

# ISSUES IN HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY

ISSN:1117-7314

Vol. 12: June 2009

JOURNAL OF THE CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY DIVISION OF THE  
NIGERIAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, SOUTH WESTERN ZONE

UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN LIBRARY

Editor-In-Chief: Benedicta Y. Oladimeji, Ph.D



ISSN 1117-7314

A Publication of the Nigerian Psychological Association,  
South Western Zone

All right Reserved. No part of this publication may be  
reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means  
without permission.

Printed by:  
**FREEDOM PRINTING PRESS**  
07040559265, 07042132727

**Issues 2009**

**Content**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| A Survey Of Mentoring Context And Job Involvement<br>Of Health Service Employees-<br>David E. Okurame, Phd. & Oluwayemisi P. Akiniyi.....   | 1  |
| Delusional Content Self- Esteem, Assertiveness And Illness<br>Factors As Predictors Of Relapse Rate Among Schizophrenics<br>In Southwest Nigeria- Adegbola, A., Taiwo, A.O. &<br>Osinowo H..... | 24 |
| The Influence Of Youth Culture, Self Efficacy<br>And Peer Influence On Attitude Towards Sexual<br>Abstinence Among University Students-<br>Dr. A.s. Okhakhume .....                             | 35 |
| The Role of Gender, Parental Monitoring and Self Efficiency<br>on Risk Sexual Behaviour - Karick N and Adekeye B.O.....   | 52 |

UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN LIBRARY

## The Influence of Youth Culture, Self Efficacy and Peer Influence on Attitude Towards Sexual Abstinence Among University Students

By

Dr. A.S. Okhakhume  
Department of Psychology,  
University of Ibadan, Ibadan  
Email: [okhasly2004@yahoo.com](mailto:okhasly2004@yahoo.com)

### ABSTRACT

This study was designed to look at the role of youth culture, peer influence and self efficacy as it influences university students' sexual behaviour. Two hundred and forty (240) university undergraduates with the mean age of 24.32 years (60% males and 40% females) were selected through purposive sampling technique.

Self efficacy, peer group and youth culture were independently and significant joint predictors of attitude towards sexual abstinence ( $R^2 = 0.40$ ,  $F = (3, 239)$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Self efficacy, peer group influence and youth culture interacted to influence sexual abstinence ( $F = (1, 239) = 3.765$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Students high on self efficacy and youth culture reported negative attitude towards sexual abstinence compared to those low on both self efficacy and youth culture other dyads of youth culture and self efficacy. Students high on Youth culture and peer influence also significantly reported negative attitude towards sexual abstinence ( $F = (1, 239) = 8.830$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The students high on self efficacy and peer influence reported negative attitude towards sexual abstinence compared to those low on both self efficacy and peer influence and other two dyads of peer influence and self efficacy ( $F = (1, 239) = 11.00$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Self efficacy, peer group influence and youth culture have significant influence on university sexual behaviour. The findings have implication for the design of intervention programmes such as peer counselling and referral services and educational programs for students on campus.



## Introduction.

Abstinence until marriage continues to be the best way to prevent the spread of STDs, teen pregnancy, and emotional distress in relationships. Complete sexual abstinence has been identified as the most effective means of preventing HIV infection, pregnancy, and sexually transmitted infections. Abstinence offers adolescents, in particular, a number of advantages because it requires no supplies or clinic visits (Mwangi, Cheluget, Mwikya, Marum & Wandia, 2004). The Center for Disease Control and Prevention (2004) describes abstinence as the "surest way to avoid transmission of sexually transmitted diseases," and it is obviously an effective method of preventing unwanted pregnancies. Abstinence in schools may impart important psychological and emotional benefits that, in turn, lead to increased human capital accumulation.

Though abstinence is recognized as an effective and appropriate HIV prevention method among unmarried youth, premarital sex remains the major factor that exposes youth to HIV infection (Mwangi, et al, 2004). In today's Nigeria most adolescents and the youths in general find it difficult to wait until marriage to begin a sexual relationship for a number of reasons. Recognizing the social forces which run counter to the successful practice of abstinence can help experts and practitioners recognize and plan for interventions. Psychosocial factors such as the social milieu which the youth and adolescent operate, the possession of specific skills, including a high degree of motivation, self-control, social support from community members and communication have implications for how much youths and adolescent can abstain from premarital sex and illegal sexual intercourse.

