International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)
ISSN: 2319-7064
Impact Factor 2025: 7.089

The Impact of Premarital Sexual Trauma and Experience on Fear of Marriage: A Conceptual Model and Research Proposal

Kavya S. Nair

M.Sc. Psychology, Semester IV, Centre for Distance and Online Education, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bengaluru, India

Abstract: ***Marriage is widely regarded as a developmental milestone of adulthood, yet a growing number of young adults report apprehension, avoidance, or outright fear when contemplating it. This paper examines how premarital sexual trauma (unwanted, coercive, or abusive sexual experiences occurring before marriage) and premarital sexual experience (consensual sexual activity before marriage, particularly where it is culturally stigmatised) may contribute to fear of marriage. Drawing on attachment theory, the traumagenic dynamics model, cognitive models of post-traumatic stress, shame research, and sociocultural perspectives on sexuality in India, the paper integrates existing empirical literature on childhood and adolescent sexual abuse, adult intimate functioning, and marital outcomes. A conceptual model is proposed in which sexual trauma and stigmatised sexual experience influence fear of marriage through insecure attachment, sexual shame, distorted trust and safety beliefs, and anticipatory fear of disclosure and rejection, with social support, psychological help-seeking, and a sense of control over partner choice acting as moderators. A cross-sectional, mixed-methods design is outlined for empirical testing, along with ethical safeguards appropriate for sensitive research. No primary data are reported; the paper is a theory-driven re-view and research proposal. Implications for counselling, premarital education, and trauma-informed practice in the Indian context are discussed.***

Keywords: premarital sexual trauma, sexual abuse, premarital sexual experience, fear of marriage, gamophobia, attachment, sexual shame, trauma-informed counselling, India

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

Marriage remains one of the most significant social institutions in India. It is tied to identity, family honour, social acceptance, and, for many, economic security. At the same time, patterns of marriage are changing globally. Cherlin (2004) argued that marriage has be-come increasingly deinstitutionalised, valued as a marker of personal achievement and fulfillment rather than as an obligatory social role. In India, Allendorf and Pandian (2016) show that although arranged marriage persists, spouses now often have greater say in partner selection, which raises expectations around compatibility, emotional closeness, and personal choice.

Alongside these shifts, mental health professionals increasingly encounter young adults who describe dread, avoidance, or panic when marriage is discussed. This apprehension is sometimes informally labelled *gamophobia*, although it is not a diagnostic category in the DSM-5 (American Psychiatric Association, 2013) or ICD-11 and is better understood as a continuum of fear, ranging from ordinary worry to clinically significant avoidance.

Sexual experiences before marriage constitute one important, and under-researched, source of such fear. Two quite different experiences are involved. The first is sexual trauma: unwanted, coerced, or abusive sexual contact, including childhood sexual abuse, adolescent sexual assault, sexual harassment, and intimate-partner sexual violence. The second is premarital sexual experience that was consensual but that the individual, family, or community evaluates as transgressive. In cultures that place high value on premarital chastity, particularly for women, such experience may produce secrecy, guilt, and fear of exposure, and it can intersect with trauma, as when an abusive experience is later reinterpreted as personal "fault."

1.2 Rationale and Significance

The consequences of sexual abuse for mental health are well documented (Chen et al., 2010; Maniglio, 2009). Research also links abuse histories to difficulty with trust, intimacy, sexual functioning, and relationship satisfaction (Davis & Petretic-Jackson, 2000; DiLillo, 2001; Leonard & Follette, 2002). However, most studies focus on existing relationships and marital outcomes, not on the anticipatory stage, namely how people who have not yet married, or who are considering marriage, think and feel about it. Moreover, research on stigmatised premarital sexual experience and its psychological costs is limited, and almost none addresses its link to marriage-related fear in India. This gap matters because fear of marriage may delay or prevent partnership, affect family relationships, and compound distress in people who are already carrying an undisclosed burden.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

The central problem examined is: *How do premarital sexual trauma and premarital sexual experience relate to fear of marriage, and through which psychological and sociocultural mechanisms do they exert their influence?*

1.4 Objectives

1) To review theoretical and empirical literature on sexual trauma, premarital sexual experience, and relational outcomes.

