

WWJMRD 2021; 7(7): 24-25 www.wwjmrd.com International Journal Peer Reviewed Journal Refereed Journal Indexed Journal Impact Factor SJIF 2017: 5.182 2018: 5.51, (ISI) 2020-2021: 1.361 E.ISSN: 2454-6615

DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/TEJBH

Bhanu B.S

Research scholar, Dept of Psychology, Bangalore University, Bengaluru India

Dr. Sreenivas M

Associate Professors, Dept of Psychology, Bangalore University, Bengaluru India

Role of marriage on psychological wellbeing among young adults

Bhanu B.S. Dr. Sreenivas M

Abstract

Marriage is one of the major components in our life. Most of us think it is the turning point and also marriage place's vital role in our society which is finding changes. The major change is cohabitation. Marriage and cohabitation both have its merits and demerits keeping above points in view the present study was undertaken to find out the psychological wellbeing of married and cohabited young adults were taken for the study. Total (N=60) married and (N=60) cohabited young adults (only men) were included in the study. Psychological wellbeing questionnaire developed by (Sisoda and Choudary 2012) was administered. The obtained result shows that there is a significant difference between Marriage and cohabitation young adults in their psychological wellbeing scale score.

Keywords: Psychological wellbeing, marriage, cohabitation

Introduction

Marriage is the form of universal custom and it is a history of being together. There are many benefits in marriage Myers (2000) reports Married people tend to be happier than unmarried the transition into a marriage brings happiness, wellbeing, mental health. Winker (1998) reports married couples are in more harmony than not married. Marriage is a part of live as most of the youngsters are changing their way of marriage, as marriage is no longer dictated as a social norm. People have the freedom to stay without marriage it's their personal choice. In most of the Asian country's marriage is a social norm but in western countries youngsters choose cohabitation which is also called as trail marriage. Cohabitation is derived from Latin word Cohabitare which means together dwell or cohabit or coexist. It has become a social stigma. Scott (1998) reports changing attitude towards pre-marital life is striking. Keeping the views of the previous research the present study undertaken to explore the psychological wellbeing among the married men and cohabited men.

Methodology

Problem

To study the role of marriage and cohabitation on psychological wellbeing among young adults.

Aim

Aim of the study is to explore the role of married men and cohabitation men on psychological wellbeing.

Objectives:

The objective of the study is

To determine the psychological wellbeing in married and cohabited young adults.

Hypotheses

The hypothesis are as follows:

Correspondence: Bhanu B.S

Research scholar, Dept of Psychology, Bangalore University, Bengaluru India **H1:** There is a significant difference between married men and cohabited men on psychological well being

Operational Definition:

Cohabitation: The state of living together and without being married.

Marriage: The legally or formally recognized union of two people as partners in a personal relationship (historically and in some jurisdictions specifically a union between a man and a woman).

Psychological wellbeing

The wellbeing of our mental state, the positive health and satisfaction of being happy.

Research Design

The present research design is between group research designs.

Sample

The present study contains 60 married men and 60 cohabited men who are in a relationship from past 2 years. Snow ball sampling was used.

The Inclusion Criteria

- Married men age range between 21-30 years who are married within 2 years and without children.
- Cohabited men age range between 21-30 years with minimum 3 months to 2 years in cohabitation.
- Residents of Bengaluru.

The Exclusive Criteria:

- Married men below the age of 21 and above 30 years of age.
- Cohabited men below the age of 21 and above 30 years of age.
- Married and cohabited Men who are living in outside Bengaluru District.

Materials

Psychological wellbeing scale (PWBS – SDCP) Dr. Devendra Singh hod Sisodia, Udaipur (raj.) Ms. Pooja Choudary research scholar Udaipur. (Raj.) (2012). The scale consists of 50 items in areas. The scale has 5 subscales. This is five-point Likert scale with 5 as strongly agree to 1 as strongly disagree respectively. The sub areas are as follows 1. Satisfaction (10 items). 2. Efficiency (10 items). 3. Sociability (10 items). 4. Mental health (10 items). 5. Inter personal relation (10 items).

Analysis Of Results and Discussion

The data was collected by taking the consent of the young married and cohabited male adults. The collection of socio demographic details was taken. The questionnaire was administered to the subject and asked them to read the questions and doubts were cleared before the correct option to fill the forms. After the response was filled the analysis was done further using suitable statistical measures.

Table 1: shows the married men and cohabited men mean scores.

Subjects	N	Mean	SD	t	df	р
Married Men	60	184.6500	15.71658	2.648**	118	0.009
Cohabited men	60	175.6833	20.99676	2.648**	109.318	0.009

To find out the significant difference between two group 't' test was used. The obtained 't' value is significant at 0.01 level, which states that there is a significant difference between married young men and cohabited young men. The obtained results also support the study result given by Brien, M.J., L.A, Lillard, and S. Stern (2006) reports that married adults are having better psychological wellbeing than cohabitants. The probable reasons may be that the difference in stability in relation and the kind of hindrance absorbed in relation by both married men and cohabited men.

Conclusion

There is a significant difference between married men and cohabited men in psychological wellbeing and married adults having better psychological wellbeing being than cohabitants.

Reference

- Brien, M.J., L.A. Lillard, and S. Stern (2006). "Cohabitation, marriage and divorce in a model of match quality." International Economic Review 47 (2): 451–494.
- 2. Bruce, S. (2002). God Is Dead: Secularization in the West. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 3. Davie, G. (2002). Europe: The Exceptional Case. London: Darton, Longmann, and Todd.

4. Liefbroer, A.C., and E. Dourleijn (2006). "Unmarried cohabitation and union stability: Testing the role of diffusion using data from 16 European countries." Demography 43 (2): 203-221.