Various groups interpret the notion of abstinence differently; for example, most faith-based groups generally view abstinence as a commitment to refrain from sexual intimacy until marriage, while others may view abstinence as delaying sex until some future time. The term can also refer to those who have been sexually active at one time but have now decided to abstain, referred to as 'secondary abstinence or 'secondary virginity.' Today's culture of sex and instant gratification make long-term abstinence a struggle for many. The desire to begin a sexual relationship is normal, but the consequences can be severe. By being prepared for social forces which make abstinence difficult, young people can hope to succeed in saving sex for marriage. ( c o n t r a c e p t i v e . o r g , 2 0 0 9 )

A youth subculture is a youth-based subculture with distinct styles, behaviors, and interests. According to subculture theorists such as Dick

Hebdige, members of a subculture often signal their membership by making distinctive and symbolic tangible choices in, for example, clothing styles, hairstyles and footwear. However, intangible elements, such as common interests, dialects and slang, music genres and gathering places can also be an important factor. Youth subcultures offer participants an identity outside of that ascribed by social institutions such as family, work, home and school. It is important to distinguish between subcultures and countercultures.

Social class, gender and ethnicity can be important in relation to youth subcultures. Youth subcultures can be defined as meaning systems, modes of expression or lifestyles developed by groups in subordinate structural positions in response to dominant systems—and which reflect their attempt to solve structural contradictions rising from the wider societal context. Youth subcultures are often defined or distinguishable by elements such as fashion, beliefs, slang, dialects, behaviours or interests. Vehicles—such as cars, motorcycles, scooters, skateboards, surf boards—have played central roles in certain youth subcultures. In the United Kingdom in the 1960s, mods were associated with scooters while rockers were associated with motorcycles. Many youth subcultures are associated with specific music genres, and in some cases music has been the primary characteristic of the group, such as with punk rockers, ravers, Metalheads, Goths, hip hoppers, emo and indie. Brake, (Michael, 1985).

Another significant variable identified as a likely causal variable in the student abstinence behavior. Because peer pressure can be a driving force behind youth low abstinence, they do not necessarily adhere to the ideals of abstinence their parents or people want for them. Peers influence the sexual beliefs and decisions of young people. Young people feel comfortable talking about sex and contraception with each other; however, peers often provide each other with incorrect information. The successful formation and navigation of interpersonal relationships with peers is a process central to adolescent development in all cultures. Because adolescents spend a large amount of their time with peers, it is not surprising that they play a highly influential role in adolescents' lives. The feeling of belonging and social acceptance is very strong at early adulthood. This is why peer influence plays a huge part in steering the experiences and interest of individuals. When searching for their identity and social influences, peer interaction play a huge part in this process. Social influence and pressure can lead to behaviors like substance abuse, risk taking, and promiscuous sexual activity. Behaviors such as these can prove to be detrimental to the health of the individual. The peer influence is often initiated through peer psychological control.

Peer psychological control refers to a rearing style characterized by the excessive use of techniques that intrude upon the individual psychological world just like a parent (Barber & Harmon, 2002; Barber, 1996). Psychologically controlling peers rely on intrusive and manipulative strategies such as guilt induction, shaming, and love withdrawal to make their individual comply with their expectations. Psychological control has been shown to be predictive of maladjustment and internalizing problems (e.g., depression,



anxiety, and loneliness) in both individual and adolescents (e.g., Psychological control, as it relates to peers attempts to control the psychological world of their individual via guilt-induction, love withdrawal, and manipulations of the attachment bond with the individual (Barber, 1996; Schaefer, 1965).

Psychological control characterizes peers who are overly involved with their personal needs and lack an appropriate sense of empathy for their individual's perspective and goals. As such, psychologically controlling peers hinder autonomy of the individual (Barber & Harmon, 2002). Because psychological control intrudes on the youth's self-direction and psychological sense of self (Barber, 1996), high psychological control is predictive of a lower self-esteem and higher vulnerability to defiant behaviour which include risky sexual behaviour (e.g., Barber, 1996; Barber & Harmon, 2002; Soenens, Vansteenkiste, Luyten, Duriez, & Goossens, 2005). As such, psychological control inhibits experiences of autonomy in youths and adolescents (Barber, 1996, 2002; Vansteenkiste, Zhou, Lens, & Soenens, 2005). Consequently, these adolescents are less in touch with their inner self and, hence, may experience difficulties in making a personal commitment. In addition, recent research found linkages between psychological control and fear of failure (Elliot & Thrash, 2004) and maladaptive perfectionism (Soenens, Elliot, et al., 2005).

