2000

Stability in interracial relationships

Lorraine Converse May
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

May, Lorraine Converse, "Stability in interracial relationships" (2000). *Master's Theses*. 2103.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.aevy-fs58>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/2103

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

STABILITY IN INTERRACIAL RELATIONSHIPS

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Sociology

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of the Arts

By

Lorraine Converse May

December 2000

UMI Number: 1402527

Copyright 2000 by
May, Lorraine Suzanne Converse

All rights reserved.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 1402527

Copyright 2001 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2000

Lorraine Converse May

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

Dr. Yoko Baba, Ph.D.

Dr. Chris Hebert, Ph.D.

Dr. Amy Best, Ph.D.

Dr. Geoffrey Tootell

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

STABILITY IN INTERRACIAL RELATIONSHIPS

By Lorraine Converse May

This thesis addresses the state of interracial relationships in contemporary society using a non-random sample of seventy-two respondents residing in the San Francisco Bay area. Theoretically informed by Durkheim's conception of social cohesion, the study will explore differences between gay and straight interracial relationships on the basis of stability, with specific regard to social networks and cohesiveness in the straight and gay communities. The research methods will also include qualitative analysis to further examine the relationship between stability and support networks for gay and straight interracial couples.

The results of statistical analysis did not find a significant difference between gay and straight individuals' stability in their relationships with regard to Durkheim's conception of social cohesion. The qualitative analysis noted differences in social networks between straights and gays, however their influence on stability was not determined.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the members of my thesis committee, Dr. Yoko Baba, Dr. Chris Hebert, Dr. Geoff Tootell, and Dr. Amy Best, for their support of my thesis. I would like to thank Dr. Baba in particular for her encouragement and assistance on a project that at times seemed out of my reach of completion.

I would also like to thank all of the men and women who participated in the study and opened up their hearts to share intimate details about their heartaches and triumphs in interracial relationships.

Finally, I would like to thank my husband Bill and my daughter Baleigh for giving me the push I needed to complete this project.

Table of Contents

Chapter		Page
	Abstract.....	iv
I	Introduction.....	1
	Review of Theory.....	5
	Footnotes.....	9
II	Literature Review.....	10
	Historical Perspective.....	11
	Rates of Interracial Marriage.....	17
	Obstacles in Interracial Relationships.....	19
	Sources of Social Support.....	22
	Acculturation, Integration and Social Isolation.....	25
	Motivations.....	27
	Individual Characteristics.....	29
	Hypothesis Section.....	30
III	Methodology.....	35
	Data Collection Procedures.....	35
	Demographic Characteristics.....	36
	Methods of Analysis.....	38
	Operationalization of Variables.....	40

IV	Quantitative Findings.....	42
V	Qualitative Findings.....	50
VI	Discussion.....	60
VII	Conclusion.....	62
	References.....	66
	Appendices.....	
	Appendix A. Survey Instruments and Consent Form.....	71
	Appendix B. Frequency Tables for Age, Income, Education, And Length of Relationship.....	83
	Appendix C. Correlation Matrix of Variables Used in the Analysis	86
	Appendix D. Human Subjects Approval.....	89

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Frequencies of Sexual Orientation	36
2. Frequencies of Gender	37
3. Mean with Standard Deviation in Parentheses and Median for Age, Education, Length of Relationship, and Income by Sexual Orientation	38
4. Chi-Square Test for Independence Between Race and Sex	43
5. t-tests for Demographic Characteristics: Income, Age, Length of Relationship, and Education	44
6. Factor Analysis for the Composite Variable: STABILITY	46
7. Regression Analysis for Gay Participants of Independent Variables for AGE, INCOME, FAMILY, SFRIEND, LRELATE, and EDUCATE on Dependent Variable STABILITY with Standard Deviation in Parentheses	47
8. Regression Analysis for Straight Participants of Independent Variables for AGE, INCOME, FAMILY, SFRIEND, LRELATE, and EDUCATE on Dependent Variable STABILITY with Standard Deviation in Parentheses	48
9. Frequency of Age	84
10. Frequency of Income	84
11. Frequency of Years of Education	85

12.	Frequency of Length of Relationship in Years	85
13.	Correlation Matrix of Variables Used in the Analysis	87

Chapter I

Introduction

Interracial dating, relationships, and marriage have become increasingly common in the last decade. Second or later generations of immigrants have acculturated and often intermarried. A diverse community has created an environment more conducive to interracial relationships. While the community appears to be more tolerant of these unions, existing disapproval may often be rooted in deep-seated racism (Rosenblatt, Karis, & Powell, 1995). Older immigrants may hold onto the ideal of their children and grandchildren marrying someone of their own race¹ and culture, while others may still harbor prejudice towards other races. Despite all of these barriers, interracial relationships continue to exist. This study will examine the stability in interracial relationships and compare gays and lesbians and straights. It will analyze the difference between gays, lesbians, and straights' stability in interracial relationships and if it is related to type of social network.

Those involved in interracial unions before the 1980s often faced numerous obstacles including discrimination, persecution, and degradation. Until the late 1960s, most interracial relationships were illegal except for those that occurred between U.S. Military Personnel and foreigners. The landmark Virginia vs. Loving Supreme Court case in 1967 overturned miscegenation laws (Porterfield, 1978). The laws prohibiting interracial marriage had also been very specific in their description of what comprises an interracial relationship.

An interracial relationship is described as a union of two individuals who are distinctive racially. Physically, both of the partners may look very different (Baird & Rosenbaum, 1997). Many interracial relationships are inter-cultural, combining both differences in race and cultural background. According to the 1990 U.S. census, 1.2 million people described themselves as being in interracial marriages (Paik, 1996).

For the many interracial relationships occurring in the United States, family may play a very important role in the success or failure of relationships. This may be even truer for interracial relationships. Smith and Brown (1997) note that family approval often validates a relationship. They found that family validation of the relationship was related to satisfaction in the relationship, and was more important than social support from friends in the relationship's stability.

Dating an interracial partner without family approval could lead to isolation from the family and serious damage to the individual's social network if he or she depends on his or her family for emotional support. At first, family members may scold the individual, chiding them for having a relationship out of spite or rebellion (Porterfield, 1978). Marriage to the interracial partner may be the last straw for the individual, severing all amicable ties with his or her family (Rosenblatt et al., 1995). The impact this has may last until the couple has a chance to establish other social networks outside the family or family members have accepted the relationship.

Straight and gay and lesbian interracial couples face different hurdles in the legitimization of their unions. For straight couples, who are usually closer to their families than gay and lesbian couples, the biggest barrier may be family support

(Plummer, 1992). Straight couples may face immediate and strong disapproval from their families. The strain of lack of support may create stress upon the relationship, leading to dysfunction (Rosenblatt et al., 1995).

For gay and lesbian couples, the biggest issue is recognition and acceptance of their sexuality (Plummer, 1992). Many gay or lesbian couples have already told their families about their sexual orientation and sought alternate social support because of lack of family approval.

The quest for recognition of the gay and lesbian identity is still under consideration for much of society, even though much awareness of the lifestyle exists. Gay and lesbian couples have challenged the constitutionality of the laws prohibiting same-sex couples from marrying (Baird & Rosenbaum, 1997). Although gay and lesbian couples lost these challenges in the 1970s and 1980s, the Supreme Court of Hawaii found the state's laws requiring marriage partners to be of the opposite sex unconstitutional in 1993. Many companies are also honoring health benefits for same-sex partners, which is a step towards recognition of same sex unions.

Gays, lesbians, and straights face different obstacles in their relationships. Most importantly, the gay and lesbian sexuality is infrequently recognized and validated in popular culture. This is underscored by the lack of literature available on gay and lesbian interracial relationships. Many gays and lesbians have redeveloped their social networks to center on friends because of family disapproval of their sexuality (Plummer, 1992). In families that have accepted the individual's homosexuality and maintain close relationships with each other, interracial dating partners may not create a conflict

(Plummer, 1992). Finally, McWhirter (1984) notes that gays and lesbians have less societal pressure than straights to marry and have children, since their lifestyle is non-traditional, and society does not encourage gays and lesbians to have children. Thus, if a gay person has already come out to his or her family, the chances are that his or her revelation of an interracial relationship would not carry the same emotional weight. For a straight person's family, the impact may be greater since they may not have the previous experience in accepting a controversial aspect of the family member's lifestyle.

The most conclusive literature studying interracial relationships dates back to the late 1980s and early 1990s. Most available recent studies focus specifically on a certain ethnic group's experiences in interracial relationship; rather than surveying the whole public. Also, few studies are available about Hispanic intermarriage, and no studies were found that were devoted to gay and lesbian interracial couples. This study will attempt to fill some of the gaps that exist currently in the literature on interracial relationships.

Measurement of marital or relationship satisfaction, according to Jones and Bates (1978), can be used to determine the relationship's stability. This study will investigate in the relationships of straight and gay interracial by examining their support networks i.e., family and friends. Lesbians and bisexuals were excluded from the analysis because they did not comprise large enough number in the sample. Specifically, the study will test the relative importance of support from parents and friends and their impact on stability in the relationships.

