

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

PERTINENT CONTRIBUTING FACTORS
TO DIVORCE AMONG THE RESIDENTS OF
ADDIS ABABA.

THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE
STUDIES OF ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN
COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY.

By
WODAJENEH MEHARENE



JUNE 2006
ADDIS ABABA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES.

PERTINENT CONTRIBUTING FACTORS
TO DIVORCE AMONG THE RESIDENTS OF
ADDIS ABABA.

By
WODAJENEH MEHARENE

APPROVAL OF BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Taha Fawczi

CHAIR PERSON, DEPARTMENT
GRADUATE COMMITTEE

Taha Fawczi

Signature

Dr. Bidyachar Sen

ADVISOR

AB

Signature

Reda Darge

EXAMINER, EXTERNAL

Reda Darge

Signature

Tamiric Andualem

EXAMINER, INTERNAL

Tamiric Andualem

Signature

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It is with sincerity that I express my gratitude to my advisor Dr. Sa for sharing the riches of his experience and knowledge with me. I would like to thank him for his warm friendliness and excellent counsel and advice from the inception of this research project to its completion. I would also like to thank all the instructors in the department of psychology for the knowledge I gained from them in class.

I would like to express my appreciation and gratitude to Miss Emebet Basazinev for her excellent secretarial skills, which facilitated the preparation of this thesis. My heart-felt thanks goes to Mr. Cherenet Mekonen, Mr. Girma Baye and Miss Elleni Tekle who worked as research assistants in collecting data for this project.

I would also like to thank the seven professionals who cooperated in giving the interview in this paper. This project, however, would have been impossible if it were not for the participation of the respondents.

OUTLINE OF CONTENTS

<u>Content</u>	<u>Page</u>
▪ Acknowledgement	i
▪ List of Tables	iv
▪ List of Abbreviations	vi
▪ Abstract	vii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1: Background of the problem	3
1.1.1: Theoretical Background	3
1.1.1. A: An overview of divorce	3
A1: What is divorce?	3
A2: History of divorce and divorce law	4
A3: Models of divorce process	7
A4: Effects of divorce	10
A5: Factors associated with divorce	11
1.1.1. B: Related past research	13
1.1.2: Practical considerations	20
1.1.2 A: Divorce in Addis Ababa	20
1.1.2 B: Significance of the study	22
1.1.3: Statement of the problem	24
1.2: Purpose of the research	25
1.2.1: General objectives	25
1.2.2: Specific objectives	25
1.3: Operational definitions of terms used	27
1.4: Delimitation of the study	28

CHAPTER TWO: METHOD	29
2.1: Method of Research	29
2.2: Study area	30
2.3: Population and Sampling	31
2.4: Tools of data collection	31
2.5: Procedure of data collection	32
2.6: Method of data analysis	33
CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS	34
3.1: Result of the Demographic Factors	34
3.2: Result of the Pertinent Contributing Factors	54
3.3: Result of the Perceived “Reasons” of Divorce	59
3.4: Result of the Interview with the Professionals	63
CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION	64
4.1: Discussion on the Demographic Factors	64
4.2: Discussion on the Pertinent Contributing Factors	71
4.3: Discussion on the Perceived “Reasons” of Divorce	85
4.4: Discussion on the outcome of the Interview with the professionals	88
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS	89
5.1: Summery	89
5.2: Conclusion	89
5.3: Suggestions	92
References	95
Appendices.	
Appendix A: Pearson correlation of factors.	
Appendix B: Questionnaire in English.	
Appendix C: Questionnaire in Amharic.	
Appendix D: Structured interview.	

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1: Data from AACGADO	21
Table 2: Calculated divorce rate	22
Table 3: Age at previous marriage	35
Table 4: Descriptive statistics for age at previous marriage	35
Table 5: Age difference between husbands and wives where husbands are older than wives.	36
Table 6: Age difference between husbands and wives where wives are older than husbands	36
Table 7: Percentages of ethnic origin for the respondents	37
Table 8: Percentages of ethnic origin for the ex-spouses of the respondents. .	37
Table 9: Cross tabulation of ethnic origin of respondents and their ex-spouses	38
Table 10: Occupation of the respondents and their ex-spouses	39
Table 11: Educational status of the divorcees.	40
Table 12: Educational status of ex-spouses of the respondents	41
Table 13: Cross tabulation of educational status of respondents and their ex-spouses	42
Table 14: Religion of the respondents and their ex-spouses	43
Table 15: Cross tabulation of religion of the divorcees and their ex-spouses ...	44
Table 16: Traditional and non-traditional marriages of the divorcees	44
Table 17: Legality of marriage of the respondents	45
Table 18: Duration of engagement of the divorced couples	45
Table 19: Descriptive statistics of duration of engagement	46
Table 20: Premarital intercourse between the divorced couples	46

Table 21:	Premarital pregnancy	47
Table 22:	Number of children from previous marriage	48
Table 23:	Descriptive statistics of number of children	48
Table 24:	Duration of previous marriage	49
Table 25:	Descriptive statistics of duration of previous marriage	49
Table 26:	Filing for divorce	50
Table 27:	Number of divorce	50
Table 28:	Remarriage of the respondents	51
Table 29:	Length of time between divorce and remarriage	52
Table 30:	Previous divorce of present spouse	52
Table 31:	Parental divorce of respondents.	53
Table 32:	Parental divorce of ex-spouse	53
Table 33:	Pertinent Contributing Factors for divorce.	55
Table 34:	T-value for the Pertinent Contributing Factors and significance at 0.05 levels.	58
Table 35:	Perceived Reasons of Divorce	61
Table 36:	T-value for the Perceived Reasons of Divorce and their significance at 0.05 levels.	62
Table A1	Correlation between contributing factors for males	App.A
Table A2	Correlation between contributing factors for female	App.A

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AACGADO.	Addis Ababa City Government Acts and Documentation Office.
ADTP.	Australian Divorce Transition Project.
EMP.	Extramarital pregnancy.
EMS.	Extramarital sex.
PCF.	Pertinent Contributing factor.
PRD.	Perceived “Reason” for Divorce.

ABSTRACT

A survey study was conducted in Addis Ababa to study the pertinent contributing factors to divorce and perceived “reasons” of divorce among the residents. A sample of 100 male and 100 female divorcees, 10 males and 10 females from each of the sub cities, filled out questionnaires and a group of professionals were interviewed. Percentages, descriptive statistics, Pearson correlations, t -values and spearman rank difference correlations were used to analyses the collected data. From the result, seven groups of pertinent contributing factors i.e. “Affective”, “cognitive”, “behavioral”, “familial”, “social”, “economic”, and “addictive” factors were identified. In addition, ten demographic factors were found to be pertinent contributing factors to divorce. Significance of difference was found between males and females for some of the factors. Suggestions are made on how to reduce the rate of dissolution of marriages.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

People who have witnessed the divorce of their parents and suffered from the consequences and those who have undergone the painful process of divorce themselves know what divorce is really like. The researcher and writer of this paper had witnessed divorce in his own family in times of his childhood and truly understand how disturbing divorce is. The effect of divorce can be devastating and it has long term sequel. Divorce is not a delightful experience either to the spouses or their children.

Divorce or dissolution of marriage is the ending of marriage before the death of either spouse (Wikipedia, 2005). Much attention is being given world wide to the danger of the disintegration of marriage and its harmful consequences. Divorce rate has increased markedly in the developed countries during the twentieth century (Wikipedia, 2005). Among the countries where divorce has become common phenomena are the United States, members of the European Union and Korea. Japan retained a markedly lower divorce rate though it has increased in recent years. If one considers divorce statistics of the United States, it can be seen that divorce rate more than doubled in the 15 year period from 1963 to 1978 (Goodman, 1983). It is important to note that the only information that divorce statistics provides is to inform us how many marriages were legally dissolved in a given period of time (Guttmann, 1993). There are, however, other divorces which are dissolved traditionally.

Ethiopia is not exempted from the divorce problem. Among the social problems that haunt the population of Addis Ababa, capital city of Ethiopia, is Divorce. According to the Addis Ababa City Government Acts and Documentation office (AACGADO, 2006), in the year 1997 EC (2004-2005) 9,170 couples were certified to be married while 1,294 individuals took divorce certificate making the divorce to marriage ratio 0.141. This is significantly higher when compared to the ratio in 1987 EC (1994-1995) which was 0.027.

Divorce is known to have negative consequences on the divorcees and their children (Gottmann, 1994). Its effects on children include depression, withdrawal, poor social competence, health problems, poor academic performance and a variety of conduct related difficulties. On the divorcees, the negative effects include increased incidence of physical illness, suicide, violence, homicide, and mortality from various diseases.

Researchers suggest that one of the contributing factors for the increasing divorce rate is the change in family laws in different countries (Crouch, 2005). In most of the states in USA where “No fault” divorce law was implemented, divorce rate increased substantially. Revision of the family law has occurred in Ethiopia. The revised family code of Ethiopia enacted on July 4th, 2000 has done away with the necessity to provide reason for divorce (Woldegiorgis, 2005). The effect of this revised code on divorce rate is not yet known.

There are different “causes” of divorce or contributing factors suggested by different studies. Some of these factors include communication problems, basic unhappiness, incompatibility, emotional abuse, financial problems, sexual problems, alcohol abuse, infidelity, physical abuse, in-laws, disagreement over children, religious differences, mental illness, drug abuse etc (Cleek & Pearson, 1985). There are also demographic factors like early age at marriage, premarital pregnancy, cohabitation, race, previous divorce, parental divorce, occupation, income, number of children etc which contribute to divorce in a significant manner (Bonham & Balswick, 1980).

There are some movements in the world to day such as “the divorce reform movement” which believes that divorces can be prevented (Crouch, 2005). In order to prevent divorce and its grave consequences, it is very important to know what the pertinent contributing factors are.

1.1.1 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1.1.1. A - AN OVERVIEW OF DIVORCE

A.1. WHAT IS DIVORCE?

Divorce is a process. It is a psychological and social process that occurs over a long period of time (Guttman, 1993). This process begins with serious and consistent thought of divorce followed by proceedings leading to permanent separation and ending with the possibility of rebuilding a productive and comfortable life. According to Guttman (1993) divorce is a process in which a couple experience a personal crisis, with unique characterizations and exclusive opportunities for growth and development.

Divorce is an effect, not a cause. It is a symptom, not the disease (Lichtenberger, 1931). Lichtenberger argues that divorce never broke up a single marriage. It is adultery, cruelty, desertion, drunkenness, incompatibility, the decay or transfer of affection, and the like, that destroy marriage. Divorce never occurs until after the marriage has been completely wrecked. It is only when every other marriage tie has been severed, after the parties have discontinued their marital relations and have gone their separate ways, when the marriage actually has no longer any existence that persons resort to the divorce court in order that the remaining artificial bond, created by the law, may be dissolved also. Divorce then may be defined as the readjustment of the legal states of persons formerly married but between whom marital relations already have ceased to exist (Lichtenberger, 1931).

Divorce can be viewed from different angles. It can be viewed both as a problem and as a solution (Adams, 1986). For some, divorcees are people who have not achieved a good marriage and who would not settle for a bad one. Divorce is considered as a solution for an individual in unhappy marriage. For some others, divorce is a problem. It is a very painful and disorienting experience (Kammeyer, 1987). A first year high school student chose to write a term paper on divorce. He explained in his introduction, "I was interested in divorce because my mother and father had a divorce and I had a vague idea what was going on, but did not fully understand and now I do." He concluded the introduction to his

market place with a rope or halter around her neck. The rope would then be handed over to the prearranged buyer. The money would be paid in public for all to see. Since all this was done in public, the members of the community understood, that the two people, former husband and wife, were no longer married. The woman was now the wife of the man who had purchased her, and the husband was free to remarry.

It was in 1857 that the English changed their divorce laws. This was done to make legal divorce more accessible to the majority of the people. Divorce became possible on the ground of adultery, extreme cruelty by the husband and desertion for at least two years by the husband.

When we consider the divorce law of the United States, we can see that through the early twentieth century the "the big three" grounds for divorce were desertion, adultery, and cruelty (Adams, 1986). By the 1950s, some 60% divorces were granted on the basis of cruelty, often mental cruelty. During the 1970s however, no-fault divorce spread like wild fire. It was in 1970 that the "Divorce revolution" took place when California's state legislature enacted the no-fault divorce law (Guttmann, 1993). This no-fault divorce law was adopted with some variations through out the 50 states of the United States except South Dakota.

The no-fault divorce law conditioned divorce only upon one partner's assertion that "irreconcilable differences have caused the irremediable breakdown of the marriage". This reform in divorce emanated from trends such as the women's movement, women's greater participation in the labor force, greater sexual freedom, and the increase in divorce rate.

The main purposes served by the reform of the divorce law are the elimination of the need for hypocrisy, perjury, and collusion often required by the fault system and the reduction of the levels of bitterness and suffering that are part of the divorce process and assistance given to reach a fairer and more rationed financial settlement (Guttmann, 1993)

There are four most important characteristics of the no-fault law. These are:

1. The new law eliminates the "fault-based" ground for divorce.
2. The new law removes adversarial confrontation from divorce proceedings.

3. Under the reformed law, the division of property and the financial settlement are based on equality, and the economic needs of the former partners.
4. The no-fault divorce law redefined the traditional gender based family and parental responsibility.

This divorce law has been widely accepted and implemented. Although some argue that "No-fault" divorce opens the door to increase in rate of divorce, research showed that it did not (Guttmann, 1993).

Coming to African countries, Kenya has four types of divorce law (FIDA Kenya, 1990). The first is civil or statutory law under which divorce is possible for reasons of adultery, desertion, cruelty and insanity. The second type is the African customary law under which each case is considered by the elders or the District magistrate's Court. The common grounds are: - refusal of sexual intercourse without just cause, witchcraft, repeated theft, desertion, incest and excessive physical abuse. The third type is the Muslim divorce law, which operates in Kadhi's court or the High Court. The common grounds for divorce under this law are: - desertion (5 years), no support (3 year), imprisonment (7 years), impotency, mental illness, cruelty, adultery and giving up the religion Islam. The fourth type of law is the Hindu divorce law. The common grounds for divorce under this law are adultery, desertion (3 years), cruelty, mental illness (5 years), rape, sodomy, bestiality and giving up the religion Hindu.

When we come to the Ethiopian situation, the federal family code (revised) enacted on July 4th, 2000 as proclamation 213/2000 has made the following changes (Woldegiorgis, 2005);

- (1) It made age at marriage 18 years for both sexes.
- (2) It has done away with betrothal.
- (3) It has embodied the concept of consent and equality in marriage across the board in a comprehensive way.
- (4) Allowed divorce to be pronounced by the mutual consent of the parties.

- (5) Made the courts the custodians of all marriage disputes and divorce as opposed to family arbitrators.
- (6) It has done away with the decision powers of the family arbitrators and limited their activity to that of conciliation.
- (7) Erased the provision of reasons for divorce. Providing reasons for divorce has impacted negatively on women especially in the division of property.
- (8) Recognized an irregular union (to live as man and wife with out concluding marriage) as a union worthy of common property if the union stays for more than 3 years.
- (9) Provided conditions on who should have the use of temporary shelter until the adjudication of the case.
- (10) Improved (though very slightly) paternity proof procedures.

A. 3. MODELS OF DIVORCE PROCESS.

As divorce is a very complex phenomenon, different models have been used to explain it. For this paper, two of the different models, the model of "stations of Divorce" and "divorce as a psychological process" are considered.

When we consider the model "stations of divorce" we find six stations of divorce (Kammeyer, 1987).

- 1. THE EMOTIONAL DIVORCE:** - the recognition that the emotional relationship with a spouse is deteriorating and the marriage is ending. In this station, at least one partner reduces his or her emotional investment in the relationship. The family may function normal or even better in a calmer and relaxing fashion.
- 2. THE LEGAL DIVORCE:** - the process of meeting the requirement for divorce that have been established by the state. This process has become easier today. However, mishandling of the situation can complicate divorce.
- 3. THE ECONOMIC DIVORCE:** - the division of money and property and determination of the level of continuing economic support (e.g. alimony or

maintenance award). Every financial gain and property is considered joint property and it is divided according to the law of the country.

4. **THE CO-PARENTAL DIVORCE:** - the determination of the custody of children and visitation rights. This is the most painful station of divorce because only one of the parents is granted the right of custody. The other parent's right is usually limited to prearranged visit.
5. **THE COMMUNITY DIVORCE:** - the changes necessary in dealing with friends, relatives, and associates during and after divorce. The divorcees may enter a new community as they may feel uncomfortable when around old friends.
6. **THE PSYCHIC DIVORCE:** - the process of regaining an individual identity and autonomy. It is the separation of self from the personality and the influence of the ex-spouse. Psychic divorce is usually considered the most important and potentially constructive element of the divorce process.

According to the second model, "Divorce as a psychological process", divorce has seven emotional stages (Guttman, 1993).

1. DISILLUSIONMENT.

Disillusionment occurs when the early romantic blindness wears off and when differences and difficulties are discovered. The unwillingness to deal with these problems causes partners to focus and dwell on the negative aspects of the relationship. At first, disillusionment is inconsistent. It disappears from consciousness with ease. But with time, awareness and focus on the negative becomes more concentrated.

2. EROSION

Erosion follows a disillusionment that was not dealt with properly. The frustration and anger that was repressed in the previous stage are now expressed outwardly. Verbal and nonverbal, overt or covert behaviors are common ways to hurt, ignore and avoid one another

3. DETACHEMENT

This is a significant reduction of investment of time, energy & money in the marriage. There is a growing disinterest. The joy of life, the excitement, the patience and the will to give and share that were once a part of the couples life are now repressed or channeled in to work, hobbies, or substitutes. Usually one of the spouses experience detachment first.

4. PHYSICAL SEPARATION

This can be the most traumatic aspect of the divorce process. The two individuals face their feelings of loneliness, anxiety and confusion and their need to build a new identity. The spouse who initiated the process suffers from guilt, failure and anger while the other spouse suffers from feelings of being rejected.

5. MOURNING

This stage is characterized by depression and anger. Both spouses try to free themselves from the psychological presence of the other. Pleasant and unpleasant memories threaten the beginning of the new independence.

6. SECOND ADOLESCENCE

There is a readiness to accept the sense of relief and freedom associated with divorce. The release from pressures and stress that were a part of daily marital life, along with the divorce proceedings, enable the divorced individual to view the future more clearly and more optimistically

7. EXPLORATION AND HARD WORK

In this stage, there is a feeling of a free choice of goals and confidence in attaining them. Readiness to develop relationships out of strength and with active participation is experienced.

A.4. EFFECTS OF DIVORCE

Separation and divorce have strong negative consequences for the mental and physical health of both spouses. Among the negative consequences are increased risks for psychopathology, increased rates of automobile accidents including fatalities, increased incidence of physical illness, suicide, violence, homicide, and mortality from diseases. If divorce is not a direct cause of these consequences, it is one of the most powerful predictors of them. Stable marriage is the best predictor of longevity.

Poorer marital quality results in to poorer cellular immunity (Gottmann, 1994). It is well known that poor cellular immunity results in to decreased resistance to disease. Divorce and separation also have deleterious effects on children. These effects include depression, withdrawal, poor social competence, health problems, poor academic performance and a variety of conduct related difficulties. Children from divorced families are socially and scholastically less competent than children from non- divorced families (Gottmann, 1994). Adults who experienced the divorce of their parents as children report less satisfaction with family and friends, greater anxiety, that bad things happen to them more frequently, and that they find it more difficult to cope with life's stresses in general. There are also evidences for intergenerational transmission.

A study conducted among male air force veterans of the Vietnam era showed that age adjusted testosterone levels are lower in married men than those who are divorced or single (Mazur, 1998). Testosterone level is high during the years surrounding a divorce. It is known that high level of testosterone is associated with criminality and abuse. Divorce is also mentioned as the 2nd most important stressor, second to death (Lee, 2005). In another study, which was conducted in Moscow on 374 respondents, aged 16 and older it was shown that both divorced and single persons have elevated risks of drinking relative to married persons (Stack & Bankowski, 1994). This relationship is independent of control variables including gender, education level and religiously.

In a study conducted to examine the long-term effect of divorce on individual's mental health, a British birth cohort was followed from birth to age 33. The result

suggested a negative effect of divorce and its aftermath on adult mental health. The result also suggested that a parental divorce during childhood or adolescence continues to have a negative effect when a person is in his or her twenties and early thirties (Mc Rae, 1998).

A. 5. FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH DIVORCE

The problem of divorce is associated with several different factors.

