

Practices of 'Living Together' in Kathmandu Valley

A Dissertation Submitted to the
MPhil-PhD Programme in Sociology
Central Department of Sociology
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Tribhuvan University
In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree
of MPhil in Sociology

Submitted by:

Narayani Devkota

TU Regd. No.: 7-1-32-750-2002

Batch: 2018

Exam Roll No.: 712

Tribhuvan Univeristy
Faculty of Humanity and Social Sciences
MPhil Program in Sociology 2024

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION

This thesis entitled “**Practices of ‘Living Together’ in Kathmandu Valley**” has been prepared by Narayani Devkota under my supervision for the partial fulfillment of the requirement for MPhil in sociology. I am satisfied with her dissertation and I would like to recommend this dissertation to be examined by the dissertation evaluation committee of Tribhuvan University.

.....

Professor Dr. Youba Raj Luintel

(Dissertation Supervisor)

Central Department of Sociology

Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal

Date:

Tribhuvan Univeristy
Faculty of Humanity and Social Sciences
MPhil Program in Sociology 2024

LETTER OF APPROVAL

This dissertation entitled “**Practices of ‘Living Together’ in Kathmandu Valley**” prepared and submitted by Narayani Devkota, has been evaluated and approved for the partial fulfillment of the requirement of MPhil Degree in Sociology by the dissertation evaluation committee.

Approved by

Dissertation Evaluation Committee

Professor Dr. Youba Raj Luintel

Head of the Department

Dr. Tika Ram Gautam

(External Examiner)

Associate Professor

Dr. Guman Sing Khatri

External Examiner

Professor Dr. Youba Raj Luintel

(supervisor)

Date:

LETTER OF DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this dissertation entitled **“Practices of ‘Living Together’ in Kathmandu Valley”** is my own work based on field based primary information. Data, which provided here, I gathered from the field work, between 15 May to 14 June of in Kathmandu valley. In the process of thesis writing I highly sensitive to maintain the anonymity of my respondent. I conduct the research to fulfill the partial requirement for MPhil in sociology program under the guidance and supervision of Professor Dr. Youba Raj Luintel.

.....

Narayani Devkota

Acknowledgements

First of all, I want express my sincere thanks with gratitude to my supervisor Professor Dr. Youba Raj Luintel for his restless encouragement, advice and supervision. The words 'thanks' or 'thank you' only can't cover his support to me on this thesis. I would like to thank to my external supervisor associate Professor Dr. Tikaram Gautam and Dr. Guman Shingh Khatri for their valuable comment and encouragement. I feel really thank full to my respondent who share their experience/reality with me, I really think great full toward with trust. Without respondent's support it was impossible to finalize this thesis. Various individual tries to connect me with the respondent who are/were in living together relationship, here I would like to thanks Pranika Koyu, Ritamaya Baramu, Manju Pudhasaini who connect me to other respondents. I would like to thanks Dristi Nepal and Parina Limbu; and Jagriti Mahila Mahashang and Abha Chettri; Sunil Babu Panta and Mayako Pahichan Nepal for their safe space to take interview, connecting to respondents and providing a tea/coffee/cock and snakes. I would like to thanks my dear friends Punam Palpali and Wofowon family for their effort to convince individuals for interview.

This thesis is my work, but to make this thesis in this beautiful form I got various support from various individual. I want to acknowledge my mother-in-law Laxmi Neupane here for her unconditional support on home to leave her daughter-in-law free from household chore's responsibilities. I always get support from my colleagues on my work, in this thesis my senior and colleagues provide the support from searching a literature to searching a respondent too. I would like to thank to my friend Advocate Bipana Yogi, Advocate Rebat Tripathi, Jhakendra Gharti Magar, Bhim Sigdel, Nabin Acharya, Dr. Renu Adhikari, Binda Pande, Binod Dulal, Tara Khanal, Bina Dhital and Hari Bhujel for their continuous help and support.

Abstract

In this dissertation, I am going to focused on living together relationship between urban people, particularly focused on Kathmandu valley. Conceptually, living together is a relationship between two individual living as a couple without socio-cultural and legal recognition, and they haven't socio-cultural and legal right and responsibility too. They shared everything such as household responsibility, economic condition, sexual desire and pleasure without socio-cultural and legal recognition. There are various words as synonyms of "living together". In this Thesis time and again these all name will be use as synonyms of living together as a relationship between two individuals who live in same private sphere for more than a six month, share physical, economic and emotional attachment without social, cultural and legal recognition.

Methodologically, information of this paper are field based qualitative data through the in-depth interview with 20 respondents who are living in living together relationship and Key Informant interview with those individual who are directly engage on this issue. Respondent and Key Informant were selected through the propulsive sampling specially snowball sampling.

This thesis first, covers social factors which encourage individual to practices of living together; such as how the introduced first, development of love between Partner, how they decide for living together, which factor encourage to live together (such as not clear in long time relationship, interest to live without family relationship, gender division of labor, symbolic domination toward women in marital relationship, legal hurdle to get marriage, economic support in living, economic burden on marriage, skip from the child birth and bearing or trust issues). And in second the everyday reality in the process of living together, such as how they introduce their relation with in a society, who work the domestic work, what and who work for earning, their interest to get marriage, challenges in a living together, possibility of extra affair while they are in living relationship with partner's family member, (such as parents, sibling, children), expectation of children, use of Contraceptive, management of misunderstanding.

In preliminary finding there are a huge diversity within living together relationship. They have different experience in various part of the research.

Key words: *Marriage, Living together, Social realities.*

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
CDO	Chief District Officer
HIV	Human immunodeficiency virus
IT	Information Technology
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organization
KII	Key Informant Interview
LGBTIQ	Lesbian, Gay, Bi sexual, Trans Sex, Intersex and Queer
MPhil	Master of Philosophy
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NRN	Non Resident Nepali
PCL	Proficiency Certificate Level
PHD	Doctor of Philosophy
SLC	School Leaving Certificate

Table of Contents

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION	i
LETTER OF APPROVAL	ii
LETTER OF DECLARATION	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Abstract.....	v
Acronyms and Abbreviations	vi
Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Introduction of the studies	1
1.2 Statement of Problem.....	3
1.3 Objectives of Research	6
1.4 Research Question	6
1.5 Significance of the Study	7
1.6 Limitation of the Study and way forward	7
1.7 Chapter Plan.....	8
Chapter II: Literature Review	10
2.1 Marriage and Living together	10
2.2 Theoretical Review	12
2.2.1 Marxist Perspectives to marriage and Family	12
2.2.2 Modernist Perspective on Marriage and Family	13
2.2.3 Feminist Critique of Marriage and Family	14
2.3 Empirical Review: Rise of Living Together	15
2.4 Policy Review	18
2.5 Research Gap	22
Chapter III: Research Methodology.....	23
3.1 Research Philosophy	23
3.2 Exploratory Research Design	24
3.3 Location of the Study.....	24
3.4 Sampling	25
Purposive Sampling	25
Snow Ball Sampling	26
3.5 Nature and Sources of Data	27
3.6 Techniques of Data Collection.....	28
In-depth Interview.....	28
Key Informant Interview.....	28

3.7 Ethical Considerations of the Data.....	28
3.8 Data Analysis	29
3.9 Self-reflection of Researcher	29
Chapter IV: Socio-Demographic Profile of Respondents.....	32
Introduction.....	32
4.1 Caste/Ethnicity.....	32
4.2 Age of Groups and Duration of Living.....	34
4.3 Religious combination between respondent and their Partner	35
4.4 level of Education of respondent and their partner	35
4.5 Sex/Gender combination of respondent.....	36
4.6 Permanent Address between Couple in District	37
4.7 Occupational Status of Respondent and their partner	37
4.8 Marital status and having children before living together	38
Conclusion	40
Chapter V: From Knowing Each Other to Living Together	41
5.1 Knowing Each other	41
5.2 Love affair and Bonding	44
5.3 Modernization of emotional relationship.....	47
Not clear in long time/term relationship	47
5.4 Thrust of equality.....	48
5.5 Societal unacceptance to get marriage.....	51
Conclusion	56
Chapter VI: Practices of Living Together.....	57
6.1 Societal Sanction.....	57
6.2 Responsibility of Bread Wining.....	63
6.3 Is marriage the Next Option?	66
Conclusion	71
Chapter VII: Summary, Conclusion and Theoretical Reflection	73
7.1 Summary of the Thesis	73
7.2 Conclusion	75
7.3 Theoretical Reflection.....	78
Reference	82
Annexes	85
Annex-1: Name list of Key Informants.....	85
Annex-2: Checklist for interview with Key Informant.....	86
Annex-3: Checklist for interview with Respondents	87

Chapter I: Introduction

1.1 Introduction of the studies

In common understanding, living together is a relationship between two individuals living as a couple without socio-cultural and legal recognition, and they haven't socio-cultural and legal right and responsibility too. They shared everything such as household responsibility, economic condition, sexual desire and pleasure without socio-cultural and legal recognition. There are various words as synonyms of "living together"¹. In this thesis time and again these all name will be use as synonyms of living together as a relationship between two individuals who live in same private sphere for more than a year², share physical, economic and emotional attachment without social, cultural and legal recognition.

In Nepal too, living together is rising after the political change of 1990s, in the areas of comparatively developed urban area such like Kathmandu, Pokhara, Dharan and other newly develop urban area. Despite the rising trend of living together, in Nepal we do not have any authentic data that how many people are in living together relationship. The big surveys conducted in Nepal, such as Census, Nepal Demographic Health Survey, Nepal Living Standard Survey of government still unable to recognized that living together has also been practiced in Nepali society. On the absence of authentic data, we do not know how many people are in Living together relationship. According to the news published in *Setopati* in 2080³, monthly ten to fifteen young girls came to the National Women Commission to register complain that "after living

¹In European and American context living together relationship is known as Cohabitation and often it came as synonym in cited literature. I want to declare it that the term "cohabitation" and the living together is a same in this thesis. like, "cohabitation", "living apart relationship" "live-in relationship", "civil union", "civil partnership", "intimate care giving union (ICGU)".

² There some confusion, dilemma and disparities on the relationship specially in Kathmandu Valley. Many people often social media tend to relate extra marital relationship as living together. In this research I want to make clear that to be living together relationship, individual live with only one partner for more than a month, he or she share their emotional, economic, physical relationship without Legal and socio cultural recognition. They also do not have alternative living partner or shelter with in the same place. To provide a room, to engage in sexual intercourse and to bearing economic responsibility for their love one but live with their legal and socio-culturally bonded spouse will not recognize as living together in this research.

³ This feature news was published at one of few authentic online portals named *Setopati* in 27 August 2023 based on the case studies and the Key Informant Interview provided by Women Commission of Nepal. In Women Commission, women came to register the case of domestic or sexual violence. In the process of discussion to registered the file, they share their relationship as living together which are not legally recognized. <https://www.setopati.com/social/310290>

together relationship he did not get marriage with me”. This data indicates that there are various couple who live under the living together relationship.

In Nepal, there are diverse range of perception and practices on living together. Perception depends on the level of freedom, awareness and social connectivity on how people enjoyed with living together. Empirically we can see a prism of living together relationship and in these multi-colored relationship impact differently in individual’s life. Some people are enjoying with it as liberation as freedom, some people are waiting a time and situation to accept their relationship by their parent and society to get marries, some individual are suffering the burden of unwanted child, some people are suffering from domestic violence and some people lost their life through the killing too, some people suffered from emotionally breakdown and in psychological trauma, threat of life, some children are sufferings economic, physical and emotional pain through the parent’s living together. On the lack of authentic data, we do not know, how many people have better peaceful relationship and how many individuals are suffering from it.

At the public sphere, we engage in the debate concerning the social change and recognition of living together. It was socially stigmatized as unsocial behavior, culturally sin, and over freedom. Living together depicted In Nepali news (paper, radio, TV and social media such as Facebook, Twitter, YouTube) depicted as a cause of crime, such as killing, domestic violence⁴, depression and suicide⁵, honey trapping, birth of unwanted child and violence⁶, leaving a child in garbage, forest and killing of them. Some time it’s portrayed as bargaining tools to exploit another partner. And from the side of human right activist, “Living Together” relationship also suppressive for women and girls.

Despite the negative portrait of the living together relationship, people’s engagement on it is rising in trend. This thesis rises some prominent questions, that “why living together relationships are rising?” or “What are causes behind to live together?”. In

⁴ Case of X (who live with her boyfriends), was suffered from domestic violence by her boyfriends. She tried to file the case against her boyfriend in police office, Nepal Police denied to file the case and she publicly post her statement at face book. It’s highly debatable in social media.

⁵ Case tory “Y” who are actor suicide and there is news he was living together with her girlfriend and they are acting in same film.

⁶ Case “Z”, a famous singer was in the living together relationship. After the birth of their baby, Z started to ignore his partner and baby at the time of early motherhood. “Z” used to beat his partner when they meet. After suffering by beating “Z”’s partner file the case and got legal marital status.

this mess, superficial we can relate living together as the alternative form of conventional marriage institution and also alternative form of being single. From various sociological theory such as Marxism, and Modernism a consequences of social change from pre modern agrarian feudal society to modern industrial capitalist society. Or it's a reflection of the modern industrial capitalist society where social institutions are weakened.

In this regards, this thesis focused on systematic analysis of causes which encourage the urban couple to engage in the living together relationship and their experiences on living together. Cases studies are collected in Kathmandu Valley. There are some reasons to select the Kathmandu Valley, which is highly populated, diversified urban area and Capital city of Nepal. Under the Interpretative research philosophy, I was collect the information through the in-depth interview with those individual who live together as respondent and key informant interview. The case studies have been finalized through the recorded in-depth interview, verbatim transcription of the interview with those people who are/were in living together relationship in Kathmandu valley. Key informant interview was conducted with the human right activist Renu Adhikari, feminist Pranika Koyu, Advocate Rewati Thripathi, policy maker Sunilbabu Panta and Binda Pandey, Parbati Aryal, a secretary of National Women Commistion and Nepal Police Officer.

Methodologically this thesis is a qualitative exploratory research, focused on subjective life experience of the respondent. Respondent was selected through either purposive basis or snowball sampling to those people who I as researcher know that they are/were in living together, I was conducted in-depth interview on my and their convenience time and space. But some respondent I did not know before the day of interview, they were find out through the activist of right based organization, for them I was use the snowball sampling method.

1.2 Statement of Problem

There are no exact terminology and pattern of "Living Together" relationship available in classical sociological thought. But, on various sociological theories we can link with the living together relationship as an alternative form of marriage or alternative relationship being a single. We can relate living together with theory of Modernity Marxism, Feminism. Theories of modernity, which provide the aspect of rational form

and modern form of society with the changing social structure and human relationship. Through the lance of *Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft* of Ferdinand Tonnies (Tonnies, 1957), and mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity is as part of Emile Durkheim's *The Division of Labour in Society* (Durkheim. 1893).

From the modernity theory, another hypothetical cause we can assume the weakened of religious control over the individual. With the growth of science, religion lost the control over individual in general and lost control over the women sexuality in particular. Sexual relationship before marriage was denoted as sin in Hindu, Christianity⁷ and Islam. After the rise of modernity its started to criticize again the thought of purity and pollution. Living with emotional or physical attachment was stigmatized in Christian society too. According to the news published in 15th September 2014 at Australian Broad Casting Corporation (ABC), under the title that 'Pope Francis break taboo by marrying cohabiting couples, conducts mass wedding ceremony'. Liberal political thought also provides the ground to develop personal relationship as love partner, sex partner or other relationship.

From the dawn of the Marxist thought, it's always against the modern bourgeoisie family structure and they depicted it as oppressive intuition toward a woman and children (Marx and Engels 1848, Engels 1972). And more loudly than Marxism, from the feminist corner marriage criticized on various part such as controlled over the work by gender division of labor and denied to recognized the domestic work as work, control over the sexually by various cultural practice and symbol, controlled over their identity (Beauvoir, 1949; Freidan, 1963). And somehow freedom to love without marital burden is highly idealized.

Despite the theoretical stand, there is a question which form of marriage is oppressive? or there is a question that the marriage is oppressive for whom? And why Gay liberation movement and movement of sexual minority people why demanding a marital right? These some prominent questions remained unsolved to address the intimate relationship.

Empirically the context of living together relationship in Nepal is flued, multi-color and diverse. If we see living together from the experiences of Nepal police officer,

⁷ Living with emotional or physical attachment was stigmatized in Christian society too. According to the news published in 15th September 2014 at Australian Broad Casting Corporation (ABC), "Pope Francis break taboo by marrying cohabiting couples, conducts mass wedding ceremony".

lawyer and courts, media and NGO worker often we can see only a negative side of living together. On this negative side, there are violence, sexual exploitation, murder after living together, several time abortions (both legal and illegal), emotional breakdown and attempted to suicide which are fundamentally different than the claim of the Marxism, Feminism and modernism. In this regards we can say the public face of the living together in Nepali society, as the alternative form of marriage “as oppressive institution” is vulgar than the marriage. Despite the Negative depiction of living together, people are rise to choose it.

Government of Nepal is still silent on these types of relationship and no one policy formulate for the separate legal recognition of it. There are some scattered legal provisions; such as supreme court’s presidency and order, legal provision on domestic violence, recognition of children who get birth in any relation, these are not enough and directly related with living-together.

In this mess, we can make a question that based on Marxist perspective on marriage and family, is the current state of society in a transition phase of capitalist mode of production to socialist mode of production? Is living together relationship standing in the socialist mode of production? Is at a socialist mode of production individual might freely express their relationship or desire of their relationship? If we focused on violence in living together as media, police and NGO present, we make another question that ‘are we interring in non-responsible, valueless society?’

Same question we can asked with in feminism too. As feminist depiction that marriage as oppressive institution, are people going to abolishing marriage institution? If marriage abolishable why people demanding/advocating the same sex marriage, or state recognition of living together relationship?

Single Theory unable to address these types of diversity and diverse questions. In this situation, post modernism theory is adopted on this dissertation to dig out individual’s reality from their social structure, to their introduction, their bonding to living together relationship and their experiences through the subjective analysis. These subjective analyses developed through the in-depth interview. Post-modernist theory and method will help the incorporate multiple reality as with subjective analysis of the cause to living together relationship.

1.3 Objectives of Research

I have two level of research objective; first, general objective of research and second specific objectives research. In general objective of the dissertation is to find out the causes why individual participate/live in “Living Together” relationship, which will be focused on holistic approach of the phenomenon. In second, I have two specific objectives of the research divided in particular aspect. First is social factors which encourage them to practices of living together and second, to analyze their everyday experience when they are in living together relationship.

1.3.1 General Objectives of research

- 1) To find out that, why individual participate/live in living together relationship.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives of research

1. To Analyze the social demography of those individual who are/were in living together relationship
2. To analyses the encouraging social factors for individual to practice of living together.
3. To analyze individual everyday experience when they are in living together relationship.