Review of Theory

In Suicide, Durkheim (1951) studied the differences in suicide rates between Protestants, Catholics, and Jews in urban and rural areas. In his attempt to discover the cause for a higher suicide rate among Protestants, he found that the degree of integration of the church, the strong universal beliefs for members, and established institutions of worship were related to a lower suicide rate. The Catholic Church sets international church standards, and ideals are enacted in regional churches. Catholicism is much more structured than Protestantism, which is characterized by a personal relationship with god and has many factions including Lutheran, Presbyterian, Mormon, Mennonite, Amish, and Quaker, that do not subscribe to a singular set of beliefs except for their common use of the bible. Durkheim found that Catholics were less likely to commit suicide because of their strong ties to a highly organized religion that considered suicide a sin. Durkheim notes that the Catholic community is more cohesive than the Protestant community. Like Catholicism, Judaism consists of strict beliefs and practices integrated into everyday life. Durkheim found Jews had a lower rate of suicide than both Protestants and Catholics. He also found that historical persecution caused them to develop strong religious ties and credos. After years of religious intolerance, Judaism became highly organized to protect its members from harm. Like the Jewish community, the gay and lesbian community has faced persecution. This persecution has led to organization of the community of a whole to ensure its survival. Unlike the gay and lesbian community, the straight community has not had to organize against such a threat.

Durkheim's (1951) concepts of cohesion and integration can be applied to homosexual and straight communities. Like the Jewish community Durkheim described, the gay and lesbian community has developed interdependent networks as a result of persecution and intolerance (Turner, Hayes, & Coates, 1993). The similar life experiences associated with being gay or lesbian are unique, and the community has developed specific coping mechanisms and patterns of behavior. In most areas where there is a large enough gay and lesbian population, there are establishments developed to assist with issues particular to gays and lesbians: AIDS, discrimination, and psychological issues specific to gays and lesbians.

In response to years of intolerance and the recent AIDS crisis, the gay and lesbian community has become even more strongly united. The AIDS crisis created an altruistic atmosphere in the community, drawing people together to bring awareness and provide care for the sick (Plummer, 1992). Gays and lesbians depend more on the support of friends within the community than their families and generally develop their primary support networks around friends. According to Frabel, Wortman, and Joseph (1997), for gays and lesbians choosing an open gay lifestyle, a community that accepts and nurtures their identity is important. The gay and lesbian community is generally more tolerant of interracial dating because they have been victims of severe persecution for many years, and there are less partner choices in the community. However, racial prejudice still exists in the gay and lesbian community.

Plummer (1992) notes that gay culture often provides a friend-based network. Traditional support networks often disappear when the individual announces his or her sexuality. The gay community has developed its own culture that differs significantly from mainstream culture. Gays and lesbians react jointly to specific issues targeting them, e.g., hate crimes, AIDS, and domestic partner issues. While not homogeneous ethnically, the gay and lesbian community assumes that sexual orientation provides a strong basis for holding the community together. Also, the gay community celebrates its heritage with pride days during the month of June. Because of the nature of the community, interracial relationships may be more acceptable in the gay and lesbian community. Further, the level of social support which interracial relationships receive from members of the community, when applied to their daily lives as friends and family, may be more significant than that of members of the straight community.

The straight community is not organized on the sole basis of its sexual orientation, nor have many of its members developed a tolerance for interracial relationships. Sexual orientation is only one factor in a diverse population arranged around cultural background, socioeconomic status, and the traditional extended or nuclear family (Mott, 1965). The same level of urgency and need to organize the community in order to protect itself from persecution is also absent. Unlike gays and lesbians, straights may not reside in an atmosphere that is tolerant of interracial dating. Family support may play a bigger part in the social network of the straight since he or she, unlike gays and lesbians, does not have to re-establish a new social network after choosing a lifestyle that is seen as immoral in the eyes of his or her family. Because of the lack of an existing permissive

support system, straights may experience less stability in their relationships than gays or lesbians with established social networks.

Footnotes

1. Race refers to physical appearance and ethnic background, rather than social, political, and economic definitions.

Chapter II

Literature Review

According to the 1990 U.S. Census, 1.2 million people are married interracially (Paik, 1996). As diversity has increased, these relationships are visible everywhere: in our neighborhoods, our cities, and our families. This study will examine some of the complexities of interracial relationships while at the same time examining the stability of the individuals involved in interracial relationships.

Interracial relationships occupy an obscure and contradictory place in American history. The latter part of the 20th century saw laws enacted to decriminalize interracial marriages, but strong social stigma still remain for some ethnic groups and some regions of the country. As the United States continues to diversify, more interracial relationships will occur. This chapter will examine straight and gay and lesbian relationships, integration into the community, family support, and stability in the relationship. It will also discuss the historical perspective, interracial marriage rates, relationship obstacles, sources of social support, acculturation, integration, and social isolation, motivations, and individual characteristics. Because there is little research on gay and lesbian interracial relationships, the literature review has incorporated studies of non-interracial gay and lesbian couples.

Historical Perspective

American interracial activity dates to the slave trader ship voyages in the 17th century (Larsson, 1965). African women were sexually exploited at the hands of their white captors, beginning a pattern of behavior that continued well through the end of the slavery era. Once on land, slave masters again victimized African-American women. Many socially prominent whites including Thomas Jefferson and George Washington, had affairs with their slaves that resulted in children (Porterfield, 1978).

For the average white American during colonial times, strong disapproval for interracial mixing came from two primary sources: Puritan doctrines that explicitly forbade racial “impurity” and an economic system that exploited blacks for their labor (Larsson, 1965). White women were strictly forbidden to have relations with African-American men. However, relations often occurred because of the proximity of indentured white female servants to slaves. As a result, in the 17th century Maryland enacted one of the first laws that forbade relationships between African-American men and white women. The law, which required that any children of the union were property of the slave master, was later revoked after it was found that slave masters were profiting and encouraging these unions for their benefit.

Before the American acquisition, the American Southwest was more tolerant of intermarriage (Murguia, 1982). In the early 1840s, there were few white women on the frontier. When Anglos initially arrived, their relations with Mexicans were good and they intermarried. However, this changed as more whites came to the territory, and tolerance

of intermarriage lessened. Unlike the American Southwest and the rest of the mainland United States, Hawaii maintained its history of intermarriage throughout colonization. With Hawaii's colonization in the 18th century, the first white male settlers began arriving and interracial marriages began to occur (Adams, 1969). As the economy of Hawaiian began to change with colonization, so did the demographics. Native Hawaiian culture was not highly cohesive and thus permitted the intermarriage of white males and Hawaiian females. White males who came to begin plantations in Hawaii were easily able to marry into Hawaiian families. In fact, Hawaiian women often preferred to marry white males because they believed them to be more generous and hard working than the native Hawaiian men. Also, it was more economically beneficial for whites to intermarry with Hawaiians and to gain privilege and favor with the ruling class. By the time white women arrived, the local economy had begun to favor whites, hence eliminating their need to intermarry. Furthermore, white men were beginning to emerge as the dominant class.

Adams (1969) noted that status and wealth greatly influenced marital patterns in Hawaii. Since the whites were not the dominant group when they first arrived, intermarriage with native Hawaiians gave them a favorable social position, allowing them to become liaisons to the king. Adams notes that miscegenation laws prohibiting whites and people of other racial backgrounds from marrying on the United States mainland would not have been beneficial for the Hawaiian lower classes. Since men continued to outnumber all women almost 3 to 1 through the turn of the 19th century, these laws

would have caused hardship. Interracial couples and their offspring formed important social and political bridges between many immigrant groups in Hawaii (Adams, 1969).

During the 1890s, Asian immigrants who arrived in Hawaii began to intermarry as well (Adams, 1969). To explain why some marriages were more successful than others, Adams developed a research-based theory dividing the immigrant groups into a hierarchy of organized groups. The more organized groups had common customs, historical heritage, common language or dialect, and a strong cultural tradition than the less organized groups. Adams (1969) criterion for classifying the groups as more or less organized is similar to Durkheim's (1951) concept of social cohesion used to explain the difference in suicide rate between various religious groups. Like Durkheim's finding that more cohesive religions have a lower suicide rate, Adams found more organized groups have longer marriages.

Adams (1969) used the degree to which each ethnic group had strict rules and social cohesion to create a scale of organization in the study. Adams ordered the groups from highest to lowest level of organization: Japanese, Chinese, Korean, white, Hawaiian, Filipino, and Puerto Rican. The divorce rate for couples of intermarriages where the groom was of Japanese ancestry and the bride of Chinese ancestry was the lowest at 10.3%. In more organized Asian groups, such as Chinese and Japanese, there was more opposition to intermarriage. He found that Chinese and Japanese culture had very strict rules, and were very organized or socially cohesive, unlike whites, Hawaiians, and Filipinos who had fewer common rules and mores.

Although intermarriage was less common for the Chinese and Japanese, the lack of women from their native culture forced men to intermarry with the native and racially mixed Hawaiian women. However, once they had earned their fortune, Chinese men often abandoned their families and returned to China. Consequently, many Chinese-Hawaiian children were raised as Hawaiians without knowledge of their Chinese heritage. Intermarried Chinese and Japanese had the longest marriages, while white women and Chinese males had the shortest. According to Adams (1969), in marriages between less organized groups, the child would often be raised with a mixture of cultures because neither culture was dominant in mores and practices. For example, children of a Portuguese man who married a Filipino woman might be raised with both Filipino and Portuguese traditions. In subsequent studies that tested Adam's (1969) organization concept, Japanese were found to have the lowest divorce rates (Schwertfeger, 1982). Schwertfeger (1982) found that when Japanese married persons of either Asian or Hawaiian descent, the marriages were very stable, sometimes even surpassing the stability of other Asian groups who married endogenously like Filipinos and Koreans. Like Adams, she defined less organized groups in the following order: Korean, Caucasian, Filipino, and Puerto Rican.

Adams (1969) also described standards of behavior and cultural expectations for different groups. Although Adams found that the divorce rate was lower when members of organized groups married members of a less organized group, than for members of unorganized groups, this pattern did not hold true for all combinations. Chinese males were more likely to divorce Caucasian women, perhaps because of different sex-role

expectations. Western and Asian cultures are often at odds with preferable gender specific traits that can often affect the gender specific behavior.

