

Volume-1, Issue-1, February 2018



ANEKANT

Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences

EXPECTATION FROM LIFE PARTNER AND MARRIAGE ATTITUDE OF BOYS FROM RURAL AND URBAN AREA

Jyotiram Awate *¹ and Sayali Bhopale

*Department of Psychology, T. C. College, Baramati, Pune, MS.-413102

jnawate@gmail.com

Abstract:

The present study was aimed to study the expectation from life partner and marriage attitude of boys from rural and urban area. The purposive sampling method of sampling is used. The sample size of 60 (Rural Boys= 30, Urban Boys=30) from the educational institution of Baramati, Pune was selected. The respondents to the tools of expectation for life partner scale (2005) and marriage attitude scale (1986). The data collected on the variable were analyzed using mean, standard deviation and 't' test. In the present study obtain finding shows that, there is significant difference found expectation from life partner of rural and urban boys. The Rural and urban boys' was found positive attitude towards the marriage.

Keywords: Expectation from life partner, Marriage attitude, Rural and Urban boys

INTRODUCTION:

In India we have various religions that really affect the life style of the communities that follow their own beliefs and traditions. Oriental countries are more inclined towards following their own religious. This religious impression is found among the people and individuals. The person who is going to marry the other person

thinks that they would be life-partner may have certain expectations and marriage attitudes because every individual is shaped and grown up by his or her own religion, sanskar, traditions and philosophical principals. All these facts affect our thoughts, habits, attitudes, likes and dislikes. So it is very open and clear that when a person chooses someone for marriage, he or she is definitely impressed by religions principals, rule, and sanskars. In the many families females receive equal rights and freedom. In some families women get secondary position or they don't get equal treatment.

Expectation from life partner:

Friendship, romantic love and marriage are three components of life partner selection these motives guide a person in selecting a partner. It is claimed that norms for life partner. Selections are now changing in India.

The concept of expectation from life partner has linkages with marriage and the various ideas related to choosing a life partner. In India a majority of marriage are arranged by parents, relatives and kin choosing ones marital partner on the basis of premarital acquaintance. Love and courtship is still unacceptable even among the urban, educated middle class. The freedom to choose one's spouse is perceived as being against the cast, religion and therefore, endogamous alliances are preferred. However new expectation and assumptions about marital ideas have also emerged. Living in a nuclear family strengthens the conjugal bonds between the spouses.

Since they have the time and opportunity to interact and communicate freely.

The term life partner denotes ideas about sharing, caring, ideas about the future life style, goals and togetherness in married life. The term life partner has been used instead of wife emphasizing and egalitarian relationship.

The Nature of Attitude:

Suppose, after the first day of classes, you bump into a friend who asks you how your day has been. You might reply “I hear a wonderful lecture in my psychology class, ate lunch at an awful French restaurant, and stood in the line for such a long time that I missed my favorite soap opera.” You have described your day by expressing a series of attitudes. The defining characteristic of attitude is that they express an evaluation of some object (Insko&Schopler, 1972; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). Evaluations are expressed by terms such as liking-disliking, pro-anti, favoring-not favoring, and positive-negative. They are the feeling tone aroused by any attitude object. Attitudes can be entities, people (my best friends, the president, myself), or abstract concepts (abortion, civil rights, foreign aid). Indeed, anything that arouses evaluative feelings qualifies as an object of attitude.

Social psychologists generally use the term attitudes to refer to our evaluations of virtually any aspect of social world the extent to which we have favorable or unfavorable reactions to

issues, ideas, persons, social groups, objects including desserts. Some social psychologist defined attitudes:

According to, Gergen (1974) “An attitude is the disposition to behave in particular ways toward specific objects.” Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) “An attitude is a learned predisposition to respond in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner with respect to given object”.

Positive attitude:

A positive attitude can impact every aspect of your life people who maintain a positive approach to life situation and challenge will be able to move forward more constructively than those who become stuck in a negative attitude.