B.N Adams (1986) divides the “causes” or factors of divorce into indirect “causes” and direct “causes.” The indirect “causes” suggested are:-

- (1) **LOW FAMILY INCOME:** low status families are more susceptible to many stressors like alcoholism and unemployment, which eventually lead to divorce.
- (2) **HIGH INCOME FOR WOMEN:** this results in to divorce because of the threatened male ego and the wife’s economic independence.
- (3) **LOWER FAMILY EDUCATION:** the lower the family education, the more likely a divorce will occur.
- (4) **OCCUPATION:** Divorce rate is higher among families of lower or working class background.
- (5) **WELFARE:** Those families on welfare dissolved their marriage at a higher rate than those who are not.
- (6) **TEENAGE MARRIAGE:** Youthful marriages are on the whole less likely to last. The reasons given are less stable personalities and lack of psychological and intellectual preparation in mate selection.
- (7) **GENERATIONAL TRANSMISSION:** parental divorce is a partial cause of divorce. The children learn from their parents that divorce is all right and use it as a way out of bad marriage.

The direct “cause” suggested are **Non-support, Value divergence, Arbitrary authority, Disagreement about consumption patter, Drinking, Extramarital affairs, Personality problem, Combination of reasons and Unsatisfactory home life.**

Kammeyer (1987) identified some factors, which are highly related with divorce such as.

- (1) **Age at marriage:** If one marries at an early age, there is a greater likelihood of divorce. Couples who marry under age 18 are particularly prone to divorce.
- (2) **Race:** In the United States the rate of divorce is higher in blacks than whites.
- (3) **Socioeconomic status:** People who have lower educational level, lower income, and lower status occupation have higher rate of marital dissolution.
- (4) **Religion:** The more often people attend religious services, the less likely they are to have a marital breakup. Among the major religious denominations in the USA, Protestants as a group have slightly higher dissolution rates than Catholics, while Jews have lower rates than Catholics. The highest marriage disruption rates are among those people who claim no religion.

The divorce rate in interfaith marriages has consistently revealed itself to be higher than in religiously homogenous marriages (Guttmann, 1993).

David H. Olson (2000) provides problems reported by divorcing couples. The problems reported are communication problem (87%), power struggle (62%), unrealistic expectation (50%), sex problems (47%), decision making (47%), demonstrating affection, (45%), money management (43%), lack of feelings of love (40%), children (38%), individual problems (38%), value conflicts (35%), role conflicts (32%) and extramarital affairs (28%).

Other researches gave other “causes” or “correlates” of divorce. This will be reviewed extensively under “Related past research.”

1.1.1. B RELATED PAST RESEARCH

In this part of the paper an attempt is made to review past researches conducted by different researchers in different countries on the issue of "causes" of divorce or factors associated with divorce.

Margaret Gumiski Cleek and T.Allan Pearson (1985) reported their finding on the interrelationship between perceived causes of divorce. In a sample of 275 males and 336 females, seven dimensions of divorce, underlying 18 possible contributing causes, were revealed suggesting the need to look beyond single causes. The study was conducted in Wisconsin, USA in 1980 and 1981 using a single page surveys including demographic data items as well as cause-of -divorce items. The 18 possible "divorce causes" were derived from clinical interaction with divorcing persons.

The "divorce causes," with the findings for males and females were communication problem (F. 69.7%, M. 59.3%), basic unhappiness (F. 59.9%, M 46.9%) incompatibility (F. 56.4%, M.44.7%), emotional abuse (F. 55.5%, M. 24.7%), financial problems (F. 32.9%, M. 28.7%), sexual problems (F. 32.1%, M. 30.2%), alcohol abuse (F. 30.0%, M. 5.8%), infidelity-spouse (F 25.2%, M 10.5%), physical abuse (F. 21.7, M. 3.6%), in-laws (F. 10.7%, M.11.6%), children (F. 8.9%, M. 4.4%), religious differences (F. 8.6%, M. 6.5%), mental illness (F. 5.0%, M. 6.9%), drug abuse-spouse (F. 3.9%, M. 1.4%), infidelity-self (F. 3.9%, M. 6.2%), women's lib (F. 3.0%, M.14.5%), alcohol abuse-self (F. 0.9%, M. 9.4%) and drug abuse-self (F. 0.3%, M 1.1%)

A similar study was conducted by Alisa Burns (1984) on a 335 divorced and separated male and female sample subjects in Sydney, Australia. Burns reported the contributing factors as sexual incompatibility (M. 56%, F. 40%), lack of communication (M. 41%, F. 40%), husbands lack of time at home (M. 28%, F. 46%), financial problem (M. 24%, F. 36%), husband's association with another women (M. 17%, F. 37%), husband's drinking (M. 17%, F. 36%), husband's cruelty (M. 37%, F. 4%), wife's lack of interest (M. 25%, F. 26%), friction with relatives (M. 29%, F. 21%), disagreement over children (M. 22%, F. 19%) wife's association with another man (M. 35%, F.12%),

husband's lack of interest (M. 15%, F. 12%), wife's ill health (M. 13%, F. 13%), inadequate housing (M. 4%, F.13%), religious differences (M. 5%, F. 5%) and husbands gambling (M. 3%, F. 7%).

As it can be seen there is some similarity between the above two studies in that incompatibility and communication problems are among those variables in the top.

When some of the demographic factors are considered, an interesting review was done by Sharon Price-Bonham and Jack O. Balswick (1980). They reviewed selected research and theoretical writings published in 1970s on divorce, remarriage, and desertion. Their finding is summarized below.

1. **Race:** Blacks had a higher rate of marital dissolution than whites. However, after controlling for income, color differences, with in the same income interval are almost negligible
2. **Income:** There was inverse relationship between income and marital dissolution. However, it was not clear whether low income caused divorce or divorce caused low income.
3. **Employed women:** A positive relationship between the wife's earnings and marital dissolution was found. Workingwomen were more likely to get divorced or separated.
4. **Education:** No significant inverse relationship between education and marital dissolution was found when age at marriage, race and religion were controlled.
5. **Age:** An inverse relationship between age at first marriage and the proportion of marriages, which end in divorce, was found.
6. **Religion:** Catholics had a lower rate of divorce than Protestants. Catholicism may inhibit divorce as Catholics are less likely to terminate separation by divorce, but it does not seem to inhibit separation.
7. **Transmission between Generations:** Children's marriages were more susceptible to divorce as a result of their parent's divorce. However, findings in this area were inconclusive.

8. **Children:** Childless women had substantially higher disruption rates than women with children. The presence of school-aged children lowered the probability of divorce. However other studies indicated that divorcing couples had higher fertility than non-divorcing couples.
9. **Premarital pregnancy:** Premarital pregnancy was consistently found to be related to higher dissolution rate.
10. **Previously married:** Those who marry three or more times were more likely to divorce again than those who married once or twice.

Another interesting review was made by George Levinger (1965) on marital cohesiveness and dissolution. According to him specific factors were found to differentiate between high and low cohesive marriages. The factors which were found to be sources of attraction were affectional rewards such as esteem for spouse, desire for companionship and sexual enjoyment; socioeconomic rewards such as husband's income, home ownership, husband's education and husband's occupation; similarities in social status such as religion and education. Factors, which were found to be sources of barrier strength, were feelings of obligation to dependent children and to marital bond; moral proscription such as proscriptive religion and joint church attendance; external pressure such as primary group affiliation, community stigma, legal and economic bars. Factors which were found to be sources of alternate attraction were affectional rewards such as preferred alternate sex partner, disjunctive social relations and opposing religious affiliation; economic rewards such as wife's opportunity for independent income.

It was concluded therefore, that the strength of the marital relationship is a direct function of social and psychological attraction and barrier forces inside the marriage and an inverse function of such influences from alternate relationships.

A longitudinal study to identify the predicting factors of divorce was done from 1980 to 1992 (Amato & Rogers, 1997). According to this study, a variety of marital problems predicted divorce up to 12 years in the future. These problems or predicting factors were (1) Infidelity (2) Spending money foolishly (3) Drinking or drug abuse or both (4) Jealousy (5) Moodiness (6) Irritating habits. When these factors are present in a marriage, divorce can be predicted.

Extramarital sex (EMS) is known to be one of the determinant factors of divorce. However it is suggested by a study (Glass & wrigh, 1977) that its effect is dependent on the length of the marriage. The study reanalyzed subject's response to a psychology today sex questionnaire. The result showed that divorce rate is higher for EMS than non- EMS women in early marriages. Divorce rate is also higher for EMS men in young and old marriages. EMS subjects generally report lower marital satisfaction than non – EMS subjects, except for women in early marriages and men in late marriages. Marital satisfaction declines the longer married, except for EMS husbands. Romanticism was found be lower for EMS subjects.

To examine the specific effect of relative earnings of husbands and wives on divorce, researchers used data that was collected on socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of 5000 households by the University of Michigan (Heckert, etal, 1998). The researchers found that income dependency is an important determinant of martial disruption, although the effect is non-linear. Non-traditional couples in which wives earn between 50% and 75% of household income are significantly more likely to separate or divorce than other couples. Reverse traditional couples in which wives earn an even greater share of household income (from 75% to 100%) are less likely to divorce, although the difference is less significant. Among traditional couples in which 75%- 100% of the income is earned by husbands, divorce rate is lowest.

To examine the effect of parental divorce on partnership dissolution in adulthood, Kathleen E. Kidrnan and Andrew J. Cherlin (1999) did a longitudinal survey of a British

cohort born in 1958. The result showed that by the age of 33, offsprings of divorced parents are more likely to have dissolved their first partnership. This finding persisted after taking into account age at first partnership, type of first partnership (marital, pre-marital and cohabitation union), and indicators of class back ground and childhood and adolescent school achievement and behavioral problems. Some of these factors were associated with partnership dissolution in their own right, but the association between parental divorce and second-generation partnership dissolution was largely independent of them.

The intergenerational transmission of divorce was also suggested to be significant by another study (Diekmann & Schmidheiny, 2004). The researchers investigated the intergenerational transmission of divorce in thirteen European countries, the United States and Canada. They analyzed the cross-national data from the fertility and family survey applying techniques of event history analysis. The main findings they came up with were: -

- (1) In all countries in Eastern Europe, Western Europe and North America included in their sample, the effect of intergenerational divorce transmission was significant. The divorce risk of children of divorced parents was on average 2.03 times higher than that of children of non-divorced parents, whereby the multiplier range from 1.5 in Hungary to 3.2 in Italy.
- (2) When taking marriage and fertility patterns into account the effect was only marginally reduced. These findings were in support of the hypothesis that low acceptance and stigmatization of divorce aggravate the long-term consequences for children of divorced parents. There are some other researchers, which suggested that divorce risk was to a substantial degree, genetically mediated (Jockin et al, 1996). These researchers used twins in their study and concluded that in women and men, respectively, 30% and 42% of the heritability of divorce risk consisted of genetic factors affecting personality and divorce risk correlated largely as a result of these common genetic influences.

The relationship between cohabitation and divorce was also analyzed (Hall, 1996). The study used the Canadian fertility survey, administered by telephone to a national probability sample in the spring and summer of 1984. The result of the analysis showed that, contrary to the popular belief that living together before marrying is an effective way to reduce a couple's chance of divorcing, couples who cohabit prior to marriage have a

significantly higher risk of getting divorced than couples who do not cohabit before marriage.

When we try to review past researches on divorce in different countries, we find an observation by Vern L. Bullough and Fang Fu Ruan (1994) in China. According to them the increase in divorce rate from 110,930 in 1982 to 500,000 in 1986 cannot be explained by the increased number of Chinese who are married as there was a very real increase in proportion. There would be a much greater increase if divorce were made easier since divorce like everything else in China requires permissions of the officials. The report shows that 70% of the divorces are initiated by women and 70% take place between individuals in the 30-35 age range. There are so called "Divorce restaurants" in Beijing where the newly divorced couple can have a friendly "Good by dinner". Some couples have also been reported as having a "Divorce Banquet" to which friends and relatives are invited in order to commemorate the end of the marriage relationship. The main reason for divorce is said to be extra-marital sexual relationship.

In a study done in Oklahoma, USA, by the Oklahoma Marriage Initiative (OMI,2005) the "causes" of divorce identified were lack of commitment (85%), too much conflict and arguing (61%), infidelity (58%), early marriage (43%), little or no helpful premarital preparation (42%), financial problems (41%), domestic violence (30%), lack of support from family members (29%) and religious difference (21%). OMI suggested that knowing the cause of divorce is helpful in finding methods of preventing divorce.

Based on surveys of matrimonial lawyers, an annual study in UK by management consultants Grant Thornton, estimated the main causes of divorce in UK (Wikipedia, 2005). The main causes identified in 2004 were extramarital affairs (27%), family strains (18%), emotional or physical abuse (17%), mid life crisis (13%), addictions (6%) and work-holism (6%).

According to this survey, men engaged in extramarital affairs in 75% of cases while women in 25%. In cases of family strain, women's families were the primary source of strain in 75%, compared to 22% of men's families. Emotional and physical abuses were more evenly split, with women affected in 60% and men in 40% of cases. In 70% of work

holism-related divorces, it was men who were the cause, and in 30% it was the women. This survey showed that 93% of divorce cases were petitioned by women, very few of which were contested. 53% of divorces were of marriages that had lasted 10-15 years, with 40% ending after 5 to 10 years. The first 5 years are relatively divorce free, and if marriage survives more than 20 years it is unlikely to end in divorce.

Ileve Wolcott and Jody Hughes (1999) conducted a study in Australia to determine the reasons of divorce. They drew the data from the Australian Divorce Transition Project (ADTP), a random national telephone survey of 650 divorced Australians. Respondents in ADTP were asked, "What would you say was the main reason for your marriage ending?" The responses were then grouped in to three categories of "affective reasons", "abusive behavior" and "external pressures".

The "*affective reasons*" were communication problem (27%), incompatibility drifting apart (21%), sexual incompatibility (2%) and infidelity (20%). The "*abusive behaviors*" were alcohol abuse (11%) & drug abuse (3%) and physical, verbal and emotional violence to self or children (6%). While "*External pressure*" were mental and physical health (5%), financial problems (5%), work (3%) and in-laws.

In a study, which took 312 Muslim Citizens who lived in Israel as participants, some 16% of the sample endorsed conflict over traditionalism and modernity as a reason for their divorce (Savaya & Cohen, 2003). Of these, 62.7% complained that their spouse was too traditional, while 37.3% complained, "their spouse was too modern".

When we come to Ethiopian situation, we find a study by Tilsen & Larsen (2000). According to this study, 45% of first marriage end in divorce with in 30 years, and two third of women who divorce do so with in the first 5 years of marriage. The data used was from the 1990 national family and fertility survey conducted by the government of Ethiopia. A total of 8757 women of reproductive age (15-49) were analyzed. The result of the analysis showed that early age at marriage and childlessness have significant effect on the risk of divorce.

1.1.2 PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

1.1.2 A. DIVORCE IN ADDIS ABABA

The population of Addis Ababa is nearly 3.5-4 million. In this capital city of Ethiopia, marriage and divorce can be traditional or legal. Marriages are known to be authorized in front of elders as witnesses or can take place at churches. Other marriages can be authorized by the government body of municipalities. When marriages are authorized by the government body, the newly wed take marriage certificate from the Addis Ababa City Government Acts and Documentation Office. In the same way divorce can take place under different authorities. Marriages can be annulled traditionally by elders or by the court. Those individuals who annul their marriage by court decision can take divorce certificate from the Addis Ababa City Government Acts and Documentation Office. Thus, it is clear that the documentation office documents not all marriages and not all divorces. The discussion on this paper is based on marriages and divorces, which were legally documented by the documentation office.

The Addis Ababa City Government Acts and Documentation Office has a data of the number of certified marriages and divorces from 1981-1997 EC. In table 1 the raw data is presented.

Using the method of calculating the ratio of the number of marriage certificates granted in a given year and the number of divorce declared, divorce rate was calculated and the result is presented in table 2.

$$R = \frac{\text{No divorce decreed in a year}}{\text{No of marriages in a year}}$$

Table 1. Data from AA CGADO

Year	No of Marriage certificate issued.	No of divorce certificate issued
1981	1567	64
1982	1760	63
1983	1736	54
1984	2195	78
1985	2793	66
1986	3198	90
1987	5390	147
1988	5571	160
1989	5340	162
1990	4893	168
1991	4700	N/A
1992	5500	N/A
1993	6161	321
1994	5978	471
1995	8711	735
1996	10,049	1009
1997	9170	1294

As it can be appreciated from the table the rate of divorce is increasing in Addis Ababa. It has to be noted that it is not all divorced people who take divorce certificate from the documentation office. There are other divorcees who do not bother to take divorce certificate after the dissolution of their marriage. This suggests that the increase in divorce rate may even be more marked.

Court sources were not used because sufficient data was not available at the courts. The only data available was at Lideta Federal First Instance Court, which handled all divorce cases in Addis Ababa for the past two years. In the period between 01/04/1996 and 29/04/97(EC) the number of files disposed was 654. While from 01/04/1997 – 29/04/98, the number of files disposed was 715.

Table 2. Calculated Divorce Rate.

	Divorces to marriage	Percentage.
1981	0.0408	4.08
1982	0.0357	3.57
1983	0.0311	3.11
1984	0.0355	3.55
1985	0.0236	2.36
1986	0.0281	2.81
1987	0.0272	2.72
1988	0.0287	2.87
1989	0.0303	3.03
1990	0.0343	3.43
1991		
1992		
1993	0.0521	5.21
1994	0.0787	7.87
1995	0.0843	8.43
1996	0.01004	10.04
1997	0.1411	14.11

1.1.2 B. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

When the increase in divorce in Addis Ababa is considered, one question is what the reason for it are. It is known that dissolution of marriage has severe consequences. The effect of divorce is on the divorcees, their children and the society at large. Researchers in different countries are trying to study the reason for the increase in divorce rates in their countries. Some researchers in USA blame the “No fault” divorce law and unilateral divorce as the reasons of the increase in divorce rate. Eighty percent of the divorces in USA are unilateral rather than mutual decisions (Crouch,2005). Analysis suggests that in 32 states of USA where the no-fault law was implemented, it resulted in a substantial number of divorces that would not have occurred otherwise. Others argue that law changes

have had little effect on increases in the incidence of divorce in most states (Wright & Stetson, 1978). Others incriminate women's labor force participation rates in industrialized societies as the causes of increase in divorce rate (Hou & Omuanda, 1997). When the effect of divorce is considered, there are some researchers who argue that divorce is better than staying in bad marriage. Daniel N. Hawkins & Alan Booth (2005) used a nationally representative longitudinal study to track unhappy marriages for 12 years period and concluded that remaining unhappily married is associated with significantly lower levels of overall happiness, life satisfaction, self-esteem and over all health along with elevated levels of psychological distress compared to remaining otherwise continuously married. They also suggested that staying unhappily married is more detrimental than divorcing.

There are some scholars who oppose the divorce reform movement, a movement, which believes that many divorces can and more importantly should be prevented. These scholars suggest that divorce is a legal remedy and that the "cause" of this legal remedy is that a human being consciously chooses to seek it (Bring and Allen, 2002.)

In most countries, it is the wives who apply for divorce (Black, 2005). Statistics from Canada shows that in 1994 application for divorce was made by wives in 68.1% of the cases and by husbands in 23.87% of the cases. The rest 8.03% was applied jointly. While in 1995 application for divorce was filed by wives in 67.85% of the cases and by husbands in 25% of the cases. The rest 6.38% was filed jointly.

As discussed under 1.1.1 a 4, divorce can result in to increased risk of psychopathology, increase rates of automobile accidents including fatalities, physical illness, suicide, violence, homicide and mortality from disease (Guttman, 1993). Effects of divorce on children include depression, withdrawal, poor social competence, health problems, poor academic performance and a variety of conduct related difficulties.

If divorce has these serious consequences and if its rate is increasing in Addis Ababa, studying its associated factors makes it worthwhile. Why is divorce rate increasing in Addis Ababa and what are the pertinent factors contributing to divorce among its residents? When we answer this question in this study we can use the result for betterment of the family and prevention of divorce. By preventing divorce, we can prevent its grave

consequences. Premarital counseling services and marriage counselors can also use the result. It can also be useful for lawmakers to support or revise the existing family law.

1.1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

“Why do people divorce?” is a question that is being asked by psychologists, sociologists and family specialists. People inquire, “What is causing marital break down”. Seventy five percent of people who divorce remarry (Broody et al, 1998.) However the rate of divorce is even higher among the remarried. It is puzzling that as much as people want to get married, their chance of ending up in a marriage breakdown is very high. Different scholars have suggested different factors as “causes” of divorce.