Likewise, Cheng and Yamamura (1957) found that Japanese and Chinese groups have the greatest marital stability in interracial marriages. In 1957, they showed that there was a significant difference between the divorce rate of female and male Asians marrying whites. The divorce rate for white males marrying Asian females was 27.4 per 100 marriages, while the divorce rate between Asian men and Caucasian women was 49.3 per 100 marriages. They noted that high divorce rates could result from cultural differences in sex role expectations between Asian men and white women.

According to Schwertfeger (1982), there was a 59% success rate for Japanese women married to Chinese males. The highest divorce rates for the intermarriage occurred in unions of a Chinese male and a Filipino female at 27.3%. Overall, the divorce rate for interracial marriages was higher than non-interracial marriages.

Adams (1969) noted that women's smaller population gave them an advantageous position in marital choice in Hawaii. If they divorced, remarriage was almost always possible. In the absence of their native culture, it is possible that foreign women who immigrated to Hawaii often were able to become more outspoken and liberated. While immigrant groups did experience racial prejudice, most notably the Chinese, it was moderate compared to that of the U.S. mainland. Since the economy had a labor shortage, each group was vital to the economic success of the islands.

Laws that prohibited interracial marriages in several states went into effect shortly after the civil war: 1865-1880. (Porterfield, 1978). Written primarily with African-

Americans in mind, these laws were expanded to include the Chinese during the mid-19th century migration: 1849-1882. Sixteen states had miscegenation laws during the 1967 *Virginia vs. Loving* Supreme Court case. The Lovings were an interracial married couple who moved to Virginia, a state with miscegenation laws (Baird and Rosenbaum, 1997). The couple was given a suspended jail sentence providing they left the state. However, the Lovings appealed the case, and the U.S. Supreme Court overturned the Virginia law, legalizing interracial marriage in the states where it was illegal. However, the case did not set a social precedent, or acceptance of intermarriage, which only slightly increased after the ruling.

The war marriages of the 1940s and 50s constituted the majority of interracial marriages before the repeal of miscegenation laws (Wong, 1989). The U.S. government expressly enacted “War Bride Legislation,” allowing U.S. military personnel to return home with their Japanese, Filipino, Korean, and Chinese brides. War-bride interracial marriages were often under tremendous strain (Strauss, 1954). The conditions under which the marriages occurred caused instability: the simultaneous departure of the brides from their home countries and immersion to an alien culture of the husband. Differing cultures and language often led to conflict, and communication was a major issue in these interracial unions. Imamura (1990) notes that Japanese women in the wake of WWII and Asian women who were categorized as Japanese, faced extreme prejudice in their new husband’s homeland because of their nationality and identity as the “enemy”. Asian women in America also faced marginalization as they followed their husbands back to a foreign culture where they had no history and no relation to the country around them.

Foreign women faced an inability to fit in with their peers because of their different culture and appearance.

Interracial relationships have faced numerous historical obstacles on the road to acceptance. Success has been attributed to the cultural organization of the individuals who intermarry, a climate that permits interracial relationships to occur, and similar gender roles or sex-differentiated patterns of behavior across cultures. Hawaii's heterogeneous culture provided an environment that was not highly organized and in which interracial marriages initially flourished.

Rates of Interracial Marriage

Some interracial unions have more social approval than others. A white male with an Asian female is a common sight. Endo and Hirokawa (1983) note that Japanese-American females are more often involved in interracial unions than Japanese-American males. Also, the study revealed that third and later generations of Japanese-American men and women married non-Japanese partners at a 58% rate in Fresno County, California. Likewise, Kitano and Chai (1982) found that while Korean-American women's outmarriage rates were increasing in the late 1970s, Korean-American men's outmarriage rate was decreasing. African-American male and white female unions, which still elicit strong disapproval, occur more often than African-American female/white male unions (Porterfield, 1978).

According to Tucker and Mitchell-Kernan (1990), in 1985 African Americans had the lowest rates of out-marriages: 1.2% for black women and 3.6% for black men. Prevalence for intermarriage also varied by region, age, level of integration, and gender. Overall, the rate of intermarriage for the United States was 3.6% for African-American males and 1.3% for African-American females. As expected, the South had the lowest rate of interracial marriage, with 0.6% of African-American women and 1.6% of African-American men intermarried. Kouri and Lasswell (1993) found that African-American men and white women marry more frequently than African-American women and white men. In 1985, 3.6 % of African-American men married a white woman, while only 1.2% of African-American women married a white man. Monahan (1979) further noted that while African-American and white marriages were uncommon in 1979, they did not have a higher divorce rate than non-interracial marriages. Divorce rates also vary greatly by region, with tolerance playing an important role. Other factors also set interracial married couples apart from their non-intermarried peers. They were found to be older than non-interracial couples. Interracially married African-American men found to more educated, had been married previously, and were likely to differ from their wives in age, either much younger or much older, than those who were not interracially married.

With respect to Chinese-American intermarriage rates, Wong (1989) noted that 36.1 percent of Chinese-white marriages in 1980 were between U.S. born Chinese compared to 13.1 percent of foreign-born. The remaining 49.2% was comprised of naturalized citizens. Furthermore, Wong also noted that acculturation plays a significant factor in interracial marriage. He found that intermarriage rates increased from foreign-

born to naturalized citizen, and were highest among Chinese-Americans who were born in America.

Obstacles in Interracial Relationships

For many couples, recreating or strengthening existing social networks may be an important factor in the stability of the relationship. Finding family support can be very difficult for the interracial couple, particularly if they live near their primary family. Rosenblatt and Powell (1995) noted that individuals who depended on family as their primary means of social support before the relationship, may find themselves without support, or they may have to endure disapproval and intense scrutiny from family members. Because of lack of support, many couples seek new support networks that tolerate their partner choice.

For gay and lesbian couples, family support of relationships may not be important because their relationships with their families may falter after they reveal their sexuality. Most gays' and lesbians' primary social networks revolve around friends who are tolerant of their sexuality. These types of social networks are often created when the individual moves into a gay and lesbian community in an urban area (Plummer, 1992).

Issues that can disrupt an interracial marriage are far more numerous than those for non-interracial married couples. Societal and family pressure make it difficult for the couples to find adequate emotional support. Rosenblatt and Powell (1995) note that most white kin are initially hostile to their new African-American family members. Also

several other dynamics within white families may cause difficulty. Often, only one white parent approves of the relationship. The non-dissenting parent may choose to continue the relationship with the child in secret or side with the hostile parent. Many families often have a dominant vocal member who politicizes the family, prohibiting members from interacting with the couple. Other family members may continue to keep in touch with the interracial married member though they did not fully approve.

Rosenblatt and Powell (1995) also pointed out that opposition is greatest in both African-American and white families when the child dating interracial is female. African-American families often veil their opposition to the couple rather than being outspoken like their white counterparts.

In addition to family obstacles, interracial couples also confront disapproval from the community. African-American and white unions, particularly those with a black male and white female, are still found to elicit strong disapproval, and may receive vocal objection from strangers who see the couple together on the street (Porterfield, 1978). Porterfield (1978) notes that unequal approval for various interracial unions may be a product of white stereotypes and generalizations about the African-American male e.g., he is virile and animalistic. Also, intermarriage for African-Americans and whites is often seen as rebellion against society and parents. However, Porterfield's studies found that rebellion was not a significant reason in interracial marriage between African-Americans and whites. Couples interviewed most often married for love and not out of racial motivations.

Parents may also be sensitive to cultural stereotypes. For instance, if their daughter marries an African-American male, they may think that he may not have a high enough social status for their daughter and may not provide well for her (Porterfield, 1978). However, Porterfield (1978) found that socioeconomic status as measured by occupation was equal within mixed African-American and white marriages.

While interracial relationships may disrupt the emotional support network for both individuals in the straight couple, gay couples are likely to have strong support from friends. The literature does not extensively address the amount of support that straights receive from friends. However, unlike gays who may have had to develop a new social network because of breakdown of their family-based support network due to their sexuality, straights have not yet faced the challenge of rebuilding a more tolerant social network.

Communication is an obstacle in most interracial relationships. Strauss (1954) asserts that differing socialization of the two individuals in the relationship results in differing ideas about individuality. When two individuals from a different culture are married and live together as husband and wife, different behavior, cultural beliefs, and expectations of the relationship will give rise to conflict. Consequently, Strauss (1954) notes that rates of divorce for War-Bride unions are much higher than non-exogenous unions.

Today, a diverse society has lead to increased contact for all racial groups, increasing the chance for interracial relationships to flourish. For the younger people of the United States, particularly California, the public school system has become a place

where there is great exposure to other people of different races and ethnicities. The situation invokes an obscure comparison to the fields of Hawaii a century ago where field workers of different ethnicity and race, worked together on sugar plantations. As continued interaction leads to closer ties and a greater likelihood for intermarriage, disapproval of interracial marriages may decrease. (Murguia, 1982).

Communication and family support are the most disruptive issues for interracial couples (Rosenblatt, et al., 1995). Cultural differences may create insurmountable obstacles for the couple that end in divorce. However, many couples are able to overcome difficulties and develop a method of communication that proves beneficial for the relationship.

Sources of Social Support

Social support is an important factor in the success or failure of interracial relationships. Rosenblatt and Powell (1995) note that for most African-American and white interracial couples there is some form of disapproval from the couple's parents. Gay and lesbian couples generally receive disapproval from their families because of their sexuality (Kurdek & Schmitt, 1987). However, since there are no studies exploring gay and lesbian interracial relationships, it is not known if they experience parental disapproval similar to that of heterosexuals. Gay and lesbian couples generally have different social support networks than their straight counterparts. Smith and Brown (1997) note there is a positive correlation between social support and quality of gay and

lesbian relationships. They found that the gay and lesbian support network most often names gay male friends and female heterosexual friends as the most significant source of support. Kurdek and Schmitt (1987) also noted that straight couples depend on family support more often than gay and lesbian couples. Smith and Brown (1997) further noted that as a percentage for the gay and lesbian couples, social support “providers” listed by the gay and lesbian couples were 75% friends and 25% family.