According to social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986), self-efficacy, or an individual's beliefs about his/her ability to perform a particular behavior in a given situation, mediates the relation between an individual's knowledge and skills related to performing a behavior and his or her actual performance of the behavior. For example, in the area of sexual risk taking, contraceptive self-efficacy has been found to be linked to actual contraceptive use level at last sexual intercourse (Sieving, Bearinger, Resnick, Pettingell, & Skay, 2007). Likewise, condom use self-efficacy has been linked to actual condom use (Kalichman et al., 2002), and resistive efficacy has been linked to having fewer sexual partners (Mitchell, Kaufman, & Beals, 2005).

Gender issues affect abstinence in numerous ways. In many cultures, gender norms for females include submissiveness, deference to male authority, dependence, virginity until marriage, and faithfulness during marriage. Norms for men, in contrast, are built around power and control, independence, not showing emotions, risk taking, using violence to resolve conflict, early sexual activity, and having multiple sexual partners. Such inequity and inequality limit young people's control over their sexual and reproductive lives. Many young women and men cannot choose abstinence for themselves, either because they are already married, or may be coerced into sex in exchange for money or food.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The main purpose of this study is to understand the influence of some identified individual characteristics and environmental factors that determine low sexual abstinence among youths in Nigeria; specifically this study aim to:

- (1) To examine the collective and independent contributions of self efficacy, youth culture and peer influence to attitude towards sexual abstinence among university students.
- (2) To identify the contribution of gender to abstinence among university students.
- (3) To examine the interaction effects of self efficacy, youth culture and peer influence on sexual abstinence among university students.

### **Significance of the Study**

University is often a more liberal environment that students are accustomed to and often sex is regarded more casually especially on the campuses. This may limit the influence of abstinence programs in the university. Students need to acquire the information and decision-making skills that will guide them throughout their lives. Therefore, abstinence intervention needs to acknowledge the role of psychological variables that have made the abstinence message less functional. The goal is to promote healthy and satisfying sexual relationships. Appropriate knowledge and skills will help young people to become sexually responsible and healthy adults. This study contributes to knowledge as it can be used to guide intervention programmes and intervention responses in an effort to reduce sexual health related problems. The outcomes of this study will be useful in the elimination of risk of pregnancy and STDs, understanding behavioral beliefs that give support to abstinence. The finding of the study will advance knowledge and contribute immensely to the existing literature and as well enrich empirical studies on the level of sexual abstinence among youths in the university settings.

### **Hypotheses**

1. Self efficacy, peer group psychological control and Youth culture would jointly and independently predict sexual abstinence among university students.
2. Female student will significantly report being more sexually abstinent than male students.
3. University students high on self efficacy, youth culture and peer psychological control will significantly report low sexual abstinence compare to those low on self efficacy, youth culture and peer psychological control.



## Method

This study examined the impact of youth culture, peer influence, sex abstinence, and self efficacy on university students' sexual behaviour. The study is a cross-sectional survey which undertook a descriptive analysis of the influence of the independent variables on the dependent variable. The independent variables are youth culture, peer psychological control and sex abstinence self efficacy while the dependent variable is sexual abstinence behaviour of university students.

### Sample

Two hundred and forty (240) university undergraduates participated in the study, between the ages of 15 and 29 years. Their mean age was 24.32 years. The students were sampled from the faculty of social sciences, Arts, Education, Law, Technology and Agriculture. 140 (60%) were males and 100 (40%) were females. The purposive sampling technique was utilized in the study.

### Instrumentation

The main instruments used for this study were questionnaires obtained from different sources in existing literatures. The instruments were outlined into five sections: A, B, C, D, and E,

**Section A: (Demographic Variable):** The first section of the questionnaire was designed to provide demographic information such as department, age, sex, marital status and educational qualification and nature of heterosexual relationship.

