate young adults by Home Economist and Family Life Educator on living apart relationship before making the decision to live apart.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page…	…	…	…	…	i
Declaration …	…	…	…	…	ii
Certification…	…	…	…	…	iii
Dedication…	…	…	…	…	iv
Acknowledgements…	…	…	…	…	v
Abstract…	…	…	…	…	vii
Table of Content…	…	…	…	…	viii
List of Tables…	…	…	…	…	x
List of Abbreviation…	…	…	…	…	xii
Operational Definition of Term…		…	…	…	xiii

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1	Background of the Study…	…	…	…	1
1.2	Statement of the Problem…	…	…	…	5
1.3	Objectives of the Study…	…	…	…	8
1.4	Research Questions…	…	…	…	9
1.5	Hypotheses of the Study…	…	…	…	10
1.6	Significance of the Study…	…	…	…	10
1.7	Assumptions of the Study…	…	…	…	11
1.8	Delimitation of the Study…	…	…	…	12

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1	Theoretical and Conceptual Frame Work… … …	14
2.2	Types of Living Apart Relationship among Couples…… …	18
2.3	Factors Influencing Living Apart among Couples… … …	20
2.4	Benefits Associated with Living Apart Couples… … …	26
2.5	Risks Associated with Couples Living Apart… … …	29
2.6	Impact of Career and Geo-Location on Couples Living Apart… …	32
2.7	The Effects of Couples Living Apart on Marriage and Family Relationship… … … … …	35
2.8	The Effects of Socio Economic Perceptive on Couples Living Apart… … … … …	48
2.9	The Socio Emotional Effect of Living Apart on Couples… …	50
2.10	Coping Strategies that can be utilized by Newlyweds and Older Couples Living Apart… … … …	53
2.11	Empirical Studies… … … … …	57
2.12	Summary of Review of Related Literature … … …	64

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1	Research Design… … … … …	67
3.2	Population for the Study…. … … … …	67
3.3	Sample Size and Sampling Procedure… … … …	68
3.4	Instrument for Data Collection… … … …	71
3.4.1	Validity of the Instrument… … … … …	73
3.4.2	Pilot Study… … … … … …	73
3.4.3	Reliability of the Instrument… … … …	74

3.5 Procedure for Data Collection… … … … 74

3.6 Procedure for Data Analysis… … … … 75

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION

4.1 Analysis of Demographic Characteristic of the Respondents… … 77

4.2 Answer to Research Questions… … … … 80

4.3 Test of Null Hypotheses… … … … … 91

4.4 Discussion on Findings… … … … … 94

4.5 Summary of Findings… … … … … 99

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary… … … ... … … 101

5.2 Conclusion… … … … … … 104

5.3 Recommendations … … … … … 104

5.4.1 Limitation of the Study… … … … … 106

5.4.2 Suggestions for Further Study … … … … 106

REFERENCES… … … … … … 107

APPENDICES A-C … … … … … 119

TABLES **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 2.1:	Common Stress Reactions on Children When Couples Live Apart… … … …	46
Table 3.1:	Population for the Study ... … …	68
Table 3.2:	Sample Size for the Study … … …	70
Table 3.3	Breakdown of the Questionnaire Items … …	72
Table 4.1.1:	Classification of the Respondents by their Gender… … … … …	77
Table 4:2.2:	Age (in Years) of Respondents… … …	77
Table 4.1.3:	Respondents Higher Educational Qualification… …	78
Table 4.1.4:	Occupation of the Respondents… … …	79
Table 4.1.5:	Number of Years in Marriage of the Respondents… …	79
Table 4.1.6:	Types of Living Apart Practiced by the Respondents …	80
Table 4.2.1	Distribution of Respondents on Reasons Influencing Living Apart … … … …	81
Table 4.2.2	Distribution of Respondents on the Socio-Economic Effects of Living Apart on Couples… … …	82
Table 4.2.3:	Distribution of Respondent on the Socio Emotional Effects of Living Apart Newlyweds and Older Couples… …	84
Table 4.2.4	Distribution of Respondents of the Comparable Differences in the Socio Economic Effects of Living Apart Among Newlyweds and Older Couples… … …	86
Table 4.2.5	Distribution of Respondents on the Comparable Difference in the Socio Emotional Effects of Living Apart on Newly Weds and Older Couples… … …	88
Table 4.2.6:	Distribution of Respondents Opinion on the Coping Strategies Utilized by Couples Living Apart … … …	90
Table 4.3.1	Independent T-test result on the reasons influencing living apart among newlyweds and older couples… …	92
Table 4.3.2	Independent T-test result on the socio economic effects of living apart on newlywed couples … …	93

Table 4.3.3 Independent T-test results on the socio emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples… … 93

Table 4.3.4 Independent T-test result on the coping strategies utilized by the newlyweds and older couples living apart… … 94

LIST OF ABBREVIATION

LAT:	Living Apart Together
SPSS:	Statistical Package for Social Science
UNESCO:	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Education

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Commuter Marriage:	A marriage in which partners live and work in separate geographical areas and get together intermittently.
Dual Career Couples:	Both heads of the household pursue career and the work require a high degree of commitment character involving increasing degrees of responsibility.
Geographical Mobility:	The movement by people from one level of class hierarchy to another.
Living Apart Together:	Is a relationship in which married couples feel committed to each other but do not maintain a common household.
Living Apart:	Is a commuter marriage where couples maintain two residences in different geographical location and are separated for at least three or nights.
Newlyweds:	These are the most recently married couples who are within 0 – 10years in marriage experience.
Older couples:	These are married couple who had been married for 11years and above with marital experience.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.8 Background to the Study

In the past, people fell in love, got married and set up homes together. The idea was to integrate another person into their lives by living together. This frame work within which marriage occurred has changed drastically, as some married couples now live separately from one another, thus identifying themselves as couple while still committed to each other. According to Levin (2004), this phenomenon is coined "Living apart together" (LAT). This was affirmed by Levin and Trost (2004) who pointed out that, living apart together is a relationship in which individual feel committed to each other and enjoy erotic and sexual sharing but do not maintain a common household. Living apart together (LAT), is the accepted term for people having a regular partner in what is understood to be a sexual relationship, though residing separately. They may be of the same sex as well as opposite sexes. A married couple could be in a living apart together relationship, if they maintain two separate addresses and do not live together. However, living apart relationship is in one respect similar to co-residence, cohabitation, or living together, in that the partners involved regard themselves as couple, and friends and relatives know and accept them as husband and wife (Ermisch and Seidler, 2009).

Levin and Trost (1999), in a study, confirmed that living apart together is perceived to be a medium or long term choice for a flexible type of living arrangement, where this type of union is socially recognized and accepted as a distinct type of relationship termed *Sarbo*. Although, the number of couples choosing this kind of living arrangement was estimated to have increased during the 90s, but the exact figure were difficult to produce. One estimate was that, 60,000

couples were LAT in 1993, as compared to those with 130,000 couples in 1998, (Levin and Trost, 2000). Kiernan, (2002) opined that young women aged 29-49, who had never lived together with their husbands, were living apart from their spouse. According to Levin, (2004) living apart relationship is a new family form which existed in the past, but in recent years has become much more prevalent and visible in the society. Until recently, majority of the research studies on LAT relationships originated from Scandinavian countries such as Sweden and Norway. According to 2006 data from the United States Census Bureau, there were 3.8 million married couples who lived apart from their partners. Studies conducted in 1993 in Sweden showed that approximately two percent (2%) of Sweden ages 18-70 for (35, 000 couples) were in living apart relationship by 2001 this had increased to over five (5%) (75, 000 couples), (Allapia, 2010).

Haskey, (2005) affirmed that, living apart among couples was an intimate and exclusive relationship, where both couples may or may not be legally married and but chose to maintain separate living arrangement. The couples marital relationship is generally viewed as monogamous in nature and their living arrangement are perceived to be more than temporary fleeting or casual relationship. Nevertheless, Haskey (2005) further affirmed that, living apart together is the most common name for this arrangement, although, other names included are:

a. Non-co residential cohabitation
b. One couple two household
c. Dual dwelling separately
d. Long term, two-home relationship.

All these names refer to the same basic theme. Some definition implies two separate dwellings to have distinct and separate space for each person in it, (Heartchoice, 2010).

The decisions to live apart or wanting to maintain separate space are many and varied. Socio-economic factors such as occupational reasons or difference in career, being responsible for elderly parents, unemployment, geographical location and personal preference, all play a part in decision to live apart, as well as practical matters like socio-emotional status of the couples makes it difficult, even, when the couples would actually like to, (Binstock and Thornton, 2003). Binstock and Thornton (2003) went on to state that, families/couples might continue to live in different places but can be reunited through regular visits of either one of the couples or children. Notably, it is costly to maintain dual household, even though it favors one gender rather than the other. This reunion could be possible by different regular visit (once in every month or more), occasional family reunion (during school holiday or religious feast) and the decision to resume co-residences (after graduation or retirement).

In addition, living apart relationship among couples is a way of preserving independent. Florida (2004) remarked that there are couples who live apart because of the difficulty in locating residential accommodation or school near their place of work or employment, examples of such individuals in the living apart relationship includes; bankers, military personnel, construction workers and politicians. Hence these couples find living apart preferable to living together giving the challenges of living separately. Also, there might be small children or elderly parents living with one of the living apart partner and it would be disruptive to bring a new person into the existing living arrangements.

As it is said that “absence makes the heart grow fonder” and “absence is to love, why the wind is to a fire. If the wind is little, it fans the flame of fire aglow but when the wind is strong, it quenches the fire”. So it is when couples live apart, the short absence of a partner fuels the passion of love and makes one yearn for the partner, but when absence too long and to live apart, it wearies the heart, leading to impatience and lack of commitment in the marital relationship,(Obasakin,1993). Holmes (2006) found that living apart among couples is not the same for everyone; it involves challenges and adapting to new situation both socially and emotionally, it may take a while to deal with all the emotions and stresses of living apart from spouse. This is because when couples live together, spend time together, memories are built around family activities, thus togetherness help eliminate isolation, loneliness, and depression. Thereby helping the couples develop an identity to avoid future problems in marriage relationship. Stelak, (2006) saw that, couples living apart are most often faced with unavailability of the other partner and where a partner is hardly available, it makes the second partner to be withdrawn, distancing him/herself from the second partner. The distance created among the couples leads to distrust and tension in marriage. Similarly, children social emotional competence is often linked to the emotional lives of their parents; where a parent displays negative emotional expressiveness, the children may have low socio-emotional competence. Though parent differs in the way they relate with each child, but when emotions are tempered, the children are often the victims (Stelack, 2006).

Furthermore, the influence of social and economic issues such as jobs, schools, and better accommodation has made it impossible for couples to live together. Ononuju (2004), opined that, the successful achievement and satisfaction of members in a family depends on the initial handling of relationship by the couple. Almighty God also saw that the only way for couples to

overcome challenges in marriage was to stay in unity and togetherness in marriage. It is on this basis that, God commanded (in Deuteronomy 24:5) that "When a man hath taken a new wife, he shall not go out to war, neither shall he be charged with any business; but he shall be free at home one year and shall cheer up his wife which he hath taken". The newlyweds were to stay together for one whole year to protect the relationship from too much outside influence and pressure and have the opportunity to mature the relationship. Yet couples must make frantic effort to meet with the social and economic demands of their immediate environment, (Kumuyi, 2004). Newly married, fairly old and even those who are married for decades are faced with these peculiar problems. Therefore the decision to live apart produce a lifestyle that is difficult at best, endorsed enthusiastically.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Entering into marriage normally involves living together; this is probably the basic form of marriage. According to Batur-laha (2002), marriage is supposed to be a harmonious integration of husband and wife. Many other factors such as psycho-social, cultural and economic problems make people to deviate significantly from the objective of marriage-living together. Living together in marriage means husband and wife sharing the same and one residence or household, newly wedded and older couples benefit equally from marriage when they live together. Socio emotionally and socio economically, couples live longer, happier, healthier and wealthier lives when they live together. Socio economically husbands typically gain greater health benefits while wives gains greater financial advantage. When couples live together, their marriage are defined as a creation that has taken hard work, dedication and commitment (to each other and to the institution of marriage), but when they live apart the

happiness of shared lives in friendship and compatible interests and value are altered, (Adams and Chase, 2002).

In Nigerian context most couples marry in their quest for intimacy, companionship and mutual affection but paradoxically intimacy too often decline and sometimes are completely destroyed after marriage. Although, living apart is always an exhilarating experience especially for young couples because it will soon be discovered that the journey through living apart in marriage is full of ups and downs, delights and despairs, daylights and darkness. All these are not peculiar to any age or length of marriage (Fitchen, 1994).

However, from the researcher's interactions with couples living apart from their spouse in school, place of work, and visit to families, it was discovered that due to the rapid changes in an era of globalization, crave for luxury that is not attainable and the increasing reliance of couples and families on two incomes have altered the living together of couples, as both couples strive to attain high socio-economic status. Young couples now leave the other partner, so that one is available to care for the children or home. In the midst of all these, the living arrangement of couples has become disorganized as a partner move for example from one location to another location to work in the state of being on transfer or have gained a better employment but no better accommodation. These expectations are charged with those in the banking sectors, forces, politicians and construction workers. Notably, it was also discovered that wives complained that they missed the emotional protection that they expect from the concept "husband" as such the wives have propensity to feel a loose of protection in their marriage relationship. In like manner, the husbands express much unhappiness about the loss of emotional closeness from their wives. Also, some couples living apart said that this living apart arrangement affect them socially and

economically (low standard of living). A number of wives who are living apart from their husbands complained that, they are financially disadvantaged because they are not living with their spouses and this has caused untold hardship to them and their children

In line with the above statement, Chang and Browdewood (1996) reported that couples who are in a living apart relationship revealed that the emotional cost of living apart include lack of emotional support and companionship as well as the feeling of loneliness, tension, frustration and even depression. Younger couples who are living apart fear that they will grow apart and jeopardize their marriage. Boman, (2004), remarked that the distance created during the time couples are living apart causes distrust and gradually reduces the passion between them. This has however affected most marriages thus, leading to decline in rate of marriages, children born out of wedlock, high divorce rate, single parenting and child delinquency.

Consequently, Astone and McLanahan, (1994) pointed out that couples who are living apart lamented that this living arrangement have negative effects on the children, thus influencing a number of outcomes including school dropout rates, delinquent behavior, and substance abuse. While for some newlyweds couples living apart and the stress of commuting to see their spouse is not economically rewarding. This has discouraged them, hence precipitating a separation that may have happened at the later date.

Similarly, Ayodeji (2010) confirmed that women whose husbands are residing apart claimed that they were already in a fresh relationship with other men because they perceived that their husbands were already in a relationship with other women in America and they are already anticipating divorce with other women in America. From the foregoing discussions, it can be established that the consequent effects of this living arrangement among couples has affected the

socio economic status and socio emotional relationship of newlyweds and older couples living apart. It is in the light of all these challenges that this study was conducted to compare the socio economic and socio emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State, with the view of identifying reasons influencing living apart among couples, the socio economic status and socio emotional effects on the couples and to identify effective coping strategies used by couples living apart in order to strengthen their marriage and family relationship.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the study was to compare the socio-economic and socio-emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State.

Specific objectives of the study are to;

1. establish the reasons that influence living apart among newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State.
2. determine the socio economic effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State.
3. establish the socio- emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State.
4. compare the differences in the socio -economic effects of living apart on newlyweds couples as compared to older couples in Kaduna State.
5. compare the differences in the socio- emotional effects of living apart on newlywed couples as compared to older couples in Kaduna State.

6. identify coping strategies that are utilized by newlyweds and older couples living apart in Kaduna State.

1.4 Research Questions

Based on the research objectives, the following research questions were drawn to guide the study.

1. What are the reasons that influence living apart among newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State?
2. What are the socio economic effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State?
3. What are the socio emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State?
4. What are the differences in the socio- economic effects of living apart between newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State?
5. What are the differences in the socio-emotional effects of living apart between newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State?
6. What are the coping strategies utilized by the newlyweds and older couples involved in a living apart relationship in Kaduna State?

1.5 Hypotheses of the Study

The following Null hypotheses served as guide in the study.

Ho_1. There is no significant difference between the reasons that influence living apart on newlywed couples and older couples in Kaduna State.

Ho_2. There is no significant difference between the socio economic effects of living apart on the newlywed couples and older couples in Kaduna State.

Ho_3. There is no significant difference in the socio emotional effects of living apart on the newlywed couples and older couples in Kaduna State.

Ho_4. There is no significant difference between the coping strategies utilized by the newlywed couples and older couples living apart in Kaduna State.

1.6 Significance of the Study

In theory, living apart need not mean divorce or disconnection. In reality, it often means having two parents who could not find it in themselves to stay or live together. A greater distance between husbands and wives affect their relationship as well as their marriage, which could lead to frustration that is why living apart relationship is a more difficult process than most couples anticipate. The findings of this study will be beneficial to the newlyweds and older couples in

that, it will help them identify useful coping strategies that could be employed for successful living apart arrangement.

The research work will be of great importance for both the young and older couples, and families in several ways; because newlyweds, older couples and families will be enlightened on various types of living apart arrangement encountered by newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State. It will also help them to understand more about living apart on their own right by providing some insights into factors influencing living apart among couples, this will help them avoid being strapped with serious marital problems and to understand the need to bear the burden of parenting together and strengthening family relationship in other to develop a lifestyle that suit family members.

The result of this study will be valuable to family life educators, because it will sensitize families in Kaduna State on the effect of living apart on couples and parent-child relationship and to understand their own (couple) relationship while living apart. The findings of the study will also provide special information for Home Economics students to utilize the findings of this research in guiding young adults in the society towards decision making in living apart relationship and to utilize the findings of this research for curriculum review.

The research work, will also serve as a reference for other researchers on similar topic.

1.7 Assumptions of the Study

The basic assumptions on this study are that:

1. living apart among couples is responsible for decline in marriage rate, high divorce rate and single parenting.

2. unemployment, lack of better accommodation are the reasons responsible for the decision to live apart among newlyweds and older couples.
3. the decisions to live apart are influenced by both husbands and wives opinion.
4. newlyweds and older couples are negatively affected socio economically when they live apart.
5. newlyweds and older couples are negatively affected socio emotionally when they live apart.
6. utilizing appropriate coping strategies will help couples living apart in their marriage and family relationship.

1.8 Delimitation of the Study

The study embraced the comparison of socio economic and socio emotional effect of living apart on newlyweds and older couples. The survey study was delimited to 11 Local Government Areas in Kaduna State. The rationale behind the choice of these areas is due to the fact that Kaduna State is an exciting state with wide range of ethnic groups. The study was delimited to newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State, however, couples who are married from 0 to 10 years was regarded as newlyweds, while 11 years and above in marriage was regarded as older couples. The study was delimited to employed literate married men and women (newlyweds and older couples) working with the civil and public service commission in Kaduna State for accessibility.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter was concerned with the review of relevant literature to the study, in order to gain adequate insight on what other scholars and researchers have studied. The review covered the following sub-headings;

2.1 Theoretical and Conceptual Frame Work

2.2 Types of Living Apart Relationship among Newlyweds and Older Couples

2.3 Reasons Influencing Living Apart among Couples.

2.4 Benefits Associated with Living Apart Couples

2.5 Risks Associated with Couples Living Apart

2.6 The Impact of Career and Geo-Location on Couples Living Apart

2.7 The Effects of Couples Living Apart on Marriage and Family Relationship

2.8 The Effects of Socio Economic Effects Living Apart on Couples

2.9 The Socio Emotional Effects of Living Apart on Couples.

2.10 Coping Strategies that are utilized by Newlyweds and Older Couples

2.11 Empirical Studies

2.12 Summary of Review of Related Literature.

2.1 Theoretical and Conceptual Frame Work

As rationale creatures, human beings seek explanations when husband and wife live apart, family and friends for instance look for answers to a variety of questions. What happened? Why are they living separately? What will happen to them and the children in this type of living arrangement? These questions form the theoretical bedrock in the structural Functional Theory. Functionalism theories are significant in the works of Murdock (1897-1985) and Parsons (1902-1979).

According to McLennam, Ryan and Spoonley (2000), functionalists' theories in family sociology explain social institution like the family. Hence the structural functionalist perspective of the family is closely associated with Parsons and Murdock, which focuses on the family and its relationship to society. The family as theorized by Murdock (1949) is a social group characterized by common residence economic cooperation and reproduction; it includes adult of both sexes at least two of whom can maintain a socially approved sexual and familiar behavior.

On the hand, Parsons (1951) theorized that, societies evolved as a result of family and its functional adaptations to the problems presented by inter relationship between and within the family system that make up the social totality. The functionalism functionalist believed that every family is useful and indispensable to the individual and the society. This is because the family contributes to the smooth running of the society.

Parsons (1987) further analyzed the family in the modern society, as providing new members for the society, (reproduction), for its members (economic) and socializing the young into the society, norms and value (education). According to the theory of Parsons (1902-1979)

the family is a modern strip down of the family structure; appropriate for an advance modern industrialize society. As society industrialized and become more complex, increasing division of labour (dual career) becomes visible among heads of the households. The theory further holds that, the role of the family living together does not just socialize children but also adults. Yet the majority of adults (husbands and wives) do not live in this fashion at any given time. The husbands and wives live apart from one another, at one point in time or another. Parsons' major premise is that, the differentiation gender roles within the family, with each partner filling one of two somewhat opposing role but complementary function, remains stable to destabilizing forces, when unwanted changes is threatened.

Murdock (1949), structural functional theory, identified four basic functions of the family which is; providing a common residence, economic cooperation, reproduction, and sex. However, Murdock's first identified two basic functions are used to explain the theory of living apart among couples.

