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Abstract
This study's purpose was to establish the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students of main campuses in Nakuru County. Social Learning Theory by Albert Bandura and Person-Centred Theory by Carl Rogers guided the study. The study was carried out among 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th-year undergraduate students from main campuses in Nakuru County. The study adopted a correlational research design. The target population was 18570 undergraduate students. The accessible population was 8456 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th-year undergraduate students whose sample was 367. Respondents were selected by applying the simple random sampling technique. The study included a sample of 10 peer counsellors and 2 student counsellors from the Egerton University and Kabarak University main campuses who were selected through purposive sampling. Data were obtained using a questionnaire for undergraduate students, focus group discussions guide for peer counsellors and interview schedule for student counsellors. Validation of research instruments was done through peer and expert review and also through pilot testing, which was done in Mount Kenya University (MKU) - Nakuru Campus. Quantitative data was analysed by both inferential and descriptive statistics using SPSS Version 25, whereas the qualitative data was analysed thematically. The analysed data was presented in tables, graphs, and narratives. The findings indicated that the majority of the respondents were of the view that socioeconomic status influences risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students.
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Introduction
Risky sexual behaviours have become significant all over the world and may affect the undergraduate students' experiences in many ways including exposure to sexually transmitted diseases and unintended pregnancies, abortions, negative academic performance, inability to progress through the university academic years, decision to remain at university and overall psychological well-being. In the context of this study, the risky sexual behaviours may refer to unprotected penetrative sexual contact, prostitution, multiple sexual partners, sexual intercourse under the influence of alcohol and drugs, lack of contraceptive use, sexual intercourse under coercion and sexual abuse among undergraduate students. Research has been done globally and regionally on the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students. However, there was little research on the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students in Kenya and particularly Nakuru County. The study, thus, aimed at closing this gap by investigating the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students with a focus on selected universities in Nakuru County, Kenya.

Socioeconomic status may influence risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students as one of the factors statistically associated with risky sexual behaviour is financial hardship (Levesque et al., 2016). Mellins et al. (2017) noted that one of the factors associated with increased risk for group and multiple sexual partners included difficulty paying for basic necessities. Rios-Zertuche et al. (2017) noted that poor adolescents in Costa Rica begin sexual activities early and undertake behaviours that increase their risk of unwanted pregnancies and sexually transmitted infections. In Africa, socioeconomic status was identified as one of the psychosocial factors that may influence risky sexual behaviour (Adanikin, Adanikin, Orji, & Adeyanju, 2017; Berhan, & Berhan, 2015). In Kenya, Embleton et al. (2015) noted that young people living in HIV-prone situations endemic settings face unique sexual health risks, and in the context of abject poverty, orphan-hood, social marginalisation, and discrimination, young people may be particularly at-risk of horizontal HIV transmission.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Research has shown that the socioeconomic status of an individual can lead to risky sexual behaviours including prostitution (Kamruzzaman, & Hakim, 2016; Vanwesenbeeck, 2017; Picos, Gonzalez, & Gutierrez, 2017). Sanders and Hardy (2015) observed that robust academic research on the topic of students involved in the sex industry was in its infancy, yet the relationship appeared consistent and permanent. Sagar et al. (2015) discussed student sex workers in higher education in Wales from an institutional perspective and found that staff members' knowledge on the legalities of sex work and on appropriate referral pathways was inadequate. Whereas some institutions, as well as some of their staff, deemed that student involvement in sex work would result in ruining the reputation of the university and/or the profession for which the student was training, other institutions and staff indicated that student sex work required a personal approach, which could offer support in different areas. Therefore, this study sought to establish the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students.

