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Marriage vs. Cohabitant

We do know for sure that marriage is a legitimized relationship recognized under federal statutes, however, perhaps it is the statistical label or title of “cohabitation” that seems to obscure the representation of a relationship (NeJaime, 2016). Cohabitation is nothing more than two people indulging in a relationship living under the same roof and sharing the same stress factors in life, including money, time, and of course most of all supportive and nourishing trust. The unfortunate fact is that the term cohabited limits the beneficial a jurisdictional resource within one’s community that would normally be offered to those who are recognized by the state to be in a relationship (Manting, 2005, p. 1). Marriage is better than cohabited because it has more benefit such additional financial support, creates a progressive and connective relationship, as well as the social impediment of responsibility

Many people within the United States of America are not aware that there are more social benefits offered to a married couple then there is for co-inhabitants (NeJaime, 2016, p. 81). This is mainly due to the lawful implications that are associated to those that endure traditional marriages within their jurisdictional and or geological areas One of the main fundamental results of being married is acquiring differentiating benefits whether it’s from the federal, state, and or local resource agencies including culpable tax breaks. Marriage couples enjoy more federal and state benefits, increased social statues, as well as the social perceptions of conformity then cohabitation.

Marriage has many social and economic benefits over to individuals that simply cohabitate. Many married couples enjoy tax breaks from the United States government including health benefits (Wight, LeBlanc, & Badgett, 2013, p. 8). For example, individuals can take a tax break as a married couple which will reduce or offset their tax bracket, whereas, co-inhabitants do not have this benefit. From a professional employee standpoint, married couples can acquire axis as well as affordability to competitive health care coverage (Wight, LeBlanc, & Badgett, 2013, p. 6). Married couples can claim their taxes jointly which increases their potential return or reduces their increased tax bracket as well as the reassurance of companionship through togetherness and completeness. Those who become married will find many benefits that can be utilized only by a legal and a lawful marriage.

There are over 2,118,000 marriages with a 6.8% per 1000 individuals in a given geological locations (prevention, 2016), however, no definitive data could be found statistically proving the actual results of cohabitating couples with the United States. What we did find is a quantitative research indicating just over 50% of cohabitating couples eventually get married and utilize social benefits (Trost, 2016). The bottom line is closely associated with a lawful implication and a societal perception which further delineates the limitations that cohabitants may acquire as well as the increase of marriageable stability.

Co-inhabitant is not a recognized status within the United States, thus, such said partnerships do not enjoy equal benefits as those who become lawfully wedded. Co-inhabitants do not follow customary and or tradition rules in which social perceptions would be closely associated to that of marriage (Trost, 2016, p. 10). Society itself as a norm does not recognize co-inhabitants as a beneficial factor associated with relationships within the United States. Because of its lack of social recognition as well as traditional norms, co-inhabitants are nothing more than two people living in the same dwelling, have no definitive and legally recognized relationship, as well as not having the reassurance and supportive connection that is established during the marriage (Trost, 2016, p. 5). The reason why co-inhabitants do not enjoy the same benefits, social and economic, is because it’s not legally recognized, however, there are exceptions in today’s society which would allow for a marriage that is not of the same gender. If co-inhabitants wish to enjoy the benefits of married couples, it’s best that they have their relationship solidified through the jurisdiction system.

Now that we realize most of the social benefits will be utilized by individuals who are legally married within their state, therefore solidifying on a piece of paper saying that their relationship is real, it is always in the best interest, if there seeking social benefits, to solidify their relationship by getting married (Manting, 2005). Another superficial claim is that co-inhabitants, those with children, do not have the marital structure the society is accustomed to, the dynamics that is included in the labeling of marriage, as well as the cultural development that is offered to the children with an a cohabitant relationship (William Little, 2012, p. Chapter 14). Basically, social norms are claiming that without having the perception of marital structuring, partnerships involving children would seem to hinder the cognitive growth of the child as well as a deceptive depicting of what a relationship should be, according to the social norm. What a lot of people don’t realize is that even though they are considered cohabitants with children, individually they are more than welcome to apply for and potentially be approved for social benefits.

According to the law within the United States, married couples will enjoy social benefits as a result of being legally recognized (Amato, 2015). Benefits would include, and in addition to tax and health coverage, employment benefits, as well as family benefits. These benefits are essential for a couple in cover such things as legal inheritance, receiving partners disability and Social Security benefits, As well as child support just in case each child has become part of the relationship, yet, the relationship has failed (NOLO, 2016). These coverages which are essential for countless reasons will aid the marital relationship as it facilitates strengthening and support between two people. Co-inhabitants will not have the same social status as a married couple, therefore, exempt from all governmental benefits.

As mentioned above, there are still opportunities for co-inhabitant parents to apply and receive social benefits, however, this will be very limited in resources and not nearly comparable to that of their marital counterparts (dictionary, 2016). According to the federal government, social benefits that can be received by co-inhabitants with children includes insurance coverage, food assistance, as well as other day care and or cash assistance. So, depending on the perspective that you consider the relational tie, there are still benefits, social and economic, that cohabitant parents can acquire for their household as well as to their children regardless whether the relationship is solidified by the state or not (Amato, 2015). Although the society may have a preconceived notion that cohabitants do not have the same relational ties as the marital couple, it seems that the society has agreed upon the furnishing of resources regardless of relationship and or stewardship from the state. Conclusively, the evidential society may have a descriptive social norm of how relationships should be solidified within the United States, however, something can be made that resources are available to co-inhabitants with children as well as without children.

It is unquestionabl that co-inhabitants do not share existing relational benefits that are forwarding to individuals that are married. Without solidifying the relationship between two individuals through the court procedure, which recognizes a license this process, co-inhabitants are surely likely to not be involved in countless benefits that are offered to the married couple (Bradford, 2014, p. 13). I guess true love is only recognized by the marital process which then allows individuals to qualify for an increased amount of resources and benefits from differentiating resources.

Irrevocably, regardless to marital status, cohabitant status, with children or without children, benefits are available for individuals who apply for the through federal, state, and local resources regardless if the acknowledgment of marital status exist. Although society’s norms separate the ideologies of relationships regarding a married couple and a contingent relationship, no one really knows how the relationship is structured nor the expectations within the relationship. Also, the society can not judge the amount of contribution that each one of the unmarried cube is brining to the relationship, which ultimately makes it a strong partnership. This may sound similarly eerie to the same fundamental concepts that social norms consider as a marital couple. The marital couple also has contingent relationships, as well as the means to financially and structurally support their family dynamics.
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