1. **Common Residence;** in recent decades changes in the society have created many several of these functions. One of such changes is living apart among couples, for example, spouses maintain separate residences for much of the time. Seeing each other only on weekend or occasionally during the month. Today the expected norms for common residence for husbands and wives have been drastically altered. Some members of the family may share a common residence only for some time, but they still form a family.

2. **Economic Cooperation;** economic cooperation is a broad concept that can include a wide range of activities from maintaining a household to earning an income. Historically many families moved off the family farm and came to depend more on those outside the

family for the production of goods and services. As families become consumers rather than producers, earning an income become more necessary. Partly because of increasing demands for income, wives as well as husbands were enlisted in the task of providing a living. Thus, spouses became mutually dependent in fulfilling this task.

To sum up these theories, the modern family is seen as perfectly suited to the task of socialization in a modern industrial society where individuals in achievement orientation are required. The family and the links to the wider world through fathers' occupation ensure the propulsion of the mother in to industrial and social economic challenging world.

2.1.1 Conceptual Frame Work

Societies are built upon some sort of marriage and some have also constructed non marital cohabitant as a social institution. In the 1970s, the concept of living apart relationship appears in some countries. This was first identified in Netherlands. The term Living Apart Together *relatie* first appeared in a newspaper articles in 1978, (Levin and Trost, 1999) and has since become the international term in English. There are however, many questions as to how these relationships should be defined and accommodated at both a theoretical and conceptual level. According to Levin and Trost (1999), living apart is a separation of couples who do not live together. These couples live at different addresses and they are regarded by themselves and others as couples.

Levin and Trost (1999) further explained that, couples do not have to share a household each, but the two individuals (couples) lives in his or her own household in which other persons

also might live; they define themselves as couple and they perceive that their close surroundings also do so. Similarly, Haskey and Lewis (2006) remarked that a living apart relationship is a couple, of same or opposite gender, who lives together but does not share the same home. The two are defined by their social standing as a couple and treated in the same manners as married couples; however these couples have two separate homes and households in which other persons may live, such as children or parents. In support with the above statement, Scott, (2010) was of the view, that living apart relationship is term used for couples while committed to each other 'decide' to have separate homes, rather than shared residence. Thus "LAT" is a general term use to cover all cohabiting relationship and marital relationship for heterosexuals.

In Sweden living apart is termed *'Sarbo'* and is described as a couple that has chosen to live in separate household, (Bjoornberg and Dahigen, 2001). Milan and Peters (2003) saw living apart as more permanent living arrangement by couple who do not want or are not able to share a home. On the same note, Levin (2004) argued that, alternatively, LAT relationship can be more permanent arrangement that allows for intimacy but also autonomy and independent, particularly in the case for older couples. Roseneil (2006) agreed that, living apart can be viewed as a historically new family form where couples living apart can pursue 'both/and' solution to partnership. They can experience both the intimacy of being in a couple relationship, and at the same time continue with pre existing commitments.

Living apart relationship is therefore, a new family form which existed in the past, but in recent years has become visible, by attracting popular attention, possibly because it is more prevalent among the better educated, who write about it and comments on society. It is suffix to

say that living apart relationship is where unusual living arrangement of couples sharing their lives but not their homes, and yet are called couples or husband and wife.

2.2 Types of Living-Apart Relationships among Couples

A wide range of socio demographic processes and the diversity of living arrangements among couples have risen during the last decades. Levin (2004) pointed out that some living apart couples live nearby and others further away. These are commonly referred to as;

- couples living with parents
- Commuter or distance relaters couples.

2.2.1 Couples Living with Parents or Relations

In most culture around the world, people live in the company of kin; at least some people usually the majority live near or with kin. Which kin live together differ from one society to the next and from family to family with a culture, (Holy, 1996). Ermisch, (2000) noted that, this type of traditional base couples relationships, happens in a situation where the husband is going away to work at sea or join the military, and according to the traditional context of the culture, the wife is meant to stay with the parents of the groom. This is a fact because many cultures have explicit rules that specify their new home. However, each traditional or culture has their based line to this type of living arrangement among couples especially the newly wedded couples, and this is common in African countries, China and some parts of Western countries (Ermisch, 2000). Brussels (2010) further explained that in most societies around the world, newly married couples

are required or expected to change household. Which is a situation where one of the couples live first with the husband's family and then with the wife's parents for a certain period of time.

2.2.2 Commuter or Distance Relaters

The established customs and norms of marriage is that a couple must live together in order to maintain their relationship, however couples with strong accomplishment to one another and to their careers accepts jobs in different location and maintain long distance relationship . Green and Canny (2003) posited that, commuting and distance relating usually refers to partners who live apart because they have professional careers that are difficult for them to pursue within the same town. According to Holmes (2004), the term 'distance relaters' is sometimes used to focus on the particular issues associated with pursuing an intimate couples relationship whilst living apart. Levin (2004) revealed that, couples in commuter or distance relationship, supposedly have a main house and a second apartment, which the commuter travels between them. John (2007) pointed out that, the term commuting and distance relaters can be used inter-changeably to describe non-cohabitation across different location

However, most commuter couples or distance relater give each partner's household fairly equally importance and take turns to travel between them (Holmes, 2006). In support with the above statement, Ehreureichs and Hochschild (2005) was of the view that most career couples find that they need to live apart, or at a minimum, considering the prospect of living apart together in order to establish their careers in their profession or in order to be promoted. Although dual residence relating among dual career couples is a new pattern. Couples are often

apart, reuniting either each weekend of being apart and together for longer periods. Ehreureich and Hochschild (2005) further pointed out that, distance relationship among couples, involve them spending at least two nights a week apart, or they could be separated for longer periods on a regular basis. Thus when separated they have relatively permanent and non-institutional residence.

Holmes, (2009) agreed that the need to live apart is not peculiar to dual-career marriages. Persons in certain occupation have long been associated with marital separation. This type of separation continues within the politicians, business executives, professionals, ball players, actors, as well as oil and mining industries, construction workers, and merchants, marine. Specific circumstances have also caused such separation, for example war, immigration, imprisonment and seasonal work. The case of travelling salesman also comes to mind as an example of an occupation requiring patterned periods of time away from primary household. The men tend to live in an institutional accommodation while away, their wives may work, but this work is typically subordinate to the husband's career and expected to fit around the home and care for the children, (Beach 1999, Makee, Mauthner and MacLean 2000; Guldner 2003 and Gallagos 2006).

2.3 Reasons Influencing Living Apart of Couples

Formally, the need for couples to live apart is typically the husband's occupation that occasions the need. However, today, the decision to live apart confronts both husbands and wives, young and older couples as well as family members. The motives for living apart among couples could be in "gladly apart" along with the "regretfully apart", (Roseneil, 2006).

Beaujouan, Regnier and Gokalp (2008), confirmed that the reasons influencing living apart relationship among couples are diverse and are likely to very across the life course.

2.3.1 Career Demand

Career demand among couples, is a contemporary phenomenon in modern African society and is expected to become even more prevalent and noticeable impact in the near future. Couples living apart are faced with multiple concerns, including the need to balance two careers, to maintain a mutually satisfying relationship and complex child care issues. Smith, (1992) pointed out that, one of the main reasons influencing living apart among couples is the growing interest on the integration of work and family life; where both couples pursue a professional career and simultaneously maintain a family life together. Other reasons such as equal opportunity legislation, economic necessity, growth in white collar employment and the impact of the female emancipation/the women's movement have led to an increase in the number of couples living apart. These reasons among others have caused women to take up employment in the market place and pursue professional career analogous to those pursued by their male counter parts.

Harvey (1995) commented that, when both heads of the household pursue a professional career and are intrinsically motivated to reach the higher levels of the organizational chart. These couples find it difficult to reconcile the worlds of family and career. They try to perform a balancing act of responsibilities and "it seems that there are too many roles to be played simultaneously, too many demands on time and energy and too many problems to be resolved in living apart relationship". On the same note, Pierce and Delahaye (1996) confirmed that, career aspiration, rigid work, schedules further exacerbate living apart among couples. This often

produces conflicts between professional and family balance that career typically demand. Thus, couples living apart often find themselves in a constant juggling act to combine work and family demands to make matter worse; the career of both partners are highly interrelated and career choices and experiences of each partner are likely to affect the other. Pierce and Dalhaye (1996) furthermore, emphasized that these couples often feel that being at work enhances their chances to be promoted, earn a higher salary, and enhance productivity rates as a result of cooperation and communication possibilities with colleagues, while lack of discipline and interruptions by other family members will decrease their productivity when working from home.

Levin and Trost, (1999) also noted that the fast moving and competitive social environment directly influence the high rate of couples in living apart. Thus increasing the number of single parent's families, marital dissolution and stepfamilies. Most young couple, now live apart due to constrains of school, the labour market and societal factors because of the extraordinary improvement in female educational attainment in many countries. McKee, Mautuner and Maclean (2000) revealed that, there are couples living relatively far from each other who have jobs at their respective locals. In order to quit a good job and to take another in a different place might be impossible or too risky, because the tendency of gaining a job is not certain .These couples therefore would decide to live apart. Baldassar, Baldock and Wilding (2007) further confirmed, that when spouses each have a career in addition to home responsibilities they need to work out difficult compromise; if one spouse is offered a promotion that means moving to another town, these couples tends to commute long distance if their home and their career base are in different location. They may work weeks in separate places and get together on weekends, thus compelling them to live apart.

Holmes (2006) further explained that, living apart of newlyweds couples is not necessarily 'chosen' but there is a dimension of choice as it is a way to ensure that both partners can pursue professional work or educational opportunity that arose for one partner. Degenova and Rice (2002) concurred that, dual career couples, are frequently expected to go on business trips, attend out of town meeting, conference or consult with others in different localities or states, usually from two to 10 days. Some have to travel monthly or more often, a few have to make extended trips abroad, with the hope of only reuniting with their partner occasionally. Due to the importance of alternating commuting arrangements, most frequently, the couples commute every two weeks to the partner's residence. However, infrequent commutes are attributed to their career demand. This is because, the greater the demand of the career (job or school) the less frequently the couples commute.

2.3.2 Unemployment and Economic Distress

The age- old division of labour between man (the provider) and woman (the mother tending the home) is no longer accepted. Now young women wish to have other roles in life than that of spouse or mother. The effect of this is reinforced by inadequate housing, high unemployment rates and precarious job opportunities. Young couples now react by postponing child bearing and by electing to have only one or two children so that they can have a better employment and better standard of living for the family, (Van, 2000). Although these, social phenomena are commonly seen as the disturbing reasons, influencing living apart of couples. According to Holmes, (2004) when couples engage in an active job search, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible to find these jobs within the same community or location. Couples

must deal with challenges of residing apart, altering family living arrangement and traditional values regarding husbands and wives living together.

Young and Schucheveltdt (2001), and Holmes (2004) agreed that, precarious situation such as unemployment also appears to prevent couples from living together. Unemployment, reflect the difficulties young couples have in finding work after they have left the educational system. Economic distress and unemployment is challenging for many couples; young and old this situation not only influences living apart together of post nuptial couples but also individuals as a whole. Due to economic distress and unemployment one partner is compelled to migrate to seek work. It could be either of the spouses as these could hold considerable meaning beyond providing a livelihood having a satisfying job. Accordingly, it is not unusual that corporate organizations which have geographically dispersed subsidiaries would expect employees to relocate as part of an employee development plan.

2.3.3 Independence and Conservation

According to research by Barwin and Gauthier, (2001) living apart couples claimed that it is in order to retain independence and stay in familiar surroundings, while maintaining an intimate relationship. Since some couple in living apart relationship believe that maintaining their own home prevent an unequal division of domestic labour and care-giving while allowing them to retain their independence. Maria (2010) maintained that, other reasons, aside from independence among couples living apart, include couples, who never want to give up their lifestyle, even after marriage; unwilling to give up their own homes or are unwilling to accommodate their partners decorating lifestyle. These are couples who never want to embrace change; even when they are married, except that they love each other enough to be married.

2.3.4 Emotional Bases

Mostly the wide believe of a primary relationship between a man and a woman, is perceived to be a source of emotional security for the famine gender. Aries (1996) opined that, women all over the world are brought up to believe that they have to be associated with a man, thus they seem to be more elected psychologically when associated with a man, as the society accord women more respect when they are associated with a man. Emotional bases are another detrimental reason, why couples live apart. These includes: breakdown of a previous cohabiting relationship. Levin and Trost (2000) noted that, couples that have already tried the nuclear model of living arrangement and do not wish to replicate the same mistake, they made in the previous relationship. This way, with living apart they feel they might be able to keep the relationship alive, keep their own households and still stay married while apart.

2.3.5 Previous Relationship and Caring for Others

Older and younger couples may intend to live apart due to the negative experiences from previous relationship and the obligations of caring for others. Levin (1994) opined that, divorced persons may prefer non residential partnership because they are reluctant to give up their autonomy and want to avoid falling into the habit that they associate with their previous relationship. Levin (1994) further noted that unwillingness to impose a new partner onto children from previous relationship is perceived as another factor influencing living apart among couples. These couples do not want to live in a step family household but prefer to keep the home intact, remain at the same address. This was affirmed by Levin and Trost, (1999) who pointed out that, one of the factors influencing living apart among couples, is because they are responsible for the care of other persons. For example, one or both members of the couple may have children or

aging parent, they feel responsible for. Buttressing this view, Levin and Trost (2000), supported this by stating that, concerns about the children well being may prevent other desires. This is done especially, if individual couples care for both their children, and the new relationship and are reluctant to risk either, they may decide to stay apart but together. This is because both persons in the living apart together relationship might have children at home and if they move in together, the children of one of them would be force to deal with various changes, such as the move itself, changing school, missing friends and playmate.

Levin and Trost, (2000) continued by stating that some couple however chooses this form of arrangement as a stepping stone before finalizing a separation or divorce. While Holmes (2004) stressed that, couples in this situation might have elderly parents to care for and cannot or do not wish to live together.

2.3.6 Retired Couples

Retired couples may prefer a living apart together relationship, according to Scandinavia, (2001) there can be various reasons influencing this, as mentioned above, it ,may have to do with the perceive risk of falling into a boring routine if they live together. Alternatively, one or both members of the couple may have grand children or great grand children nearby and they may remain close to them especially if the other member of the couple lives far away.

2.4 Benefits Associated with Living Apart among Couples

Benefits associated with living apart of married couples are diverse, as perceived by several sources, these benefits include:

1. **Space and privacy: -** in every family couple regulate personal privacy. Couples come together for family rituals such as playing games or watching televisions, but they also need and want to spend time alone. Being short changed on privacy or living in a crowded household is associated with irritability, weariness, family violence, poor family relationships and emotional distance from one's spouse (Maxwell, 1996; Mumola, 2000). Heart Choice (2010) concurred that, space and privacy enable each partner to have separate space to him or herself to read, watch television, and talk on phone or loot over things. This is not only provided as a measure of privacy for the individuals but also as a couple. For example when the couples have an overnight guest, the guest can stay in one place while the couple stays in the other. This arrangement gives the guest ample space and also gives the couples private time apart from the guest (Heart Choice, 2010).

2. **Career and work space independence: -** living apart enhances career opportunities as both spouses are better able to devote long hours to their work-related activities and generally need to be less concerned about spousal or parental roles. Some individual couples work at home and need a controlled quite space to work on projects, talk on the phone or concentrate on their work living apart arrangement gives couples independence both in personality and finances. The husband has his own possession likewise the wife. Thus enabling couples to value their independent having freedom to do things in one's own abode. Living apart also grants, each spouse to continue working at what he/she deems important enough to occasion the decision to live apart in the first place. There is also freedom to devote long and uninterrupted hours to work. This is a freedom which comes from not needing to dovetail to each other schedules around, such constraints as mealtime, recreation and sleep patterns, (Barwin and Gauthier, 2001 and John 2007).

3. **Variable sleep needs: -** while some partners enjoy going to bed at the same time and sleeping in the same bed. Others like to go to bed at radically different times and sleep in separate beds or rooms. The living apart arrangement allows for the partners to have their own sleep needs/schedules met without interference with the partners' (Heart choice, 2010).
4. **Allergies: -** couples who have cat or dog allergies may need to live in separate antiseptic environment from their partner who love animals and would not live without them, (Heart Choice, 2010).
5. **Variable social needs: -** couples differ in terms of their need for social contacts with friends, siblings and parents. The living apart together arrangement allows for the partner who enjoys frequent time with others to satisfy that needs without subjecting the other to the presence of a lot of people in one's life space. For example, a wife from family may enjoy both her siblings and parents being around. The living apart relationship allows her to continue to enjoy her family at no expense of her husband. It also allows for an open relationship thereby giving room for both spouses to become intimate with people other than their spouses and not to be seen as adulterer, (John, 2007).
6. **Relationship revitalized: -** relationship revitalized when living apart couples got back together after a few nights apart, which is like a first date, as with the folk tale "absence makes the heart grow fonder". It also keeps relationship existing, for times spent apart among couples make time spent together feel more precious. Thus the principle of *satiation* is in existence. However, the term satiation is a well established psychological principle. Basically satiation means that a stimulus loses it value with repeated exposure just as if we are tired of eating the same food or listening to same music, so is satiation relevant to relationship. Indeed couples who are in long distance relationship know the joy of "missing"

each other and the excitement of being with each other again. Therefore, couples in a living apart relationship help to ensure that they will not "satiate" on each other but maintain some of the excitement in seeing and being with each other. Hence there is stability of a long term relationship, as couples get along better when they are apart. It is easy to avoid fighting with someone that is not there, (Marie, 2010).

7. **Self expression and comfort:-** couples often have very different taste in furniture, home decoration, music and temperature, with two separate places, each can arrange and furnish their respective homes according to their own individual preferences and play whatever music they like, (Holmes, 2006).
8. **Cleanliness/orderliness: -** separate residence allows each partner to maintain the desire level of cleanliness and orderliness without arguing about it. Some individual couples like their space to be clean. Others simply do not care. (Heart choice, 2010).
9. **Elder care:-** one couple may care of an elderly parent in the parent's house or his or her own house either way, the partner may have a preference not to live in the same house as a couple with a parent. Living apart allows the partner take care of the elderly parent, and also create place for the couple alone, (Levin, 2004).

2.5 Risks Associated with Living Apart among Couple

Although there are positive aspects to living apart of married couples, there is also a mutual realization that some of the benefits and risks specific to each spouse are strains with the other, which includes:

A. **Stigma/disapproval:** since the norm that married couples move in together is firmly entrenched, couple especially the newlyweds who do not do so, are suspect. These often lead to decline in all forms of interaction between the family members and the society. The family members could attack these couples, by shaming, belittling them, through name calling and attacking sensitive issues in a spirit of disapproval or contempt. Even though a temporary avoidance might be wise at times to gain a bearing on the issue, as people who love each other ought to be together. While those who live apart do not really want a life together, (Baldassar, Baldock and Wilding, 2007).

B. **Emotional insecurity:** peace, contentment, love and security in the home is not possible when couples are emotionally insecure. Jibril, (1992) in Onyeme (2002) posited that, emotions such as love is a motivating force present in every person from cradle to death, and without love the will to live is often impaired to such an extent that a person's resistance is critically lowered and most of the time, lack of love makes couples to be depressed, anxious and without zeal for life. When couples living apart are emotionally insecure, feel depressed, and remain lonely and unhappy without friends or work they care for. Their lives become a barren treadmill, stripped of all love and joy that comes with the togetherness of living together. Collaborating this fact, Cox (2002) remarked that, anxieties and bickering often prevail among living apart couples, thus causing emotional insecurity that are associated with depression, psychological distress and mental or psychiatric hospital admissions. Living apart of newly married couple breeds problem of maintaining intimacy and dealing with conflict, especially without being able to touch and hug. Couples tend to yield to temptation involving them in secret sexual relationship, thereby increasing chances of infidelity. This is due to the fact that their

marriage have not endured long enough to exist as solid reality and the rewards of firmly established professional identities are not yet theirs, (Baldassar et al, 2007).

C. **Resentment and guilt:** Marital success is more attainable if the commitment is mutual. One person cannot build a relationship or save a marriage no matter how much he or she tries. DeGenova and Rice (2002), cited that, the general increase of resentment among couples elevate tension, promote suspicion, undermine confidence, trust, friendship and effective feeling of guilt. This is often due to the criticism of the other partner resulting in loss of companionship. Resentment and guilt are common to both older and younger couples but it is a theme with different variations. Younger couples grapple more with career ascendancy conflict, as to who career commitment should predominant, while older couples expand more effort at adjusting to the lifestyle of the other couple because they are more likely to have children who contend more with conflict over increased childcare and domestic responsibilities for the spouse who stay with the family. Though not without difficulties, their response to the lifestyle is less stressful, because they are more established, (Marie, 2010).

D. **Cost:** living apart represents an expensive lifestyle, the cost of maintaining two separate living arrangements can be more expensive than two people living in one domicile. However, there are ways living apart couples manage their lifestyle, for example; some live in two condominiums which are cheaper than two houses. Others are willing to set up their housing, out of high priced real estate areas. As a lot of what goes on in each house does not become part of the life history of the other, (Levin and Trost, 1999). The demands of two residence living are greatest for couples with dependent children. The

couples are not convenient especially when couples decide to live in separate housing unit. Going between the two places to share meal or stay together can be very tasking for both couples and the children, (Scandanivia, 2001).

E. **Leads to frustration:** couples who live apart, and tend to unite together weekends, usually encounter financial strains and struggle to maintain intimacy. Due to tiredness from traveling or anxiety of waiting. It makes the marriage seem worthless. This is because the idea of marriage is commitment and living with one another was part of the arrangement especially for newlyweds, (Olson and Defrain, 2001). Bomen (2004) Commented that, this may cause the spouse to lose appetite or become over active, feeling down and discouraged, especially when the other partner is being difficult. In fact severe frustration can cause the spouse feeling annoyed or irritated by others, having diminished interest in family or friends, relationships.

