



WWJMRD 2021; 7(8): 53-55  
www.wwjmr.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/6BWEK

**Bhanu BS**  
Research scholar, Dept of  
Psychology, Bangalore  
University, Bengaluru India

**Sreenivas M**  
Associate Professor, Dept of  
Psychology, Bangalore  
University, Bengaluru, India

**Correspondence:**  
**Bhanu BS**  
Research scholar, Dept of  
Psychology, Bangalore  
University, Bengaluru India

## The role of marriage and cohabited young adults on attachment styles

**Bhanu BS, Sreenivas M**

### Abstract

Humans are social beings; we attach to each other it may be emotionally or psychologically. We tend to attach to each other by birth, ethologically or psychologically. Another form of attachment is mother child attachment or partner attachment or family or friends' attachment. When it comes to attachment with the partner, we tend to marry them to form a bonding. Marriage is the bond between two people and it extends to two families for normal social and emotional development we tend to develop relationship with the other person. Cohabitation is a bonding with the partner, living with our soul mate it is also called as trial marriage. Marriage and cohabitation both have its merits and demerits of young adults using attachment style scales developed by Alexander, Feeney, Hohaus, and Noller (2001), keeping above points in view the present study was undertaken to find out the attachment style in married (n=60) and cohabited young adults(n=60). The obtained result signifies no significant difference in attachment style between Married young adults and cohabitation young.

**Keywords:** Attachment style, marriage, cohabitation

### Introduction

Attachment is bonding emotionally. It may be parent child attachment, peer attachment or attachment with the partners. According to John Bowlby (1960) and Mary Ainsworth (1970) attachment can be of four type secure attachment, anxious attachment, avoidant attachment, disorganised attachment. Attachment theory says to increase the survival rate, humans have a socio-biological need which forms a strong affection. The attachment behavioural system says depending on the proximity threat or distress is dependent. The distressed individuals maintain a secured and close relationship with each other. As the years proceed the individual interacts with other who is called as the attachment figure. By them they gain the stability and form attached (Gillath et al., 2005). Attachment style thus refers to individuals' most accessible mental schema, and behaviors, associated with close relationships. We need a legal bond which is called marriage. The togetherness is formed by marriage. Getting married has many benefits reports Myers (2000). More harmony is seen in married couples. Winker (1998). Another form of being together is cohabitation it is also called as trial marriage. Cohabitation had a social stigma the reported by Scott (1998). The several aspects in marriage were examined by Tamara.L fuller and frank D Fincham (1995) attachment style changes over the period of marriage (over the period of 2 years). Keeping the views of the researchers the current study tries to find attachment style among the married women and cohabited women.

### Methodology

#### Problem

The role of married and cohabited young adults on attachment styles.

#### AIM

Aim of the study is to find the attachment style of married and cohabited young adults.

#### Objectives

The objective of the study to know the attachment styles in married and cohabited young adult

**Hypotheses**

The hypothesis are as follows: **H<sub>1</sub>** : There is a significant difference between married and cohabited young adults in their attachment styles.

**Variables**

Independent variable: Relationship (Type of marriage)  
 Dependent Variable: Attachment Styles.

**Operational Definition**

**Cohabitation:** Living with the partner without legal recognition.

**Marriage:** The bond between two people who love each other.

**Meaning of family:** The group of people living together with a bond.

**Attachment styles:** The emotional bonding between the partners where the feel anxious leaving each other.

**Research Design**

The present research design is between group research designs.

**Sample**

60 married women and 60 cohabited women in a committed relation at least from past 2 years. Snow ball sampling technique was used to collect the relevant data only women were included in the study.

**The Inclusion Criteria**

- Married women age ranges from 21-30 years who are married within 2 years.

- Cohabited women age ranges from 21-30 years with 3 months to 2 years in cohabitation.
- Residents of Bengaluru district.

**The Exclusive Criteria**

- Married women below the age 21 and above 30 years.
- Cohabited women below the age 21 and above 30 years.
- Married and cohabited women who lives outside Bengaluru district.

**Materials**

- Attachment style questionnaire (ASQ) developed by Alexander, Feeney, Hohaus, and Noller (2001) it has two factors 1. Avoidance and 2. Anxiety and again this can be analysed with five factor model which are as follows 1. Confidence 2. Discomfort with closeness 3. Relationship as secondary 4. Need for approval 5. Preoccupied scored 1=totally disagree,2=strongly disagree,3=slightly disagree,4=slightly agree,5=strongly agree,6=totally agree. The test as high on reliability and validity.