2) To clarify the construct of fear of marriage and its components.
3) To propose a conceptual model explaining how sexual trauma and stigmatised sex-ual experience may lead to fear of marriage.
4) To outline a rigorous, ethical research design for testing the model among Indian young adults.
5) To draw implications for counselling and premarital education.

1.5 Research Questions

RQ1: Is a history of premarital sexual trauma associated with higher fear of marriage?
RQ2: Is premarital sexual experience, especially when accompanied by shame or se-crecy, associated with fear of marriage?
RQ3: Do attachment insecurity, sexual shame, and negative trust beliefs mediate these associations?
RQ4: Do social support, help-seeking, and autonomy in partner choice moderate these pathways?

2. Conceptual Definitions

Sexual trauma. Any sexual contact or act experienced without genuine consent, or un-der coercion, force, manipulation, or developmental incapacity to consent, that produces significant distress or impairment. It includes childhood sexual abuse, sexual assault, and sexual coercion. In India, such acts are criminalised under the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act, 2012, and under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

Premarital sexual experience. Consensual sexual activity occurring before marriage. The experience itself is not inherently harmful; its psychological significance depends on meaning, context, and the social response to it. In this paper it is examined mainly as a source of stigma-related distress (shame, secrecy, fear of discovery), and not as a pathology.

Fear of marriage. A cognitive, emotional, and behavioural pattern of apprehension or avoidance toward entering marriage. Drawing on research on fear of intimacy (Descutner & Thelen, 1991) and commitment, the construct is conceptualised here as having four components: (a) fear of intimacy and vulnerability; (b) fear of sexual intimacy within marriage; (c) fear of negative evaluation, exposure, or rejection by a spouse and in-laws; and (d) fear of loss of safety, control, or autonomy.

3. Review of Literature

3.1 Theoretical Perspectives

Attachment theory. Bowlby (1969/1982) proposed that early caregiving experiences shape internal working models of self and others. Hazan and Shaver (1987) extended this to adult romantic love, and Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) described four adult attachment styles (secure, preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful-avoidant). Sexual abuse, particularly by trusted persons, can violate the expectation that closeness is safe, fostering anxious or avoidant strategies (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Because marriage requires sustained, exclusive closeness, those with insecure or fearful-avoidant attachment may anticipate it as threatening.

Traumagenic dynamics model. Finkelhor and Browne (1985) identified four dynamics through which sexual abuse produces lasting harm: traumatic sexualisation, betrayal, powerlessness, and stigmatisation. Each is relevant to marriage. Traumatic sexualisation may link sex with fear or disgust; betrayal erodes trust; powerlessness makes the loss of control inherent in a binding commitment frightening; stigmatisation fosters shame and the belief of being "damaged" or unworthy of a spouse.

Shattered assumptions and cognitive models of trauma. Janoff-Bulman (1992) argued that trauma shatters basic beliefs that the world is benevolent, meaningful, and that the self is worthy. Ehlers and Clark (2000) proposed that persistent post-traumatic distress arises from negative appraisals of the trauma and its consequences, together with disturbed autobiographical memory. Negative post-trauma cognitions about the self and the world have been measured with the Posttraumatic Cognitions Inventory (Foa et al., 1999). Appraisals such as "I can never be safe with a partner" or "my spouse will reject me if he knows" are direct precursors of marriage-related fear.

Shame and the sexual double standard. Tangney and Dearing (2002) distinguish shame (a global negative evaluation of the self) from guilt (a negative evaluation of a behaviour), and show that shame is more strongly associated with withdrawal and concealment. Sexual double standards, in which women are judged more harshly than men for equivalent sexual behaviour, have been documented extensively (Crawford & Popp, 2003). In con-texts where virginity is symbolically linked to family honour, shame about sexual history may become a decisive barrier to marital intimacy, since the person fears both exposure and moral judgement.