Plummer (1992) noted that gays and lesbians form strong, socially important friendships in the face of a family disapproval and misunderstanding of their lifestyle. The friendships are formed when the accepted, common social bonds of family no longer function as a positive support network. Plummer further notes that the gay and lesbian community has undergone a significant social redevelopment since the beginning of the AIDS crisis. Ultimately, the crisis has mobilized the community and created more nurturing and tolerance.

Gay, lesbian, and straight interracial couples may face difficulties from family, friends, and society. Gays and lesbians will more often be rejected by straight, mainstream society because their sexuality than choice of a partner. Durkheim (1951) notes that community cohesion flourishes in an environment of common practices and beliefs. Thus, the gay and lesbian community, brought together by adversity and persecution, has adapted to create these necessary bonds for survival. The heterosexual interracial couples may face social and interpersonal rejection. When their families reject their spouses or partners, they find themselves disassociated from prior family and social networks because their primary social networks do not understand their new

relationships. In order to minimize dysfunction from the lack of social support, many straight interracial couples seek new friends who are accepting of their relationship or gravitate towards family members who approve of the union (Rosenblatt & Powell, 1995).

As discussed in Chapter I, Durkheim noted that suicide rates were higher in urban areas and more common among highly educated people except for Jews. He noted that Jewish culture was highly integrated and closely knit, mostly because of persecution. The experience of gays and lesbians parallels that of the Jews to a certain extent. Like the Jews in Durkheim's research, gays and lesbians have also faced persecution. According to Turner, Hays, and Coates (1993), gays and lesbians have developed highly integrated communities in such places as San Francisco which provide social support to involved individuals.

In short, gays and lesbians may find satisfaction in their interracial relationships through support from their friends, while heterosexuals may get satisfaction through support from their family (Plummer, 1992). Many gays and lesbians have already come out and told their families about their homosexuality or have found new social networks which support their lifestyle. Although there is no literature to demonstrate a difference in the sources of social support between gays, lesbians, and straights, past studies suggest the issue of family is a greater concern for straights than for gays.

Acculturation, Integration and Social Isolation

Intermarriage is more common among second and third generation immigrants than first generation immigrants. Wong (1989) found that most Asian-Americans who intermarried were second and later generations. Wong also noted that generation was the most influential variable in intermarriage, and that Chinese who were raised or lived in non-Chinese areas had higher rates of intermarriage as well.

Endo and Hirokawa (1983) found that first generation Japanese, Issei, remained tied to traditional marriage patterns, but intermarriage increased with second and latter generations. Kitano, Yeung, Chai, and Hatanaka (1984) found that many second and third generation Asian females refused to date 1st generation Asian males because of their “traditional male dominance” (p. 186). They surmised this might also be a reason for intermarriage among Asian females. Less acculturated members may feel unable to compete against their English proficient and American culture-savvy peers in the dating arena.

Jeong and Schumm (1990) found that for Korean families, English proficiency had the greatest effect on marital satisfaction. While not proven statistically, Oey (1992) noted that higher scores on some personality traits may indicate greater acculturation levels. Intermarried Chinese-Americans scored higher on exhibition (assertive behaviors) and free child (gregarious, humorous, and talkative behavior), than their non-intermarried counterparts who often scored higher on traits such as caution, quietness, and shyness. Likewise, Ahern, Cole, Johnson, & Wong (1981) found that interracial married women

from all ethnic backgrounds scored significantly higher than their non-interracially married counterparts in the area of dominance.

A racial or ethnic minority gay or lesbian who is active in the gay and lesbian community probably would date outside his or her race more often. Gays and lesbians with more friends from different ethnic backgrounds would be expected to date outside their race more often. However, since the organization of gays and lesbians does mimic that of larger society to a certain extent, smaller ethnic or racial divisions have developed inside the community (Mott, 1965). Unfortunately, little research has been conducted that addresses gay and lesbian interracial relations and dating.

Seventy-five percent of gay and lesbian primary sources of support are friends (Smith & Brown, 1997). Thus, integration exists in the gay and lesbian community, via friends, family, and acquaintances who are gay and lesbian or are accepting of the gay and lesbian lifestyle. Much of San Francisco's gay and lesbian community is composed of people who have moved some distance away from their families to adopt an openly gay and lesbian lifestyle without scrutiny. San Francisco's gay and lesbian community also offers a wealth of support and resources (Turner et al., 1993).

Although many gays and lesbians move away from their families, family support is still an important factor in the relationship quality they have with their significant others. Brown and Smith (1997) note that for homosexual couples, family support is highly correlated with a successful relationship, perhaps because of the nature of the family relationships and the deeply ingrained ties individuals feel to their family. Also, Smith and Brown (1997) note that family approval may be important because of the

symbolic significance it holds, and family relationships are given a unique and important role in society. Family approval of a partner is often an affirmation of the individual.

Kouri and Lasswell (1990) found that many African-Americans and whites in their study lived far away from their families, perhaps so that they could conduct their relationships without family interference. Porterfield (1978) also notes that these couples tended to live far away from their families as well.

Although Stringer (1991) found a significant difference in happiness between white and African-American marriages, he did not find any difference between African-American and interracial married African-American and white couples. This suggested the happiness component in the marriage could be explained by other factors such as compatibility or love.

Motivations

There are many motivations for marrying interracially. While some are quite controversial, others are as simple as a lack of sufficient partners of the same race. Individuals may find certain other physical and cultural traits attractive. Individuals may have stereotypes of certain ethnic groups that they consider attractive traits in partners. For most couples, race is not an important factor in partner selection. However, Porterfield (1978) noted that the obvious differences of skin color and physical appearance between African-Americans and whites may attract them to each other. Love and compatibility are the biggest motivators. Likewise, Kouri and Lasswell (1993) found

that no couples cited rebellion against society or family as their motivation to become involved with an interracial partner. Many people who entered into interracial relationships cited their own families as unconventional and more tolerant. This tolerance was seen as a factor in their ability to conduct a successful interracial relationship (Rosenblatt, et al., 1995).

Porterfield (1978) points out that those who interracially married tended to be socially isolated from families, and less likely to consider their families' opinion important in their decision of a partner. He also gives a description of individuals who married interracially:

Some of the blacks were intellectuals, bohemians, members of cults, and lower class persons without race pride. Among the whites they were widowed, divorced, older, rural, lower class and foreign born. The assertion that black-white marriages most often involve a prosperous black man and a lower class white woman has been seriously questioned. (p. 43)

No one factor is responsible for intermarriage. However, love and compatibility are the most common reasons for relations as would be expected in western society. No research has shown social rebellion to be a significant factor in marriages, although it is often suggested as a motivator.

Individual Characteristics

Ahern et al. (1981) found significant differences between intermarried and non-intermarried women in a study testing six different personality traits: dominant, assertiveness, aggression, abasement, exhibitionism, and deference. Dominant factors pertain to a person's ability to take an authoritative position in certain roles.

Assertiveness relates to a woman's tendency to speak out or up in certain social situations rather than remaining quiet. Aggression refers to an individual's ability to use force to solve a situation. Abasement pertains to a person's willingness to be humiliated and degraded and not retaliate. Exhibitionism was defined as a woman's willingness to gain attention through behavior with such factors as dress and physical appearance. Deference is the person's willingness to obey the orders of others. Interracially married women scored higher on the characteristics of dominance, exhibitionism, autonomy, and aggression and lower in the categories of abasement and deference. This difference in score might be expected, given the social roles that women occupy in society.

Because the women's scores were significantly different from that of their non-interracially married counterparts and higher than that of the interracially married males, Ahern et al. (1981) assumed that personality characteristics are more influential in interracial marriage. Also, Ahern et al. (1981) found that people who marry across racial lines tend to be different from their spouses in many ways besides race. They have different interests, economic or class backgrounds, and different career aspirations.

Males who marry women of different racial groups differ significantly from men who marry within their own race on only two personality factors: lower endurance and orderliness scores. Endurance is the ability to challenge and withstand difficulty, and orderliness is the individual's desire to maintain situations in a strict pattern (Ahern et al., 1981).

Oey (1991) notes that non-interracially married Chinese-Americans scored higher in categories of order, deference, counseling readiness or the ability to successfully enroll in counseling, and self-control than intermarried Chinese-Americans. Oey grouped the traits into those that were considered more common in the Chinese community and those that were considered more common in American society. By contrast, Chinese-Americans who are intermarried scored higher in the areas of exhibition, creative personality scale, and in free child which embodies the personality traits of talkative, gregarious, and humorous. Oey (1991) attributed most of these differences to higher levels of acculturation into the American culture rather than actual individual differences. Overall, greater similarity in levels of acculturation may be the most important factor in increased marital satisfaction.

Hypothesis Section:

Durkheim (1951) found that socially cohesive groups were less prone to suicide and other social dysfunction. In his work Suicide, Durkheim explored the reasons for the difference between the suicide rates of Jews, Catholics, and Protestants. He found that

more suicides occurred in urban areas, that highly educated people were more likely to commit suicide, and that the suicide rate for Protestants was much higher than that of Jews and Catholics. Also, he noted that the rate for Jews was lower than Catholics, even though most were concentrated in cities and worked in intellectual professions. Durkheim found a relationship between suicide and the level of integration of the prevailing religion in the area. For areas containing a large number of Protestants, for example France and Germany, he found that the suicide rate among Protestants was almost four times greater than that of Catholics.