1.4 Research Question

Here I am going to divide the research question on two level first, general research question and second specific research question. General research question focused on holistic approach of the phenomenon that why individual start to live together even these social realities depicted with negative consequences. In specific research question, will be divided in particular aspect living together. First I will have focused on that the factors that force to individual to engage in living together and in second, who people experience their relationship when they are in living together relationship.

1.4.1 General research Question

1. Why individual practice/live in living together relationship?

1.4.2 Specific research Question

1. Who are in living together relationship?
2. Why they get start to involve in living together relationship, which social factor encourage them to engage in living together?

3. How they are experiencing their relationship when they are in Living together?

1.5 Significance of the Study

This research tried to dig out the everyday reality of those person who are/were in living together relationship in Kathmandu valley. Kathmandu valley is highly populated urban area and the capital city of Nepal, with huge diversity. It's also a central place of Nepal to gain new knowledge, lifestyle, modern idea, rejection conventional practices and revolution too. Here living together is becoming the common understanding as alternative form of marriage and also alternative form of being single. This research will be more fruitful to academic researchers and human right activists generally and those people who are advocating for abolishment of gender based violence particularly. In the same way living together is rising issue globally and Nepal also not isolated from this global trend. This research might be one stepping stone to policy makers to adopt appropriate strategies, plans, and programs for vulnerable people, unmarried couple and reduce gender based violence, killing, unwanted pregnant and abortion too.

1.6 Limitation of the Study and way forward

This study also has various limitations, first of all the phenomenon of "Living Together" still not in solid form and it's still in meaning making in Nepal. There are diverse types "Living Together" and have a diverse background force them to live in "Living Together" and it seems like a prism or flued form. Government still unable to recognize it. Due to the non-consolidated form, this research is doing on ongoing process. Another limitation of this thesis is thesis covers the stories of 20 couples but I became unable to take interview with both individual of their relationship. I found interview from one member of each couple. It was a one side stories of my respondent and might be another side of stories missing in the research. On these basis, findings of the research will not be generalizable for all community and society. In this regards, this thesis gives some glimpses of the living together relationship in Kathmandu valley, for wider understanding need to do more research and study.

There is various aspect which I skip cause limitation of time frame and some issue lately, near to end of my thesis I realized. It would be helpful to other respondent for further researcher on Living together. That is intimate partner violence in living together relationship; women empowerment and living together for general research.

Child live who live with their parent's partner and children who born from living together will be serious research area which I thought at the process of my research.

1.7 Chapter Plan

This dissertation is divided into seven chapters. Following the first chapter as introductory chapter, I will review the literature related to the living together in Chapter II. Chapter II will give the theoretical, empirical and policy review to understand the living relation. Theoretically researcher tried review the sociological literature of Marxist and feminist perspective as the oppressive institution and wish to abolish it; and theory of modernity the changing dynamic of family structure with the modernization. In empirical literature I will review the sociological research based journal articles, newspaper and media based material such as news, social media such as Facebook, twitter, and YouTube. In the policy review I will review the literature on available policy, program and advocacy for living together in Nepal. After the finding of gap between these literature, I will develop relevant research questions.

Chapter III as Research method: Methodologically I will to focused on qualitative exploratory research design. Field was selected Kathmandu Valley which is highly populated, diversified urban area and Capital city of Nepal. Under the qualitative research method, I wonder to gather data through the case studies and Key Informant Interview. The case studies method will be sued of those people who life in Kathmandu valley and also live in living together relationship. And, through the Key Informant Interview I will be gather data from policy maker, police officer, lawyer and human right activist. Before to collect the data I will develop checklist to ask to respondent for both of technique for data collection. Also in this chapter I will focused to selection process of respondents, techniques of data collection, and ways of analysis, and presentation.

Chapter four I present the demographic character of my respondents and their partner. This chapter will provide the social structure of individual who are/were in living together relationship. On these demographic character, I present the caste/ethnic combination of my respondents, their partner and caste based relationship of them; age of respondent and age combination between respondent and their partner, religious status of respondents and combination of religious status between the partner and respondents, level of education and combination of level of education between partner

of respondents, sex and sexuality, rural urban setting respondents and their partner; occupational status of respondents and their partner; and marriage and having children before their living together relationship. All these information is presented on both description and table description.

Chapter five, I am going to analyzing the data that I gathered from the field work, which done between 15 May to 14 June of in Kathmandu valley. To analyses the process that individual's introduction and make a relationship. How they introduced to love and how love affair encourage them to start living together relationship. Similarly, this chapter gives the glimpse of various factors that influence, push forward one individual to start living together relationship, which factor encourage to live together (such as not clear in long time relationship, interest to live without family relationship, gender division of labor, symbolic domination toward women in marital relationship, legal hurdle to get marriage, economic support in living, economic burden on marriage, skip from the child birth and bearing or trust issues). In this chapter I am going to look about why people started their relationship as living together relationship rather than a marriage. Research found that there is various factor play an important role to encourage the individual to start together relationship. Among these factors, not clear on long time relationship, interest to live without family or already have a failure married life, gender division of labor at household, symbolic domination toward women, legal hurdle to get marriage, economic burden at and after marriage and economic pulling sharing, trust issues to ward partner.

Chapter six, covers the everyday reality as experience of those who are/were in living together relationship and their feeling or realization while they are/were in living together relationship. In living together relationship how they introduce their partner with in a society?, among the two partner who is/was highly invested on the domestic work? what occupation they obtained and who work for earning, while living together their interest to get marriage, challenges they face in a living together, possibility of extra affair while they are in living relationship, relationship between their partner's family member, (such as parents, sibling, children), expectation of children, use of contraceptive, management of misunderstanding, having children on living together relationship and their present relationship are focused on this chapter.

Chapter Seven is the last chapter of this thesis, which give the summary of dissertation, conclusion of the finding, and theoretical reflection with the data.

Chapter II: Literature Review

2.1 Marriage and Living together

In sociology, marriage is an important social institution among many social institutions as comparatively permanent relationships; such as, religious, educational, political, economic employment related institutions. In the normative (conventional) definition marriage is a permanent (lifelong) relationship between male and female for permanent sexual relation, reproduction of human life and sharing all matters of their life as well as the marriage is a socio-cultural right and responsibility. These rights and responsibilities are not only toward their couple rather toward their in-laws, kin member and community too. In this regard, marriage is a relationship between two opposite sex, who are young by their age, sexually virgin and as well as also a monogamous. In sociological classic, Ferdinand Tönnies wrote on his book *Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft* (1957) that:

The generality of marriage among human beings has a twofold meaning: in the first place, that such a sexual living together between man and women is possible at all; secondly, that every people, or even every town, expresses this general idea in special manner and relates the possibility of a marriage to certain conditions in such a way that will be valid according to its will and law (Tönnies, 1957, pp.200).

As Tönnies writes, special ways related to social, cultural and economic factors of marriage, which are closely associated with the family. Structural Functional theory viewed the family as a unique type of group and social system. Which is characterized by common residence, economic co-operation and reproduction. In the nuclear family or its constituent relationships we thus see assembled four functions fundamental to human social life—the sexual, the economic, the reproductive and the educational. Without provision for the first and third, society would become extinct for second, life itself would cease; for the fourth, culture would come to an end (Murdock, 1949; Trung, 2018.).

According to structural functional perspective husband and wife are closely associated and interdependent. The 'unequal' relationship in a family that husband is breadwinner whose earnings provide the economic basis of the family-household, whereas wife is home maker, and her primary responsibility to the care of husband, household, and children (Trung, 2018). In this regard heterosexual marriage is often analyzed as an

“oppressive institution” toward women from corner of Marxist and feminist perspective (Marx and Engels, 1848; Engels, 1972; Beauvoir 1949; Friedan, 1963).

Sexual relationship before marriage, without marital status and in widowhood was restricted specially toward women in Hindu religious society (Mainali, 2021). It manifest in “Sati⁸” system and Widowhood⁹ which reflect without red color of Hindu religion, white dress in marriage in Christianity¹⁰. Giving a birth without marriage is legally restricted in various countries.

In a one sentences, marriage is both social and legal foundation to fulfill their sexual and reproductive desire, to live together, to share and collective earing, sharing and owning of their property, mutual right and responsibility towards their partner and in-laws. Through the development of philosophical ground, which provide the logical understanding toward phenomenon, science and technology provide the assistance and capitalist mode of production scattered individual from the well-known society to unknown society and make alienated. With these change in social conceptions normative definition of marriage has also changed. With the growth of science and technology the forms of purity and pollution of sexuality was started to be criticized and became less restricted. At present, we can see various rupture in marriage as social institution. We can see these ruptures in various aspects of society, people started to prefer to live as living together relation (co-habitation), many people fall in love with those people who belong form same sex. Many people live without marriage, without any partner or many women became mother out of wedlock. Divorce and remarriage or old age marriage became common all over the world.

⁸ Sati is a wife burning system in Hindu religious system after the death of her husband, which practiced in south Asia. In 1977 government of Nepal officially banned this system.

⁹ In Hindu religious society, widow women are not allowed to make makeup, use bangle, wear read color cloth and vermilion in forehead. Widow women also do not have the right to get marriage, if she got marriage, she and her children deducted from the caste status.

¹⁰ And also Christianity not allowed the sexual desire of women Clare Chambers write on her article The Marriage Free State (2013) that “The white wedding is replete with sexist imagery the father ‘giving away’ the bride; the white dress symbolizing the bride’s virginity and emphasizing the importance of her appearance; the vows to obey the husband; the minister telling the husband ‘you may now kiss the bride’ (rather than the bride herself giving permission, on indeed initiating or at least equally participating in the act of kissing); the reception at which, traditionally, all the speeches are given by men; the wife surrendering her own mane and taking her husband’s”.

Now citizenship right became a constitutional right but in a practice the registration of child was unable to register without the marriage certificate of their parents. Various parents now get married to registered their children’s birth certificate at Government record.

Among these various fraction, in this dissertation I am going to relate living together relationship as an alternative form of marriage and also alternative form of being single. Living together is a relationship between two individual living as a couple without socio-cultural and legal recognition, and they haven't socio-cultural and legal right and responsibility too. In this chapter I am going to review the literature of marriage and living together both in theoretical form, empirical research and writing and policy formulations to understand the living relation. Theoretically am going to review the sociological literature on marriage from theoretical lance of modernization as changing value system and social structure through the linear development paradigm; from the lance of Marxist and feminist perspective as the marriage is "oppressive institution" to ward women and children and wish to abolish it. In empirical literature I am going to review the sociological research based journal articles, newspaper and media based material. In the policy review, I am going to review the available literature on living together in legal filed Nepal. After the finding of gap between these literature, I will develop relevant research questions.

2.2 Theoretical Review

2.2.1 Marxist Perspectives to marriage and Family

At the dawn of the Marxist philosophy, with the declaration of communist movement through *The Communist Manifesto*, in 1848, Marx and Engels declare their position on the modern bourgeois family relation is oppressive toward women and vanish able social relation with the capitalist mode of production. Marx and Engels (1872) wrote:

Abolition of the family! Even the most radical flare up at this infamous proposal of the communists.

On what foundation is the present family, the bourgeois family based? On capital, on private gain. In its completely developed form, this Family exists only among the bourgeoisie. But this state of things finds its complement in the practical absence of the family among the proletarians, and in public prostitution. The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course when its complement vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital (Marx, Engels, 1872, p. 69).

After the declaration of *The Communist Manifesto* Engels published his ground breaking Book *Family, Private Property and Origins of State* in 1884 based on the

book of L.H. Morgan and Marx note on this Book. It provides the wider audiences to advocate the abolition of family structure.

However, now in the European continent there is the debate that living together (cohabitation) relation rose after the demolition of Soviet Union. In central and Eastern Europe, during the late 1980s and early 1990s, there were major political changes, such as the fall of communist governments. These societies entered a new era of increased social freedom, less rigid rules, and less authoritarian governments. They interacted with western Europe and some become members of the European Union. As a result, the pattern of family life has change, marriage rates have declined and marriage was postponed to a later age. Cohabitation and births to unmarried mothers increased, and in some countries the increase was very quick (Arland Thornton and Dimiter Philipov, 2009). It shows that the communism does not force to abolish the marriage relationship.

2.2.2 Modernist Perspective on Marriage and Family

Modernity theory, which is based on the linear development on stage such as, Ferdinand Tonnies's *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*, Emile Durkheim's *Mechanical* and *Organic Solidarity*, Howard Becker's *Sacred* and *Secular* society, Max Weber traditional and Modern society or *Types of Action*, Parsons *Pattern Variable* suggests that development of science and technology advancement the individual's thought on sacred relation to rational secular thought, weakened the traditional value system and familial and kinship and it's replaced by individualism, rational and secular thought. It's also break the traditional taboo on sexuality, cultural domination, has diminished religious influence on individuals, particularly regarding sexuality.

Living with emotional or physical attachment was stigmatized in Christian society too. But the Pope Francis started to give marital status for those people who were in living together relationship. According to the news published in 15th September 2014 at *Australian Broad Casting Corporation (ABC)*, "Pope Francis break taboo by marrying cohabiting couples, conducts mass wedding ceremony". Liberal political thought also provides the ground to develop personal relationship as love partner, sex partner or other relationship.

2.2.3 Feminist Critique of Marriage and Family

Like Marxist, feminists also criticize the concept of marriage. From the feminist corner marriage controls the women's dignity economically, socio-culturally, symbolically and on their identity by and under patriarchal norms, values, power and politics. It is not only in one particular society, nearly all over the world.

Socio-culturally, white wedding dress of Christianity is depicted as the virginity of women and non-virgin girl negatively. And also Christianity not allowed the sexual desire of women. Chambers (2013) write on her article *The Marriage Free State*:

The white wedding is replete with sexist imagery the father 'giving away' the bride; the white dress symbolizing the bride's virginity and emphasizing the importance of her appearance; the vows to obey the husband; the minister telling the husband 'you may now kiss the bride' (rather than the bride herself giving permission, on indeed initiating or at least equally participating in the act of kissing); the reception at which, traditionally, all the speeches are given by men; the wife surrendering her own mane and taking her husband's. (Chamber, 2013, p.123)

Socio-cultural norms in Nepal, once manifested in the Sati and Widow practices, now continue through early teen Gunyu Choli and Kanyadan during marriage. Despite the legal abolition of Sati, these enduring customs still shape women's dignity and autonomy.

Economically, marriage provide the ground for gendered division of labor, which is unpaid care work, and also counted as non-productive work. As other feminist the groundbreaking work of Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique (1963)* gives the new way of thought of marriage as the unsolved problem of materially prosperous house wife of America. She starts this book with the description she called "the problem that has no name". This unnamed problem widely spread unhappiness of women in the 1950s and 1960s America and after 1990s in Nepal. Married women were unhappy despite good living condition and having a child too. On her book Friedan also questions the women's magazine, women's education system and advertisers for creating this widespread image of women. The harmful effects induced by this image were that it concerned women into the domestic sphere, and that it led many women to lose their own identity.

We can see the similar criticism in Nepali Feminist movement after 1990s political change and they have advocated that the count of women's domestic work. After the publication of Mina Acharya's Research *Status of Women in Nepal: Statistical Profile of Nepalese Women (1979)*, it gives the logical understanding that unpaid domestic work also a work. Government of Nepal still unable to incorporate how to recognized domestic work on system. But it creates great social understanding which provide the knowledge to develop women liberation and individual's freedom.

2.3 Empirical Review: Rise of Living Together

As already mentioned in introduction, "Living Together" is a relationship between two individual living as a couple without socio-cultural and legal recognition, and they haven't socio-cultural and legal right and responsibility too. They share everything such as household responsibility, economic condition, sexual desire and pleasure without socio-cultural and legal recognition. There are various words as synonyms of "living together" but in this article all these terminologies used as only living together.

Living together is an alternative or modern form of conventional marriage institution. There is diverse analysis on the debate that 'living together' is new phenomenon or old phenomenon. Some writers write that it's a new phenomenon (Scott, 2008, Chambers, 2013, Thornton and Philipove, 2009, Kien, 2018). But, Anastasia de Waal (2008) who is a head of the Education and family Unit of Civitas, a UK-based think tank wrote on his article *Cohabitation* that "Cohabitation, when a couple live together in a sexual partnership without being married, is not a new phenomenon. It is estimated between the mid-eighteenth and mid-nineteenth centuries, either as a precursor to marriage or as an informal alternative."

But at the same article he writes that cohabitation became progressively more widespread across society toward the second half of the 20th century, with a particularly increased since the mid-1980. So, there can be no contention that living together (cohabitation) was not a new phenomenon, it was prevalent in scattered way before 1970s too, but it's rapidly increased after 1970s. In Nepal too, living together was rising after the political change of 1990s, in the areas of comparatively developed urban areas like Kathmandu, Pokhara, Dharan. But, in Nepal we do not have any authentic data that how many people are in living together relationship. The big survey, such as Census, Nepal Demographic Health Survey, Nepal Living Standard survey of

government still unable to recognize that living together has also been practiced in Nepali society.

On the absence of authentic data, we do not know how many people are in Living together relationship. According to the news published in *Setopati* in 2080, monthly ten to fifteen young girls came to the Women Commission to register complain that “after living together he did not get marriage with me”. This data indicates that there are various couple who live under the living together relationship.

At the public sphere, we engage in the debate concerning the social change and recognition of living together. It was stigmatized socially unsocial behavior, culturally sin, and over freedom. Living together depicted in Nepali news (paper, radio, TV and social media such as Facebook, Twitter, YouTube) comes as a cause of crime, such as illing¹¹¹²¹³, domestic violence¹⁴, depression and suicide¹⁵, honey trapping, birth of unwanted child and violence¹⁶, leaving a child in garbage, forest and infanticide. Sometime it is depicted as bargaining tool to exploit another partner. And from the side of human right activist, 'living together' relationship also suppressive for women and girls.

Social perception also depends on the level of knowledge, freedom, awareness and social connectivity on how people enjoy with living together. Empirically we can see a prism of living together relationship and in these multi-colored relationship impact differently in individual's life. Some people are enjoying with it as liberation and freedom, some people are waiting a time and situation to get marries, some individual

¹¹ The death story of Safina Miya, who was in living together relationship for a year but after some miss understanding she was killed by her partner.

https://www.onlinekhabar.com/2024/01/1422817?utm_source=Facebook&utm_medium=FBpage1&fbclid=IwAR13JiNx13yCHvb6QhzVfVnDV3W80ln-rfqVf9WwRGWaYOeol73q3ckrqB0

¹² The killing of Rojina Tamang at Thamel. She was in living together relationship since January 2023 and she was killed by her partner with in a six month.

<https://ekantipur.com/national/2023/06/07/168482522499493996.html>

¹³ Story of death of Unisha Rai and Anish Jimi, they were in living together relationship since 2021 December and within a month Anish killed Rojina and he also suicide.