F. **Breeds Problem of Intimacy**- Thomson (1998) referred intimacy as a state of having a close personal relationship with someone. So, intimate relationship is one in which two or more people are connected and affect each other. It is also a situation in which two people (husband and wife) spend time together or live together and have romantic or sexual feelings for each other, this play a vital role among couples and family cohesion and helps in the development of relationships for members of the family. Thus when couples live apart there is no family cohesion which involves commitment and spending time together with family. Commitment to the husband or wife is lost which include honesty, dependability, and faithfulness, (Holmes, 2006).

2.6 The Impact of Career and Geographical Location on Couples Living Apart

Geographical location is the position of a given town or place, where features and things of comfort are found in the place or town. Geographical location is one of the major reasons of migration of couples. A partner may prefer a particular town to another due to a change in career. Although migration studies confirmed that, the obvious reasons why married couple live part is that people in poor countries afflicted by poverty and lack of career opportunity often leave their place of abode to try their luck elsewhere. African as the second largest continent has a long history of migration in search of better economic future (Findley, 1997). However, migration could be local (rural to urban migration) or international (one country to another) with the intension of having temporary or permanent settlement (Usher, 2005). Local migration in Nigeria from urban center has driven rapid urbanization seen throughout the region up to date. This has often been as a result of seeking better job for better salaries, better educational environment and nearness to international nations, for global connections, Usher (2005) confirmed that, the husbands (male) tend to dominate labour migration flows to the foreign nation, in some cases, the husbands moves first and are later or never followed by their wives and children .Although there are two factors that motivate couples to move from their place of abode, they are the push and pull factor.

The push factors are the circumstances in the home (e.g. Nigeria) that makes a partner think of leaving his normal place of abode for another part of the same country, a neighboring country, or for a distant place like the United States. Push factors are issues that can influence living apart of couples. These push factors causes a husband to be dissatisfied with his work and career in his home country, such as poor compensation, working and living conditions or career

opportunities. According to the UNDP (2005) there are more than 21,000 Nigerian doctors in the United States of America alone, these doctors as well, have family (wives) whom they left behind to reside apart, yet they still maintain a family. These couples now live apart, thereby not staying together as husband and wife to jointly take care of their children and other family members. On the other hand, the pull factors, draws people to particular destination, condition, such destination motivate workers to migrate. These factors include employment, high salaries, and better infrastructures.

Jacobson and Levin, (1997) reported that disparities in labour force participation rates and human capital investment between sexes have declined, since the 1970s. Couples now weigh the career of both partners equally in decision making. A couple is assumed to consider the value of each partner's potential earnings properly before deciding to live apart. Jacobson and Levin (2000) pointed out, that conflict over location arises most often and is most severe among highly educated couples in living apart relationship. This is because both partners have invested heavily in their human capital, and are strongly attached to the labour force. The costs of fore-going job opportunities maybe high, to the extent that the couples work in specialize, non portable occupations, thus, the likelihood of finding suitable job opportunities in the same location maybe low. Cooke (2001) further concurred that, if the best location for the couples as a whole is not the best location for each partner's career, individually one or both partner will sacrifice their best career related utility to live together or the partner will choose to live apart.

On the other hand, as one partner's earning potential or career-orientation increases, either one or both members of the couples will experience worst career outcome or that their career outcomes will be unaffected, but the couples will live apart. In support with the above

statement, Blau and Kahn (2007) were of the view that the impact of career and location on couple living apart is likely to increase as a partner's preference over job choices become less positively correlated with those of the other partner. Therefore, couples living apart need only consider options of one partner and the location preferences of both partners. Blau and Kahn (2007) further explained that couples chosen location need not coincide with either individual's optimal location. In many respects couples can be expected not to have common preferences over location, characteristics such as region, presence of mountains or oceans, proximity to family and friends, or size of place. Consequently, couples of this nature are likely to experience longer years of living apart or breakup in order to pursue career opportunities in different geographical location.

Permalink (2010) confirmed that, tough career times make living apart among couples more difficult. Couples in the living arrangement struggle to make ends meet. A number of young couples reject their first choice of job offer in order to accommodate their partners and on the average accept jobs they view as less prestigious and less suitable to their intellectual preferences. At the same time compromise, with respect to job opportunities, rather than forgo career advancement. These couples live in difference places and commute to see one another. Permalink (2010) further stated that, although not all couples would be better off financially from staying apart or living apart. Especially dual earner households, in which both spouse are employed, and have been identified as an obstacle to job housing balance concept because of their constrained ability to choose a residential location near work. These couples have no choice but to work in different places and localities as well as to reside there. This is in line with, Bailey (2010), who stressed that, couples who live apart create housing shortage, as this trend of lifestyle will lead to serious shortage of household in two decades.

2.7 The Effects of Couples Living Apart on Marriage and Family Relationship

One of the greatest mysteries of human organization is marriage. Marriage is a social institution that binds a union of two marriageable persons as husband and wife. It is an institution in which interpersonal relationship (usually intimate and sexual) are acknowledged. Marriage is a choice that two people make for themselves; it is rarely a selfless or altruistic act. People marry because they find someone who bring them happiness and fulfillment in life. Of course there is also the promise to live together and to make the other person happy, (DeGenova and Rice, 2002). Similarly, Olaitan and Akpan (2003) regarded marriage as a mutual relationship between husband and wife, where they are joined in a special kind of social legal dependence for the purpose of friends and maintaining a family.

2.7.1 Effects on Marriage

In consensus with this statement, Action Health Incorporated (2003) consented that marriage is a legal and social commitment between two people, to share their lives and family responsibility. However, marriage is the same legal status for all couples, whether living together or living apart from spouse, it may in fact, be a very different institution and may have a differential effects on relationship quality for couples living apart depending on the characteristics of the individual involve in it, (Boman, 2004). Roles of marriage participants are as enormous, tasking, trivial and simple as the level of success, they (couples) want for marriage. Traditionally marriage actually imposes a strict division of labour by gender and mandated unequal power relations between men and women (Coontz, 2005). Man was regarded as the bread winner of the family who was required to support the family especially financially, footing all the bills ranging from shelter to children's school fees, feeding electricity and phone bill. Also

he is expected to partake in the teaching and disciplining the child. While the woman was obligated to keep the home, nurture children and provide sex (Phan Jar Uniti, 2006).

Surprisingly, marriage has been in a constant state of evolution since the dawn of Stone Age. In the process it has become flexible, but also more optional now, with advent of formal education, science and technology awareness of human right and societal change of orientation; there is change in sex roles, and living arrangement in marriage. Thereby it does not matter who act as family breadwinner, working at far distance, or who takes care of the domestic affairs. Elloy and Smith (2003) posited that the living apart relationship and traditional marriage roles, specifying stereotype roles behaviour are challenged in a fundamental way, because sex-role conflicts come to the fore. This is because couples living apart are more vulnerable to role conflict and role ambiguity. Role conflict is caused by opposing demands within one role or between multiple roles. Role ambiguity is cause by insufficient information regarding a certain role, leading to uncertainty concerning the expectations and behaviours that are associated with that role. Thus when living apart couples re-divide the distribution of marital responsibilities, as scarce time need to be divided between their career and marriage demands and cannot be devoted to solely one of these areas. Neither of the spouses is able to take full care of the marriage; both spouses must take on more responsibilities in the marriage sphere. This situation creates considerable time pressure and consequently, conflict may arise over equitable task division in the couple's marital relationship. Schneider and Barsoux, (2003), stated that women are more susceptible to role conflict in marriage than their male counterparts, since they generally experience greater difficulties, with placing their careers above their marriage.

Inherently, the depleting effect of couples living apart on marriage is that, the more couples involve are unsatisfied with their work, life and with the home they have for themselves, the more the negative effects of living apart are perceive in their family lives, their partner relationship and life as a whole. This is because, there is mutual realization that some of the advantages specific to each spouse are a source of disadvantages for the other. Thus, couples who are living apart, show a visible marital reaction of resentment over the felt disadvantages and guilt, (Guldner, 2003). According to this opinion, Olaitan and Akpan (2003) revealed that resentment felt, by each couples, could lead to marital instability, as marriage is the foundation of the family and society. Therefore conflicts in marriage produce discord, separation and the total dissolution of marriage and family system. In line with this statement, Permalink (2010), remarked that, one of the hardest things about living apart relationship is explaining it to family and friends, who may see it as a sign that the relationship is failing or at least not progressing on or that one person in the relationship has a commitment problem or even a psychological fear of intimacy.

Nevertheless, Marie (2010) emphasized that, the consequences of living apart on marriage, could create some serious implication for social cohesion. That is, if increasing numbers of couple's lives apart, in reality people may marry at later age; many may choose to simply cohabit without any official commitment, under either civil or religion law. Evidently leading to high divorce rates, single parenthood and same sex marriage, these circumstances would make marriage to lose it place in the society.

2.7.2 Effect on Family Relationship

In Nigeria, the accepted meaning of family remains encompassing right from the dawn of creation, the family has remained the foundation of human life and the cradle of human development. As human organisms, we spend our total life in the family. This explained why the family remains the most significant and enduring human group, providing enduring social and emotional relationship and security supports to its members. In all respects, the role of the family cannot be equated or substituted with that of any other human institution in advancing the course of humanity. It is a solidity network constituting not only of a couple and their children, but also of grandparents, uncles, aunts, cousins, and even more distant relatives. Among families' ties, the marital relationship has historically been viewed as central to nuclear family dynamics. The marital relationship has been pointed out as a preponderant factor to the families' quality of life particularly regarding the relationship that fathers and mothers keep with their children, (Cumming and O'Reilly, 1997). The evidence of living apart does not seem to be one isolated episode among married couples in the marriage; it affects every member of the family.

Thornton, Fricke and Young (1994) opined that a typical family, however, is becoming more and more difficult to define. Family has become a fluid term which reflects a rapid change in society. Thus there is no single definition of family, as the concept of family has expanded over the years to include many types. The term family is no longer associated only with those who dwell together under the same roof but, is inclusive of individuals who share similar concerns and conflicts. Regardless of its different forms as nuclear, extended or more diverse and inclusive circle of people that one may refer to as a family, Degenova and Rice (2002) view family as a unit of interacting personalities rather than purely in a common fixation of sexual,

parental and filial instincts. Where wishes, attitudes and sentiments are all interplayed. It is also recognized that the nature of today's family predicts the nature of society tomorrow. The difference between and among families lie in the quality of social functions discharged to its members. These basic functions of the family, according to Degenova and Rice (2002), can be outlined as follows:

a. Reproduction and preparation of the human species.

b. Child rearing responsibility as the key agent of socialization and training centre, particularly in their moral, religion and spiritual life.

c. Shared social and emotional relationships where affection and cooperation are cultivated for the sustenance of life and well being of members.

d. Provision of emotional security, safety and social supports for its members

e. Promotion, protection and health care for members.

The relationships of family members have been traditionally defined with prominent features of respect for age, gender and roles of men outside the homes as providers and women in the dominant role inside the home, (John 1996). James (2001) commented that, family relationship is the relationship that exists among family members. These relationships are long lasting and social living as members depends on each other for comforts. Family relationship is an omnibus concept that includes the dynamic forces. The family structure, the environment and the process factors in the various relationship model in the family. Family relationship actually centers essentially on family communication between and among family member; parent-child communication. It is through this subsequent relationship that family value emotional support

and solidarity family sentiments are transmitted for the identity of members, (Marie, 2010). Sharing this view Anyakowa and Eluwa (2010) grouped this relationship as:-

a. Husband – wife (couples) relationship
b. Parent – child relationship
c. Brother – sister (sibling) relationship.

Living apart couples have families to contend with and the amount of time spent with family members such as mothers and mother-in-law are likely to reduce. This may lead to alienation from the family and cause added pain and guilt as these couples disregard the existence of a family and social life, (Karambayya and O'Reilly, 1992). On the other hand, Szinoivacz (1997) and Howlett (1999) noted that the adverse effects of living apart on family are on its young members. The family has a tendency to produce psychopathic personality and schizophrenic in children, there by reproducing itself from one generation to another. DeBoer (2001), reported that differences in the living arrangement of couples were partners alternately move toward each other then back away to re-establish a sense of individuality are more likely for couples whose parents had similar problems.

2.7.3 Effect on Couples Relationship

James (2001) stated that whatever draws a partner away, whether work, business, another person, hobby or even children from attending to a partners request may arouse jealousy and this will lead to destruction of couple's relationship. Consequently, partners who have experienced hurtful rejection in previous intimate relationships or who, for other reasons, lack feelings of adequacy or worth, often depend heavily on their marital partners to bolster their self-concept

which help in strengthening couples relationship. Warren (2002), pointed out that time is couple's most precious gift because they only have a set amount of it which is 24 hours a day couples can make more money, but they cannot make more time. Words alone are worthless, for nothing can take the place of time. When couples give themselves their time, they are giving themselves a portion of their lives that they will never get back. It is not enough just to say that relationships are important; couples must prove it by investing their time in them. Whenever couples give their time, they are making a sacrifice and sacrifice is the essence of an intimate relationship.

According to family researchers, one of the most difficult qualities to develop among young couples living apart is the ability to spend time together, since couples living apart devote considerable efforts to their career they are generally unable to spend a lot of time relating to one another. Not only do they find themselves challenged by a busy and competitive social environment outside the home but the boundaries between the home and work are being blurred, (Hochschild, 2003). Work has become more like home and home become more like work. Caught in the time bind, the more the couple's work, the more stressful their home life becomes and the more they want to escape back to work.

On the same note, Hochschild (2003) added that, couples who live apart are likely to find it more difficult at certain points, depending on their age, career and family. It might be easier for childless women who can sometimes escape the emotions of work involved in continual cohabiting, or for younger couple establishing careers.

However, for those with younger families it is likely to be extremely complicated. Binstock and Thornton (2003) remarked that, living apart of couples, often lead to the rejection

of traditional marital demands of the husband's role, which could easily lead to dissolution of marriage according to matrimonial cause acts, (1990) section 15 (2) E and F, Holmes (2006) revealed that, wives in living apart relationship, miss the emotional protection that they expect from the concept "husband" as such, the wives have a propensity to feel a loss of protection in the relationship and the sense that this is the cost of their gaining independence. In like manner, the husband' also look to marriage for emotional intimacy but they are less likely to express it, as much unhappiness about the loss of emotional closeness that living apart can produce.

On the other hand, the men are less likely to feel quite as abandoned if they are not emotionally involved with someone. They recognize the guilt they feel about not being able to provide the emotional protection they sense their wives needs. Similarly, the wives also recognize that responsibilities they either expected their husbands would assume or would at least be shared become theirs to manage single handedly. Having to contend with hassles produced by everyday problems with the care and household maintenance and other domestic responsibilities. Scott, (2010) concluded that, couples who live apart for a longer period of time are prone to psychological maladjustment and depression.

2.7.4 Effects on Parent-Child Relationship

The influence of both a male and female parent on a child's development cannot be understated. A good mother, on balance brings a nurturing, protesting and confronting aspect to a child life, while a good father brings his child stability, security and strength. Parents' relationship with their children can be described as being sensitive, warm, close, friendly, supportive, intimate, nurturing, affectionate, encouraging, comforting and accepting. Palkovltz (1997) broadened the conceptualization with reference to 15 categories of parental involvement

that included; communication, (listening, talking, and showing love), teaching (role modeling, encouraging activities and interest); monitoring (friends, home work); cognitive processes ; (worrying, planning, praying); errands; care giving (feeding, bathing); shared interests; (reading together); availability; planning (activities, birthdays); shared activities (shopping, playing together); providing (food, clothing); affection; protection, and supporting emotionality (encouraging the child).

Marriages are not perfect, neither are parent-child relationships. When couples live apart from one another, parent's child relationship can be especially strained, as the youngsters struggle to fit into the new lifestyle and inevitably lose touch with post traditions, (Olson and Defrain, 2000). DeGenova and Rice (2002) pointed out that children need love affection, security, stability and guidance in their lives. If couples in a living apart relationship supply these needs, children will likely benefit from dual parenting but if they do not, the children will be affected negatively. Where stability is not established towards the children certainly, it will create insecurity in their lives.

According to Harris, Furstenberg and Marmer (1998), father involvement, in child development, protect children from engaging in delinquent behavior, less substance abuse among adolescents, less drug use, truancy, and stealing. For example, father's involvement with child's school age (Zimmerman, Salem and Natoro, 2000). The negative effect of having a father, who resides apart from the wife and children, is the reason why children engage in delinquent activity and substance abuse, (Bronte, Moore, and Carrono, 2006). This is associated with a higher frequency of externalizing and internalizing symptoms such as acting out, disruptive behaviour,

anti social behaviour, depression, sadness and lying (Flouri and Buchanan 2002, King and Sobolewski, 2006)

More recently Flouri and Buchanan (2004) found that, when fathers are able to spend time together on relationship quality with their children at the age of seven (7) they are protected against psychological maladjustments in adolescents. This is in line with Howard, Lefever, Borkowski and Whitman (2006) who revealed, that, children whose parent live together and are readily available have fewer behavioural problems, they tend to feel close to the parents and do things frequently with their fathers and mothers display less antisocial behaviour and care less depressive and withdraw. Their research further indicated that, early parental attention was also evidenced for non problematic young sons but not daughters. This tends to enhance the quality of the parent child relationship and thus facilitates positive developmental out come for their children.

Although, Crouter, Bumpas, Head and McHale (2001), confirmed that fathers who worked long hours were more likely to feel over loaded, less accepting of their adolescent children, and be less effective in perspective care taking. The combination of long working hours and roles over load, among couples living apart are predicted by worse family functioning, more depressive symptoms, and less effective parenting. Their children are also more likely to have social and emotional difficulties and these relationships are mediated by the living arrangement of the couples. Likewise, the mismatch between employed parents, commuting schedules and their children's school schedule creates parental after school stress, which is related to the psychological well being of the parent as well as child, (Bernett and Garies, 2006).

Carlson and Furstenberg (2007) further explained that, parenting while in a living apart relationship can be more demanding when children are involved. They will feel the decision to live apart as intensely as the parents do, but depending on their ages may respond differently. Young children do not have the concept of time, as opined by Piaget Theory (1896-1980) and may not understand where their other parent is or why they are gone, (Piaget, 1970). Although older children may have a clear understanding of what "living apart" entails, they too will need help adjusting to living with a single parent for a while Carlson, et al (2007), further outlined common stresses reactions expected among children when couples live apart, they are shown in Table 2.1

Table 2.1: Common Stress Reactions on Children When Couples Live Apart

S/No.	AGE GROUP	EFFECTS
1	Infants (Birth-12 Months	Changes in eating and sleeping patterns
		May want to hold more
		May seem "fussier".
2	Toddlers (Ages 1-3 Years)	Show regression in walking or potty training
		Cry for no apparent reason
		Whine and cling to you
3	Pre-Scholars/Kindergarten Age	clinging to people for favourite toy/blanket
		Unexplained crying or tearfulness
		Increased acts of frustration or anger
		Sleep difficulties, nightmares, frequent waking up
		Worry about the safety of everyone
		Eating difficulties
		Fear of new people or situations
4	School age	Change in school performance
		Increase in complaints of headaches, stomachs, or others illness when nothing physically seems to wrong.
		More irritable or crabby
		Fascinated with the military and news about it
5	Adolescence	Drop in school performance
		Acting out behaviours (getting into troubles at school, at home with the law).
		Misdirected anger
		Low self esteem and self-criticism
		Loss of interest in usual hobbies or activities.
		May drift away from the family and seek approval from friends.
		Increase in headaches, sickness or nightmares

Source: Carlson and Furstenberg (2007) *Marital Success and Domains for Social Supports in Long Term Relationships.*

In addition, Temple and Reynolds, (1999) opined that children's' academic and school functioning are always affected when couples live apart, including negative adolescent behaviour. Krishnakumur and Buchler (2000) concluded that, regardless of causality, positive parent-child relationship is less likely to exist when couples choose to live apart.

2.7.5 The Effects of Child bearing on Couples Living Apart Relationship

The transition to parenthood represents a major life event in which couples must individually and collectively negotiate extensive personal, familiar, social and often professional changes. Kelly Plate (1994) asserted that, the arrival of a new baby in a family can upset routines, as some adjustments may be needed. Space and possession must be shared, feelings like resentment and insecurity may surface. This is often due to the unwillingness of the couples to accommodate and express their acceptance, when a new baby arrives. Belsky and Kelly (1994) concurred that marital, quality among couples living apart often decline following the birth of a (first) child, as parenthood brings new identifications and responsibilities for mothers and fathers.

According Cowan and Cowan (1998) married couples at the time of a baby's birth appears to be protective against rapid decline in relationship quality and couples who are living apart from their partner after marriage does not significantly improve in relationship quality on the same note Carlson et al, (2007), commented that newlyweds couples living apart, handing two residents breakup within a few years of their baby's birth, while older couples, who, live apart remain in a romantic relationship and continue to live apart while raising their child. Although it clear that child birth represent a significant change in every couples life, whether young or old couple, living together or living apart. There is however, some evidence that family of origin experiences (particularly of the wives) affect marriage following child birth. Michael and Goldberg (2007) remarked that, the pregnancy being unplanned for and spousal depressive symptoms are associated with less positive marital balance between couples living apart in transition to parenthood.

Michael and Goldberg (2007) further stated that, the arrival of a new born baby holds joy for every family member and at the same time crisis. The wife's attention is most often diverted to the new baby and the little time that the husband and wife have to reunite and share marital intimacy are most often neglected thus causing strain in the marital relationship. In this case, the women experience greater parental strain than the men in this living arrangement. This is because of their greater responsibilities as a mother and as a wife. Due to demand of her time, she is often affected by lack of sleep, interference with regular work energy; hence the difficulty involved in combining a career with parenthood become apparently stressful for the mother after the first child is born.