Negative Attitude:

A negative attitude is a disposition, feeling, or manner that is not constructive, co-operative or optimistic. It should now be clear that attitude is individual expressions representing the summary of evaluation of an attitude object. The expression that one makes publicly to other is not always the same as the expression one makes privately to oneself. Marriage involves the union of two individuals who decide to live in an intimate relationship for the major portion of their life. It said to be one of the deepest and most complex form of human relationship.

A number of psychological theories have been suggested to explain how attitude form and why they change. The theories most frequently employed can be categorized as either 1) learning theories, 2) consistency theories, or 3) cognitive-response theories.

Examples of each will be discussed below. It should be noted that these different approaches are not contradiction but simply focus on different factors which may affect the way attitudes develop and change.

Good and bad attitude towards marriage:

Attitude towards the marriage are influenced by many factors in society e.g. the divorce rate and so on. Cultures also affect attitudes towards marriage. Religion also plays major role in influencing these attitudes. Those people who have bad attitudes towards are mainly concerned about longevity of marriage; they fear that it will not be as stable as they would want it to be.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Mishra, (1993) found that urban, rural differences in the extent to which marriage were decided upon by the elders. 57% of rural youth want their parents to settle to their marriage, whereas only 27% urban youth view this with favors. Rao and Rao (1995) reports increasing individualism with regard to desired qualities in a prospective partner. As opposed to family related factors such as economic, status of the family, cast, religion and support of relatives. Urban youth in the study preferred more individual centered features such as personality, characteristic (honesty, sincerity, understanding, kindness etc.) intellectual traits (intelligence, knowledge talent) or career oriented traits (being settled in job, education, ambition).

Bumpass, Sweet and Cherlin, (1991); Gassanov, Nicholson & Koch Turner, (2008); Guzzo, (2009). Cohabitation has also been found to effect one's expectation for marriage. Cohabitation has been found to be positively associated with expectations to get married. Kline et al. (2008) found that the idea of life partner ,the pursuit of psychological and physical intimacy and the importance of external support from family or other social sources were all rated more important than the ability to legally.

DeMaris & Rao (1992) Point out that cohabitation is historically regarded as a nontraditional lifestyle and therefore might attract individuals who are more prone to having unstable long term relationship. If it is true that cohabitation attracts individuals who are more prone to having unstable relationship, it makes sense that the same individuals might have more negative attitudes towards marital relationships with less intent to marry and less expectations regarding length of a marital relationship.

OBJECTIVES

- 1) To study the effect of residential area on expectations from the life partner.
- 2) To study the effect of residential area on attitude towards marriage.
- 3) To compare the egalitarian and traditional expectations of boys.

HYPOTHESIS:

I. There is significant difference between rural and urban boys on expectation from life partner. II. There no significant difference between rural and urban boys on attitude towards marriage.

METHOD:

Sample:

For the present study the researcher purposively selected 60 boys from rural and urban area from educational institutions of Baramati. The sample is collected from different colleges.

Type of residential area	Boys
Rural	30
Urban	30
Total	60

Tools used for the data collection:

In addition to the personal data sheet following two instruments were used to collect the data.

Expectations from the life partner scale (EFLPS):

It is constructed by Dr. Sadhana Natu and Dr. A. J. Wadkar (2005). It contains 66 items related to egalitarian and traditional expectations dimensions. Each item is to be answered with the help of 5 points. Split half reliability coefficient for two dimensions of Expectations from the life partner scale is 0.84. An expectation from the life partner scale content validity is used.

Marriage Attitude Scale (MAS):

It is developed by Pramod Kumar (1986). It consist 38 items measures negative and positive attitude of marriage. The respondents has to given the response in three ways given in scale, i.e. Yes, Doubtful, No and the scoring is in directions of 3-1. The split half and test-retest reliability is used. In this the higher score indicate the positive attitude toward marriage. The face validity of the scale seems to be fairly high.