As divorce can have different contributing factors to it (Cleek & Pearson, 1985) it would be appropriate to look in to them. We ask, what is the relationship between divorce and different factors such as age at marriage, Ethnic origin, occupation, educational status and divorce. We also ask if religion has effect on rate of divorce. The type of marriage, i.e. legal or not legal; traditional or non-traditional; the length of engagement, cohabitation, premarital sexual intercourse, premarital pregnancy are also some of the factors that should be scrutinized. We would like to know if the divorcees had premarital counseling and marriage counseling. Is it childlessness or high number of children that contribute to divorce? Does parental divorce really have effect on adult children and is it likely that there is transgenerational transmission of divorce? These are some of the questions that the present study attempts to answer.

This study also inquires if some of the pertinent contributing factors suggested by other researchers have in deed any association with divorce in Addis Ababa. Factors such as communication problems, incompatible behavior, sexual incompatibility, financial problems, lack of happiness, failed expectation, in-laws are studied to see if they are contributing factors. Other factors such as disagreement over children, extramarital affairs, cruelty, wide age difference, immaturity, work holism, jealousy, irresponsibility are also considered. The role of physical illness, mental illness, physical abuse, verbal abuse, smoking, alcoholism, drug abuse in dissolution of marriage are also studied. Inadequate

housing, stinginess, gambling, desertion and imprisonment are also some of the factors that are studied in this research. We would also want to know if it is the husband or the wife who is filing for divorce and if the individuals remarried after the divorce. The present available data from the Addis Ababa City Government Acts and Documentation office reporting 1009 divorce certificate issued in the face of 10,049 marriages in 1996 and reporting of 1,294 divorce certificate issued in the face of 9,170 marriages in 1997 alerts one as to the high rate of divorce and prompts investigation of the pertinent factors contributing to the dissolutions of marriages.

Realizing the economic condition of Ethiopia, which is again plagued by different natural and social problems, the increasing rate of divorce in Addis Ababa can aggravate the crisis we already have. Therefore this study aims at identifying the different pertinent factors, which are contributing to family break down in Addis Ababa. The study also inquires what the divorcees consider their main reason for divorce is so that we know the “perceived causes”. As not much research has been done on this issue, the research result will answer vital questions contributing to the stability of the family and the society at large.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

1.2.1 GENERAL OBJECTIVES:

The general objective of this research is to identify and study the different pertinent factors contributing to the dissolution of marriage in the city of Addis Ababa. The study also aims at scrutinizing the “perceived causes” of divorce as perceived by the divorcees.

1.2.2 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES:

1. To study demographic factors such as age at previous marriage, ethnic origin, occupation, education, religion, number of children and parental divorce in relation to divorce.
2. To study factors such as premarital sexual intercourse, premarital pregnancy, length of engagement and premarital counseling in relation to divorce.

3. To study the rate of remarriage and serial marriages after the divorce.
4. To study the relationship between divorce and affective factors such as lack of happiness, failed expectation, lack of interest and jealousy.
5. To study the relationship between divorce and behavioral factors such as incompatible behavior, physical abuse, verbal abuse, gambling, stinginess, etc.
6. To study the relationship between divorce and addictive behaviors such as smoking, khat use and alcoholism.
7. To study the relationship between divorce and physical illness, mental illness and physical injury.
8. To study the relationship between specific economic factors such as financial problems and inadequate housing and divorce.
9. To study the relationship between divorce and social problems such as imprisonment, friction with relatives and repeated or long term separation.
10. To study the relationship between divorce and cognitive factors such as immaturity and irresponsibility.
11. To study the relationship between infertility and divorce.
12. To study the relationship between age difference between the spouses and divorce.
13. To study the relationship between divorce and familial factors such as desertion, child birth from another partner etc.
14. To study the interrelationship between the different factors.
15. To determine major "Reasons" of divorce as perceived by the divorcees.

1.3 OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED.

The following operational definitions are used in this study.

- **Marriage:** Marriage is traditional or legal unity between a man and a woman for the purpose of living together as a husband and a wife.
- **Divorce:** Divorce is an act by which a valid marriage is dissolved legally or traditionally freeing the parties to remarry.
- **Pertinent contributing factors:** Pertinent contributing factors are factors, which are known to contribute towards dissolution of marriage.
- **Demographic factors:** Demographic factors include age at previous marriage, ethnic origin, occupation, educational status, religion, premarital pregnancy, cohabitation, length of engagement, number of children, previous divorce, parental divorce etc.
- **Affective factors:** Affective factors include lack of happiness, failed expectation, lack of interest, jealousy etc.
- **Economic factors:** Economic factors include financial problem, inadequate housing etc.
- **Cognitive factors:** Cognitive factors include immaturity, irresponsibility, inferiority etc.
- **Behavioral factors:** behavioral factors include incompatible behavior, verbal abuse, physical abuse, stinginess etc.
- **Social factors:** Social factors include friction with relatives (In-laws), long-term separation, and other people living in the same house, imprisonment etc.
- **Addictive Behavior:** Addictive behaviors included smoking, alcoholism, and khat abuse.
- **Familial factors.** Familial factors include factors such as desertion, infertility, child born from another partner etc.
- **Health factors:** Health factors include mental illness, other illnesses, physical injury etc.

1.4 DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The present study has been delimited.

1. The method used to calculate divorce rate is to calculate the ratio of N_0 of divorce decreed and number of marriages in a given year.
2. There are traditional marriages and divorces, which are not registered by Addis Ababa City Government Acts and Documentation office. This is the only data available for use.
3. The sample size was delimited to 200 only.
4. Some of participants had reservations to discuss their past marriage because of painful bad memories
5. Some participants had hesitation to answer items such as “sexual incompatibility”, “extramarital affairs”, “cruelty” etc
6. As the study was conducted in the metropolitan city of Addis Ababa, the result cannot be generalized to other cities of Ethiopia.

CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

2.1 METHOD OF RESEARCH.

There are different approaches of research that can be used for divorce research. One method is to use systematic observation in clinical setting where the couples are interviewed during which the family specialist observes. The specialist will be able to identify and study factors that predict the break down of the family or the stability of it (Gottman, 1994).

The researcher can also use naturalistic observation where the researcher observes the family in the natural setting of home. Using this method also the researcher attempts to identify factors that determine the stability or dissolution of a marriage.

The other method researchers may use is to take a cohort of married couples and follow them through the years. This longitudinal study is said to have high reliability and validity. The families are followed till they divorce or die.

Researches also use archival studies often. They use data collected by others like statistical data, survey data or written and mass communication records. Family researchers usually scrutinize these data that are collected by government or non-governmental agencies. The method, however, that is usually used by divorce research researchers is survey research. The survey research can be cross sectional survey, successive independent survey or longitudinal survey. As can be seen from the above discussion, divorce research is usually a non-experimental research.

The present study is a non-experimental research which is qualitative rather quantitative. It is a survey research, which is descriptive of the present status of divorce in Addis Ababa. As information was collected only once from the selected population, the study is a cross sectional survey research. It is neither longitudinal survey nor successive independents survey.

The study has its own dependent and independent variables. The dependent variable is divorce. The independent variables are the different demographic and pertinent contributing factors that are considered in the present study. There are no moderator variables, but some of the factors can be controlled variables and their effects can be neutralized during data analysis.

2.2. THE STUDY AREA.

The study area is Addis Ababa, which is the capital city of Ethiopia. The city is Ethiopia's largest metropolis and was founded some 118 years ago (AACAA, 2006). Addis Ababa stretches from 1800 to 3200 meters above sea level and has a population of 3.5-4 million. Various nationalities live in Addis Ababa and the city is an official diplomatic capital of Africa with more than 90 embassies and consular representatives.

Addis Ababa has ten sub cities. These sub cities are listed below with their population (AACAA, 2006).

1. Arada	303,810.
2. Addis Ketema	296,389
3. Lideta	296,073
4. kirkos	318,508
5. Yeka	304,550
6. Bole	298,000
7. Akaki Kaliti	182, 502
8. Nifas silk -lafto	304,550
9. Kolfe - Keranio	261,235
10. Gullele	333,998

2.3. POPULATION AND SAMPLING

The sampling method used in this study took into consideration the adequateness and representativeness of the sample. There was an attempt to make the sample as adequate as possible and as the budget and time allowed it. Care was taken to reduce selection bias by avoiding under representation, over representation and exclusion of segments of the population. Care was also observed to minimize response bias.

The sampling frame was list of divorcees in each sub city. The sampling size was 200 with 100 male participants and 100 female participants. There was no age limit for the participants. The only criterion to include was that the participant had divorce whether he or she is remarried or not.

The sampling technique, systematic random sampling, could not be used as originally intended because complete list of divorcees and their addresses could not be obtained from the sub cities. Expert choice sampling technique was used instead.

Using this expert choice sampling, 10 male divorcees and 10 female divorcees, a total of 20 divorcees were taken from each of the 10 sub cities, making the total number of participants 200.

Male participants (divorcees) = 100

Female participants (divorcees) = 100

Total number of participants = 200.

Expert choice sampling was also used to sample the professionals for the interview. The professionals are those in occupations that are directly or indirectly related to divorce. A medical Doctor (Gynecologist-Obstetrician), a Lawyer, a psychologist, a counselor, a Church Pastor, a journalist and a teacher were sampled.

2.4. TOOL OF DATA COLLECTION

One of the tools that were used for data collection for this study was a questionnaire prepared by the researcher. This questionnaire has 3 parts. The first part of the questionnaire has twenty items, which are related to demographic factors.

The second part of the questionnaire is a kind of a check list for the pertinent factors, which are identified to be contributing factors for divorce by different previous researches. The participants had to answer “Yes” or “No” for each of the 60 items.

The third part of the questionnaire has only one question. To determine the main “perceived causes” of divorce as perceived by the participants, the item asks, “In your opinion, what are the main three reasons for your divorce?” It then gives instruction to the participants to fill out three reasons.

The questionnaire was evaluated by teachers and colleagues and necessary improvements were made. The questionnaire is very comprehensive and clear. The English version and the Amharic version of the Questionnaire are attached in appendix B and C respectively.

Another questionnaire was also used for the structured interview. This questionnaire is attached in Appendix D.

2.5 PROCEDURE OF DATA COLLECTION.

Three research assistants were employed for the collection of data for the selected sample. The research assistants were given short-term training on the procedure of the data collection. The assistant introduced himself/herself to each participant politely. He or she then explained the purpose of the research and the use of the result. The confidentiality of the information collected was explained to the participants and they were reassured that it was not to be given to any other third party. After these procedures, the participants were asked to fill out the questionnaire sincerely. For those participants who could not read or write, the research assistants readout the items and marked the answer. This took place in places where privacy was observed. The research assistants checked if the questionnaires were filled out completely and they were collected for analysis.

Structured interview was used to interview the seven professionals. They were asked, from their experience and observation, to suggest possible contributing factors and “reasons” for divorce. They were also asked to suggest possible ways of reducing divorce rate in Addis Ababa.

2.6 METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

The data was analyzed by tallying manually as well as using SPSS. Percentages were calculated for each demographic factor and descriptive statistics was calculated for age at previous marriage, duration of engagement, number of children, duration of previous marriage and number of divorces. Cross tabulation was used to study ethnic origin, educational status and religion.

Percentages were calculated for the sixty pertinent contributing factors for males and females and the factors were ranked accordingly. After ranking the factors spearman rank difference correlation (γ_{ho}) was calculated. To appreciate the correlation between the different contributing factors, Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient was calculated and those correlations equal to and above 0.40 were tabulated. To see the significance of difference between the percentages for males and female respondents, t – test was used and t – value was derived. Regarding the perceived “reasons” or “causes” of divorce, percentages were calculated and the perceived reasons were ranked. Spearman rank difference correlation (γ_{ho}) was calculated. T-value was also calculated for the perceived reasons of divorce.

The result of the interview was compared with the results of the pertinent contributing factors and the perceived reasons of divorce.

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

The focus of the present study was to identify the different pertinent factors contributing to dissolution of marriage in the city of Addis Ababa. To realize the objectives, appropriate tools were used and to transform the collected data in to information, suitable statistical techniques were applied. This was discussed in details in the preceding chapter. The present chapter deals with the results. The results are presented in four sections. Section 3.1 deals with the Demographic Factors. Section 3.2 deals with the Pertinent Contributing Factors. Section 3.3 deals with the Perceived “Reasons” for divorce while Section 3.4 deals with the result of the interview with the professionals.

3.1 RESULT OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS

3.1.1 AGE AT MARRIAGE

The respondents were asked their age and their ex-spouses age at the previous marriage. The result showed that the minimum age for males was 17 and the maximum 49 with the mean of 32.91 and standard deviation 6.724. Concerning ex-wives of the males, minimum age at marriage was 15 and maximum 40 with the mean of 26.42 and standard deviation of 5.786. The result obtained for the females showed that the minimum age at marriage was 14 and maximum 45 with the mean of 25.33 and standard deviation of 6.492. Concerning their ex-husbands’ age, the result showed that the minimum age at marriage was 20 and the maximum 55 with the mean of 34.02 and standard deviation 8.476.

Table 3 gives the percentages for the different age groups.

Descriptive statistics, the range, the mean, standard deviation and variance, were calculated for both males and females and the result is presented in table 4.

Table 3. Age at the previous marriage.

		Respondents Sex				Total	
		Male		Female		Number	Percent
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Age of Respondent at marriage	≤ 20	3	30%	28	28.0%	31	15.5%
	21-25	6	6.0%	26	26.0%	32	16.0%
	26-30	40	40.0%	28	28.0%	68	34.0%
	31-35	16	16.0%	12	12.0%	28	14.0%
	36-40	19	19.0%	2	2.0	21	10.5%
	>40	16	16.0%	4	4.0%	20	10.0%
Total		100	100.0%	100	100.0%	200	100%
Age of ex-spouse at marriage	≤ 20	16	16.0%	3	3.0%	19	9.5%
	21-25	37	37.0%	15	15.0%	52	26.0%
	26-30	29	29.0%	21	21.0%	50	25.0%
	31-35	10	10.0%	21	21.0%	31	15.5%
	36-40	8	8.0%	20	20.0%	28	14.0%
	>40	0	0.0	20	20.0%	20	10.0%
Total		100	100.0%	100	100.0%	200	100.0%

Table 4. Descriptive statistics for age at previous marriage

	Males		Females	
	Age at previous marriage (Respondent)	Age at previous marriage (ex-spouse)	Age at previous marriage (Respondent)	Age at previous marriage (ex -spouse)
N	100	100	100	100
Range	32	25	31	35
Minimum	17	15	14	20
Maximum	49	40	45	55
Mean	32.91	26.42	25.33	34.02
Std. Deviation	6.724	5.786	6.492	8.476
Variance	45.214	33.478	42.143	71.838

The age difference between the respondents and their ex-spouses was also studied. The result showed that among the 200 cases, husbands were older than wives in 188 families (94%) and wives were older than husbands in 12 families (6%). The maximum age difference that husbands exceeded wives was 30 years and the maximum age difference that wives exceeded husbands was 18. The details of age difference between husbands and wives are presented in tables 5 and 6.

Table 5. Age difference between husbands and wives where husbands are older than wives.

Age difference	Number	Percentage
≤ 5	58	29.0%
6-10	73	36.5%
11-15	40	20.0%
16-20	13	6.5%
21-25	3	1.5%
26-30	1	0.5%
Total	188	94.0%

Table 6. Age difference between husbands and wives where wives are older than husbands.

Age difference	Number	Percentage
≤ 5	6	3.0%
6-10	4	2.0%
11-15	1	0.5%
16-20	1	0.5%
21-25	0	0.0%
26-30	0	0.0%
Total	12	6.0%

3.1.2 ETHNIC ORIGIN

The participants and their ex-spouses ethnic origin was studied and cross tabulated. Seven ethnic origins and two foreign origins were identified.

Amhara and Oromo Ethnic origins are the first and second highest ethnic origins to which the male as well as the female participant belong. Table 7 and 8 present the details of the result for ethnic origin with their percentages.

Table 7. Percentages of ethnic origin for the respondents

Ethnic origin of respondents	Respondents Sex				Total	
	Male		Female		Number	Percent
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Amhara	36	36.0%	45	45%	81	40.5%
Tigre	13	13.0%	16	16.0%	29	14.5%
Oromo	30	30.0%	23	23.0%	53	26.5%
Gurage	14	14.0%	11	11.0%	25	12.5%
Kembata	5	5.0%	4	4.0%	9	4.5%
Wolayita	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%
Adere	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%
Eriterian	0	0.0%	1	1.0%	1	0.5%
Total	100	100.0%	100	100.0%	200	100.0%

Table 8. Percentage of Ethnic origin for the ex-spouses of the respondents

Ethnic origin of respondents Ex-spouses	Ex-wives		Ex-husbands		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Amhara	40	40.0%	42	42.0%	82	41.0%
Tigre	14	14.0%	16	16.0%	30	15.0%
Oromo	21	21.0%	23	23.0%	44	22.0%
Gurage	21	21.0%	9	9.0%	30	15.0%
Kembata	1	1.0%	5	5.0%	6	3.0%
Wolayita	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0%
Adere	0	0.0%	1	1.0%	1	0.5%
Eriterian	3	3.0%	3	3.0%	6	3.0%
European	0	0%	1	1.0%	1	0.5%
Total	100	100.0%	100	100.0%	200	100.0%

To appreciate the ethnic combination of the divorced spouses, cross tabulation was done. The result showed that the highest percentage of ethnic combination of the divorced spouses is Amara-Amhara (22.5%) to be followed by Oromo-Amhara (11.5%), Gurage-Gurage (10%) and Oromo-Oromo (9.5%). The cross tabulation is presented in table 9.

Table 9. Cross tabulation of Ethnic origin of respondents and their ex-spouses.

	Ethnic origin of Ex-spouse									
	Amhara	Tigre	Oromo	Gurage	Kembata	Wolayita	Adere	Eritarian	European	Total
Amhara	45 (22.5)	12 (6%)	13 (6.5%)	4 (2.0%)	1 (0.5)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	4 (2.0%)	1 (0.5%)	81 (40.5%)
Tigre	9 (4.5%)	11 (5.5%)	7 (3.5%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	29 (14.5%)
Oromo	23 (11.5%)	6 (3.0%)	19 (9.5%)	5 (2.5%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	53 (26.5%)
Gurage	4 (2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	20 (10.0%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	25 (12.5%)
Kembata	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.0%)	1 (0.5%)	5 (2.5%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	9 (4.5%)
Wolayita	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.5%)
Adere	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.5%)
Eritarian	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.5%)
European	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)
Total	82(41%)	30(15%)	44(22%)	30(15%)	6(3%)	0(0%)	1(0.5%)	6(3%)	1(0.5%)	100%

3.1.3 OCCUPATION

It was found that occupation of the male divorcees in descending order of frequency was: Teacher (14%) merchant (13%), driver (11%), soldier (11%) . . . The occupation of the female divorcees in descending order of frequency was: housewife (25%), merchant (17%), student (13%), and secretary (12%) . . . The occupation of the ex-wives of the male divorcees in descending order of frequency was: House wife (39%), teacher 12%, and secretary (6%). The occupation of the ex-husbands of the female respondents in descending order of frequency was: Merchant (26%), private business (11%), soldier (9%), driver (7%), administrator (7%) . . . The details of the result are presented in table 10.

Table 10. Occupation of the respondents and their ex-spouses

Occupation	Respondents and their ex-spouses							
	Male respondents		Ex-spouses of Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Ex-Spouse of Female Respondent	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Doctor	2	2.0%	1	1.0%	1	1.0%	3	3.0%
Engineer	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	6.0%
Pharmacist	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.0%
Banker	1	1.0%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.0%
Accountant	5	5.0%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Tailor	2	2.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nurse	0	0.0%	1	10%	2	2.0%	0	0.0%
Lawyer	4	4.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	5.0%
Evangelist	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.0
Administrator	5	5.0%	0	0.0%	3	3.0%	7	7.0%
Inspector	3	3.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.0%
Police	2	2.0%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Soldier	11	11.0%	3	3.0%	0	0.0%	9	9.0%
Const. Worker	3	3.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.0%
Teacher	14	14.0%	12	12.0%	5	5.0%	4	4.0%
Driver	11	11.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	7.0%
Mechanic	3	3.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	4.0%
Office clerk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	3.0%	0	0.0%
Merchant	13	13.0%	12	12.0%	17	17.0%	26%	26.0%
Laborer	3	3.0%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
House wife	0	0.0%	39	39%	25	25%	0	0.0%
Janitor	0	0.0%	2	2.0%	2	2.0%	0	0.0%
Casher	1	1.0%	2	2.0%	2	2.0%	1	1.0%
Secretary	0	0.0%	8	8.0%	12	12.0%	1	1.0%
Investor	0	0.0%	1	1.0%	1	1.0%	1	1.0%
Student	0	0.0%	6	6.0%	13	13.0%	1	1.0%
Health officer	1	1.0%	2	2.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unemployed	1	1.0%	2	2.0%	0	0.0%	26	2.0%
Gov. employee	5	5.0%	3	30%	5	5.0%	3	3.0%
Journalist	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%
Private business	7	7.0%	2	2.0%	7	7.0%	11	11.0%
Hostess.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%
Guard	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.0%

3.1.4 EDUCATIONAL STATUS

The educational status of the divorcees and their ex-spouses was also studied and cross tabulation was done for the educational status of the divorcees and their ex-spouse. 25.0% of the male divorcees had college diploma, 20% were in grade 5-8, 15% in grade 9-11 and 14% had first degree. None of the male respondents were illiterate. It was found that 33.0% of the female divorcees had college diploma, 16.0% had completed high school, 11.0% were in grade 5-8, 9.0% of the female respondents were illiterate.

