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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

One of the most striking facts about marriage in the United States is the extent to which persons from widely different backgrounds marry each other. People are constantly crossing economic, social, racial, and religious lines in their marriages. A marriage is a process in which two persons learn to live together and adjust to each other in order to work toward common goals and achievements (Ho, 1984). When persons of different cultural backgrounds marry, the difficult cultural factors in adjusting to one another are far greater than for couples of the same cultures.

About one American in five has dated someone not of his or her own race, according to a 1971 Louis Harris Survey. The figures rise to one in three on the west coast and for young people (21 to 25) across the nation. In the south, the figure falls below one in ten (Porterfield, 1973). Of course, this rate does not confirm anything about marriage, but at least it shows the percentages of young people who go out with people from different races compared with those of the past decades. It has been shown that in every society,
historical or contemporary, primitive or modern, cultural restrictions are designed to limit the possible marriage partners available to any person. In short, people seem to play roles which society and other people expect them to play (Barron, 1922). Among many restrictions, endogamy or inmarriage is basic and universal, for it defines the social groups outside of which marriage is applicable, prohibited, or to be avoided. In most societies, endogamy is applicable with respect to race, religion, and, to a lesser extent, national background. To frustrate intermarriage along these lines, society has devised many types of informal taboos and controls including gossips, ridicule and family sanctions (Brewer, 1982; Ponce, 1977).

Over the years, few topics have preoccupied whites, blacks and others as much as interracial dating and ultimately, intermarriage. With few exceptions, resistance to integration - in public accommodation, in the neighborhood or in the school - is implicitly or explicitly motivated, at least in part, by the fear of intimate interracial contact. The pressures against interracial dating are many, and originate from many sources. The result of the poll, while informative and interesting, cannot provide the whole picture. A poll cannot vividly explore the social world of equal status, or the pressures and crosspressures, the groupings and regroupings, the conflict and alliances, and the overall costs of interracial
dating and interracial marriage to the participants (Stuart, 1973). In earlier times, the rules governing mate selection were relatively simple, fixed, and allowed little room for changes or deviation. In essence, the basic rule was that one marries one's own kind. The definition of "kind" varied from group to group depending on the common bond(s) that held the group together, be it religion, culture, family, country, color of skin, professional identities, socioeconomic status, or geographic propinquity (Ponce, 1977). Although the intermixing of races is as old as mankind, the overwhelming preference of most cultures has been toward inmarriage or endogamy. This preference was couched sometimes in mild terms such as "like should marry like" or "birds of a feather flock together," and often in stronger terms such as "don't mix oil and water" (Kikumura and Kitano, 1973). In other words, individuals are drawn together by the similarities of their characteristics. These similarities have been verified for racial pluralism, ethnic identity, education, socioeconomic status, and religion (Stuart, 1973).

The national frequency of mixed marriage is not known, but it appears to be rare. The 1960 census shows that nearly one-third of the racial mixture consists of blacks married to whites. Of the 55,000 white men married to wives of "other races," 22,000 were married to Japanese wives. Similarly, of the 5,000 black men married to wives of "other
races," 2,000 were married to Japanese wives. Almost all of the intermarriage involving husbands and wives of two different "other races" related to persons of American Indian, Oriental or Polynesian origin (Glick, 1970). A very small proportion (less than one percent) of the white persons or blacks who entered their first marriage during the 1950s, married persons of a different race. By sharp contrast, 38% of the Japanese wives, 33% of the Filipino wives, and 24% of the American Indian wives who first married in the 1950s were married to husbands of a different race, usually white men. Corresponding figures for men who outmarried were smaller for the Japanese (9%) and American Indian (19%), but reached 42% for Filipinos. About 18% of the Chinese men and 14% of the Chinese women who first married in the 1950s did not have a Chinese spouse. A large majority of the Japanese and the Filipino population of the United States live in California or Hawaii, and nearly half of the Chinese live in California.

In general, the research has indicated that intermarriage has increased over the last several generations in the United States (Tinker, 1973). Although it has been neither indiscriminate nor complete, the greatest amount of intermarriage has occurred among nationality groups sharing a common religion. There has been somewhat less intermarriage across religious lines and the least intermarriage has involved members of different
racial groups (Tinker, 1973).

The United States seems to have both a positive and a negative reputation in intermarriage studies. First, the United States has had the greatest ethnic diversity of any nation in history. The word "melting pot" occurred in this country since immigrants from nations all over the world migrated to the country which offers the great "freedom and opportunities." The melting pot blinded the immigrants to its inherent diversity. There are several places which offer intermarriage studies; the best known are Hawaii, California, and Texas. Hawaii has long been a land characterized by a great deal of racial and cultural fusion. This state with its ethnic diversity and high intermarriage rate (50% of all marriages) (Ho, 1984), provides an especially good setting for the study of patterns of intermarriage (Leon, 1975; Lind, 1964; Schwertfeger, 1982; Brewer, 1982).

Second, it is undeniable that the United States has been called a racist society (except Hawaii), (Tinker, 1982), a society in which the color of a person's skin has more to do with his life chances than the quality of his mind. In some parts of the country, racism is not just a state of mind. Racism in the south is solely a matter of prejudice and mental phenomena. Instead, racism is also a way of life; things that masters did to slaves and that whites do to blacks (Stuart, 1973). It is institutionalized
- in works, in schools, in politics, in social esteem and honor, and in property and economic advantages, and even in recreation and religion. Racism operates twenty four hours a day, and it "does in" people to the advantage of certain caucasians. One of the corollaries of racism is an ideology against biracial marriages. These tell us something about how well the American melting pot is working and how thoroughly the different ethnic ingredients are mixing together (Tinker, 1973). It does not, however, provide the most serious possible test for the melting pot because in one important sense these groups are all alike (Polish, Italians, etc.). In a country in which racial differences are very salient, these groups all belong to the same race. A lot of Oriental groups, especially Chinese and Japanese American, experience discrimination against their groups in this country. Studying specific groups in a society with racial distinctions, is thought to have enormous importance. Unlike an Italian or Polish person, an Oriental wears his own ethnic identity on his face (Tinker, 1982). The question now is whether the racism in this society is ineradicable. Moreover, the United States leads the western world in opposition to intermarriage (Erskine, 1973). In a 1968 World Gallup Poll, the 72% disapproval by Americans was higher than that of any other countries surveyed. Great Britain placed next to the United States with 57% disapproval. In the same Poll, in Sweden, France
and the Netherlands, only about 25% of the citizens frowned on racially mixed marriages.

**Purpose of the Study**

1. To review intermarriage literature in the United States.
2. To present the motivations of intermarriage while determining differences between intra and intermarriage.
3. To investigate communication problems in intermarriage based on cultural conflicts which the author assumes are the underlying problems couples face when entering marriage.
4. To offer a comparative picture of intra and intermarriage as intermarriage is portrayed in the past as an abnormality or disgrace.
5. To present the adjustment of intermarriage, how to communicate more richly, more smoothly. The author believes that entering intermarriage is a kind of marital choice and preference. Much depends on the couples involved to work toward achieving a compatible marriage.

**Definitions**

Culture - The widely shared customs or traditions of a relatively homogeneous population (Alexander, 1977).

Endogamy - 1. The custom or requirement of marrying only
within one's tribe, caste or social system (Barron, 1972).

2. The tendency to marry within a particular group, caste or class (Stuart, 1973).

Ethnicity - A self-concept of belonging to a particular group characterized by similar cultural basic premises (McGoldrick, 1982).

Interethnic - Marriage of parties who were reared in cultures and native environments which differ; for example, German Jews marrying Polish Jews (Barron, 1972).

Interfaith - Marriage in which the parties marrying were born or reared in families each of which has identified with a different religion (Barron, 1972).

Interrmarriage - Married persons whose religious, racial or ethnic background is or was different from each other's, prior to or after their marriage (Barron, 1972).

Intramariage - 1. A marriage out of one of the three major religious groups, which are Protestant, Catholic, and Jews in the United States (Bumpass, 1970).

2. Marriage of persons derived from those different in-groups and out-groups (other than the family) which are culturally
conceived as relevant to the choice of the spouse (Brewer, 1982).

Interracial marriage - Marriage of persons belonging to different races. For instance, a black Protestant marrying a white Protestant (Barron, 1972).

Miscegenation - The biological mixing of the genes of two different stocks, breeds or races (Stuart 1973).

Mixed marriage - Marriage in which separate religious ideologies are maintained by the parties subsequent to their marriage (Barron, 1972).

Role - The behavior that is characteristic and expected of the occupant of a defined position in a group (Stuart, 1973).

Taboos - Prohibited behavior patterns which have a fair probability of occurring but which are viewed as potentially disruptive to the social group (Stuart, 1973).

Value - A standard or yardstick to guide actions attitudes, comparisons, evaluations, and justifications of self to others (Condon, 1973).

The author refers to intermarriage in her study as a marriage of persons whose racial, ethnic group, or religions, are not the same.
Methods of Research

The research techniques employed in this study are library research, past participant-observation, personal interviews and exchange of ideas with other intermarriage couples.

Library research - Library materials and other related literature are utilized to give necessary background knowledge of intermarriage in the United States. Previous studies on intermarriage history in the United States, geography and literature, plus living in this culture helps the author gain an insight into the folkways, traditional cultures, and general concepts of the American family and other ethnic groups in this country.