Investment and commitment. Rusbult's (1980) investment model proposes that commitment depends on satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investment. Individuals fearing negative outcomes may appraise marriage as high-cost and low-reward, reducing commitment before it begins. This offers a lens on anticipatory fear.

Posttraumatic growth. Importantly, trauma does not inevitably produce avoidance. Tedeschi and Calhoun (2004) describe how some survivors report positive change, including deeper relationships. A balanced analysis must therefore examine moderators of outcome and not assume uniform harm.

3.2 Prevalence of Sexual Abuse

A global meta-analysis estimated self-reported prevalence of childhood sexual abuse at roughly 18% to 20% for girls and 7.6% for boys, with substantial variation by methodology (Stoltenborgh et al., 2011). Earlier national survey work in the United States likewise found that substantial minorities of adults reported childhood sexual abuse (Finkelhor et al., 1990). In India, the Ministry of Women and Child Development's national Study on Child Abuse: India 2007

reported high rates of sexual abuse among both boys and girls, though under-reporting and stigma mean that official figures understate true occurrence. These figures indicate that a considerable proportion of young adults approaching marriageable age may carry an undisclosed abuse history.

3.3 Sexual Trauma and Psychological Outcomes

Meta-analytic evidence shows that childhood sexual abuse is associated with elevated risk of depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder, eating disorders, substance use, and suicidal behaviour (Chen et al., 2010; Paolucci et al., 2001). A systematic review of reviews concluded that abuse has wide-ranging consequences for mental and physical health (Maniglio, 2009). Repeated victimisation is also a concern: survivors are at heightened risk of sexual revictimisation in adolescence and adulthood (Classen et al., 2005), which may intensify beliefs that intimacy is dangerous.

3.4 Sexual Trauma and Intimate Relationships

Davis and Petretic-Jackson (2000) reviewed how childhood sexual abuse affects adult interpersonal functioning and identified difficulties in trust, communication, intimacy, and sexual satisfaction. DiLillo (2001) similarly found links between abuse histories and im-paired interpersonal functioning in women, while noting methodological limitations such as reliance on clinical samples and the absence of controls for other adversities. Leonard and Follette (2002) found that women with abuse histories reported more sexual dysfunction, including aversion, arousal difficulties, and pain. Prospective evidence from Colman and Widom (2004) showed that childhood abuse and neglect predicted poorer adult inti-mate relationship outcomes, including higher likelihood of divorce or separation in some groups. Whisman (2006) reported associations between childhood trauma and adult mar-ital outcomes, and Nguyen et al. (2017) found that the link between childhood abuse and later marital difficulty may depend on partner characteristics, which implies that supportive partners can buffer the effects.

These studies centre on people who have already entered relationships. Fewer have asked how the expectation of marriage is shaped by abuse. Reasonable inference from this literature suggests that anticipated problems with trust, sexual intimacy, and vulnerability may translate into fear before marriage even occurs, but this requires direct testing.

3.5 Premarital Sexual Experience

In Western contexts, premarital sex is normative; Regnerus and Uecker (2011) describe it as common in young adulthood, and its psychological correlates depend heavily on context, such as relationship quality, age of onset, and whether sex was desired. In In-dia, attitudes are more conservative and gendered. The literature on sexual double standards suggests that women may face harsher social sanctions (Crawford & Popp, 2003). Consequently, two individuals with identical behaviour may have different psychological outcomes depending on how their social environment responds. Where an experience is consensual but is later framed as dishonourable, the person may internalise shame. Where an experience was non-consensual but is nonetheless labelled “loss of virginity” by family or society, the survivor may experience a double burden of trauma and stigma. This overlap is a key reason for studying trauma and experience together while keeping them conceptually distinct.

Parental divorce and observed family conflict are additional factors. Whitton et al. (2008) found that parental divorce was linked to lower confidence in the marital relation-ship, suggesting that fear of marriage has multiple origins and that sexual history should be studied alongside family background.