**Section B: Sexual Abstinence:** Sexual abstinence was measured in this study using the adapted 12-item scale from the attitudes toward abstinence scales (Miller et al., 1998). Items were adapted to meet up with the nature of sexual abstinence among youth and young adults. Response format is coded on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 represented strongly disagree and 5 represented strongly agree. Cronbach alpha = 0.85 (Miller et al., 1998).

**Section C: The Sexual Self-Efficacy Scale (SSE):** The Sexual Self-Efficacy Scale (SSE) is concerned with measuring people's beliefs that they have the ability to exert personal control in sexual situations. This scale can be used to assess refusal skills for sexual behavior. The scale was originally developed by Kasen and colleagues (Kasen et al., 1992). This scale has been validated on a sample of predominately Caucasian college students by Cecil and Pinkerton (1998).

Only the subsection "Refuse Sexual Intercourse" is reported here. Reliability: Cronbach alpha (whole scale) = 0.82 (Kasen et al., 1992).

#### **Section D: Peer Psychological Control Scale (Peer Influence):**

Psychological control was measured with the adaptation of the 8-item Psychological Control Scale – Youth Self-Report (PCS-YSR; Barber, 1996). Barber provided evidence for the validity and un-dimensional factor structure of this scale. Cronbach's alphas of this scale were found to range between .72 and .86, demonstrating its reliability across samples. All items were answered on a 1 ("does not apply at all") to 5 ("applies

strongly") Likert scale. A sample item is "My friends are less friendly to me if I don't see things like they do".

**Section E: Youth Culture Scale:** This section measures a youth culture using youth culture media exposure questionnaire by Xiaoming and Leng leng (2004), the items were originally adapted from Rubin (1977, 1979) television affinity scale which deals with media exposure which measures the students perception of popular culture. Items here added to reflect the popular culture in Nigeria. The scale is a 40 item questionnaire scale. The scale reliability is 0.905. While the reliability for this study 0.92.

#### **Procedure**

The researcher visited the students at the hall of residence and the faculties to carry out the administration of the questionnaire. The researcher identifies the respondents through the purposive sampling technique. The researcher will introduce himself and explained to the respondents the purpose of the study and assured them of the confidentiality of the information they are to give and also implored them to give accurate response to the items. Participants were allowed approximately 10 -15 minutes interval to fill in the entire questionnaire. 280 questionnaires were distributed, however 250 questionnaires were retrieved. 240 appropriately filled questionnaires were used in the analysis.

#### **Statistical Analysis**

The study utilized both descriptive and inferential statistical. Study hypotheses were tested with t-test, ANOVA and multiple regressions.



## Results

The first hypothesis which states that self efficacy, peer group psychological control and youth culture would jointly and independently predict sexual abstinence among university students was tested using multiple regression analysis's and the result presented in table 4.1

**Table 4.1: Summary of multiple regression analysis showing the influence of self efficacy, peer group psychological control and youth culture on sexual abstinence behaviour.**

| Predictors                 | R    | R <sup>2</sup> | F     | P    | $\beta$ | t      | P    |
|----------------------------|------|----------------|-------|------|---------|--------|------|
| Self efficacy              | .629 | .395           | 51.23 | <.01 | -.393   | -6.894 | <.01 |
| Peer Psychological Control |      |                |       |      | -.155   | -3.031 | <.01 |
| Youth culture              |      |                |       |      | -.303   | -5.275 | <.01 |

The result in table 4.1 demonstrates that, self efficacy, peer group psychological control and youth culture jointly predicted sexual abstinence among university students. The result shows that students scores on self efficacy, peer group psychological control and youth culture scales accounted for 40% of the change observed in the reported sexual abstinence scores of the university students ( $R^2 = 0.395$ ,  $F = (3,239)$ ,  $p <.01$ ). The result further demonstrated that there was independent influence of self efficacy ( $\beta = -.393$ ,  $p <.01$ ), peer group psychological control ( $\beta = -.155$ ,  $p <.01$ ) and youth culture ( $\beta = -.303$ ,  $p <.01$ ) on sexual abstinence among university students. Signifying that students with high self efficacy, under high influence of peer psychological control and with high exposure to youth culture to have low sexual abstinence. The first hypothesis is accepted.