Past participant-observations - This research technique is made possible by the author's past attendance and observation of intermarriage couples in the United States, which would help to analyze the research.

Personal interviews and exchange of ideas - The author exchanges ideas with her native people and foreign people who intermarry in
Columbus and elsewhere. This part of the research helps greatly in obtaining the knowledge and necessary understanding of this study.

**Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses are designed to investigate how people who intermarry differ from those who marry inside their group in the United States. Through the utilization of such an analysis, and socio-psychological traits of people who intermarry and intramarry counterparts, we have the following:

**Hypothesis 1:** Third and subsequent generations have a greater tendency to marry out than those who marry inside the group.

The objective of Hypothesis 1 is to examine the relationship between the generation of ethnic groups and its influence on intermarriage. As length of residence in the country for an ethnic minority group increases, the chance of intermarriage of its members also increases.

**Hypothesis 2:** Those ethnic groups who marry out are less likely to favor male dominance in the decision making process with their spouses than those who marry within the group.

**Hypothesis 3:** There will be an increasing rate of intermarriage since there is an attitude
change and people have more contact with each other.

Hypothesis 4: In order to decrease problems in intermarriage, good communication is an essence adjustment required for the couples to adjust to their married life.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE OF INTERMARRIAGE IN THE UNITED STATES

Since the early 1900s American sociologists and other social scientists have periodically engaged in the study of intermarriage (Cretser and Leon, 1982). The belief has been that this type of study may provide answers to a whole host of questions about social life within and between racial, religious, and national origin groups in American society (Barron, 1951). It must be remembered that as late as 1966 sixteen states had formal prohibition against one or more forms of intermarriage. On the basis of racial classification, these states were Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia (Kikumura and Kitano, 1973). The United States Supreme Court overturned the sixteen existing anti-miscegenation statutes with a decision rendered June 12, 1967. At one time or another, forty of the fifty states have had laws which prohibited blacks from intermarrying with whites. Pennsylvania, in 1780, was the first state to repeal its anti-miscegenation law, while Indiana and Wyoming took this action as recently as 1965.
As Weinberger (1966) has pointed out, the various statutes were not uniform. For example, in Arkansas, a person "who has in her or his veins any negro blood whatsoever" was forbidden from marrying a white person. More commonly, the laws specified that only persons with one-eighth or more of such blood, or those related within three generations to a member of a particular racial group were so prohibited. Aside from regular prohibitions against marriages of blacks and whites, other groups mentioned in one or more statutes included West Indians, Japanese, Chinese, Mongolians, Indians and Malayans.

Bossard noted in 1939 that the sociological study of intermarriage, especially between different nationalities, had been neglected. He suggests that the study of intermarriage was important because it indexed the assimilation process and degree of social distance, as well as aiding in understanding family life and personality problems.

Kennedy (1944) associated intermarriage with assimilation among white ethnics in New Haven. She suggested that intermarriage can be thought of both as an indicator of the degree of assimilation occurring in the society and as a means of promoting assimilation itself. Kennedy found that at least among white ethnics, intermarriage was increasingly common but largely occurred within major religious groupings. On the other hand,
Bugelski (1961) found that the 1960 residents of Buffalo with Polish or Italian names, when compared to the 1930 residents, were intramarrying at a declining rate. In fact, he expected such marriages to become rare by 1975, but added that he was not able to draw any strong conclusions from his preliminary investigation. Marcson (1950) also takes issue with the notion that intermarriage can be thought of as an index of assimilation and instead argues that this assumption is fallacious. He points out if intermarriage was functionally interrelated with assimilation, intermarriage ratios would be higher for the oldest ethnic groups and lowest for those most recently arrived. He also suggest that conditions which facilitate intermarriage are "high education, middle class status, middle income, professional and proprietary occupations, second and third generations, and rural nonfarm residence." This position is actually very similar to that of Kennedy in that he expects intermarriage between ethnic groups to occur much more often than between individuals representing differing religious groups or social classes.

An assimilation approach to understanding intermarriage is also taken by Parkman and Sawyer (1967) in dealing with this phenomenon in Hawaii. They developed a combined index to measure the variation in race, religion, and nationality for marriages. From their data analysis, two dimensions of intermarriage were observed. One, they labelled East-West
(a measure of the extent to which a group has acquired the
dominant contemporary way of life) and two, urbanicity
(percentage of the group living in Honolulu). According to
this model, intermarriage rates will be highest between
groups who are similar in these two dimensions.

Barnett (1963) confirms that there is evidence that the
rate of mixed nationality marriage is gradually increasing.
He suggested that a number of studies show that the rate of
intermarriage decreased in the first half of the century,
and prior to the 1954 Federal Supreme Court decision
declaring unconstitutional segregated public schools.
However, data from California indicated that the rate of
intermarriage has increased slightly since the court
decision; thus, intermarriage accounted for 1.2 percent of
all marriages in the states in 1955, for 1.4 percent in 1952,
for 1.5 percent in 1958, and 1.4 percent in 1959. He also
states the conditions associated with cross-nationality and
cross-racial marriages:

1. Whites appear to be more willing to engage in
intermarriage with Orientals than with Blacks.

2. Protestants have the highest rate of mixed nationality
marriages and Jews have the lowest, with Catholics
standing between the two.

3. Apparently, among whites, it is the Protestant and
Catholic male and the Jewish female who most frequently
marry members of other races. In international
marriages, it seems to be the Protestant and Catholic
males who cross boundaries most frequently.

4. Persons experienced with disorganized and stressful
parental families are most likely to marry out than
those who were raised in cohesive and stable families.

5. Persons living in urban areas, cross nationality and racial lines to a greater extent than persons living in rural areas.

6. Persons crossing nationality lines to marry, generally choose partners who are members of the same religion and of the same socioeconomic level. In intermarriage, the spouse generally comes from a different religion and apparently from a different socioeconomic level.

7. Americans undertaking an international marriage are usually from lower-than-average socioeconomic homes. In interracial marriages, it appears that the non-white male has a higher-than-average socioeconomic status and the white male and female and the non-white female have a lower-than-average socioeconomic level.

8. In black-white marriages, it is the black male who marries the white female in the majority of cases. In oriental-white marriages, generally the Chinese male marries the white female, and the white male marries the Japanese female.

9. Among those who undertake an interracial marriage, a greater-than-average number have been married previously.

10. Foreign-born white males more than native white males, and native white females more than foreign-born white females, undertake black-white marriages.

11. In black-white marriages, the family of the black spouse seems to be more willing to accept the couple than does the family of the white spouse.

12. American males and females marrying out of their nationality or racial group are generally older than the average at time of marriage.

13. The degree of success attained by international marriages is unknown. The evidence is contradictory regarding the success, in terms of divorce, of mixed racial marriages. Such marriages are less successful than marriages between persons of the same race, while he reported that a failure rate for black-white marriages was not greater than average (Barnett, 1963).
CHAPTER THREE
LITERATURE OF MARITAL COMMUNICATION

Literature of Marital Communication

Within the context of human relationships in general and interpersonal relationships in particular, the marital relationship is unique. It is not unique in the sense of its having been established by virtue of ritual or ceremony, but unique in the sense that commitments entered into by both parties tend to be more binding and potentially more self-fulfilling, while at the same time potentially more self-destructive than is normally the case for less personalized relationships, e.g., friendships or mutual acquaintances.

In regard to the marital relationship, marital adjustment is probably the most frequently studied dependent variable (Spanier, 1976; Spanier & Lewis, 1980). Indeed, researchers have for years been searching for correlates in an attempt to explain more of the variances in marital adjustment. Those investigating this phenomena have isolated numerous factors, e.g., role orientation, socioeconomic status, age, social structure, communication, etc., that contribute to marital adjustment.
Of all the factors believed to contribute to marital adjustment, however, "marital communication" stands out as the process underlying and supporting most other, if not all marital processes and outcomes (Jorgensen & Gudy, 1980). In fact, Snyder (1980) found communication to be the best predictor of marital adjustment in a multi-dimensional assessment of marital adjustment. Moreover, it is the belief that effective communication is linked to marital adjustment, which underlines the efforts of many professionals who work with maladjusted couples (Bolte, 1970), as well as those developing marital enrichment and encounter programs (Miller, Nunnally, & Wackman, 1975). Communication concerns are even integrated in theories of successful marital relationships (Walzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 1967).

Communication is the essence of the marital relationship and that communicator style occupies a central role in such relationships. Specifically, it examines the association between married couples' similarity of communicator style and marital adjustment, and the association between accuracy of spouses' perception of partners' communicator style and marital adjustment. In an attempt to understand the relationship between communication and marital adjustment, researchers have investigated features of communication that differentiate adjusted from
maladjusted couples. For example, it has been found (Navran, 1967) that adjusted couples have communication skills that enable them to resolve mutual problems. Conversely, maladjusted couples lack such skills, which result in greater tension, anger and conflict in their relationships.

Although adjusted and maladjusted couples both experience conflict in their relationships, adjusted couples are more likely to "rely on positive control as the primary strategy for insuring rewards, cooperation, and compliance from their partners..." (Weiss, Hops, & Patterson, 1973), than are maladjusted couples, whose primary strategy for resolving conflict is "excessive use of aversive control tactics" (Weiss, et al.).