In the USA, Updegrove, Muftic and Niebuhr (2018) drew upon the economic model of risky sexual behaviour of prostitution to explore the relationship between gender, prostitution role, and criminal justice system outcomes. Benoit, Jansson, Smith and Flagg (2017) observed that stigma was a fundamental determinant of behaviour, well-being, and health for many marginalised groups, but sex workers were notably absent from their analyses and therefore gave special attention to its negative effect on the working conditions, personal lives, and health of sex workers. Prostitution among undergraduate students has
to do with benefits motivations (Stein, Mongeau, Posteher, & Veluscek, 2018). In China, Bay-Cheng and Goodkind (2016) observed that young women's orientation toward romantic relationships and being single was shaped not only by hetero-normative gender expectations but also by their socioeconomic status (SES). The study focused on women’s romantic relationships influenced by socioeconomic status, whereas this study sought to establish the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students.

In Africa, socioeconomic status may influence risky sexual behaviours (Schalkkwyk, 2018). In agreement, Kangiwa (2015) researched on the problem of prostitution in Ojoo community Ibadan Nigeria. The study identified the socioeconomic factors and conditions that were associated with prostitution. Prostitutes were found to have pathological problems at their backgrounds, and the social relations amongst them were based on the elemental pattern. Ranganathan et al. (2016) noted that young adolescent women in sub-Saharan Africa had three to four times the likelihood of being HIV-positive compared to boys or men. One of the relationship dynamics that was likely to be associated with young women’s increased vulnerability to HIV was transactional sex. Transactional sex was defined as a non-commercial, non-marital sexual relationship whereby sex was exchanged for money and/or gifts.

Roth, Benoit, Jansson, and Hallsgrímsdóttir (2017) noted that Sub-Saharan African HIV/AIDS research emphasised situating studies in locales where new sexual partnerships form and HIV transmission risk is high. The consequences of campus prostitution are dire, as Poku (2017) noted that Sub-Saharan Africa was a region devastated by HIV/AIDS. Also, in South Africa, Coetsee, Jewkes, and Gray (2017) noted that the rate of HIV in the prostitution population was exceedingly high. The above studies focused on the effects of prostitution, whereas this study seeks to establish the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students.

According to Ampt et al. (2017), new interventions were required to reduce unintended pregnancies among female sex workers in low-and middle-income countries and to improve their nutritional health. Derbie, Assefa, Mekonnen, and Biadglegne (2016) noted that youth were foundational to any society. Neglecting their reproductive and sexual health leads to a high social and economic crisis. Prostitution has become a profitable business field for those with money and sex orientation (Irawan, Gultom, & Amsani, 2018).

In Uganda, Swahn et al. (2016) examined the prevalence of and risk factors for engaging in prostitution among youth living in Kampala, Uganda. According to the study, important commonalities in the structural factors that shape the three paradigms of prostitution are gender, inequality and processes of economic change; therefore this study examined the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students.

In South Africa, those who practised risky sexual behaviours with young people because of their socioeconomic status yet they are older than them by ten years were called blessers/blessees as Thobejane, Muludzi and Zitha (2017) noted that most undergraduate students were getting involved with “blessers” mainly for resources or material gain. The majority of the young females indicated that they wouldn’t be in a relationship with a person who doesn’t support them financially, some indicated that if they were in a relationship with a person who does not provide for them, they would find an alternative man (blessor) who will support them financially (Thobejane et al., 2017; Mavhandu-Mudzusi, 2017).
desperate relationships also contribute to prostitution among undergraduate students (Jean, 2017). The above studies focused on the financial demand in exchange for sex among young people, whereas this study aimed at investigating the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students.

In Kenya, Lowthers (2018) noted that young people are attracted to Naivasha's flower farms which depend on a female migrant labour market that operates within a system of intense sexual-economic exchange. Mumbi and Orinda (2019) identified the demographic characteristics for female sex workers associated with uptake of HIV and AIDS combined prevention strategies in Nakuru County. The study adopted a descriptive cross-sectional research design and found that tertiary level of education and long duration in sex work increased the likelihood of uptake of HIV and AIDS combined prevention strategies. Female sex workers residing in Kibra, Kenya, experienced elevated exposure to adverse events, yet the prevalence of parental bereavement was not well characterised (Denckla et al., 2018). The above studies focused on the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviour among tertiary level students and adopted descriptive cross-sectional research design, whereas this study sought to establish the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students.