When the ex-husbands of the female divorcees are considered, 34.0% had college diploma, 16.0% first degree and 15% had completed high school. None of the ex-husband was illiterate. When the ex-wives of the male divorcees are considered, 25.0% had college diploma, 19.0% were in grade 5-8, 14.0% were in grade 9-11. It was found that 8.0% of the ex-wives were illiterate. The details of this result are presented in tables 11 and 12.

Table 11. Educational status of the divorcees

Respondents educational status	Respondents Sex				Total	
	Male	Female		Number	Percent	
	Number	Percent	Number			Percent
Illiterate	0	0.5%	9	9.0%	9	4.5%
Read & write	2	2.0%	1	1.0%	3	1.5%
Grade 2-4	5	5.0%	6	6.0%	11	5.5%
Grade 5-8	20	20.0%	11	11.0%	31	15.5%
Grade 9-11	15	15.0%	10	10.0%	25	12.5%
High school complete	12	12.0%	16	16.0%	28	14.0%
Certificate	4	4.0%	4	4.0%	8	4.0%
College Diploma	25	25.0%	33	33.0%	58	29.0%
First Degree	14	14.0%	8	8.0%	22	11.0%
Second Degree	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Third Degree (PHD)	3	3.0%	2	2.0%	5	2.5%
Total	100	100%	100	100%	200	100%

Table 12. Educational status of ex-spouses of the respondents

Educational status of ex-spouses the respondents	Ex-wives		Ex- husbands		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Illiterate	8	8.0%	4	4.0%	12	6.0%
Read & write	5	5.0%	2	2.0%	7	3.5%
Grade 2-4	6	6.0%	2	2.0%	8	4.0%
Grade 5-8	19	19.0%	10	10.0%	29	14.5%
Grade 9-11	14	14.0%	9	9.0%	23	11.5%
High school complete	10	10.0%	15	15.0%	25	12.5%
Certificate	11	11.0%	1	1.0%	12	6.0%
College Diploma	25	25.0%	34	34.0%	59	29.5%
First Degree	1	1.0%	16	16.0%	17	8.5%
Second Degree	0	0.0%	3	3.0%	3	1.5%
Third Degree (PHD)	1	1.0%	4	4.0%	5	2.5%
Total	100	100%	100	100%	200	100%

Cross tabulation of educational status showed that both spouses had college diploma in 11.5% of the couples, one had college diploma and the other first degree in 11.5% of the couples, both had a degree in 0.5% of the couples, both could write and read in 0.5% of the couples and both were illiterate in 1% of the couples. Details of the result of the cross tabulation of presented in table 13.

The result of the educational status of the divorcees and their ex-spouses showed that husbands and wives had equal educational status in 28% of the couples, husbands had better educational status than wives in 55% of the couples and wives had better educational status than husbands in 17% of the couples.

Table 3.1.4.3 Cross tabulation of educational status of respondents and their ex-spouse

Educational status of the respondents	Ex-spouses educational status											
	Illiterate	Read & Write	Grad 2-4	Grade 5-	Grade 9-11	High School Comp.	Certificate	College Diploma	First Degree	Second Degree	Third Degree (PHD)	Total
Illiterate	2(1%)	2(1%)	2(1%)	2(1%)	0(0%)	1(0.5)	0(0.0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	9(4.5%)
Read & write	1(0.5%)	1(0.5%)	0(0%)	1(0.5)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	3(1.5%)	3(1.5%)
Grade 2-4	4(2%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	1(0.5)	2(1%)	3(1.5%)	0(0%)	1(0.5)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	11(5.5%)
Grade 5-8	4(2%)	4(2%)	3(1.5%)	8(4%)	8(4%)	2(1%)	0(0%)	2(1%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	31(15.5%)
Grade 9-11	0(0%)	0(0%)	1(0.5%)	1(5.5%)	3(1.5%)	3(1.5%)	2(1.5%)	5(2.5%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	25(12.5%)
High school complete	0(0%)	0(0%)	1(0.5%)	5(2.5%)	4(2%)	2(1%)	1(0.5)	10(5%)	5(2.5%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	28(14%)
Certificate	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	1(0.5%)	2(1%)	2(1%)	3(1.5%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	8(4%)
College Diploma	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	1(0.5%)	4(2%)	9(4.5%)	7(3.5%)	23(11.5%)	10(5%)	2(1%)	2(1%)	58(29%)
First Degree	1(0.5%)	0(0%)	1(0.5%)	0(0%)	1(0.5%)	2(1%)	0(0%)	13(6.5%)	1(0.5%)	1(0.5%)	2(1%)	22(11%)
Second Degree	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
Third Degree (PHD)	0(0%)	1(0.5%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	1(0.5%)	0(0%)	2(1%)	1(0.5%)	0(0%)	1(0.5%)	5(2.5%)
Total	12(6.0%)	8(4%)	29(14.5 %)	23(11.5 %)	25(12.5 %)	12(6%)	59(29.5%)	17(8.5%)	3(1.5%)	5(2.5%)	7(3.5%)	200(100%)

3.1.5 RELIGION

Only four religions were identified in this study. These are Orthodox, catholic, protestant and Muslim. 77% of the male divorcees and 77% of the female divorcees were Orthodox. 74% of the ex-husbands and 69% of the ex-wives were also Orthodox. 4% of the male divorcees and 2% of the female divorcees were Catholic. 3% of the ex-husbands and 4% of the ex-wives were also Catholic. 11% of the male divorcees and 5% of the female divorcees were Protestants. 6 % of the ex-husbands and 13% of the ex-wives were also Protestants. 8% of the male divorcees and 16% of the female divorcees were Muslims. 17% of the ex-husbands and % of the ex-wives were also Muslims. Details of the results are presented in table 14.

Table 14. Religion of the respondents and their ex-spouses.

Religion	Males		Ex-wives		Females		Ex-husbands	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Orthodox	77	77%	69	69%	77	77%	74	74%
Catholic	4	4%	4	4%	2	2%	3	3%
Protestant	11	11%	13	13%	5	5%	6	6%
Muslim	8	8%	14	14%	16	16%	17	17%
Total	100	100%	100	100%	100	100%	100	100%

Cross tabulation of the religion of the respondents and their ex-spouses was done. The result showed that 87.5% of the 200 couples had same religion in the family. While 12.5% of the couples had difference in religion between the spouses. Among the same religion couples, 68% were Orthodox, 1.5% Catholics, 7% Protestants and 11% Muslims. The details of the cross tabulation is presented in table 15

Table 15. Cross tabulation of religion of divorcees and their ex-spouses.

Religion of Respondents	Religion of ex-spouse				Total
	Orthodox	Catholic	Protestant	Muslim	
Orthodox	136(68%)	4(2%)	5(2.5%)	9(4.5%)	154(77%)
Catholic	3(1.5%)	3(1.5%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	6(3%)
Protestant	2(1%)	0(0%)	14(7%)	0	16(8%)
Muslim	2(1%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	22(11%)	24(12%)
Total	143(71.5%)	7(3.5%)	19(9.5%)	31(15.5%)	200(100%)

3.1.6 TRADITIONAL MARRIAGE

The result of the study showed that in 56.5% of the 200 couples, the marriage was traditional i.e. arranged by family. The rest 43.5% of the couples had non-traditional marriage i.e. the marriage was not arranged by the family.

Table 16. Traditional and non-traditional marriages of the divorcees

Traditional marriage	Respondent's Sex				Total	
	Male		Female			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	60	60%	53	53%	113	56.5%
No	40	40%	47	47%	87	43.5%
Total	100	100%	100	100%	200	100.0%

3.1.7. LEGALITY OF MARRIAGE

The result of the study showed that 66.5% of the couples were legally certified to be married by a government office. While the rest 33.5% of the couples were not legally certified.

Table 17. Legality of Marriage of the respondents.

Legality of Marriage	Respondent's Sex				Total	
	Male		Female			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Legality certified	51	51%	82	82%	133	66.5%
Not legally certified	49	49%	18	18%	67	33.5%
Total	100	100%	100	100%	200	100%

3.1.8 DURATION OF ENGAGEMENT

The result of the study showed that 39.5% of the couples were engaged for 1-2 years, 24.0% for less than a year and 12.0% for more than four years. This shows that 81.5% of the couples had period of engagement. However, the rest 18.5% of the couples had no defined period of engagement. The minimum year of engagement for the male respondents was less than a month and the maximum was 10 years. The mean year of engagement for them was 1.35 years with standard deviation of 1.829 and variance of 3.346. The minimum year of engagement for the female respondents was less than a month and the maximum was 8 years. The mean year of engagement for them was 1.88 with a standard deviation of 1.784 and variance of 3.183. Details of these results are presented in tables 18 and 19.

Table 18. Duration of engagement of the divorced couples

Duration of Engagement in year	Respondent's Sex				Total	
	Male		Female			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No period of engagement	8	8.0%	29	29%	37	18.5%
Less than a year	19	19%	29	29%	48	24%
1 – 2 years	50	50.0%	29	29%	79	39.5%
3 – 4 years	15	15.0%	9	9.0%	24	12%
> 4 years	8	8.0%	4	4%	12	6%
Total	100	100%	100	100%	200	100%

Table 19. Descriptive statistics of duration of engagement.

Year of engagement	Male	Female
Range	8	10
Minimum	<1m	<1m
Maximum	8	10
Mean	1.88	1.35
Std. Deviation	1.784	1.829
Variance	3.183	3.346

3.1.9 COHABITATION

The result showed that 16% of the divorcees co-habited before marriage while the rest 84% had no history of cohabitation. Of the 16% couples who cohabited, duration of cohabitation was for 1-2 years in 48% of the couples, less than a year in 24% of the couples, 3-6 years for 24% of the couples and more than 6 years for 4% of the couples.

3.1.10 PREMARITAL SEXUAL INTERCOURSE

The result of the study showed that 44.0% of the couples had premarital sexual intercourse while the rest 56% did not have premarital sexual intercourse. The result is presented in table 20.

Table 20. Premarital sexual intercourse between the divorced couples

Premarital sexual intercourse	Respondent's Sex				Total	
	Male		Female			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	55	55.0%	33	33.0%	88	44%
No	45	45.0%	67	67%	112	56%
Total	100	100%	100	100%	200	100%

3.1.11 PREMARITAL PREGNANCY

The result of the study showed that 23.5% of the couples had premarital pregnancy while the rest 76.5% of the couples did not have premarital pregnancy. The result is presented in table 21.

Table 21. Premarital pregnancy.

Premarital Pregnancy	Respondent's Sex				Total	
	Male		Female			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	36	36.0%	11	11.0%	47	23.5%
No	64	64.0%	89	89.0%	153	76.5%
Total	100	100%	100	100%	200	100%

3.1.12 PREMARITAL COUNSELING

The result of the study showed that 95.0% of the couples did not have premarital counseling. Only 5% of the couples had premarital counseling. Of the 5% of couples who had premarital counseling, 70% of them were counseled by church ministers while the rest 30% were counseled by friends.

3.1.13 NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE PREVIOUS MARRIAGE

Out of the 200 couples, 15% had no children from the dissolved marriage. 49% of them had 1-2 children, 22.0% had 3-4 children, 10.0% had 5-6 children while 4% had more than 6 children. The mean number of children of the male respondents was 2.36 with a standard deviation of 2.036 and variance of 4.145 while the mean number of children of the female respondents was 1.834 with a standard deviation of 1.834 and variance of 3.362. The details of the results are presented in tables 22 and 23.

Table 22. Number of children from the previous marriage

Number of children	Respondent's Sex				Total	
	Male		Female			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
None	15	15%	15	15%	30	15.0%
1 - 2 Children	48	48%	50	50%	98	49.0%
3 - 4 Children	22	22%	22	22%	44	22.0%
5 - 6	3	3%	5	5%	8	4.0%
> 6	100	100%	100	100%	200	100.0%

Table 23. Descriptive statistics of number of children.

Number of children	Sex of respondents	
	Male	Female
Range	12	8
Minimum	0	0
Maximum	12	8
Mean	2.36	2.42
Std. Deviation	2.036	1.834
Variance	4.14	3.362

3.1.14 DURATION OF PREVIOUS MARRIAGE OF RESPONDENTS.

It was found that the shortest duration of marriage reported by the males was 01 year and by the females 03 months. While the longest duration of marriage reported by males and females was 33 years. The mean duration of marriage was 9.65 years and 8.75 years for males and females respectively. Details of the result are presented in tables 24 and 25.

Table 24. Duration of previous marriage

Duration of previous marriage	Males		Females	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
< 1 year	0	0%	1	1%
1 - 2 years	4	4%	4	4%
3 - 5 years	20	20%	22	22%
6 - 10 years	43	43%	49	49%
11 - 15 years	20	20%	14	14%
> 15 years	13	13%	10	10%
Total	100	100%	100	100%

Table 25. Descriptive statistics of duration of previous marriage

Duration	Male	Female
Minimum	1 year	0.25 year
Maximum	33 year	33 year
Range	32 years	32.75 years
Mean	9.65 years	8.75 years
Std. deviation	5.902	5.450
Variance	34.836	29.702

3.1.15 FILING FOR DIVORCE

The result of the study showed that petition for divorce was filed by both spouses by agreement in 19.5% of the couples. Wives applied for divorce in 52.5% of the 200 couples while husbands applied for divorce in 28% of the couples. Result is summarized in table 26.

Table 26. Filing for divorce.

Filing of Divorce	Number	Percent
Husbands	56	28%
Wives	105	52.5%
Both	39	19.5%
Total	200	100%

3.1.16. DIVORCE CERTIFICATE

It was found out that only 18% of the male respondents have taken divorce certificate while the rest 82% did not. Among the female respondents only 25% took divorce certificate while 75% did not. This shows that 78% of the participants did not take divorce certificate. Most of the participants, (90%) said they do not know if their ex-spouse has taken divorce certificate or not.

3.1.17 NUMBER OF DIVORCE

The number of divorces during the lifetime of the participants was studied. It was found that 68.5% of the participants had only one divorce, 26.5% had 2-3 divorces while 5.0% of them had 4-6 divorces. The maximum number of divorce was six.

Table 27. Number of divorce.

Number of divorces	Respondent's Sex				Total	
	Male		Female			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	52	52%	85	85%	137	68.5%
2 - 3	39	39%	14	14%	53	26.5%
4 - 6	9	9.0%	1	1%	10	5.0%
Total	100	100%	100	100%	200	100%

3.1.18 REMARRIAGE

3.1.18.1 REMARRIAGE OF THE RESPONDENTS.

The result of the study showed that 67% of the male participants and 40% of the female participants are remarried. Among those who remarried 7.5% of the male respondents and 7.5% of the female respondents remarried within a year after divorce. While 25.4% of the male respondents and 35% of the female respondents remarried within 1-2 years. The result is summarized in tables 28 and 29.

Table 28. Remarriage of the respondents

Remarried	Respondent's Sex				Total	
	Male		Female			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	67	67%	40	40.0%	107	53.5%
No	33	33%	60	60.0%	93	46.5%
Total	100	100.0%	100	100%	200	100%

The result also showed that 46.3% of the present spouse of the remarried male respondents had previous divorce and 38.2% of the present spouse of the remarried female respondents had previous divorce. This result is presented in table 30

Table 29. Length of time between divorce and remarriage

Length of time	Respondent's Sex				Total	
	Male		Female			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
< 1 year	5	7.5%	3	7.5%	8	7.5%
1 - 2	17	25.4%	14	35.0%	31	29%
3 - 5 years	20	29.9%	16	40%	36	33.6%
6 - 10 years	21	31.3%	6	15.0%	27	25.2%
> 10 years	4	6%	1	2.5%	5	4.7%
Total	67	100%	40	100%	107	100%

Table 30. Previous divorce of present spouse.

Previous divorce	Present spouse	
	Male	Female
Yes	38.2%	46.3%
No	61.8%	53.7%

3.1.18.2 REMARRIAGE OF THE EX-SPOUSES

Among the 100 male respondents 50% do not know if their ex-spouse is remarried or not. While 33% reported that their ex-spouse is remarried and 17% reported that their ex-spouse is not remarried. Among the 100 female respondents 34% do not know if their ex-spouse is remarried or not. While 55% reported that their ex-spouse is remarried and 11% reported that their ex-spouse is not remarried. Most reported that they do not know the length of time between the divorce and remarriage of their ex-spouse.

3.1.19 PARENTAL DIVORCE

The result showed that the parents of 42% of the male respondents and 61% of the female respondents were divorced. It was also reported that the parents of 32% of the ex-wives and 44% of the ex-husbands were divorced. The result is presented in tables 30 and 31.

Table 31. Parental divorce of respondents

Parental divorce	Respondent's Sex				Total	
	Male		Female			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	42	42%	61	61%	103	51.5%
No	58	58%	39	39%	97	48.5%
Total	100	100%	100	100%	200	100%

Table 32. Parental divorce of ex-spouses

Parental divorce (Ex-spouse)	Ex- wives		Ex-husbands		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	32	32%	61	61%	103	51.5%
No	45	45%	26	26.0%	71	35.5%
Not known	23	23.0	30	30.0%	35	26.5%
Total	100	100%	100	100%	200	100%

The result also showed that 13% of the male respondents and 22% of the female respondents reported that their parents as well as their ex- spouse's parents were divorced.

3.2 PERTINENT CONTRIBUTING FACTORS.

Pertinent contributing factors to divorce were studied using the checklist of 60 factors. The result showed that the top ten factors checked by the male respondents were:- **Incompatible behavior(84%), Immaturity of spouse (80%), Lack of interest (self) (80%), Communication problems (78%), Failed expectation (self) (78%), Lack of happiness (self) (76%), Inadequate housing (71%), Desertion by spouse (70%), Lack of interest (spouse) (67%), and verbal abuse (self) (67%).**

The top ten factors checked by the female respondents were: **Differences over plans and visions (68%), Irresponsibility of spouse (56%), Incompatible behavior (51%), Friction with relatives (in-laws) (51%), Immaturity in the area of marriage and the family (self), (51%), Failed expectation (self) (50%), Lack of interest self (48%), Alcoholism of spouse (46%), Lack happiness (self) (46%), and cruelty of spouse(44%).**

Table 33 presents the pertinent contributing factors with their rank.

Table 33. Pertinent Contributing Factors for divorce.