When compared with maladjusted couples, adjusted couples not only manage their relational conflict more constructively, they make superior use of both verbal and non-verbal communication. Specifically, adjusted couples:

1. talk more to each other;
2. convey the feeling that they understand what is being said to them;
3. have a wider range of subjects available to them;
4. preserve communication channels and keep them open;
5. show more sensitivity to each others' feelings;
6. personalize their language symbols; and
7. make more use of supplementary non-verbal techniques of communication (Navran, 1967).
Not only are these communication features found to be lacking among maladjusted couples, there is a sense in which maladjusted couples exhibit higher rates of "punishing" behavior, i.e., negative criticism, hostility, inappropriate responses, etc., than do adjusted couples whose communication seems to consist of "rewarding" behaviors, i.e., attentiveness, appropriate responses, etc. (Birchler, Weiss, & Vincent, 1975).

Several other theorists have stressed the importance of communication in the marital relationship by discussing various aspects of quality couple communication. For example, Bienvenu (1970) isolated a number of factors which distinguish effective from ineffective marital communications. These differences include understanding, good listening habits, tone of voice, handling of problems and self-disclosure. Those factors related to ineffective couple communication are nagging, conversational discourtesies, and uncommunicativeness. Bienvenu (1970) also found that self-disclosure is the most significant discriminator of effective and ineffective marital communication.

In light of Bienvenu (1970) finding that self-disclosure is a significant aspect of effective marital communication, and Jorgensen and Gaudy's (1980) argument that "communication (to one's spouse) about relatively
personal and intimate matters constitutes an important step in the process, of need and goal fulfillment in marriage," it is not surprising that researchers have spent considerable effort focusing on the impact of this variable on marital adjustment.

For instance, a number of researchers (Gelman & McGinley, 1978; Gilbert, 1976; Jorgensen & Gaudy, 1980; Jourard, 1971; Miller, Corrales, & Wachman, 1975) investigating the impact of self-disclosure on the marital relationship have concluded that self-disclosure is one of the most important variables in the development of fulfilling and stable marriages. In fact, Fenterheim (1972) and Knox (1971) found that the fundamental problem in many disturbed marriages is the inability of spouses to express their feelings in an honest and direct way.

Other researcher (Bienvenu, 1970) while acknowledging the importance of self-disclosure, have argued that too much disclosure to one's spouse can result in marital difficulties. He notes that "too much disclosure can cause couples to lapse into a matter of factness which leaves no room for surprise."

Contrary to studies suggesting the importance of full disclosure of all feelings (Jorgensen & Gaudy, 1980; Jourard, 1971) and studies reporting a curvilinear relationship between self-disclosure and marital adjustment (Limmel, 1964), other studies (Levinger & Senn, 1967) have
found that couples who disclose greater marital adjustment than do couples who disclose negative feelings. Based on research by Sutton (1975) as cited in Gilbert (1976) which found that disclosure of negative feelings only has a negative effect on the marital relationship if one does not verbalize acceptance of his/her spouse, it could be argued that other aspects of communication reflecting one's confirmation or disconfirmation of one's partner might be expected to impact self-disclosure.

Hawkins, Weisberg, and Ray (1980) investigated four styles of emotional communication in an attempt to make a more general statement concerning the role of interaction in enhancing or retarding the sharing of emotional issues in this relationship. Four emotional communication styles, i.e., conventional, controlling, speculative, and contactful, were employed in the Hawkins, et al. (1980) study as a framework to determine the communication styles of 171 married couples. Subjects were interviewed to assess their preference and perception in terms of the four styles, and subsequently were observed interacting on a joint task. Hawkins, et al. (1980) explicates the four styles as follows:

...conventional and control styles are closed in that they minimize the importance of the other's experience or are disrespectful of the other's internal realities. Speculative and contactful speeches are open in the sense that they convey interest in, respect for, and validation of the internal realities of self and others. Controlling and contactful speeches are high
disclosure in the sense that the speaker evidences relatively strong emotional commitment to expressed feelings, intentions, interpretations, sense data, and action statements...Conventional and speculative styles, are by contrast, low disclosure styles.

In terms of preferred communication styles, results indicate that (1) wives prefer less controlling behavior in their husbands than did the husbands concerning their own behavior; (2) the wives preferred contactful behavior in their husbands more than the husbands did for themselves; (3) spouses appear to be in agreement regarding the value of conventional behavior in the husband, as well as on the value of controlling (negative) and contactful behavior (positive) in the wife; (4) husbands value conventional behavior in their wives somewhat less than did the wives, (5) although not statistically significant, husbands wanted more speculative behavior in their wives than the wives prefer to give; and (6) in spite of differences concerning preferred communication styles in themselves and their spouses, husbands and wives gave the same rank-order of preference for the four communication styles, i.e., contactful, speculative, conventional, and controlling.

In regard to perceived communication styles in spouses, findings suggest that (1) wives perceive their husbands as engaging more often in the "less approved styles," as compared to husbands' perception of themselves; (2) wives perceive that their husbands are more controlling and less contactful than the husbands perceive themselves to be; and
(3) there were no statistically significant differences between the communication behavior believed to be used by the wives themselves and that perceived in the wives by their husbands.

Finally, in terms of observed behavior of husbands and wives, the subjects perceived themselves as engaging in contactful or speculative behavior two or three times as often as they used controlling or conventional styles—as observed while the spouses worked on a joint task. All of the subjects in the study tended to view their communications style in a favorable light (Hawkins, et al., 1980). These investigators note that the overall findings from their study suggest: women want to move closer to husbands or rather, they want their husbands to be more vulnerable and share more intimately with them. The emotional quality they seek is of the deepest, most open, fully sharing, personally respectful and accepting—husbands still prefer to give less of this than their wives would like.

In addition, Hawkins, et al. (1980) suggest that the potential for dissatisfaction in marriage is less likely to arise among husbands since "wives would be more likely to notice behaviors which deviate from expectations than a husband."

The study by Hawkins, et al (1980) does shed some light on emotional communication styles preferred and perceived by
married couples; however, their investigation like that of many others, views communication from a rather narrow perspective, i.e., focusing specifically on emotional communication behavior.

**Marital Communication Perspective**

Although research has established that adjusted couples can be differentiated from maladjusted couples in terms of communication features, no single construct has served to structure and organize a number of these features that would be expected to be present or absent during couple interaction. As a result, specific communication behaviors that are more crucial to marital adjustment have not been identified. Even though self-disclosure appears to be a significant dimension of effective marital communication, it has not been determined if disclosure is more important than behaviors other than those identified by Bienvenu (1970).

Moreover, the literature does not make clear whether both spouses must be perceived by their partner as exhibiting effective communication before their relationship is considered adjusted. In addition, it is not clear to what extent accuracy of perceiving one's partner's communication behavior contributes to adjustment in marriage. These issues need to be addressed since a number of communication features (behaviors) would be expected to occupy a central role that determines how they will respond
to each other's messages (Anderson & Todd de Mancillas, 1978).

It appears that most of the conclusions regarding marital communication have been derived from discreet, univariate studies which limit the predictive potential of communication in the marital relationship. According to Capella (1981), "Manipulating message features one at a time is in the best tradition of experimental science,...however, the aim of such research is to be described a total response to a full message on all its expressive features." Of course, it would be unlikely that researchers would be able to investigate the response to a "total" message because of the numerous interacting variables and the lack of a unified theory of human communication. Researchers would, however, come closer to understanding the influence of a total message and all its expressive features on marital adjustment if they investigated communication from a broader (multidimensional) perspective.

A number of theoretical approaches, i.e., rhetorical sensitivity, communication competency, communicator style (Hart & Burks, 1972; Wiemann, 1977; Parks, 1977; Norton, 1978) could be employed to conceptualize marital communication from a multidimensional perspective. This study, however, is not concerned with couples' ability to recognize situational demands and elicit strategies appropriate to the situation, i.e., rhetorical sensitivity,
nor with couples' ability to maximize communication encounters and/or achieve goals, i.e., communication competency. It is concerned with focusing on a number of communication features likely to be present or absent during couple interaction. It would appear therefore, that these features would be reflected in one's style of communication, and as such, a holistic communication style construct (Norton, 1978) would offer a more appropriate perspective.

By examining a number of communicator style features at once, unique combinations of style variables that account for variance in marital adjustment can be identified and individual style variables can be isolated. Thus, conclusions that can be derived from a multivariable communicator style approach would not depend on the accumulation of single bits of information from univariate instruments as used in previous studies. Therefore, the use of multidimensional communicator style perspective would provide an examination of all the communication features of interest at once.

Communicator Style

Communicator style is a recently developed communication construct (Norton, 1974a, 1974b) and has received much attention from communication scholars. The multivariable communicator style construct developed by Norton (1978) is being used as a conceptual framework for this investigation since it captures a number of
communication features. Communication is the variable which appears to provide a significant impact on the success or failure of the marital relationship but it has only been examined from a narrow (univariate) perspective. The communicative style construct provides the opportunity to examine communication in the marital context from a broader perspective, and thus may provide a clearer answer to the impact of communication in the marital relationship. To date, the construct of communicator style has not been used to examine communication in the marital relationship.

Norton (1978) defines communicator style as "the way one verbally and paraverbally interacts to signal how literal meaning should be taken, interpreted, filtered, or understood." His studies have isolated ten styles or dimensions which define the construct: dominant, dramatic, contentious, animated, impression leaving, relaxed, attentive, open, and friendly. In addition, the dimension of communicator image is included as an overall assessment of communicator ability. In order to assess communicator style, Norton developed a Communicator Style Measure (CSM), a questionnaire that can be answered as one perceives his/her own communicator style and that of another.