Ssewanvana et al. (2018) noted a lack of research around the most common forms of sexual risk behaviours among adolescents, including their underlying factors, in Sub-Saharan Africa. The findings showed that transactional sex, early sexual debut, coerced sex, and multiple sexual partnerships were prevalent and mostly driven by socioeconomic status. Percesepe et al. (2016) noted that early initiation of sex work was prevalent among female sex workers worldwide. Sex tourism was an aspect of socioeconomic status of prostitution among undergraduate students (Kibicho, 2016; Berman, 2017; Lorway et al., 2018; Cesnulyte, 2017). Longfield, Glick, Waithaka and Berman (2019) asserted that young women actively sought partners who were willing to spend money on them whereas men looked for partners who were well mannered, need the money and had certain physical attributes. Women's primary incentive for engaging in cross-generational sex was financial and material gain, while men sought younger partners for sexual gratification (Longfield et al. 2019). Therefore, this study sought to establish the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students.

Risky sexual behaviours in the form of prostitution among undergraduate students in Nakuru County seems to be very lucrative because the town gets many visitors both local and foreign, coming for tourism, meetings, seminars, workshops, retreats and many other functions (Ngunjiri, 2018). One of the things raising the image of the lakeside is prostitution which is thriving at an alarming rate. In Nakuru, sex workers operate during the day and openly (Ngunjiri, 2018). The above studies addressed the prevalence of prostitution, whereas this study sought to establish the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students.

**METHODOLOGY**

The researcher applied the correlational research design. The researcher adopted a positivist research philosophy. The location of the study was Nakuru County, where undergraduate students in two main campuses within the county were targeted, namely: Egerton University Njoro Campus and Kabarak University-Main Campus. The study's target population of this study was the undergraduate students of the above-named main campuses. The researcher focused on 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th-year undergraduate students thus constituted the accessible population. Also, ten peer counsellors participated in the focus group discussions, and two student counsellors were interviewed each representing the main campuses. The two campuses were selected using a purposive sampling technique. The selection of study participants was done using simple random sampling technique based on the records of those students who were in session at the
Registrar of Academics office of the two main campuses. The researcher used proportionate sampling to identify the number of respondents required per main campus. The researcher used undergraduate students' questionnaire, peer counsellors' focus group discussions guide and student counsellors' interview schedule for soliciting data from the respondents. To ensure the reliability and validity of the research instruments, a pilot study was done at Mount Kenya University (MKU)-Nakuru campus. Both qualitative and quantitative data were analysed. Inferential and descriptive and statistics were employed in data analysis with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25. The analysed data was presented in tables, graphs and narratives systematically so as to draw useful conclusions and recommendations.

**FINDINGS AND DATA ANALYSIS**

The objective of this study was to establish the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students of main campuses in Nakuru County. In this section, the study established the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students. The students were required to fill the questionnaires; the peer counsellors were asked to give information through focus group discussion (FGD), whereas the student counsellors were asked to give information through the interview schedule.