Osborne and McLanahan (2007) pointed out that, having a new baby changes the lives of dual career couples as it, often leads to decrease in positive marital interchange, an increase in marital conflict and a decline in marital satisfaction. Adjusting to the new care giving role responsibilities and routines of a new born child in their lives could be very tasking since it involves emotional support, family income and resources. Where the child basic needs (love, care and protections) are not met, the child feels emotionally rejected, which may latter affect the child self esteem and self concept at latter stage and age. This is because the child was ignored by one or both parents.

2.8 The Socio-Economic Effects of Living Apart on Couples

Many couples are seen seeking employment, and often work at more than one job in order to meet the needs of the family so as to improve the economic security of the family, in the form of savings, regular employment, absence of debt and effective economic management. This lifestyle has made many couples to live apart because it is believed that, couples from the middle

and upper classes have fewer economic challenges compared to those from the lower classes, (Olaitan and Akpan, 2003). Florida (2004), documented that as couples are financially stressed up seeking for a high level of socio economic status, a considerable number of young couples living apart work in high professional occupational jobs that usually require an academic degree. The members of this economic status fall within the high and middle class, commonly known as the creative class. The high proportion of those working in information technology, research and science, united organizations or as professional consultant are seen within this creative class.

Similarly, couples may live apart due to socio economic constraints rather than choices. Thornton, Fricke, and Young (1994) revealed that, industrialization and economic growth expand material aspiration by creating new products and improving old ones. Thus the tastes of individuals and family may shift across time and the additional economic resource could be used to finance the newly accrued tastes. Aspiration change may lead to the formation of families living apart, a condition which both husband and wife resist their work for acquiring more money, (Kiernan, 2002). Labour market opportunities, housing costs and partners' socio-economic circumstances influence younger couples to live apart. These socio-economic factors are akin to those that affect older couples in marriage, to live apart, (Smock, Mannig and Porter, 2005).

Florida (2004) opined that economic distress, income loss and financial crises have significant effects on couples living apart, and this is because couples do not sit down with each other to analyze their financial goal, priorities and basic needs. Couples living apart are often on the job, and career pursuit. Rarely deciding how they will control their finances. Sheldon (2004) concurred that, couples that rarely have time to plan on their financial resources, generally results

into financial misunderstanding, because either a spouse can spend before consulting his or her partner, use expensive items, or buy on credit because there was no financial plan or communication. Smock, Manning and Porter (2005) confirmed that, couples living apart spend more in maintaining two household, which often leads to excessive indebtedness, poor satisfaction from their financial resource and temptation to use credit as the means to maintain current levels of living arrangement.

Beaujouan, Regnier Golkalp (2008) was also of the view that financial constraints are reasons why couples are in a living apart together relationship. Living together requires sufficient economic resources to relinquish the inter-generational transfer associated with parents (Martin, Folguerans and Garcia, 2008). Marie (2010) argued that the growing number of dual career families mainly as a result of increase of women social status through education attainment has lead to mutual agreement between husband and wives to rearrange their residential patterns and presume its social, economical, cultural and psychological consequences to all the family. Thus, many families have been force to live apart as an alternative lifestyle.

2.9 The Socio-Emotional Effects of Living Apart on Couples

Marriage among couples typically provides social integration, social support and emotional expressiveness among husbands and wives. Coleman (1995) perceived emotions as feelings that are distinctive in thought both in psychological and biological state which ranges from propensities to act. Couples need instrumental support from their spouse; to have someone to talk to, someone to listen, and someone who cares about them, who care about their problems and who they can rely on. (Cobb, 2001) opined that an emotion may be positive or negative with basic primeval force of great power which influences the individual to be able to cope with

circumstances, that demands for utmost survival or success spire to our living. Etta (2001) perceived social emotion as the process of expressing an attitude and learning skills which enables individuals to live easily with another, by way of demonstration of feelings about self and others either negatively or positively. One of the socio emotional effects of living apart on couples is feeling of stress.

According to Missouri Advisory Council (2010), stress is can be defined as the body's and mind's way of meeting challenge. Stress leads to build up of tension that if not relieved, can cause anxiety- a fear of what might happen even when no threat exists. The symptoms, result and effect of stress on living apart couples are many. For instance it has been established that the disappointment or frustration that causes stress also can lead to depression, a serious mental illness characterized by fatigue, insomnia, boredom, restlessness, lack of interest in life and withdrawal which if left untreated can lead to feeling of unworthiness, isolation and even suicide. However, stresses within couples living apart, could be as a result of distance, illness, or individual members wanting to satisfy personal needs than those of other member. This further puts partners apart. Moreover, Dreyfus (2010), posited some other sources of stress which includes, family relationship, occupation, change of job, not feeling appreciated, are all ways by which stress build up among living apart couples.

Koslowsky, Kuger and Reich (1995) asserted that, the socio emotional effect of living apart is associated with many environmental stressors like noise, crowd pollution and terminal conditions that cause negative emotional and physical reactions. These reactions, however, depend not only on the time and distance involved among couples living apart. There is also the strain of blood pressure, muscle disorders, lowered frustrations, tolerance, increase hostility,

being depressed and low input in the work; as well as adverse effect on cognitive performance. In addition, Tcoslowsky (1998) confirmed that couples who are lived apart and who always commuted long distances were stressful over and about monetary cost. This is due to the frequency of travelling to and fro, just to reunite with the other members. Hence, the source of strain, in the frequency of travelling to and fro to work place and the demand of the marriage, children and career often leave the couples tensed and exhausted because of the difficult flexibility in work schedule, the age of the youngest child and the number of children. Tcoslowsky (1998) concluded that, when couples are martially distressed and physiologically under stress; the couples tend to be cold toward their children and may relate to anger and non compliance in their environment as well as high level of stress related hormones that increases depressive symptoms which may be associated with a reduction in cognitive functions.

According to Van (2000), the major socio emotional effect of living apart on couples is that they loss their spouse companionship and love sometimes which often leads to loneliness. Although it is difficult accepting the absence of their spouse as one or both partner go to places alone and does things alone. It essential to recognize that the personal and social meanings attached to the couples intimacy maybe troubling, arousing feelings of guilt, regret, loss or shame. Van (2000) further established that, the couples may become isolated and may suffer from:

i. loss of concentration
ii. disturbed sleep
iii. sudden floods of tears
iv. outburst of anger, and
v. a loss of appetite.

Simply because it is difficult to see the partner (husband or wife) they are used to, due to job or different location. The partner however may find that the main link with the outside world has disappeared and he/she would constantly be thinking about the end of the marriage. On the same note, Costata and Kahn (2011) pointed out that the feeling of loneliness among dual career couples, who live apart could be, social isolation. This is a situation of being geographically separated or emotional isolation in relational. That is, feeling estranged from a person who is not physically nearby. When the spouse did rather be with someone, or feel they are still together but do not feel close to him or her. However, for the women, in these living arrangements tend to report lower marital quality especially when the man does not fulfill the roles his spouse expects him to, she would not be completely satisfied with the relationship. Men, too have certain preconceived expectation about the roles their spouses, should fulfill, if the women do not live up to their expectations, their marital satisfactions is less. Costata and Kahn (2011) concluded that the emotions and tensions arouse during negative marital interaction, among living apart couples are carried over into parent-child interactions.

2.10 Coping Strategies for Living Apart Couples

The coping strategies theory view coping among others as a process of changing the emotional state of mind from negative to positive in bringing effective response to the problem. DeGenova and Rice (2001) noted that coping strategies in couples relation, does not imply the existence of problem, but it is the methods of managing and resolving the challenge faced by couples at a certain periods of time. It is the application of skills in solving or dealing with disagreement between couples, when they arise. They further identified the following coping strategies for couples' relationship. These include:

Avoidance: Some couples try to deal with conflict through avoidance because they believe that by avoiding the people, situations and issues which cause crisis, they will overcome the problem. At time like these, avoidance become counterproductive as the issue may continue to brew into a more serious crisis. This often leads to a decline in all forms of interaction especially intimacy and sexual intercourse. Even though a temporary avoidance might be wise at times to gain a bearing on the issue, positive solutions are reached only after intense negative feelings of have been expressed and have subsided such that people can think straight again.

Ventilation: This coping strategy has been used by psychotherapist for many years where it involves encouraging partners in dispute or with a boiling problem to talk-out, act out their feeling in the open; this is based on the idea of psychological catharsis or draining negative emotions so that they can be replaced by positive ones. The disadvantage here is that such expression might elicit same reactions from the other aggrieved party and emotions may clash into violence. Therefore the author suggested an intellectual approach of 'civility' and etiquette in dealing with crisis, as they have been found to be useful in coping with interpersonal relationship problems and promoting marital stability. These are destructive arguments that attack the individual person rather than the problem, they aim at. Destructive strategies are often characterized by lack of good communication, suspicion and rely on criticism in an attempt to influence the other party. Hence they generally increase resentment, elevate tension; undermine confidence, trust, friendship and effective feelings resulting in loss of companionship, a total breakdown in communication and greater conflict.

Anderson (2003) pointed that, in order to maximize a couple capacity to cope with the living apart style, intervention should begin at the decision making stage, with a discussion of how to integrate work in family issues to considered for a living apart marriage are :

1. couples should check their financial stability as this will help living apart couples reduce undue financial burden.
2. the couples should considered family's life cycle stage before deciding to live apart.
3. time spent between couples should be utilized effective as this will encourage strong mutual emotional support among the couples.
4. how systematic the couples is in making decisions; and
5. couple should be able to reassess in between the time frame whether the living apart relationship is working or not.

Paterson, (2004) also proposed that there are three broad categories for successful coping strategies in living apart among couples and they are:

Problem focused emotional focused and meaning focused. According to him, problem focused techniques help families to manage specific problems by trying to alter problem situations; emotional focused help families to regulate their emotions and meaning focused strategies help couples understand why this has happened. In another contribution it was suggested that a good relationship with in-laws helps in resolving crisis as they could assist the marriage in several ways; such as child care, advising and even financially if they are wealthy.

Coping with living apart marriage is significantly supported if the couples can easily afford the increased financial cost of the lifestyle (Anderson and Spruill, 1993). Additionally, if spouses have no children at home, or older children have been married longer, and have at least one established career, continuity seems to be easier. Those spouses who can tolerate periods of

separation and enjoy spending time alone also seem to adjust to and cope with the lifestyle most easily. Financially, using a more systematic or planned decision style helps many couples to express higher satisfaction with their decision to live apart and their adapting to the community lifestyle. However it is important to recognize that entering into a living apart relationship in marriage is a decision that couples make. Re-evaluating the implemented decision to assess its effectiveness also is critical for enhancing family well-being.

Haddadj (2007) stated that, in order to cope with living apart relationship, there are few basic strategies that couples living apart must follow. Below are some of the strategies;

1. **Rekindle the closeness and love by making the best use of time spent together**; couples living apart make extra sacrifices of their time to compensate for what they missed when they were away. The living apart couples can gain back their intimacy in a marital relationship as this will help reduce pressure when they are together to make all reunion special.
2. **Stay close by communication often**; couples living apart, must maintain intimacy by calling, e-mailing, text-messaging, writing letters and surprising partners with care packages by this, the distance or absent is not felt.
3. **Make sure that you remember the important date or occasion**; make it appoint to celebrate the important date together with your distance spouse. Distance should not be a barrier as couples can always call up each other on special date or occasions. Do not also forget to send gifts to spice up the living apart relationship.
4. **Set intervals to visit one another;** couples living apart may often regret having done so, unnecessary misunderstanding may arise. These provide added tensions at a period when

there is boredom in a marriage. There will be quarrels and normally, one of the many cause of these quarrels will be the question of who should visit or who will be with the children. It is important for couples to know that if there is an interval set for visiting one another, must be base on true communication and not on mere convenience or compulsion. Hence in other to survive living apart relationship partner must make it a point to visit each other from time to time. This will help to strengthen living apart relationship, the objective is to see and reconnect yourself with your partner if you have the extra time off.

5. **Get involves with community groups such as worship centers and social services**; Loneliness is common by product of living apart, socializing is a good way to counter the boredom of living apart from spouse. Distance does not mean that couples have stop living, rather such partner should be involve in the community activities such as, social, civic, and spiritual activities. Getting involved in community groups help couples living apart maintains a happy married life without confrontation.

2.11 Empirical Studies

Many studies have been carried out on different areas relating to couples living apart. Milan and Peters (2003) conducted a study in Canada on couples living apart. The aim of the study was to investigate the most prevalence reasons for living apart among couple's in Canada. The study was based on a sample of about 2,190 individuals aged 20 years and over, who were not living with a spouse but married. The researchers used descriptive survey design and purposive random sample. Data were collected through face-to-face interview and questionnaires which were distributed and collected. Simple percentages were used to analyze the data

collected. The study revealed that living apart arrangement was most common for 20 to 29 years old. While the most prevalence reasons influencing living apart among couples were differences in career demand 65%, differences in career demand 66%; 43% reported that it was active job search due to external pressures, usually family and work related (66%); 34% revealed that, it was family obligations. The study concluded that, regardless of whether living apart among couples is a temporary or permanent arrangement, it is contributed by labour market changes, higher educational attainment, changing family responsibilities and living arrangement, increased divorce and separation rates, higher standards of living, and higher life expectancy. This study guided the researcher on the reasons influencing living apart among couples, thus forming part of the objectives of this research.

Haskey, (2005), carried out a study on married couples living apart. The purpose of the research was to identify couples involved in living apart relationship and to find out how important the new form of relationship were. Survey research design was used for the study, with 47 respondents. Face to face interview, was the instrument employed by the researcher in collecting data. The survey revealed that, risk was perceived to attach more to making commitment in the form of having children, for the arrival of children threatened to change the lifestyle and the living arrangement the couples had made. The study also established, that for divorced couples who were once in a living together family, felt that co-residence (living apart) would be too difficult for their children from their first marriage. While those who had never married before or divorced revealed that career demand family obligation and geographical location were reasons that influenced them, for continuing to live apart from their partners.

The present study shared many similarities with the past study, in the sense that the issue of children was considered in the present study literature review, except that the present study used 370 couples; with structured questionnaire which was used to collect data, under 11 Local Government Areas in Kaduna state.

In another study, Haskey and Levin (2006) conducted a study on living apart together in Britain. The researchers drew their samples from six (6) qualitative samples. Method for collection of data was focused on group discussion and questionnaire. Simple percentage and weighted mean was used to analyze the data. Findings revealed that middle aged and elderly couples viewed living apart relationship as a way couples balanced aspects of shared intimate autonomy, independent in taking care of children or older parents. Married women in the study revealed that the decision to live apart from their intimate partner was an effort to achieve greater gender equity in the division of household work.

The present researcher believed that living apart among couples is a way for couple to balance their needs for independence with their needs for intimacy. The authors however, limited the sample size to six (6) respondents. These seemed inadequate to the researcher as the study was not fully represented in Britain. On the other hand, the findings of this study was relevant to the present study in supporting research finding on demographic characteristics on the personal decision to live apart among couples in Kaduna State.

Roseneil (2006) completed a study that examined couples not living with their partner in Yorkshire of Northeastern England. The purpose of the study was to examine the incidence and demographic characteristics of those who lived apart together, the understanding that they held about their relationship and why they did not live together. The researcher used 47 respondents

as samples in the study. Sampling procedure employed was purposeful sampling technique. Two instruments used for data collection were structured interview and questionnaires. The result of Roseneil's finding revealed that, couples living apart, did not live apart because they were forced to do so, however, some lived apart because of housing and labour market constraints. Although many couples living apart chose to do so for various reasons even though it would be possible for them to live together. To these, the researcher termed "the regretfully apart" (those who are forced into it by competing work commitment or family responsibilities), the "undecidedly apart", (those who while committed to one another, did not find themselves on the path towards living together) and the "gladly apart" (those who had made a conscious decision to keep their domestic live separate). In this way living apart among couples were of various types.

Roseneil's study has similarities with the study being carried out; the present study identified several types of living apart and reasons influencing living part. The same sampling procedure was used as the sampling technique and structured questionnaire was also used as an instrument for collecting data from couples living apart. However, Roseneil has done a good research but in the opinion of the researcher the sample size used for the study could have been a little more than 47, as 47 respondents did not reveal a more satisfactory assessment and conclusion.

In another study, Beaujoaun, Regnier-Loiher and Gokalp (2008) carried out a study on living apart relationship in France. The study investigated the characteristics of couples concerned in the relationship and the way their relationship function. Interview data were randomly collected from the national sample of 2014 married persons, from age group of 25-79 years. A pre-structured closed ended interview was prepared. Respondents were personally

interviewed to collect the authentic first hand data. The data were tabulated using frequency and simple percentage, to ascertain the main characteristics of the individual age. SPAD (software Process Analysis Design), Software was used to analyze the characteristics of the respondents' relationship and their future intension that is, if they would like to live together.

The study revealed that growing number of women who refused to abandon their professional career to join their partners, favoured living apart relationship (82%). It was concluded that couples in LAT unions were likely to have more schooling than those who lived with their spouse. The study thus was adequately useful for the present study in the general characteristics of couples living apart and the way their relationship function. Similarly, the present study sampled employed married couples. The present study was also similar to the past study in that career demand and economic perspective was found to be one of the reasons influencing couples to live apart.

Strohm, Selzer, Cochran and Mays (2009) carried out a study to analyze LAT relationships in the United States. Some of the objectives were to investigate the attitudes and values of couples living apart; and couples relationship with their partners and family. The researchers used two complementary population-based data source; one a national sample (GSS-General Social Survey) and the other a state sample (CalQOL-California Quality of Life Survey) for data collection. The samples were 638 respondents aged 23-70 years. The GSS was used as an instrument for investigating the attitude and values of couples living apart, while CalQOL was used to investigate couples relationship with their partner and family. In addition, four-point scales were used and face-to-face interview was also used as instrument for collection of data.

The statistical analysis used was simple percentages, contingency table analysis, weighted mean chi square and Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficient.

The results of the analyzed data showed that, couples in living apart together union placed a longer value on independent and more likely to expect both partners to contribute to paid work and family care-giving, compared to couple living together. The result indicated that couples living apart were unable to balance autonomy with obligations of intimate relationships, critical for understanding family ties in the 21st Century. It was further revealed from the results that couples in living apart unions perceived low level of support from their partners in term of family relationships. The findings of this research went a long way in guiding the present study in the area of socio economic and socio emotional effects of living apart on couples. However the dissimilarity between the past research and the present research; is that the present research was conducted in Kaduna state of Nigeria using survey research design, while the past study was conducted in United States of America

Reimonds, Evans and Gray (2010) conducted a research on living apart together in Australia. The aim was to assess the prevalence of these relationships, to investigate the characteristic of the individuals in these unions and to examine how the meaning attached to this union relates to life course factors such as age and previous relationship history. The researcher used data from the 2005 wave of the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) survey, (National Representative Longitudinal Survey). Methods of data collection were the face-to-face interview and questionnaire. The population consisted of 12066 couples aged 18 and more. A sample of 487 husbands and 487 wives were used for the study. The analysis was undertaken in three main parts. In one, weighted percentages and summary statistic

was used to describe the prevalence and characteristics of LAT respondents. The second part used the duration, the frequency of contact and geographical distance between partners to look at three key characteristic of living apart relationship, while Multiple Correspondence Analyses (MCA) and cluster analysis were used to identify the profile of respondents with similar demographic characteristics.

The study revealed that couples living apart voluntary chose to, in order to maintain a degree of independence and autonomy, especially most of whom were young and older couples, widowed and divorced. A possible reason was that; they did not want to disrupt the home environment of their resident children by bringing new partner in the home or by moving into another residence. The study was relevant in the current research in supporting research findings on reasons influencing living apart among couples. However the present research made use of structured questionnaires.

Duncan (2010) conducted a study on people who lived apart and how different are they. The aim of the study was to examine living apart couples by choice or constraint, to investigate the social activities of couples living apart and to seek the opinions of couples in a living apart relationship. Survey research designs were employed in the study. The survey was carried out through face-to-face interview and structured questionnaire with response options of strongly agreed to strongly disagreed were used for the study. The age of the respondent in the study was 18 years and above with sample of 320 people living apart from partners. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to provide frequency distribution, cross tabulations, and regression analysis of respondents.

The study revealed that many found advantages in living apart, while other found living apart as a more constrained situation rather than an individual choice. However, couples in living apart, stated that their relationship was stronger while others whereof the view that they are not socio emotionally related with their spouse as they both spend a lot of time in career pursuit.

The present study shared many similarities with the past study in the sense that, the present study also used survey type of research design and some of the socio emotional effects of living apart relationship were also considered in the present study which in fact, formed one of the research questions. Some of the dissimilarities were that the present study used 370 respondents, while the past research used 320 respondents.

In a related case study of living apart, Ayodeji (2010) conducted a study on the psychological status of women whose husbands reside abroad. The sample of the study consisted of 198 married women whose husbands have gone to America to work or stay. The respondents were drawn from four banks since, the women only used these banks for business transactions; they collected the money sent by their husbands through the banks either in local or in foreign currencies. Instrument used for data collection was structured questionnaire. The study used an expost facto design that involved the use of battery of scale. T-test of significance was used to test the three Null Hypotheses that were drawn from the study. Findings revealed that, there was a significant relationship between wife's health status and husbands living apart. Result of the study also revealed that women (wives) whose husbands resided apart were faced with social economical challenges such as anxiety and emotional insecurity. They are also faced with socio emotional problems as the women claimed to spend a lot of money on hospital bill, the money that should have been spent on some other things like the children clothing, toy and feeding.