<https://ekantipur.com/national/2022/01/07/164155822169968243.html>

¹⁴ Case of X (who live with her boyfriends), was suffered from domestic violence by her boyfriends.

She tried to file the case against her boyfriend in police office, Nepal Police denied to file the case and she publicly post her statement at face book. It's highly debatable in social media.

¹⁵ Case tory “Y” who was an actor suicide and there is news he was living together with her girlfriend and they are acting in same film.

¹⁶ Case “Z”, Famous singer was in the living together relationship. After the birth of child, he started to ignore his partner and child at the time of early motherhood, he used to beat her and his partner file the case and got marital status.

are suffering the burden of unwanted child, some people are suffering from domestic violence and some people lost their life through the killing too, some people are in psychological trauma, threat of life, some children are sufferings economic, physical and emotional pain through the parent's living together. On the lack of authentic data, we do not know, how many people have better peaceful relationship and how many individuals are suffering from it.

Empirically, there are various forms of living together in Nepal such as early age marriage which are socio-culturally recognized but legally not marriage heterosexual couple, sociocultural and legally not recognized youth heterosexual couple, sociocultural not recognized homosexual couple, extramarital relationship holder couple and so on. Living relationship is socially stigmatizing, controversial and sensitive relationship even in highly modern and educated Kathmandu valley.

Nepal police office, courts, media and NGO worker often saw a dark side of living together¹⁷. Rather than the claim of the Marxism, Feminism and modernism, the public face of the living together as the alternative of marriage relation “as oppressive institution” is vulgar for those people. Along with the killing, depression, suicide, there are various impact on children whose parents are not legally recognized as husband and wife. High rate of illegal abortion, leaving a child in garbage, domestic violence, to get of birth certificate, getting government's identity such as citizenship is hard without the marriage registration of parents. Socially they are unable to fully enjoy with their parent's culture and social surrounding, specially their grandparent, uncle aunties and cousin and they also not recognized by these social setting.

Academically we have few research on living together in Nepal. One among these few research is Bishnu Prasad Dahal's *Living Together Relationship; Towards a New Pattern of Adult Life in Kathmandu* (2020). His study based on case studies on Kathmandu District Court after separation of individual from the living together. He wrote that:

The field study was carried out in among respondents who go away from living together and those respondents were key respondents who filed the cases in Kathmandu

¹⁷ Senior Lawyer Shashi Adhikari answer on her interview on TV show that when to people are in living together relationship they hide their relationship, when they suffered or feel threat from relationship they bring the relation on public sphere ether with police case, or asking support from NGOs or direct case file in court. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bkk_p-ulDBk

District Court after separation most of the cases are filed under the clauses the female partner was raped by her male partner while they were in living together relationship. (Dahal, 2020)

His research is unable to give the cause of living together rather it gives the glimpses of violence within the living together relationship.

2.4 Policy Review

As authentic data, Government of Nepal also do not have separate law to recognize the living together relationship, to address complexities on this relationship, recognition of children and transfers of inheritance to their partner after the death of one partner while living together relationship. But through the President and order provide of supreme court and scattered provision for difference law can used the legal ground by talented advocate in court. First time in 25 Jeth 2055 (June 1998) in the case of Annapurna Rana, supreme court, Bench of both justice Arbindnath Achaya and Rajendra Nakhwa gave the presidency that any adult individual has sexual relationship, they can declare it or hide it that's their private affair.

If we consider changing social contexts, the choice to maintain one's virginity or not in sexual relationship with a person of her choice is a private affair. Some people may do this secretly, while others may be more open about their choice. Having sexual relation with another person does not change a woman's legal status. Some may opt to legally get married after having sexual intercourse and even after the birth of a child. Further, we cannot say that a woman is married even if she lives with a man for years as if they were spouses. It cannot be ascertained that they are spouses when they stay together, but behave independently until they actually get legally married. It cannot automatically be said that a girlfriend and boyfriend are married just because they go out together and have a child together. In the given context, it cannot be determined that a woman has been married to a man without factual basis – proof that they were married in accordance with established traditions or married by registering it as per law. Since our modern society emphasizes personal liberty and must keep up with evolving social norms, the notion of premarital sex alone cannot establish marriage and this situation does not imply that the parents' responsibility to their daughter has been over. (Acharya and Khakhwa, decision number 6588, 2000, p. 2)

It was a land mark decision and it's used as presidency for case registered in court. After the nine years of this presidency of supreme court, in 6 Poush 2064 (2007) supeme court, bench of Hon'ble Justice Balram K.C. and Hon'ble Justice Pawan

Kumar Ojha gives the order on petition registered by Sunil Babu Panta, Meena Nepali, Sanjeev Gurung, And Manoranjan Kumar Vaidhya for legitimation of living together/cohabitation or marriage for same sex couple. In this ordered they ordered to government to formulation separate committee to develop separate law. They write on their order:

...petitioners pertain to the protection of the fundamental right of the lesbians, gay, bisexual people by the state though appropriate legal provisions which, by granting them legal and social recognition from the state and society on the basis of their sexual orientation, ensures a life of freedom as other heterosexual people have. In reality, this claim is specific in regard to the issue of same sex marriage or co-habitation of such couple looking at the issue of same sex marriage who hold that it is an inherent right of al adult with her/his free consent and according to her/his will. The same sex marriage should be viewed from the view point of interest and right of concerned people as well as that of the society, family and all other. (K.C and Ojha, decision number 7958, 2007, p. 30)

This order more strengthens the will to start living together relationship either same sex or heterosexual relationship they have. But this ordered is toward specifically for sexual minority community.

At the same year government replaced the old Civil Code by *Civil Code of 2074*. New Civil Code also recognized the living together relationship on the case they have baby. This laws are attracted when couple have baby their can automatically have converted on marriage. In *Article 74 of the Civil Code of 2074* unable to give a way that “if a woman is found to have conceived and given birth to a child through physical contact with a man, such marriage shall be deemed to have occurred automatically” (Government of Nepal, 2074, p.). This legislation provides the ground to acknowledgement the relationship of living together and legal recognition of child and father relationship. But other side of the flip of this Article also provide the ground on the case of sexually abused, rape, forced marriage too. In this way we can say that this legal legislation is supportive to ward children, but it’s not able to address the relationship between partner without having children too. In this way we cannot say/write that it’s a legal recognition of living together couple, and it’ unable to solve the complexities related to the living together relationship.

Similarly, in *Domestic Violence (Offend and Punishment) Act 2009* had also acknowledge the relationship as living together/cohabitation:

“Domestic relationship” means a relationship between two or more persons who are living together in a shared household and are related by decent (consanguinity), marriage, adoption or are family member living together as a joint family; or a dependent domestic help living in the same family. (Government of Nepal, 2009, p. 1-2)

As other, Domestic Violence (Offend and Punishment) Act 2009 gives some ground for acknowledgment of living together but do not provide proper understanding. Government of Nepal do not try to formulation of separate law to recognized living together relationship and address the complexities on this. After fourteen years of the supreme court ordered in 2078 two different committee of House of Representatives; first Women and Social Committee and second Law; Justice and Human Rights Committee organized discussions on the issue of living together and criminalization of relationship (*Kantipur*, 2078). These two different meetings focused on registration of the relationship as couple under the government’s rules and regulation. After a meeting and report it is still pending.

From the side of lawyer, senior advocate Shashi Adhikari, Mohan Acharya have been advocating for legal recognition of living together relationship. Last time, first Chaitra 2080 advocate Annu Bhattarai filed a petition to supreme court urging for the legal status for living together relationship¹⁸.

In the next side of flip, in the case or from the corner of sexual minority (LGBTIQ) community, they are focused on same sex marriage, and demanding the marital right as Heterosexual people. After the rise of sexual minority movement particularly and LGBTIQ movement generally demanding the marital status indicate that marriage is also a privilege to enjoy the sexual, reproductive and socio-cultural life. And there is a prominent theoretical question on feminism which form of marriage is oppressive? or there is a question " Marriage is oppressive for whom?

¹⁸ In 14 March 2024 Advocate Annu Bhattarai file the petition at supreme court demanding the legal status for living together relationship. In this petition she claims that if government formulate the legal foundation to living together divorce rate will be reducing with the reduction of physical, mental violence and destruction of social structure. <https://newsgriha.com/detail/18442>

Clare Chambers, a British political philosopher at the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Cambridge write on her article *The Marriage-free state* which published on 2013, there are specially two types of critics from the feminist corner such as marriage as oppressive institution and it is privileges only for those who has heterosexuality. In Nepal too for some individual, living together relationship because they do not have the legal privilege to get register their relationship and socio-culturally family and society are unable to accept their relationship.

As Chambers, in Nepal too marriage became a privilege to those people who are unable to registered their relationship and they also suffered from emotional breakdown, multiple relationship and violence and there is no other legal ground of living together. According to Durga Thapa, who's interview is collected in the book named of *Samanata Ko Rile Daud* (2021), where she is one among twelve interviewees. She said that there are various cases on emotional torture, multiple relationship, battering and economic exploitation in the same sex relationship too. Within the women right movement in Nepal they are together with other women in some part of movement. But same-sex (lesbian) women now in that position to fight for already stablished right for women. These already stablished right is right to get marriage and to stablish own family. Thapa said on her interview Gautam, Rai and Onta (2021):

State and society does not acknowledge and has not allowed the same sex relationship of women. Through the same sex relationship, we are fighting for social and legal recognition for to enjoy the marital life and stablished the family. (Gautam et al., 2021, p. 256)

In a conclusion we can say that, In Nepali Legal system despite the lack/absence of exact law on living together relationship, in scattered form there are some legal ground which provide legal ground for individual and advocate in court. But other side of the flip that all of these ground; that presidencies and ordered of supreme court, *Article 74 of Civil Code* or the *Law Domestic Violence (Offend and Punishment) Act, 2009* are unable to address the complexity such as on forced living together form the beginning, unwanted living (after unable to adjustment), forced abortion, negligence, domestic violence against partner (not only a women) and child, inheritance of partner after a death of living together partner.

2.5 Research Gap

From literature we found that various factors play important role to push an individual to live in living together relationship. This factors include rising literacy, information and fictitious thought and search of romantic love relationship, not clear for lifelong commitment but searching a sex partner, urbanization which provide the sense of privacy, freedom from traditional value, family and kin member. Urbanization provide the space for relationship, education system which always teach the sense of freedom and sometimes separate from the traditional family setting, mass migration and high division of labor isolate the individual, limitation of legal provision; on a same sex relationship, double partnership, early age marriage. Some of these causes are interconnected to each other and some of the cause are not inter connected. In this regard, are unable to declare which factors are prominent and which factors are less important without conducting detail research.

Chapter III: Research Methodology

Research methodology is important way to systematically solve the research problem. It may be understood as a science of studying how research is done scientifically/sociologically. In this chapter, I will focus on research philosophy, research design, location of the study, selection of respondent as sampling procedure, nature and sources of data, techniques of data collection, data presentation and analysis and my as researcher's self-reflection on the subject matter and thesis writing process.

3.1 Research Philosophy

Living together in Nepal is empirically vague and politically-legally non recognized subject. To analyses the multicolor, flued and diversified reality of living together I will follow the Interpretative research paradigm in this research. I have been highly fascinating after reading Herbert Blumer's contribution on the methodology of symbolic interactionism. Ruth A. Wallace and Allison Wolf cite the Blumer's discussed on their book *Contemporary Sociological Theory: Expanding the Classical Tradition* (2006) that the technique that researchers might use in analyzing the "inner career of Action". This paragraph one again I want to recite to relate my research interest on the living together relationship.

One would expect that starting from such a view, actual study and research would use methods and techniques that aim to penetrate into the area of inner experience. Such is the case. We find that much use in made, in social psychology, of such devices as the life history, the interview, the autobiography, the case method, diaries and letters. These devices are employed for three purposes. First, to gain a picture of the inner and private experience of the individual that seems to constitute the background for the emergence and existence of a given form of conduct. Thus the account given by delinquent of his life history is held to reveal the texture of personal happenings, which presumably has given rise to, and which sustains, his delinquency. Second to show the nature of the individual's subjective slant on life-the world as he views it, the values and meaning which different objectives have for him, his "definitions" with which he seems to meet situations, his stock of attitudes and the way in which he views himself. Third to throw light on the life and operation of the imaginative process: fantasizing evading, planning, deciding, and the different ways in which in his imagination, he meets difficulties, frustrations, and problematic situations. (Blumer, 2006, p. 193-194)

In Blumer's writing there are various gender blind terminology. But the essence of research philosophy is highly used able to collect information on the diverse, fluid and scattered reality. Now Interpretative research philosophy is highly used in social science in general and sociological research particular. I also want to add the views of Lawrence W. Neuman. According to Lawrence W. Neuman in his book *Social Research Method: Qualitative and Quantitative approaches* (2008):

The interpretive theorist attempts to discover the meaning of an event or practice by placing it within a specific social context. He or she tries to comprehend or mentally grasp the operation of the social world, as well as get a feel for something or to see the world as another person does. Because each person's subjective worldview shapes how he or she acts, the researcher attempts to discern other's reasoning and view of things (Neuman, 2008, p.72).

In this regard this research will be focused subjective reality of the individual who are in living together relationship.

3.2 Exploratory Research Design

Following the interpretative research philosophy, methodologically this research adopt that exploratory research design. Among various research design, in this dissertation on the living together relationship still in meaning making process, fluid and diverse phenomenon in Nepal. Government do not have proper law to recognized it and response the complexities on it. Society, media and police often depicted it as problematic relationship. In this situation to explore that types of relationship they have, how they develop their relationship, in which point they decide to living together, which factor encourage them to choose living together rather than marriage, how they introduced their partner and relationship with in a society, how they have relationship with their partner's family member, similarly their family how treated with their partner, their interest on marriage, babies, and after a living together what types of relationship they have yet present is focused on this dissertation through the qualitative in-depth interview.

3.3 Location of the Study

In this research to select the Kathmandu Valley for location of the study, I have two reasons, first is Kathmandu Valley is most one urban area of Nepal; Second reason is Kathmandu is my living place, where I know, engage in the newest debate since 2004

as two decades. Kathmandu Valley is the highly populated, diversified, urban area and capital city of Nepal. It's historically a center of political power and trade. It's an ancient city as well as the center of new thought, new ideology and revolution too. Now Kathmandu valley is the home of ethnic, linguistic, regionally and culturally diverse people. Kathmandu provide the space to those people and who want to hide their life and it's also provide the space of to stand on own thought in reflexive way.

In the same manner as urban society individual detached/alienated from their family, community and society's control, domination and the support too. People in urban area they also detached/alienated by their tradition norms, value, rule and regulation too. Comparatively urban people are free from their cultural stigma, taboo and unnecessary responsibility toward their family, community in world-wide Kathmandu is not isolated with those pattern. Under the qualitative research method, I wonder to gather data through the case studies and Key Informant Interview. The case studies method will be used of those people who life in Kathmandu valley and also live in living together relationship.

3.4 Sampling

To select of respondents, I used two different types of sampling process, purposive and snow ball sampling. For those respondents who are/were in living together relationship openly and I already know them, I used purposive sampling to take an interview on my and their convenience. Key informant also selected on the basis of purposive sampling process. But various people I do not know before to take interview but through the friend, colleague and relatives circle I find out the, and became able to take interview with them was selected from snowball sampling.

Purposive Sampling: Purposive sampling was used to select the respondent to take in-depth interview from respondent who are/were in living together and key informant interview with those who are professionally work in the area of issue of living together. Purposive sampling is one of the non-probability sampling techniques. Sample elements are judged to be typical or representatives are chosen from the population. It is relatively small size of sample that can ensure the representative of diverse characteristic. In purposive sampling the researcher chooses the sample based on who they think would be appropriate for the study. This is primarily used when there is a limited number of people that have expertise in the area being researched, or when the

interest of the research is on a specific field or a small group. I used this sampling process for seven respondents who are/were in living together relationship, based on the availability of respondent's time and space I will follow the purposive sampling method. At the same manner I select the respondents for Key Informant Interview (KII) too.

Snow Ball Sampling: I used Snow Ball Sampling method because most of my knowing person dined me to give recorded interview for my thesis. Before and between of the proposal development, I was severally discussed about the topics living together with my friend, senior, colleague. It was starting from some news evidence and we often analyses the pattern of living together in our tea/coffee meeting. When I shared that I am going to conduct research on living together in Kathmandu valley, various friend shared that their friend or relatives is/was in living together relationship from many years. Some friend from LGBTI Community also share that intimate partner violence is high in living together relationship, on the absence of Legal formulation. Additionally, I and our friends circle already knowing close friend also was in living together relationship. I was so excited while making the list of living together couples in Kathmandu valley, some of them I closely knowing people, some of them were just knowing.

I make the list of them at that time of my proposal viva. After the viva of my proposal I started to call those people whom I knew that they are/were in living together relationship. I call the first name who is my like best friend from 22 years and I know her many thing and she know my life from nearer. We have been witness on our ups and down. She was nearly five years in living together relationship before the marriage. When I asked her for a time to record the interview, she denied to give an interview to me and she also said 'I do not break our more than 20 years long friend on the basis of this one interview'. I said what are you saying? She said me, 'I can give the interview to anyone except you, I need you forever in my life. In this regard I can't give my interview with you. If I gave interview, it will be bias. I can't share all thing with you'. I became awkward on her response.

I request other friend for to give an interview and she know that I know her relationship. She said me that "it was not a living together relationship. Someone came to my setting without any consultation any agreement, live some month being a depend on single

earning people and skip from the responsibility”. I became unable to convince herself to share her experiences on forceful living together relationship.

Other three individual who are more excited to give an interview for my thesis, one became unable because she is pregnant and suffering from several complexity of pregnancy. Two of my targeted respondent became too busy because of “Month June is Pride Month”. They became busy for project and program.

First two week of May I became sad thinking that I will have just five six respondents who already excited to share their story for a thesis. Then I started to asked all friends and former colleague who are working for women right. Some of them said me ‘you can take my story; I was/am in living together relationship’. Thirteen of my respondent are found through the connection of other. Before to take interview as researcher I do not have any connection with them.

For connection might be help by organization, friend’s circles of respondent, snowball sampling will be best incorporate. As P K Majumdar write on his book *Research Methods in Social Science* (2005):

We can start with enlisted individuals, each of them can offer a few other names who were actively associated with the movement from their memory; the individuals in the second list can further refer to some others, whose name did not feature either in the first or in the derived second. This process can continue till we are satisfied that we reasonably have located those individuals who in some way or other were involved in the movement under the study (Majumdar, 2005, p.198).

For this thesis, I found thirteen respondents from the other respondents. I do not have any idea and information before to meet them. So these eleven respondent connected as snow ball sampling.

In this way research used both sampling selection process to gather the subjective analysis of causes and experience of living together in Kathmandu Valley.