3.6 Sociocultural Context in India

In many Indian families, marriage is arranged or semi-arranged, and spouses may have limited prior acquaintance. Sexual history is rarely discussed. For a person with an abuse history or a stigmatised experience, this creates a dilemma: disclosure risks rejection, and non-disclosure risks later exposure and feelings of deception. Concerns about “purity” and family honour, limited sexuality education, and the stigma attached to mental health care can discourage disclosure and help-seeking. Survivors may therefore enter the marriage market with a heavy concealed burden, consistent with models linking secrecy to chronic shame and anxiety (Tangney & Dearing, 2002).

3.7 Gaps in the Literature

Three gaps emerge. First, little research targets the pre-marital, anticipatory stage. Second, studies seldom distinguish trauma from stigmatised consensual experience even though their psychological pathways differ. Third, culturally grounded evidence from India is limited, particularly for men and for non-heterosexual individuals, who are often missing from samples.

4. Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses

4.1 Proposed Model

The model proposes two independent variables (premarital sexual trauma; premarital sexual experience accompanied by stigma-related distress), one dependent variable (fear of marriage), four mediators, and three moderators.

- Independent variables: Premarital sexual trauma (type, age at onset, perpetrator relationship, severity); premarital sexual experience (consensual, with perceived stigma, secrecy, and shame).
- Mediators: (1) Attachment insecurity (anxiety and avoidance); (2) sexual shame; (3) negative post-trauma cognitions about trust, safety, and self-worth; (4) fear of disclosure and rejection.
- Moderators: Perceived social support; psychological help-seeking or therapy; autonomy in partner choice.
- Outcome: Fear of marriage (intimacy fear, sexual fear, fear of rejection or exposure, fear of loss of control).
- Covariates: Age, gender, education, religion, family type, parental marital status, other adverse childhood experiences, current mental health.

4.2 Hypotheses

- H1: Premarital sexual trauma will be positively associated with fear of marriage.
- H2: Premarital sexual experience accompanied by shame or secrecy will be positively as-sociated with fear of marriage, whereas consensual experience without stigma-related distress will show no or a weak association.
- H3: Attachment insecurity, sexual shame, negative trust and safety cognitions, and fear of disclosure will each partially mediate the relationship between sexual trauma and fear of marriage.
- H4: Sexual shame and fear of disclosure will mediate the relationship between stigma-tised premarital sexual experience and fear of marriage.
- H5: Social support, help-seeking, and autonomy in partner choice will weaken (moder-ate) the associations in H1 to H4.
- H6: Gender differences will be found in the strength of associations, reflecting differing cultural expectations about sexual conduct.

5. Proposed Methodology

Note: This section describes a proposed research design. No primary data have been collected for this paper.

5.1 Research Design

A cross-sectional, explanatory sequential mixed-methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018) is proposed. Phase 1 is a quantitative survey to test associations and mediation or moderation. Phase 2 comprises semi-structured interviews with a purposive subsample to explain and enrich survey findings.

5.2 Participants and Sampling

The target population is unmarried adults aged 21 to 35 years in India (those engaged or recently married could be considered as a comparison). Participants would be recruited through purposive and snowball sampling using online platforms, university networks, and counselling centres. Sample size would be estimated through power analysis; for example, G*Power (Faul et al., 2009) can be used to determine the number needed to detect small-to-medium effects in regression analyses, and a sample of approximately 300 or more is suggested for mediation and moderation testing, to be confirmed by the final analysis plan.

Inclusion criteria: aged 21 to 35, unmarried, able to read English, and providing in-formed consent. Exclusion criteria: current acute crisis or active suicidality at screening (such individuals should be referred to support rather than excluded without care).