No	Pertinent contributing factors	Total		Males		Females	
		Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank
1	Incompatible behavior	67.5	1	84	1	51	4
2	Differences over plans and visions	65.5	2	63	14.5	68	1
3	Lack of interest (self)	64	3.5	80	2.5	48	7
4	Failed expectation (self)	64	3.5	78	4.5	50	6
5	Lack of happiness (self)	61	5	76	6	46	8.5
6	Communication problems	58.5	6	78	4.5	39	14
7	Immaturity (spouse)	57.5	7.5	80	2.5	35	17.5
8	Friction with relatives	57.5	7.5	64	12.5	51	4
9	Irresponsibility (spouse)	57	9	58	18.5	56	2
10	Inadequate housing	56	10	71	7	41	13
11	Lack of interest (self)	55.5	11	67	9.5	44	10.5
12	Immaturity (self)	52	12	53	22	51	4
13	Lack of happiness (spouse)	51.5	13	61	16	42	12
14	Suspiciousness and Jealousy (spouse)	50	14	60	17	40	15
15	Failed expectation (spouse)	48.5	15	63	14.5	34	19.5
16	Desertion (spouse)	47	16	70	8	24	26.5
17	Verbal abuse (spouse)	46.5	17	55	21	38	16
18	Cruelty (spouse)	43.5	18	43	30	44	10.5
19	Suspiciousness and Jealousy (self)	43	19	51	23	35	17.5
20	Financial problems	41	20	58	18.5	24	26.5
21	Verbal abuse (self)	39.5	21.5	67	9.5	12	38.5
22	Stinginess (spouse)	39.5	21.5	37	34.5	42	12
23	Alcoholism (self)	35.5	23.5	65	11	6	45.5
24	Physical abuse (self)	35.5	23.5	64	12.5	7	43
25	Wide age difference	34.5	25	48	27.5	21	30
26	Irresponsibility	32.5	26	49	25.5	16	31
27	Stinginess (self)	31	27.5	57	20	5	48
28	Sexual incompatibility	31	27.5	48	27.5	14	34.5
29	Inferiority (spouse)	30.5	29	50	24	11	40
30	Other people living in the same house	28	30	34	37	26	23
31	Inferiority (self)	30	31	41	31	15	32
32	Repeated or long term separation	27	32.5	32	38	22	29
33	Disagreement over children	27	32.5	31	39.5	23	28
34	Extramarital affairs (self)	26	34	47	29	5	48
35	Smoking (self)	25.5	35.5	49	25.5	2	54

36	Alcoholism (spouse)	25.5	35.5	5	53	46	8.5
37	Other illness (self)	24.5	37.5	37	34.5	12	38.5
38	Physical abuse (spouse)	24.5	37.5	23	42	26	23
39	Extramarital affairs (spouse)	24.5	39	17	45	32	21
40	Cruelty (self)	23.5	40	40	32	7	43
41	Workholism (self)	23	41	38	33	8	42
42	Khat abuse (spouse)	22	42	20	43.5	24	26
43	Khat abuse (self)	20.5	43	35	36	6	45.5
44	Child birth from another partner(spouse)	19	44.5	12	48	26	23
45	Smoking (spouse)	19	44.5	4	54.5	34	19.5
46	Imprisonment	16.5	46	31	39.5	2	54
47	Work holism (spouse)	15.5	47	6	52	25	25
48	Religious differences	14.5	48	16	46	13	36.5
49	Gambling	14	49	28	41	0	59
50	Other illness (spouse)	13.5	50	14	47	13	36.5
51	Desertion (self)	12	51	9	49	15	32
52	Child birth from another partner (self)	10.5	52	18	43.5	3	51.5
53	Gambling (spouse)	7.5	53	1	58.5	14	34.5
54	Infertility (self)	7	54	4	54.5	10	41
55	Infertility (spouse)	6.5	55	8	50	5	48
56	Mental illness (self)	3.5	56	7	51	0	59
57	Imprisonment (spouse)	2	57	2	57	4	50
58	Physical injury (self)	2	58	1	58.5	3	51.5
59	Mental illness (spouse)	1.5	59	3	56	0	59
60	Physical injury (spouse)	1	60	0	60	2	54

Person product moment correlation was calculated for pertinent factors to see to what extent the factors are correlated to each other. The result showed that, for males, the highest correlation exists between physical abuse (self) and verbal abuse (self) γ 0.714 followed by extramarital affairs and childbirth from another partner γ 0.652, incompatible behavior and failed expectation (self) γ 0.624. The highest negative correlation for males was found to be between desertion (self) and desertion (spouse) γ - 0.480. The result for high and marked correlation between the contributing factors (for males) is presented in table A.1 in appendix A.

For females the highest correlation was found to be between lack of happiness (self) and failed expectation (self), γ 0.682, failed expectation (spouse) and lack of interest (spouse) γ 0.682 followed by verbal abuse (spouse) and physical abuse γ 0.668, extramarital affairs (spouse) and cruelty (spouse) γ 0.656, stinginess (spouse) and cruelty (spouse) γ 0.656 and irresponsibility (spouse) and physical abuse (spouse) γ 0.629. The result for high and marked correlation between the contributing factors (for females) is presented table A.2 in appendix A.

Spearman rank difference correlation (γ_{ho}) was also calculated to appreciate rank correlation of the factors between males and females. The result was found to be $\gamma_{ho} = 0.55$ which is statistically significant at 0.5 and 0.1 level.

To study the significant of difference between males and females for each determinant factor, t-test was used using the percentages. The result is presented in table 34 with significance at 0.05 .

Table 34. T-value for the Pertinent Contributing Factors and significance at 0.05 level.

No	Pertinent contributing factors.	t - value	Significance at 0.05 level
1	Incompatible behavior	5.00	Yes
2	Differences over plans	0.74	No
3	Lack of interest (self)	4.70	Yes
4	Failed expectation (self)	4.12	Yes
5	Lack of happiness(self)	4.34	Yes
6	Communication problems	5.65	Yes
7	Immaturity (spouse)	6.44	Yes
8	Friction with relatives	1.86	No
9	Irresponsibility (spouse)	0.28	No
10	Inadequate housing	4.29	Yes
11	Lack of interest (spouse)	4.29	Yes
12	Immaturity (self)	0.28	No
13	Lack of happiness (spouse)	2.71	Yes
14	Suspiciousness and Jealously (spouse)	2.86	Yes
15	Failed expectation (spouse)	4.14	Yes
16	Desertion (self)	6.57	Yes
17	Verbal abuse (abuse)	2.42	Yes
18	Cruelty (spouse)	0.14	No
19	Suspiciousness and Jealously (self)	2.29	Yes
20	Financial problems	5.23	Yes
21	Verbal abuse (self)	7.97	Yes
22	Stinginess (spouse)	0.72	No
23	Alcoholism (self)	8.7	Yes
24	Physical abuse (self)	8.38	Yes
25	Wide age difference	4.05	Yes
26	Irresponsibility (self)	5.00	Yes
27	Stinginess (self)	8.00	Yes
28	Sexual incompatibility	5.23	Yes
29	Inferiority (spouse)	6.00	Yes
30	Other people living in the same house	1.25	No
31	Inferiority (self)	4.13	Yes
32	Repeated or long term separation	1.61	No
33	Disagreement over children	0.81	No
34	Extramarital affairs (self)	6.77	Yes
35	Smoking (self)	7.58	Yes
36	Alcoholism (spouse)	6.61	Yes
37	Other illness (self)	4.17	Yes
38	Physical abuse (spouse)	0.5	No

39	Extramarital affairs (spouse)	2.5	Yes
40	Cruelty (self)	5.59	Yes
41	Work holism (self)	5.88	Yes
42	Khat abuse (spouse)	0.69	No
43	Khat abuse (self)	5.09	Yes
44	Child birth from another partner (Sp.)	2.55	Yes
45	Smoking (spouse)	5.45	Yes
46	Imprisonment (self)	5.58	Yes
47	Work holism (Spouse)	3.73	Yes
48	Religious differences	0.61	No
49	Gambling (self)	4.83	Yes
50	Other illness (spouse)	0.21	No
51	Desertion (self)	1.30	No
52	Child birth from another partner (self)	3.49	Yes
53	Gambling (spouse)	3.51	Yes
54	Infertility (self)	1.67	No
55	In fertility (spouse)	0.86	No
56	Mental illness (self)	2.69	Yes
57	Imprisonment (spouse)	0.83	No
58	Physical injury (self)	1.02	No
59	Mental illness (spouse)	1.76	No
60	Physical injury (spouse)	1.43	No

3.3 PERCEIVED "REASONS" OF DIVORCE

Respondents were asked to state what they perceive to be the three main "reasons" of their divorce. The result showed that the top twenty reasons stated by men were

1. Jealously 26%
2. Physical abuse 24%
3. Child from another partener 23%
4. Extramarital affairs 21%
5. Communication problems 17%
6. Alcoholism 14%
7. Differences over plans and visions 14%
8. Financial problems 13%
9. Work holism 12%
10. Friction with relatives 11%
11. Stinginess 10%
12. Incompatible beh. 10%
13. Infertility 8%
14. Failed expectation 7.5%
15. Religious differences 7%
16. Sexual incompatibility 6%
17. Lack of happiness 6%
18. Lack of interest 5%
19. Desertion by spouse 5%
20. Irresponsibility 5%

The top twenty reasons given by females were: -

1. Differences over plans and visions 34%
2. Stinginess 23%
3. Friction with relatives 21%
4. Extramarital affairs 21%
5. Communication problems 18%
6. Jealousy 18%
7. Irresponsibility 16%
8. Physical abuse 15%
9. Lack of happiness 11%
10. Financial problems 10%
11. Incompatible behavior (9%)
12. Desertion by spouse (9%).
13. Separation (9%).
14. Alcoholism (9%).
15. Infertility (7%).
16. Child born from other(6%)
17. Wide age difference (6%).
18. Lack of interest (6%)
19. Gambling (5%).
20. Inadequate housing (5%).

The number of different types of reasons given by males were 34 and by the females 31.

Spearman rank difference correlation (γ_{ho}) was calculated and was found to be 0.66 which shows statistically significant positive relation at 0.01 levels.

The details of the result for the perceived "reasons" of divorces is given in table 35.

To see significance of difference between the perceived reasons, t-value was determined and its value with significance at 0.05 and 0.01 levels is presented in table 36.

Table 35. Perceived "reasons" of divorce

No	Perceived "reasons"	Total		Males		Females	
		Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank
1	Differences over plans and visions	24	1	14	6	34	1
2	Jealousy	22	2	26	1	18	5.5
3	Extramarital affairs	21	3	21	4	21	3.5
4	Physical abuse	19.5	4	24	2	15	9
5	Communication problems	17.5	5	17	5	18	5.5
6	Stinginess	16.5	6	10	11.5	23	2
7	Friction with relatives	16	7	11	10	21	3.5
8	Child born from another partner	14.5	8	23	3	6	18
9	Financial problems	11.5	9.5	13	8	10	11
10	Alcoholism	11.5	9.5	14	6	9	14
11	Irresponsibility	11	11	5	19	16	8
12	Incompatible behavior	9.5	12.5	10	11.5	9	14
13	No 2 nd or 3 rd reason	9.5	12.5	2	28	17	7
14	Lack of happiness	8.5	14	6	16	11	10
15	Infertility	7.5	15	8	13	7	16
16	Desertion	7	16	5	19	9	14
17	Workholism	6.5	17	12	9	1	31.5
18	Repealed or long term separation	6	18	3	24.5	9	14
19	Failed expectation	5.5	19.5	7.5	14.5	4	23
20	Lack of interest	5.5	19.5	5	19	6	18
21	Religious differences	5	21	7	14.5	3	27
22	Wide age difference	4.5	22	3	24.5	6	18
23	Sexual incompatibility	4	23.5	6	16	9	14
24	Gambling	4	23.5	3	24.5	5	20.5
25	Lake of happiness	3	25.5	2	17	4	23
26	Inadequate housing	3	25.5	1	33	5	20.5
27	Immaturity	2.5	28	2	28	3	27
28	Inferiority	2.5	28	2	28	3	27
29	Cruelty	2.5	28	1	33	4	23
30	Differences in ethnicity	2	30.5	4	21.5	0	34
31	Disagreement over church	2	30.5	4	21.5	0	34
32	Imprisonment	1.5	33	3	24.5	0	34
33	Smoking	1.5	33	1	33	2	29.5
34	Different illness	1.5	33	1	33	2	29.5
35	Other people living in the same house	0.5	35.5	1	33	0	34
36	Physical injury	0.5	35.5	0	36	1	31.5

Table 36. T- Value for the perceived “reasons” of divorce and their significance.

No	Perceived “reasons”	t - value	Significance at 0.05 level
1	Difference over plans and visions	5.0	Yes
2	Jealously	1.38	No
3	Extramarital affairs	0	No
4	Physical abuse	1.61	No
5	Communication problems	0.02	No
6	Stinginess	2.50	Yes
7	Friction with relatives	2.0	Yes
8	Child birth from another partner	3.4	Yes
9	Financial problems	2.67	Yes
10	Alcoholism	1.11	No
11	Irresponsibility	2.75	Yes
12	Incompatible behavior	0.25	No
13	No 2 nd or 3 rd reason	3.75	Yes
14	Lack of happiness	1.28	No
15	Infertility	0.27	No
16	Desertion	1.11	No
17	Workholism	3.24	Yes
18	Repeated or long term separating	1.28	No
19	Failed expectation	1.00	No
20	Lack of interest	1.33	No
21	Religious differences	1.03	No
22	Wide age difference	1.03	No
23	Sexual incompatibility	0.81	No
24	Gambling	0.71	No
25	Lack of happiness	0.83	No
26	Inadequate housing	1.66	No
27	Immaturity	0.45	No
28	Inferiority	0.45	No
29	Cruelty	1.36	No
30	Differences in Ethnicity	2.11	Yes
31	Disagreement over children	2.11	Yes
32	Imprisonment	1.76	No
33	Smoking	0.59	No
34	Different illness	0.59	No
35	Other people living in the same house.	1.11	No
36	Physical injury	1.11	No

3.4 THE RESULT OF THE INTERVIEW.

The result of the interview showed that the different professionals gave different possible reasons for divorce and suggestions on how to reduce divorce rate.

Medical Doctor (Gynecologist and Obstetrician). The possible reasons for divorce are: lack of preparation before marriage, low level of education, Infertility, early marriage, sexual dis harmony and mistrust. According to him the solutions are: premarital counseling, education and regular medical checkup.

Lawyer. The main reason for divorce in Addis Ababa is disagreement over property. The husband hides his money. The lawyer suggests that the possible solution is to implement the law already enacted.

Psychologist. The reasons given by the psychologist are: communication problems, immaturity, differences in ethnicity, religion and family background. The solutions suggested are: Marriage should be between two people from the same religion and ethnicity. There should not be a big gap in educational status.

Journalist. According to the journalist the main reason for divorce is extramarital affairs and the solution is education on fidelity.

Church pastor. The main reasons for divorce are misunderstanding its meaning, having wrong goals and failed expectation. According to him the solutions are adequate mental and spiritual preparation before marriage using counseling services, teachings and panel discussions.

Teacher. The main reasons for divorce are keeping secrets from each other and financial problems. The solution according to him is to improve communication skills.

Counselor. The main reasons for divorce are communication problems, selfishness and failed expectation. The solution according to the counselor is to improve the degree of maturity through education and reading.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

4.1 DISSCUSSION ON THE DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS.

4.1.1 AGE AT MARRIAGE

In a study conducted by Bonham and Balswick (1980) it was found that there is an inverse relationship between age at first marriage and the proportion of marriages, which end in divorce. This means the younger the age at marriage the higher probability of divorce. Kammeyer (1987) also identified young age at marriage to be a factor highly related to divorce. According to him couples who many under age 18 are particularly prone to divorce. B.N Adams (1986) also suggested that teen-age marriage is a “cause” of divorce because the couples have less stable personalities and lack psychological and intellectual preparation in mate selection.

According to Collin Gibson (1974), the divorce rate for marriages where both spouses are under twenty at the time of marriage is approximately three times the rate of divorce of all marriages. Where, however only the wife married before twenty, the divorce rate falls to approximately twice the rate of divorce of all marriages. This study also suggests that young age at marriage is a factor associated with divorce.

The finding of the current study showed that 28% of the female respondents and 16% the ex-wives were younger than 20 at their previous marriage. It can also be seen that 54% of the female respondents and 53% of the ex-wives were younger than 25 at their previous marriage. While only 9% of the male respondents and 18% of the ex-husbands were younger than 25. It is thus possible to suggest that the females’ young age at marriage is one important factor which contributed to the dissolution of their marriage. As discussed above, the lack of psychological and intellectual preparation at young age may make marriages difficult. The mean age at marriage was 25.33 for the female respondents and 26.42 for the ex-wives of the male respondents. Since there is inverse relationship between age at marriage and divorce rate, young age at marriage can indeed be a contributing factor for divorce.

When age difference between the spouses is considered we see that husbands were more than 10 years older than the wives in 28.5% of the spouses and they were more than 5 Years older in 65% of the spouses. Wives were older than husbands in 6% of the spouses. Although previous studies could not be found on age difference it is important to consider wide age difference as a possible contributing factor for divorce. However this finding is not conclusive.

4.1.2 ETHNIC ORIGIN

According to Kammeyer (1987) the rate of divorce is higher in blacks in the USA. However in another study it was found that even though blacks had higher rate of marital dissolution than whites the difference becomes almost negligible when the factor of income is controlled (Bonham & Balswick, 1980).

In the present study the highest percentages of the respondents, both males and females, are from the Ethnic origin of Amhara to be followed by Oromo and Gurage. It is however not possible to conclude on Ethnic origin as a factor because the ethnic composition of the residents of Addis Ababa is not available. Divorce in same ethnic origin spouses constituted to 50% of the divorces. The rest 50% of the couples were from different ethnic origin. Thus is possible to suggest that spouses who had difference in ethnic origin have the same rate of divorce as those from same ethnic origin.

4.1.3 OCCUPATION

A study by B.N Adams (1986) has shown that divorce rate is higher among families of lower or working class background. The same study showed that low status families, in term of income, are more susceptible to divorce. Bonham and Balswick (1980) also have shown that there is inverse relationship between income and rate of marital dissolution.

The present study showed that 14% of the male respondents were teachers, 13% merchants, 11% drivers and 11% soldiers. Even though the income of merchants may depend on the type of business they are involved in, it is possible to see that teachers, drivers and soldiers belong to the low-income part of the society. When we consider the

occupation of the female respondents we see that 25% were housewives and 13% students, which gives us 38% of unemployed females. The rest 62% are employed. It was also shown that 61% of the ex-wives of the male respondents were employed.

It is possible to suggest from the result that family low income or low-income occupations are associated with divorce. It is also possible to suggest that women's employment can be a factor contributing to divorce as 61.5% of all the ex-wives were employed. There are studies, which show that women's participation in labor can be an important factors contributing to divorce. A study done at the University of Michigan (Heckert, etal, 1998) showed that non-traditional couples in which wives earn between 50%-75% of household income are significantly more likely to separate or divorce than other couples. Bonham and Balswick (1980) have also shown that workingwomen were more likely to get divorced or separated.

4.1.4 EDUCATIONAL STATUS

The result of the present study showed that the highest percentage of the male divorcees (25%) had college diploma and the highest percentage of the female divorcees (33%) had also college diploma. 25% of the ex-wives and 34% of the ex-husbands had also college diploma. The next highest percentage for the males was 20% for grade 5 – 8 and for the females it was 16% for high school complete. The result suggests that there is no linear relationship between educational status and divorce. Interestingly divorce rate is higher in those who hold college diploma.

This finding is not in agreement with some past researches. B.N Adams (1986) for example, suggested that the lower the family education the more likely a divorce will occur. The finding is however in agreement with a study done by Bonham and Balswick (1980) who concluded that there is no significant inverse relationship between education and marital dissolution.

4.1.5 RELIGION

According to Kammeyer (1987) among the major religious denominations in the USA, Protestants as a group have slightly higher dissolution rates than Catholics, while Jews have lower rates than Catholics. He also showed that the highest marriage disruption rates were among those people who claim no religion. Bonham and Balswick (1980) have also shown that Catholics had a lower rate of divorce than Protestants. Levinger (1965) found proscriptive religion and joint church attendance to be sources of barrier strengths preventing the spouses to come out of marriage. Guttmann (1993) reported that divorce rate in interfaith marriages is higher than in religiously homogenous marriage.

The result of the current study showed that the highest percentage of the male respondents (77%) as well as the female respondents (77%) were Orthodox. 74% of the ex-husbands and 69% of the ex-wives were also Orthodox. After the Orthodox come the Muslims, the Protestant and the Catholics in that order. This result is inconclusive because the proportion of the population of Addis Ababa belonging to different religious is not known.

Among the 200 couples in this study, in 87.5% spouses had same religion while in 12.5% spouses had different religion the highest being Orthodox-Muslim (4.5%). Thus it is possible to suggest that in term of the effect of religion the study is inconclusive.

4.1.6 TRADITIONAL MARRIAGE

It is known that marriages can be arranged by families in Ethiopia. In this study in 56.5% of the cause the marriages were arranged by the families and the rest 43.5% were non-traditional marriages. Thus the effect of family arrangements of marriages was not appreciated in this study.

4.1.7 LEGALITY OF MARRIAGE

The result of the study showed that 51% of the couples were legally certified by the government office while the rest 49% were not. This shows that the data that is obtained from the Addis Ababa City Government Acts and

Documentation office is not complete and cannot show the true prevalence of marriages.

4.1.8 DURATION OF ENGAGEMENT

In 79% of the 200 couples, it was found that the couples were engaged for 1-2 years. The result shows that there is no linear relationship between length of engagement and divorce rate. Thus it is not possible to appreciate the effect of duration of engagement on divorce in this study.