The previous research went a long way in supporting the findings of the present study in the areas of socio economic and socio emotional effect of living apart on couple, and the risks associated with couples living apart. However, the present research employed survey research designs and 11 Local Government Areas in Kaduna State which the previous research did not indicate.

2.12 Summary on Review of Related Literature

Living apart together is seen as a diverse and heterogeneous category, where couples live apart either by choice or constraints. Types of living apart relationship ,reasons influencing couples to live apart as well as the socio economic and socio emotional effects of living apart on couple were reviewed. Couples were, more influence by employment, economic, and caring commitment as reason for living apart relationship. Space, career space independence, were been noted as part of the benefits associated with living apart of married couples while resentment and guilt was identified as the risks associated with couples' living apart. Available literature revealed that living apart has effect on the couples, their marriage and family relationship. Thus the socio economic and socio emotional effect of living apart on couple depends on the age of the marriage relationship. Common emotional effect of living apart among couples was identified as stress related causes. According to various literatures it was also revealed that, the impact of career and geographical location influence couples to live apart .The findings of some empirical studies carried out related to couples living apart, summarily showed that living apart among couple are influenced by various reasons, the benefits and risk were also identified in some literature. Although a comparative study of the socio-economic and socio

emotional effects of newly wedded and older couples living apart were not researched into which was the main essence, of the current study intends to focus on.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter gave an insight description of procedures that were used for this study. It was discussed under the following sub-headings:

3.1 Research Design

3.2 Population for the Study

3.3 Sample Size and Sampling Procedure

3.4 Instrument for Data Collection

3.4.1 Validity of the Instrument

3.4.2 Pilot Study

3.4.3 Reliability of the Instrument

3.5 Procedure for Data Collection

3.6 Procedure for Data Analysis

3.1 Research Design

Descriptive research design in form of survey was used for this study. This research design was adopted because, it was the best method suited for handling a large population located at different places under a natural setting. Ekeh (2003) posited that survey method of research is concerned with systematic collection of data and generalized statistics resulting when data are obtained from a large number of cases. Since the researcher is comparing the socio-economic and socio-emotional effect of living apart on newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State, descriptive survey method was therefore considered appropriate for use in the study.

3.2 Population for the Study

The population for this study comprised of all employed literate married men and women in the 23 Local Government Areas in Kaduna state, with a total of eight hundred and forty-one thousand, eight hundred and twenty-four (841,824) as shown on Table 3.2:

Table 3.1 Population for the Study

S/n	Senatorial Zones and LGAs	Population of Employed Married Men and Women
	ZONE 1	
1	Zaria	53,781
2	Kudan	16,406
3	Sabon gari	37,977
4	Giwa	32,552
5	Ikara	31,017
6	Soba	45,483
7	Kabau	45,606
8	Makarfi	18,785
	ZONE 2	
1	Kaduna south	56,693
2	Kaduna north	51,283
3	Kauru	33,382
4	Kajuru	15,183
5	Lere	52,962
6	Birni-Gwari	36,543
7	Chukun	14,239
	ZONE 3	
1	Kaura	28,008
2	Jaba	24,472
3	Jama'a	41,839
4	Sanga	22,302
5	Kachia	37,116
6	Zango Kataf	49,646
7	Igabi	63,243
8	Kagoro	33,306
Total	**23**	**841,824**

Source: *National Population Commission Kaduna State and National Bureau for Population (2006).*

3.3 Sample Size and Sampling Procedure

Multistage sampling technique was adopted in selecting the sample. In the first stage, stratified random sampling technique was employed in selecting 11 Local Government Areas from the three senatorial zones in Kaduna State proportionately. Fifteen percent (15%) of each stratum of the 23 Local Governments was proportionally sampled, (Osuola, 2003), which reflected the distribution of employed literate married men and women, working in the 23 Local Government Areas in Kaduna State, comprising of; Sabon Gari, Giwa, Makarfi, Kudan, Kaduna South, Kaduna North, Kajuru, Jaba, Kachia, Jama'a and Kagoro.

In the second stage, proportionate simple random sampling was used to select 370 employed literate married husbands and wives living apart, which gave 1% of a population of 365,162. This is based on the recommendation of Okeke (1999), who pointed out that if the total population of a study runs into tens of thousands, a sample of 1% is considered adequate

While in the third stage, purposive random sampling was used to select 164 newlyweds and 206 older couples. The purposive sample was chosen because these couples are living apart and they are literate and employed civil/public servants. According to Ekeh (2003) purposive sampling technique is one selected on the basis of the researcher's judgement on the suitability and appropriateness of the sample. Table 3.3 showed the distribution of the population and sample drawn from the 11 Local Government Areas.

Table 3.2: Sample Size for the Study

Zone	Local Govt Areas	Population of employed married husbands and wives	Sample	Percentage (%)
1	Sabon Gari	37,977	38	10
	Kaduna North	51,283	52	14
	Kaduna South	56,693	57	16
	Kachia	37,116	38	10
2	Giwa	32,552	33	9
	Jaba	24,472	25	7
	Kudan	16,406	17	5
3	Makarfi	18,785	19	5
	Jama'a	41,839	42	11
	Kagoro	33,306	34	9
	Kajuru	15,183	15	4
	Total	**365,612**	**370**	**100**

Formular = sample = $\frac{\text{population of LG x Total sample}}{\text{Total Population}}$

Percentage = $\frac{\text{population of LG x 100}}{\text{Total population}}$ = %

3.4 Instrument for Data Collection

A self-designed structured questionnaire was used in gathering data for this research. The questionnaire was structured based on the research objectives, research questions and Null hypotheses. The questionnaire was consisted the following sections:

Section A; consisted of information on the demographic characteristics.

Section B; was based on reasons influencing living apart among couples

Section C; the socio economic effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples

Section D; the socio emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples

Section E; comparable differences in the socio economic effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples

Section F; comparable differences in the socio emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples

Section G; coping strategies utilized by couples living apart

Table 3.3 Breakdown of the Questionnaire Items

Research Questions	Items	Focus of the Items
1	1-6	Reasons influencing living apart among couples.
2	7-12	The socio economic effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples.
3	13-17	The socio emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples.
4	18-23	Comparable differences in the socio economic effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples.
5	24-29	Comparable differences in the socio emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples
6	30-35	Coping strategies utilized by couples living apart

Questionnaire items in section A-B basically required the respondents to provide information by ticking in the appropriate spaces provided while other sections (C-G) was on a 4-points scale of Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (DA) and Strongly Disagree (SD). This was purely a modification of the existing Likert scale. The responses were given a numerical values from 1-4 for strongly disagree to strongly agree thus the respondents were required to tick against the item, under the appropriate rating scale based on the option. The 4-point scale was collapsed into two; agree and disagree thus, both strongly agree and Agree were

administered as Agree, while Disagree and Strongly Disagree were administered as Disagree; the mean of the scores was found as:

Strongly Agree (SA) = 4

Agree (A) =3

Disagree (D) =2

Strongly Disagree (DA) =1

Therefore; $\frac{4+3+2+1}{4} = \frac{10}{4} = 2.5$

Therefore, any item with a mean of 2.5 and above was interpreted as agree (A) while score below 2.5 was interpreted as disagree (D).

3.4.1 Validity of the Instrument

In order to establish the validity of the instrument used for the study, the instrument was validated by three experts in Home Economics Section, Department of Vocation and Technical Education, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and two experts in Measurement and Evaluation Department, Ahmadu Bello University Zaria. The items in the questionnaire were restructured and repositioned accordingly based on the suggestions of the evaluators.

3.4.2 Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted using 20 employed married husbands and wives in Chukun Local Government Area of Kaduna State which was not among the sampled Local Government

Areas but has similar characteristics as the sample population. This was done in order to determine the reliability and consistency of the research instrument, and to ascertain the difficulty that the researcher may encounter when carrying out the main study, as well as to determine the possibility of the subjects in providing necessary information required for the study. Another reason for the pilot study was to test whether subject understood the questions and in providing answers that are valid for this study. The researcher randomly selected 20 respondents and administered the questionnaire to them by hand. The researcher adopted a personal on-the-spot delivery and recovery method. The complete copies of questionnaire were collected on the same day of distribution. Thus it was possible to recover the entire questionnaire administered.

3.4.3 Reliability of the Instrument

The data from the pilot study were coded and subjected to statistical analysis using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS), Version 16; the option selected from the SPSS for reliability test was the Cronbach's Alpha methods. These methods were chosen in order to determine if items are internally consistent and reliable. The result of the analysis revealed a reliability coefficient of 0.780 for the Cronbach's Alpha, coefficient, reliability obtain was 0.620. This is in line with the proposition of Ekeh (2003) and Odagboyi and Jonathan, (2009) who stated that the high correlation of 0.70- 0.89 is considered high enough for the reliability of an instrument.

3.5 Procedures for Data Collection

The researcher with the help of eight trained research assistants administered the questionnaire to the employed married husbands and wives living apart in each of the selected 11 Local Government Areas. The questionnaire was distributed to the respondents in various Departments/ Parastatals and Ministries in Kaduna State civil and public services. The respondents were given a period of two weeks to complete the questionnaire after which the researcher retrieved them back with the assistance of the trained researcher. A total number of 370 copies of the questionnaire were distributed and collected for data analysis.

3.6 Procedure for Data Analysis

The data collected were analyzed using appropriate statistical methods from the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 16. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentile were used for identification and classification of respondents demographic characteristics in Section A-B, while in the other sections (C-G), frequencies, percentile and weighted mean score were used in answering research questions, in chapter one. In order to analyze the Four Null Hypotheses, inferential statistics of students' two-tiled independent t-test was used to test if significant differences existed between two variables (newly wedded and older couples). All Null hypotheses were tested at 0.05 (α) alpha level of significance. This was considered suitable for this research analysis because the entire Null hypotheses required a comparison between the mean of the groups under study that is, the newlyweds and older couples living apart.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

This chapter dealt with analysis of the data collected for the study. The research work was on comparative study of socio-economic and socio-emotional effects of living apart of newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna state of Nigeria. Data collected were organized into frequency distribution tables, percentiles and weighted score means in order to highlight major findings and to answer research objectives in line with research questions and Null hypotheses. The Null hypotheses were tested, by collapsing the 4-point scale into two which reflected agree and disagree. This enabled the researcher to utilize the students' two-tailed independent t-test, inferential statistical tool for testing the Null hypotheses.

This chapter is organized under five subheadings as stated:

4.1 Analyses of Demographic Data

4.2 Answers to Research Questions

4.3 Testing of Hypotheses

4.4 Discussions of Findings

4.5 Summary of Findings

A total of 370 copies of questionnaire were administered and was retrieved, making 100% retrieval.

4.1 Analysis of Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

The demographic variables of the respondents considered to be important in this study included the sex gender, age, educational qualification, occupational status and numbers of years in marriage. Others were types of living apart, personal decision to live apart and reasons for living apart of the respondents. Two hundred and twenty (220) male and one hundred and fifty (150) female making a total of three hundred and seventy (370) respondents from the 11 Local Government Areas in Kaduna State were involved in the study. Tables 4.1.1 to 4.1.6 were used to summarize the characteristics of respondents as shown:

Table 4.1.1: Percentage Distribution of Respondents, by their Gender

Sex	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Male	220	59.5
Female	150	40.5
Total	**370**	**100**

The data in Table 4.1.1 indicated that 59.5 % (220) of the respondents were male, while 40.5% (150) were female. Both gender were given the opportunity to participate in the exercise and were both represented in the study.

Table 4:1.2: Percentage Distribution of Respondents by to Age (in years)

Age range (in years)	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
18-24	089	24
25-34	131	35
35-44	113	31
45-54	022	06
55-79	015	04

Total	**370**	**100**

The data in Table 4.1.2 indicated that the age range of 25-34 years were the dominant group among the respondents, which accounted for 35% of the total respondents. The next in number among the respondents were those a little above 34 years. The group (35-44 years) accounted for 31% of the total respondents. Respondents less than 18-24 years accounted for 24%, the group under the 45-54 years were 6%, while those under 55-79 years accounted for 4%. This means that the couples involved in the study could not be said to be too young or too old. It would therefore be expected that they were well informed about the socio-economic and socio-emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples.

In Table 4.1.3 the respondents were assessed in terms of their higher educational qualification.

Table 4.1.3: Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Educational Qualification

Highest Educational Qualification	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Secondary Cert	049	13
NCE/ND	131	35.4
HND/Degree	153	41.3
Masters	021	6.0
Ph.D	016	4.3
Total	**370**	**100**

From Table 4.1.3, respondents with higher National Diploma and First Degree were the highest which gave 41.3% of the total respondents. This was followed by those with National Certificate in Education (NCE) and National Diploma (ND) which accounted for 35.4%. Those who had Secondary Education accounted for 13% followed by those with Masters Degree (6%), while those with Ph.D accounted for 4.3%. The dominant of the HND, University Degree, NCE

and ND among the highest qualifications of the respondents bear more reflection of the places where the questionnaire was administered in each of the 11 Local Government Areas in the State.

Table 4.1.4: Percentage Distribution of Respondent by Occupation

Respondents occupation	Frequency	Percentage
Civil servants	247	67
Public servants	123	33
Total	**370**	**100**

The occupation of the respondents indicated in Table 4.1.4 showed that 67% of the respondents were employed under civil service, while 33% were employed under public service. Hence, the dominance of the civil service in the study could be attributed to the reason that majority of the total respondents attained Higher National Diploma (HND), First Degree, National Diploma (ND), and National Certificate in Education (NCE).

The Number of years in marriage of the respondents was another variable that was of concern in this study. Table 4.1.5 showed the classification of the respondents by the number of their year in marriage.

Table 4.1.5: Percentage Distribution of Respondent by Years in Marriage

No. of years in marriage	Frequency	Percentage
1-10	164	44
11 and above	206	56
Total	**370**	**100**

From Table 4.1.5, 56% of the respondents had been in marriage from 11 years and above. While 44% (164) of the respondents said they had been in marriage for 1-10 years only. This means that 44% (164) of the respondents were newlywed couples, while 56% (206) of the respondents were older couples as represented in the study.

The type of living apart practiced by respondents was another variable that was of major concern in this study. In Table 4.1.6, the types of living apart practiced by respondents are tabulated in frequencies and percentiles.

Table 4.1.6: Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Types of Living Apart Practiced

Types of Living Apart	Frequency	Percentage
Living with parent	023	06
Living in a different town from spouse	247	67
Living with relatives	033	09
Living alone but in the same town with spouse	067	18
Total	**370**	**100**

The Table 4.1.6 indicated that 67% of those respondents were living in a different town from their spouse, with a high frequency of (247) and was followed by these living alone but in the same town with spouse with (18%). Only 9% stated categorically that they lived with their relatives and 6% of the respondents claimed they were living with their parents. This means that most respondents would be expressing their opinions on familiar activities with regards to the variable being investigated in the study.

4.2 Answers to Research Questions

The main objectives of this study were to compare the Socio-Economic and Socio-Emotional Effects of Living Apart on Newlyweds and Older Couples in Kaduna State. In providing the required answer to the research questions the items for each research question one were analyzed using simple frequencies and percentile. While six research question items for each respective variable scored in means and percentile data and processed using the SPSS statistical package to obtain the means (x) for weighted scores. Decision was reached based on the four point modified Likert Scale for decision making:

1.00-1.49 Highly Negative 1.5-2.49 Negative 2.50-2.99 Positive 3.00-4.00 Highly Positive

The research questions are as follows;

Research Question One: What are the Reasons that Influence Living Apart among Newlyweds and Older Couples in Kaduna State?

In answering this question, Section B of the questionnaire was used. This is presented in Table 4.2.1.

Table 4.2.1: Distribution of respondents on reasons influencing living apart among newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna state.

VARIABLES	FREQ	PERCENT	MEAN STATISTICS	STD. ERR	ST. DV
Differences in jobs location	105	28.4	0.2838	0.0235	0.4514
Partners state of health	20	5.4	0.0541	0.0118	0.2264
Active job search	53	14.3	0.1432	0.0182	0.3508
Differences in career demand	84	22.7	0.2270	0.0218	0.4195
Lack of suitable accommodation	71	19.2	0.1919	0.0205	0.3943
Other family obligation	31	8.4	0.0838	0.0144	0.2774
Total	370	100			

In answer to research question one. Table 4.2.1, showed that the majority of the respondents revealed that, differences in job location was the major reasons why they lived apart with mean responses of 0.2838 (28.4%). 22.7% with mean of 0.2270 and standard deviation of 0.4195 opined that differences in career demand made them to live apart from their spouses. While 19.2% with mean of 0.1919 and standard deviation of 0.3943, indicated that, lack of suitable accommodation was a peculiar reasons why they lived apart. Consequently, 14.3% of

the respondents with mean of 0.1432 and standard deviation of 0.3508 disclosed that active job search was the reason influencing living apart, and 8.3% with a mean of 0.0838 believed that other family obligation were the reasons for living apart. However, only a mere 5.4% of the respondents with mean of 0.0541 and standard deviation of 0.2264 indicated that, partners' state of health was a reason why couples live apart.

Research Question Two: What are the Socio-Economic Effects of Living Apart on Newlyweds and Older Couples in Kaduna State?

The socio-economic effects of living apart on couples are expressed in frequencies, percentages and means in Table 4.2.2.

Table 4.2.2: Distribution of Respondents on the Socio-Economic Effects of Living Apart Newlyweds and Older on Couples

s/no	Socio Economic Effect of Living Apart on Couple	Newlywed Couples				Older Couples				Mean	Remarks
		Agree		Disagree		Agree		Disagree			
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
1	Spouse living apart encounter financial strain in maintaining two homes	133	81.0	31	8.9	197	95.6	9	4.4	3.21	Agreed
2	Couples living apart have poor satisfaction from their financial resources	129	78.7	35	21.3	171	83.0	35	17.0	3.08	Agreed
3	Couples living apart have difficulty choosing residential location near work	157	95.7	7	4.3	170	82.5	36	17.5	3.25	Agreed
4	Living apart among couples causes economic strain and income loss	104	63.4	60	36.6	137	66.5	69	33.5	2.70	Agreed
5	Couples living apart spend more on commuting to see one another	145	88.4	19	11.6	204	99.0	2	1.0	3.28	Agreed
6	Couples living apart are faced with misunderstanding between who should handle the family financial decision	101	61.6	63	38.4	137	66.5	69	33.5	2.77	Agreed
	Aggregate Mean Score									**3.05**	**Agreed**

Table 4.2.2 indicates the distribution of respondents on the socio-economic effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples

Table 4.2.2 showed that all 6 items has their means above the cut-off point of 2.49. The data, in Table 4.2.2, indicated that 88.4% (145) and 99% (204) of newlyweds and older couples respectively, agreed that they spend more on commuting to see one another. This was the foremost socio-economic effect of living apart on couples with a mean of 3.28. The next socio economic effect of living apart which 95.7% (157) of the newlyweds and 82.5% (170) of older couples consented to was the difficulty choosing residential location near work. This was seen as a vital socio-economic effect of living apart on couples with the mean of 3.25. In this hierarchy on the socio-economic effect of living apart on couples, was encountering financial strain in maintaining two homes, which 81% (133) of the newlyweds and 95.6% (197) of the older couples agreed, to this socio-economic effect, with a mean of 3.21.

Poor satisfaction from financial resources was identified, next with 78.7% (129) for newlyweds and 83% (171) for older couples with a mean of 3.08. The respondents agreed that items 2 in the Table 4.2.2, was a socio economic effect of living apart on couples. Misunderstanding between who should handle the financial decision was viewed next as important. In this socio-economic effect of living apart on couples, 61.6% (101) of the newlyweds and 66.5% (137) of older couples acknowledged that there was disagreement on family financial management with mean of 2.77. 63.4 % (104) and 66.5 (137) of newlyweds and older couples respectively opined that living apart causes economic strain and income loss with a mean of 2.70.

Unsurprisingly, Table 4.2.2, showed an aggregate mean score of 3.05 which indicated that all the socio-economic effects listed affected newlyweds and older couples living apart.

Research Question Three: What are the Socio-Emotional Effects of Living Apart on Newlyweds and Older Couples in Kaduna State?

In Table 4.2.3, the distribution of respondents on the socio emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples were presented in frequencies, percentile and mean, in Table 4.2.3.

Table 4.2.3: Distribution of Respondent on the Socio Emotional Effects of Living Apart on Newlyweds and Older Couples

	Socio Emotional Effect of Living Apart on Couples	Newlywed Couples				Older Couples				X	Remarks
		Agree		Disagree		Agree		Disagree			
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
1	Living apart among couples leads to emotional insecurity	164	100	0	0	200	97.1	6	2.9	3.42	Agreed
2	Living apart among couples causes loss in concentration	135	82.3	29	17.7	100	48.5	106	51.5	2.69	Agreed
3	Living apart among couples leads to marriage dissolution and separation	125	76.2	39	23.8	150	72.8	56	27.2	2.97	Agreed
4	Couples living apart spend less time relating emotionally to one another.	125	76.2	39	23.8	174	84.5	32	15.5	3.09	Agreed
5	Couples living apart are open to resentment and guilt	143	87.2	21	12.8	132	64.1	74	35.9	2.97	Agreed
6	Living apart among couples causes much unhappiness and restlessness	149	90.9	15	9.1	138	67.0	68	33.0	3.04	Agreed
	Aggregate mean score									**3.03**	**Agreed**

Tables 4.2.3: indicates the distribution of respondents on the socio-emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples.