The gay and lesbian community is small numerically: just roughly 2 to 3% the population is exclusively homosexual (Kinsey, 1982). The community's unity has grown with recent events, including the AIDS crisis and hate crimes (Turner, et al., 1993). A tightly knit community and universal support builds a healthier environment for interracial relationships. Therefore, the gays and lesbians probably have a greater deal of social cohesion and "solidarity" than the general population at large. The larger straight community is organized around economic and racial or ethnic divisions. Cohesion may be strong for a particular racial or ethnic background within a particular community, but the larger community itself is comprised of many different people who are not necessarily united (Mott, 1965). In addition to the challenge of having an openly gay and lesbian lifestyle in contemporary society, there is also a lack of partner choice due to the relatively smaller gay and lesbian community. With fewer members of their own ethnic group available, gays and lesbians may be more likely to date interracially.

Family and friends of gays who have accepted their children's sexual orientation may show more tolerance in accepting a partner of another race. Families may find accepting a child's sexuality more difficult than accepting an interracial partner. Likewise, a family that shows tolerance with respect to an individual's sexuality may be more likely to show tolerance to that individual's interracial partner.

The gay and lesbian community has been brought together through such events as the AIDS crisis (Plummer, 1992). Like Durkheim's (1951) concept of altruism, the individual within the gay and lesbian community because of the AIDS crisis has become less focused on himself or herself and more focused on the common good of the gay and lesbian community. Families will often isolate members who marry or date a person who does not fit their racial standards (Rosenblatt, et al., 1995). Many traditional families will become disappointed with their children who marry interracially. The stigma of family disapproval sometimes affects the individuals profoundly.

While diverse, the various tightly bound groups in the community may exercise tremendous influence over their members (Prethus, 1962). Unlike the unique situation that Adams (1969) found in Hawaii, there is no scarcity of women and therefore no reason, according to traditional members of the community, to interracially date or marry. Consequently, when an individual belonging to one of these tight ethnic communities chooses to marry outside of his or her race, it may cause great strain on the relationships the individual has within the community, even ending them (Tseng, 1977). However, despite inciting much opposition from family and friends within the community, many interracial marriages and relationships endure.

The researcher has formulated hypotheses applying Durkheim's concept of social cohesion to the stability of gay and heterosexual interracial relationships. Durkheim noted that religions having tightly organized beliefs and common credos had a smaller incidence of suicide than unorganized ones. He also noted that Jews had a lower incidence of suicide, although their demographic fit the highly educated, urbanized, protestant profile.

Like Jews, gays and lesbians have had to endure persecution as well. Consequently, a homosexual culture has developed to protect and provide a community for gays and lesbians. As Kurdek (1987) noted, gays and lesbians often depend on friends instead of family for social support in tightly knit gay and lesbian communities. Heterosexual couples in interracial relationships may not have strong ties to the community or may not have had much time to develop ties as their gay counterparts. Therefore, heterosexuals in interracial relationships may try hard to develop a positive relationship with their family and friends.

Past research citations on the satisfaction and stability of relationships indicates that people who are older and have a higher income are more stable and satisfied with their relationships than their younger, lower income counterparts. Likewise, Bradbury (1998) noted that age influences satisfaction in marriage with older respondents reporting higher levels of satisfaction. Thorman (1980) noted that marital stability was associated with income and employment status of the partners. As past studies have shown, present research intended to examine the association between social support and the stability of

the relationship controlling for age, income, length of the relationship, and education.

Two hypotheses have been developed to test this theory:

- 1) Among gay interracial couples, support from friends is more likely to influence stability than support from the family, controlling for age, income, length of relationship, and education.
- 1) Among straight interracial couples, support from the family is more likely to influence stability than support from friends, controlling for age, income, length of relation, and education.

Chapter III

Methodology

Data Collection Procedures

Data were gathered from the mainland U.S. using phone and face-to-face interviews and e-mailed surveys. A total of 72 respondents were sampled. When possible, both members of interracial couples were interviewed. The researcher obtained participants with snowball sampling, advertising in local newspapers, posting flyers at local social centers, going to known bars and social gathering places for interracial couples, and advertising on interracially-oriented web sites. Face to face interviews were conducted in social settings agreeable to the participants. Interviews were tape-recorded with the participant's consent. Phone interviews were conducted with individuals who could not do face-to-face interviewing, i.e. out-of state interviews. Participants wanting the least amount of contact with the researcher filled out surveys in e-mail. All respondents were informed of their rights, and were assured of the strictest confidentiality.

The instruments of measurement were two sets of questionnaires: one for straight participants and one for gay and lesbian participants. Bisexual participants answered both the gay and lesbian and straight questionnaires. However, since there were only two bisexuals and three lesbians, they were omitted from the study's analysis. This effectively reduced the sample size to 67 respondents (93% of original respondents).

While fundamentally the content of the surveys was the same, the questionnaire for gay participants differed slightly with several questions directly addressing adjustment and involvement in the gay community. Since the sample was not random, the results of the study can not be generalized to interracial relationships in the entire straight and gay population.

Demographic Characteristics

Table 1 shows the frequencies of gays and straights in the sample. Gays comprised 32.80 percent of the sample while straights made up the larger percentage of the sample at 67.20 percent.

Table 1: Frequencies of Sexual Orientation

Sexual Orientation	N	%
Gay	22	32.80
Straight	45	67.20
Total	67	100.00

Table 2 shows the frequencies of gender in the sample. Straight females comprised 41.79 percent of the sample at 28, while gay and straight males comprised 58.21 percent of the sample at 39 participants.

Table 2: Frequencies of Gender

Gender	N	%
Male	39	58.21
Female	28	41.79
Total	67	100.00

Table 3 displays the means, medians, and standard deviations by sexual orientation for age, education, length of relationship, and income. The participants ranged in age from 18 to 60 years with a mean of 29.40 years for straights and 35.59 years for gays. Years of education ranged from 12 to 21 with a mean of 15.96 years for straights and 16.23 years for gays. All of the participants had completed high school and most had completed college (62.68%). Length of relationship, which was defined as the amount of time the participant had been dating his or her significant other, ranged from 1 to 30 years with a mean of 4.93 years for straights and 4.82 years for gays. Income ranged from 0 (for full-time students) to \$120,000 with a mean of \$25,440 for straights and \$48,972 for gays with a median of \$20,000.

Tables of the complete frequencies for age, education, length of relationship, and income are presented in Appendix B.

Table 3: Mean with Standard Deviation in Parentheses and Median for Age, Education, Length of Relationship, and Income by Sexual Orientation

Variable	Mean		Median
	Straight	Gay	Entire Population
Age (years)	29.40 (8.16)	35.59 (7.33)	31.00
Education (years)	15.96 (2.31)	16.23 (2.35)	16.00
Length of Relationship (years)	4.94 (5.74)	4.82 (4.73)	3.00
Income (dollars)	25,440.48 (34,082.25)	48,972.22 (48,958.71)	20,000.00

Methods of Analysis

The surveys contained qualitative and quantitative measurements to extract a wide range of data from participants. SPSS/PC+ Version 8.0 was used to analyze the statistical portion of the data. Quantitative analysis allows the researcher to test the hypothesis, collect data with precision, and statistically analyze the data (Bhormstedt & Knoke, 1994). Qualitative analysis allows the researcher to use personal commentary and individual contribution to make analytical conclusions.

Sets of statistical tests were used including chi-square analysis, t-tests, factor analysis, and regression analysis. Chi-square analysis allows the researcher to explore the extent to which two variables may be associated with each other (Bhormstedt & Knoke, 1994). A t-test allows the researcher to compare the means of two groups using the

variance between the means to find out if there is a statistically significant difference between them (Bhornstedt & Knoke, 1994). A factor analysis was calculated using the principal components factor analysis, the most common form of factor analysis in use today. Factor loadings and factor score coefficients are equal, assuming principal components are used (Bailey, 1994). The eigenvalue measures the number of factors in the variable group. Communality of the variable shows the measured variance that can be explained by the other variables in the factor analysis. Factor loading shows the relationship between the factor and variables in the model (Grousch, 1983). Multiplying each participant's score on an item by the factor loading and summing the total for each yielded the scale which was used to measure stability in the relationships. The factor analysis uses a correlation matrix to determine if there are relationships between a group of variables, allowing the researcher to create a scale that will utilize the variable in analysis.

Operationalization of Variables

Independent Variables

(1) Sexual Orientation is defined as whether the respondent has relationships with the same-sex, opposite sex, or both. The three values are gay, straight, and bisexual. The participant was asked, “What is your sexual orientation?” Possible responses were heterosexual, homosexual, and bisexual. The bisexual and lesbian categories were later dropped from the analysis, creating a dummy variable called GAY, coded 0 for straight and 1 for gay.

(2) Emotional support is a nominal variable that measures whether the respondent receives most of his emotional support from family members, friends or equal support from both. The following question was used to measure emotional support: I get most of my emotional support from: Family, Friends or Equal support from both. Dummy variables for family (FAMILY) and friends (FRIEND) were created. The dummy variable for family (FAMILY) was 0 for no and 1 for yes. The dummy variable for friends (SFRIEND) was coded 0 for no and 1 for yes. The excluded category, (EQUAL), was used as a reference category.

Age, education, length of relationship, and income were included as control variables. The correlation matrix for all variables is presented in Appendix C.

Dependent Variable

(1) The dependent variable was the respondent's total measure on the "Stability Scale"(SCALE). The respondent rated 9 statements, based on the stability of the relationship with the values 1-5. A total of nine variables were used to measure stability.