The second hypothesis which states that Female student will significantly report being more sexually abstinent than male students was analysed using t-test for independence. The result is presented in table 4.2.



**TABLE 4.2: Summary of T-test For Independent Sample Showing the Influence Of Gender on Sexual Abstinence Among University Students**

| Dependent variable | Gender | N   | Mean  | SD   | df  | t     | p    |
|--------------------|--------|-----|-------|------|-----|-------|------|
| Sexual abstinence  | Male   | 140 | 18.49 | 7.85 | 237 | 1.197 | >.05 |
|                    | Female | 95  | 17.26 | 7.70 |     |       |      |

The result of the hypothesis two tested presented in table 4.2, revealed that male students ( $x = 18.49$ ,  $S.D = 7.85$ ) mean score on sexual abstinence was not significantly different from females students mean score on sexual abstinence ( $x = 17.26$ ,  $S.D = 7.70$ ). The result suggest that there is no significant difference between females and male students ( $t(237) = 1.197, p > .05$ ) in sexual abstinence behavior in this of study.

The third hypothesis which states that university students high on self efficacy, youth culture and peer psychological control will significantly report low sexual abstinence compare to those low on self efficacy, youth culture and peer psychological control. This was tested using  $2 \times 2 \times 2$  ANOVA and the result presented in table 4.3a and 4.3b.

**Table 4.3a: Summary of  $2 \times 2 \times 2$  ANOVA showing the influence of self efficacy, peer psychological control and youth culture on sexual abstinence among university students**

| Source  | SS        | df  | MS       | F      | Sig. |
|---|-----------|-----|----------|--------|------|
| Self efficacy   | 1142.781  | 1   | 1142.781 | 32.499 | .000 |
| Peer psychological control                                | 570.798   | 1   | 570.798  | 16.232 | .000 |
| Youth culture   | 1608.172  | 1   | 1608.172 | 45.734 | .000 |
| Self efficacy * peer psychological control                | 387.066   | 1   | 387.066  | 11.007 | .001 |
| Self efficacy* youth culture                              | 132.378   | 1   | 132.378  | 3.765  | .054 |
| Peer psychological control * youthculture                 | 310.485   | 1   | 310.485  | 8.830  | .003 |
| Self efficacy * peer psychological control * youthculture | 62.951    | 1   | 62.951   | 1.790  | .182 |
| Error   | 8122.865  | 231 | 35.164   |        |      |
| Corrected Total   | 14452.444 | 238 |          |        |      |

**Table 4.3b: Descriptive statistics showing the mean difference in sexual abstinence based on self efficacy, peer psychological control and youth culture among university students**

| Self efficacy | Peer psychological control | Youth culture | Mean    | Std. Deviation | N   |
|---------------|----------------------------|---------------|---------|----------------|-----|
| Low           | Low                        | Low           | 25.0385 | 7.24144        | 26  |
|               |                            | High          | 24.5882 | 3.75930        | 17  |
|               |                            | Total         | 24.8605 | 6.05365        | 43  |
|               | High                       | Low           | 22.3725 | 6.50219        | 51  |
|               |                            | High          | 14.3571 | 5.78602        | 14  |
|               |                            | Total         | 20.6462 | 7.13142        | 65  |
|               | Total                      | Low           | 23.2727 | 6.83188        | 77  |
|               |                            | High          | 19.9677 | 6.98801        | 31  |
|               |                            | Total         | 22.3241 | 7.00711        | 108 |
| High          | Low                        | Low           | 20.0000 | 6.31238        | 14  |
|               |                            | High          | 13.7949 | 6.03141        | 39  |
|               |                            | Total         | 15.4340 | 6.64631        | 53  |
|               | High                       | Low           | 20.8095 | 8.57099        | 21  |
|               |                            | High          | 11.7368 | 3.45133        | 57  |
|               |                            | Total         | 14.1795 | 6.64449        | 78  |
|               | Total                      | Low           | 20.4857 | 7.65572        | 35  |
|               |                            | High          | 12.5729 | 4.75449        | 96  |
|               |                            | Total         | 14.6870 | 6.64841        | 131 |
| Total         | Low                        | Low           | 23.2750 | 7.26773        | 40  |
|               |                            | High          | 17.0714 | 7.37035        | 56  |
|               |                            | Total         | 19.6562 | 7.91112        | 96  |
|               | High                       | Low           | 21.9167 | 7.13995        | 72  |
|               |                            | High          | 12.2535 | 4.10476        | 71  |
|               |                            | Total         | 17.1189 | 7.56985        | 143 |
|               | Total                      | Low           | 22.4018 | 7.18289        | 112 |
|               |                            | High          | 14.3780 | 6.23219        | 127 |
|               |                            | Total         | 18.1381 | 7.79260        | 239 |