In Table 4.3.2, it was noted that all the socio- emotional effect listed were found to be positively related to newlyweds and older couples living apart on the average the frequency, percentage and mean of the respondents revealed some socio emotional effects that are predominant. 100% (164) of newlyweds and older couples 97% (200) surveyed strongly agreed

that, emotional insecurity was indeed a socio emotional effect of living apart on couples, with a high mean of 3.42. 76.2% of newlyweds and 84.5% (174) of older couples also noted that couples living apart. The mean score for this item revealed 3.09. While, most 90.9% (149) of newlyweds and 67 %(138) of older couples agreed that, living apart among newlyweds and older couples causes much unhappiness and restlessness. In the case of item 3 and 5, the mean responses revealed 2.97 respectively. Thus, indicating that, the socio-emotional effect of living apart on couples led to marriage dissolution and separation as well as, making couples living apart to be open to resentment and guilt. 76.2% (125) of newlyweds and 72.8% (150) of older couples agreed to item 3 in Table 4.2.3, while, 87.2% (143) of newlyweds and 64.1% (132) of older couples further affirmed that, couples living apart are open to resentment and guilt. Following these, 82.3% (135) of the newlyweds agreed that the socio emotional effect of living apart causes loss in concentration, while 51.5% (106) older couples disagreed thus reflecting a relatively less effect.

From Table 4.2.3, there was a good agreement by the respondents that living apart among couples have socio emotional effects on both newlyweds and older couples as indicated by the aggregate mean score of 3.03 in the Table.

Research Question Four: What are the Comparable Differences in the Socio Economic Effects of Living Apart between Newlyweds and Older Couples in Kaduna State?

The comparable differences in the socio-economic effect of living apart among newlyweds and older couples are scored in frequencies, percentages and means in Table 4.2.4.

Table 4.2.4: Distribution of Respondents on the Comparable Differences in the Socio Economic Effects of Living Apart Among Newlyweds and Older Couples

	Comparable differences in the socio economic effects of living apart among newlyweds and older couples	Newlywed Couples Agree		disagree		Older Couples Agree		disagree		X	remark
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
1	Older couples living apart encounter more financial strain in maintaining two homes compared to newlyweds.	145	88.4	19	11.6	182	88.3	24	11.7	3.23	Agreed
2	Older couples living apart experience very poor satisfaction from their financial resources compared to newlyweds.	98	59.8	66	40.2	163	79.1	43	20.9	2.84	Agreed
3	Newlywed couples living apart have difficulty in choosing residential location near work compared to older couples.	164	100	0	0	142	68.9	64	31.1	3.10	Agreed
4	Living apart among older couples causes more economic strain and income loss compared to newlyweds.	80	48.8	84	51.2	175	85.0	31	15.0	2.8	Agreed
5	Older couples spend more on commuting to see one another compared to newlyweds.	137	83.5	27	16.5	194	94.2	12	5.8	3.18	Agreed
6	Newlywed couples living apart are often faced with misunderstanding on who should handle financial decision compared to older couples.	162	98.8	2	1.2	145	70.4	61	29.6	3.12	Agreed
	Aggregate mean score									**3.05**	**Agreed**

Table 4.2.4 indicates the distribution of respondents on the comparable differences in the socio economic effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples.

As shown on Table 4.2.4, 88.4% (145) of newlyweds and 88.3%(184) of older couples with mean score of 3.23 maintained that older couples encountered more financial strain in maintaining two homes while living apart, compared to newlywed couples. This was followed by

response of the respondents that older couples spent more on commuting to see one another compared to newlyweds. While 94.2% (194) of older couples and 83.5% (137) of newlyweds, consented with mean of 3.18. This was followed by 98.8% (162) of the newlyweds and 70.4% (145) older couples with mean score of 3.12, who agreed that newlyweds were often faced with the misunderstanding on who should handle financial decision in the home compared to older couples. Interestingly, 100% (164) of the newlyweds agreed that there was difficulty in choosing residential location near work compared to 68.9% (142) of older couples with mean score of 3.10. While, 59.8% (98) of newlyweds and 79.1% (163) older couples agreed that older couples experienced very poor satisfaction from their financial resources as compared to newlyweds with the mean score of 2.84. Nonetheless, 85% (175) of older couples agreed that they experienced more economic strain and financial loss, compared to newlywed couples. Though, 48.8% (80) of newlyweds agreed that older couples living apart experienced more economic strain and income loss with a mean of 2.80. The aggregate mean score of 3.05 indicated that the respondents agreed that there is a comparable difference in the socio economic effect of living apart on newlyweds and older couples.

Research Question Five: What are the Comparable Differences in the Socio Emotional Effects of Living Apart on Newlyweds and Older Couples in Kaduna State?

The respondents' opinion of the comparable differences in the socio-emotional effects of living apart on the newlyweds and older couples is expressed in frequencies, percentages and means in Table 4.2.5.

Table 4.2.5: Distribution of Respondents on the Comparable Difference in the Socio Emotional Effects of Living Apart on Newlyweds and Older Couples

S/No	Comparable Differences in the Socio Emotional Effects of Living Apart Among Newlyweds and Older Couples	Newlywed Couples				Older Couples				mean	Remarks
		Agree		Disagree		Agree		Disagree			
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
1	Living apart among newlywed couples often leads to emotional insecurity compared to older couples.	156	95.1	8	4.9	107	52.0	99	48.0	2.92	Agreed
2	Newlyweds living apart often experience more loss in concentration compared to older couples.	159	97.0	5	3.0	106	51.5	100	48.5	2.85	Agreed
3	Living apart among newlyweds gradually leads to marriage dissolution and separation compared to older couples.	149	90.9	15	9.1	125	60.7	81	39.3	2.93	Agreed
4	Older couples living apart spend less time relating emotionally to one another compared to newlyweds.	109	66.5	55	33.5	172	83.5	34	16.5	3.00	Agreed
5	Newlywed couples living apart are more open to resentment and guilt compared to older couples	161	98.2	3	1.8	120	58.3	86	41.7	2.92	Agreed
6	Newlywed couples living apart experience much unhappiness and restlessness compared to older couples	147	89.6	17	10.4	140	68.0	66	32.0	3.00	Agreed
	Aggregate mean score									**3.00**	**Agreed**

Table 4.2.5 indicated the distribution of respondents on the comparable difference in the socio emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples.

The responses to the items in the Table 4.2.5 with aggregate mean score 3.00, were clear indication that there was a comparable difference in the socio emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples. From item 4 in the Table 4.2.5, 83.5% (172) of older couples

agreed that they spent less time relating emotionally to one another, whereas, 66.5% (109) of newlyweds agreed that older couples spent less time relating emotionally to one another compared to newlyweds, with mean score of 3.00. In the case of item 6, 89.6% (147) of newlyweds and 68% (140) of older couples agreed that newlywed couples experienced much unhappiness and restless, in living apart relationship, therefore, indicating a mean score of 3.00. Although, 149 newlyweds representing 90.9% agreed that, living apart among newlywed couples gradually led to marital dissolution and separation compared to older couples. Also, 60.7% (125) of older couples agreed that living apart among couples gradually led to marital dissolution and separation among newlywed couples, with a mean score of 2.93.

Item 1 and 5 revealed a mean score of 2.92 respectively, thus indicating that 95% (156) of newlywed couples and 52% (107) of older couples agreed that living apart among newlywed couples often led to emotional insecurity compared to older couples. As in the case of item 5, 161 newlyweds with 98.2% agreed that newlywed couples living apart are more open to resentment and guilt. While, 58.3% (120) of older couples concurred that newlywed couples living apart were more open to resentment and guilt compared to older couples.

In addition, newlyweds also agreed that, there was a comparable difference in the socio emotional effects of living apart among newlyweds and older couples with a mean score of 2.85. 97% (159) of newlywed couples and 51.5% (106) of older couples revealed that newlywed couples often experienced more loss in concentration compared to older couples living apart.

Researches Question Six: What is the Coping Strategies Utilized by Couples Living Apart in Kaduna State?

The opinions of respondents on the coping strategies utilized by couples living apart are shown in Table 4.2.6.

Table 4.2.6: Distribution of Respondents Opinion on the Coping Strategies Utilized by Couples Living Apart

S/No	Coping Strategies Utilized by Couples Living Apart	Newlywed Couples				Older Couples				X	Remark
		Agree		Disagree		Agree		Disagree			
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
1	Rekindle the closeness and love by making the best use of time spent together.	119	72.6	45	27.4	148	71.8	58	28.2	2.95	Agreed
2	Communicate regularly via mail, cell phones and letters	123	75	41	25	177	85.9	29	14.1	3.04	Agreed
3	Make it a point to celebrate important date or occasions together	145	88.4	19	11.6	144	69.9	62	30.1	3.02	Agreed
4	Send presents or gifts to spice up living apart relationship	121	74	43	26	138	67	68	33	2.85	Agreed
5	Set intervals to visit one another	118	72	46	28	143	69.4	63	30.6	2.87	Agreed
6	Get involved with community groups such as worship centers and social services	119	72.6	45	27.4	146	70.9	60	29.1	2.80	Agreed
	Aggregate mean score									**2.92**	**Agreed**

From the mean score of 3.04 for item 2 in Table 4.2.5 the respondents agreed that communicating regularly via mail, cell phones and letter helped them in their living apart relationship, this could be observed by the agreement of 75%(123) of newlyweds and 85.9% (177) of older couples that agreed. Items 3 in the Table 4.2.5, indicated mean score of 3.02 which revealed that respondents agreed that making it a point to celebrate important date or occasions, such as birthdays, wedding anniversary were strategies that helped couples to cope in a living

apart relationship. Although 88.4% (145) of newlyweds and 698.9% (144) of older couples agreed with this opinion, while 72.6% (119) of newly wedded couples and 71.8% (148) of older couples, also agreed that they rekindled the closeness and love by making the best use of time spent together as a coping strategy for living apart. The mean for this item 1 was 2.95.

Nevertheless, in item 5 of the Table, 118 representing 72% of newly wedded couples and 143 representing 69.4% of older couples with a mean score 2.87 agreed that, they set intervals to visit one another, as a coping strategy for living apart. From responses item 4, with mean score 2.85 in the Table, showed that 74% (124) of newlyweds and 67% (138) of older couples, agreed that as a way of coping with living apart they sent presents or gifts to spice up living apart relationship. Responses for item 6, revealed that 119 (72.6%) of newlyweds and 146 (70.9%) of older coupes agreed respectively with mean score of 2.80, that they involved themselves with community, group such as worship centers and social service as a strategy to cope with living apart from spouse. The aggregate mean score of 2.92 indicated that the respondent agreed that they used most of these coping strategies in living part.

4.3 Test of Null Hypotheses

Four Null hypotheses were raised in this study to provide statistical backing to the solutions proffered for the research question raised in the study. The student two tailed independent t-test statistical method was used to test the Null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance in the ensuring analysis. Therefore, the t-calculated value was greater than t-critical value; the Null hypothesis was rejected in favour of alternate hypothesis, implying there is a significance difference between the variables. Where t-calculated was less than t-critical value, then Null hypotheses was retained that is, significance difference does not exist among variables.

All computations were done using the SPSS version 16.

Null Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the reasons that influence living apart among the newlywed couples and older couples in Kaduna State.

In order another or test this null hypothesis a two tailed independent t-test statistic was used. The result of the test is shown in Table 4.3.1

Table 4.3.1: T-test independent result on the reasons that influence living apart among the newlywed couples and older couples.

VARIABLES	N	MEAN	SD	SE	T-CAL	P	T-CRT	DEC
Newlyweds	164	0.909	0.289	0.023	-2.06	0.008	1.96	NOT SIGN
Older Couples	206	0.976	0.154	0.011				

Note: SD= Standard Deviation, SE= Standard Error, T=Observed, T=Value and P=observed level of significance.

Results in Table 4.3.1, revealed that calculated t-value of -2.06 is less than the critical t - value of 1.96 at the observed level of significance 0.08 ($p>0.05$). This means that both the newlyweds and older couples agreed that reasons such as differences in job location, difference in career demand, lack of suitable accommodation, and active job search are the reasons that influence living apart among the newlyweds and older couples. The Null Hypothesis is therefore accepted or retained because they both agreed on these reasons. Thus the Null hypothesis is accepted in favour of the alternative.

Null Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the socio economic effects of living apart on newlywed couples and older couples in Kaduna State.

This hypothesis was tested with the scores in Table 4.2.2 where the socio economic effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples were presented. The two samples t-test

procedure was used for the test because of the two independent groups (newlyweds and older couples) involved in the test. The result is presented in Table 4.3.1

Table 4.3.2 T-test independent result on the socio economic effects of living apart on newlywed couples and older couples

VARIABLES	N	Mean	SD	SE	DF	T.cal	P	T-crt	Dec
Newlywed couples	164	3.01	0.06	0.02	368	1.56	0.113	1.96	NOT SIGN
Older couples	206	3.08	0.06	0.02					

Note: SD= standard deviation, SE= standard error, DF= degree of freedom, T= observed t-value and P= observed level of significance.

As shown in Table 4.3.2, the t-value 1.56 lies within the limits of the critical region 1.96 (t-critical), and P>0.05, Which implies the acceptance of Null hypothesis showing that there is no significant difference in the socio economic effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State. The data from Table 4.2.2, also confirmed that, newlyweds couples and older couples are challenged financially in maintaining two homes. Hence the Null hypothesis which state there is no significant difference in the socio economic effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples was accepted.

Null hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the socio emotional effects of living apart on newlywed couples and older couples in Kaduna State.

Table 4.3.3: T-test Independent results on the socio emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples.

VARIABLES	N	Mean	SD	SE	DF	T.cal	P	T-crit	Decision
Newlywed couples	164	3.18	0.02	0.37	368	6.0	0.005	1.96	significant
Older couples	206	2.88	0.12	0.39					

Note: SD= standard deviation, SE= standard error, DF= degree of freedom, T= observed t-value and P= observed level of significance.

The Table 4.3.3 revealed that t-val 6.0 is greater than t-critical of 1.96, and P<0.05, which implied that the null hypothesis is rejected. Hence there was a significant difference in the socio emotional effects of living apart on newlywed couples and older couples in Kaduna. The data from Table 4.2.3 also confirmed that, newlywed couples feel more loss in concentration than older couples. Therefore the Null hypothesis which stated there is no significant difference in the socio emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples was rejected.

Null hypothesis 4: There is no significance difference between coping strategies utilized by the newlywed couples and older couples living apart in Kaduna State?

Table 4.3.4: T-test independent result on the coping strategies utilized by the newlyweds and older couples living apart

VARIABLES	N	Mean	SD	SE	DF	T.cal	P	T-crt	Decision
Newlywed couples	164	2.98	0.016	0.44	368	2.75	0.007	1.96	Significant
Older couples	206	2.87	0.018	0.41					

The t-test result in Table 4.3.4 showed that the t-cal of 2.75 is greater than t-critical value of 1.96, at 0.05 level of significance, and probability value of 0.007. Thus the null hypothesis is rejected in favour of the alternative. This indicated that there is a significant difference between the coping strategies utilized by newlyweds and older couples living apart in Kaduna State. Hence the Null hypothesis of no significance difference is rejected.

4.4 Discussion of finding

Null hypothesis 1 examined a t-test of no significant difference between the reasons that influence living apart on the newlywed couples and older couples. Table 4.3.1, clearly showed that there was no significant difference between newlyweds and older couples, in their reasons

for living apart. This means that apart from the numbers of older couples being higher than that of the newlywed couples; their means in Table 4.3.1 of 0.909 for newlywed couples and 0.976 for older couples indicated a test of no difference among the groups. Hence the newlyweds and older couples living apart involved in the study remarked that differences in job location, career demand and lack of suitable accommodation, influenced living apart among couples. This finding agree with the opinion of Delahaye (1996) who confirmed that career aspiration, rigid work further make living apart among couples worse which often produces conflicts between spouses living apart. This finding is also in line with the findings of McKee, Mautuner and Maclean (2000) who revealed that living apart among couples are highly linked to their differences in jobs location. This is because couples who are relatively far from each other who have jobs at their respective locals find it impossible or too risky to quit a good job, and the tendency of gaining a good job is not certain. These couples therefore would decide to live apart. This finding corroborates the findings of Beaujuoan, Reginer and Gohalp (2008) who stated that the reasons influencing living apart among couples were diverse and likely to vary across the life course. Which may include, lack of suitable accommodation, family obligation (being responsible for the elderly or younger children), career demand and partner state of health.

Null Hypothesis II which states that, there is no significance difference between the socio economic effects of living apart on newlywed couples and older couples, revealed a test of no significant difference. This implies that significant different did not exist in the means of the two groups of respondents; hence the Null hypothesis was retained. In other words the two groups of respondents were unanimous in their response to the items in Table 4.2.2 and Table 4.3.2 which clearly revealed a test of no difference with the aggregate mean score of 3.05, and the highest percentage of 88.4% for the newlywed couples and 99.0% for the older couples. While in Tables

4.3.2, the means of the t-test was 3.01 for newlyweds and 3.08 for older couples. The standard deviation of the t-test independent result was 0.06 for newlyweds and 0.06 for older couples, which indicated no differences between the two groups. It was also observed that the newlywed couples encountered the same socio-economic effects of living apart as the older couples. Hence it can be concluded that both the newlyweds and older couples are faced with almost the same socio economic effects of living apart, which includes, having difficulty in choosing residential location near work, having poor satisfaction from financial resources and encountering financial strain in maintaining two homes. This finding is in accordance with Tcoshowky (1998) who confirmed that both newlyweds and older couples living apart and who always commuted long distance, were stressful over and about monetary cost. This is due to the frequency of travelling to and fro, just to reunite with other members of the family hence the source of strain on demand of marriage, children and career, makes them to experience very poor satisfaction from their financial resources.

This observation is also in agreement with Smock, Manning and Porter (2005), who revealed that couples living apart spend more in maintaining the cost of two household, which often leads to excessive indebtedness, poor satisfaction from their financial resources. This findings are in line with Permalink (2010) who identified that couples who are living apart encounter financial strain while living in different places and spent more on commuting to see one another. To this end, Permalink (2010) discovered that these couples have obstacles to job housing balance concept because of their constrained ability to choose a residential location near work and not all couples would be better off financially from staying apart or living apart.

Null Hypothesis III which states that there is no significant difference between the socio emotional effects of living apart on the newlyweds and the older couples were rejected. This implies that a significant difference exists in the opinion of the newlyweds and older couples on the socio emotional effects of living apart. Table 4.3.3 clearly portrayed the differences, with the mean score of the newlyweds as 3.18 and older couples as 2.88 respectively.

The researcher also observed that the newlywed couples were gravely affected by the six (6) items outlined in Table 4.2.4 namely: emotional insecurity, loose in concentration, marriage dissolution and separation open to resentment and guilt, and causing much unhappiness and resentment, while on the other hand, the older couples where fairly affected. These differences were also shown in their mean scores and standard deviations, respectively. A possible explanation for this present finding could be that, newlywed couples were still in their prime years of marriage, while the older couples may have no emotional tensions due to long time/years of living apart. This observation is consistent with the observations of Cox (2002) where it was observed that there exists emotional insecurity, especially with couples living apart, despite dealing with emotional conflicts of living apart. These tend to breed problems of maintaining intimacy, physically unavailable, for one another and not being able to see, touch or hug. This finding confirms the study carried out by Holmes (2006) who revealed that, newlywed couples living apart are often open to resentment and guilt, which leads to emotional insecurity, thus gradually leads to marriage dissolution and separation. This was due to the fact that their marriages have not endured long enough to establish distance relationship, hence, commitment to the husbands or wives were lost. The findings on the socio-emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples confirmed an opinion expressed by Holmes (2009), that when couples living apart do not maintain intimacy, loneliness sets in. This can be another serious

issue in a living apart marriage, because living apart among couples require each partner to attend to social events alone, this loneliness can lead to couples growing apart instead of growing together as leisure time and interest are separate.

Null hypothesis IV tested the significant difference in the coping strategies utilized by the newlyweds and older couples living apart in Kaduna state. Findings revealed overwhelming differences, in Tables 4.2.6 and 4.3.4. This implies that newlyweds and older couples living apart utilize different coping strategies in living apart. Newlywed couples living part were those who were highly familiar with the different types of coping strategies itemized, in Table 4.2.6. Newlywed couples made it a point to celebrate important date or occasion together, communicate regularly via mails and phones, send presents or gifts to spice up living apart relationships.

On the other hand, the older couples living apart were couples who were fairly not too concerned with the coping strategies, save for, communicating via cell phones or mail and rekindling the closeness and love by making the best use of time spent together.

This finding is in agreement with Anderson (2003), who reiterated that, coping with living apart marriage involve different strategies like keeping the chain of communication open among couples. This observation is also in line with Haddaj (2007) who outlined several basic coping strategies for couples living apart, like rekindling the closeness and love by making the best use of time spent together, staying close to communication often via mails and letters and sending presents or gift to spice up living apart relationship.

Consequently, the differences between the coping strategies utilized by newlyweds and older couples living apart will certainly be very significant and obvious considering their differences in years of marriage. A possible explanation for these findings may be that older couples are further moving over the excitement in their early years of marital relationship, but for the newlywed couples this may be an issue for marital establishment.

4.5 Summary of Finding

The major findings of this study as summarized below:

1. In the test of hypothesis one, it was found that newlyweds and older couples are faced with diverse types of reasons influencing couples to live apart. These reasons include; differences in job location, differences in career demand and lack of suitable accommodation.

2. In test of hypothesis two, it was observed that there was no significant difference in the socio-economic effects of living apart on newlywed couples as compared to older couples. Hence, older and newlywed couples perceived similar socio economic challenges on encountering financial strain in maintaining two homes, having poor satisfaction from financial resources and spending more on commuting to see one another in their living apart relationship.

3. In the test of hypothesis three, significant differences existed in the socio emotional effects of living apart on newlywed couples compared to older couples. Newlywed couples were gravely affected in terms of lack of emotional security and loss in concentration when living apart from their spouse. A possible explanation for this finding may be that, newlywed couples are still in their prime years of marriage while the older couples may have no emotional tension due to long time of living apart.