The participants rated the following nine questions:

1. (FREQCOMM): My partner and I communicate well.
2. (DISAGREE): We can settle disagreements well.
3. (TIME): We spend time together.
4. (ENJOY): We enjoy each other's company.
5. (HAPPYREL): I feel that our relationship is happy.
6. (RELPRTRNR): I relate well to my partner.
7. (LISTEN): I feel like my partner listens to me.
8. (SENSITIV): My partner is sensitive to my needs.
9. (EQUAL): My partner and I care equally about each other.

The possible responses were 1-5 with 5 indicating the highest rating of the question and 1 indicating the lowest. Respondents could score between 9-45 on the questions.

Chapter IV

Quantitative Findings

Preliminary Findings

First, a chi-square test for independence of sex and race in the sample was conducted. Overall, the sample consisted of 43.28% white, 16.42% African-American, 16.42% Asian/ Pacific Islander, 11.94% Hispanic, and 11.94% mixed-racial. The non-random sample's racial make-up is different from that of Santa Clara County. In the present study, whites were under-represented, as were Hispanics. However, Asian/Pacific Islander, African Americans, and other or mixed racial were over-represented. According to the 1990 census, Santa Clara County consisted of 66.17% white, 12.68% Hispanic or Latino, 11.88% Asian or Pacific Islander, 3.19% African-American, 5.57% other race, and .51% American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut (1990 Census).

Table 4 shows the chi-square test of independence for sex and race/ethnicity in the sample. The result was not statistically significant, illustrating that sex and race/ethnicity were not associated in the sample.

Table 4: Chi-Square Test for Independence Between Race and Sex

Variable	Male		Female		Chi-Square	P
	N	%	N	%		
Race						
White	19	48.72%	10	35.72%	6.01	0.20
African-American	8	20.51%	3	10.72%		
Asian	5	12.82%	6	21.42%		
Hispanic	5	12.82%	3	10.72%		
Mixed Racial	2	5.13%	6	21.42%		
Total	39	100.00%	28	100.00%		

As a next step, a set of t-tests was conducted for demographic characteristics.

Table 5 presents a summary of income, age, length of relationship, and education in the sample. The groups are divided into straight and gay participants. Standard deviations are presented in the parentheses. Income shows a statistically significant result with gay participants making about \$22,000 more on average than straights ($p=.04$). Age also shows a statistically significant result with gays being slightly more than six years older than straight participants on average ($p=0.00$). Length of relationship and education are not significantly different between the two groups.

Table 5: t-tests for Demographic Characteristics: Income, Age, Length of Relationship, and Education

Variable	Gay Mean (Std. dev.)		Straight Mean (Std. dev.)		T	P
INCOME (\$)	48972.22(48958.70)		25440.48 (34082.25)		-2.14	0.04*
AGE (Years)	35.59	(7.33)	29.40	(8.16)	-2.87	0.00**
LGRELATE (Years)	4.81	(5.73)	4.94	(4.73)	0.09	0.79
EDUCATE (Years)	16.23	(2.31)	15.96	(2.35)	-0.45	0.65

*p<.05 **p<.01

Next, a factor analysis was conducted to examine if the variables in the scale indicate the same underlying construct and was related. After the factor analysis was completed, a multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to examine the relationships between the independent and dependent variables.

Factor Analysis

Table 6 shows the factor analysis for the proceeding nine variables: “My partner and I care about each other equally” (EQUAL), “My partner listens to me” (LISTEN), “We enjoy each other’s company” (ENJOYCO), “My partner is sensitive to my needs” (SENSITIV), “I relate well to my partner” (RELPRTRN), “I consider my relationship with my partner happy” (HAPPYREL), “We spend time together” (TIME), “We settle disagreements well” (DISAGREE), and “We communicate frequently” (FREQCOMM).

The eigenvalue revealed the existence of one factor that was labeled as stability (STABILITY). The factor loadings illustrate the strong relationship between the nine variables and the factor called stability (STABILITY). The highest factor loading was for SENSITIV (0.864) proceeded by RELPRTNR (0.837), FREQCOMM (0.837), LISTEN (0.826), DISAGREE (0.750), ENJOYCO (0.704), HAPPY (0.703), EQUAL (0.684), and TIME (0.539). Communality of the variable shows the measured variance that can be explained by the other variables in the factor analysis. The variable with the highest communality was SENSITIV(0.718), proceeded by RELPRTNR(0.672), LISTEN(0.677),FREQCOMM(0.670), DISAGREE(0.494), HAPPYREL (0.492), ENJOYCO(0.412), EQUAL(0.359), and TIME(0.273).

A composite scale was created to determine if there was a relationship between the independent variables and stability by multiplying each participant's score on a five-point scale with the corresponding factor-loading coefficient and then summing. (SCALE= 0.847*SENSITIV + 0.820*RELPRTNR + 0.819*FREQCOMM + 0.823*LISTEN + 0.703*DISAGREE + 0.642*ENJOYCO + 0.701*HAPPYREL + 0.599*EQUAL + 0.523*TIME). The scale represents the participant's reported level of stability.

Table 6: Factor Analysis for the Composite Variable: STABILITY

Variable	Eigenvalue	Factor Loading	Communality
TIME	4.768	0.523	0.273
SENSITIV	.924	0.847	0.718
RELPRTR	.844	0.820	0.672
DISAGREE	.757	0.703	0.494
ENJOYCO	.575	0.642	0.412
EQUAL	.411	0.599	0.359
FREQCOMM	.359	0.819	0.670
HAPPYREL	.210	0.701	0.492
LISTEN	.142	0.823	0.677

Multiple Regression Analysis

Two separate multiple regression analyses were conducted in order to examine the relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable for gay and straight participants.

For both gay and straight groups, (STABILITY) was regressed on FAMILY (family support), SFRIENDS (friend support), AGE, INCOME, LGRELATE (length of relationship), and EDUCATE (education). As Table 7 exhibits, only the effect of the control variable AGE ($B=.79$, $p=.04$) was significantly related to stability for gay participants. That is, among gay interracial couples, older participants had more stable relationships than younger ones. INCOME, FAMILY, SFRIEND, and LRELATE, EDUCATE and were not statistically significant ($p=.95$, $p=.84$, $p=.56$, $p=.67$, and $p=.56$, respectively).

The first hypothesis states among gay couples, support from friends is more likely to influence stability than support from family, controlling for age, length of relationship, education, and income. This hypothesis was not supported.

Table 7: Regression Analysis for Gay Participants of Independent Variables for AGE, INCOME, FAMILY, SFRIEND, LRELATE, and EDUCATE on Dependent Variable STABILITY with Standard Deviation in Parentheses

Independent Variables	STABILITY		
	b(unstandardized)	B(standardized)	T
AGE	.68(.27)	.79	2.47*
INCOME	.00 (.00)	.02	-.07
FAMILY	-1.66(8.08)	-.06	-.21
SFRIEND	-2.66(1.93)	-.18	-.57
LRELATE	.17(.39)	.12	.44
EDUCATE	-.53(.88)	-.15	-.60
Constant	11.71		
R ²	.54		

* p<.05

Table 8 shows the regression analysis for straight participants. The effects of AGE, INCOME, FAMILY, SFRIEND, LRELATE, and EDUCATE were not statistically significant (p=.27, p=.53, p= .87, p=.72, p=.32, and p=.31 respectively). Thus, the second hypothesis was not supported.

Table 8: Regression Analysis for Straight Participants of Independent Variables for AGE, INCOME, FAMILY, SFRIEND, LRELATE, and EDUCATE on Dependent Variable STABILITY with Standard Deviation in Parentheses

Independent Variables	STABILITY		
	b(unstandardized)	B(standardized)	T
AGE	-.10 (.09)	-.22	-1.11
INCOME	.00 (.00)	.11	.64
FAMILY	.27 (1.70)	-.27	-.16
SFRIEND	-.54 (1.50)	-.07	-.36
LRELATE	.13 (.13)	.20	1.00
EDUCATE	.31 (.30)	.18	1.03
Constant	23.78		
R ²	.08		

R^2 shows the amount of variation that can be explained in the dependent variable by the independent variables (Knoke, et al., 1994). Tables 8 and 9 show a large difference in R^2 values. According to Table 8, 54% of the stability among gay couples was explained by AGE, INCOME, FAMILY, SFRIEND, LRELATE, and EDUCATE. By contrast, Table 9 shows that only 8 percent of the stability among straight couples was explained by AGE, INCOME, FAMILY, SFRIEND, LRELATE, and EDUCATE.

Chapter V

Qualitative Findings

The qualitative findings were based on open-ended questions from the survey and personal commentary reported by the respondents. Qualitative methods allow the researcher to examine data at a micro level, gain insight into the personal experiences of the respondents, and analyze how each individual copes within his or her interracial relationship. All face-to-face interviews were conducted in public places such as parks, libraries, and coffee shops. The questionnaire and consent forms, included in the appendix, were used to interview the participants. Participants were encouraged to discuss issues that they felt positively or negatively affected stability in their relationships. Participant response varied, with some people showing more reserve and others giving more detail about the nature and history of the relationship. Phone interviews were conducted similarly to face-to-face interviews and the same questionnaire was used.

Partner Preference and the Effects of Racial and/or Cultural Differences on the Relationship

According to Porterfield (1978), who examined straight interracial relationships between African-Americans and whites, racial differences may serve to attract interracial partners to each other. Tseng (1977) further noted that racial differences may be

attractive because they make the partners exotic or different than other potential partners. Also, prevailing white standards of beauty and attractiveness may influence partner choice as well. Most respondents were acutely aware of the racial differences between them and their partners and many said they found one racial type particularly attractive and sought out individuals who met those specifications. One gay respondent recounted how he only was attracted, as a Filipino male, to white men. He said of his preference, "Dating a Filipino would be too much like looking in the mirror. Too much like incest. I prefer white men."