The result in table 4.3a and 4.3b, shows that there is main effect of self efficacy ( $F(1,239) = 32.49, p < .01$ ), university students high on self efficacy ( $x = 22.32, S.D = 7.00$ ) significantly reported higher sexual abstinence behaviour compare to university students who reported low self efficacy ( $x = 14.68, S.D = 6.64$ ). Also, the result demonstrated that there was significant main effect of peer psychological control on sexual abstinence ( $F(1, 238) = 16.23, p < .001$ ), university students with low peer psychological control ( $x = 19.65, S.D = 7.91$ ) reported higher sexual abstinence than students with high peer psychological control ( $x = 17.11, S.D = 7.56$ ). There is main effect of youth culture ( $F(1,243) = 45.73, p < .01$ ) on university students sexual abstinence. University students low on youth culture ( $x = 30.26, S.D = 6.3$ ) significantly reported higher sexual abstinence compare to university students who reported high on youth culture ( $x = 24.66, S.D = 7.18$ ).

There is significant interaction between self efficacy and peer psychological control on university students' sexual abstinence ( $F(1, 239) = 11.00, p < .001$ ). University students low on self efficacy and peer psychological control significantly reported high sexual abstinence compared to student low on self efficacy but high on peer psychological control, high on self efficacy but low peer psychological control and students high on both self efficacy and peer psychological control.

There is significant interaction between self efficacy and youth culture on university students' sexual abstinence ( $F(1, 239) = 3.765, p < .001$ ). University students low on self efficacy and youth culture significantly reported high sexual abstinence compared to student low on self efficacy but high on youth culture, high on self efficacy but low youth culture and students high on both self efficacy and youth culture.

There is significant interaction between youth culture and peer psychological control on university students' sexual abstinence ( $F(1, 239) = 8.830, p < .001$ ). University students low on youth culture and peer psychological control significantly reported high sexual abstinence compared to student low on self efficacy but high on peer psychological control, high on youth culture but low peer psychological control and students high on both youth culture and peer psychological control.

There was no significant interaction between self efficacy, youth culture and peer psychological control on university students' sexual abstinence ( $F(1, 239) = 1.790, p < .001$ ). This hypothesis is not fully supported.



## Discussion

This study looked at the role of youth culture, self efficacy and peer influence on attitude towards abstinence behaviour among university students. Three hypotheses were tested in chapter four and the discussions of the findings are discussed in this chapter. The first hypothesis stating that self efficacy, peer group psychological control and Youth culture would jointly and independently predict sexual abstinence among university students was confirmed. The result demonstrated that self efficacy, peer group psychological control and youth culture jointly predicted sexual abstinence among university students. Students with high self efficacy, under high influence of peer psychological control and with high exposure to youth culture have low sexual abstinence. This findings is synonymous with the study impact (2001) survey were they found the direct influence of youth culture and media exposure on sexual abstinence among youths age 13 to 19, found that many decided to remain abstinent as a direct result of exposure to the television and radio advertisements. In the same vein, the study of Bogart et al (2007) who found that Watching sex on TV predicts and may hasten sexual initiation and increasing initiation of coital and noncoital activities. Findings also supports the findings of Impact (2001) which demonstrated that sex abstinence self efficacy may reduce incidence of sexual risk taking (defined as condom use) with both casual and regular sex partners. But With regular partners individuals may not practice sexual abstinence.

The second hypothesis stated that female students will significantly report being more sexually abstinent than male students was not confirmed. The result suggested that there is no significant difference between females and male students in sexual abstinence behaviour in this study. This findings is contrast to the findings of Bogart et al (2007) who demonstrated that females student often have higher level of sexual abstinence compare to males.