4. In the test of hypothesis four, it was discovered that the newlywed couples rated higher than the older couples in utilizing the coping strategies identified in the study. Especially making it a point to celebrate important date or occasions together as shown in Table 4.2.6

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents summary, conclusion and recommendation based on the results from the study, under the following sub headings;

5.1 Summary

5.2 Conclusion

5.3 Recommendations

5.4 Limitation of the study

5.5 Suggestion for further studies

5.1 **Summary**

The study was carried out to compare the socio economic and socio emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State. In order to achieve the purpose of the study, it sought to achieve the following objectives:

1. Establish reasons that influence living apart among newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State.
2. Determine the socio-economic effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State.
3. Determine the socio-emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna State

4. Compare the differences in the socio-economic effects of living apart on newlyweds couples compared to older couples in Kaduna State.

5. Compare the differences in the socio-emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds couples compared to older couples in Kaduna State.

6. identify coping strategies that are utilized by newlyweds and older couples living apart in Kaduna State.

Six research questions were formulated in the study and answers were provided while the following four null hypotheses were postulated and tested with relevant inferential statistics.

H_o 1. There is no significant difference between the reasons influencing living apart on the . newlywed couples and older couples in Kaduna State

H_o 2. There is no significant difference between the socio economic effects of living apart on the newlywed couples and older couples in Kaduna State.

H_o 3. There is no significant difference between the socio-emotional effects of living apart on the. newlywed couples and the older couples in Kaduna State

H_o 4. There is no significant difference between the coping strategies utilized by the newlywed . couples and older couples living apart in Kaduna State

The review of literature examined the theoretical and conceptual frame work, types of living apart relationship among newlyweds and older couples, reasons influencing living apart among couples, benefits and risks associated with couples living apart, the socio-economic and socio-

emotional effects of living apart and coping strategies that are utilized by couples living apart. Some relevant empirical studies were also reviewed .From the review it was observed that researchers, identified types of living apart and reasons influencing couples to live apart, but none of the research was on the socio-economic and socio-emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples.

The study was conducted in 11 Local Government Areas in Kaduna State. The researcher used survey research design in carrying out the study. Three hundred and sixty-five thousand, six hundred and twelve (365,612) populations of employed married husbands and wives, three hundred and seventy (370) respondents were drawn using proportional sampling technique. Instrument for data collection were structured questionnaire. A four point rating scale of strongly agree to strongly disagreed statement were analyzed using percentiles, frequencies and means. Independents two tail t-test statistics was used in testing the four (4) null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. The t-test of null hypotheses accepted hypotheses I and II, while null hypotheses III, and IV were rejected at 0.05 level of significance.

The findings included among others that

1. Living apart among couples is significantly dependent on various types of reasons like differences in career demand and differences in job location.
2. Newlyweds and older couples are similarly faced with socio economic challenges of living apart.
3. Newlywed couples are more exposed socio emotionally when living apart from their spouse compared to older couples.

4. Coping strategies identified from the result of the finding as found appropriate for coping with living apart among newlywed and older couples includes: communication via: cell phones, email and rekindling the closeness and love by making the best use of time spent together.

5.2 Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study it was concluded that the socio economic and socio emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples are related to a wide range of reasons; such as, career demand, suitable accommodation and differences in job location. These negative effects continue as couples live apart. Newlywed couples are two to three times more open to resentment and guilt. They are also at increased risk for marital separation or dissolution and are emotionally insecure compared to older couples. More so, both newlyweds and older couples living apart have difficulty in choosing residential location near work as well as being faced with misunderstanding on financial issues. The study had also shown that couples living apart socio-economically spend more on commuting to see one another, hence encounter financial strain in maintaining two homes. It was also worth noting that older couples spend little or no time relating emotionally to one another, thus, making their living apart to turn sour. However, the study endeavored to suggest some coping strategies utilized by couples living apart.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the analysis of findings in this research and conclusion, the following recommendation was made by the researcher.

- Multiple reasons including differences in job location career demand and lack of suitable accommodation makes couples to live apart, hence couples who choose to live apart should absolutely be sure of each other motives and should discuss extensively on why either one of the spouses is staying or the other needs to go or wants to go.
- In order to improve in the socio-economic effects of living apart, couples living apart should discuss in detail, the financial cost of running two homes and know if they can really afford two homes.
- Couples living apart should consider their financial burden in maintaining phone bills and travelling cost, in order to make living apart bearable for each other.
- Newlyweds and older couples living apart should understand and be knowledgeable about the emotional cost of living apart, the lack of emotional support, lack of companionship, feeling of loneliness isolation, tension, frustration and depression as negative effects of living apart.
- Efforts should be made by couples living apart in finding time to attend social events; this will help the couples grow together in leisure time and interests.
- Couples living apart must keep up to date with communication through mails, phone calls. This is to enable each spouse to know and understand what is happening in another spouse emotional life and to make sure that both of the couples are still happy with the decision and whether there should be an adjustment.
- In order to minimize job related reasons for living apart, the Federal Government and Non-Governmental Organization should create a working environment that favours marital responsibility and reduces the practice of posting married couples to different stations. This would allow flexible working arrangement.

- Mass contact programme or seminars organized by Family Life Educators and Home Economist should be introduced. This will encourage extensive information about couples living apart and the negative effects on couples should be discussed, thus broadening the knowledge of couples intending to go into living apart marriages.
- One of the constructive coping strategies identified by the study was, getting involve with community groups such as worship centres. To this end, religious leaders should teach on the moral values inherent in a healthy living apart marriage. Teaching should be focused on meditation and prayers while discouraging jealousy or suspicion among couples living apart.

5.4 Limitation of the Study

During the course of study, the researcher experienced in obtaining permission in offices where the study was conducted, this constituted delay of the study.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Study

It is suggested that further study can be carried out on the same area in other states to see whether similar results can be obtained and also in the following areas.

i. Effects of early maternal employment on couples living apart.
ii. Effects of family stress on couples living apart.
iii. Socio emotional effects of living apart on marriage and family.

REFERENCES

Action Health Incorporated (2003). *Comprehensive Sexuality Education,* Lagos Nigeria Action Health Inc.

Adams, E.K & Chase, P.L (2002). *Home Sweet Home. Parental Separations, Residential Moves and Adjustment Problems in Low Income Adolescents Girls.* Developmental Psychology 38: 792-805

Allapia, J. (2010). *Living Apart couples in marriage.* Research online http://www.lot_of_essay.com/research_livingaprt_marriage/html retrieved on 05/26/2010

Amoateng, A.Y (1997). *The Structure of Urban Black Households*: New Survey Evidence from a Coloured & African Community on the Cape Flats in the Western Cape of South Africa. African Sociological Review/ 22-40

Anderson, E.A (1992) Decision Making Style: Impact on Satisfaction of the Commuter Couples Lifestyle *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 13, 1-21 Retrieved 18/02/2011 from http://www.family.jrank.org/pages/2967/commutercouples.com

Anderson, E.A & Spruill, J.W (1993). "*The Dual Career Commuter family: a Lifestyle on the Move Marriage and Family Review"* 19,137-147. Retrieved 18/02/2011 from http://www.civitas.org/uk/hwu/cohabitations

Anyakoha, E. U. & Eluwa, M.A (2010). *Home Management for Schools and Colleges, Nigeria*. African FEB Publishers Limited Onitsha

Aries, E (1996) *Men and Women in Interaction Reconsidering the Difference* New York: Oxfords University Press.

Astone, N.M & McLanahan, S.S (1994). *Family Structure, Residential Mobility and School Dropout* A Research Note. Demography Journal 31, 575-584.

Ayodeji, A.S (2010). The Psychological Status of Women Whose Husbands Residing Abroad. *Human Resources Development*; Ife Psychological Publication.

Baach, R. (1999) *The Impact of Intense Work Schedule on Family Structure:* A Case Study of a 4:1 Fly-In/Fly-Out Schedule in the Australian Mining Industry. In NM Collins, and Russell (eds).

Bailey, C. (2010) *Couples Who Live Apart Creates Housing Shortage:* http://www.google.org.com/couples_who_live_apart_housing_shortagew.html. Retrieved 07/28/2010

Baldassar, L. Baldock, C and Wilding, R. (2007) "*Family Caring Across Borders; Migration, Aging and Transitional Care Giving."* Basingtoke, UK, Palgrave Mac Million.

Barwin,L.B & Gauthier, A (2001) *Regulation of Intimacy and Love Semantics in Couples Living Apart Together* International Review of Sociology 11, 1:39-46.

Batur-Laha, R.C (2002). *Marriage and Family Interactions.* New York Basic Books. http://www.socresonjlive.org.uk/google.com retrieved 10/08/2010

Beaujouan, E. E, Regnier, A & Gokalp, C (2008) *Neither Single nor in A Couple:* A Study of Living Apart Together in France. Paper Presented at the 2008 Meeting Population Association of America, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 16-19, 2008. Retrieved Sept/11/2010 from http://www.google.livingapartrelation.org

Belsky, J & Kelly, J (1994) *The Transition to Parenthood: How a Child Changes a Marriage.* Why Some Couples Grow Closer and Others Apart. New York; Delacorte Press.

Bennett, R. C. (2010) *Couples Living Apart*: http://www.google.org.com/uktimes/syndicationservices.html Retrieved 08/03/2010

Bernett, R.C & Gareis, K.C. (2006). *Parental After-School Stress and Psychological Well-Being. Journal of Marriage and Family* 68, 101-108.

Binstrock ,G. & Thornton, A.T (2003). *Separations, Reconciliations and Living Apart in Cohabiting and Marital Union Journal of Marriage and Family.* 432-443.

Bjoornberg, U & Dahigen, L (2001). *Cohabitation and Marriage:* Living Apart Together International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family 15, 350-362 Oxford University Press.

Blau, F & Kahn, L (2007). *Changes in the Labour Supply Behaiour of Marriage Women1980-2000,* Journal of Labour Economics, .25, (3).393-438

Bomen, M.I (2004). *Societal Regression as Viewed Through Family System Theory*. Retrieved 27/01/2011 from http://www.wbowencentre.org

Bracewell, J.R. (2000). *The Men's Resource Network, Inc/the Men's Centre.* http://en.wikipedia.org/liivngaparttogetherandliivngapart/html Retrieved 20/01/2011

Bronte, T.J, Moore, K. A & Carrono, J (2006). *The Parenthood Relationships, Parenting Styles and Adolescents Risk Behaviour in Living Apart Families*. Journal of Family Issues 2766, 850-881.

Brussels, H (2010). *Kinship-Residence Rules*: *Living Apart*. Retrieved August 18, 2010 From http://www.google/homelinbrussels.com/family.or/pages/1014/ kinship-residence-free encyclopedia

Carlson, M.J & Furstenberg, F. (2007). *Marital Success and Dominions of Social Support in Long Term Relationships:* Parents Journal of Marriage and the Family, CA: Sage Publications, inc.

Chang, R.O & Browdewood, E.I (1996). *Marriage and Family Living.* Pamona: CA Chimanikire D.P (2005) *African Migration: Causes Consequences and Future Prospects and Policy Options Presented at WIDER, United Nation University Conference on Poverty, International Migration, and Asylum,* 17-18 September, 2002 Helsinki, Finland

Cob, N.J (2001). *The Child: Infants, Children and Adolescents*; Mayfield Publishing Company.

Coleman, D (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*; Bloomburg Publishers London.

Cooke T.J (2001). *Trailing Wife or Training Mother The Effects of Parental Status on the Relationship Between Family Migration and the Labour-Market Participation of Married Women Environment and Planning.* 33,419-430. Retrieved 08/21/2010. http://www.google.com

Coontz, S (2005). *The Heterosexual Revolution*: New Intelligence. New York Times.

Costata, D.L & Kahn.C (2011). *Socio Emotional Effect of Living Apart on Couples*; Retrieved from http://www.webstuck.issues/marriage/wikipedia.org on 26/03/2011

Cowan, C.P & Cowan P.A (1998) *When Partners Becomes Parents;* The Big Life Change For Couples Malhwah, NJ; Erlbaun.

Cox, F.D (2002) "*Human Intimacy: Marriage the Family and its Meaning*." Studies in Family relationship, San Francisco, USA.

Crouter, A.C, Bumpass, M, Head, M & McHale, S (2001). *Implications of Overworkand Overload for the Quality of Men's Relationships.* Journal of Marriage and the Family, 63, 404-416.

Crouter, A. C, Davis K.D, Updegraff, K. Delgado M & Fortner, M. (2006) *Mexican Psychological Adjustment;* Journal of Marriage and Family 68, 843-858.

Cummings, E.M & O'Reilly A.W (1997). *Fathers in Family Context; Effects of Marital Quality on Child Adjustment.* In M.E Lamb (ed) The Role of the Father in Child Development (3rd edition) 49-65. New York: Wiley.

DeBoer, C. (2001). *Focus on the family.* Unwin Hyman, London.

DeGenova, M.K & Rice, F.P. (2002). *Intimate Relationships, Marriages and Families*. Fifth Edition, USA. McGraw Hills Companies.

Dikkson, F.C (1995). *The Best is yet to be Research on Long Lasting Marriage.Unstudied Relationship,* Eds. J.T Wood and S. Duck. Thousand Oaks', CA: Sage Publishing.

Doughty, S. (2010). *The Live-Partners*, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/articles-131675/the-live-apartners-how-million-couples-live-separate-homes.html retrieved 244/10/2010

Dreyfus, E.A (2010). *Stress Coping: Understanding Stress So You Can Cope*: (online) available: http://www.selfhelpmagazine.com/articles/stresscoping.htlm Retrieved 20/10/2010

Dunacan, S, (2010). *People Who Live Apart Together (LAT) How Different Are They?* (Eds) British Social Attitudes. Social Sciences and Humanities, University of Bradford, Bradford BD& IDP, UK Research Online s.s.duncan@bradford.au.uk http://www.s.s.duncan@bradford.org

Ehrenreich, B. & Hochschild A, (2005). *Global Woman; Work and Family in the New Economy.* Grata Press, London.

Ekeh, F.I, (2003). *Research Methodology and Staticsics in Education*." Madol Press Ltd. 40-75.

Elloy, D.F & Smith, C.R (2003). *Patterns of Stress, War-Family Conflict, Role Conflict, Role Ambiguity and Overload:* an Australian Study. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ermisch, J, & Seidler, T. (2009). *Living Apart Together; Changing Relationships*, Brymin, M & J Ermisch (eds) 29-43 Routledge Press, London.

Ermisch ,J, (2000). *Personal Relationship and Marriage Expectations: Evidence from the British Household Panel Survey* ISER Research Working Paper, Retrieved 08/16/2010 From http://www.isersex.ax.uk/publications/universityofessexworking-papers/iser/2000-27

Etta, E. F (2001). T*he Psychological of Learning an Introduction Textbook for Teachers and Students in Africa.* Malt Huse Press Limited.

Findley, S.E (1997). *Family, Population and Development in Africa*: Edited by Adepoju. A Zed Books Ltd, London and New Jersey.

Fitchen ,J.M (1994). *Residential-Mobility among the Rural Poor.* Rural Sociology Journal, 59: 416-438.-

Florida, R. (2004). *The Rise of Creative Class.* New York.

Flouri, E & Buchanan, A (2002). *What Predicts Good Relationship With Parents in Adolescent and Partners in Adult Life:* Findings from the 1958 British Birth Cohort. Journal of Family Psychology 16, 186-198

Flouri, E. & Buchanan, A (2004). *Early Father's and Mother's Involvement and Child's Later Educational Outcome.* British Journal of Educational Psychology, 74 (2) 141-153.

Furstenberg. F.F & Andrew, C (2007). *Divided Families, What Happens to Children When Parents Part.* Cambridge. Harvard University Press.

Gallegos, D. (2006). *Airplane Always Come Back. Fly-In/Fly-Out Employment: Managing Parent Transitions*. Perth, Australia. Centre for Social and Community Research: Murdoch University/Ngala Retrieved 08/18/2010.

Green, A.E & Canny, F (2003). *Geographical Mobility: Family Impacts*, Policy Press: Bristol, UK.

Guldner, G.T (2003). *Long Distance Relationships:* The Complete Guide. Corona, CA:JF. Miline Publications. http://www.cscr.murch.edu.au/aeroplanes_always_come_report.pdf

Haddadj, D. F (2007). *Making a Long Distance Relationship Work*; Revolution Health Group, Washington, DC.

Harris, K.M, Furstenberg, F.F & Marmer, J.K (1998). *Parental Involvement with Adolescents in Living Apart Families;* The Influence of Fathers Over the Life Course. Demography, 35 (2) 201-2116.

Harvey, M.G (1995). *The Impact of Dual-Career Families on International Relocations.* Human Resources Management Review, Fall 95, 5 (3): 223-244.

Haskey, J (2005). *Living Arrangement in Contemporary Britain*: Having a Partner Who Lives Elsewhere and Living Apart Together (LAT) Population Trends 122:35-45 Retrieved 11/01/2011 from http://www.demographic-research.org

Haskey, J & Lewis J. (2006). *Living Apart Together in Britain:* Context and Meaning International Journal of Law in Context 2(1): Research Journal Online, 37 -48 www.google.com Retrieved 21/07/2010.

Heart Choice (2010). *Living Apart Together.* www.heartchoice.com/helpful_article.html Retrieved 08/28/2010

Hochschild, A. (2003). *The Commercialization of Initiate Life*: Note from Home and Work, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.

Holmes, M. (2004). *An Equal Distance? Individualization Gender and Intimacy in Distance Relationship Sociological Review,* 52 180 -200, http://www.socresonline.org/uk/52/180-200/holmes.html. retrieved 07/12/2010

Holmes, M. (2006). *Love Lines at Distance Relationship over the Life Course Sociological:* Research Online 11(3*),* Retrieved From http://www.socresonline.org.uk/11/3/holmes.html Retrieved 12/07/2010.

Holmes, M. (2009). *Commuter Couples and Distance Relationships*: Living Apart: Flinders University. TASA 1999 Conference Proceedings, Sociology for a New Millennium: Challenges and Prospects.

Holy, L. (1996) *Anthropological Perspectives on Kinship:* Pluto Press: Chicago – London Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland 39:77 -84, www.holy.org.

Howard, K.S., Lefever, J.E., Borkowski, J.G., & Whitman, T.L (2006). *Fathers Influence in the Lives of Children with Adolescent Mothers.* Journal of Family Psychology. 20 (3), 468-476.

Iloslowsky. M (1998). *Commuting and Socio Emotional Effects;* Mental Health; in Encyclopedia of Mental Health, (1) Ed ; Friedman, Howards-New York.

James, M.B (2001). *Focus on the Nigerian Family Nigeria*, Holma Nigeria Limited.

Jocobson, J.P & Levin, L.M (1997). *Marriage and Migration: Comparing Gains and Losses from Migration for Couples and Singles* Social Science Quarterly, 78, 688-709.

Jocobson, J.P & Levin, L.M (2000). *The Effect of Internal Migration on the Relative Economic Status of Women and Men.* A Journal of Socio Economics, 29, 291-304.

John, H. (2007). *Living Apart Together :* Wikipedia the Free Encyclopedia. www.wikipedia.org Retrieved 07/12/2010 Melbourne, Austria Monassh University.

John, S.W (1996). *Theories of Human Communication,* (Fifth Edition) United States of America, Wadst Worth Publishing Company, pg1-3

Jibril, S.N (1992). *Hints on Effectives Parenting for Effective Family Living Nigeria*,

New Nigerian Newspapers Limited. Revised edition.

Karambayya, R. & Reilly, A.H (1992). *Dual Earner Couples: Attitudes and Actions in Restructuring Work for Family Journal of Organizational Behaviour* 13:585-601.

Kelly Plate, J & Eubanks, E. (1994*). Today's Teens*. Glencoe McGraw Hill. United States of America (4th edition).

Kiernan, K (2002). *European Perspectives on Union Formation* in: Waite, L., Bachrach, C., Hindiu, M. Thomson, E, and Thornton, A (eds) *The Ties that Bind Perspectives on Marriage and Cohabitation.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter; 40-58

King, V. & Soboleswkski, J.M (2006). *Nonresident Fathers' Contributions to Adolescents Well-Being.* Journal of Marriage and Family 68 (3), 537-557

Kinnear, P (2002). *New Families for Changing Times*; Retrieved 08/19/2010 from http://www.tai.org.au/publications_files/family+relationships.com

Koslowsky. M, Kuger, A.N & Reich, M. I (1995). *Commuting Stress Causes, Effect and Methods of Coping:* USA, McGraw Hill Companies.

Krishnakumar, C.D & Buchler, M (2000). Equal parenting: Albany, NY; State University of New York Press.

Kumah, P. (2002). *Relating to Your Husband*, Sonlife Printing Press and Services, Second Edition.

Kumuyi, W. F (2004). *Getting Along With Your Spouse*: Christian Women Mirror: Lagos Life Press Ltd. 8-9.

Lamanna, M.A & Reidman, A (2003). *Marriages and Families: Making Choices in a Diverse Society.* UK Thomson Wadsworth

Levin, I (1994). *Family as Mapped Realities Journal of Family Issues*, 14, 82-91.

Levin, I (2004). *Living Apart Together;* A New Family Form, Research Online http://www.wfnetwork.be.edu/enclopediaenrty.com. Retrieved 07/14/2010

Levin, I & Trost, J (1999). *Living Apart Together*, Community, Work and Family 2(3):279-294. http://www.wfnetwork.be.edu/enclopediaenrty.com.

Levin, I, & Trost, J (2004). *Living Apart Together Context and Meaning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levin, I & Trost, J (2000). *Living Apart Together.* A Precursor to Marriage or an Alternative to Being Single. Belgium: Leuven University Press.