5.3 Measures

Table 1: Proposed Quantitative Measurement Battery

Construct	Suggested Instrument
Childhood and adolescent sexual abuse	Sexual abuse subscale of the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire-Short Form (Bernstein et al., 2003), supplemented with items on adolescent and adult sexual coercion
Post-traumatic symptoms	PTSD Checklist for DSM-5 (PCL-5; Weathers et al.,
Post-trauma cognitions	Posttraumatic Cognitions Inventory (Foa et al., 1999)
Adult attachment	Experiences in Close Relationships-Short Form (Wei et al., 2007)
Fear of intimacy	Fear of Intimacy Scale (Descutner & Thelen, 1991)
Sexual shame and premarital experience	Researcher-developed items on premarital sexual experience, perceived stigma, secrecy, and sexual shame (to be validated in a pilot study)
Fear of marriage	Researcher-developed Fear of Marriage Scale (to be developed and validated through expert review, pilot testing, and factor analysis)
Social support and help- seeking	Standard social support scale of choice, plus items on therapy and disclosure history

Because no widely validated scale of fear of marriage exists, scale development is a crucial first step: item generation from literature and interviews, content validation by subject experts, exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, and assessment of reliability (Cronbach's alpha or omega) and construct validity.

5.4 Qualitative Component

A subsample of 10 to 15 participants (balanced by gender and trauma or experience status where possible) would complete semi-structured interviews exploring beliefs about marriage, disclosure dilemmas, family pressure, and coping. Interviews would be transcribed and analysed through reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

5.5 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics and reliability analyses would be followed by correlation and hierarchical multiple regression to test H1 and H2, controlling for covariates. Mediation and moderation (H3 to H5) would be tested using bootstrapped conditional process analysis (Hayes, 2018). Group differences by gender (H6) would be examined using multi-group comparison or interaction terms. Qualitative themes would be integrated with quantitative results through joint display.

5.6 Ethical Considerations

Research on sexual trauma requires particular care. The study would follow the American Psychological Association's (2017) ethical principles and the Indian Council of Medical Re-search's (2017) national ethical guidelines. Specific safeguards include: institutional ethics approval; informed consent that explains the sensitive nature of questions, voluntariness, and the right to skip or withdraw at any time; anonymity of survey responses and secure

storage of data; pre-warning about distressing content; a list of helplines and referral to qualified counsellors displayed at the start and end of the survey; screening for acute distress; and trained interviewers for the qualitative phase. Mandatory reporting duties for abuse of minors under the POCSO Act, 2012, must be considered if any participant discloses ongoing abuse of a child. Participants should never be pressured to disclose experiences.

6. Discussion of Anticipated Contributions

Because this paper is a theory-driven review and proposal, there are no empirical results to report. Instead, the anticipated contributions of the proposed work are discussed.

Theoretical contribution. The model integrates attachment, traumagenic dynamics, cognitive, and shame frameworks into a single account of anticipatory marriage fear. It also separates trauma from stigmatised consensual experience, which have often been con-flated, and treats their overlap explicitly.

Clinical implications. If supported, the model would suggest that therapy for marriage-related fear in survivors should address (a) attachment-related beliefs, (b) shame, through approaches such as compassion-focused or trauma-focused cognitive therapies, (c) post-trauma appraisals about trust and safety, and (d) practical preparation for disclosure decisions. Therapists should avoid assuming that every survivor must disclose, as disclosure should be a considered, client-led decision. Trauma-informed care, in which safety, choice, collaboration, and empowerment are central principles (Herman, 1992), is essential.

Premarital counselling and education. Premarital counselling programmes might include screening sensitivity, discussion of expectations about intimacy and sexual communication, and psychoeducation that challenges the equation of sexual history with moral worth. Parents and families could benefit from education to reduce coercive pressure and stigma.

Policy and community. Wider access to age-appropriate sexuality education, survivor-friendly mental health services, and public campaigns to reduce stigma could reduce the burden that makes marriage feel unsafe. Strengthening confidential, affordable counselling in colleges and online settings is especially relevant for distance learners and working adults.