Another gay Asian man, who was dating a significantly older individual, said that he never had an Asian boyfriend and preferred "tall well-built Caucasians." While still another heterosexual African-American male participant talked about how he just felt more "sexually comfortable with white women" than with African-American women. A heterosexual African-American woman noted that she "just preferred white men" and found them attractive. Yet another straight African-American man said, "You shouldn't cheat yourself of the right mate because they are of a different ethnicity. Give everybody a chance."

One gay Latino man noted with disdain, white preference for high status and wealth in a partner. Another gay Latino male noted that his partner "tried to make him feel less because he has more money and he flaunts it." Several heterosexual minority respondents recalled feeling inferior to their white partners. One woman said, "he had a hard time relating, he assumed all Latinas were below him."

✓ Perception of cultural differences in communication also caused relationship difficulties. One gay Latino participant mentioned how his relationship was different from others he had with other Latinos because his white partner was very withdrawn during arguments. A straight white woman complained that her marriage to her former African-American husband ended because of a lack of communication on an emotional level.

Race and minority- versus white status also became an issue for straight relationships, in particular for those involving African-Americans and whites. One straight, white woman noted that her partner, “thinks everything is so easy for me because I am white.”

Another straight white participant noted that while he had really loved his African-American partner, he would never consider her for marriage because of the societal implications: He said, “I don’t want my children (biracial) to hate me because I am white.”

Gay couples, while aware of race, did not usually perceive it as disruptive towards stability. One gay white male commented that although he was very aware of his partner’s Latino heritage, he felt quite comfortable with other Latinos and with his white identity. Another white gay male noted that race was not a factor for he and his Asian boyfriend, however, he perceived that cultural differences in communication were often responsible for difficulties.

Some minority respondents commented that they had been hassled by others for what others perceived as selling out their race. African-American participants perceived

that many in the community believed dating whites was not beneficial for their race. One straight African-American respondent said that although his parents were interracially married, he could never date a white woman because of the societal and race implications.

Although race did sometimes seem to be related to choice of partner, the vast majority of participants perceived other reasons as important. Most respondents cited attraction and compatibility as important factors in partner choice. Many simply noted that they never considered race in their decision to conduct a relationship with their partner. Gays and lesbians and heterosexuals did not differ between their reasons for preferring a partner from another race.

Cultural differences also played a part in relationships as well. One white woman felt that “cultural issues” including the different expectations of her Asian husband about sex roles contributed to the breakup of her marriage. A lesbian Latina recalled how she believed cultural differences and her partner’s feelings about her African-American heritage being inferior contributed to the relationship’s instability and eventual breakup.

The Impact of Family Disapproval

For straight, interracial couples, family disapproval often proved to be a great hurdle. Many couples weathered extreme disapproval from parents who were slow to change their opinions of their partners. According to Rosenblatt et al. (1995), many whites in interracial relationships faced greatly diminished or non-existent family

relations after announcing their relationships to their family. Many couples remedied this by forging stronger bonds with approving family members or finding friends who are tolerant of the relationship.

One straight, white woman regretfully discussed how her mother had ended their relationship when she married her African-American husband. They lived in a small town where she and her small child would often run into her mother. The child would run up to her mother and call her “Grandma”, but the mother would look right through her, never even acknowledging her or her daughter. The woman said that she had grown to accept her mother’s cold reception in the seven years since her marriage, and her relationship with her husband was more important than her relationship with her mother. She had maintained a successful relationship with her husband despite a very negative relationship with her family. However, she noted that she and her husband carried on positive relations with his family who did approve of the relationship.

None of the gay participants described levels of family estrangement similar to straights. Many gay couples described positive experiences with their and their partners’ families. Several individuals had forged close relationships with their partner’s relatives. One white male recalled amicably sitting around the Thanksgiving dinner table with his partner’s family and feeling like they were in-laws. Another white male recalled the close contact he still maintained with his partner’s family long after his partner had died of AIDS.

Kouri and Lasswell (1993) noted that older generations may have difficulty accepting interracial relationships. Many respondents noticed a relationship between age

of the family members and approval. Older family members such as grandparents, great uncles, and aunts often disapproved. However, some family members would begin to support the relationship with time. One straight, Hispanic woman mentioned that her parents would not talk to her for the first six months she was dating her future white husband. She also mentioned that they had recently begun to approve the relationship. One straight, Asian woman discussed how her parents learned that she was marrying a white man. Her father was so angry he resorted to corporal punishment, spanking his twenty-five year old daughter.

Friends can often markedly disapprove of the relationship causing discomfort and fracturing of social networks. One straight Asian woman who met her white husband over the Internet recalled getting “a lot of flack” from her Asian girlfriends. While she may have perceived this as a result of her partner’s race, the manner in which she met her husband may also be suspect. Internet encounters have not yet been accepted as a way to meet partners.

Tucker and Mitchell-Kernan (1990) noted that straight couples often became involved in interracial relationships after they had moved some distance from their families. Turner et al. (1993) also found that many gays and lesbians in the San Francisco community moved away from where they grew up to avoid the scrutiny of intolerant family and friends. Gays and lesbians noted that the San Francisco Bay Area provided an atmosphere more tolerant of their sexual orientation. A white gay man noted that not only did he move to San Francisco for the support it afforded him when he came out, but he felt that his relationship with his African-American boyfriend was more acceptable.

He mentioned that if he had stayed in the Midwest, he probably would have never dated an African-American.

For heterosexuals, distance often provided a buffer for couples desiring to keep parental opinions out of their relationship. One straight white woman mentioned that her African-American boyfriend's father lived far away and was not told about the relationship.

Plummer (1992) noted that gay and lesbians' social support networks were friend-based rather than family-based. Many gays and lesbians noted they lived far away from their families. Some felt this was the product of an intolerant community. One gay man mentioned that he had come to San Francisco from the Midwest because of a more tolerant environment, and although he had relations with his family, his closest social contact was with friends. For gay couples who had close relationships with their families, interracial dating was rarely mentioned as an issue of concern. If their families accepted their sexuality, their partner was usually accepted as well.

Most gays and lesbians who lived in the Bay Area were out about their sexuality to their families or not in great contact with them. Most gays and lesbians who were close geographically to their families reported a relatively easier acceptance of their partners by family than did straights. One white gay man noted that his African-American partner's family treated him like a brother, and his own sisters doted on his partner. Another gay Asian man who had been involved with his white partner for several years commented that his parents treated his partner like family, and would call him regarding certain professional issues seeking his advice.

Most participants, both gay and straight, noted a diverse racial mixture of friends. If their partner was of another race, they noted having many friends from other races rather than their own.

Gender of the family member in the interracial relationship in straight families divided families more often than other factors. Female respondents noted strong opposition from their families. One straight white respondent who was dating an African-American male noted that her parents would not permit him to set foot in their house.

Another straight Latina respondent noted that her parents refused contact with her for several years when they found out her boyfriend was not Latino.

Stability

Like the quantitative analysis reported for gays, younger respondents noted less stability in their relationships. Many younger participants noted that they were not willing to make a significant commitment to their partners. Some mentioned a lack of strong emotional feeling for their partner. One straight, 24 year-old African-American male noted that after a while his feelings for his Latina girlfriend were just not worth the difficulty of maintaining the relationship, particularly with the amount of disapproval the couple was receiving from her father. Another straight, 26 year-old white male found that after a few months with his girlfriend, he was just not committed to making the

relationship work. One gay 23 year-old Latino male noted that he was just having fun and wanted to figure out what he wanted in a partner before making a commitment.

Couples who had successful relationships voiced a commitment to making the relationship work and having strong emotional feelings for their partners. Individuals often would ignore the disapproval from families or confront family members about their disapproval, sometimes causing disruptions among family relationships. However, one white woman said she was committed to her relationship with her African-American husband no matter how harshly her family reacted. Her family had discontinued all relations with her. Some gay participants noted they felt strongly about their partners and would continue to maintain their relationships through difficulties that they perceived to be caused by ethnicity or race.

Public Disapproval

Rosenblatt (1995) confirmed that public intolerance to interracial relationships was still a problem, whether it was blatant, such as someone making a loud comment in public, or a disapproving stare given to interracial couples.

While there was some public disapproval noted by the respondents, it was not great. It should also be noted that most of the participants were from the bay area where there is more tolerance of such relationships. One straight, African-American woman noted that African-American men would come up to her, and publicly display their disapproval when she was walking down the street with her white boyfriend. However,

she felt angry about seeing these same men in clubs with white women. One straight, African-American woman noted that people would stare, but no one usually said anything to her and her husband.

Gay and lesbian participants often noted social disapproval as well. Occasionally, when couples would appear in public, persons of the same race as one partner would make comments. Such as they were “selling out” their race or that they hated their own race. One lesbian noted that she often received negative comments from other Latina lesbians about her choice of an African-American partner.

Chapter VI

Discussion

Quantitative Results

For both straight and gay couples, the source of support had no relationship with the stability of the relationship. This may indicate that for both straights and gays there was no difference in the source of support, whether from family, friends, or both family and friends. The current study did not support Plummer's (1992) finding that friends were more important sources of social support than family for gays.

While there was no relationship between the independent variables and stability in either hypothesis, the control variable AGE was positively related to stability for gays. Interracial relationships involving older gay individuals were found to be more stable. This finding was similar to that reported by Bradbury (1998) who found that older straight couples have more stable relationships. In the current study, however, age was not found to be significant for straights.

While length of relationship was not found to be significant in the current study, Bradbury (1998) showed there was a relationship between the components of a long relationship and satisfaction in a relationship. Other factors such as familiarity and intimacy can also contribute to satisfaction in relationships. Kurdek (1992) found that satisfaction in gay and lesbian relationships was related to growing emotional support and comfort individuals felt from their partners. As exhibited in the quantitative section, a

small value of R^2 (.08) for straights indicates that other variables that are not included in the present study may contribute to stability.