The third hypothesis stated that university students high on self efficacy, youth culture and peer psychological control will significantly report low sexual abstinence compare to those low on self efficacy, youth culture and peer psychological control was however partially supported. The result revealed the main effect of self efficacy, peer psychological control and youth culture. There was significant interaction between self efficacy and peer psychological control as University students low on self efficacy and peer psychological control significantly reported high sexual abstinence compared to student low on self efficacy but high on peer psychological control, high on self efficacy but low peer psychological control and students high on both self efficacy and peer psychological control.

There was also significant interaction between self efficacy and youth culture on university students' sexual abstinence. University students low on self efficacy and youth culture significantly reported high sexual abstinence compared to student low on self efficacy but high on youth culture, high on self efficacy but low youth culture and students high on both self efficacy and youth culture. The significant interaction between youth culture and peer psychological control on university students' sexual abstinence was also confirmed. University students low on youth culture and peer psychological control significantly reported high sexual abstinence compared to student low on self efficacy but high on peer psychological control, high on youth culture but low peer psychological control and students high on both youth culture and peer psychological control. While there was no significant interaction between self efficacy, youth culture and peer psychological control on university students' sexual abstinence. This finding supports the study of Mwangi, et al, (2004) who demonstrated that the key obstacle to abstinence was personal desire for sex, peer pressure and attitude form as barriers to abstinence. In the same vein, Bogart et al (2007) who found that watching sex on TV predicts and may hasten sexual initiation and increasing initiation of coital and non coital activities. Findings also supports the findings of Impact (2001) which demonstrated that sex abstinence self efficacy may reduce incidence of sexual risk taking (defined as condom use) with both casual and regular sex partners. But With regular partners individuals may not practice sexual abstinence.

The second hypothesis stated that female students will significantly report being more sexually abstinent than male students was not confirmed. The result suggested that there is no significant difference between females and male students in sexual abstinence behaviour in this study. This findings is contrast to the findings of Bogart et al (2007) who demonstrated that females student often have higher level of sexual abstinence compare to males. The third hypothesis stated that university students high on self efficacy, youth culture and peer psychological control will significantly report low sexual abstinence compare to those low on self efficacy, youth culture and peer psychological control was however partially supported. The result revealed the main effect of self efficacy, peer psychological control and youth culture. There was significant interaction between self efficacy and peer psychological control as University students low on self efficacy and peer psychological control significantly reported high sexual abstinence compared to student low on self efficacy but high on peer psychological control, high on self efficacy but low peer psychological control and students high on



both self efficacy and peer psychological control.

There was also significant interaction between self efficacy and youth culture on university students' sexual abstinence. University students low on self efficacy and youth culture significantly reported high sexual abstinence compared to student low on self efficacy but high on youth culture, high on self efficacy but low youth culture and students high on both self efficacy and youth culture. The significant interaction between youth culture and peer psychological control on university students' sexual abstinence was also confirmed. University students low on youth culture and peer psychological control significantly reported high sexual abstinence compared to student low on self efficacy but high on peer psychological control, high on youth culture but low peer psychological control and students high on both youth culture and peer psychological control. While there was no significant interaction between self efficacy, youth culture and peer psychological control on university students' sexual abstinence. This finding supports the study of Mwangi, et al, (2004) who demonstrated that the key obstacle to abstinence was personal desire for sex, peer pressure and attitude form as barriers to abstinence. In the same vein, Bogart et al (2007) who found that watching sex on TV predicts and may hasten sexual initiation and increasing initiation of coital and non coital activities.

## **Conclusion**

This study has contributed to knowledge seeking-out psychosocial factors limiting the level of sexual abstinence among university students. The study tried to identify those psycho-social variables promoting good social adjustment and those that are contributory factor in vulnerability. This study found that Self efficacy, peer group influence and youth culture were significant independent predictors of attitude towards sexual abstinence among university students. There were no gender differences in sexual abstinence among university students. The interaction effect of the dyads of self efficacy and youth culture, self efficacy and peer influence, youth culture and peer influence were all found to be significant. However the interaction between self efficacy youth culture and peer influence on university students' attitude towards sexual abstinence was not significant.