**Undergraduate Students’ Responses on the Influence of Socioeconomic Status on Risky Sexual Behaviours**

The undergraduate students were asked to give information on their perceptions of the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours. The findings are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ Response Rate</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty can lead to prostitution</td>
<td>25(7.4%)</td>
<td>12(3.6%)</td>
<td>22(6.5%)</td>
<td>130(38.5%)</td>
<td>149(44.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s OK to engage in sex for financial or material gain</td>
<td>205(60.7%)</td>
<td>78(23.1%)</td>
<td>29(8.6%)</td>
<td>15(4.4%)</td>
<td>11(3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s OK to engage in sponsor mentality/ cross-generational sex</td>
<td>207(61.4%)</td>
<td>84(24.9%)</td>
<td>26(7.7%)</td>
<td>15(4.5%)</td>
<td>5(1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s OK to engage in sex orgies/group sex for economic gain</td>
<td>223(66.0%)</td>
<td>78(23.1%)</td>
<td>22(6.5%)</td>
<td>10(3.0%)</td>
<td>5(1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s OK to engage in hook-up culture for financial gain</td>
<td>183(54.8%)</td>
<td>99(29.6%)</td>
<td>33(9.9%)</td>
<td>14(4.2%)</td>
<td>5(1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t fear unplanned pregnancy or STDs or HIV as long as I get financial/material gain</td>
<td>268(79.3%)</td>
<td>38(11.2%)</td>
<td>15(4.4%)</td>
<td>11(3.3%)</td>
<td>6(1.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the results indicated in Table 1 above, it was observed that the proportion of the students who perceived that poverty could lead to prostitution was large. The proportion of respondents who perceived that poverty could lead to prostitution was 279(82.6%). This means that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that majority of students perceived that poverty can lead to prostitution. The results indicate that majority of students perceive that it’s not OK to engage in sex for financial or material gain. From the results, it was observed that 283(83.8%) of the respondents perceive that it’s not OK to engage in sex for financial or material gain. This means that there was...
sufficient evidence to conclude that majority of students perceive it's not OK to engage in sex for financial or material gain. The study also indicates that the majority of the students perceived that it's not OK to engage in sponsor mentality or cross-generation sex. The results indicate that 291(86.3%) of the respondents perceived that it's not OK to engage in sponsor mentality or cross-generation sex. This means that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that majority of students perceive it's not OK to engage in sponsor mentality or cross-generational sex.

The results indicate that majority of students perceive that it's not OK to engage in sex orgies or group sex for economic gain. From the results, it was observed that 301(89.1%) of the respondents perceive that it's not OK to engage in sex orgies or group sex for economic gain. This means that there was sufficient evidence to conclude that majority of students perceive that it's not OK to engage in sex orgies or group sex for economic gain. The study also indicates that the majority of the students perceived that it's not OK to engage in hookup culture for financial gain. The results indicate that the proportion of the students perceived that it's not OK to engage in hookup culture for financial gain was 282(84.4%). This means that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that majority of students perceive that it's not OK to engage in hookup culture for financial gain. The study also indicates that the majority of the students strongly fear unplanned pregnancy or contracting STDs or HIV in the process of engaging in unprotected sex for financial or material gain.

The findings agree with a study by Thobejane et al. (2017), who noted that most undergraduate students were getting involved with “blessers” mainly for resources or material gain. The majority of the young females indicated that they wouldn't be in a relationship with a person who doesn't support them financially; some indicated that if they were in a relationship with a person who does not provide for them, they would find an alternative man (blessor) who will support them financially. The research findings also concur with the study by Sanders and Hardy (2015) who observed that robust academic study regarding students involved in the sex industry was in its infancy, yet the relationship appeared consistent and permanent. Prostitution has become a profitable business field for those with money and sex orientation (Irawan et al., 2018).

The findings also coincide with a study by Longfield et al. (2019) who asserted that young women actively sought partners who were willing to spend money on them whereas men looked for partners who were well mannered, need the money and had certain physical attributes. Women's primary incentive for engaging in cross-generational sex was financial and material gain while men sought younger partners for sexual gratification. Bay-Cheng and Goodkind (2016) also observed that young women’s orientation toward romantic relationships and being single was shaped not only by hetero-normative gender expectations but also by their socioeconomic status (SES). Ssewanvana et al. (2018) noted a lack of research around the most common forms of sexual risk behaviours among adolescents, including their underlying factors, in Sub-Saharan Africa. The findings showed that transactional sex, early sexual debut, coerced sex, and multiple sexual partnerships were prevalent and mostly driven by socioeconomic status. Other research findings in agreement with the study have shown that socioeconomic status of an individual can lead to risky sexual behaviours including prostitution (Kamruzzaman, & Hakim, 2016; Vanwesenbeeck, 2017; Picos et al., 2017, Kangiwa, 2015; Lowthers, 2018; Mumbi, & Orinda, 2019). The study findings also agree with the study by Wamuswa (2018) who noted that risky sexual behaviours in the form of prostitution among undergraduate students in Nakuru County seem to be very lucrative because the town gets many visitors both local and foreign, coming for tourism, meetings, seminars, workshops, retreats and many other functions.