3.5 Nature and Sources of Data

Primary field based data was collected for this research. For this dissertation, I gathered from the field work, which done between 15 May to 14 June of in Kathmandu valley, through the in-depth interview with those people who are/were in living together relationship. Similarly, I take Key Informant Interview with those people who

are closely work with the person who are/were in living together relationship. These data have purely primary nature, and field based which gathered through the different types of interview.

3.6 Techniques of Data Collection

Under the qualitative research method, I gathered data/information through the case studies, and Key Informant Interview. To collect the information, I developed checklist to incorporate main point that concern with research. Interview was recorded, which was became helpful for verbatim transcription. Verbatim transcription helped me to consolidate the case studies of those individual who are/were live in living together relationship in Kathmandu Valley. Key informant interview also conducted based on the checklist, it also recorded and transcribed. Key informant was selected purposively and on the convenience, time and space of researcher and key informant, interview was conducted. For document review also I do not develop any checklist I just search the recorded from the various case filed on the National Woman Commission.

In-depth Interview: To collect the date I used in-depth interview technique with 20 respondents who live in Kathmandu valley and they have/had living together relationship. I do not have limitation of number and it was not saturated To dig out the cause encourage them to live in living together relationship rather than a marriage and to collect their everyday reality as experience on living together is collected through the recorded in-depth interview. These in-depth interview first I record and transcribe in Nepali language they. Put translating form on analysis section.

Key Informant Interview: As a knowing person, through the Key Informant Interview I was gather data from policy maker, police officer, lawyer, human right activist and feminist who are/were directly worked with those people who are/were in living together relationship in Kathmandu valley. Before to collect the data I was develop checklist to ask my respondent for both of technique for data collection.

3.7 Ethical Considerations of the Data

In this research I as a researcher was involving in all process of the research. To make it ethical I was developed the rapport with those respondent whom I select purposively, and make bonding for other respondent who are/were in living together relationship. I was conduct/take in-depth recorded interview with those individual who are/were in living together relationship, recorded interview was transcribed. Key informant also

selected through my knowledge and suggestion by other source. I develop rapport with them, before to take interview and transcribe myself. I fully invested to gathered the data.

3.8 Data Analysis

After of conduction of an in-depth and Key Informant interviews, I develop analytical chapter on the basis of my research question. I am going to analyze this information in three other chapters; chapter four analyze the socio-demographic character of respondents and their partner, chapter five present their introduction, love affair and decision to living together and that factor that encourage them for living together relation. Chapter six analyzed every day experiences of my respondent while they are/were in living together relationship. All data are analyzed with simple table and narrative format.

3.9 Self-reflection of Researcher

For me, writing this thesis became a beautiful journey to me to know the double standard face of my society. At the beginning, it was exciting situation to do thesis on my own choice topics, after the several discussions with senior, colleague and friends. In this section I want to share my, self-reflection on two sub sections. In a first section I am going to focused on my interest to select the research topics on living together as self-reflection as reflexive sociology. In second section is focused on my field experience to collect the information.

Living together relationship is common in my surrounding. I was involving left movement from my late teenage since 2004. After complete my bachelor level education I started my first job as newspaper journalist, where we often involved the debate on how communist life like, work like speak like. After getting marriage and having baby I started to work on feminist organization. These all place were full of various changing debate, but one debate is continuing that “marriage is oppressive social institution toward women”. Both (left and Feminist) movement are highly criticize the marriage as oppressive institution. And Engels’s *Family, Private Property and Origine of State (1891)* was highly recommended book in those both circle. These debate influence our life at the left movement, journalism and feminist movement (some time these three field interconnected too) some of my friends and senior sisters are never ever get marriage. Some of my feminist friend didn’t registered their

relationship as marriage, and some of friend proudly say that “I am living with my partner”.

Those who are/were in living together relation, their family and friends are well known that they are/were in living together relation. Parents and friends also do not have any problem on their relationship. But when I started work to the feminist organization often we faced with the problem like rape, beating, neglecting, leaving after getting birth of baby or pregnancy. These cases force me to search about living together in media and in a media too there are same story such as living together and killing, living together and rape. And again I search the academic research based on Nepali society, I found the consequences focused literature. Then I wonder, about those people who are happily living in living together or those friend who were in living together and get marriage after a while. I think to focused on cause of living together in this research.

Before and between of the proposal development, I was severally discussed about the topics living together with my friend, senior, colleague. It was starting from some news evidence and we often analyses the pattern of living together in our tea/coffee meeting. When I shared that I am going to conduct research on living together in Kathmandu valley, various friend shared that their friend or relatives is/was in living together relationship from many years. Some friend from LGBTI Community also share that intimate partner violence is high in living together relationship, on the absence of Legal formulation. Additionally, I and our friends circle already knowing close friend also was in living together relationship. I was so excited while making the list of living together couples in Kathmandu valley, some of them I closely knowing people, some of them were just knowing.

I make the list of them at that time of my proposal viva. After the viva of my proposal I started to call those people whom I knew that they are/were in living together relationship. I call the first name who is my like best friend from 22 years and I know her many thing and she know my life from nearer. We have been witness on our ups and down. She was nearly five years in living together relationship before the marriage. When I asked her for a time to record the interview, she denied to give an interview to me and she also said ‘I do not break our more than 20 years long friend on the basis of this one interview’. I said what are you saying? She said me, ‘I can give the interview to anyone except you, I need you forever in my life. In this regard I can’t

give my interview with you. If I gave interview, it will be bias. I can't share all thing with you'. I became awkward on her response.

I request other friend for to give an interview and she know that I know her relationship. She said me that "it was not a living together relationship. Someone came to my setting without any consultation any agreement, live some month being a depend on single earning people and skip from the responsibility". I became unable to convince herself to share her experiences on forceful living together relationship.

Other three individual who are more excited to give an interview for my thesis, one became unable because she is pregnant and suffering from several complexity of pregnancy. Two of my targeted respondent became too busy because of "Month June is Pride Month". They became busy for project and program.

First two week of May I became sad thinking that I will have just five six respondents who already excited to share their story for a thesis. Then I started to asked all friend who are working for women right. Some of them said me 'you can take my story; I was/am in living together relationship". Some other suggest respondent, they provide their space with tea, coffee and snacks. In that's way these people give me a hope, whom I know professionally. Three of my respondents connect other respondent. Some of my NGO worker friends tried to connect their living together individual, but individual denied to share the story on recorded form, some of individual became ready to give interview in phone or messenger call but do not became ready to give face to face recorded interview.

Chapter IV: Socio-Demographic Profile of Respondents

Introduction

In this chapter I am going to give some details profile of respondents and their partner. Respondent's demographic profile such as caste and ethnicity, caste ethnic relation between partner, age of respondent and age combination between respondent and their partner, religious status of respondents and combination of religious status between the partner and respondents, level of education and combination of level of education between partner of respondents, sex and sexuality, rural urban setting respondents and their partner, occupational status of respondents and their partner generally I followed while conducting interview. During the process of interview, I get information that many of my women respondents already married and they have child before their living together relationship, they were survivor multiple form of violence. Then I add marital status and having children as another demographic profile, I thought that status of marriage and having children also one important factors to start "Living Together" relationship rather than a marriage.

At the field work I take an interview with 20 respondents, but this chapter give the information of 20 couple and 40 respondents detail information of my respondents and their partners.

4.1 Caste/Ethnicity

At the time of proposal development, haven't plan to choose respondents according to caste and ethnicity. Neither I choose the respondent on the basis of their caste, as snowball sampling, I found level respondents from the other respondents. I do not have any idea and information before to meet them. At the process of interview with my respondents I just fill up their demographic profile. It the process of interview I got respondents belonging to different caste and ethnic groups. Out of 20 respondents of the interview, six respondent belong from the Brahmin community, three from Chhetri community. Ten of my 20 respondents belong from different endogenous/ Janajati community (such as four respondents from Ria community, one from Janajati, one from Gurung, one from Sunuwar, one from Kirat, one from Tamang, and one from Limbu community. And one respondent among 20 belongs from Dalit community. It's shows that Janajati community have a domination on living together relationship.

Table 1: *Caste/ethnicity combination of respondents*

Caste/ethnicity	Number of respondent
Brahmin	6
Chhetri	3
Ethnic people (Rai, Janajati, Gurung, Sunuwar, Kirat, Tamang, Limbu)	10
Dalit	1
Total	20

Source: Field work, 2024

At the same manner there are the diversity of respondent's partner's caste and ethnic composition. Four among the 20 respondents' partner belong from the Brahmin community, five from Chhetri community, nine of them represent from diverse ethnic community (such as three from Newar, three from Gurung, one from Tamang, one from Magar and one from Thakali). At the similar way one of my respondent's partner belong from the Madhesi Community and another respondent's partner belong from Sanyashi community.

Table 2: *Caste/ethnicity combination of respondent and partner of respondents.*

Caste/Ethnicity	Number of respondents
Brahmin	4
Chhetri	5
Ethnic people (Newar, Gurung, Sunuwar, Kirat, Tamang, Limbu)	9
Sanyasi	1
Madheshi	1
Total	20

Source: Field work, 2024

Research found that the dominant respondent has an inter caste relationship with their partner. And only five couple of my 20 respondent has same caste relationship with their partner.

Table 3: *Caste ethnic relationship between partners*

Caste relationship	Number of couples
Same caste relationship	5
Inter caste relationship	15
Total	20

Source: Field work, 2024

In this way research cover the diversity of the respondent and their partner based on the caste and ethnic categories. These data also show that the living together relationship is rising between inter caste relationship, but data do not deny that in same caste relationship too, people have a living together.

4.2 Age of Groups and Duration of Living

There are no specific focused age group on the research. I just want to know in which time individual can join in living together relationship. Research found diversity based on the age group from 23 to 55. seven respondents among 20 respondents were belong from the 20-30 age group, 7 respondents among the 20 from 30-40 age group, three individual from 40-50 age group and three individual from 50 to 60 age group. It's show that there are not specific age group to engage in living together relationship.

Table 4: *Age group of Respondents*

Age group of my respondents	Number
20-30	7
30-40	7
40-50	3
50-60	3
Total	20

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

In the process of interviews, I found that the diversity of age group on respondent's partner. Five individual among 20 belong 20-30 age groups, seven individual belong from 30-40 years' age group, other 7 individual belong from 40-50 years' age group and one respondent's partner belong from more than fifty-year age group. It's indicate that 20-50 years' age group's individual involvement in living together relationship.

Table 5: *Age group of Respondent's partner*

Age group of Respondent's partner	Number
20-30	5
30-40	7
40-50	7
50+	1
Total	20

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

With age, I already make a plan to take interview to them who are/were in living together relationship more than a six month. There is diversity of duration of living from six-month to 16 years. Four respondents among 20 are living less than a one year,

three respondents are/were live in living together relationship for two years, two respondents for four years, five respondents for five years, three respondents for three years, one respondent for 7 years, one respondent for 11 years, one respondent for 12 years, and one respondent for 16 years spend in living together relationship.

Table 6: *Duration of living together of respondent with their partner.*

Duration of living	Numbers
5 month to one year	4
2 year	3
4 years	2
5 years	5
6 years	3
7years	1
Above 10 years	3
Total	20

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

Research shows that there is no specific time line for living together relationship. In the process of research, I found the respondent who just started their living together relationship before five months to just break people who live nearly 16 years together. But there is diverse story on living, skipping and reliving relationship with in same individual and different individuals.

4.3 Religious combination between respondent and their Partner

Regarding religious status or combination between the respondent and their partner, there are a huge diversity between them. Respondents are divided into five religious groups. Ten respondents among twenty believed/followed Hindu religion, two respondents believed in Buddhist religion, two respondents were Atheist, one respondent belong from nature worshipping community, one respondent belong form Christian and one respondent thought the religion of humanity will make prosperous world. In same manner, there are a diversity on religious practices between partner of respondents. Twelve among 20 they follow the Hinduism, 4 of them follow the Buddhism one and two are Atheist two respondent do not have idea of their partner's religion.

4.4 level of Education of respondent and their partner

Research found that the big diversity based on the level of education among respondent and their partner. Respondent belong form the 3 class to MPhil level they get

education. In the same manner, respondent's partner belongs from Five class of their education to PHD level of their education. Eight among 20 of my respondents has up to SLC (School Leaving Certificate) Level of education, no one from the 12 class, six of my respondent from Bachelor level, five respondents from Masters level and one respondent from MPhil level.

Table 7: *Level of education of respondents and their partner*

Level of education	Number of respondents	Number of respondent's partner
Up to SLC	8	8
12/PCL:	-	4
Bachelor	6	4
Masters	5	3
MPhil/PHD	1	1
Total	20	20

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

Level of education also found different level among 20 respondent's partner. Eight respondent's partner have fifth class to SLC level of education, four respondent's partner have 12 class or intermediate level of education. Four respondent's partner has Bachelor level education, three have master level education and one have a PHD. This information shows that there is no specific level of education to among the people who have living together relationship.

4.5 Sex/Gender combination of respondent

I get more diversified group to take respondent in terms of caste/ethnicity, occupational, level of education, age, duration of living. These types of diversity mostly belong from the heterosexual formalities. Sixteen among the 20 respondent has heterosexual relationship and one respondent has homo sexual relationship.

Table 8: *Sex and Gender based combination of respondent*

Sex/Gender	Number of respondent
Female	14
Other	2
Male	4
Total	20

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

At the beginning of the research I have a plan to take interview with the couple who are/were in living together relationship. But at the time of my field work many of my known respondent denied to give an interview. Then, I search the respondent whom I didn't know previously. I able to connect only women and their couple dinned to give an interview. I got four male respondents, one is gay-male among these four. Fifteen women (one is lesbian) respondents among 20 of my respondent. It's look like some biasness to select the respondent, and I became agree on that as women I able to convince for interview to women or I have a connectivity with them.

4.6 Permanent Address between Couple in District

As a study area I select the Kathmandu valley to conduct research, all of my respondents are living in Kathmandu valley too. But, only one among of my 20 respondents permanently belong from Kathmandu Valley and three of my respondent's partner belong form Kathmandu. Permanent address might provide the rural urban setting/connectivity of individual who are/were in Living together relationship. There are come from different parts of the Nepal, (one came from Sikkim too), and settle in Kathmandu temporarily or partially permanently. Two respondents come from Makawanpur, two from Bhojpur, one from Kaski, one from Udaypur, one from Sindhuli, one from Palpa, one from Kathmandu, one from morang, one respondent from Sunsari, One respondent from Dhading among the 20 respondent.

There are also have a diversity on my respondent's partner's permanent resident too. Four partner of my respondents belong from Kaski, four from Chitawan, three from Kathmandu, one from Sunsari, one from Gorakha, one from Kabhrepalanchok, one from India, one from Baglung among 20 partner of my respondent. Of couple belong from the same district and 14 couple has the inter district combination on their living relationship.

These data show that the most of respondent's and partner of respondents belong from outside the Kathmandu valley. But we might not have generalized this data one for all individual, on the basis of my connectivity to ward individual might be bias.

4.7 Occupational Status of Respondent and their partner

Out of 20 respondents of interviewed and 20 of their partners 7 respondents are INGO/NGO workers. Four of NGO worker previously survivor of multiple form of violence. At the process to fight against the violence they became a NGO worker now.

Three of INGO/NGO worker are professionally academically engaged on NGO/INGO work. Three individual out of twenty are sex worker. Two individual out of 20 is engage in teaching one is at University Assistant professor and another is college lecturer. Two individual among 20 respondents are communist activist. Two respondent are writer/consultant, one respondent from re-habitation center operator and another one individual from domestic worker. Another one respondent among them are plumber.

Table 9: *Occupational Status of respondents and their partner*

Occupation	Number of respondents	Number of respondent's partner
NGO Worker	7	-
Lecturer	2	1
Sex worker	3	-
Writer	2	1
Activist	2	1
Daily wage labor	1	4
Foreign labor	1	2
Business	1	1
Information Technology	-	2
Rehab center operator	1	1
Shopkeeper	-	1
Tourism	-	1
Artist	-	2
House maker	-	1
Engineer	-	1
Medical Person	-	1
Totle	20	20

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

Research shows that the big diversity on the basis of occupation. Among 40 individual (20 respondents and 20 respondent's partner) belongs from the 16 different occupational background. Research found that all of them has multiple occupation with in a same time. Here I present their master occupation only, it's show that the no specific sector's individual engagement in living together relationship.

4.8 Marital status and having children before living together

At the time of proposal development, I didn't think about the factor that having already marriage and children can play an important role to live together. On the process of interview of ninth respondent I strongly feel that already married, broken marital life

and having children also play a vital role to encourage living for together relationship. Research found that eight among 20 of my respondent already have children before to engage in living together relationship. Seven among 8 respondents were women who have early child marriage. One among 8 married respondents is male who haven't a child marriage. Nine among 20 respondents were unmarried their, 10 respondent's partner also unmarried individual before they get start their living together relationship. Three among of my 20 respondents have already married and their story also related to a child marriage but they do not have children. Two of my respondent were unmarried but their partner was married these two individual's marriage also related to forced marriage. One among them have a baby girl and one respondent partner do not have a child.

Table 10: *Marital status and having children of respondents and their partner before living together*

Marital status before living together relationship	Number of respondents	Number of respondent's partner
Do not have marriage	9	10
Yes already married but do not have child	3	3
Yes married and have child	8	7
Total	20	20

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

In this ways research found that the diversity on marital status before their living together relationship. Nearly half of my respondent and half of the respondent's partner were not married before to start their living together relationship. More than half of the respondents already have marital breakdown and most of them have children from their first marriage. At the same manner half of my respondent's partner were already married and seven of them had a child from their first marriage.

Conclusion

This chapter gives the details profile of respondents and their partner. It is a story of 40 individuals about their caste and ethnicity, caste ethnic relation between partner, age of respondent and age combination between respondent and their partner, religious status of respondents and combination of religious status between the partner and respondents, level of education and combination of level of education between partner of respondents, sex and sexuality and marital status of respondent before their living together relationship.

Respondent belong from diverse caste and ethnic back ground and data also show that the living together relationship is rising between inter caste relationship, but data do not deny that in same caste relationship too, people have a living together. In the case of age group research indicate that 20-50 years' age group's individual involvement in living together relationship. there is diversity of duration of living from six-month to 16 years. Four respondents among 20 are living less than a one year, three respondents are/were live in living together relationship for two years, two respondents for four years, five respondents for five years, three respondents for three years, one respondent for 7 years, one respondent for 11 years, one respondent for 12 years, and one respondent for 16 years spend in living together relationship.

On the case of respondent's religion, ten respondents among twenty believed/ followed Hindu religion, two respondents believed in Buddhist religion, two respondents were Atheist, one respondent belong from nature worshipping community, one respondent belong from Christian and one respondent thought the religion of humanity will make prosperous world. There is the diversity on education from class three to MPhil level, among 40 individual (respondents and their partner) they belong from 16 types of occupation and many time the involve in multiple work. More than a half of my responded and half of respondents' partner were already married and they already have a child from their first marriage. These demographic data show that the big diversity among the respondent even these belong from the small population size.