There have been a number of studies using Norton's communicator style construct. For example, in three studies Norton and Pettigrew (1977) found that certain communicator style dimensions appear to be correlated with certain
attraction variables. In the first study, subjects rated the communicator styles of best liked and least like friends. Subjects revealed that these were satisfied with the best liked friend's communicator style and indicated how the least liked friend could become a better communicator, i.e., should become less dominant and impression leaving, and more attentive.

The second study revealed that the most attractive communicator style had the best communicator image, i.e., was dominant/open. The least attractive communicator style was dominant/not open. The findings in study two were replicated in study three with respect to three different indices of attraction: personality, physical, and enjoyment of working with others. Three communicator style dimensions, attentive, friendly, and relaxed emerged as the best predictors of attraction. Norton and Pettigrew caution, however, that communicator style characteristics that influence attraction depend on context, situation, and time.

Communicator style not only appears to be correlated with interpersonal attraction, it seems to be linked with perceptual processes and outcomes. Using the CSM as a pretest to assess communicator style, Norton and Miller (1975) paired high-low scoring communicator style subjects and middle-middle scoring communicator style subjects, and then asked the pairs to interact on a joint task.
Following, two posttests were administered; one measuring subjects' self-perception of communicator style and the other measuring subjects' perception of partners' communicator style.

Subjects scoring low on the CSM pretest did not report a difference between their communicator style and that of subjects scoring high on the CSM. High CSM scorers did report a difference between their communicator style and low communicator style scores. Middle CSM scores accurately reported their own and each others communicator style. These findings suggest that persons scoring low on the CSM are unable to report differences between their own communicator style and that of others.

Miller (1977) replicated the Norton and Miller study; however, in addition to having subjects rate themselves and each other, they were video taped and rated by objective observers. The results of Miller's study were the same as those reported by Norton and Miller. Moreover, the objective rater's data further suggest that those scoring low on the CSM do not accurately perceive a difference between their own communicator style and that of high CSM scorers.

Miller (1977) provides two explanations for the failure of low CSM scorers to report a difference between their own communicator style and that of high CSM scorers: social desirability and perceptual deficiency. If the low CSM
scorer desires to appear competent in communication skills, "...he may be fully aware of differences between himself and his partner but choose not to acknowledge them" (Miller, 1977). The second explanation, perceptual deficiency, overshadows the social desirability explanation, however, in that subjects were initially asked to assess their own communicator style and were subsequently classified according to their CSM scores. Miller (1977) verifies neither explanation, but notes that the interpretation of the data "maintains simply that low CSM scorers failed to focus on the relevant communication cues and consequently are unable to report the presence of differences."

It could be argued that if low CSM scorers do not accurately perceive another's communicator style, they may misperceive other relevant factors important in achieving effective communication in a relationship. Thus, since effective communication is positively related to marital adjustment, it would appear the spouses' accuracy of perceiving partners' communicator style is in need of investigation.

In a study designed to investigate sex differences in self-perception of communicator style, Montgomery and Norton (1981) found that males and females report more similarities than differences in communicator style. There were significant differences reported only in terms of precise and animated dimensions, i.e., males see themselves as more
precise and females see themselves as more animated. No consistent differences were found between males and females in predictor variables of an effective communicator. It appears that the dominant and impression leaving dimensions were consistently important in predicting communicator image for both males and females.

The Montgomery and Norton (1981) study seems to support the Hawkins, et al. (1980) investigation which found that husbands and wives perceive their own communicator style similarly, at least with respect to the open dimension. If husbands fail to perceive a difference between their own communicator style and that of their wives, as suggested by Hawkins, et al. (1980), it could be due to perceptual deficiency on the part of the husband. Studies cited earlier (Miller, 1977; Norton & Miller, 1975) indicate that low CSM scorers fail to perceive a difference between their own communicator style and that of a high CSM scorer, while high CSM scorers do perceive a difference. A person who is open would tend to score high on this particular dimension of the CSM. Thus, wives could be more accurate than husbands in perceiving spouses' communicator style.

In summary, it was suggested that Norton's communicator style construct provides the opportunity to examine communication in a marital relationship from a broader perspective. Studies employing the communicator style construct have found that certain dimensions of communicator
style appear to be correlated with certain attraction variables. It was also suggested that communicator style may be related to perceptual processes and outcomes. Studies of self-perception of communicator style have revealed that males and females perceive their own communicator style similarly.
CHAPTER FOUR
MOTIVATIONS FOR INTERMARRIAGE

It seems that there are plenty of questions to ask people who tell their folks, their friends, or their colleagues that they plan to intermarry. Why him or why her? Perhaps we need to understand the motivations of intermarriage, which are numerous and include most of the reasons for any marriage.

The numbers of motives may depend on one's definition of a motive. Char (1977) stressed that the motivation of intermarriage are the same as those who intracultural marriage. Each marriage is based on complementary combinations of conscious motives which must be interpreted in regard to the involved cultures, setting and time. People have unconscious as well as conscious motives for their actions, marriage included, expressed or not (Stuart, 1973). Moreover, Char (1977) and Ho (1984) suggested it can be categorized to sociological and psychological motivations relevant to outgroup marriage.

It can be interesting when people bring up talking about intermarriage or have some kind of feelings when they see intermarriage couples walking together with mixed kids.
on the street. Of course, people who strongly believe in "endogamy" would not like it that much. They do not understand why those people do not stick around with their own people. What kind of people are they? What problems do those people have?

Perhaps finding answers to marriage motivations would clear something in our minds. There are many sociologists who have studied the motivations of intermarriage. There is one which is interesting about international dating. Actually people start dating to get a chance to know somebody better. If the relationship does not go well...that is fine, but if it does, it can lead to the advance relationship which involves a romantic situation and lets the feelings and relationship go deeper. Blood and Nicholson (1962) found the motivation for international dating at the University of Michigan campus. He interviewed American students who go out with international students on campus. The answers came up as personality liking for the individual as the main reason, which is the same as the motivation for people who date within their own group. Plus, he found that American students feel that international students have interesting personalities, maturity and charms. Also, dating people from different cultures can give them the experience of practicing language skills and the opportunity to meet interesting people.
Since the starting point of attraction between people from the same and different cultures is similar, perhaps we need to find out more about people who intermarry.

**Love.** Love may be the healthy tie that binds two people as well as the push to be involved in spite of cultural differences (Char, 1977). Partners in intermarriage often mention love as the force that motivated them to get married despite severe social and family pressures against it. The motives both sociological and psychological, that have been discussed could be labelled as love, by couples involved in intermarriage. Romantic love, generally defined as erotic physical attraction, is highly valued by Western society and is closely related to the physical and psychological needs for an individual (Barron, 1970; Stuart, 1973; Char, 1977; Barron, 1951). The popular saying "If they don't fall head over hills in love, then why don't they stick to their own kind?" seems to explain real well. But then again, as Lawrence Kubie warns, "Love" is a poor criterion for marriage (Ponce, 1977). Such needs and motives are sometimes subconscious and irrational. Romantic love may fade at a rapid pace after the wedding, and its diminution can cause heartache and often divorce for couples who consider romantic feelings the only criterion for marriage.

**Chance and availability.** These are important motives, especially for intermarriage couples (Ponce, 1977; Ho,
1984). These are main factors in the mate selection. For example, a white American soldier in Vietnam may marry a Vietnamese girl simply because of the factor of availability and propinquity in a setting where it seems appropriate. If he were not a lonely GI stationed in Vietnam, he would never have exogamous marriage.

**Need to be different.** An adventuresome need to be different and an eagerness to be with the new is often a personality trait of patterns in an intermarriage. The need may be exemplified into a narcissistic exhibitionism for attention-getting purposes (Ponce, 1977; Ho 1984). Jacob, a white Unitarian, is a flamboyant individual who likes to dress and behave differently from his peers. He complains that others, including his relatives, do not accept him and his black moslem wife. "To be different is what I have strived for all my life. I don't see what the big deal is about my wife's skin and religion being different from mine," complains Jacob. The need to be different as a means to achieve self-identity is healthy and normal. But to marry someone from an opposite religious and cultural background only as a means to express individualism—and sometimes exhibitionism—may subject the individual and his or her marital partner to unfortunate consequences.

**Childhood rebellion.** Parental influence, however subtle or open, can sometimes have the opposite affect on
our mate selection process. Mary grew up in a home where both parents were devout Catholics. In addition to sending Mary to a Catholic grade school and high school, her parents insisted and tried to ensure that she associated with people, especially boys, of her age who were Catholics. As a means of establishing her self identity and challenging her parents' control over her, Mary announced at the end of her freshman year in college that she would marry an Orthodox Jew. The wedding would take place in a synagogue (Ho, 1984).

**Act of Aggression.** Intermarriage may be an act of aggression toward another race. Defiance and revenge by one partner can humiliate the in-laws. The partner will generally complement this need by either feeling personally inferior or angry and rebellious against parents, cultures and society. For instance, a black male angry at whites may marry a white female as an act of defiance and revenge against the whites (Barron, 1972; Ponce, 1977; Brewer, 1982). It is the desire for revenge toward family and society. For example, black men who date or marry white girls in order to show their superiority; their way of trying to hurt white men (Stuart, 1973). It appears to be an act of independence but is in fact rebellion against social pressure to conform (Stuart, 1973).

