

## Attachment Styles of Married and Cohabited Young Adults

Bhanu BS<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr. Sreenivas M<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

Human beings are social being in nature. We tend to attach to each other by birth, ethnologically or psychologically. Marriage is one of the major components which attaches each other through bonding. For normal social and emotional development, we tend to develop relationship with the other person. Cohabitation is a new form of bonding with the person with whom we like and 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 shows that there is a no significant difference in Marriage and cohabitation young adults in their attachment styles.

**Keywords:** *Attachment style, Marriage, Cohabitation*

Attachment is the form of 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, disorganized attachment. According to attachment theory to increase the survival rate, humans have a socio-biological need which forms a strong affection. The attachment behavioral system says depending on the proximity threat or distress is dependent. Maintaining this closeness generates comfort and security for the distressed individual. Over the lifespan, the attachment system is shaped by interactions with attachment figures that yield fairly stable individual differences in mental representations of attachment relationships, resulting in an attachment style (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. Through marriage we can be together. Getting married has many benefits reports Myers (2000). Married couples are more harmonious reports Winker (1998). Another form of being together is cohabitation it is also called as trial marriage. Cohabitation is derived from Latin word Cohabitare which means together dwell or Cohabit or coexist. 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) over the years of marriage the attachment

<sup>1</sup>Research scholar, Dept of Psychology, Bangalore University, Bengaluru India.

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, Dept. of Psychology, Bangalore University, Bengaluru, India.

\*Corresponding Author

Received: July 19, 2021; Revision Received: September 10, 2021; Accepted: September 22, 2021

## Attachment Styles of Married and Cohabited Young Adults

style changes (over the period of 2 years). Keeping the views of the researchers the present study tries to explore the attachment style among the married women and cohabited women.

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### ***Problem:***

Attachment styles of married and cohabited young adults.

#### ***Aim:***

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

#### ***Objectives:***

The objective of the study is to determine the attachment styles in married and cohabited young adults.

#### ***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:** 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).
- **Meaning of family:** The practice of controlling the number of children one has and the intervals between their births, particularly by means of contraception or voluntary sterilization.
- **Attachment styles:** The emotional bonding between the partners where they feel anxious by leaving each other.

#### ***Research Design***

The present research design is between group research designs.

#### ***Sample***

The present study contains 60 married women and 60 cohabited women who are in a relationship 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.

## Attachment Styles of Married and Cohabited Young Adults

### *The Exclusive Criteria*

- Married women below the age 21 and above 30 years of age.
- Cohabited women below the age 21 and above 30 years of age.
- 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. Which is scored as 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 collect by taking the consent of the young married and cohabited women adults. The collection of socio demographic details were taken. The questionnaire were given to the subject and asked them to read 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 on attachment style in two factors Attachment avoidance and attachment anxiety.**

Scale		Subjects	N	Mean	SD	“t”	df	p
Two factors attachment avoidance and attachment anxiety.	Attachment avoidant	Married women	60	61.600	6.263	18.06**	118	.000
		Cohabited women	60	91.750	11.311			
	Attachment anxiety	Married women	60	90.300	10.115	0.74 <sup>NS</sup>	118	.461
		Cohabited women	60	91.750	11.311			

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

## DISCUSSION

When we look into the table the married women and cohabited women mean scores. To find out the significant difference t test was used. The obtained “t” value of attachment avoidant is significant at 0.01 significance for both married and cohabited women where as its not significant in attachment avoidance which states that there is a significant relationship between married women and cohabited women who are young adults. There were findings given by A. Peter (2001) according to this marriage in both spouse who has a secure attachment tend to be happy as they were taking care of their security and comfort level. In contrast to the high level of dissatisfaction was seen in wives who had attach avoidant marriages, the attachment was not met due to avoidance was the proximity with the partners. A spouse was particularly influence but the anxious avoidant partners which typically led to the withdrawal from marriages. The spouse did not have enough intimacy and emotional closeness in their marriages. Attachment in marriage: Peter MacLean (2001) Predicting marriage satisfaction from partners matching using a three-group typology of adult attachment style.

### CONCLUSION

There is a significant difference found in Attachment avoidance while there is no significant difference found in attachment anxiety.

### REFERENCES

- 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.
- Backstrom, M., & Holmes, B. M. (2001). Measuring adult attachment: A construct validation of two self-report instruments. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 42, 79–86.
- Cassidy, J., & Shaver, P. R. (2008). Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications (2nd ed). New York: Guilford.
- 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.
- 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.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 511–524.
- 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.
- 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.
- Tamara L. Fuller and Frank D. Fincham. (1995). University of Illinois Personal Relationships. 2 17-34. Printed in the United States of America. Copyright 0 1995 Cambridge University Press. 1350-4126/95.

### Acknowledgement

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

### Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

**How to cite this article:** Bhanu BS & Sreenivas M (2021). Attachment Styles of Married and Cohabited Young Adults. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 9(3), 1693-1696. DIP:18.01.159.20210903, DOI:10.25215/0903.159