Chapter V: Causes of Living Together

In this chapter, I am going to analyze the data that I gathered from the field work, which done between 15 May to 14 June of in Kathmandu valley. As a researcher, first in this chapter I am going to analyses the developing process that individual introduced each, development process of their relationship as love affair and take decision for living together without marriage. This chapter give a detail how they introduced each other through which plate farm, what was the relationship between them before their affair and their bonding to living together relationship.

5.1 Knowing Each other

In the process of interview, I found diversity on connectivity or to get tough with their partner. Three among 20 of my responded were first time they meet at a college. At a college one respondent and their partner have a relationship of class mate and two of my respondent were a teacher of their partner before being a partner. Among these two teacher and partner after being a student have different story. One story we can trash back to 1999 when she started her career as a lecturer and her partner was as student. Here as researcher need to reiterate that the time, when was no cell phone, no google search, no have internet to search information and preparation for an everyday class. At that time, in her class one boy always came with full preparation and asked various question to her. She felt some humiliation as being a women lecturer, at one point she became anger and decided to leave a job from the college. After her decision student try to convince her that he wasn't humiliating her rather he correct her some minor mistake. After his convince she became ready to come back on the class. After the ending of his Bachelor level education she and her student became a colleague in NGO too. After 18 years of their first meeting at class they started to live in living together relation. In another story, where other teacher fell in love with his student in 2023. He has totally different story with first story. At the beginning they became a friend in face book up to three months they like and react on Face book post. After a three month of their introduction in Facebook they became a partner. First they started a dating and after a two month of their affair they started their living together relationship.

Five among my 20 respondents first they meet with their partner on the process of profession work. Within a professional work, one among them meet their partner at office where both of them were work together, one of my respondent meet her partner

as sex client for one year. One among five respondent meets her partner as drug user on antidrug program, and two of my respondent and their partner introduced each other in social movement.

Three respondent meet with their partner at community based program (village program). One of respondent among them first time meets with her partner in maintenance of local irrigation system called "Paini Jhada". They exchange information as Face Book account, with each other as village sister-in-law they became a friend.

Two respondents first meet with their partner, when they suffered from a problem. One of my respondent are now recovering from the drug used. Her partner found her in madness of drug and he help her to find out her home and children. From the beginning of their relationship he started to care her and come her room, live with her and her children. Before to get them she already has one daughter and one son. Another respondent meets her partner when see need a vehicle to took her family member in hospital. He helps with his bike, live with her at hospital, and support to uptown between hospital and home. After a year of their first meeting they started to living together relationship.

Three respondents were first time meet in virtual space such as social media specially Facebook and mistake phone call. Two respondents were already a friend in Facebook. Both of they do not have specific idea why they were connected in a Facebook, they and their partner were in random friendship in Facebook. When they like each other post and started like, react and comment on their post and they became a friend. After a more than a year they physically meet, before to meet they already have somehow emotional relationship. Both of them were belong from different districts, after the meeting they started tea, coffee, Mo: Mo: meeting and nearly a one year they started to live together. One respondent among these three meet her partner through miscall. They started to call time and again, after a six month of her first miscall, they meet physically. They share their pain and joy with each other as "sukha dukhkhaka Kura" as life condition with eating a peanuts and oranges, and after a year they started to live together. One of my respondent meet with is partner at a bookshop, they were reader of each other and they were excited while they meet there. At the first meeting they go for coffee and exchange their number. After that they start to meet nearly every day and in fifteen days they start to live together.

Two of my respondent were first time meet at the restaurant. One of my respondent is NRN who is living at hotel and he have a drinking habit. He was drinking alone at restaurant and he saw another woman also drinking a wine in net table as alone as himself. They introduce each other, and they together add other glass of wine. At that time with random gaff he gets information that she is going abroad to her professional work, she also asked with his as NRN how to settle in foreign too. In late night with heavy drink she requests him lets' go in my apartment, due to the late night of festival your hotel might be closed". He said me that 'who can deny that, a beautiful girls asked with me to go to with her home at mid night, I unable to deny her'. Then they started their relationship, with in a four year and having a baby they officially get marriage and emotionally separated from each other. Another one couple were meet at the restaurant, they exchange their phone and Instagram, and started too chat with each other. And they fall in love with in a third week of their meeting they started to date each other and live together.

Table 11: *Sphere of first introduction between them before being a partner*

Meeting place/sphere	Relation before affair with their partner	Number of Individual
College	Classmate	1
	Student	2
Process of Profession	Colleague at office	1
	Client of sex work	1
	Client on Anti-drug program	1
Community Program	Comrade on social activism	2
	Village sister in-law	1
Community Program	Solti (son of maternal uncle)	1
	They meet at village	1
Community	Supporter in worse situation	2
Virtual Space	Facebook	2
	Miscall- miscall	1
At bookshop	Reader of each other	1
At Restaurant	Stranger	2
Total		20

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

After the listening of stories of my respondent, or from the data there is no specific place to fall in love. Some people might fall in love from social media, some fall in love when another individual are in suffered, teacher might fall in love with their student, women fall in love while working in typical community work, obviously people fall in love classmate, colleague or comrade, even sex client can fall in love with sex worker. In this research data/information shows that there are not specific cause and sphere when they fall in love.

5.2 Love affair and Bonding

These research found the diverse view of my respondent on the love or affair and decision to live as living together relationship. This section focused the bonding between couple before they start their living together relation.

Four of my respondents among 20s has interest on sexual pleasure make their bolding. My first respondent M. Chhetri is lecturer and male he said me that “the thought of male is ultimately searching to sexual pleasure” (M. Chhetri, In-depth interview, May 31, 2024). He was neither committed to long term relationship with his girlfriend nor deeply fall in love, he shares that his girlfriend also has this type of. Nearly same, but differently other one women respondent share that good looking individual and similar stories and understanding pushed them to start their relationship. Another two respondents also have nearly same story. Queen Sharma, after three years of living together relationship and more than one year of legally married she said that “I was gazing him, from the opposite corner of restaurant, when he shut down his laptop and call for a bill, I weak up and asked his phone number” (Q. Sharma, In-depth interview, June 15, 2024). D. Wagle a already married, 53 years old said me, “as a man what I need to more? If I am with young, beautiful girl dinking a wine till late night. Definitely I wanted sexual pleasure with her without thinking any other” (D. Wagle, In-depth Interview, 11 May 2024). His meaning is that male always searching a sex and he was no exception.

Five of my respondents have an interest on sharing a room, caring each-other, economic pulling and other support. They already conscious on both way of future that the relationship will go long time or bread at the middle. They were more calculatedly involved on the relationship. One respondent among them was already search how to maintain the living together relationship. Now, all of them still in living together with

their partner which was more than five years each of them with few expectation, few support, few responsibility and respect.

Table 12: *Love Affair and Decision for Living Together*

Love and types of affair	Number
Interest on physical and emotional support	4
Interest on room sharing, economic pulling and other support	5
Already got unconditional emotional Support from Partner	4
Emotional Bonding	5
Interest on new patter (western Pattern) of life	1
Unwanted adjustment	1
Total	20

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

Four respondent already got emotional unconditional support from their partner. These unconditional support make them more emotional to live in living together relationship. They said me about their partner as “there are no one rather him” or “he came in my life like a god”. These four women already get married, were a mother of children. Three women among them were rearing their children without specific skill-education, without economic based, without support of their parents. They just have a memories of early marriage, early motherhood and memories of multiple for of violence. Their partner was help them on their worse day and they haven’t choice or option to living together.

Other one of my respondent were highly educated, lecturer but after the getting birth of baby she wasn’t want to life with her husband. She suffered 18 years long un wanted marital life, which give her savior depression. At the time when she is suffering from savior depression she got divorce and started to live in Kathmandu. But her ex-husband wrote a book portraying her as bad women with extra marital affair with her former student. Her student already got marriage and settle with his wife and children. After the publication of the book he search her, he decides to take care of herself. He helps her to overcome from the depression. After completing her treatment, she decided to live with him acknowledging with he have wife and two children.

Five respondent came from the same ideological background or have emotional bonding and have common friend circle before they fall in love. Two respondent and

their partner came from the same activism, every day they meet at the movement and to hide from the police officer they live either girls room or boys room with other friends. These was a starting point of living together of them. One respondent and their partner were a classmate, they have common friend circle, both parent's know each other and to pick up and drop in home after party was common before their love affair. One of them have a homo sexual relationship between married women who already have a girl baby and village girl. They were committed to start long lasting relation and their relation also rebel as homosexual too. Another girl has a more than a one year of affair and they have a first love and they were committed for marriage or long term relationship.

One of my respondent said that they just meet at the book shop, he and his partner were known each other before their accidental meeting. At the same day from the bookshop they went for coffee. And they have started chitchat in phone call, from next day they started dating and within a 15 day they started in living together relation. He already a father of one daughter, but his partner said me at call he wasn't said about the first marriage and the daughter before their living relationship. He has an interest on living together relationship was taste the new form of relationship as modern/western society. There was not love and lifelong commitment with her but just as test he live with her.

One other women respondent case number thirteen has another types of story. Her parents organized her marriage at her early teenage, she tries to being a good daughter in law. But she became unsuccessful to maintain her marriage life. After the divorce she went foreign labor and earn some money and by a house at Kathmandu valley. At the time of her foreign labor, she started chatting with one individual. He draws tattoo of her name photo on his arm. After returning to Nepal she meets him and he said that he loved her and unable to live without her. She became confuse to trust or not he started to come to her home and started to live with her. She repeatedly requests him to go his home but slowly he convince her that he really love to her. She said that "he draws my name and photo in his arm, I thought that surely he loved and commitment to me". After some time, request and his danaid the leave to request him to leave her home and they started living together relationship.

5.3 Modernization of emotional relationship

In this section, I am going to relate the data on modernization of emotional relationship from the field data, I am going to as not clear and committed to long term relationship, test of new life style and interest to live without family and in-laws.

Not clear in long time/term relationship

Research found that to be a clear, not clear in their long term relationship, or no option to think about the long term relationship also play an important factor which encourage them to live in living together relationship. Half of my respondent (10) were not clear on their long term relationship. Seven respondent among ten were live more than five years with the same person, one gets marriage after six months long living together, one gets marriage after two year living together and are in process of divorce, and one respondent was separated after two years of living. Beyond their confusion on the long term relationship they have a diverse view on it; such as their past relation either marital breakdown or love tragedy, based on the societal observation and their realization “whatever will happen in our life”, and thinking that let’s test our compatibility.

Three of my respondent were fully committed on their forever relationship. One of them socialized (not registered and culturally marriage) their relationship with media and friend, now they are expecting baby. Two of them are planning marriage now.

Stories of five respondents have different that they haven’t any option to feel commitment they have or do not have. They said me that ‘there is nothing to think about it’ or ‘I exactly do not know what happen with me’. A. Brahmin share me that when she meets his partner at Tinkune TU, she was suffering from the savior depression, her partner come and start to live her. He starts to counseling her, help on her reading and writing, he prepares meal to her, timely he feed her food, water and medicine. After his caring she became better psychologically, emotionally and academically. She knows him, his family as he has wife and children, but she was no option to leave him at that time. Other two respondent’s stories also nearly same with her. And two of my respondents haven’t interest and haven’t choice too because they already have a child from first marriage and they did not want to lost the relationship with their new partner.

Interest to live without Family or Already have a Married Life

At the time of checklist development, I thought that the cause of modernity, people became individualist and they were uninterested to live with family member. In this way I focused the point that “interest to live without family” in my checklist. At the middle of the field work as taking an interview nearly half of my respondents I deeply realized that the failure marital life and having children also encouraged them to choose living together rather than the marriage. Ten respondent among 20 has suffering from the marital breakdown before they started to living together. Marital broken has already push them to think about the limitation of relationship. On this ten respondent nine are women and one is man. They thought that they already test marriage thinking as sweet and experienced bitter in their early active life. They said me that “tyo bhanne pani yastai ta raichha ni”.

Two of my respondent does not have interest to live with in-laws. These also a factor of encouraging to live together, but not a dominant factor as marital breakdown. Five couple of respondent testing their compatibility toward their partner in relationship. They do not have any problem with their in-laws and they have first living. Two of them were living with their partner and parent’s parent home with them from the beginning of their living together relationship. Additional two respondents were now living with their partner’s parents in own resident and one couple of my respondent are planning to get marriage.

5.4 Thrust of equality

This section is focused on thrust of equality from the marginalized community member. Specially form the women and Dalit community’s point of view. From the feminist critique on marriage that “marriage as oppressive institution” and its theoretical explanation that marriage and family oppressed to women through a gender division of labor on domestic work, symbolic domination at time of marriage or after marriage, economic subordination, and creating a boundary from endogamous, heterosexual relation for marriage. These oppression and domination encourage the individual for living together relationship, rather than to get marriage. Here I am going to analyze the data that on the question is imagination of domination free relationship.

Gender Division of Labor on Domestic work

At the beginning, I thought that the Gendered division of domestic labor also encourage to those women who are already empowered to denied the marital life and

they want to start living together. All and all of my respondent thought that gender division of labor. But research does not found that the gender division of domestic work as the leading factor to encourage to living together rather than the marriage. Both male and female are/were conscious about the gender division of domestic work, but they did not think and discussed about it before they start their relationship as living together relation

Symbolic Domination toward women

Research found that the symbolic domination toward women also play a role to denied marriage and start living together relationship. Five of my respondent and partners of my two male respondents were deeply thought that being wife of someone, to go husband home s other's home, donation of bride as Kanyadan, and warning symbol such as Sindur are symbolic domination toward women. They have a different story behind this thought. One of my respondent hasn't brother in home and people always said that, 'girls will leave you after the marriage of them' to her parent's. It was hurt her, and she decided that she will not go other house after getting marriage. This thought still deeply embedded on her activities. One of my respondent is feminist activist, she meets her partner at the process of activism, never ever interested to get marriage. She said, "I never ever want to know as a wife of someone". Now she is living with her partner and son without marriage from the 12 years.

Another one of my respondent also has hesitation to get marriage because of she knows the symbolic domination on marriage to ward women. But after the 6 years of living together, they got marriage. Another one of my respondent does not want to get marriage because she thought that she is not house wife types women, she thought that if she is able to earn, manage all things in her life why accept other's any types of domination. But, one couple thought that the marriage makes the symbolic domination toward women and they first six-month live in living together relation. After the six month of their relationship they make socialized their relationship called life together "Sahajiwah" in one public program. Difference between marriage and Sahajiwah is they denied socio-cultural symbolic marriage and try to remove the any form of domination in their life. He said that "there are no on in higher and lower strata in our life, we are equal".

In other side of flip, most of (12 respondents) the respondent did not think about the symbolic domination of marriage before to start their living together relationship. Research found that symbolic domination also plays a role to encourage individual to live in living together relationship rather than marriage. But it is not a dominant factor.

Economic pulling, sharing and support

Research found that the economic pulling and support is another factor of living together relationship rather than a being single or rather than a single earner. For my six respondents economic purpose also paly partial role to start living together not comparing with marriage. P. Janjati (change name) was became alone in their apartment after and his boyfriend also searching a room. Then they decide to living together on sharing economic based.

Two of my respondents have same stories have nearly same. They were impress from her partner's helps on her all her activities. B. Sunuwar (name changed) said me, "he helps me, in all form of my life even he helps me to open re-habitation center for drug addicted women. Then I became impressed from his unconditional support with economic help to." (Sunuwar, in-depth interview, June 3, 2014). Similarly, another respondent shares her story that first time her partner found herself as unconscious situation of drug, he cares herself, her children with economic support. His support impress herself and unable to restrict his coming on her room. Two of my respondent who belong from sex worker occupation were looking someone to say as partner in home and sharing some economic burden with her.

One of my respondents share other types of economic interest of his partner rather than pulling, sharing and support. M. Thapa share her story that she and her partner was connected to each other by Facebook, when she was working at Kuwait. She meets with him after coming to Nepal, at that time she saw the tattoo of her name and face at his arm. It was makes her emotional. She started to live in her home, which she buys from the money of her foreign labor. He first as friend started to come to her home, slowly started to make sexual relation and said that "I can't live you'. She already faced early marriage and marital breakdown on her life. He makes good impression to her and she started to trust him. After a lone year of living she know he has a wife and children. In this situation her partner convinced her that he has not a good bonding with his wife and he want to give divorce to his wife and want to get marriage with

her. Again became convince and they started the process of divorce in his first marriage. He gets divorce and legally get marriage with my respondent. After two years of marriage, he started to less coming to her house saying that he has lots of work. Recently, he wasn't come to home more than a month and she get a letter that cancelation of their marriage. She became socked when she gets this letter, she became more shocked when she found her house was sold out and bank balance also has empty. She searches him and found the information that he is planning to go Canada with his new girlfriend. Her lawyer suggests her to register the forced rape case against him to stopped in Nepal. She registered it and now he is in custody and she is suffering from multiple form of dilemma. Remaining ten respondents does not have any types of economic interest. Even it has it was not play a dominant role to start live in living together relationship.

5.5 Societal unacceptance to get marriage

Research found that societal unacceptance to get marriage force them to start living together relationship. First is a legal hurdle which create unacceptance of their relationship, specially based on the formal registration. Second is discriminating societal norms and value, based on the caste, ethnic relationship. research shows that caste based discrimination and discrimination based on sexuality forced them to start living together relationship. Third, individual's childhood trauma, marital breakdown or not bonding with parents also forced them to start living together relationship.

Legal hurdle

Research fund that the legal hurdle also encouraging factors for living together relationship. In this research researcher found three types of legal barrier to get official marriage; first is double marriage, second is unavailable necessary document to register their marriage, and third is same sex marriage are research found that legal barrier. Ten among 20 of my respondent were already married and eight of them were already having a child. Similarly, 7 of my respondent's partner were have already children. These factor play as legal hurdle to get marriage.

Here I need to add the case story of F. Rai (change name) who do not have access to legal document to get marriage. She is now a 29 years old young women, with two children one son, aged 10 and a six years' daughter. She has a confusion about herself surname. Her mother was Biswokarma (A Dalit Caste belong from hill) who get

marriage with the Rai from Bhojpur. After marriage and having two daughters her father started to bitten her mother. Then single mother became full responsible of two girls without any economic based. After a year her mother got marriage (live together) with the Tamang Man belong from the Makawanpur District. Her mother give birth other babies with Tamang father she and her sister also live together with mother and step farther. It wasn't easy to live with step family and she often felt that her mother didn't love her. At the age of 18 she elopes with Sapkota Boy from Kathmandu who work on Pasupati Cremation area. Within a year she became pregnant and she also know that the boy she got marriage was from the poor economic class, rearing by widow mother and has drug addiction too. After having baby, she tries to register their marriage and get the citizenship from husband. At that time, she knows that her husband also doesn't have citizenship. She, her husband, and mother in Law went to Okhaldhunga to get citizenship. Okhaldhunga CDO office request them for marriage certificate between her mother and father in-law, which was not and father in law already dead. Mother-in-Law had a citizenship, but it was from the name of her father (maiti Paxa). They were unable to get citizenship. At the same time, she knows after some time individual can get citizenship from the name of mother. She living with her husband even knowing that he hasn't citizenship, he has drug addiction and do not have any economic foundation. She gives birth to girl after four years. At the time her biological father calls her from Dillibazar jail. Now she is living with her Indian partner and her child in Kathmandu from Mansir.