**Parental Messages.** These messages expressing satisfaction or lack of satisfaction about marriage may be
followed or be the motivation for intercultural marriage. For instance, a Japanese mother might tell her daughter to look for a Chinese husband because he will be more helpful around the house and not simply expect to be waited upon like her father. An individual's parents may strongly insist that he or she marry someone within their own ethnic group (Ho, 1984).

**Self-hatred.** Another finding discloses that people entering into intermarriage are suffering from group self-hatred (Stuart, 1973). As Barron (1972) explains, whites feel that they should be punished for marrying blacks. Some psychiatrists agree that an intermarriage may be motivated by the desire for punishment. Moreover, rebellion against their parents or against society, or feeling sorry, is the guilt society has aimed at the members of other race groups (Brewer, 1982). Some whites feel very guilty about the wrongs they have perpetuated against blacks. They marry a black to punish themselves for having been born whites. This comes to the explanation that guilt is not an augur of success in marriage, they thereby visit punishment on two people (Stuart, 1973).

**Oedipus/Electra complex.** Psychoanalysts believe that one reason for intermarriage is the Oedipus/Electra complex. The conflict is experienced by a three to five-year-old child who has strong positive feelings toward the parents of
the opposite sex and competitive and negative feelings toward the parent of the same sex. If these emotions are not solved, one possible outcome can be an exaggerated phobia of incest or the selection of a spouse who is quite different from the opposite sex parent. This can circumvent competition with the same sex parent (Ho, 1984).

Idealism. This may be a motive of a "Liberal" marrying interculturally (Stuart, 1973; Tinker, 1973). A "Liberal" with high ideals regarding race relationships and the equality of man may marry someone outside his or her race as a result of those ideals. For example, an American social worker met a Laotian girl who lost everything, including her parents, in the war. He was empathetic toward her situation. He was touched by her filial piety and was impressed by her ability to make the most of her life in the United States and decided to marry her. His decision to marry the young Laotian girl was motivated by her belief that all men and women are created equal.

Physical Attraction. Attraction based on physical characteristics which leads one to marry someone from a different culture is probably best understood on the basis of personal preference and idiosyncracy (Ponce, 1977). For example, the white female is considered to be more beautiful than most other American females (Ponce, 1977), or some people prefer tall, heavy set, well-endowed, blue-eyed blondes; there will be others who prefer short, frail, fat-
chest, brown-eyed brunettes.

**Sex ratio.** The sex ratio balance is one broad background factor in outmarriage (Kikumura & Kitano, 1973). Whenever people have an unbalanced sex ratio, they will tend to intermarry; whereas if they have a relatively well balanced distribution of the sexes, they will tend to marry within their own people (Panunzio, 1942). The approach was primarily associated with accounting for the high rate of intermarriage among Filipino males who greatly outnumbered the supply of available Filipino females as it was called a "womanless group of people" (Catapusan, 1938). This report is significant in that the scarcity of the native women in this country explains the immediate tendency for Filipinos to associate with women of other races which results in intermarriage.

**Status symbol.** The desirability of the white woman to black men; society has idealized the white female as an exciting sexual object in part because she is forbidden. She becomes a status symbol. Some blacks may derive a sense of power from knowing that she finds him more desirable than a white lover (Porterfield, 1973; Ponce, 1977). In fact, the white man has raised the white girl to believe she is the queen of the world and should wear the crown proudly (Stuart, 1973). It is a desire for status she be something to flaunt. Or, a black male may offer his higher
socioeconomic position for the preferred color-caste of the lower class white female. Plus, a white nurse may marry an Oriental physician because she thinks she will improve her status by becoming a physician's wife. In turn, the physician may see himself gaining a wife from the more highly "valued" white group.

Practical Reasons. Reasons may be practical, such as improvement of financial security and social status (Ho, 1984; Char, 1977). A poor, white, German girl may consent to marry a black American soldier stationed in postwar Germany for the marital benefits he can give her, and the opportunity to escape from her unhappy home and come to the United States. Likewise, on the other side of the world, a Japanese girl might marry an American GI for similar reasons (Brewer, 1982), or a Korean woman who dated or married an American soldier was expected to obtain hard-to-get items for her family and friends in her desire to help family members financially (Ratliff, el al, 1978). A lot of women from the third world countries marry Americans in order to get away from financial problems. Many of them want to come to the United States, since they have heard so much about it. They have positive images and expect their American husbands to be wealthy, have big houses and a lot of cars, as they have seen from American movies in their home countries. Plus, in the countries where the American soldiers are stationed, the wage of an enlisted soldier is
many times greater than the average local peoples' wage. Thus, soldiers were seen as wealthy, financial prospects for marriage.

Stereotyped Impressions. These kinds of impressions about other cultures may be the motive for a marriage. These impressions may be sexual fantasies which label one group to be more sexual than others. For example, blacks offer more satisfying sexuality (Stuart, 1973; Brewer, 1982; Barron, 1972); the idea is that white females are less domineering than black females (Ho, 1984). Some blacks believe that white women are affectionate, understanding, concerned about fulfilling the needs of their husbands (Porterfield, 1973). American girls are seen as pushy and aggressive, while German girls are really feminine (Ponce, 1978). American soldiers are wealthy (since U.S. dollars are strong and the soldiers seem to be able to afford to buy things for their girls) (Ratliff, et al., 1978). Moreover, an American man might marry an Oriental woman because they are stereotyped as being obedient, making good wives, not fooling around and going out with other men, and willing to wait on him (Kitano & Chai, 1982). Plus, Hawaiians come to look upon foreign men as desirable because they are industrious persons and good providers (Cheng and Yamamura, 1957-58).

Usually, stereotype is a kind of picture or cultural impression. Persons in one culture may or may not behave as
the stereotypes. Numerous problems occur and often end as stressful, since the partner finds out it is just the image he created.

More Contacts. More and more young people are in contact with one another across racial lines in schools and colleges, jobs, public places, integrated housing, cultural activities, recreation, in cooperation, in churches, political parties and social movements (Stuart, 1973; Barron, 1982; Smith, 1971). The involvement in wars and military occupation in other countries (Smith, 1971), the sharing common tasks and goals in the Peace Corp and Vista (Ho, 1984), the opportunities for exchange fellowships and travel abroad—all these have brought about contacts and relationships that have often led to attachments and deep friendships.

Barron (1972) finds that more people attend colleges and universities which let young people share a lot of things in common. He also states that more and more blacks attend school and get a higher education since the supreme court's decision in 1954, officially outlawing segregation in the schools; this has increased the racial mixes. Among international students in the United States, in 1959-60 school year, 48,486 international students from 141 countries attended 1,712 institutions in every part of the United States. At the same time, 13,651 American students
enrolled in 520 institutions in 62 foreign countries. Although the international students in the U.S. are mainly in colleges and universities, many are attending high school. In 1961-62, there were AFS youths attending high schools all over the country (Barnett, 1963). The intermingling of young adults of different nationalities and races at high school and college levels is widely spread, and is reflected over the long run in an increased rate of intermarriage.

In 1969, a study showed that 70% of blacks and 64% of whites lived in metropolitan areas (Stuart, 1973). Persons living in urban areas cross nationality and racial lines to a greater extent than persons living in rural areas where their opportunities for increased contacts with other racial groups provide conditions conducive to higher rates of outmarriage (Kikumura and Kitano, 1973; Schnepp & Yui, 1955; Strauss, 1954). However, this may not necessarily make for intermarriages, but it may increase the possibility because of such contacts.

**Attitude Changes.** These changes can be one of the important factors which affect intermarriage. Attitudes of American young people, particularly those who are college and university students, has markedly changed with respect to intermarriage (Barron, 1972). The reduction of religious denominationalism is good from one point of view, but nevertheless it lowers the barriers of race and religion in
most fraternities and sororities, and increased the opportunities for social intercourse among the college youth. These changes in attitude do not necessarily mean that young people will, in all certainty, intermarry. But at least they can show how open-minded they are. There is a vast difference between a person's attitude and his ultimate action. The young may be influenced by many factors that presently fail to impress him. His early religious training; the response to parents, to priest, rabbi, or minister in the moment of decision; his knowledge of his own cultural tradition—among other factors—as he gets older, tend to sway him from an earlier attitude. The liberalism of an earlier age may give way to a greater consideralism at a later age. Hence it is hardly likely that every liberal attitude of college youths will later be translated into a liberal action such as intermarriage, as supposed by some. Although success does not lead by definition to intermarriage, it probably is associated with intermarriage in this case for at least two reasons.

1. Kitano and Chai (1984), in the study of upward mobility, may find young Japanese Americans more desirable as potential husbands, but it does not assure that this desirability will be translated into marriage.

2. The prestige occupations and extensive education caused by Oriental values make the second and third generation
Japanese American desirable potential mates. The evidence pattern could be a result of the economically secure and "successful" status of Japanese males; "My son-in-law, the doctor" may very well describe a second and third generation and for many Americans the color of the skin or slant of one's eyes may not be as important as the status and position the individual represents. And Japanese males are not short or bucktoothed or myopic, as caucasians expect.