4.1.9 COHABITATION

A study which used the Canadian fertility survey (Hall, 1996) showed that couples who cohabit prior to marriage have a significantly higher risk of getting divorced than couples who do not cohabit before marriage. This is contrary to the popular belief that living together before marriage is an effective way to reduce a couple's chance of divorcing.

The present study showed that 16% of the couples co-habited before marriage and this might have contributed to the dissolution of their marriage.

4.1.10 PREMARITAL SEXUAL INTERCOURSE AND PREGNANCY

Even though studies on the effect of premarital sexual intercourse are not available, Bonham and Balswick (1980) have shown premarital pregnancy to be consistently related to higher dissolution rate of divorce. In the present study 55% of the male respondents and 33% of the female respondents reported that they had sexual intercourse with their ex-spouse before marriage. 36% of the male respondents said that their ex-spouses were pregnant before marriage. Among the female respondents 11% were pregnant before marriage. This result suggests that premarital pregnancy can be a contributing factor to dissolution of marriage.

4.1.11 PREMARITAL COUNSELING

In this study 95.0% of the couples had no premarital counseling. This shows that most of the couples had no access to premarital counseling services. The couples were not prepared for marriage by professionals. In California, USA, a law was implemented which required premarital counseling for any couple applying for marriage where either party is under 18 years of age (Elkin, 1977). This law is believed to have improved stability of marriage showing the relevance of premarital counseling. The absence of premarital counseling can be a pertinent contributing factor for divorce.

4.1.12 NUMBER OF CHILDREN

According to Bonham and Balswick (1980) childless women had substantially higher divorce rate than women with children. The study showed that the presence of school-aged children lowered the probability of divorce. The researchers reported however, that other studies had shown that divorcing couples had higher fertility than non-divorcing couples.

The present study showed that 49% of the couples had 1-2 children, 22% had 3-4 children and 15% had no children. Thus the relationship between the number of children and divorce rate is not clear. This is in agreement with past researches, which are inconclusive.

4.1.13 DURATION OF THE PREVIOUS MARRIAGE.

Among the 200 couples, 49% were married for 6-10 years before divorce, 22% were married for 3-5 years and 14% were married for 11-15 years. This suggests that marriages are likely to be dissolved 6-10 years after marriage. After these years the probability of divorce declines. An annual study in UK based on surveys of matrimonial lawyers showed that 40% of marriages end after 5-10 years and 53% end after 10-15 years. (Wikipedia, 2005)

4.1.14 FILING FOR DIVORCE

Different studies show that most petitions for divorce are filed by women. In 1994, 68.1% of divorce petitions were filed by wives in Canada (Black, 2005). The rest 23.87%

was filed by husbands and 8.03% was filed jointly. The same source showed that in 1995, 67.85% of divorce petitions were filed by wives, 25% by husbands and the rest 6.38% filed jointly. According to Vern L. Bullough and Fang Fu Ruan (1994) 70% of the divorces in China are initiated by the women. While annual study in UK showed that 93% of divorce cases were petitioned by women.

The present study showed that 52.5% of divorce is filed by women in Addis Ababa. The rest 28% is filed by the husbands and 19.5% is filed jointly. This shows that most petitions for divorce are filed by the wives.

4.1.15 DIVORCE CERTIFICATE

The present study showed that 82% of the male respondents and 75% of the female respondents did not take divorce certificate. This shows that most divorcees in Addis Ababa do not apply for divorce certificate and that the data available at the documentation office cannot be complete.

4.1.16 NUMBER OF DIVORCES AND REMARRIAGE

In a study done in Arizona State University it was shown that among adults who had ended their first marriage in divorce, about three fourth of the elderly men and two thirds of the elderly women were remarried (Glick & Lin, 1987). However there was decline in 1970s among those under 35. Recent studies show that 75% of people who divorce remarry (Brody et al, 1988).

The effect of remarriages on the rate of divorce was studied. Bonham and Balswick (1980) reported that those who marry three or more times were more likely to divorce again than those who married once or twice.

The current study showed that 5% of the participants had 4-6 previous divorces, 26.5% had 2-3 divorces and 68.5% had only one divorce. The study also showed that 67% of the male respondents and 40% of the female respondents are remarried. This shows that serial marriages and divorces are not uncommon in Addis Ababa. Among those who remarried 35% of the women remarried within 1-2 years while the majority of the men (31.3%) remarried after 6-10 years. This shows that women remarry faster than men do.

4.1.17 PARENTAL DIVORCE

Parental divorce was suggested to be a pertinent contributing factor to divorce. According to Kiernan and Cherlin (1958), offspring of divorced parents dissolve their first partnership by the age of 33. Other study has also suggested the intergenerational transmission of divorce (Diekmann and Shcmidheiny, 2004). According to this study, which included Eastern Europe, Western Europe and North America, the divorce risk of children of divorced parents was on average 2.03 times higher than that of children of non-divorced parents. There are also other researches, which suggested that there is a genetic transmission of divorce (Jockin et al, 1996).

The result of the current study showed that the parents of 61% of the female respondents and 42% of the male respondents were divorced. 13% of the male respondents and 22% of the female respondents reported that their parents as well as their ex-spouse's parents were divorced. This result indicates that parental divorce can be taken as one of the pertinent contributing factors for divorce and intergenerational transmission of divorce is possible.

4.2 DISCUSSION ON THE PERTINENT CONTRIBUTING FACTORS

In this part of the paper factors which ranked 1-20 for males and females are discussed with their t-value and correlation.

4.2.1 PERTINENT CONTRIBUTING FACTORS (MALES)

1. INCOMPATIBLE BEHAVIOR (84%)

This factor was considered a pertinent factor by 84% of the men. It was significantly checked by males than females ($t = 5.00$). This factor is markedly correlated with communication problems. It is also correlated with the husband's failed expectation, lack of happiness, lack of interest, abusing the wife verbally and physically, financial problems and stinginess. In the study by Cleek and Pearson (1985) this factor was checked by 44.7% of the respondents and ranked

3rd. In the present study it ranked 3rd for females. Thus incompatible behavior is one of the pertinent contributing factors.

2. IMMATURITY OF THE WIFE (80%)

Immaturity of the ex-wife is considered as a pertinent contributing factor by 80% of the men. That is, they believe that their wives were not mature enough in the areas of marriage and the family. The factor is checked by the men more than by the females ($t=6.44$). This factor is not present in the Cleek and Pearson's list. Immaturity of the wife is markedly correlated with physical abuse by the husband. Interestingly 51% of the females also considered their own immaturity as a pertinent contributing factor.

3. HUSBAND'S LACK OF INTEREST (80%)

Lack of interest is checked more often by males than by females ($t=4.70$). 48% of the females also confessed that they lacked interest in the marriage (rank 7). The husband's lack of interest is markedly correlated with incompatible behavior and the husband's lack of happiness and verbal and physical abusive behavior. It is important to note that the abusive behaviors are markedly correlated with incompatible behavior as well. This factor is one of the 16 perceived "causes" of divorce found by Burns (1984)

4. HUSBAND'S FAILED EXPECTATION (78%)

Failed expectation was checked significantly more by the males than the females ($t=4.12$). 78% of the husbands did not find marriage as they expected it and 50% of the females also gave the same reason. The husband's failed expectation is markedly correlated with the husband's lack of happiness and incompatible behavior between the spouses. Thus this factor is one of the pertinent contributing factors for divorce.

5. COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS (78%)

This factor was checked significantly more by males than females ($t = 5.65$). 78% of the men considered communication problems between the spouses to be one of the pertinent factors which contributed to their divorce. 39% of the female also did the same (rank = 4). There is marked correlation between communication problem and incompatible behavior. It is also markedly correlated with lack of happiness. One can appreciate the intercorrelation between failed expectations, lack of happiness, communication problem, lack interest and incompatible behavior.

6. HUSBAND'S LACK OF HAPPINESS (78%)

Lack of happiness (self) is also significantly more checked by males than females ($t = 4.34$). This factor ranked 2nd (46.9%) in the study by Cleek and Pearson. Lack of happiness of the wives also ranked 2nd (59.9%) in the same study for females. The correlation of this factor with others was appreciated above. However, it is also markedly correlated with verbal abuse by the husband and the husband's stinginess. The above discussion shows that husband's lack of happiness is a pertinent contributing factor to divorce.

7. INADEQUATE HOUSING (71%)

This factor was checked by 71% of the males and by 44% of the females as a contributing factor. It is however significantly more checked by males than females ($t = 4.29$). It is interesting to note that this factor is in the top 20 for both males and females. Inadequate housing is markedly correlated with financial problem and alcoholism. It is easy to appreciate these correlations. Inadequate housing was given as one of the 16 main perceived causes of divorce in the study by Burns (1984). Thus, inadequate housing is a pertinent factor contributing to divorce.

8. *DESERTION BY THE WIFE (70%)*

Desertion by spouse was checked more significantly by males ($t = 6.57$) than by the females (24%). The study shows that 70% of the husbands were deserted by their wives. One expects to find some correlations for this factor. Desertion by the wives is markedly correlated with physical abuse, verbal abuse by the husband, and gambling by the husband. It is also correlated with lack of interest of the husband.

9. *VERBAL ABUSE BY THE HUSBAND (67%)*

Verbal abuse by the husband is believed by the male to be a contributing factor for their divorce. Only 12% of the women took their own verbal abuse to be a factor. Verbal abuse (self) was checked more by males than females ($t = 7.97$). This factor ranked 4th (5.5%) for females and 6th (24.7) for males in the study by Burns (1985). Husband's verbal abuse is marked correlated with the husband's lack of interest, cruelty and inferiority. It is also correlated with desertion by the wife and incompatible behavior. Thus this factor is a pertinent contributing factor for divorce.

10. *THE WIVES LACK OF INTEREST (67%)*

As 67% of the husbands gave lack of interest by wives as a contributing factor 48% of the females gave their own lack of interest as a contributing factor. Lack of interest (spouse) was checked more significantly by males than females ($t = 4.29$). Wives lack of interest was the 8th perceived cause of divorce in the study by Burns (1985). Thus this factor is a pertinent contributing factor to divorce.

11. *ALCOHOLISM (HUSBAND) (16%)*

As 65% of the males gave their alcoholism as a pertinent factor for divorce, 48% the females checked alcoholism of their husband as a pertinent factor. Alcoholism (self) was checked more significantly by males the females ($t = 8.38$).

Alcoholism was the 5th perceive cause in the study by Burns. Husband alcoholism also ranked 7th for females (30%) and 14th for males (30.2) in the study by Cleek and Pearson (1985). In this study male alcoholism is markedly correlated with smoking, gambling, jealousy, and physical abuse by the husband. It is also markedly correlated with financial problem and inadequate housing. Only 6% of the females reported their own alcoholism. From the above discussion, it is possible to say that husband's alcoholism is a pertinent contributing factor for divorce.

12. PHYSICAL ABUSE BY THE HUSBAND (64%)

This factor was checked significantly more by males than females ($t=8.38$). 26% of the female respondents have also reported that they were physically abused by their husbands. It is note worthy that it is the physical abusers who have mainly mentioned the factor as pertinent rather than the abused. In the study done by Cleek and Pearson, physical abuse by husbands ranked 15 (3.6%) for males and 9 (21.7) for females. In the present study, this factor is markedly correlated with verbal abuse by husbands, husband's jealousy, cruelty, alcoholism, financial problems, immaturity and inferiority of the wives, verbal abuse by wives, smoking by husbands, inferiority ,stinginess, lack of interest by the husbands and incompatible behavior. We can see that physical abuse is correlated with 13 different factors. This factor is a pertinent contributing factor for divorce.

13. FRICTION WITH RELATIVES (64%)

There is no significant difference between males and females in checking this factor ($t = 1.86$). 64% of the males and 51% of the females have checked it as a pertinent factor. It ranked 3rd for females in this study. In the study by Cleek and Pearson (1985) this factor ranked 8th (11.6%) for males and 10th (10.7%) for females. In the study by Burns (1984), friction with relatives was the 9th important perceived cause of divorce. In the present study no marked correlation

was found with other factors. Friction with relations is a pertinent contributing factor.

14. FAILED EXPECTATION OF THE WIVES (63%)

This factor was checked more by males than females ($t = 4.14$). 34% of the wives also reported that there was failed expectation of the husbands. This factor is a pertinent contributing factor for divorce.

15. DIFFERENCES OVER PALNS AND VISIONS. (63%)

This is the factor ranked 1st for the females (51%). No marked correlation was found with other factors. It is pertinent contributing factor for divorce.

16. WIFE'S LACK OF HAPPINESS (61%)

Lack of happiness (spouse) was checked significantly by the males than the females ($t = 2.71$). 42% of the females also said that their husbands lacked happiness. In the study by Cleek and Pearson (1985), basic unhappiness ranked 2nd for both males (46.9%) and females (59.9%). We can see that it is a pertinent factor contributing to divorce. No marked correlation was found with other factors.

17. SUSPICIOUSNESS & JEALOUSY OF THE WIVES. (60%)

(60%) of the male respondent have reported suspiciousness and jealousy of the wives as a contributing factor. While 40% of the females reported that their husbands were jealous. 51% of the males and 35% of the females have also said that they were jealous themselves. The difference between males and females was not statistically significant at the 0.01 level ($t = 2.29$). Jealousy was mentioned as a perceived cause neither in Burn nor Cleek and Pearson's study. In the present study this factor is considered a pertinent contributing factor.

18. IRRESPONSIBILITY OF THE WIVES (58%)

Interestingly 58% of the males and 56% of the females said their spouses were irresponsible. There was no significant difference between men and women in checking this factor. Irresponsibility in marriage is a pertinent contributing factor for divorce.

19. FINANCIAL PROBLEM (58%)

Financial problem was checked more significantly by males than females ($t=5.23$). Only 24% of the females reported this factor as a contributing factor. In the study by Cleek and Pearson (1985), financial problem stood 5th for both males (28.7%) and females (32.9%). In the present study financial problem is correlated with inferiority of the husband as well as the wives, inadequate housing, verbal and physical abuse by the husbands, incompatible behavior, Alcoholism and stinginess by the husbands. Thus financial problem is a pertinent contributing factor for divorce.

20. STINGINESS OF HUSBANDS. (57%)

Husband's stinginess was checked by 57% of the males. 42% of the females also reported that their husbands were stingy. This factor, stinginess (self) was checked more by males than females ($t=8.00$). This factor is markedly correlated with incompatible behavior, financial problems, physical abuse and lack of happiness of the husband. This factor is also a pertinent contributing factor for divorce.

4.2.2 PERTINENT CONTRIBUTING FACTORS (FEMALES)

Those factors, which are discussed in details under "males", will not be dealt with here in details.

1. DIFFERENCES OVER PLANS AND VISIONS (51%)

This factor ranked 1st for females. No marked correlation with other factors was found. It belongs to the top 20 factors for males and is a pertinent contributing factor.

2. IRRESPONSIBILITY OF THE HUSBAND (56%)

This factor ranked 2nd for females. It belongs to the top 20 factors for males. It is markedly correlated with lack of interest, physical abuse, failed expectation, and alcoholism of the husband. It is also correlated with alcoholism and desertion by the wife's.

3. FRICTION WITH RELATIVES (51%)

This factor which ranked 3rd for females is also in the top 20 factors for males. It is markedly correlated with incompatible behavior and is a pertinent contributing factor.

4. INCOMPATIBLE BEHAVIOR (51%)

This factor also stood 3rd for females and belongs to the top 20 factors of the males. It is markedly correlated with communication problems, lack of happiness and failed expectation of the wives, lack of happiness of the husbands, verbal abuse, physical abuse, lack of happiness and immaturity of the husbands. It is also correlated with friction with relatives. This factor is a pertinent contributing factor.

5. IMMATURITY OF THE WIVES (51%)

This factor also ranked 3rd for females and belongs to the top 20 factors of the males. It is markedly correlated with communication problems, incompatible behavior, lack of happiness and failed expectation by the wives. It is also correlated with difference over plans and visions. It is a pertinent contributing factor.

6. FAILED EXPECTATION OF THE WIVES (50%)

This factor ranked 6th for females and also belongs to the top 20 factors for males. It is markedly corrected with lack of happiness and lack of interest by the wives. It is also correlated with communication problems and incompatible behavior. It is also correlated with sexual incompatibility, immaturity of the wives and husbands, husband's cruelty and irresponsibility. This factor is pertinent contributing factor.

7. WIVES LACK OF INTEREST (48%)

Ranked 7th for females and belongs to the top 20 factors of the males. It is markedly correlated with the wives lack of happiness and failed expectation, alcoholism and failed expectation and verbal abuse by husbands. This factor is pertinent contributing factor for divorce.

8. WIVES LACK OF HAPPINESS (46%)

Ranked 8th for females and belongs to the top 20 factors for males. It is correlated with incompatible behavior, communication problem, alcoholism, cruelty, immaturity and physical abuse by husbands. It is also correlated with the failed expectation of the wives. This factor is a pertinent contributing factor for divorce.

9. ALCOHOLISM OF THE HUSBANDS (46%)

Ranked 8th for females and belongs to the top 20 factors for males. Alcoholism of spouse was markedly correlated with smoking, verbal abuse, cruelty, irresponsibility of the husband. It is also correlated with lack of happiness and lack of interest by the wives. This factor is a pertinent contributing factor for divorce.

10. HUSBAND'S LACK OF INTEREST (44%)

This factor ranked 10th for females and also belongs to the top 20 factors for males. It is markedly correlated with husband's lack of happiness and failed expectation. It is also correlated with communication problem, incompatible

behavior, irresponsibility and immaturity of husbands. This factor is a pertinent contributing factor.

11. CRUELTY OF HUSBANDS (44%)

This factor does not belong to the top 20 factors of the males. Cruelty of husband ranked 32 (40%) for males. Husband's cruelty was mentioned as the seventh important perceived cause in the study by Burns (1984). It is markedly correlated with stinginess, extramarital affairs by husband as well as verbal abuse by wives. It is correlated with alcoholism, verbal abuse, and irresponsibility of husbands. It is also correlated with communication problems, lack of happiness and failed expectation by the wives. This factor is also a pertinent contributing factor.

12. HUSBANDS'S LACK OF HAPPINESS (42%)

This factor ranked 12th for females and also belongs to the top 20 factors for males. It is markedly correlated with failed expectation and lack of interest of husbands. It is a pertinent contributing factor.

13. STINGINESS OF HUSBAND (42%)

Ranked 12th for females and belongs to the top 20 factors for males. It is markedly correlated with cruelty of husbands. It is a pertinent contributing factor.

14. INADEQUATE HOUSING (41%)

Ranked 14th for females and belongs to the top 20 factors for males. It is markedly correlated with financial problem and immaturity of husbands.

15. COMMUNICATION PROBLEM (39%)

Ranked 15th for females, this factor belongs to the top 20 factors of the males. It is markedly correlated with failed expectation of self and husbands, incompatible behavior, lack of interest and verbal abuse by the husbands,

cruelty and immaturity of the husbands, lack of happiness and immaturity of the wives. This factor is also a pertinent contributing factor.

16. *SUSPICIOUSNESS AND JEALOUSY OF THE HUSBANDS (40%)*

This factor does not belong to the top 20 of the male's factors. However 51% of the men (rank 23) reported that they were jealous and suspicious. No marked correlation was found with other factors. This factor is a pertinent contributing factor.

17. *VERBAL ABUSE BY THE HUSBAND (38%)*

This factor ranked 17th for females and belongs to the top 20 factors in males. It is markedly correlated with physical abuse by the husbands, incompatible behavior, desertion by wives, cruelty, khat abuse, and alcoholism by the husbands. It is also correlated with lack of interest by the wives.

18. *WIVES SUSPICIOUSNESS AND JEALOUSY (35%)*

Ranked 18 for females and belongs to the top 20 factors. No marked correlations were found. It is a pertinent contributing factor.

19. *HUSBAND'S FAILED EXPECTATION.*

Ranked 18 for females, this factor belongs to the top 20 factors for males. It is markedly correlated with husband's lack of interest, lack of happiness, communication problems, self failed expectation, self immaturity, lack of interest and irresponsibility of spouse. This factor is also a pertinent contributing factor.

20. *HUSBANDS SMOKING (34%)*

This factor ranked 18th for females. 49% of the males also mentioned this factor as a contributing factor (rank 25). Husbands' smoking is correlated with alcoholism, imprisonment and irresponsibility of the husbands.

From the above discussion it becomes clear that 16 of the twenty top factors are common for males and females. There are additional four factors for each. This makes the most pertinent factors twenty-four. The 16 common factors are.