Two couple belong from homosexual relationship. One couple of my respondent recently get marriage certificate after 7 years of culturally they get married. And one couple haven't try to get register their marriage, but they thought that government will denied to register their marriage.

Table 13: *Types of Legal hurdle to get marriage*

Types of legal Hurdle for get marriage	Number of case
Already get marriage and have children of respondent	8
Partners' already get marriage and have children of respondent	7
Unavailable of necessary document to register marriage	1
Homo sexual relationship	2

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

In this way research found that legal hurdle also plays an important role as encouraging factor for living together rather than to get marriage. But it not related to all respondent and not generalization factor for all. Other seven couple haven't any legal hurdle to get marriage and they have other story behind living together relationship.

Caste/ethnicity and sexuality

Research Found that caste/ethnicity and sexuality somehow play role to start living together relationship than getting marriage. The combination of my respondents are four respondents and their partner represent from the same caste group and 13 respondents and their partner belong from inter caste relationship. From these thirteen respondents, only one respondent has upper caste and Dalit relationship, they are unable to get married based on the caste. My respondent is Dalit and his partner is Brahmin, Brahmin parents/family unable to accept their relationship then they decided to live together. After six months they declare their relationship on public program called "life together". It can indicate that relation between Dalit and Non-Dalit partner still unacceptable in Nepali society.

On the basis of sexuality, there are various legal hurdle to get marriage and this hurdle forced sexual minority's individual to start living together relationship. Two of my respondents has homosexual relationship. Both of my respondent's partner were already married. They have a different story as lesbian couple and as gay couple. One of my respondent's partner who is lesbian and she has a child form her husband before homosexual relationship with my respondent. After falling a love and getting divorce from her husband, this couple tried to get marriage. But their parents start her psychological treatment, they used shaman to reduce imaginary thought as getting married to same sex girl. My respondent said that "my partner's parents tried various way to make separate to us, saying that 'it's okay if her partner is boy, but how we give our daughter with other girl?' they are not ready to accept our homosexual relationship" (D. Chhetri, In-depth interview, June 8, 2024).

Another gay couple have a different story, one of them was already divorced with his wife with whom he was culturally married in teenage. They meet at village repeatedly and after various tea meeting they decide to search a work in Kathmandu valley. They came together rent one room and start small job, as plumbing. After some time, he

getting to know that his partner used makeup,.In this way sexuality play an important role as a dominant factor for a member of LGBTI community and Dalit individual to develop relationship with non-Dalit partner. But we cannot have generalized it for heterosexual upper caste but inter caste relationship.

Childhood Trauma/not bonding with Parents

Research found that childhood trauma plays an important role to select the partner, established a relationship and develop the trust with their partner. Six respondent among 20 has a problem with their parents in minor to serious problem. Parents of my respondent lost the trust of their children about that they love them. All six respondent have different types of problem such as freedom, care, provide a proper food, love, respect and the space trust. They have different stories on it. And all of them are eloped to love one suffered multiple form of violence such as forced sexual relation, domestic violence, bittering, not provided food by family member of their partner. And all six respondent break their relationship with this first person, Amon these six girl five girls have a child.

Other four of my respondent has a story of forced child marriage by their parents. They also suffered multiple form of violence from in-laws. And they also unable to get support from their parents to break this unwanted marital burden to divorce. After a while they get divorce with their first marriage, and they share me that they became unable to build trust to their parents again. One of my respondent suffered from the savior depression for a long time (seven years). For my two respondent this untrusted environment forced to start their new live as sex worker, and one of my respondent suffered forced and fraud relationship. Two of my respondent's partner has a child marriage, one is lesbian women and another is gay man. After they getting marriage and getting a baby by girl respondent they realized that they are homosexual. Female falls in love with the village sister in-law, after knowing that her parents started her mental health treatment and culturally used the shamanism (Dhami/Jhakri). Male respondent has different story, they started to living in Kathmandu and after a year of living my respondent realize they have connection and they started emotional bonding.

Research found that two of my respondents hesitated to get marriage because they do not have male sibling and at her childhood. At the absence of son their parent listens various suggestion, domination, and humiliation in front of their daughters as my

respondent. Villager, neighbor, relatives said that, ‘daughter will go other (their husband’s) house after getting marriage, in an old age who will see you?’’. These types of humiliation stopped them to get marriage and encourage to start living together. Now one of my respondent get marriage after six years of living together and another respondent confused to decide get marriage or not after five years of living together. One of my respondent’s partner do not have a mother from her child age, father has a relationship with other women but they do not get married. My respondent thought that she feels lonely on the absence of her mother and this loneliness forced to search a partner who love herself. But it was just assumption of my respondent.

Another one of my respondent is a survival of psychological disorder while her teenage. These types of health problem also play some role to escape from marriage. One of my respondent thought that his partner suffered from the question of her sexuality such like “Like a tom boy girl”, on the basis of her short hair, fight with boy and other activities. He said me ‘she desperately expected a child, while we were in our relationship’ because she grows up listening the question ‘how she will give a birth to baby?’’. My one another respondent represent from Dalit community, and he suffered from the caste based discrimination. Even the time of their relationship while they are living with upper caste love one, they felt rejected from parents of his partner. Only one of my respondent do not have any childhood problem. a

Table 14: *Childhood Trauma*

Problem	Number
Non trust to parents and eloped	6
Child Marriage	4
Child marriage of partner	2
Gender stigma to being a daughter in home	2
Not having a mom of Partner	1
Psychological Disorder	1
Question on Sexuality of partner	1
Caste based discrimination	1
Do not have any problem	2

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

At the beginning of thesis and starting to conduct interview, I did not have any idea about the childhood trauma. While taking interview I realized that childhood trauma plays a role from multiple way to encourage the individual to start living together relationship; such like creating situation of not possibility to get marriage, creating non trusting environment to anyone.

Conclusion

Research found that diverse space, such as work place, bookshop, restaurant, community program, virtual space, where individual introduced each other and they have a different type of relationship before their affair (not only emotional love). At the beginning most of them haven't a thought for long time relationship and they also have not a commitment to ward their partner. research found that there are various factors play an important role to encourage the individual for living together relationship. Among these factors, first is impact of modernity such as not committed for long time relationship, interest to live without family and in-laws, test of modern phenomenon. Second encouraging factor that research found is thrust of equality, especially from the point of view of women and Dalit side, such as skip from symbolic domination toward women, gender division of labor and, economic sharing (based on the women empowerment). But when we talk about the encouraging factors, societal unacceptance also forced individual to choose living together relationship based on the caste, ethnic and sexuality, child hood trauma and not bonding with parents, legal hurdle to get marriage, already failure married life and having with children forced them to living together relationship and bread the trust on family and marriage. Research also found that one specific factor only does not play a major role for all individual. Some individual have an interest to get marriage rather than living together, they are in living together because government and family do no allowed them for marriage. Multiple factor encourages to one individual for living together relationship with in a same time.

Chapter VI: Practices of Living Together

This chapter of dissertation I am going to analyze everyday reality that experienced by individual while they are/were in living together relationship, specially their feeling and realization. This chapter also divided in three parts. In the first part I am going to focused on societal sanction of living together; how they introduce their partner with in a society, relationship with partner's family member, expectation or having babies while they are/were in living together and possibility of extra marital affair. In second part I am going to focused on responsibility of bead winning and this part also divided as engagement on domestic work and earning. Third section focused on the question that 'is marriage the next option?'; in this section I will analyses the data their interest on marriage while they are/were in living together relationship and nature of existing relationship at present with their partner.

6.1 Societal Sanction

In this section I am going to analyze the data as how they introduced their relationship in society, what types of challenge they faced while living together relationship, which types of relationship they have between their partner and family member, family member of partner and them, is they have expectation of babies while they are/were in living together relationship

Introduction of their relationship with in a society

Research found diverse and interesting way of introduction of living together couple that used to introduce their partners with them in society. Six among 20 respondents used the word that he or she is my partner. But many people of society my respondent found that they want to make sure on their relationship. All and all of five respondents among 20 they have a same story. One of my respondent introduced her partner with her neighbor lady as "he is my partner". But she against asked with my respondent "what is means by a partner?" and my respondent replied her "he is my husband". Two of my respondents denied the marriage cause of symbolic violence to ward in patriarchal society, many time she encountered with the person who said "what's do you mean by partner". My respondent said that "I used the sentence that he is my son's father". Then people never stopped in the point and said that "husband?" some time she became angry, some time she forgives them. One of 23th years old respondent said that "answers depend on individual's level of understanding. They want to introduced their partner as partner, but society forced them to say husband and wife.

Five of my respondent introduced themselves as boyfriend and girlfriend. But before they think and introduced themselves with society, society count them as boyfriend and girlfriend. Three of them were young couple and they share their relationship in as boy and girl friend and after some time of living together they got marriage. But other two females are already divorced women and have a child both of them. Their relationship is known as girlfriend and boy in by society after they became together. No one asked about their boyfriend that “who is he?”. They said in an interview may be they know automatically.

Seven couple recognized their relationship as husband and wife. Four women among these seven respondents have already children from their first husband and no one asked them about their relationship. One respondent lives with her partner at her home, she has not any connection to society, renter of home they call uncle aunty and she call her partner as “Buda”. Another girl respondent said that she often went her partner hometown, in there her partner’s mother introduced my respondent as daughter in Law with her relatives and neighbor. R Chhetri (name changed) has different story that they were living in same room after a year of living they feel that they have an emotional bonding and his partner also criticized for wearing a women dress, being like a girl. But no one asked with them as their relationship as gay. People thought that they are just friend as other. After three years of living together relationship they decided to get marriage, they get support from LGBTI society and they invited whole community (tol) on their cultural marriage ceremony. Then no one asked about their relationship. Two of my respondents were not face that types of question on their relationship from neighbor. Might be a short duration of their living or might be a cause that one couple is lesbian and people might have thought they are friend. For other couple they were live in apartment system where no one asked and gazed other relationship.

Table 15: *recognition of their partner at society*

Relation they introduce	Number
Partner	6
Boy Friend/Girlfriend	5
Husband and Wife	7
No one asked with them	2
Total	20

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

Research found that different way to recognizing of partner within neighbor and society. Six individual recognized as partner, five respondent recognized as boyfriend/girlfriend, seven of them recognized as husband and wife and two of them still did not face for legitimacy of their relationship. But they shared me that one interesting fact if they did not introduce their partner with in a society, individual of the society automatically known their relationship. Almost all said that “they used their common sense”. These stories are a one side of story other side of story they felt that many people do not care about other’s relationship. For neighbor and some friend who are quite far away from them they asked a question, if they were close they obviously know the relationship without saying.

Challenges they faced in a living together relationship

Research found that there is no one respondent who haven’t face challenge in while they are/were in living together relation. Seven among 20 respondents thought that misunderstanding, different understanding, thought, feeling might have different with different individual and they thought that if we need to be together, misunderstanding need to be manage. Research found that this management are differed by level of understanding and have a space of freedom. Three sex worker do not want to make argument even they accept the way their partner does. They thought that “what will be then next?” three of them have a child from first marriage. M. Chhetri (change name) thought that his partner is so innocent and young to make disagreement. B. Sunuwar (change name) and A. Brahmin (name change) get support by their partner in their panic day and they do not want to fight with him. Similarly, E. Brahmin shared that they never fight in their more than 5 years of their living and they get marriage two years before. She said that “if we have not good bonding we did not get marriage”.

Three of my respondent thought that they have economic challenges. One respondent said that she was single earner in her living relationship and that make challenge to the. Two respondent; one male and one female they shared that their partner has an economic interest on them. One is now fighting in legal ground and her partner is in jail on forced rape case and another is planning to leave Nepal.

Three of my respondent face challenge on the basis of their family relationship. R. Gurung (change name) share with me that she faced the various comments from her partner’s family member on her life style and her previous marriage. J. Rai has a

problem that her family believe in Christianity and her partner is Hindu. She still unable to share her religious thought with her partner's family and T. Bishwakarma (change name) share me that they face the discrimination being a Dalit and his partners parent still unable to accept his as partner son-in-law. Two of my respondent get challenge on the issue of children. One of them has already a children and partner also has a child, in her living relationship she feels that bearing a responsibility if both child was challenging to her relationship. Another respondent did not want to be a mom, after getting pregnant she fights with her partner on this issue. But right now they have a baby and they still in living together relationship.

Two of my respondent thought that they fell challenge in habitual thing such as loud sound, introvert extrovert habit, managing their necessity, cooking and cleaning. One of my respondent deeply feel challenge on cultural different with her partner and his family. Two respondent who belong from sexual minority community they face various challenge by society. Big number of respondent face challenge that they or their partner have an extra affair while they were in living together relationship.

Table 16: *Challenges they faced in a living together relation*

Challenges while living together	Number
Economic	3
Family and relatives	3
Children	2
Habitual	2
Cultural difference	1
Manageable misunderstanding	7
Society	2
Extra affair	8

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

In this way some people face challenge with economic burden, economic interest on relationship; some respondent shared that they face challenge by family, relatives, having or already have children and cultural difference create a challenge; one respondent feel cultural challenge, seven respondent thought that manageable misunderstanding always a part of life, two homosexual respondent feel big challenge from the society, and 8 respondent face the extra affair as challenge of their living together relationship.

Relation with partner's family member

Research found diverse and complicated stories on relationship between respondent's partner and family; and between respondent's partner's family and their relationship. Already mentioned that eleven respondents were already got married and nine respondents already have a child. In the similar way, six respondent's partner also have child. Thirteen of my respondent even haven't good relationship with their parent's.

They shared that six of them have good relationship with their partner's parents, seven respondent said that they have not a good relation with their partner's parent and other seven respondents do not introduce with their partner's parents even they are living more than ten years. In the similar way ten respondent shared that their partner and their parents have a good relationship. Two of my respondent share that their partner and parents of respondents do not have a good relationship. Other eight respondents said that they did not un-introduced their partner and their parent. In the case of children from partner's nine of my respondent have already child from their first marriage. Eight respondent's and their child are/were live together with their partners. Only one respondent said me that he did not introduced partner and his child. Six of my respondent's had already child before their relationship. Three respondent said that they have a good relation with children of their partner and three respondents said that their partner did not introduced their children with my respondents.

Table 17: *Relationship with partner's family*

Relationship with family member	Types	Number
Relationship with respondent's partner's parents	Good	6
	Bad	7
	Not introduced Yet	7
Relationship of partner and respondent's parents	Good	10
	Bad	2
	Not Introduced Yet	8
Relationship of respondent's child and partner	Good	8
	Bad	-
	Not introduced yet	1
Relationship between respondents and partner children	Good	3
	Not introduced Yet	3

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

Research found that the layers and complications on relation between family member and partner and respondent's relationship with their partner's family member and child have diverse story. Some have good bonding with their partner's family and child some has didn't introduced with them and some have not good relationship. In the same manner ten respondents said that they have a good relation between their parents and partner and eight respondents among those nine having babies' respondents are living with new partner and children with good bonding. In this ways research found diverse and complicated stories on relationship between respondent's partner and family; and between respondent's partner's family and their relationship.

Expectation or having babies

Research found that half (10) of the respondent do not have/had expectation of children. There is multiple cause behind not interested to have baby. M. Chhetri (changed name) and Queen sharma (change name) share me that they recently register their marriage (legally) in CDO office and yet they haven't socialized (they haven't shared the information with their their relatives, neighbor) their marriage. They also thought that they are in their early age, starting their carrier. R. Janajati (change name) is still in dilemma that they will have good relationship or not. Couple of E Bramin did not think they need a baby, they got marriage but did not want to give a birth. Similarly, D. Chhetri (changed name) partner already have a baby and they are lesbian couple. Remaining seven respondents did not expect child because they already have.

Five of my respondents are/were thinking about child but they haven't yet. B. Sunuwar (changed name) and M. Thapa (change name) were already separated, and another one respondent expecting a baby after her marriage with her partner. Partner's of T. Bishwakarma is now pregnant. Case number nineteen are gay couple, they are thinking about baby, but my respondent said me "we do not exactly know how will have, but we will have a child".

Similarly, four of my respondents have a child while they are/were in living together relationship. These four respondents have a different story related to a child. One of them is male respondent he has child but he was not in contact with his former partner and child from more than ten years. Another women respondent has a baby and she is living with her partner and child. Similarly, another having child respondent have a child from her first partner with whom she lived nearly 16 years. After getting baby

they were separated. Now she is living with her son and new partner, they have a good relationship. In the case of another male respondent that he has a child while they were in living together relationship. After having a child, he thought that his partner has an interest on his properties. Officially they registered marriage, but emotionally they are separated after giving his property and suffering from the multiple form of domestic violence. Three among four having baby respondent said that they haven't interest to have babies.

Table 18: *Expectation of baby or to give birth baby while their living together*

Expectation of babies	Number
No expectation	10
Thinking to have babies, but do not have yet	6
Having babies while living together relationship	4
Total	20

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

In this ways research found that half of the respondents do not have interested to give birth of baby. Six of my respondent has an interest to give birth of baby, but two of them were separated, one is gay couple, one couple are planning to get marriage and one respondent's partner is pregnant right now. Similarly, four of my respondent have a baby while they are/were in living together relationship. But they have a diversity to expect baby or they denied to give birth of baby.

6.2 Responsibility of Bread Wining

In this section, I am going to focused on responsibility of bead winning and this part also divided as engagement on domestic work and earning.

Engagement on domestic work

Research Found that the diversity on the engagement on the domestic work such as cooking, cleaning, washing cloth and dices, rearing child. Five respondents among the 20 couple said that female engage in domestic work, three male engage, eight couple said that they work together or share the work that depend on their other work and engagement, three respondents said that their mother or partner's mother engage in domestic work. And one respondent has a domestic worker for that, but even they have domestic worker, in absence of domestic worker his partner engages on that. Research

found that domestic work and earning is closely related with in their partnership. Earning person has few engagements to domestic work whatever they are male or female. Despite O. Brahmin (changed name) a male respondent, who is a political cadre, all of my respondent have their income and the except a partner of D. Chhetri (changed name) and M. Thapa (changed name), all of them engage to earning. And all of them share their domestic work based on their engagement on work time, level of earning.