This study further sought to establish the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students, a null hypothesis: $H_0$: There is no statistically significant influence of socioeconomic status
on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students was generated. Undergraduate students’ socioeconomic status was conceptualised by means of composite variables derived from non-missing responses on 6 items measuring the various domains of students’ socioeconomic status in relation to risky sexual behaviours. Chi-square statistical tests were applied to these composite variables to establish their relationship and the findings presented in Table 2.

**Table 1: Chi-square Test Statistics on Influence of Socioeconomic Status on Risky Sexual Behaviours among Undergraduate Student**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ Response Rate</th>
<th>Chi-Squ.</th>
<th>Df.</th>
<th>Asymp.Sig.</th>
<th>Exact Sig.</th>
<th>Point Probab.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty can lead to prostitution</td>
<td>258.953</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s OK to engage in sex for financial or material gain</td>
<td>391.231</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s OK to engage in sponsor mentality/cross-generational sex</td>
<td>417.169</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s OK to engage in sex orgies/group sex for economic gain</td>
<td>496.645</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s OK to engage in hook-up culture for financial gain</td>
<td>751.497</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't fear unplanned pregnancy/STDs or HIV so long as I get financial/material gain</td>
<td>333.665</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 67.6.
b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 67.4.
c. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 66.8.

The chi-square results in Table 2, indicate that the p-value of the areas of the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students was as follows: Poverty can lead to prostitution (.000), it’s OK to engage in sex for financial or material gain (.000), it’s OK to engage in sponsor mentality/cross-generational sex (.000), it’s OK to engage in sex orgies/group sex for economic gain (.000), it’s OK to engage in hook-up culture for financial gain (.000), I don't fear unplanned pregnancy/STDs or HIV so long as I get financial/material gain (.000). Given that all the p-values were less than 0.05, the study rejected the null hypothesis and accepted the alternative hypothesis that there is a statistically significant influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students. This finding implies that socioeconomic status does influence risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students and therefore should be given attention by parents, counsellors, university administrators and all other stakeholders in order to empower undergraduate students on socioeconomic status in order to curb risky sexual behaviours.

The risk factor analysis of the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students was sought. Findings are indicated in Table 3.
Table 2: The risk factor analysis on the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence of Socioeconomic Status on Risky Sexual Behaviours</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>95% confidence interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Odds Ratio for university (Kabarak / Egerton)</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.078 - 0.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For cohort eff12 = strongly disagree</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.852 - 0.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For cohort eff12 = strongly agree</td>
<td>4.296</td>
<td>1.676 - 11.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 indicates the results that give the odd ratio of the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students. It was observed from the analysis that the odds ratio was 0.212, which indicate that the students in private and public university show that there was a strong influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours.

Focus Group Discussions and Interviews Report on the Influence of Socioeconomic Status on Risky Sexual Behaviours among Undergraduate Students

The peer counsellors and student counsellors were requested to give information on the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students. Majority of peer counsellors from Egerton main campus were in agreement that socioeconomic status influences risky sexual behaviours among their peers. The peer counsellors had also handled a number of clients who engage in risky sexual behaviours for financial gain. They noted that due to the humble background of some students, they tend to yield to risky sexual behaviours with sugar mammys and daddies (sponsors) for financial and material gain. Concerning the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours, the Egerton student counsellor reported that socioeconomic status influences risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students in campus. The student counsellor observed that students whose economic status was stable might not engage in risky sexual behaviours in exchange of financial or material benefit, but those who were from low socioeconomic status may yield to sponsor mentality. The student counsellor noted that a good number of clients found themselves in a compromising situation because of their poor background.