Protective factors. Consistent with research on posttraumatic growth (Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004) and the role of supportive partners (Nguyen et al., 2017), the proposed study would also identify protective conditions under which survivors report confidence and hope about marriage. A strengths-based interpretation is important to avoid reinforcing the harmful belief that survivors are unfit for marriage.

7. Limitations

Several limitations apply. First, this paper does not report primary data, so its propositions remain hypotheses. Second, the literature relies heavily on Western and clinical samples, limiting generalisability to community populations in India. Third, retrospective self-report of sexual experiences is subject to recall bias and under-reporting due to stigma. Fourth, cross-sectional designs cannot establish causality; longitudinal studies would be needed to examine how fear of marriage develops and changes over time. Fifth, fear of marriage may stem from many factors unrelated to sexual history, including family conflict, economic insecurity, career goals, and gender-role expectations, which must be controlled. Finally, online recruitment may overrepresent urban, educated respondents.

8. Directions for Future Research

Future research should include longitudinal and diary-based designs; samples of men and sexual and gender minority individuals; comparison of arranged and self-chosen marriage contexts; evaluation of interventions such as trauma-focused therapy and premarital counselling for survivors; and development of culturally validated measures of marriage-related fear.

9. Conclusion

Fear of marriage is a multidimensional response that can arise from many sources, among which sexual trauma and stigmatised sexual experience are significant yet insufficiently studied. Existing evidence on the consequences of sexual abuse, attachment disruption, sexual shame, and the sexual double standard strongly suggests that these experiences can make marriage appear unsafe, shameful, or unattainable. In cultures where sexual history is closely linked to honour, the burden of secrecy may amplify this fear. The pro-posed model and research design provide a structured path for testing these ideas and for identifying the factors that protect survivors. Ultimately, responding to fear of marriage requires compassion, confidentiality, culturally sensitive therapy, and social change that no longer measures a person's worth by their sexual history. Survivors deserve support in making free, informed, and unhurried decisions about whether, when, and whom to marry.

References

[1] Allendorf, K., & Pandian, R. K. (2016). The decline of arranged marriage? Marital change and continuity in India. *Population and Development Review*, 42(3), 435–464.
[2] American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). American Psychiatric Publishing.
[3] American Psychological Association. (2017). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. https://www.apa.org/ethics/code
[4] Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(2), 226–244.
[5] Bernstein, D. P., Stein, J. A., Newcomb, M. D., Walker, E., Pogge, D., Ahluvalia, T., Stokes, J., Handelsman, L., Medrano, M., Desmond, D., & Zule, W. (2003). Development and validation of a brief screening version of the Childhood Trauma

Questionnaire. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 27(2), 169–190.

[6] Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment* (2nd ed.). Basic Books. (Orig-inal work published 1969)

[7] Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Re-search in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.

[8] Chen, L. P., Murad, M. H., Paras, M. L., Colbenson, K. M., Sattler, A. L., Goranson, E. N., Elamin, M. B., Seime, R. J., Shinozaki, G., Prokop, L. J., & Zirakzadeh, A. (2010). Sexual abuse and lifetime diagnosis of psychiatric disorders: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 85(7), 618–629.

[9] Cherlin, A. J. (2004). The deinstitutionalization of American marriage. *Journal of Mar-riage and Family*, 66(4), 848–861.

[10] Classen, C. C., Palesh, O. G., & Aggarwal, R. (2005). Sexual revictimization: A review of the empirical literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 6(2), 103–129.

[11] Colman, R. A., & Widom, C. S. (2004). Childhood abuse and neglect and adult intimate relationships: A prospective study. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 28(11), 1133–1151.

[12] Crawford, M., & Popp, D. (2003). Sexual double standards: A review and methodolog-ical critique of two decades of research. *Journal of Sex Research*, 40(1), 13–26.

[13] Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage.

[14] Davis, J. L., & Petretic-Jackson, P. A. (2000). The impact of child sexual abuse on adult in-terpersonal functioning: A review and synthesis of the empirical literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 5(3), 291–328.