Despite that dominant reality O. Brahmin was not have any earning and he did not engage in domestic work. Similar story had with the M Thapa (changed Name), her partner does not have any activity for earning and he also do not engage in domestic work. Similarly, Queen Sharma (changed name) shared that her partner always busy and do not have any interest on domestic work even they have a free time. These three individual are male. Their activities indicate that female engagement and male negligence on domestic work, a but it is not to the level of generalization.

Table 19: *Engagement on Domestic work*

Engagement in Domestic work	Number
Female	5
Male	3
Both	8
Family Member	3
Worker	1
Total	20

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

In this way research found that the diversity on engagement on domestic work. Five respondents among the 20 couple said that female engage in domestic work, three male engage, eight couple said that they work together or share the work that depend on their other work and engagement, three respondents said that their mother or partner's mother engage in domestic work. One of my respondent's partner do not have interest on domestic work and she did not think that all people need to be interest on all work. That his choice and it's manageable. But in the case few male they still do not have habit to engage in domestic work even they do not have any work for earning. Research

found that changing dynamism in house hold chore or gendered division of labor. But, in some instance, still gendered division of labor is found.

Engagement to earning among Partner

Research found that most of my respondent and their partner engage to earn money. Two of my respondents and partner of my two respondents do not have double earning family. Remaining sixteen couple are double earning. In interview they shared that earning pattern haven't strait for any couple, income always have ups and down in their life. Dominance of my respondent are women but research did not found that they are depend on their partner. The domination of earning depends on the time and situation of opportunity. Nine respondents among 20 share that women have good income in their family. Among them one is university professor, three are sex worker, three NGO worker one media person and one foreign labor for long time and one is hotel business person.

Eight respondents among 20, they shared that male partner have a good income in their household. One is lecturer and due to a gap his partner just starting a job. B. Sunuwar (Changed Name)'s partner was more income because he has already established office. One respondent trans male (female to male) his partner is coming from village after her divorce and she is looking for study if she got support. In the case of E. Brahmin (chaned name) she recently working in INGO, but before their 8 years long relationship, her engineer partner has a good earning than herself. In the case of F. Rai (Changed name) right now she started to working as social mobilizer of one NGO, she has few income, but her partner is wall painter and his income is good. Another girl also working on support of NGO, but her partner earns more in his mechanical shop. Another one of my girl respondent is now working as content writer in play and she has good earning right now, but her four years long relationship her partner who work as IT developer has a good earning than herself. One NRN respondent has a good investment in Kathmandu he earns more than his partner who work in hospital as medical person.

In the same manner, three couple of my respondents do not have sure on their and their partner's income. They said that how much work they got and how regularity of these work depend on various situation. For example, P Janajati (changed name) was working in NGO while she just dating with her partner, she leaves her job at that time when she

is in living together relationship. Similarly, partner of T. Bishwakarma (changed name) earn more than him, but now she is pregnant.

Table 20: Engagement to earning

More earning	Number
By Female	9
By Male	8
Not sure	3

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

In this ways most of my respondent are belong from double earning couple. Sixteen couple shared that earning pattern haven't strait for any couple income always have ups and down in their life. Many of my respondent are women but research found that more than a half of my respondents (not only women respondents) shared that women earn more on their house hold. These earning women belong from the occupation of University professor, sex worker, NGO worker, media person, foreign labor and hotel business person.

6.3 Is marriage the Next Option?

In this section I am analyzing the question that 'is marriage the next option?'; I am going to focused on their interest on marriage while they are/were in living together relationship, if they experience extra affair while living together relationship, and nature of existing relationship at present with their partner.

Interest on Marriage

In the context of marriage research found that diverse views and reality to make interest to get marriage while they are/were in living together relation. They faced their ups and down in relationship and back and forth on decision of marriage in the process of living together. Seven of my respondent go marriage after their living together relationship, five among these seven couple are still having good relationship as husband and wife after getting marriage, one respondent among them file the case at court of forced rape two years after their marriage. And one of my respondent leave Nepal and because he suffered from multiple types of domestic violence.

Two of my respondent has a plan to get marriage and sexuality and religious practice challenge them to get marriage. Eleven among 20 of my respondent do not have interest to get marriage, but only seven respondents never ever have interest to get marriage and other four respondents have developed their interest on marital life when they are/were in living together relationship. Two of these respondents are now became separate from

their partner and two respondents are in dilemma to get marriage or to continued their relationship.

Table 21: *Interest to get marriage while their living together*

Interest on getting marriage	Number
Gets marriage after living	7
Planning to get marriage	2
No interest to get marriage	11
Total	20

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

Respondents shared me that they felt, they need to get marriage, they felt long term commitment in one time and some evidence push them back from their interest and commitment. P. Janajati shared her story that after the knowing their relationship by their parents they decided to get marriage. After the decision of getting marriage she went to shopping with her partner's mother and sister. They belong from Chhetri community and they select the bright red neckless (pote) which she did not like, she chooses another dark red color's neckless (pote). In this shopping she felt that even simple one thing I will not wear my choice after the marriage. After some time, her partner's family member gift her red color Banarasi Sadi, when she wears it, she fell it wasn't shoot her. She felt that in small thing she need to compromise forever if she gets marriage. There is another story share by B. Sunuwar, that at the beginning her living together relationship she did not thought to get marriage. But after living three years she starts thinking to get marriage and having another child because she already has a child at her teenage from first husband. She said me "I start to imagine being a mom, having a baby bump". But her partner said her "wait some time". After some time, she starts to know that her partner is in other relationship. At the beginning her partner denied extra relation he has, after two years of extra affair she quarrel with him that chose one women ether my respondent or his new partner. Her partner chooses his new partner and she remain single.

Extra affair while they are in living together relationship

In the process of research, sixty present respondents do not experience that fall in love and have another relationship, they also do not experience their partner also do not have any other relationship. Three respondents among them are belong from sex worker

community, despite the profession sex work they also do not imagine extra emotional or physical relationship to other individual. While doing the interview, they shared to me the logical experiences that their partner also does not have sex.

Three of my respondents have affair with other individual while they were in living together. For example, of R. Gurung (changed name) share me, at the time of Dashai festival she went her parents' home and her partner also went to his parent home. While she is living at her parent's home one relatives shared that her partner has another girls friend. After coming to Kathmandu she searches her partner phone call and she released her partner have the relationship and her partner's sister trying to make a bonding between them. After the realization of that she started quarrels with all family member of her partner. Now they are still living together but she has another individual whom she has emotional bonding. Similarly, two already married male respondents, who already have a wife and children, and they also have a relationship between other. They think any time individual can have a relationship (especially sexual relationship), one of them emotional relationship with his another girl friend and another have a relationship with her wife.

Seven of my respondent experiences that the extra relationship of their partner with in a living together relationship. Despite O Brahmin all of my respondent's partner were male. But they share complexity of relationship with in one individual while living together relationship.

One respondent, F. Janajati (change name) share her story, that she found the multiple relation of her partner while living together with her. They have a story of 16 years long living together relationship. She was working in her partner's home town, after their bonding her partner started to come her apartment and live with her for a whole day. But at the evening he wants used to go her home, at the beginning of her relationship she asked with him that 'why you have a compulsion to go your parents' home?' he gave answer that "my mom is traditional and she will have worried about his son's bad manner". My respondent became agree on that parent can more worried about the single adult child. Slowly skip to asked that types of question with him. They were shift in Kathmandu and started to live in a same flat. She already has her NGO and she engage more time in her NGO work. And after four years of their living together she knows about his marriage and she also know that he has a child with her wife. She feels really bad for the situation that happen with her life, she was working for women right and

became a second women of married man. She started to request her partner to give divorce with his wife or to leave her alone. Her partner did not give any way to her. She already has a trauma of her first marital relation. Many time they realize that ‘what I am doing with this person? He has his wife and children’. She said in interview “it’s was really painful to me that a I was working against the double marriage, at the same time I was living with one married man, who already have a wife and children too”. But her partner dined to leave her with the reason of his love toward my respondent and he also did not show give a divorce with his wife. She realizes that her partner is not committed with her or with his wife too. My respondent started to expecting a child, when she became pregnant they were living in a same apartment but her partner did not care her. Rather, she found that his love affair with other girls and she also found that her pregnancy is like a sperm donation to him. Her heart broken, but she works in her office till the day before her delivery. After 11 years of her child birth and after 16 years of living together they broke their relationship.

Table 22: *Extra affair while they are in living together relationship*

Extra love affair	Number
Do not have any extra affair by couple	12
Extra affair have by respondent	3
Extra affair by Partner	7

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

Research found that diversity on experience of extra relationship while they are/were in living together relationship. Twelve respondent among 20 shared that they and their partner do not have extra relationship, three of them have extra love affair and seven of their partner have extra affair while they were in living together relationship. In this way more than a half of my respondent think that the love can have with one individual in a one time. But there is no specific time frame to have a love with one individual. On the basis of information that shared my respondent, we can say with in a living together to individual can have emotional bonding with only one partner, they might have multiple partner relationship, and their partner also can have an extra marital relationship too.

Relation right now with their partner

Relationship between my respondents and their partner is interesting, seven among them already got marriage. Only one respondent has problem with his marital relationship. Other six respondents are now living together and five among them have a plan forever living together and one among them have a plan to get marriage with her partner. Another one respondent still in living together relationship, but she did not have a trust on her partner, but she is living. Two of my respondent have a living apart relationship (they have love, trust and support, but they live in different home). After 5 years long living together relationship, one of them felt that partner's wife and child also need him and they live separate but they are still a couple. Another one respondent's partner is abroad, but they have good relationship. Four of my respondents do not have good relationship with their former partner. Cause of bad relationship has four different stories.

B. Sunuwar, was already a mother from first marriage, his partner supports her in her bad day. After falling in love with him she started her new life with own child and partner's child. They spend their five years in this time she wanted to become mother, but her partner makes her convince to abort a child she aborts two times. At the mid of their relationship she started to get information that her partner has other affair. She asked with him and he always denied her saying that "she is my office staff and have some friendly relations" about another affair. My respondent said me on her interview "I did not get any causes for not trust to him, he makes me, what I am". After five years of living together relation, her partner's partner started to post a photo on Facebook as husband and wife. Then she forces fully asked with his "choose only one women". Then her partner chooses his new partner. Story still haven't end, after two years of their break up. She got information that her partner has HIV/AIDS. She checks her HIV/AIDS and result she found positive. She said that "From that time I hate him". He need to shared me that he has HIV/AIDS.

Table 23: *Relationship right now with their partner*

Types of relation right now	Number
Husband-wife	7
Living together partner	6
Living together without trust	1
Separated but have trust and loving	2
Separated and hating	4

Source: In-depth interview, 2024

In this way my respondents have different types of relationship with their partner. Seven respondent have relationship as husband and wife after getting marriage, six of them still in living together, one among them has hating relationship even she lives with her partner, two among them have good relationship even they are living separately, and four of my respondent have not good relationship with their partner.

Conclusion

Societal Sanction research found that the interesting fact on societal action; they introduced their relationship in society, as partner, as boyfriend/ girlfriend, as husband and wife, and two of them still did not face for legitimacy of their relationship. In the process of living together they faced the challenge of economic burden, economic interest on relationship, some respondent shared that they face challenge by family member, relatives, having or already have children; and cultural difference, and extra affair seven respondent did not face any types of challenge on their relationship. They have unique, layered and complicated stories on relation between family member and partner; and respondent's relationship with their partner's family member and child. In the case babies, half of the respondents do not have interested to give birth of baby, six among 20 have interest and four among 20 have babies. In the case of earning most of my respondent are belong from double earning couple. Sixteen couple shared that earning pattern haven't strait for any couple income always have ups and down in their life.

Research found that eleven among 20 of my respondents basically did not thought to get marriage, seven respondent got marriage, two respondent have a plan to get marriage. In case of extra marital affair twelve respondent among 20 shared me that they and their partner do not have extra relationship, even they have extra affair they

thought that they haven't any problem. Other three respondent have extra affair (two with their wife and one with former lover) and seven respondents shared the stories of partner's extra affair while they were in living together relationship. Yet present, they have different types of relationship with their partner after their living together relationship. Seven respondents get getting marriage, six of them still in living together, one among them has hating relationship even she lives with her partner, two among them have good relationship even they are living separately, and four of my respondent have not good relationship with their partner.

Chapter VII: Summary, Conclusion and Theoretical Reflection

7.1 Summary of the Thesis

Marriage is one permanent pattern of human relationship as social institution and it's a prominent phenomenon for society. Under this institution, often heterosexual couple live for the lifelong commitment to produce their biological child, to care each other and their family member, kin member, share all matter of their life with the social cultural and legal recognition. In the course of time, with the growth of science and technology, development of philosophy and the rising trend of capitalism, marriage divided with various ruptures. We can see these ruptures that people started to prefer to live as living together relation (co-habitation) without lifelong commitment, without social cultural and legal recognition and without right and responsibility. Many people fall in love with those people who belong to the same sex. Many people live without marriage, without any partner or many women becoming mother without marriage, divorce and remarriage or old-age marriage became common all over the world. Nepal is not alienated from these new trend.

Living together relationship Nepal often depicted as problematic relationship in highly urban community by police officers, women activists and multimedia. Legally government still does not formulate separate law to recognized and solve the complexities created by such relationship. Academically, living together relationship is a marginalized issue to research and academic discussion. In this way, living together is not the consolidated phenomenon, it's still in meaning making stage; such as what types of relation is this, after how long time of their relation will be known as living together? What type of individuals live in such relationship from which economic-social-cultural back ground? and so on. Despite these facts, there are other facts that cases registered in National women commission indicate the rising trend of living together relationship in Nepali society specially in Kathmandu.

In this mess, this dissertation prepared with prominent research question; first to analyze the encouraging factors to individual to start their living together relationship rather than a marriage; and second how they experience their relationship while there are/were in living together relationship. I select the Kathmandu Valley to conduct my research, Kathmandu as densely populated and vibrant urban society for a new life style, new idea, knowledge and social movement.

Theoretically, I thought that one theory is unable to define these fluid, diverse, multicolor relationship. In this regard I select the three social theory; Marxist perspective on marriage, Modernist perspective of marriage and family and Feminist critique of marriage and family. From the modernist perspective I have tried to look over, rising individualism less commitment to their partner, broken traditional value system specially on sex and sexual relationship, interest to live without family member and in-laws. Similarly, From the Marxist perspective and Feminist critique on marriage I tried to analyse the reality with the thrust of freedom from marital domination specially on gender division of labor, symbolic domination toward women in and after marriage.

Methodologically I used interpretative research philosophy and exploratory research design. Respondent were selected through the purposive and snow ball sampling. As exploratory research design, I gathered information/data from the in-depth interview with those individual who are/were in living together relationship in their live. Collected data analyzed simple tabulation and describing relating to phenomenon.

For research, I have been able to reach with 20 respondents ready to give interview for this dissertation. But this thesis is a story of 40 individuals as the 20 couples and the with limitation that it's based on the subjective interpretation of respondent, I do not have other options to retest their interpretation is exact, fabricated or not. Respondents belong from diverse age, caste and ethnicity, religious belief, 23 different geographical locations of Nepal and India too, they represent, they have different level of education from three classes to PHD and different marital status of respondent before their living together relationship.

At the finding, research found that the impact of modernity, being modern 'sex is not big deal' thought, non-commitment and testing commitment for long term relationship and interest to live without family and in-laws also encouraging factor to start living together relationship. Similarly, research found that thrust of freedom especially educated women also encouraging factors for living together relationship. And a new phenomenon also research found, it's societal unacceptance; such as legal hurdle, caste/ethnic and sexuality, childhood trauma and not bonding with parents also force to individual for living together relationship.

7.2 Conclusion

Research found that there is no specific place to fall in love. Some people might fall in love from social media, some fall in love when another individual are suffered, teacher might fall in love with their student, women fall in love while working in typical community work, obviously people fall in love with classmate, colleague or comrade, even sex client can fall in love with sex worker. In this research data/information shows that there are not specific cause and sphere when they fall in love.

Half of my respondent (10) were not clear on their long term relationship. Seven respondent among ten were living more than five years with the same person, one gets marriage after six months long living together, one gets marriage after two year living together and are in process of divorce, and one respondent was separated after two years of living. Beyond their confusion on the long term relationship they have a diverse views and their life experiences on it; such as their past relation either marital breakdown or love tragedy, based on the societal observation and their realization “whatever will happen in our life”, and thinking that let’s test our compatibility.

Modernization of emotional relationship: Research found that to be a clear and committed for long term relationship, not clear in their long term relationship/commitment, test of modern world and or no option to think about the long term relationship also play an important factor which encourages them to live in living together relationship. Specially, few young women and high caste male thought that having a sexual partner and not committed relationship is not bad. Three among four male respondents view that they feel sex, sexual relation and living is not a big matter for them.

Thrust of equality: If we link living together relationship with thrust of equality, research found that the highly educated women and left cadre are committedly denied their marital relationship because it is oppressive toward them. With the thrust of equality, they are also economically empowered women, their economic condition also allowed them to select either marriage or living together relationship. They select living together relation rather than a marriage.

Research found that the symbolic domination toward women also play a role to deny marriage and start living together relationship. Five of my respondent and partners of my two male respondents were deeply thought that being wife of someone, to go

husband home as other's home, donation of bride as Kanyadan, and wearing symbol such as Sindur are symbolic domination toward women. In other side of flip, most of (12 respondents) the respondent did not think about the symbolic domination of marriage before they start their living together relationship. Research found that symbolic domination also plays a role to encourage individual to live in living together relationship rather than marriage. But it is not a dominant factor.

Societal unacceptance of relationship: Research found that Nepali societies still unable to accept free and easy way to get marriage for some instance. Specially to those people who belong from minority community or suffered from multiple form of marginalization. Research found that parent and family are not ready to allow interacts and same sex marriage. Government also unable to provide proper document to get registered their marriage even they wanted to register. In another part individual's childhood trauma, marital breakdown or not bonding with parents also forced them to start living together relationship.

In conclusion research found that no one factor plays important role for all respondent and only one role hasn't play for one respondent to. Research found that multitude of factors together play role in complicated way with one individual's life to get start living together relationship. There is diversity, diverse reality and one individual has multiple reality with in a same time too.

In experience of living together

Research found that the interesting fact on societal action; they introduced their relationship in society, their challenges while living together relationship, relationship with partner's family member and respondent's family member with their partner, and expectation of babies.

Research found that different way to recognizing of partner within neighbor and society such as partner, as boyfriend/ girlfriend, as husband and wife, and two of them still did not face for legitimacy of their relationship. But they shared me one interesting fact that if they did not introduce their partner with in a society, rather individual of the society automatically known their relationship. Almost all said that "they used their common sense".

In the process of living together some respondent faced economic burden, economic interest on relationship; some respondent shared that they face challenge by family, relatives, having or already have children; and cultural difference, and extra affair seven respondent did not face any types of challenge on their relationship.