1. **Incompatible behavior**
2. **Differences over plans and visions.**
3. **Friction with relatives.**
4. **Communication problems.**
5. **Inadequate housing.**
6. **Immaturity of the wives.**
7. **Wives' lack of interest.**
8. **Wives' lack of happiness.**
9. **Wives failed expectation.**
10. **Husbands' lack of interest.**
11. **Husbands' failed expectation.**
12. **Husbands' lack of happiness.**
13. **Verbal abuse by the husbands.**
14. **Alcoholism of the husbands.**
15. **Suspiciousness and jealousy of the wives.**
16. **Stinginess of the husbands.**

The remaining 8 factors are:-

17. **Desertion by the wife. (males)**
18. **Physical abuse by the husband. (males)**
19. **Irresponsibility of the wives. (males)**
20. **Financial problem. (males)**
21. **Irresponsibility of the husbands. (Female)**
22. **Cruelty of husbands. (Females)**
23. **Suspiciousness and jealousy of the husband. (Females)**
24. **Husband's smoking. (Females)**

These pertinent contributing factors can be grouped in to seven different types of groups. “Affective factors”, “cognitive factors”, “economic factors”, “behavioral factors”, “addictive factors”, “social factors”, and “familial factors”

1. “*Affective factors*”

- Wives lack of interest.
- Wives lack of happiness.
- Wives failed expectation.
- Husbands’ lack of interest.
- Husbands’ failed expectation.
- Husbands’ lack of happiness.
- Suspiciousness and jealous of the wives.
- Suspiciousness and jealous of the husbands.

2. “*Cognitive factors*”

- Communication problems.
- Differences over plans and visions.
- Immaturity of the wives.
- Irresponsibility of the wives.
- Irresponsibility of the husbands.

3. “*Behavioral factors*”

- Incompatible behavior.
- Verbal abuse by the husbands.
- Stinginess of the husbands.
- Physical abuse by the husbands.
- Cruelty of the husbands.

4. “*Familial factors*”

- Desertion by the wife.

5. "Economic factors"

- Inadequate housing.
- Financial problems.

6. "Addictive factors"

- Alcoholism of the husbands.
- Husbands smoking.

7. "Social factors"

Friction with relatives

If can be seen from the above that most of the pertinent factors are "Affective" followed by "cognitive" and behavioral.

When we compare the present study with studies done by Burns (1984) and Cleek and Pearson (1985), we find striking similarities. There are however some factors which are in the list of these researches but which did not make it to the top 20 pertinent factors in the present study. These factors are: - sexual incompatibility, extramarital affairs, and religious differences.

1. **SEXUAL INCOMPATIBILITY:** This factor ranked 27th (28%) for males and 34th (14%) for the females. It was checked significantly more by males than females ($t = 5.23$). In males no marked correlation was found with other factors. In women however it is markedly correlated with financial problems and wives failed expectation.
2. **EXTRAMARITAL AFFAIRS:** This factor is considered to be one of the most significant "causes" of divorce (OMI, 2006). In the present study 47% of the males and 5% of the female reported that they had extramarital affairs. 17% of the men and 32% of females also reported that their spouse had extramarital affairs. Extramarital affairs are markedly correlated with child birth from another partner and cruelty of husbands.
3. **DIFFERENCES IN RELIGION:** 16% of males and 13% of the females gave religious difference as a pertinent contributing factor. No marked correlation was

found with other factors. There was no significant difference between males and females in checking this factor.

4.3 DISSCUSSION ON THE PERCIEVED REASONS OF DIVORCE

When asked what the respondents believed were the main reasons or “cause” of their divorce the respondents gave different reasons.

The 20 top perceived reasons given by the respondents are presented under section 3.3 in the third chapter of this paper. In this part of the paper the 20 perceived reasons are compared with the top 20 pertinent factors. Factors that belong to the top 20 pertinent factors and also given as perceived “reasons” are: -

FOR MALES: Incompatible behavior, differences over plans and visions, friction with relatives, communication problems, lack of interest, lack of happiness, failed expectation, physical abuse, alcoholism, jealousy, stinginess, desertion, and financial problems.

FOR FEMALES: Differences over plans and visions, incompatible behavior, friction with relatives, communication problems, inadequate housing, lack of interest, lack of happiness, alcoholism, jealousy, and stinginess.

This shows that for males 13 problems are checked as pertinent contributing factor and given as perceived reasons. For females 10 problems were checked as pertinent factors and also as perceived causes.

When we compare males and females, 16 reasons were given by the males as well as the females although the percentage difference. These reasons are:-

- 1. Jealousy (26% M, 18% F)**
- 2. Physical abuse (24% M, 15% F)**
- 3. Child birth from another partner (23% M, 6% F)**
- 4. Extramarital affairs (21% M, 21% F)**
- 5. Communication problems (17% M, 18% F)**
- 6. Alcoholism (14% M, 9% F)**

7. Differences over plans and visions (14% M, 34 F)
8. Financial problems (13% M, 10% F)
9. Friction with relatives (11% M, 21, F)
10. Stinginess (10% M, 23% F)
11. Incompatible behavior (10% M, 9% F)
12. Infertility (8% M, 7% F)
13. Lack of happiness (6%M, 11% F)
14. Lack of interest (5% M, 6% F)
15. Desertion by spouse (5%M, 9% F)
16. Irresponsibility (5% M, 16% F)

The other reasons given by men are: - failed expectation (7.5%), religious differences (7%), sexual incompatibility (6%) and workholism (12%). The other reasons given by the females were repeated or long-term separation, wide age difference, Gambling and inadequate housing.

In terms of significance of difference we can see the t – value derived and presented in Table 36. According to this result, men gave the following reasons significantly more than females.

- **Child born from another partner.**
- **Financial problems.**
- **Workholsim.**

Females gave the following reason significance more than males.

- **Difference over plans and visions.**
- **Friction with relatives.**
- **Stinginess.**
- **Irresponsibility.**

In all the other perceived causes, significance of difference was not significant at 0.05 and 0.01 level. This indicates that females are more concerned with plan and visions for the future and responsibility. They are more affected by stinginess and friction with

relatives than men. Men on the other hand consider financial problems, child born out of wed-lock and workholism as reason for divorce than females.

By studying the pertinent contributing factors and the perceived reasons of divorce we can organize and summarize all the pertinent problems contributing towards dissolution of marriage in Addis Ababa as follows.

1. *“Affective problems”*

- Lack of interest.
- Lack of happiness.
- Failed expectation.
- Jealously and suspiciousness.

2. *“Cognitive problem”*

- Differences over plans and vision.
- Immaturity.
- Irresponsibility.

3. *“Behavioral problems”*

- Incompatible behavior.
- Communication problems.
- Extramarital affairs.
- Stinginess.
- Cruelty.
- Verbal abuse.
- Physical abuse.
- Sexual incompatibility.
- Gambling.

4. *“Addictive problems”*

- Alcoholism.
- Smoking.

5. *“Familial problems”*

- Desertion by a partner.
- Child born from another partner.
- Infertility.
- Religious differences.
- Wide age differences.

6. *“Social problems”*

- Workholism.
- Repeated or long term separation.
- Friction with relatives.

7. *“Economic problems”*

- Financial problems.
- Inadequate housing.

Thus we conclude that these seven groups of problems, reasons or pertinent contributing factors are the main contributing factors to divorce in Addis Ababa.

4.4 DISSCUSSION ON THE OUTCOME OF THE INTERVIEW.

The result of the interview showed that all the factors considered to be reasons of divorce by the professionals belong to either to the pertinent contributing factors or the perceived reasons. Some belonged to the demographic factors. This strengthens the finding in this study. It is interesting to note that all the reasons which were given by the professionals fall in to one of the seven groups of factors or to the demographic factors.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

5.1 SUMMARY.

This study was conducted with the objective of identifying the possible contributing demographic factors to divorce, the Pertinent contributing factors and the Perceived reasons for divorce. The study was conducted in Addis Ababa taking 20 samples from each of the ten sub cities making the sampling size 200 with 100 males and 100 females. The sampling technique used was expert choice and a questionnaire and structured interview were used to collect data. The collected data was analyzed using SPSS .Percentages, Pearson product moment correlations, t-values and Spearman rank difference correlations were calculated. Ten demographic factors and seven groups of factors i.e.Affective, Cognitive, Behavioral, Addictive, Familial, Social, and economic factors were found to be significant contributing factors to divorce. Twelve suggestions and recommendations are forwarded.

5.2 CONCLUSION

As discussed in chapter one, divorce is believed to have detrimental effects on the divorcees and their children. Statistics from different countries indicate that divorce rate is escalating. The data from Addis Ababa City Government Acts and Documentation office shows that divorce rate is increasing in Addis Ababa. The present research was conducted to study the different demographic factors and other pertinent contributing factors that contribute to divorce. Perceived reasons of divorce, as perceived by the divorcees, were studied.

From result it is possible to appreciate possible contributing factors for divorce. Among the demographic factors the following are possible contributing factors.

1. Young age at marriage.
2. Wide age difference (> 10 years).
3. Low socio economic status.
4. Premarital sexual intercourse.
5. Premarital pregnancy.
6. Cohabitation.
7. Lack of premarital counseling.
8. Remarriage after divorce.
9. Parental divorce.
10. Female employment.

Although these factors are suggested as possible contributing demographic factors, further research is necessary. The result of the other demographic factors i.e. Ethnic origin, educational status, religion traditional marriage, duration of engagement and number of children was inconclusive.

From the study of the pertinent contributing factors and perceived reasons, seven groups of problems are identified which contribute to the dissolution of marriages in Addis Ababa. These categories of factors are:-

1. ***“Affective factors”***

- 1.1. Lack of interest
- 1.2. Lack of happiness.
- 1.3. Failed expectation.
- 1.4. Jealousy and suspiciousness.

2. ***“Cognitive factors”***

- 2.1. Differences over plans and visions.
- 2.2. Immaturity.
- 2.3. Irresponsibility.

3. ***“Behavioral factors”***

- 3.1. Incompatible behavior.

- 3.2. Communication problems.
- 3.3. Extramarital affairs.
- 3.4. Stinginess.
- 3.5. Cruelty.
- 3.6. Verbal abuse.
- 3.7. Physical abuse.
- 3.8. Sexual incompatibility.
- 3.9 Gambling.

4. ***“Addictive factors”***

- 4.1. Alcoholism.
- 4.2. Smoking.

5. ***“Familial factors”***

- 5.1. Desertion by a partner.
- 5.2. Child born from another partner.
- 5.3. Infertility.
- 5.4. Religious differences.
- 5.5. Wide age difference.

6. ***“Social factors”***

- 6.1. Workholism
- 6.2. Repeated or long-term separation.
- 6.3. Friction with relatives.

7. ***“Economic factors”***

- 7.1. Financial problems.
- 7.2. Inadequate housing.

The conclusion of this research is that in Addis Ababa, divorce or dissolution of marriage, is the result of interplay of the demographic factors, the affective factors, the

cognitive factors, the behavioral factors, the Addictive factors, the familial factors, the social factors and the economic factors listed above. These are the possible pertinent contributing factors to divorce among the residents of Addis Ababa.

5.3 SUGGESTIONS

At the conclusion of this study the following suggestions and recommendation are forwarded.

1. A large scale, nation wide study should be conducted to study the factors contributing to divorce as well as the effect of divorce. A longitudinal cohort study is strongly suggested to identify the determinants of divorce.
2. Counseling services that serve families should be available with in the reach of the population. These counseling services should deal with family problems that lead to divorce and they should work for the betterment of the families and strengthening of their stability.
3. Premarital counseling services that help couples to evaluate their decision to marry each other and prepare those to be married psychologically should be available. Premarital counseling services should be available in accessible areas such as churches, mosques, health centers, kebeles etc.
4. Training of counselors that specialize in family therapy should be started in higher learning institutions. Training should also be given to counselors who are already in the profession.
5. Marriage at a very young age with out enough maturity and preparation should be avoided. Marriage should take place at the appropriate age and after enough preparation.
6. Marriage with a very wide age difference between the spouses should be discouraged. There has to be appropriate age difference between couples
7. Premarital cohabitation, premarital pregnancy and premarital sexual intercourse should be discouraged through education.

8. People who are already divorced and 'children of divorce' should be helped psychologically to thwart the untoward effect of divorce.
9. Extramarital affairs should be discouraged by establishing a culture of fidelity in the society through education.
10. Different professionals concerned in family issues such as psychologists, counselors, sociologists, lawyers should work in collaboration, to reduce the prevalence and effect of divorce.
11. The mass media should play important role in the betterment of families by teaching the society using different programs.
12. A better law should be enacted that prevents verbal and physical abuse by the spouses in the family. The law already enacted should be implemented.

The researcher believes that these recommendations and suggestion, if implemented would help in strengthening stability of marriage and prevention of their dissolution.

REFERENCES

- AACA, (2004). "Addis Ababa", Addis Ababa City Administration. Website ([http://: www. Addisababacity.gov.et](http://www.Addisababacity.gov.et))
- AACGADO, (2006). *Annual Report on Marriage and Birth*. Addis Ababa: Government printing.
- Adams, B.N. (1986). *The Family: A Sociological Interpretation*. Florida: Harcourt press.
- Amato, P.R & Rogers, S.J (1977). A longitudinal study of marital problems and subsequent Divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, (3), 612-624.
- Black, C (2005). Adultery is not abuse and women don't lie? Fathers for life, Website.([http// www.Fathers for life.org](http://www.Fathers for life.org))
- Bonham, S.P & Balswick, J.O (1980).The Noninstitutions: Divorce, Desertion, and Remarriage, *Journal of Marriage and the Family*.42, (4), 959-972.
- Brinig, M.F & Allen, D.W. (2002). "Why do people Divorce?" Liz note_Website. (<http://:www.lizlibrary.com.>)

- Broody, G.H et al (1988). Serial Marriage: A Heuristic Analysis of an Emerging Family Form, *Psychological Bulletin* 103, (2), 211-222.
- Bullough, V.L & Ruan, F. (1994). Marriage, Divorce and Sexual relations in contemporary China. *Journal of Comparative Family studies*, 25, (3).
- Burns, A. (1984). Perceived causes of marriage breakdown and conditions of life. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 46, (3), 551-562.
- Cleek, M.G. & Pearson, T.A (1985). Perceived causes of Divorce: An analysis of Interrelationship. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 47 (1), 179-183.
- Crouch, J (2005). "Why divorce rate increased?" Divorce reform page, website. ([http// www.divorcereform.com](http://www.divorcereform.com))
- Diekmann, A & Schmidheiny, K. (2004). The intergeneration Transmission of Divorce. Results from a Fifteen-country study with the fertility and Family survey, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, *FFS Report*.
- "Divorce." *Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia*. 2005ed

- Elkin, M (1977). Premarital Counseling for Minors: The Losangeles Experience. *The Family Coordinator* 26, (4), 419-443.
- FIDA, (1990) *A Kenyan Woman Guide to the Law*. Nairobi: FIDA.
- Gibson, C. (1974). The Association between Divorce and Social class in England and Wales. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 25, (1), 79-93.
- Glass, S.P & Write, T.L. (1977). The relationship of Extramarital sex, length of Marriage, and Sex Differences on Marital Satisfaction and Romanticism: Athanasiou's data Reanalyzed. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 39, (4), 691-701.
- Glick, P.C & Lin, S.L (1987). Remarriage and Divorce: Recent changes and Demographic variations, *Sociological perspective*, 30, (2), 162 – 179.
- Goodman, K.L (1983). *Divorce and Remarriage. Problems Adaptations and Adjustments*. London: Green wood press.
- Gottmann, J.M. (1994). *What Predicts Divorce? : The Relationship between Martial Processes and Martial out_comes.*_Newjersy: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Guttman, J. (1993) *Divorce in Psychosocial Perspective: Theory and Research*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Association.
- Hall, D.R (1996). Marriage as a Pure Relationship: Exploring the Link between Premarital Cohabitation and Divorce in Canada. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 27, (1).
- Hawkin, D.N & Booth, A. (2005) Unhappily Ever After: Effects of Long Term, Low-Quality Marriage on Well-Being. *Social forces*, 84, (1).
- Heckert, D.A. et al (1998). The Impact of Husband's and wife's Relative Earning on Marital Disruption. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, (3), 690 – 703.
- Hou, F & Omwanda, L.O. (1997). A Multilevel Analysis of the Connection between Female Labor Force Participation and Divorce in Canada. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 38, (4), 271.
- Jocklin, et al (1996) Personality and Divorce: A Genetic Analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, (2), 288.
- Kammeyer, K.W (1987). *Marriage and Family: A Foundation for Personal Decisions*. USA: Allyn and Bacon Inc.

- Kiernan, K. E & Cherlin, A J. (1999). Parental Divorce and Partnership Dissolution in Adulthood: Evidence from a British Cohort Study. *Population Studies*, 53, (1), 39 – 48.
- Lee, K. (2005) “Divorce stinks” Divorce info. Website. ([http://:www.divorceinfo.com](http://www.divorceinfo.com))
- Levinger, G. (1965). Marital Cohesiveness and Dissolution: An Integrative Review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 27, (1), 19-28.
- Lichtenberger, J.P. (1931) *Divorce: A Social Interpretation*. New York: whittlesey House.
- Mazur, A. (1998). Marriage, Divorce, and Male Testosterone. *Social Forces*, 77, (1), 315-330.
- Mc Rae, et al. (1998) Effects of Parental Divorce on Mental Health Through out the Life Course. *American sociological Review*, 63, (2), 239-249.
- Olson, D.H & Defrain, J. (2000.) *Marriage and the Family. Diversity and Strengths*. California: Mayfield publishing company.
- OMI, (2005). “What causes divorce and how can we prevent it?” Oklahoma Marriage Initiative, Website.

- Savaya, R & Cohen, O. (2003). Life Style Differences in Traditionalism and Modernity and Reasons for Divorce among Muslim Palestinian Citizens of Israel. *Journal of comparative Family studies*, 34, (2), 283.
- Stack, S & Bankowski, E (1994). Divorce and Drinking: An Analysis of Russian Data. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56, (4), 805-812.
- Tilson D, Larsen U. (2000). Divorce in Ethiopia: the Impact of Early Marriage and Childlessness. *Journal of Biosocial Science*, 32, (32), 355-72.
- Woldegiorgis, O. (2005) *"The Federal Constitution, the Revised Family Law, and the National Policy on Ethiopian Women"*. Addis Ababa: PANOS - EHTIOPIA
- Wolcott, I & Hughes, J. (1999). Towards understanding the reasons for divorce. *Working Paper*, 20.
- Write. G.C & Stetson, D.M (1978). The Impact of No-Fault Divorce Law Reform on Divorce in American states. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 40, (3), 575-580.

Appendix A.

Pearson correlation of pertinent

Contributing factors.