**Analysis Of Results and Discussion**

The data was collected by taking the consent of the young married and cohabited women adults. The collection of socio demographic details was taken. The questionnaire was given to the subject and asked them to go through the questions and till the correct option to fill the forms. After the response was filled the analysis was done further

**Table 1:** Shows the Married women and cohabited women Mean, SD, t, p scores in five factors Attachment style scale.

Scale	Subjects	Style	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Attachment scale	Married Women and Cohabited women	Confidence.1	60	30.77	4.42	3.06**	118	0.00
		Confidence.2	60	28.49	3.67			
		Discomfort.1	60	34.57	5.88	1.07 <sup>NS</sup>	118	0.28
		Discomfort.2	60	33.42	5.72			
		Relationship as secondary.1	60	21.75	2.36	0.06 <sup>NS</sup>	118	0.95
		Relationship as secondary.2	60	21.71	3.62			
		Need for approval.1	60	22.51	3.58	0.75 <sup>NS</sup>	118	0.45
		Need for approval.2	60	22.95	2.90			
		Preoccupation.1	60	26.59	2.80	0.19 <sup>NS</sup>	118	0.84
Preoccupation.2	60	26.71	4.00					

Note: \*\*significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

NS: Not significant

**Discussion**

When we look into the table 1 the married women and cohabited women mean scores. The significant difference in t test was observed. The obtained “t” value of attachment confidence is significant level at 0.01 significance for both married and cohabited women, where as in other areas there is no significant in difference observed in Relationship as secondary, need for approval, discomfort, preoccupied which rejects the hypothesis (H1) which states that there is a significant relationship between married women and cohabited women who are young adults in their attachment style. The obtained results also support the study result given by attachment occurs during the dramatic change, may be loss of relationship (Kobart and Hazan 1991). The probable reasons may be the difference in

stability in relation and the kind of hindrance absorbed in relation by both married and cohabited. According to Galo and smith (1991) the cognition is a part of forming attachment with the partners. This theory supports the hypothesis. M Mikulincer, I Erev, Br (1991) reports people in romantic relation fail in realizing their desire for a warm and secure love, low attachment is observed in relationship. Many Experience less attachment may be due to decreased in happiness, less intense love and secure people. Hence, we reject the hypothesis why says there is a significant relation in attachment styles in married and cohabited young women.

**Conclusion**

There is no significant difference in attachment styles in married and cohabited women.

## References

1. Ainsworth, M. D., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: Assessed in the strange situation and at home*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
2. 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.
3. Backstrom, M., & Holmes, B. M. (2001). *Measuring adult attachment: A construct validation of two self-report instruments*. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 42, 79–86.
4. Cassidy, J., & Shaver, P. R. (2008). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (2nd ed). New York: Guilford.
5. Feeney, J. A. (2002). *Attachment-related dynamics: What can we learn from self-reports of avoidance and anxiety?* *Attachment and Human Development*, 4, 193–200.
6. Gallo, L. C., Smith, T. W., & Kircher, J. (2000). *Cardiovascular and electrodermal responses to support and provocation: Interpersonal methods in the study of psychophysiologic reactivity*. *Psychophysiology*, 37, 289-301.
7. Gillath, O., Shaver, P. R., Mikulincer, M., Nitzberg, R. A., Erez, A., & van Ijzendoorn, M.H. (2005). *Attachment, caregiving, and volunteering: Placing volunteerism in an attachment-theoretical framework*. *Personal Relationships*, 12, 425–446.
8. Kobak, R. R., & Hazan, C. (1991). *Attachment in marriage: Effects of security and accuracy of working models*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 861-869.
9. Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). *Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 511–524.
10. Johnson, S. M. (2006). *Attachment theory: A guide for couple therapy*. In S. M. Johnson & V. E. Whiffen (Eds.), *Attachment processes in couple and family therapy* (pp. 124–143). New York: Guilford.
11. Karney, B. R., McNulty, J. K., & Bradbury, T. N. (2001). *Cognition and the development of close relationships*. In G. J. O. Fletcher & M. S. Clark (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Interpersonal processes* (pp. 32–59). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
12. Mikulincer, M. (1991). *Attachment theory: A guide for couple therapy*. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 131(4), 273-91. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.1991.tb00946.x.
13. TAMARA L. FULLER AND FRANK D. FINCHAM (1995). *Attachment theory: A guide for couple therapy*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(1), 17-34. Printed in the United States of America. Copyright © 1995 Cambridge University Press. 1350-4126/95
14. Zhaleh Refahi Department of Counseling, Marvdasht Branch, Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht, Iran *International Journal of Medical Research & Health Sciences*, 2016, 5, 11:643-652