Research found that the unique, layered and complicated stories on relation between family member and partner; and respondent's relationship with their partner's family member and child. Some have good bonding with their partner's family and child, some of them have not introduced with them and some have not good relationship. In the same manner ten respondents said that they have a good relation between their parents and partner, and eight of nine having babies' respondents are living with new partner and children with good bonding

In the case of expectation of child, research found that half of the respondents do not have interest to give birth of baby. Six of my respondent have an interest to give birth of baby, and four of my respondent have a baby while they are/were in living together relationship. But they have a diversity to expectation of child or they denied to give birth of babies.

Bread winning

In the case of earning most of my respondent belong to double earning couple. Sixteen couple shared that earning pattern haven't strait for any couple income always have ups and down in their life. Many of my respondent are women but research found that more than a half of my respondents (not only women respondents) shared that women earn more on their house hold. These earning women belong from the occupation of University professor, sex worker, NGO worker, media person, foreign labor and hotel business person. In an engagement on domestic work, research found that female, male, they work together or share the work, mother or partner's mother engage in domestic work. That their choice and it's found manageable.

Living, extra affair, marriage and break up

Research found that diverse views and complicated reality to make interest on marriage while they are/were in living together relation. Eleven of my respondent basically did not thought to get marriage, seven among them never ever thought to get marriage, four of them some time they thought and suffered from this thought from multiple ways. In

another side who did not thought seriously their relationship they got marriage and who thought seriously they haven't. Seven respondent got marriage, two respondent have a plan to get marriage. Twelve respondent among 20 shared me that they and their partner do not have extra relationship, even they have extra affair they thought that they haven't any problem. Other three respondent have extra affair (two with their wife and one with former lover) and seven respondents shared the stories of partner's extra affair while they were in living together relationship.

Yet present, they have different types of relationship with their partner after their living together relationship. Seven respondents have relationship as husband and wife after getting marriage, six of them still in living together, one among them has hating relationship even she lives with her partner, two among them have good relationship even they are living separately, and four of my respondent have not good relationship with their partner.

7.3 Theoretical Reflection

Similarly, theory of modernism focused rising individualism, weakening social institution such as marriage, familial relationship, weakening a social control, and weakening of traditional value system in society (Durkheim 1893, Tonnies 1957). Individualism is related to an economic freedom and choice too. Except two, eighteen of my respondent have a work for earning and except two respondent's partner have their earning work. It's also encourage them to live their live on their own way. Individualism also related to break a social stigma on sexuality, relationship, work, life style and so on.

All of my respondent break the traditional value system of Nepali society on sexuality, which related to sexual relationship after the marriage or marital relationship only a legitimized the sexual relationship. Seven of them thought sex can have with anyone, anywhere and they even have no problem that their partner conduct sex to other individual. Three of my respondent were sex worker and three male respondent thought that sex as a pleasure openly. And two of my respondent belong from the LGBTI community who are trying to change the traditional thought on sexual relationship with same sex person also a natural relationship which all of them break the traditional taboo on sex and sexuality.

Similarly, in a marital relationship, ten among 20 of my respondent were already married and eight of them were already having a child. Similarly, 7 of my respondent's partner have already children. Thirteen couple among these 20 couple already experiences a marital break down, this also we can interpret that marital relationship becoming weak.

Interest to live without family, at the time of my check list development, in my mind family known as parents, sibling, and partner parent's and sibling. At the time of my filed work I got respondent that they already have a child. In this regards, here I want to segregate the family as extending family and nuclear family. Nine of my respondent do not have interest on living with their extended family or in laws. Thirteen couple of my 20 respondent already suffered from marital break down and they do not have a chance to live with their parents or partner's parent's. But eight of them living with their child or partner's child, in the case of child related family. Research found that having already family forced them to living together relationship.

Five couple of respondent testing their compatibility toward their partner through the living together relationship. They do not have any problem with partner parent. Two of them were living with their partner and parent's parent home with them from the beginning of their living together relationship. Additional two respondents were now living with their partner's parents in own resident and one couple of my respondent are planning to get marriage and live with partner's parent home.

Research found that the social control over the individual's is weakening. All of them living without marriage and most of them do not face the question who is this person. Even, who face the question from the few individual not from the society. Six individual recognized as partner, five respondent recognized as boyfriend/ girlfriend, seven of them recognized as husband and wife and two of them still have not faced for legitimacy of their relationship. But they shared me that one interesting fact if they did not introduce their partner to society, individual of the society automatically known their relationship. Almost all said that "they used their common sense". Neighbor and some friend who are quite far away from them they asked a question, if they were close they obviously know the relationship without saying.

This information shows that the diversity between the respondent's live chances and interest. But, on the basis of data we can say that research found that rising

individualism, weakening marriage and family, weakening traditional value system and weakened social control over the individual's life.

From the lens of Marxism and Feminism, theoretically there two theories do not have different argument on marriage (except the theoretical explanation). Both theory focused their pin point as “marriage is oppressive institution to ward women”. In this regard I was focused that thought of gender division of labor, symbolic domination of marriage ceremony and after marital relationship, economic dependency and other form of violence. In the case of gender division of labor in domestic work, before they denied marriage and selection of living together relationship, my seven respondent deeply thought that gender division of labor is one part of traditional marriage. But research does not found that the gender division of domestic work as the leading factor which encourage individual to start their living together relationship rather than the marriage. Research found that both male and female are/were conscious about the gender division of domestic work, but they did not think that before they start their relationship as living together relation.

In the case of symbolic domination toward women on and after marriage also another form of relationship between the partner. Research found that the symbolic domination toward women also play anencouraging role to denied marriage and start living together relationship. Five of my respondent and partners of my two male respondents were deeply thought that being wife of someone, to go husband home s other's home, donation of bride as Kanyadan, and warning symbol such as Sindur are symbolic domination toward women are domination and attract on women dignity. Research also found that they have a different story behind this thought. In other side of flip, most of (12 respondents) the respondent did not think about the symbolic domination of marriage before to start their living together relationship. Research found that symbolic domination also plays a role to encourage individual to live in living together relationship rather than marriage. But it is not a dominant factor.

Economic equality, especially on earning rather than the parental inheritance, make possible to choose their own way as life style. All of my women respondents are working women. On the basis of their work (whatever they work) and income, they are/were decided to live with their partner or live with their child and new partner. They

choose living together relationship whatever their society said on them. It has not any impact on their life.

In this way, we can relate the finding with the theory of modernity, theory of Marxism and Feminism too. Most of information matches with these theories. Research found that diverse reality and some of reality match with the modern form of life, some cases match with the theoretical definition with the Marxism and Feminism and some cases do not match with any of these theory.

Reference

- Acharya, Mina. (1979). *The Status of Women in Nepal: Statistical Profile of Nepalese Women*. CEDA, TU.
- Achhami, Sarisha. (2023). Women File the Case that “He didn’t Marriage with me After Living Relationship”: do not have Evidence, do not have Law. *Setopati*, 27 August 2023. <https://www.setopati.com/social/310290>
- Beauvoir, Simone De. (1949). *The Second Sex*. Vintage Books.
- Bhattarai, Annu. (2024). Living Together Need to Register under Government System. *Petition against Government of Nepal*. Supreme Court
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (2001). *Masculine Domination*. Polity Press.
- Bumpass, Larry L, James A. Sweet and Andrew Charlin. (1991). The Role of Cohabitation in Declining Rate of Marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 53 (4).
- Carter, Julia, Simon Dunvan, Mariya Stoilova and Marianda Phillips. (2016). Sex, Love and Security. *Sociology* 50 (3): 576-593.
- Chambers, Clare. (2013). *The Marriage Free State. Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*: Oxford University Press.
- Dahal, Bishnu Prasad. (2020). Living Together Relationship: Towards A New Pattern of Adult life in Kathmandu. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research* 3:191-201.
- Durkherim, Emile. (1893). *Division of Labor in Society*. MacMilan Company.
- Engels, Frederick. (1972). *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. International Publishers.
- Formation, Lenka and Alena Krizkova. (2015). Love Will Keep Us Apart? Understanding Living Apart Together Partnerships in the Post state-socialist Czech Republic. *Czech Sociological Review* (Special Issue: Gender Aspects of the Life Course) 51 (6).
- Friedan, Betty. (1963). *The Feminine Mystique*. Penguin.

- Ghimire J. Dirgha et. al. (2006). Social Change, Premarital Nonfamily Experience, and Spouse Choice in an Arranged Marriage Society. *AJS* 111 (4). The University of Chicago.
- Gilbert, Margaret (1996). *Living Together: Rationality, Sociality, and Obligation*. Roman and Littlefield Publisher.
- Government of Nepal. (2009). Domestic Violence (Offended and Punishment) Act 2066. *lawcommission.gov.np*.
- Government of Nepal. (2018). *Civil and Criminal (Code) Law, 2017*.
- Gregorio, Veroniva L. (2020). Living Apart Together. *Philippine Sociological Review*. 68: 55-74. Philippine Sociological Society.
- Jupp, Ben. (1999). *Living Together: Community life on Mixed Tenure Estates*. Demos.
- Kenney, Catherine T, and Sara S. McLanahan. (2006). Why are Cohabiting Relationships More Violent than Marriage. *Demography* 43 (1).
- Kien Trung Nguyen. (2018). From Sociology of the family to sociology of personal life: A Review of the literature. *Sociology* 6 (2): 22-33. Institute of sociology, Hanoi.
- Kothari, CR, and Garg Gaurav. (2014). *Research Methodology: Method and Techniques*. New Age International (P) Limited.
- Majumdar, PK. (2005). *Research Methods in Social Science*. Viva Books Private Limited.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. (1848,1872, 2021). *The Communist Manifesto*. Educational Book house.
- Murdock, GP. (1949). *Social Structure*. The Macmillan Company.
- Neumann, W. Lawrence. (2008). *Social Research Method: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. PEARSON Education
- Parsons, T and Bales, Robert F. (1955). *Family: Socialization and Interaction Process*. The Free Press.

Rana, Kumud. (2021). Different sexuality is a natural reality. In Sabitri Gautam, Kailash Rai and Pratyoush Onta (eds.), *Samanatako Riledaud* (pp. 245-265). Martin Chautari.

Annapurna Rana VS Gorakh Shamsheer Jabara, Decision Number 6588, *Nepal Law Journal*, 8 (1998). Supreme Court of Nepal.

Sunil Babu Panta Vs Government of Nepal. Decision Number 7958, *Nepal Law Journal*, 4. (2008) Supreme Court of Nepal.

Shields, Stephanie A. 2008. Gender: an intersectionality perspective. *Sex Roles* 59: 301-311.

Thornton, Arland. (2009). Sweeping Changes in Marriage, Cohabitation, and Childbearing in Central and Eastern Europe: New Insights from the Developmental Idealism Framework, *European J Popul.* 25(2).

Tonnies, Ferdinand. (1957). *Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft* (Charles P. Loomis, Tran). The Michigan State University Press. (Original work published 1887)

Upreti, Mina Devi. (2023). Cohabitation: Conceptual Significance and Practical Inconsistency. *Pragya Darshan*. Tribhuvan University 5(1): 29-34

Waal, Anastasia de. (2008). Cohabitation. *An Irish Quarterly Review*. Spring: 97(385).

Wallace, Ruth A, and Wolf, Allison. (2006). *Contemporary Sociological Theory: Expanding the Classical Tradition*. Prentice-Hall. 193-194

गौतम, सावित्री, कैलाश राई, प्रत्यूष वन्त [१२०२१](#)। *समानताको रिले दौड*। मार्टिन चौतारीका

थामी, टेकराज १२०८०। विवाहेत्तर प्रेम सम्बन्धले जन्माएको अपराध: विश्वासमा लिभिड टुगेदर विवादमा हत्या। *नयाँपत्रिका*, माघ ८ गते।

<https://www.onlinekhabar.com/2024/01/1422817?>

मैनाली, सुजित। २०२१। *सती : इतिहास र मिमांसा*। किताब पब्लिसर।

Annexes

Annex-1: Name list of Key Informants

S.N	Name	Position and organization they belong
1.	Kamala Parajuli	Chairperson, National Women Commission
2.	Nabaraj Devkota	Police Inspector, Police Head Office, Naxal
3.	Dr. Renu Adhikar	Founder chair, Women Habitation Center (WOREC)
4.	Dr. Binda Pandey	Chair, Committee of Fundamental Right, Constitutional Assembly
5.	Rewati Raj Tripathi	Former Joint Secretary, Attorney General, Government of Nepal.
6.	Sunil Babu Panta	Founder, Blue Diamond Society, Mayako Pahichan

Annex-2: Checklist for interview with Key Informant

त्रिभुवन विश्वविद्यालय

समाजशास्त्र केन्द्रीय विभाग

एमफिल कार्यक्रममा अध्ययनरत छात्रा म नारायणी देवकोटाले आफ्नो थेसिस, “काठमाडौं उपत्यकामा लिभिङ टुगेदरमा बसिरहेका जोडीहरूको अभ्यास” का लागि तपाईंलाई मुख्य सुचनादाता अन्तरवार्ताका लागि सोधिने प्रतिनिधि प्रश्नहरू निम्न अनुसार छन् । कुनै प्रश्नमा तपाईंलाई उत्तर दिन अफठेरो लागेमा तपाईंले उत्तर नदिन सक्नुहुन्छ । अनुसन्धान र त्यसका आधारमा प्रकाशित हुने सामाग्रीमा तपाईंको नाम र अनुभवलाई खुल्ने गरि प्रयोग गरिने छ ।

१. नाम, थर:

१. नेपाली समाजमा लिभिङ टुगेदर बढिरहेको छ भन्ने भनाईलाई तपाईं कसरी लिनु हुन्छ ?

२. के कारणले मानिसहरूसँगै बस्न उत्प्रेरित हुन्छन् होला ?

३. लिभिङ टुगेदरले समाजिक सम्बन्धहरू भत्काउँछ भन्छन्, त्यसलाई कसरी लिनुहुन्छ?

४. लिभिङ टुगेदर सम्बन्धले कानुनी मान्यता पाउनु पर्छ भनेर रिट नै परेको छ त्यसलाई कसरी लिनुहुन्छ ?

५. लिभिङ टुगेदर सम्बन्ध विवाह भन्दा बढी समतामा आधारित हुन्छ भन्ने बुझाईलाई कसरी लिनु हुन्छ ?

६. लिभिङ टुगेदर भित्र हिंसा हुन्छ छ भन्ने बुझाईलाई कसरी लिनु हुन्छ ?

Annex-3: Checklist for interview with Respondents

त्रिभुवन विश्वविद्यालय

समाजशास्त्र केन्द्रीय विभाग

एमफिल कार्यक्रममा अध्ययनरत छात्रा म नारायणी देवकोटाले आफ्नो थिसिस “काठमाडौं उपत्यकामा लिभिङ टुगेदरमा बसिरहेका जोडीहरूको अभ्यास” का लागि उत्तरदातासँग सोधिने प्रतिनिधि प्रश्नहरू निम्न अनुसार छन् । कुनै प्रश्नमा तपाईंलाई उत्तर दिन अफठेरो लागेमा तपाईंले उत्तर नदिन सक्नुहुन्छ । अनुसन्धानको क्रममा गोपनियता पूर्णरूपमा कायम गरिने छ । अनुसन्धान र त्यसका आधारमा प्रकाशित हुने सामाग्रीमा कतै पनि तपाईंको नाम ठेगाना खुल्ने गरि परिचय प्रयोग गरिने छैन ।

खण्ड क: सामान्य जानकारी उत्तरदाता र उत्तरदाताको पार्टनरको

१. नाम (तपाईंले आफ्नो नाम नभनेर कुनै काल्पनिक नाम भन्नु भए हुन्छ ।
२. जात :
३. उमेर:
४. धर्म:
५. भाषा:
६. शिक्षा:
७. लिंग:
८. स्थायी ठेगाना (जिल्लामा):
९. पेशा:

खण्ड ख: सँगै बस्ने उत्प्रेरणा

१. तपाईंहरूको पहिलो चिनजान कहिले देखि भएको थियो ?
२. दुईजनाको बिचमा प्रेम भएको कति वर्ष भयो ?
३. प्रेम भएको कति समयमा तपाईंहरू सँगसँगै बस्ने निर्णय गर्नु भएको थियो ?

४. विवाह नगरिसँगै बस्ने सोच कसरी आयो ? (घर परिवार, नातागोतासबैको जिम्मेवारी उठाउनको गान्धोले, यो काम श्रीमान यो काम श्रीमतीको भन्ने अफ्ठेरोको कारणले, सिन्दुरपोते लगाउन पर्ने, कन्यादान, अर्काको घर जस्ता कुराले, महिला र पुरुष बिचमा हुने कामको विभाजनबाट बच्न ?
२. विवाह गर्दा धेरै खर्च लाग्छ भनेर विवाह नगरेको त होईन ?
३. विवाह गर्न कानुनी अडचन छन् कि ?
४. जति बेला पनि सँगै बसौ जस्तो लाग्छ हो ? वा लाग्ने भएरसँगै बस्नु भएको हो कि ?
५. विवाह गरे पछि बच्चा जन्माउने दवाव हुन्छ, आफ्नो जोडिको आफन्तका विविध काम गरिदिन पर्छ, बढी जिम्मेवारी हुन्छ भनेर सँगै बस्नु भएको हो ?
६. आफ्नो जोडि प्रति कत्तिको विश्वास लाग्छ ?

खण्ड ग: सँगै बसे पछिको अनुभव

१. आफ्नो जोडिलाई के भनेर चिनाउनु हुन्छ/हुन्थ्यो ?
२. घर भित्रको काम बढी कसले गर्नु हुन्छ/हुन्थ्यो ?
३. तपाईंले घरभित्र बाहेकको काम के गर्न हुन्छ ? तपाईंको जोडिले के गर्नु हुन्छ ?
४. औपचारिक रुपमा विवाह गरेर बसौं जस्तो लाग्छ कि लाग्दैन ? (अहिलेको जोडि वा अर्को कोहि सँग)
६. सँगै बसे पछि कस्ता कस्ता चुनौति आउँदा रहेछन् ?
७. अर्कै ब्यक्तिसँग प्रेम हुने सम्भावना कत्तिको हुने रहेछ ?
८. एक अर्काका अभिभावकसँगको तपाईंको सम्बन्ध कस्तो छ ?
९. जोडिको अभिभावकले तपाईं प्रति कस्तो व्यवहार गर्नु हुन्छ ?
१०. सन्तान जन्माउने नजन्माउने मनस्थिति बनाउनु भएको थियो/छ ?
११. परिवार नियोजनका साधन प्रयोग गर्ने वा नगर्ने विषयमा सल्लाह गर्नु हुन्छ कि हुन्न ?
१२. भ्रगडा पर्दा, मनमुटाव कसरी ब्यवस्थापन गर्नु हुन्छ ?