## Recommendations

Creating empowerment through education program assists people in learning ways to prevent risky sexual behavior from harm their lives than they want, to reduce the negative impact of STIs and HIV spread campus advocacy groups and NGOs should advocate for safe sex on campus, co-sponsoring significant and historical on-campus events, in addition to providing resources and services for walk-in clientele. The school should offer peer counseling and referral services and educational programs to students at on campus while distributing safe sex materials, including condoms, lubrication, pamphlets, brochures & books. Peer Educators Advocating is a program of the whose overall goal is to provide an effective peer network to encourage, support, and advocate healthy living in the areas of sexuality and nutrition for all students.

Behavioural consequences and feedback from surrounding social and physical environments, and the individual's interpretation of these, determines future action. Implications for Increasing Self-efficacy interventions should be considered for improving sexual abstinence behaviors. Bandura posits that there are four sources of self-efficacy and students should be prepared via verbal persuasion by their peers or educators.

These includes: Mastery experiences, Vicarious experiences, Verbal persuasion or enhancement, and Reduction of physiological or affective states

There is need for future research on making interventions culturally specific and culturally sensitive. A greater understanding and measurement of gender differences in sexual decision making can assist experts' educators to address the health and social issues and provide a basis for more effective programs. Cognitive-behavioral interventions combine cognitive and behavioral strategies to solve a variety of behavioral and psychological problems could also be utilized in bring about change in the students attitude. Experts should seek change in student's irrational or faulty thinking and behaviors by educating the person and reinforcing positive experiences that will lead to fundamental changes in the way that person copes." In other words, by learning to shift or alter their thinking processes, clients can think more clearly about the choices they make and the behaviors in which they engage.

## References

- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action. A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Prentice Hall
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 1-26.
- Barber, B. K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development*, 67, 3296-3319. Barber, B. K. (Ed.). (2002). *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Barber, B. K., & Harmon, E. L. (2002). Violating the self: Parental psychological control of children and adolescents. In B. K. Barber (Ed.), *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents* (pp. 15-52). Washington, DC: APA.
- Barber, B. K., Stolz, H. E., Olsen, J. A., & Maughan, S. L. (2005). Parental support, psychological control, and behavioral control: Assessing relevance across time, method, and culture. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 70(4).
- Baumeister, R. F., Campbell, J. D., Krueger, J. I., & Vohs, K. D. (2003). Does high self-esteem cause better performance, interpersonal success, happiness, or healthier lifestyles? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 4, 1-44.
- Cecil, H. & Pinkerton, S. D. (1998). Reliability and validity of a self-efficacy instrument for protective sexual behaviors. *Journal of American College of Health*, 47, 113-121.
- Chilman, C. (1983). Adolescent sexuality in a changing American society: Social and psychological perspectives for the human services professions. New York New York, state, Wiley.
- Gagnon, J. H. & Simon, W. (1973). Childhood and adolescence. In J. H. Gagnon & W. Simon (Eds.), *Sexual conduct: The social sources of human sexuality* (pp. 27-81). Chicago: Aldine.



- Koenig, H. G., McCullough, M. E., Larson, D. B. (2001). Handbook of religion and health. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mitchell, C. M., Kaufman, C. E., & Beals, J. (2005). *Resistive efficacy and multiple sexual partners among American Indian Applied Developmental Science*, 9, 160-171.
- Molloy, B. L. & Herzberger, S. D. (1998). Body image and self-esteem: A comparison of African American and Caucasian women. *Sex Roles*, 38, 631-643.
- Mwangi M, Cheluget B, Mwikya L, Marum LH, Wandia E; (2004 ) Knowledge and practice of abstinence among out of school youth in Kenya. *International Conference on AIDS*. Jul 11-16; 15:
- Salazar, L. F., DiClemente, R. J., Wingood, G. M., Crosby, R. A., Harrington, K., Davies, S., Hook, E. W., & Oh, M. K. (2004). Self-concept and adolescents' refusal of unprotected sex: *A test of mediating mechanisms among African American girls. Prevention Science*, 5, 137-149.
- Schaefer, E. S. (1965). A configurational analysis of children's reports of parent behavior. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 29, 552-557.
- Scholly, K. S., Katz, A. R., Gascoigne, J., & Holck, P. S. (2005). Using social norms theory to explain perceptions and sexual health behaviors of undergraduate college students: An exploratory study. *Journal of American College Health*, 53(4), 159-166.