The Kabarak peer counsellors also acknowledged that socioeconomic status influences risky sexual behaviours among their fellow peers on campus. The peer counsellors noted that booming business on campus currently was sex for money, especially for those who come from a humble background. The peer counsellors confessed that they had come across cases of clients who had no option but to yield to sexual pressure in order to get food, while others were driven by lifestyle motivated by a number of their fellow peers to yield to sex for an expensive Smartphone or payment of rent in exchange of sex. The peer counsellors noted that sponsor mentality was a reality in campus - those needy students who could not afford fees were tempted to yield to sponsors - some of the sponsors are the ages of their fathers or even older. In agreement, the Kabarak student counsellor acknowledged the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students. The student counsellor gave a report of cases of students who cohabited or engaged in prostitution for financial and material gain in campus. The counsellor further noted that sex for money was a reality and sponsor mentality was practised equally by both genders and had handled a good number of clients who...
had experienced risky sexual behaviours in exchange of financial and material gain especially those from a humble background.

Excerpt One: Peer Counsellors’ and Student Counsellors’ Verbatim Report on the Influence of Socioeconomic Status on Risky Sexual Behaviours

Some Peer Counsellors’ Responses during Focus Group Discussions (FGD)

Egerton Main Campus

Researcher: How does socioeconomic status influence risky sexual behaviours among your fellow peers?

Respondent 1: I have handled a case of a lady client who engaged in risky sexual behaviours for financial gain.

Respondent 2: Due to the humble background of some students, they tend to yield to risky sexual behaviours with sugar mammys and daddies (sponsors) for financial and material gain.

Kabarak Main Campus

Researcher: How does socioeconomic status influence risky sexual behaviours among your fellow peers?

Respondent 1: The booming business on campus currently is sex for money, especially for those who come from a humble background.

Respondent 2: I have come across cases of clients who have no option but to yield to sexual pressure in order to get food.

Student Counsellors’ Responses during the Interviews

Egerton Main Campus

Researcher: How does socioeconomic status influence risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students?

Respondent: Definitely socioeconomic status influence risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students. If students know that their economic status is stable, then they cannot engage in risky sexual behaviours in exchange of financial or material benefit, but those who are from low socioeconomic status may yield to sponsor mentality. A good number of our students have found themselves in a compromising situation because of their poor background, and they are supposed to gather for their basic needs as students.

Kabarak Main Campus

Researcher: How does socioeconomic status influence risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students?

Respondent: There are cases of students who cohabit or engage in prostitution for financial and material gain in campus. Sex for money is a reality. Sponsor mentality is practised equally by both genders. I have handled a good number of clients who experienced risky sexual behaviours in exchange for financial and material gain, especially those from a humble background.

CONCLUSIONS

On the influence of socioeconomic status on risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students: A case study of main campuses in Nakuru County, results indicate that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that majority of undergraduate students perceive that poverty can lead to prostitution and it’s not OK to engage in sex for financial or material gain. There is also sufficient evidence to conclude that majority of students perceive it’s not OK to engage in sponsor mentality or cross-generational sex. The study also indicates that the majority of the students strongly fear unplanned pregnancy or contracting STDs or HIV in comparison to financial or material gain.
RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to address the socioeconomic status of the needy students who may be vulnerable to risky sexual behaviours, the university management and administrators should enhance alternative sources of finances like work-study scholarship, the political class should avail more finances for bursaries, and the government should increase HELB loan allocation in order to help the needy students pay fees and get pocket money hence counter prostitution and sponsor mentality which are risky sexual behaviours among undergraduate students.
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