Generations seem to relate intermarriage to the rate of immigrants entering this country. Among Asian immigrants, first generations generally expect to marry within their own group (Kitano & Chai, 1984). They hold a higher degree of control over the dating and the marital practices of their members, especially through appeals for family solidarity and the family name variables that eventually would lose their effectiveness through acculturation and the acquisition of more individualistic American norms. Change in the interaction between the ethnic and the dominant (and other) communities are primarily in terms of time and length of residence in the U.S. Generation is the primary measure of change since the second and third generation were born, grow up and get educated, are more Americanized than their parents who were born overseas, speak broken English and still carry concepts and cultural backgrounds they brought from their home country. The younger generation are more independent and accept outmarrying than their parents. As
long as they speak fluent English, eat American food, stick around American friends and think "American" they would accept outmarrying easier than the first generation.

Moreover, a lot of the young generation have problems going out with their own people. They (mostly females) do not want to date males who are from their home country. The girls complain of communication breakdowns since the girl can not (or can barely) speak Japanese, Chinese, etc. while the males do not speak English well, and of course there is the lack of cultural background. The girls who are born here have American cultures, such as expecting her date to open the door for her, get her a seat, and not sip soup loudly. The date seems not to turn out well since the Asian guys do not meet her "standards."

Since the 1960s, Japanese females appeared to be outmarrying at a rate comparable to the males. The Japanese American family was less rewarding to them than the dominant American definition of the female role (Tinker, 1973). Some Japanese American females might have found it to their benefit to consider intermarriage. Tinker (1973) studied attitudes of Japanese American and Caucasian students toward male dominance in marriage. They found that Japanese American males were most likely to hold male dominant views while there were no significant differences between Japanese American females and Caucasian males and females. All of
this evidence suggests that the female second and third generation found that the Japanese American subcultures expected them to be subordinate to the males in marriage, while in the dominant American culture to which they were being exposed in schools and elsewhere the female's position was more favorably defined. It also suggests that many of them were not happy with the secondary role which they had been assigned.

Thus, looking at marriage as an exchange, it would not be surprising if some Japanese American female or other Oriental girls should conclude that they could get a better bargain on the open market...just as some caucasian males might have seen that it was to their advantage to enlarge the field of those eligible for marriage to include the Japanese, so, some Japanese Americans might find it to their benefit to consider intermarriage.
CHAPTER FIVE
PROBLEMS IN INTERMARRIAGE

Interracial marriage, like any other marriage, is a continuous process in which two people living together learn to adjust, and to make their marriage as much a success as they can. When persons of different religious, racial, or cultural backgrounds marry, their adjustment difficulties are likely to greatly exceed those of couples of the same backgrounds. To the normal differences in personality, social class, education, and life experiences, must be added the differences in values, customs, and traditions associated with differences, ethnicities, races and religions. There are problems involved in such marriages:

Religious Practices. Differences in these practices is one of the important factors involved for intermarried couples. Some religions require persons who marry people within their own group to convert. Some are concerned about how to bring up children, if parents have different religious beliefs. Ministers may emphasize that marital strife can result when husband and wife attend separate churches and seek to rear their child in different faiths. At the same time, the Jewish people are strongly advised against interfaith
marriages, which at that time and perhaps to a lesser extent today, also represented intercultural marriage (Barron, 1972; Ho, 1984). This advice is still given today—directly in official rabbinical announcements and indirectly in the works of novelists and playwrights. The main issue in this case is how religious the couple is. If both spouses are weakly religious and do not seem to be particularly concerned with the religious issue, the problem seems not to occur as seriously.

**Housing.** Housing is the minor problem among intermarriage couples, except those who are white and black. Some studies showed that there is housing discrimination if one of the couple is black, making it difficult to find suitable housing. This can be explained by the black and white relationship in this society, that makes people oppose living in the same neighborhood. Some couples decide to live in the area that has other mixed couples. One study result showed that the couples do not have housing problems if the husband is white and the wife is black. In turn, the couples live in the black neighborhood if the husband is black and wife is white (Ho, 1984).

**Jobs.** When parents are informed that their child is dating someone who is not the same race, they will point out the difficulties their children will face. They also emphasize that a black man who marries a white girl will have trouble getting a job—a job he might well deserve by
merit (Stuart, 1973; Strauss, 1954). They might stress the difficulties the couple will encounter in getting housing, and children will belong to neither "black" nor "white." If their son is planning to marry a black girl, they will tell him that the marriage will limit his chances for advancement. In different cases, a Japanese girl who is the only child convinces her American husband to live in Japan. She tells her husband that his parents have a number of children but her parents have none, and that it is only fair, therefore, that they return to Japan (Strauss, 1954). The problem starts here, but it is not the only issue the husband will face. It depends on whether he can get a job in Japan, which is very hard for a foreigner. Teaching English seems to be the only easy job. It does not pay much and the job would not be challenging if the husband does not like teaching.

Sanctioned by his/her own group. Intermarriage couples not only face problems of being opposed by society, they also face being sanctioned by their own people. These sanctions run the gamut from name calling to physical violence (Stuart, 1973). These cases occur in black and white relationships more than any other mixed group. Surprisingly, the violence does not come from other black men who see mixed relationships as a threat to the black movement, it is the black woman who is more vehement and angry and may beat up a black man who is a "living lie,"
which means talking black but dating white. In some cities, black women have their own clubs, having activities in order to save their men; this can be explained in that they do not have white guys to date and do not have black guys to date either. For white girls, the ones who date across the colorline find themselves unaccepted by white boys as they become "limit girls." In Oriental student communities, conservative male students are not pleased to see their own girls dating American guys. They feel insulted and they lose one of the girls they may have gone out with. The degree of strong reaction depends on how open-minded individuals are. Some can feel very bothered, some are not. Several problems are frequent sources of conflict among intermarriage couples, including friends. There are several studies which show that the relationships of the couples and friends who are prejudiced, will end, since they disapprove of such marriages (Stuart, 1973; Porterfield, 1982; Ho, 1984). One study about Filipino and American couples living in the Philippines showed that the American wife was not accepted by her own people in the Philippines because she married a Filipino man. They look down upon her as a "social outcast." This can be painful to the couple when they find out they are not accepted and the only reason is that they married someone from a different culture. **Family problems.** Conflicts with the parent of both sides, who do not accept the marriage, is one of the major
problems the intermarriage couple face (Stuart, 1973). Parental opposition is generally at the start of the relationship. In many countries in which American soldiers were stationed, most parents opposed the intermarriages. They were afraid their daughters would be labelled "prostitute." In Japan, it was the policy of the Army to require screening and checking the Japanese girls for prostitution and crime records before allowing soldiers to intermarry (Schnepp and Yui, 1955). Although opposition broke down rapidly, parents still oppose such marriages, since they still hold to the concept of feeling ashamed to accept their children marrying foreigners, staying abroad, and having mixed grandchildren who look Western and barely speak their native language. The same applies to black parents who expect their children to compete with white students, but not to date or marry (Stuart, 1973). Moreover, it seems that the black family usually accepts such marriages (between black and white) more than the white family does.

Failure to successfully enter the male's family is especially stressful when the husband is very devoted to his parents (Strauss, 1954). Even when the wife tolerates his family or is fond of it, her husband, as in any marriage, may experience conflict of loyalty. If the wife and in-laws virtually reject one another, and the males are unwilling to give up their parents, then stress is at a maximum.
The concept of marriage. Cultures differ in the way they define marriage. Each culture, by means of a particular set of values, delineates the aim and objective of marriage. And each culture develops its own model for the marital relationship by prescribing uniquely the nature of the sexual relationship, the manner in which children shall be reared, the division of labor and responsibility, and the nature of love as it applies to marriage. Also, cultures specify how and when a marital partner is to be selected and form the subgroup within the population. Moreover, the concept of marriage is so structured that the values within it specify and justify the various features of marital relationships and choice of marital partners. For example, the western concept of marriage emphasizes romantic love as a basis for selection of a partner, and mutual self-realization as an important goal is obviously a concept of marriage that could be found in a number of Oriental cultures such as Korean (Ratliff, Moon and Bonacci, 1978) and Thai (Thammavit and Golden, 1956). For example, the majority of Thai women who work on the farm and are not well educated, do not have a marriage concept based on love. They can be made a wife by arrangement and the giving of a large enough sum of money to them and their parents. They do not think that marriage is supposed to be the love of their life, but rather to give them security, status, and
the opportunity to exercise their functions as mothers and mistresses of the house (Thammavit & Golden, 1956). Certain cultural combinations may have a better "fit" with one another in regard to concepts of marriage than others. For example, Filipino culture tends to be more tolerant of fidelity on the part of husbands than the American culture. An American wife might be greatly distressed by what her Filipino husband considered normal and permissible. Her behavior might be quite discordant with her idea of marriage while being entirely consistent with his.

**Prejudices and stereotypes.** An important source of potential difficulty in the intermarriage is that each partner may view the other not as an individual but as the representative of his or her culture or ethnic group. The stereotype to which the marital partner is then expected to conform, may seem attractive because it offers a solution to individual psychological problems. For example, the Western husband finds out that his Oriental wife is not submissive, supportive of her husband, and does not make a good housewife. Or the marriage will often break down when the GI takes his wife to the United States and she suddenly finds that he is not rich but actually poor by comparison with other Americans. Or the black girl who married a Jewish guy and came to visit her in-law's house; the father-in-law was upset since his daughter-in-law was not Jewish—the same concept held by a lot of black stereotypes. He
asked them to dinner and told his daughter-in-law that he had watermelon just for her. He also asked seriously if she ate anything besides fried chicken (Barron, 1973). It happens the same way among American-Oriental couples when the girl's mother-in-law asks her if she needs a pair of chopsticks (for an American dinner).