[15] Descutner, C. J., & Thelen, M. H. (1991). Development and validation of a Fear-of-Intimacy Scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 3(2), 218–225.

[16] DiLillo, D. (2001). Interpersonal functioning among women reporting a history of child-hood sexual abuse: Empirical findings and methodological issues. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 21(4), 553–576.

[17] Ehlers, A., & Clark, D. M. (2000). A cognitive model of posttraumatic stress disorder. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 38(4), 319–345.

[18] Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41(4), 1149–1160.

[19] Finkelhor, D., & Browne, A. (1985). The traumatic impact of child sexual abuse: A con-ceptualization. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 55(4), 530–541.

[20] Finkelhor, D., Hotaling, G., Lewis, I. A., & Smith, C. (1990). Sexual abuse in a national survey of adult men and women: Prevalence, characteristics, and risk factors. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 14(1), 19–28.

[21] Foa, E. B., Ehlers, A., Clark, D. M., Tolin, D. F., & Orsillo, S. M. (1999). The Posttraumatic Cognitions Inventory (PTCI): Development and validation. *Psychological Assessment*, 11(3), 303–314.

[22] Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process anal-ysis: A regression-based approach* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

[23] Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511–524.

[24] Herman, J. L. (1992). *Trauma and recovery*. Basic Books.

[25] Indian Council of Medical Research. (2017). *National ethical guidelines for biomedical and health research involving human participants*. ICMR.

[26] Janoff-Bulman, R. (1992). *Shattered assumptions: Towards a new psychology of trauma*. Free Press.

[27] Leonard, L. M., & Follette, V. M. (2002). Sexual functioning in women reporting a his-tory of child sexual abuse: Review of the empirical literature and clinical implications. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, 13(1), 346–388.

[28] Maniglio, R. (2009). The impact of child sexual abuse on health: A systematic review of reviews. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 29(7), 647–657.

[29] Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2007). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change*. Guilford Press.

[30] Ministry of Women and Child Development, Government of India. (2007). *Study on child abuse: India 2007*. Government of India.

[31] Nguyen, T. P., Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (2017). Childhood abuse and later mar-ital outcomes: Do partner characteristics moderate the association? *Journal of Family Psychology*, 31(1), 82–92.

[32] Paolucci, E. O., Genuis, M. L., & Violato, C. (2001). A meta-analysis of the published research on the effects of child sexual abuse. *The Journal of Psychology*, 135(1), 17–36.

[33] Regnerus, M., & Uecker, J. (2011). *Premarital sex in America: How young Americans meet, mate, and think about marrying*. Oxford University Press.

[34] Rusbult, C. E. (1980). Commitment and satisfaction in romantic associations: A test of the investment model. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 16(2), 172–186.

[35] Stoltenborgh, M., van IJzendoorn, M. H., Euser, E. M., & Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J. (2011). A global perspective on child sexual abuse: Meta-analysis of prevalence around the world. *Child Maltreatment*, 16(2), 79–101.

[36] Tangney, J. P., & Dearing, R. L. (2002). *Shame and guilt*. Guilford Press.

[37] Tedeschi, R. G., & Calhoun, L. G. (2004). Posttraumatic growth: Conceptual foundations and empirical evidence. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(1), 1–18.

[38] Weathers, F. W., Litz, B. T., Keane, T. M., Palmieri, P. A., Marx, B. P., & Schnurr, P. P. (2013). *The PTSD Checklist for DSM-5 (PCL-5)*. National Center for PTSD.

[39] Wei, M., Russell, D. W., Mallinckrodt, B., & Vogel, D. L. (2007). The Experiences in Close Relationships Scale (ECR)-short form: Reliability, validity, and factor structure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 88(2), 187–204.

[40] Whisman, M. A. (2006). Childhood trauma and

marital outcomes in adulthood. *Per-sonal Relationships*, 13(4), 375–386.

[41] Whitton, S. W., Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2008). Effects of parental divorce on marital commitment and confidence. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22(5), 789–793.