Table A1 Correlation between contributing factors for males

CORRELATED CONTRIBUTING FACTORS (Males)	DEGREE OF PEARSON CORRELATION γ
Physical abuse (self) & verbal abuse (self)	0.714
Extramarital affairs (spouse) & child birth from another partner (sp.)	0.652
Incompatible behavior & failed expectation (self)	0.624
Verbal abuse (self)& lack of interest (self)	0.606
Physical abuse (self) & desertion (spouse)	0.600
Physical abuse (self) and suspiciousness and jealousy (self)	0.598
Verbal abuse (self) and desertion (spouse)	0.562
Lack of happiness (self) and failed expectation (self)	0.549
Suspiciousness and jealousy (self) and verbal abuse (self)	0.546
Physical abuse (spouse) & cruelty (spouse)	0.533
Inferiority (self) and Inferiority (spouse)	0.508
Verbal abuse (self) and stinginess (self)	0.507
Incompatible behavior and verbal abuse (self)	0.506
Financial problem and inferiority (self)	0.503
Alcoholism self and physical abuse (self)	0.498
Incompatible behavior and compunction problem	0.493
Financial problem and Inferiority (spouse)	0.486
Financial problem and inadequate housing	0.483
Financial problem and verbal abuse (self)	0.480
Lack of happiness (self) and lack interest (self)	0.480
Desertion (self) and desertion (spouse)	-0.480
Inferiority (self) and stinginess (self)	0.478

Incompatible behavior and physical abuse (self)	0.468
Alcoholism (self) and smoking (self)	0.468
Incompatible behavior and lack of interest	0.464
Verbal abuse (spouse) and cruelty (spouse)	0.461
Financial problem and physical abuse (self)	0.459
Financial problem and incompatible behavior	0.458
Physical abuse (self) and Immaturity (spouse)	0.458
Alcoholism (self) and Gambling (self)	0.458
Smoking (self) and Physical abuse (self)	0.458
Smoking (self) and Gambling (self)	0.458
Incompatible behavior and lack of happiness	0.457
Alcoholism (self) and suspiciousness and jealousy (self)	0.455
Smoking (self) and Khat abuse (self)	0.455
Physical abuse (spouse) and Inferiority (spouse)	0.451
Incompatible behavior and stinginess (self)	0.447
Verbal abuse (spouse) and physical abuse (spouse)	0.447
Desertion (spouse) and Lack of interest (self)	0.439
Alcoholism (self) and financial problem	0.438
Communication problem and Lack of happiness (self)	0.436
Gambling (self) and Khat abuse (self)	0.430
Stinginess (self) and Lack of interest (self)	0.424
Desertion (spouse) and Gambling (self)	0.421
Physical abuse (self) and Inferiority (spouse)	0.417
Physical abuse (self) and Smoking (self)	0.415
Physical abuse (self) and Inferiority (self)	0.413
Verbal abuse (self) and Inferiority (self)	0.412

Lack of happiness (self) and Stinginess (self)	0.411
Verbal abuse (spouse) and Physical abuse (self)	0.410
Alcoholism (self) and Inadequate housing	0.409
Financial problem and Stagnation (self)	0.407
Physical abuse (self) and Lack of interest (self)	0.406
Lack of happiness (self) and Verbal abuse (self)	0.402
Smoking (self) and Physical abuse (self)	0.402
Physical abuse (self) and Stinginess (self)	0.401
Stinginess (self) and Desertion (spouse)	0.401
Physical abuse (spouse) and Inferiority (spouse)	0.400

Table A2. Correlation between contributing factors for females

CORRELATED CONTRIBUTING FACTORS (Females)	DEGREE OF PEARSON CORRELATION γ
Lack of happiness (self) and failed expectation (self)	0.682
Failed expectation (spouse) and Lack of interest (spouse)	0.682
Verbal abuse (spouse) and Physical abuse (spouse)	0.633
Extramarital affairs (spouse) and cruelty (spouse)	0.656
Stinginess (spouse) and cruelty (spouse)	0.656
Irresponsibility (spouse) and Physical abuse (spouse)	0.629
Communication problem and Incompatible behavior	0.620
Communication problem and verbal abuse (spouse)	0.599
Lack of happiness (spouse) and Lack of interest (spouse)	0.593
Lack of happiness (spouse) and failed expectation (spouse)	0.587
Inferiority (self) and Inferiority (spouse)	0.568
Khat abuse (spouse) and Imprisonment (spouse)	0.565
Alcoholism (spouse) and Smoking (spouse)	0.565
Lack of interest (self) and failed expectation (self)	0.560
Lack of interest (self) and Lack of happiness (self)	0.559
Incompatible behavior and lack of happiness (self)	0.543
Incompatible behavior and failed of happiness (self)	0.540
Failed expectation (spouse) and Immaturity (spouse)	0.536
Inferiority (spouse) and Physical abuse (self)	0.522
Communication problem and Failed expectation (self)	0.513
Incompatible behavior and Lack of happiness (spouse)	0.510
Communication problem and failed expectation (spouse)	0.508

Failed expectation (self) and Failed expectation (spouse)	0.507
Cruelty (self) and Verbal abuse (self)	0.502
Lack of interest (spouse) and irresponsibility (spouse)	0.502
Failed expectation (self) and Immaturity (self)	0.500
Communication problem and Immaturity (self)	0.497
Communication problem and Lack of happiness (self)	0.496
Smoking (self) and Imprisonment (self)	0.490
Financial problem and Inferiority (self)	0.485
Immaturity (spouse) and failed expectation (self)	0.480
Incompatible behavior and Immaturity (self)	0.480
Extramarital affairs (self) and Verbal abuse (self)	0.480
Verbal abuse (self) and Stinginess (self)	0.480
Incompatible behavior and verbal abuse (spouse)	0.497
Alcoholism (spouse) and Lack of happiness (self)	0.477
Financial problems and Inferiority of (spouse)	0.476
Lack of happiness (self) and Cruelty (spouse)	0.475
Incompatible behavior and Immaturity (spouse)	0.468
Incompatible behavior and Lack of interest (spouse)	0.466
Wide age difference and Inferiority (spouse)	0.466
Immaturity (self) and Lack of interest (spouse)	0.466
Lack of happiness (self) and Immaturity (self)	0.463
Immaturity (self) and Failed expectation (spouse)	0.461
Inferiority (spouse) and Inferiority (self)	0.457
Inadequate housing and Immaturity (spouse)	0.450
Communication problem and Lack of interest (spouse)	0.448
Sexual incompatibility and Financial problem	0.448
Immaturity (spouse) and Lack of interest (spouse)	0.448

Appendix B.

Questionnaire used for data collection in the research.

The English version.

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
(DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY)

**A QUESTIONNAIRE PREPARED TO
STUDY THE PERCEIVED
DETERMINANTS OF DIVORCE
AMONG THE RESIDENTS OF
ADDIS ABABA**

December 2005
Addis Ababa

6. ሀይማኖት

- በቀድሞ ትዳርዎ ወቅት የእርስዎ ሀይማኖት

ኦርቶዶክስ

ካቶሊክ ሙስሊም

ፕሮቴስታንት ሌላ

መልስዎ "ሌላ" ከሆነ ይግለፁት _____

- በቀድሞ ትዳርዎ ወቅት የቀድሞ ባለቤትዎ ሀይማኖት

ኦርቶዶክስ

ሙስሊም

ካቶሊክ

ሌላ

ፕሮቴስታንት

መልስዎ "ሌላ" ከሆነ ይግለፁት _____

7. ጋብቻዎ ባህላዊ ማለትም በቤተሰብ የተዘጋጀ ነበርን ?

አዎ

አይልነበረም

Dear Respondent

This Questionnaire is prepared to collect data for a research. The research focuses in identifying the determinants of divorce among the residents of Addis Ababa. It is with great respect that we request you to fill out this questionnaire. The responses you give will be used for the sole purpose of the study and will not be given to any other third party. Confidentiality is well observed. You do not have to write your name. It is believed that the result of this study will be significant in the Quest of finding solutions for the family and the society at large in the area of divorce. We thus request you to respond to each item with care and sincerity.

Thank you.

PART I BACK GROUND INFORMATION

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING ITEMS IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

1. AGE AT THE PREVIOUS MARRIAGE.

- Your age at the previous marriage _____
- Your ex-spouse's age at the previous marriage _____

2. SEX

- Male
- Female

3. ETHNIC ORIGIN

- Your ethnic origin _____
- Your ex-spouse's ethnic origin _____

4. OCCUPATION

- You occupation (during the previous marriage)

- Your ex-spouse's occupation (during the previous marriage)

5. EDUCATIONAL STATUS

- Your educational status (at the time of the marriage) _____

- Your ex-spouse's educational states (at the time of the marriage)

6. RELIGION.

- Your religion (at the previous marriage)

Orthodox

Muslim

Catholic

Others

Protestant

Specify _____

- Your ex-spouse's religion (at the previous marriage)

Orthodox

Muslim

Catholic

Others

Protestant

Specify _____

7. Was your marriage traditional? (i.e. arranged by your family?)

Yes

No

8. Were you legally married?

Yes

No

9. How long were you engaged? _____

10. Did you live with your ex-spouse before the marriage?

Yes

No

If yes, for how long? _____

11. Did you have sexual relationship with your ex-spouse before the marriage?

Yes

No

12. Was there premarital pregnancy?

Yes

No

13. Did you have premarital counseling before your previous marriage?

Yes

No

14. How many children do you have from your previous marriage? _____

15. What was the duration of your previous marriage? _____

16. Who did file for divorce?

Yourself

Your ex-spouse

Both

17. Divorce certificate.

▪ Did you take divorce certificate?

Yes

No

▪ Did your ex-spouse take divorce certificate?

Yes

No

I do not know

18. How many divorces did you have? _____

19. Remarriage.

- Are you remarried?

Yes

No

If yes, how long after the divorce? _____

Had your present spouse had a divorce?

Yes

No

- Is your exspouse remarried?

Yes

No

I do not know

- If yes, how long after the divorce? _____

Had your present spouse of your ex-spouse had a divorce?

Yes

No

20. Parental divorce.

- Were your parents divorced?

Yes

No

- Were your ex-spouse's parents divorced?

Yes

No

PART II = LIST OF DETERMINANTS

The following is a list of factors contributing to the dissolution of marriage. There are two boxes in front of each factor. One box is for "Yes" and the other box is for "No". If the factor was present in your previous marriage and if you believe that it contributed to the dissolution of the marriage please put a mark (✓) in the first "Yes" box. If the factor was not present in your previous marriage and did not contribute to the dissolution of the marriage, please put a mark (✓) in the second "No" box.

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
(1) = Communication problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) = Incompatible behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) = Sexual incompatibility.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) = Financial problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(5) = Lack of happiness. (Self).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(6) = Lack of happiness. (Spouse).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(7) = Religious differences.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(8) = Failed expectations (Self).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(9) = Failed expectations (Spouse).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(10) = Friction with relatives (in-laws).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(11) = Disagreement over children.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (12) = Extramarital affairs (self). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (13) = Extramarital affairs (spouse). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (14) = Cruelty (self). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (15) = Cruelty (spouse). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (16) = Wide age difference. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (17) = Immaturity in the area of marriage and the family (self). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (18) = Immaturity in the area of marriage and the family (spouse). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (19) = Lack of interest (self). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (20) = Lack of interest (spouse). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (21) = Work holism (self). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (22) = Work holism (Spouse). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (23) = Suspiciousness and Jealousy (Self). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (24) = Suspiciousness and Jealous(spouse). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (25) = Irresponsibility (spouse). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 26) = Irresponsibility (Self). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (27) = Infertility (Self). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (28) = Infertility (spouse). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (29) = Repeated or long term separation. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (30) = Mental illness (Self). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (31) = Mental illness (spouse). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- (53) = Desertion (Self).
- (54) = Desertion (Spouse).
- (55) = Imprisonment (Self).
- (56) = Imprisonment (Spouse).
- (57) = Child birth from another partner (Self).
- (58) = Child birth from another partner (Spouse).
- (59) = Physical injury (Self).
- (60) = Physical injury (Spouse).

PART III = PERCEIVED MAIN REASONS OF
DIVORCE

In your opinion, what are the main three reasons for your divorce? Please write them in the space provided in descending order of their significance.

1 = _____
2 = _____
3 = _____

Thank you for your precious time spent in filling this questionnaire and thank you for your cooperation.

Appendix C.

Questionnaire used for data collection in the research.

The Amharic version.

በአዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ
የጽህፈት ምርመራ ትምህርት ቤት
የትምህርት ሳይኮሎጂ ክፍል

በአዲስ አበባ ከተማ ነዋሪዎች ዘንድ ሰፍቶ
የሚኖሩት ምክንያቶችን ለማወቅ ለሚደረግ
ጥናት የተዘጋጀ መጠይቅ

ታህሳስ 1998

አዲስ አበባ

የተከበሩ ተጠያቂ

ይህ መጠይቅ የተዘጋጀው ለአንድ ጥናት መረጃ ለመሰብሰብ ነው። ጥናቱ በአዲስ አበባ ከተማ ነዋሪዎች ዘንድ ለፍቺ የሚያደርሱ ምክንያቶችን ለይቶ በማወቅ ላይ ያተኩራል። ይህንን መጠይቅ እንዲሞሉ ስንጠይቅዎ ከታላቅ አክብሮት ጋ ነው። በዚህ መጠይቅ ውስጥ ላሉ ጥያቄዎች የሚሰጡአቸው መልሶች ለጥናቱ ብቻ የምንጠቀምባቸው ሲሆን የሞሉትም መጠይቅ ለሌላ ለማንም ሶስተኛ አካል ታልፎ አይሰጥም። የዚህ መጠይቅ ሚስጥራዊነት በሚገባ የሚጠበቅ ነው። በመጠይቁ በየትኛውም ስፍራ ስምዎን መጻፍ አያስፈልግዎትም። የዚህ ጥናት ውጤት በፍቺ ዙሪያ ያሉ ችግሮችን በቤተሰብና በሕብረተሰብም ደረጃ ለመፍታት ለሚደረገው ጥረት እጅግ ጠቃሚ ነው ተብሎ ይታመናል። ስለዚህ እርስዎ በመጠይቁ ውስጥ ያሉትን እያንዳንዱን ጥያቄዎች በጥንቃቄ በማንበብ መልስዎን እንዲሞሉልን በትህትና እንጠይቃለን።

ክፍል 1 አጠቃላይ መረጃ

ለሚከተሉት ጥያቄዎች በተዘጋጀው ስፍራ ላይ መልስዎን ይስጡ።

1. እድሜ።

- በቀድሞ ጋብቻዎ ወቅት እርስዎ የነበሩበት እድሜ _____
- በቀድሞ ጋብቻዎ ወቅት የቀድሞ ባለቤትዎ የነበሩበት እድሜ _____

2. የታ

- ወንድ
- ሴት

3. ብሔር

- የእርስዎ ብሔር _____
- የቀድሞ ባለቤትዎ ብሔር _____

4. ስራ

- በቀድሞ ትዳርዎ ወቅት እርስዎ ተሰማርተውበት የነበረ ስራ _____
- በቀድሞ ትዳርዎ ወቅት የቀድሞ ባለቤትዎ ተሰማርተውበት የነበረ ስራ _____

5. የትምህርት ደረጃ

- በቀድሞ ጋብቻዎ ወቅት እርስዎ የነበረዎት የትምህርት ደረጃ። _____
- በቀድሞ ጋብቻዎ ወቅት የቀድሞ ባለቤትዎ የነበሩበት የትምህርት ደረጃ። _____

8. ጋብቻዎ የተፈፀመው በህግ ነበርን?

አዎ

አይደለም

9. ከቀድሞ ባለቤትዎ ጋ በእጮኝነት ለስንት ጊዜ ቆያችሁ?

10. ከጋብቻ በፊት ከቀድሞ ባለቤትዎ ጋ አብራችሁ ኖራችኋል?

አዎ

አልኖርንም

መልስዎ "አዎ" ከሆነ ለስንት ጊዜ ?

11. ከጋብቻ በፊት ከቀድሞ ባለቤትዎ ጋ የግብረስጋ ግንኙነት ነበርዎትን ?

አዎ

አልነበረንም

12. ከቀድሞ ጋብቻዎ በፊት ቅድመ ጋብቻ እርግዝና ነበርን ?

አዎ

አልነበረም

13. ከቀድሞ ጋብቻዎ በፊት ቅድመ ጋብቻ የምክር አገልግሎት አግኝታችሁ ነበርን ?

አዎ

አላገኘንም

መልስዎ እዎ ከሆነ የምክር አገልግሎቱ የተሰጣችሁ የት ነበር ?

14. በቀድሞ ትዳርዎ ስንት ልጆች አፍርተዋል?

15. የቀድሞ ትዳርዎ ለስንት ዘመን (ጊዜ) ቆየ ?

16. ፍቺ የጠየቀው ማን ነበር ?

እርስዎ

የቀድሞ ባለቤትዎ

ሁለታችሁም በስምምነት

17. የፍቺ የምስክር ወረቀት

• እርስዎ የፍቺ ማስረጃ የምስክር ወረቀት ወስደዋልን ?

አዎ

አልወሰድኩም

• የቀድሞ ባለቤትዎ የፍቺ ማስረጃ የምስክር ወረቀት ወስደዋልን ?

አዎ

አልወሰደም

አላውቅም

18. በህይወት ዘመንዎ ስንት ጊዜ ፍቺ ፈፀመዋል ?

19. ከፍቺ በኋላ የተፈፀመ ጋብቻ

• ካለፈው ፍቺ በኋላ እርስዎ ጋብቻ ፈፀመዋልን ?

አዎ

አልፈ.ፀምኩም

መልስዎ "አዎ" ከሆነ ፍቺው ከተፈፀመ ከስንት

ጊዜ በኋላ አገቡ ? _____

• የአሁኑ ባለቤትዎ ፍቺ ፈፀመው ያውቃሉን ?

አዎ

አያውቁም

አላውቅም

• ካለፈው ፍቺ በኋላ የቀድሞ ባለቤትዎ ጋብቻ ፈፀመዋልን ?

አዎ

አያውቁም

አላውቅም

መልስዎ "አዎ" ከሆነ ከፍቺው ከስንት ጊዜ በኋላ

አገቡ ? _____

የቀድሞ ባለቤትዎ የአሁን ባለቤት ፍቺ ፈፀመው

ያውቃሉን ? _____

አዎ

አያውቁም

አላውቅም

20. የወላጆች ፍቺ።

• የእርሶ ወላጆች ፍቺ ፈፀመው ነበርን ?

አዎ

• አልፈ.ፀመ.ም

• የቀድሞ ባለቤትዎ ወላጆች ፍቺ ፈፀመው ነበርን ?

አዎ

አያውቁም

አላውቅም

ክፍል II

የፍቺ ምክንያቶች ዝርዝር

ከዚህ በታች የተዘረዘሩትን በተለያዩ ጥናቶች የፍቺ ምክንያቶች ናቸው ተብለው የተጠቀሙ ናቸው። በእያንዳንዱ የፍቺ ምክንያት ፊት ሁለት ሳጥኖች አሉ። የመጀመሪያው ሳጥን "አዎ" ለሚል መልስ የተዘጋጀ ሲሆን ሁለተኛው ደግሞ "አይደለም" ለሚለው መልስ የተዘጋጀ ነው። የተጠቀሰው ምክንያት በትዳርዎ የነበረና ለትዳርዎ መፍረስ አስተዋፅዖ ነበረው ብለው ካመኑ "አዎ" በሚለው (በመጀመሪያው) ሳጥን ውስጥ ምልክትን እንደሚከተለው ያድርጉ።

የተጠቀሰው ምክንያት ግን በትዳርዎ ውስጥ ያልነበረና ለትዳርዎም መፍረስ አስተዋፅኦ ካልነበረው "አይደለም" በሚለው (በሁለተኛው) ሳጥን ውስጥ ምልክትን እንደሚከተለው ያድርጉ

	<u>አዎ</u>	<u>አይደለም</u>
1 = በንግግር አለመግባባት ወይም በበቂ ሁኔታ አለመነጋገር	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2 = የባህሪ አለመጣጣም ወይም አለመግባባት	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 = በግብረ ስጋ ግንኙነት አለመግባባት	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4 = የገንዘብ ችግር	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5 = ደስታ ማጣት (እርስዎ)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6 = ደስታ ማጣት (የቀድሞ ባለቤትዎ)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7 = የሃይማኖት ልዩነት	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8 = ትዳርን እንደጠበቁት ሆኖ አለመግኘት (እርስዎ)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9 = ትዳርን እንደጠበቁት ሆኖ አለመግኘት (የቀድሞ ባለቤት)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10 = ከዘመዶች ጋር የሚፈጠር አለመግባባት ወይም የዘመድ ጣልቃ ገብነት።	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11 = ልጆችን በተመለከተ አለመግባባት።	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ከፍል III ለፍቺ ዋነኛ ምክንያቶች

በእርስዎ የግል አስተያየት ለቀድሞው ትዳርዎ መፍረስ ዋነኛ ናቸው የሚሉት ሦስት ዋነኛ ምክንያቶች ምንድን ናቸው? ከዚህ በታች በተሰጠው ስፍራ በዋናነት ደረጃቸው ቅደም ተከተል ይጻፏቸው።

1 = _____

2 = _____

3 = _____

የተወደደ ጊዜዎትን ሰውተው ይህንን መጠይቅ ለመሙላት ስለተባበሩን እናመሰግናለን።

* * *

Appendix D.

The Structured Interview.

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

This structured interview is prepared to be used in a research to study the pertinent contributing factors to divorce among the resident of Addis Ababa. I thank you for participating in this interview. Your name will not be revealed and confidentiality is strictly observed. The opinion and information that you give will be used for the sole purpose of the research.

PART I: IDENTIFICATION.

Name: _____

Profession: _____

Duration of service: _____

PART II: QUESTIONS.

- 2.1: According to your experience and observation, what do you think are "reasons" for divorce or contributing factors to divorce in Addis Ababa?
- 2.2: What do you suggest should be done to reduce the rate of divorce in Addis Ababa and prevent dissolution of marriage?

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work


Name: WODAJENEH MEHARENE

Signature: 

Date of submission: JUNE 16/2006

This thesis has been submitted for examination by my approval as a university advisor.

Name: Dr. Sa

Signature: 

Date of submission: 14/06/08