Prejudices like these assign to the partner in marriage a specialized role and function which the partner may be quite unwilling to discharge (Markoff 1977). Since they are usually unspoken, these attitudes constitute a hidden term to the marriage contract which may surface to create difficulties later on. Stereotypes and prejudices may exist in vestigial forms, or may not be consciously recognized. Nonetheless, they may operate sufficiently to alter feelings and behaviors.

**Being intermarriage parents.** Being able to be an intermarriage couple does not mean the couple can handle being intermarriage parents. Living together as husband and wife does not seem hard until there are new members joining the family. Often intermarriage couples decide not to have children because of fear of the impact of social ostracism and rejection on their children (Ho. 1984). In American custom, all children are considered black if one of their parents is black. They will be raised as black and have to meet the same difficulties that all black American children must meet (Stuart, 1973). There are many stress factors
that affect general problems of living and create additional pressures on the children and the families. Thus, a greater strength is required of a biracial family in order to achieve the same level of adjustment that is required of a uniracial family. One white mother can not even pay lip service to the idea that her children are black, but she would continue to relate to them with a white value system and its expectations. This is very confusing to a child, particularly if he sees the other siblings having a different role adjustment based upon the differences of the skin color. One mother reported how much easier it would be if all her children were of the same color; being considered black children and having to face the same problems as the other black kids do. A black mother, however, can at least protect her child emotionally against racial prejudice, which a white mother is not equipped to do.

There is often competition for the loyalty of the child who is manipulated by both parents. Father may lecture his son on the history and suffering of the black people. He extracts from the child declarations of racial loyalty again and again. Actually, the father is attempting to gain his wife's approval through the boy because he is never sure that he has been unconditionally accepted by her as a man in general, or as a black man in particular. These insecurities stem in many cases from unresolved infantile
conflicts. Often the mother has had great difficulties in relating to her own child. This type of feeling is especially one of racial prejudice, and therefore she cannot accept her child's dual identity and make him into a white child. If she perceives herself unsuccessful in accomplishing this, she may begin to feel alienated from her child, and she may act this out to the extent of rejecting and abandoning her child. She may do so in actuality or only emotionally. If the wife does actually abandon the family, the paternal grandmother may step in and assume the role of mother to the child.

Marriage involves socially sanctioned childrearing and the children of intermarriage tend to blur the distinctions between the parent's group. When appearances distinguish racial groups, the children of intermarriage often show features of both groups (Tinker, 1973). Cultural conflict is profound and prolonged, and if the children can not escape emotional participation and particularly if the children are vulnerable, then behavioral and emotional problems will follow. Mixed children (black and white) have difficulties in school as mentally inferior to white students and physically inferior to black students. This kind of problem can not be denied as long as "the color" is still such a big deal in this society. But at least identity should be made clear, since a child's identity is
very important related to his own personality and sense of social belonging when he grows up.

Cultural Differences. When people from different cultures marry, there is general belief that the couple involves sharp cultural contrast which can not be denied (Schnepp and Yui, 1955). Many problems involve cultural conflicts between husband and wife (Stuart, 1973); differences in value (Smith, 1971; Markoff, 1977; Ratliff et al., 1978); problems caused by outside sources, husband and wife interaction (Ho, 1984); and conflict in the home (Kim, 1972). Food and dining etiquette is one of the major problems. People have different eating habits depending on how they have been brought up. When intermarriage occurs, one must learn to adjust new eating habits, since he/she lives in his/her partner's home country. It is assumed that it would work out good if husband and wife had similar dining styles. Only the problems seem to start if both of their kinds of food are much different. Wives complain that their American husbands insist on a strictly American diet (Hunt and Coler, 1956), and they ignore sharing or experiencing their wives' native foods. Plus, they are inclined to use English in the home with their wives and children. Moreover, a wife expects her husband to show a greater interest in her homeland. The relationships become seriously damaging and conflicts occur if they do not resolve their differences (Ratliff, et al., 1978). Husbands
also complain that their wives are not career-minded (Schnepp & Yui, 1955), do not keep up with current events, do not want to be held in a public gathering, and do not quite fulfill intellectual requirements (Strauss, 1954).

Cultures differ widely in their value systems. Despite recent trends, the acquisition of material wealth, competitive success, and industriousness are values for a great many North Americans (Brown, 1963). They encourage their children to be competitive, to get ahead, to make money, to acquire possessions. In games and in business alike, the aim is to win the game, the trophy, the contract. But what about other people? A Hopi Indian child is taught that he should never push himself forward, never try to win at games. Children are shamed when they get ahead of their fellows. The Hopi way is a way of cooperation. Competition as the Americans know it, is alien to their whole system of values. Moreover, the Eskimo child who pushes himself forward too quickly is likely to be rebuked by some older person and warned that "Your head is coming up above the others."

Cultures are not monolithic as regards value systems, and often—characteristically perhaps—there are different and even conflicting values within any given society. Not only does each culture contain subcultures, but there are "ideal" values, seldom realized, often explicitly stated, embodied in common social actions. Given such complexities,
it is surprising that differences in values may lead to considerable conflict in the intermarriage. Values are incontestably "right" or "true" or "the best" and each culture tends to teach its particular value system as representing the most appropriate way to conduct one's life. It is very difficult, even for the most highly educated and cosmopolitan member of a culture, to accept fully the validity of value systems contrary to those with which he has been brought up.

Communication problems. Factors of many sorts—personal, social, physical, and economic—may interact to shape and generate problems in any marriage. There are other factors which may have special relevance for intermarriage. These influences tend to be greatest when we deal with substantially dissimilar, internally homogeneous cultures. Problems in communication are the central focus which is peculiarly relevant to success or failure in intermarriage. Markoff (1977) states that marriage demands that partners communicate their thoughts and feelings to one another. On first mention of communication, one tends to think of language, although this most obvious channel of communication is not the one which is the most significant for marriage. Nevertheless, most aspects of language are highly important, for while language is the clearest channel of communication, it may contain ambiguities which represent
a source of difficulty. An example is this brief dialogue:

Husband: I think we should visit my sister this weekend.

Wife: Yes.

There are clearly ambiguities here. The husband's statement may be a statement of an opinion, a request, or a demand. The wife's "Yes" indicates that she also thinks that they should visit her sister-in-law or that she agrees with her husband's demand. The in clarity becomes compounded when different cultures use the same word to serve different functions. Therefore, an inability to communicate verbally often brings frustration and hostility into the marriage life (Ratliff, et al., 1978).

The verbal expression of thanks offers another illustration of this sort of problem. In Japanese culture, such verbal expressions are confined to situations that call for some degree of formality which would tend not to be used within the family. In Western society, the verbal "Thank you" is used freely and frequently in all situations, both formal and informal, and might be expected between members of the family. An American wife might be hurt by her husband's omission of verbal thanks for a birthday gift, while a Japanese wife might be puzzled and wonder why she was being treated as a stranger if her husband did thank her.

Of greater significance, is nonverbal communication. This is a very large area and includes all facial
expression, gestures and dress; the way people position themselves with respect to one another in a conversation or other social interaction; vocal reflection; kind and degree of physical contact. Nonverbal communication is very important because it is used to express feelings and emotional response. As an example of confusion in nonverbal communication, consider the exchange of greetings. In Japan, the custom of bowing is a highly developed system, delicately attuned to social status and reflecting recognition of very specific status differences. How deeply one bows, how many times and who bows first convey specific meaning in Japanese culture. Foreigners may easily and quite inadvertently misuse the system of communication with highly undesirable effects (Yushikawa, 1978). Americans, on the other hand, utilize a considerable variety of greeting gestures. Imagine the confusion of a Chinese immigrant greeting his American mother-in-law for the first time. He has seen Americans shake hands, hug each other, kiss cheeks, kiss lips, or simply nod or smile. The choice of a correct and acceptable behavior may well be difficult to make.

Stuart (1973) finds that there is little communication between couples who say their marriage is not happy. As Ponce (1977) emphasizes, couple's arguments grow worse when they lose their temper and say "Well, what do you expect for a Chinese person?" (or other ethnic group). This saying
brings us to the situation where the partner brings ethnic identity to conclude the quarrel, which makes the situation even more tense. As stated before, communication between people from different cultures should concern respecting people as individuals, not the judgment he/she represents to his/her group. The other minor flaws ignored or not noticed during the initial phase of the relationship suddenly assume an importance that was not there before; for instance, personal hygiene, dress, and eating and sleeping habits.