Variables:

Independent Variable: Area of residence. (Urban and rural)

Dependent Variable: Expectation from life partner and Attitude towards marriage.

Control variable: Age of boys.

Operational Definitions:

(1) Traditional expectations from the life partner – It is a composite score obtained by rural and urban boys laid between 66 – 198, shows the traditional expectation from life partner.

(2) Egalitarian expectations from the life partner – It is a composite score obtained by rural and urban boys lies between 199 – 330 shows the egalitarian expectation from life partner.

(3) Attitude towards marriage – The precipitation of score of the scale shows attitude towards marriage”.

Data Collection Procedure:

The respondents were called in small groups, consisted of 10 to 15 only. Their seating arrangement was made in classroom. After establishing proper rapport, the scales were administered of instructions and guidance given by the respective authors.

RESULT ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION:

Hypothesis-1: there is significant difference between rural and urban boys on Expectation from life partner.

Table-1 Showing the means, standard deviations and 't' values, on the dimension of Expectation from life partner.

Residence Area	N	Mean	SD	't' value	Significance level
Rural Boys	30	193.33	21.16	-2.74	S
Urban Boys	30	212.06	30.89		

Hypothesis-2 There no significant difference between rural and urban boys on attitude towards marriage

Table-2, Shows the means, standard deviations and 't' values, on the dimension of Marriage attitude scale.

Residence Area	N	Mean	SD	't' value	Significance level
Rural Boys	30	76.067	13.74	.710	NS

Urban Boys	30	73.37	15.66		
---------------	----	-------	-------	--	--

Table 1 present the results of the ‘t’ test conducted to compare the means of the two groups on the dimension of expectations from the life partner. It is found that expectation from life partner of rural boys mean is 193.33 and urban boy mean is 212.06, the SD is 21.16 and 30.89 respectively. The ‘t’ value is -2.74 which is significant for 0.05 level so the above hypothesis is accepted. Result showed that urban boys have more expectation from life partner than rural.

Above table-2 showed that attitude towards marriage rural boys mean is 76.067 and urban boys mean is 73.37, SD is 13.74 and Urban boys is 15.66 respectively and ‘t’ value is 0 .710 which is not significant of 0.01 level.

CONCLUSION:

Researcher conclude from above study ,that in first hypothesis there is significance difference in expectations from life partner which is in the form of egalitarian and traditional expectations. Second hypothesis there is no significance difference in attitude towards marriage, so both hypotheses is accepted.

REFERENCES:

- DeMaris, A., & Rao, V. (1992). Premarital cohabitation and subsequent marital stability in the United States: A reassessment. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54(1), 178–190.
- Garrett, H.E. (1961). *Statistics in Psychology and Education*. Bombay: Allied Pacific.
- Ghadially, R., & Kazi, K. A. (1980). Sex – Role attitudes, marriage and career among college men and women. *Indian journal of Social Work*, XL (4), 441-447
- Morgan, C. T., King, R. A., Weisz, J. R., & Schopler, (1999). *Introduction to Psychology*. New Delhi: Tata Mcgraw Hill publication.
- Kakar, S. (1978). Feminine identity in India. In S. Kakar (Ed.), *The Inner world*. (pp.2-10). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Kumar, P. A. (1986). *Comprehensive study of Attitude towards Marriage of two Indian Sub-cultures: Punjab & Gujarat Ind. J. Community Guidance Services*. 3, 53-58.
- Mangal, S. K. (2006). *Statistical in psychology and education*. N.D.: Prentice-Hall.
- Natu, S.& Wadkar, A. J. (2005). *Expectation from Life Partner Scale (EFLPS)*. Anand Agencies, Pune, India.

Rao, V. V.P., & Rao, V. N. (1984). Sex role attitude of college students in India. Women in International development series. (working Paper No.72). Michigan, "Michigan University.

http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNAAX041.pdf

https://dspace.library.colostate.edu/bitstream/handle/10217/67896/Park_colostate_0053N_11226.pdf?sequence=1