Marie, C. (2010). Living Apart: Mnet Newsletter www.yahoo.com/heartcommunication.inc Retrieved 19/07/2010.

Matrimonial Causes Acts (1990). Chapter 220/Laws of the Federation of Nigeria/ http://www.google.com/matrimonialcausesacts.html Retrieved 8/3/2010.

Martin, T.M, Folgueras & Garcia T.M (2008). *Not Truly Partners Less Non-Residential Partnerships and Retreat from Marriage in Spain;* Online Demographic Research, Accessed 28/09/2010 http://demographic-research.org/upload/18(16)436-468.doi.html

Maxwell, L.E (1996). *Multiple Effects of Home and Daycare Crowding, Environmental and Behaviour*: 28, 494-511

Mckee. L, Mauthner, N & Maclean C. (2000). *Family Friendly Policies and Practices in the Oil and Gas Industry; Employers' Prospective. Work, Employment and Society* 14,557-571, Retrieved 08/18/2010 from www.google.com

McLennam, S, Ryan, O. & Spoonley H.F. (2000). *The Family Sociology* Boston: Little Broven

Michaels, G.Y, & Goldberg W.A (2007). *The Transition to Parenthood*: Currents Theory and Research Cambridge University Press.

Milan. A, & Peters, A (2003). *Couples Living Apart. Canadian Social Trend* Publication of Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 11-008, http://.www.google.com. Retrieved 08/02/2010

Missouri, Advisory Council for Comprehensive Psychiatric Services. http://www.dnh.missourie.gov/cps/facts/cpsstress.htm retrieved 21/01/2011

Mumola, C.J (2000). *Incarcerated Parents and Their Children.* Washington, DC: US Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Murdock, G.P (1949). *Social Structure.* New York Macmillan

National Bureau of Statistics, (2006). CWIE Survey Kaduna State Summary (Abuja: National Bureau of statistics)

National Population Commission (2006). *Population Census of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.* www.nigeriastat.gov.ng Accessed 28/02/2010.

Newell. C (1988). *Methods and Models in Demography*. The Guilford Press, New York

Nwajiuba, C (2005). *Global Migration Perspective*: International Migration and Livelihoods in Southeastern Nigeria. Imo State University Nigeria

Obisakin, C.G (1993). *Home Builders*, Brazil- Thomas Nelson Inc. pg 113-152.

Odagboyi, I. A, Jonathan, W.T & Nalah, A.B (2009). *Research Methodology in Education:* Jos, Elindaro Nigeria puiblishing

Okeke, M.O (1999). *Determining Samples Size for research Methodology and educational Measurement.* Educational and psychological measurement Pan African Publishers.

Olaitan, S.O & Akpan, A.E (2003) C*hildhood Development and Family Life Education, Nigeria.* Legues of Researchers in Nigeria pg 417-422.

Olson, D.H & Defrain, J. (2000*) Marriage and Diversity and Strength*. United States of America, Mayfield Publishing Company. Pg 268-277, 283.

Onyeme, K (2002). *Twenty-Six Things Couples Must Do to Ensure a Happy and Successful Marriage.* Nigeria-Keveue Evangelistic Publications 4-15.

Ononuju, J.M (2004). *The Family and Parenting in Nigeria's Social Development.* Amadi Publications.

Osborne, C & McLanahan, S. (2007). *Partnership Instability and Child Well-Being.* Princeton University, Centre for Research on Child Well-Being.

Osuala, E.C (2001). *Introduction to Research Methodology* (Third Edition) Nigeria- Africana FEB Publishers, pg 200-201.

Palkovitz, R. (1997) *Reconstructing Involvement Expanding Conceptualization of Parenting in Contemporary Families* in A.J Hawkins and D.C Dollahite (eds) Generative Parenting; CA Sage Publication.

Parsons, T. (1985). *Psychological Theories of the Family* New York: Columbia University Press.

Parsons, T. (1951). *Families in the 1990s* Journal of Family Issues, 8, 394-421.

Peterson, R. (2004) *Family First Keys*. Retrieved 18/02/2011 from http://www.pubs.ext.vt/edu/1350-093/350-093.htm

Permalink (2010). *Living Apart Together:* http://www.zerit.org/liivng_apart_together_article/2201?/html Retrieved10/08/2010

Piaget, J. (1970). *Theory of Intelligence*. New Jersey, Prentice Hall, Inc.

Pierce, J & Delahaye, B.L (1996) *Human Resource Management Implication of Dual Career Couples.* International Journal of Human Resources Management 1996, 4(7), 905-921.

Phanjaruitic, S. (2006). *Families of Today at New York*. W.H Freeman.

Rabe, B. (2006). *Dual-Earner Migration in Britain Earnings Gains, Employment and Self Selection* An ISER Working Paper 2006-1, University of Essex.

Razaq, B. & Ajayi, O.O.S (2000). *Research Methods Statistical Analysis*. Ilorin:Haytee Press.

Regnier-Loilier, A (2006). *How often do Adult Children See Their Parents?* Population and Societies 27, http://www.ined.fr/finchi.er/t_publication.pdf Retrieved 29/09/2010.

Reimondos, A., Evans A & Gray E (2010). *Living-Apart-Together (LAT) Relationships in Australia.* Journal of Marriage and Family in Experiencing Family change. Retrieved on 26/06/2011 from http://www.anu.edu.au/~efc/

Roseneil, S (2006*). On Not Living with Partner: Unpicking Coupledom and Cohabitation;* Sociological Research Online 11-13url http://www.socresoline.org.uk/11/3/roseneil.html. retrieved 08/02/2010.

Rossi, A.S & Rossi, P.H (1990). *Parent Child Relationship across the Life Course New York*. NY: Aldine de Gruytei Press.

Scandinavia, A (2010). *Living Apart Together* http://www.familyjrank.org/pages/1452/scandinavia_living_apart_together.html.

Retrieved 08/02/2010.

Schneider, S.C & Barsoux, J.L (2003). *Marriages across Cultures* (2nd edition) Harlow (UK): Family Times/ Prentice Hall.

Scout, C.N (2010). *Living Apart Together* www.wikipedia.net. Retrieved 09/03/2010.

Sheldon, S. (2004). *Managing Family Finances; How to Manage your Finance and Strengthen your Marriage at the same Time* School of Family Life. Bragham Youn University; www.google.com

Smith, C.R (1992). *Dual Careers, Dual Loyalties* Asian Pacific Journal of Human Resources 30(4), 19-30.

Smock, P. Manning. W, & Porter, M. (2005). *Everything's There except Money" How Money Shapes Decision to Marry among Cohabiters.* Journal of marriage and family 67 (3): 680-690. Retrieved 20/08/2010.

Stelak L.M (2006). *The Relation between Couples* http://www.wikipedia/socio_emotional_effect_of_living_apart_on_couples.com Retrieved 24/01/2011.

Steyn, A. (1993). *Genslewe in Die RSA Cooperative Navorsings Programme or Die Huweliksen Gensinslewe,* Ran Verslag HG/MF-4

Strohm, C, Selzer, J.A., Cochran, S.D & Mays, V. (2009). *Living Apart Together* Relationships in the United States of America. California Centre for Population Research Online Working Papers Series, CCPR 04208,Url http://www.responsibilitiesthoeries.cdlib.org Accessed 23/09/2010

Szinovacz, M. (1997). *Adult Children Taking Parents into Their Homes*: Effects of Childhood Living Arrangements. Journal of Marriage and Family. 59, 700-717.

Temple, J & Raynolds, A. (1999). *School Mobility and Achievement*; Longitudinal Findings from an Urban Cohort. Journal of School Psychology, 37, 355-377.

Thornton, A,T. Fricke, L.S & Yang J.S (1994). *Theoretical Mechanisms of Famil Change in Social Change and the Family in Taiwan.* Arland Thornton and Huoseng Lin (eds) Chicago: The Chicago University Press. 88-115.

Thonrnton, D. (1998). *The Oxford Dictionary of Current English*, New Revised Edition Oxford Universality Press, Ltd.

Trost, J. (1998). *Living Apart Together Relationship Now and In The Future.* 209-222 in K. Mattijs (ed), *The Family: Contemporary Perspectives and Challenges*, Louvain, Belgium: Leuven University Press.

United Nation Development Programme (UNDP), (2005). *2005 Statistical Update: Human Development Index, Nigeria*. http://www.hdrstats.undp.org/2005/countryfactsheet/ctyfsNGA.html Accessed 12/02/2010.

U.S Bureau of the Census (2006). *Current Population Reports*, Series pg 60: Income

Statistics, Branch/HHRS Division, US Government Printing Office, Washington,

Usher. E (2005). *The Millennium Development Goals and Migration*, International Organization for Migration (10M) Geneva 8-25

Van.O.J (2000). *Commuting and Relationship of Dushkin*, McGraw Hill Companies

Warran, R. (2002). *The Purpose Driven Life United States of America,* Grand Rapids Michigan:

Young, M.H & Schucheveldt, J.D (2001). *Dual-Resident Marriages in Thailand: A Comparison of Two Cultural Groups Women:* Journal of Comparative Family StudiesUnited Nations Development Programme (2005) Human Development Report 1993

Zimmerman, M.A Salem, D.A & Natoro, P.C (2000). *Make Room for Daddyii: The Positive Effects of Fathers Role in Adolescents Development."* In R. D Taylor and Mcwang et al (eds) Resilience Across Contexts Family Work, Culture and community (233-253) Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO RESPONDENT

Dept of Voc and Tech Educ,
Ahmadu Bello University,
Samaru- Zaria

Dear Respondent,

REQUSET TO FILL A QUESTIONNAIRE

I am a postgraduate student of the above named department currently engaged in a research on the topic; "Comparative study of socio economic and socio emotional effects of living apart on newlyweds and older couples in Kaduna state."

You have been identified to please help in completing the attached questionnaire as accurately as possible. Statement are given and you are requested to indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement by ticking (√) in the boxes provided beside each statement. All information will be treated confidentially and will be used only for this purpose of this study.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours faithfully,

Nwosu, Amarachi

M.ed/Educ/08-09/ 01660

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE ON COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SOCIO ECONOMIC AND SOCIO EMOTIONAL EFFECTS OF LIVING APART ON NEWLYWEDS AND OLDER COUPLES IN KADUNA STATE

Section A

Demographic characteristic of couples involved in living apart relationship.

Please thick ( ) in the appropriate box in the space provided.

1. Gender:
   - Female ☐
   - Male ☐
2. Age (in years):
   - 18 – 24 ☐
   - 25 – 34 ☐
   - 35 – 44 ☐
   - 45 – 54 ☐
   - 55 -79 ☐
3. Highest educational Qualification:
   - Secondary ☐
   - ND/NCE ☐
   - HND/Degree ☐
   - Master Degree ☐
   - P.hD ☐
4. Occupational status:
   - Civil servant ☐
   - Public servant ☐
5. Numbers of years in marriage
   - 0- 10 ☐ newlyweds couples
   - 11 and above ☐ older couples
6. Types of living apart

   There are many types of living apart which one is true in your own case: tick the appropriate in ☐ your case

(a) Living with parent ☐

(b) Living in a different town from spouse ☐

(c) Living with relatives ☐

(d) Living alone but in the same town with spouse ☐

7. Whose decision it is to live apart

(a) Husband's decision ☐

(b) Wife's decision ☐

(c) Husband's and wife's decision ☐

(d) Relatives decision ☐

SECTION B

Instruction: please tick ( ) in the box against the statement that best suits your opinion.

1. People live apart for many reasons which of these reason coincides with yours:

A. Differences in job location ☐

B. Partner's state of health ☐

C. Active job search ☐

D. Difference in career demand ☐

E. Lack of suitable accommodation ☐

F. Other family obligations ☐

Section C – G

Instruction: please indicate your level of agreement by ticking ( ) the moist appreciate box

SA = Strongly Agree = 4 ☐

A = Agree = 3 ☐

D= Disagree = 2 ☐

SD = Strongly Disagree = 1 ☐

SECTION C

The Socio Economic Effects of Living Apart on Newlyweds and Older Couples

S/N	The Socio Economic Effects Of Living Apart On Newlyweds and Older Couples	SA	A	D	SD
1.	Spouses living apart encounter financial strain in maintaining two homes.				
2.	Couples living apart have poor satisfaction from their financial resources				
3.	Couples living apart have difficulty choosing a residential location near work				
4.	Living apart among couples causes economic strain and income loss				
5	Couples living apart spend more on commuting to see one another				
6	Couples living apart are faced with misunderstanding between who should handle financial decision				

SECTION D

The Socio Emotional Effects of Living Apart on Newlyweds and Older Couples

S/N	The Socio Emotional Effects Of Living Apart On Newlyweds and Older Couples	SA	A	D	SD
1.	Living apart among couples leads to emotional insecurity				
2.	Living apart among couples causes loses in concentration				
3.	Living apart among couples leads to marriage dissolution and separation				
4.	Couples living apart spend less time relating emotionally to one another				
5.	Couples living apart are open to resentment and guilt				
6.	Living apart among couples causes much unhappiness and restlessness.				

SECTION E

Comparable Differences in the Socio Economic Effects of Living Apart on Newlyweds and Older Couples

S/N	Comparable Differences in the Socio Economic Effects of Living Apart on Newlyweds and Older Couples	SA	A	D	SD
1.	Newlywed couples encounter more financial strain in maintaining two homes compared to older couples				
2.	Newlywed couples living apart experiences high poor satisfaction from their financial resources as compared to older couples				
3.	Newlywed couples living apart have more difficulty to choose a residential location near work compared to older couples				
4.	Living apart among older couples often causes economic strain and income loss compared to newlywed couples				
5	Older couples spend more on commuting to see one another compared to newlywed couples.				
6.	Newlywed couples are often faced with the misunderstanding of between who should handle financial decision compared to older couples.				

SECTION F

Comparable Differences in the Socio Emotional Effects of Living Apart on Newlyweds and Older Couples

S/N	Comparable Differences in the Socio Emotional Effects of Living Apart on Newlywed and Older Couples	SA	A	D	SD
1.	Newlywed couples living apart are often faced with emotional insecurity compared to older couples.				
2.	Newlywed couples living apart are experiences more loss in concentration compared to older couples				
3.	Living apart among newlywed couples gradually leads to marriage dissolution compared to older couples				
4.	Older couples living apart spend less time relating emotionally to one another compared to newlywed couples				
5.	Newlywed couples living apart are more open to resentment and guilt compared to older couples				
6.	Newlywed couples living apart experience much unhappiness and restlessness compared to older couples.				

SECTION G

Coping Strategies Utilized By Couples Living Apart

S/N	Coping Strategies Utilized By Couples Living Apart	SA	A	D	SD
1.	Rekindle the closeness and love by making the best use of time spent together				
2.	Communicate regularly via mail, cell phones and letters				
3.	Make it a point to celebrate important date or occasions together				
4.	Send present or gifts to spice up living apart relationships				
5.	Set intervals to visit one another				
6.	Get involved with community groups such as worship centers and social services				

motional Effects Of Living	SA	A	D	SD	TOTAL	MEAN	NEWLYWEDS				TOTAL	MEAN	OLDER COUPLES				TOTAL
part On Couples	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)			SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)			SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1	
Economic Effects Of Living part On Couples	SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	TOTAL	MEAN	NEWLYWEDS SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	TOTAL	MEAN	OLDER COUPLES SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1	TOTAL
among couples leads to security	352 163	603 201	10 5	1 1	1266	3.42	292 33	273 91	0 0	0 0	565	3.45	360 90	330 110	10 5	1 1	701
among couples causes g apart encounter financial entration	392 608 98	411 534 137	80 26 40	95 27 95	978 1195	2.64 3.23	252 252 63	216 210 72	24 18 12	17 22 17	509 502	3.10 3.06	140 356 35	195 324 65	56 8 28	78 5 78	469 693
ntaining two home among couples leads to g apart have poor solution and separation from their financial	496 572 124 143	453 471 151 157	104 60 52 30	43 40 43 40	1096 1143	2.96 3.09	63 224 252 56 63	70 207 198 69 66	9 48 18 24 9	22 15 26 15 26	494 494	3.01 3.01	89 272 320 68 80	108 246 273 82 91	4 56 42 28 21	5 28 14 28 14	602 649
g apart spend less time tionally to one another	512 128	513 171	94 47	24 24	1143	3.08	204 51	222 74	64 32	7 7	497	3.03	308 77	291 97	30 15	17 17	646
ng apart have difficulty ng apart are open to esidential location near nd guilt	640 460 160 115	501 480 167 160	30 112 15 56	28 39 28 39	1199 1091	3.24 2.94	276 260 69 65	264 234 88 78	10 24 5 12	2 9 2 9	552 527	3.36 3.21	364 200 91 50	237 240 79 82	20 88 10 44	26 30 26 30	647 564
among couples causes among couples causes am and income loss piness and restlessness g apart spend more on o see one another	496 420 124 105 540 135	489 408 163 136 642 214	92 86 46 43 26 13	37 86 37 86 8 8	1114 1000 1216	3.01 2.70 2.28	260 172 65 43 236 59	252 183 34 61 258 86	18 22 9 11 24 12	6 49 6 49 7 7	536 426 525	3.27 2.59 3.20	236 248 59 62 304 76	237 225 79 75 384 128	74 64 37 32 2 1	31 37 31 37 1 1	578 574 691
	364	441	176	44	1025	2.77	208	147	92	17	464	2.82	156	294	84	27	561
ng apart are faced with nding between who should cial decision	91	147	88	44			52	49	46	17			39	98	42	27	

s/n	Comparable Differences Of Socio Economic Effects Of Living Apart On Newlyweds And Older Couples	SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	TOTAL	MEAN	NEWLYWEDS SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	TOTAL	MEAN	OLDER CO SA (4)	A (3)
1		584	543	56	15	1198	3.23	232	261	26	6	525	3.20	352	282
	Newlywed couples encounter more financial strain in maintaining two homes compared to older couples	164	187	28	15			58	87	13	6			88	94
2		448	447	116	51	1062	2.87	140	189	58	37	424	2.58	308	258
	Newlywed couples living apart experiences high poor satisfaction from their financial resources as compared to older couples	112	149	58	51			35	63	29	37			77	86
3		536	516	48	40	1140	3.08	252	303	0	0	555	3.38	284	213
	Newlywed couples living apart have more difficulty to choose a residential location near work compared to older couples	134	172	24	40			63	101	0	0			71	71
4		396	468	136	47	1047	2.82	164	117	108	30	419	2.55	232	351
	Living apart among older couples often causes economic strain and income loss compared to newlywed couples	99	156	68	47			41	39	54	30			58	117
5		496	621	44	17	1178	3.18	252	222	28	13	515	3.14	244	399
	Older couples spend more on commuting to see one another compared to newlywed couples.	124	207	22	17			63	74	14	13			61	133
6		452	582	98	14	1146	3.09	236	309	4	0	549	3.35	216	273
	Newlywed couples are often faced with the misunderstanding of between who should handle financial decision compared to older couples.	113	194	49	14			59	103	2	0			54	91

s/n	Comparable Differences Of Socio Emotional Effects Of Living Apart On Newlyweds And Older Couples	SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	TOTAL	MEAN	NEWLYWEDS SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	TOTAL	MEAN	OLDER CO SA (4)	A (3)
1		504	411	120	47	1082	2.92	276	261	12	2	551	3.35	228	150
	Newlywed couples living apart are often faced with emotional insecurity compared to older couples.	126	137	60	47			69	87	6	2			57	50
2		404	492	110	50	1056	2.85	252	288	8	1	549	3.34	152	204
	Newlywed couples living apart are experiences more loss in concentration compared to older couples	101	164	55	50			63	96	4	1			38	68
3		480	462	98	47	1087	2.93	268	246	18	6	538	3.28	212	216
	Living apart among newly wedded couples gradually leads to marriage dissolution compared to older couples	120	154	49	47			67	82	9	6			53	72
4		480	483	118	30	1111	3.00	212	168	60	25	465	2.83	268	315
	Older couples living apart spend less time relating emotionally to one another compared to newlywed couples	120	161	59	30			53	56	30	25			67	105
5		456	501	70	54	1081	2.92	288	267	4	1	560	3.41	168	234
	Newlywed couples living apart are more open to resentment and guilt compared to older couples	114	167	35	54			72	89	2	1			42	78
6		472	507	102	32	1113	3.00	240	261	24	5	530	3.23	232	246
	Newlywed couples living apart experience much unhappiness and restlessness compared to older couples.	118	169	51	32			60	87	12	5			58	82

s/n	Coping Strategies Utilized By Couples Living Apart	SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	TOTAL	MEAN	NEWLYWEDS SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	TOTAL	MEAN	OLDER CO SA (4)	A (3)
1	Rekindle the closeness and love by	508	420	124	41	1093	2.95	224	189	70	10	493	3.00	284	231
	making the best use of time spent	127	140	52	41			56	63	35	10			71	77

	together														
2	Communicate regularly via mail, cell phones and letters	476 119	543 181	76 38	32 32	1127	3.04	172 43	240 80	50 25	16 16	478	2.91	304 76	303 101
3	Make it a point to celebrate important date or occasions together	552 138	453 151	70 35	46 46	1121	3.02	268 67	234 78	14 7	12 12	528	3.21	284 71	219 73
4	Send present or gifts to spice up living apart relationships	448 112	441 147	116 58	53 53	1058	2.85	228 57	192 64	62 31	12 12	494	3.01	220 55	249 83
5	Set intervals to visit one another	460 115	438 146	112 56	53 53	1063	2.87	232 58	180 60	34 17	29 29	475	2.89	228 57	258 86
6	Get involved with community groups such as worship centres and social services	368 92	519 173	94 47	58 58	1039	2.80	172 43	228 76	38 19	26 26	464	2.82	196 49	291 97