There are numbers of studies that show that marital difficulties occur because of the inability to communicate among the couples. The difficult problems seem to worsen if the couples religion, race, and ethnic group are not the same (Stuart, 1973; Kim, 1972; Schnepp & Yui, 1955). When a Korean and Japanese wife leave their family and friends, and their accustomed way of life to come to the United States, the husband is the sole guiding and supporting person. The wife needs the husband's help and support in learning to communicate and behave in new ways. Being handicapped by language barriers causes the wife problems in trying to survive in her new home. For many couples, difficulty in communication has afforded an excuse for avoiding the inadequacies for being both husband and wife. This inability to communicate is a glaring deficiency and a handicap in mutual understanding and adjustment.
Out of his own need for support, the husband expected his wife's speedy acculturation and adjustment. His own security, frustration, and anxiety were projected into the wife, and bitter complaints about her total dependency accompanied frequent and violent fights (Kim, 1972). A wife who was separated from her culture and friends experiences an acute sense of isolation, and loss which was further enhanced by the different linguistic, physical, and behavioral responses of her new environment. New ways of living which called for a changed pattern of response threatened and confused her and generated anxiety. Seemingly simple tasks such as shopping, use of public transportation, telephoning, banking and visiting with neighbors became major undertakings. Even a kind neighbor's gesture of friendship became a source of anxiety because the wife who is from a different culture does not know what is offered or expected of her in return. Language probably is the greatest difficulty for the wives. Most of them learned some English, but it was not adequate for exclusive use. Difficulties were greatest in times of crisis or emotional excitement, and in such situations as discussions of technical matters or joking.

A husband who once had valued his wife's submission, often became angry when he felt overburdened by her essentially dependent attitudes of passivity, and her uncritical acceptance of his opinions and commands. Or, as
might be expected in her passive role, the wife feels helpless to change things, and as the communication process increases, the marital relationship fails if active casework intervention is not effected (Ratliff, et al, 1978).

When somebody mentions intermarriage, one may point out how difficult, unhappy and unsuccessful the marriage might evolve. Some bring up stories of divorce statistics that make intermarriage sound tense and scary. Sociological viewpoint and the most liberal writers contend that ideally, society would be best served by the disappearance of racial and religious prejudice, thus paving the way for unlimited mixed marriage. The opposite opinion, supported by divorce statistics, holds that mixed marriages are sufficiently precarious to be considered undesirable, at least at the present time.

In intermarriage, as in any other marriage, the couple faces general problems. Marriages are not made in heaven. Problems come up all the time when two people marry and live together. It depends on the situations and kinds of problems they face. Couples need to adjust and work things out in order to make their married life smooth and successful. Some insist that the adjustment is up to the individual, and some point out that there would be marital difficulties even when a person marries his/her own people,
which means that endogamy does not guarantee the freedom from problems. It depends upon individual preference and decisions.
CHAPTER SIX
ADJUSTMENTS IN INTERMARRIAGE

Marriage signifies a process whereby men and women share their lives with one another in pursuit of happiness, goals, and achievements. Generally, when two individuals of different cultural backgrounds marry, adjusting to one another presents challenges and adjustments which couples from similar cultures find unique only to them. To the normal differences in personality, education, and life experience must be added the differences in customs and values associated with differing cultures.

When two people of different cultural backgrounds become acquainted, even though they may develop affection for each other and establish mutual interest, sooner or later they will begin to discover that some kinds of differences exist between them. While they are dating each other, they may be aware of the existence of such differences but may not really realize how seriously the differences could affect their lives until they begin living together. Tseng (1977) describes five general patterns of adjustment in marriages between culturally dissimilar partners.
1. One-way Adjustment. There are possible reasons for this adjustment. One aspect of a culture may be so dominant that it strongly demands everything be done according to custom. For example, some religions demand that the spouse convert to that religion. The same may apply to language. In the same way but separated from the culture, such a one-way adjustment may occur if one of the spouses has a very strong personality and insists that things be done in his or her way. The other will probably comply with that demand. This type of adjustment may be more practical for everyday life when one has to move and live with his/her spouse in the place in which he/she has not grown up.

2. Alternative Adjustment. This second type of adjustment is to practice the culture behavior of both partners in an alternating way. It may occur when both of the spouses insist that their cultural behavior be observed and there is no way of giving either one, or of mixing them. Therefore, they have decided to follow certain customs at one time and others at another time. For example, it maybe very difficult for a couple to have the kind of ceremony that would meet the religious requirements of both sides. However, it would be very possible to have a Catholic wedding in the morning and a Buddhist one in the afternoon, satisfying the cultural requirements of both persons.

3. A Mid-point Compromise. This is the type of solution most appropriately used in a quantitatively measurable
solution. For example, a Chinese husband may feel required to send a hundred dollars per month to support his elderly parent out of filial respect; his American wife may feel that their own nuclear family cannot spare the money and that his parents should take care of themselves. When each realizes the other's position in light of the different cultural backgrounds and customs, they may agree to send only fifty dollars per month for this purpose.

4. Perhaps one of the most frequent methods chosen for the intermarriage adjustment is "mixing." A concrete example would be a wedding between a Hawaiian and a Japanese—possibly have a Shinto-style ceremony with Hawaiian music and flower leis, and entertaining the guests with Japanese Sake and a Hawaiian luau. The couple's home may be a combination of Western and Eastern styles. In a mixed manner of adjustment, every part may be taken randomly, wisely selected and balanced, and well-matched, to create a new kind of beauty.

5. A "Creative Adjustment" takes place when both partners decide to give up the cultural behavior of both sides and invent a completely new behavior pattern. The reason may be that they are not particularly satisfied with their own cultural behavior nor happy with the other's, so this stimulates them to create a new pattern to meet their needs. For example, they are not happy about being married in the church according to the Christian custom nor do they want a
traditional ceremony at home. Therefore, they decide to marry in a unique way—in an airplane or on the beach.

In communication, nonverbal communication expressions such as movement of the head and hands, body gestures, and eye actions surprisingly seem to have universal meanings regardless of cultural differences. Therefore, in intermarriage communication, it is vital that we learn to listen with our eyes in order to communicate fully with our partners and listen with our minds, which means being able to interpret information collected by our ears and eyes. Individuals hear, see, and interpret things differently. Our sense of the way things should be flowed from our unique cultural backgrounds. To interpret the partner's behavior based on these values and assumptions can result in distortion and failure to communicate. Listening with our minds requires that we maintain a sense of objectivity and a non-judgmental attitude.

Identifying our true feelings and then relating them to our partner are two separate tasks (Hs, 1984). Relating negative feelings can be especially difficult for intermarried couples. Prior to their wedding, they often had to struggle to convince others, especially their parents and relatives who initially opposed the idea, that their marriage would work. Consequently, when married, they may fear that expressing negative feelings may jeopardize their marital relationship and confirm their parents' misgivings.
about marriage. Nevertheless, if feelings, especially negative feelings, are unexpressed, the relationship may deteriorate. Marital intimacy is deeper than friendship and built upon a couple's ability to share loving as well as hurtful feelings.

The manner in which the couple shares hurtful feelings is important because that, too, can strengthen or weaken a relationship. The first rule in expressing a negative feeling is by using "I." The second rule is not to attack or criticize the partner and not demand that he or she behave differently or change. Rule number three is to tell the partner his or her feelings as specifically and explicitly as possible. It is important to share and identify feelings both positive and negative. Make it clear how the partner feels when others react to him/herself in certain ways. Expressing our feelings to our partner does not mean criticizing their actions. Instead, we need to provide him/her with whatever is helpful toward feeling more complete and fulfilled.

Moreover, to communicate effectively with the partner, especially on matters where we do not agree, there are some procedural issues that merit our attention. Effective communication and negotiation take place only if the timing is right. The best timing for negotiation is when both partners are free from routine duties, including office work.
or housework. It should not take place too early or too late in the day when both partners are preoccupied or tired. How well the communication goes is influenced by the time and place for which it is selected. A quiet time in a quiet setting is most conducive to serious discussion.

Once negotiation starts, it is important that we focus on the issue at hand and utilize our listening skills. An attempt should be made to avoid comparing our partner with our neighbors or friends. Relatives should not be brought in as a means to justify or defeat our partner's position. Whether it is day-to-day communication or serious negotiation, each partner has some control over the outcome of any interaction. As a rule, what we can expect to receive in communication with our partner will depend upon what he or she is willing to give. If we belittle or mistreat our partner, verbally or nonverbally, openly or subtly, then they will probably do the same to us.

Communication in intermarriage, perhaps even more than in a homogeneous marriage, requires learned skills and commitment. In attempting to communicate, diverse cultural backgrounds may contribute to one partner's perceptions, attitudes and problem-solving tools being more effective (or less effective) than the other partner's. Regardless of how hard we try, there will be times in almost any marriage when partners reach an impasse on a particular issue. We then need to draw upon our richest resource, our true love for
each other. This level of true love, more than emotional romantic love, should remind us once again that we marry others for their differences rather than their likenesses to us. Only by accepting our partner's differences and his/her right to be different, can we truly benefit from marriage or intermarriage. If we accept our differences, fewer marital problems will result. Interestingly enough, our partner, upon realizing our true acceptance of him/her will, in turn, be more sensitive to our needs and more receptive to changes to improve the marriage.

As Tseng (1977) indicates, in the past, intermarriage tended to be conceptualize as a marriage with potential problems and difficulties in adjustment. A positive aspect has been neglected if we assume that our life is a continuous process of change and improvement, not only originating from the inside but also from contact with and stimulation from the outside; thus, intermarriage should be considered as a means of bringing in new stimuli from outside and also as a challenging way of introducing adjustment. Actually, couples who intermarry may be considered pioneers who are brave enough to allow adventure into their lives by breaking the traditional patterns. Those couples who intermarry, even against possible resistance and succeed in overcoming problems have strong common goals, act as a positive balance to each other, and
have the ability to adjust. Thus, the successful intermarriage should be considered a good example of masterful intermarriage adjustment.
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