Qualitative Results

Overall, gays and lesbians depended less on family and more on friends for social support. However, many gay and lesbian participants had good relations with their families and enjoyed acceptance and tolerance of their partners in their family relationships. Gays and lesbians, who have positive relationships with their families, may enjoy more openness in those relationships as well. It is possible that families that have overcome the hurdle of accepting a child's sexual orientation are less likely to be disturbed by their family member dating someone of a different race. In contrast, straights experienced more family opposition than homosexuals to their relationships.

Stability in the relationship appeared to be related to both partners' commitment to each other, feelings for each other, and a desire to "make the relationship work", rather than overall support from family and friends. The sample contained fewer women than men perhaps reflecting the experiences of men.

Chapter VII

Conclusion

This study did not find any significant effects of type of support network (family or friend based) on stability. Rosenblatt et al. (1995), and Kurdek and Schmitt (1987) noted that emotional support does play a role in the stability of a relationship. However, the research was unable to determine whether emotional support from families and/or friends may contribute to stability. Age was the only significant factor in the stability of gay relationships, but none of the variables was significantly related to stability for straight participants. Other variables not examined in the study may also provide an explanation for stability.

Cardell, Finn, and Marecek (1981) note that the satisfaction in relationships was related to sex role differentiated behavior rather than sexual orientation. Couples with distinctively different sex role divisions were significantly more stable than those who maintained more similar roles. Since this study did not include variables that measure sex role differentiated behavior and the participants' stability can not be assessed more effectively.

Adelmann, Chadwick, & Baerger (1996) note that in straight relationships marital quality improves with familiarity, intimacy, and tolerance. Since this study did not include analysis of the variables that measure levels of emotional support from partners over time, familiarity, intimacy, and/or tolerance, the participants' stability can not be effectively assessed. However, in stable relationships it may be possible that since a

strong support network already exists, it was taken for granted and not mentioned as a factor in stability.

Qualitative findings may be interpreted to show that determination of the couple to keep the relationship together is more important than the role that emotional support networks play. A random sample of respondents may provide some statistically significant results by selecting respondents who are truly representative of the interracial dating population. The analysis on each respondent's social networks may yield more conclusive results. Further analysis of race may also be helpful. Racial difference might lead to different experiences in interracial relationships, thus affecting stability.

Like Kouri and Lasswell (1993), who note that the majority of respondents in their study were not native to the Los Angeles area and did not have family in close proximity, many of the current study's respondents noted living far away from family. The role that distance from family (both emotional and literal mileage distances) plays should be explored, as well as the impact this has on the stability of the relationships. Perhaps the anonymity of living far away from home can give the individual more freedom to behave as she or he chooses and to avoid criticism from close family and friends. This may in turn affect stability of relationships, allowing individuals sensitive to their family's criticism the freedom to pursue an interracial relationship.

The commitment to the relationship in the face of extreme disapproval that many respondents discussed should be explored as well. Davidson (1992) notes that other family members often felt that the couple was a good match for each other, even if they

disapproved of the union. Perhaps individual determination, feelings for a partner, emotional maturity (as proven statistically significant, assuming age is related to maturity), and commitment to the relationship are the more important factors in stability.

Policy Implication and Future Research

Tolerance of interracial relationships has improved in the last 50 years. However, there is still much to be accomplished. For interracial relationships to flourish there must be tolerance and support networks. Increased racial diversity in most areas of the United States in the twenty-first century may lead to more acceptance. However, continuing historical strategies to remove the social and economic barriers for many minorities is important as well. Many whites harbor prejudices against minorities, and increased encounters with a broad range of racial and ethnic groups will help to break down pre-conceived ideas that all people may have. The continuances of programs that have historically promoted the educational achievement of minorities and strengthen the existing community are crucial.

Because of their sexuality, gays and lesbians individuals face an increased likelihood that they will become victims of hate crimes. Policies that protect gays and lesbians and bring awareness to the larger community are important. Also, continuing to provide social service programs to gay and lesbians to deal with issues unique to the community are important.

Future research may involve several directions. First, the research needs to

identify variables that the present study did not measure which affect stability for straight individuals. Future research needs to explore gay and lesbian non-interracial relationships that may provide an understanding of the effects of support networks on stability. Also, quantitative studies addressing social networks of general population may provide a clear picture of the “typical” support structure. This information will be helpful to future research, since the existing literature does effectively address the general population’s current support networks, and these are needed to provide a better theoretical foundation for studies exploring interracial relationships, stability, and social support.

References

- Adams, R. (1969). Interracial Marriage in Hawaii: A Study of the Mutually Conditioned Processes of Acculturation and Amalgamation. New Jersey: Patterson Smith.
- Adelmann, P.K., Chadwick, K., & Baerger, D.R. (1996). Marital Quality of Black and White Adults over the Life Course. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 13(3), 361-384.
- Ahern, F.M., Cole, R.E., Johnson, R.C., & Wong, B. (1981). Personality Attributes of Males and Females Marrying Within vs. Across Racial/Ethnic Groups." Behavior Genetics, 11(3), 181-194.
- Bailey, K.D. (1994). Methods of Social Research. New York: The Free Press.
- Baird, R.M., & Rosenbaum, S.E. (1997). Same-Sex Marriage: The Moral and Legal Debate. New York: Prometheus Books.
- Barnett, L.D. (1963). Interracial Marriage in California. Marriage and Family Living, November, 424-427.
- Bhornstedt, G.W., & Knoke, D. (1994). Statistics for Social Data Analysis. Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers.
- Bradbury, T. (1998). The Development Course of Marital Dysfunction. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P. (1989). Black-White Interracial Marriages: A Historical Analysis. The Journal of Intergroup Relations, 16(4), 26-36.
- Cardell, M., Finn, S., & Marecek, J. (1981). Sex-Role Identity, Sex-Role Behavior, and Satisfaction in Heterosexual, Lesbian, and Gay Male Couples. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5(3), 488-494.
- Cheng, C.K., & Yamamura, D.S. (1957). Interracial Marriage and Divorce in Hawaii. Social Forces, 36, 77-84.
- Davidson, J.R. (1992). Theories About Black-White Interracial Marriage: A Clinical Perspective. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 20, 150-157.
- Durkheim, Emile. (1951). Suicide. Glen Cove, Illinois: The Free Press.
- Endo, R., & Hirokawa, D. (1983). Japanese American Intermarriage. Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology, 11(2), 159-166.

- Frabel, D.E.S., Wortman, C., & Joseph, J. (1997). Predicting Self-Esteem, Well-Being, and Distress in a Cohort of Gay Men: The Importance of Cultural Stigma, Personal Visibility, Community Networks, and Positive Identity. Journal of Personality, 65(3), 599-624.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Golden, J. (1951). Characteristics of the Negro-White Intermarried in Philadelphia. American Sociological Review, 177-183.
- Grousch, R.L. (1983). Factor Analysis. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Imamura, A.E. (1990). Strangers in a Strange Land: Coping with Marginality in International Marriage. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 21(2), 171-191.
- Jeong, G.J., & Schumm, W.R. (1990). Family Satisfaction in Korean/American Marriages: An Exploratory Study of the Perceptions of Korean Wives. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 21(3), 325-336.
- Johnson, R.C., & Ogasawara, G.M. (1990). Within and Across-group Dating in Hawaii. Social Biology, 35(1-2), 103-109.
- Jones, R.W., & Bates, J.E. (1978). Satisfaction in Male Gay and Lesbian Couples. Journal of Gay and Lesbianity, 3(3), 217-224.
- Kalmijn, M. (1993). Trends in Black/White Intermarriage. Social Forces, 72(1), 119-146.
- Kinsey, A.C. (1982). Sex Studies Index, 1980. Boston: G.K. Hall.
- Kitano, H., Yeung, W., Chai, L., Hatanaka, H. (1984). Asian-American Interracial Marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 179-189.
- Kitano, H., & Chai, L. (1982). Korean Interracial Marriage. Marriage and Family Review, 5, 75-89.
- Kouri, K., & Lasswell, M. (1993). Black-White Marriages: Social Change and Intergenerational Mobility. Marriage and Family Review, 19(3-4), 241-255.
- Kurdek, L. (1992). Relationship Stability and Relationship Satisfaction in Cohabiting Gay and Lesbian Couples: A Prospective Longitudinal Test of the Contextual and Interdependence Models. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 9, 125-142.

- Kurdek, L.A., & Schmitt, J.P. (1987). Perceived Emotional Support from Family and Friends in Members of Gay and Lesbian, Married, and Heterosexual Cohabiting Couples. Journal of Gay and Lesbianity, 14(3-4), 57-68
- Larsson, C. (1965). Marriage Across the Color Line. Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company.
- Lin, J.L. (1990). Marital Satisfaction and Conflict in Intercultural Correspondence Marriage. Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertation Services.
- Loehlin, J.C. (1987). Latent Variable Models. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Lukes, S. (1973). Emile Durkheim: His Life and Work. Great Britain: Hazell Watson & Viney Ltd.
- McWhirter, D.P. (1984). The Male Couple. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Mead, G.H. (1934). Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mindal, C., Habenstein, R.W., & Wright Jr., R. (1988). Ethnic Families in America. New York: Elsevier.
- Monahan, T.P. (1971). Interracial Marriage and Divorce in Kansas and the Question of Instability of Mixed Marriages. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 2, 107-120.
- Mott, P.E. (1965). The Organization of Society. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Murguia, E. (1982). Chicano Intermarriage: A Theoretical and Empirical Study. Texas: Trinity University Press.
- Oey, B.M. (1991). Personality Characteristics, Acculturation, and Marital Satisfaction of Interracially Married and Endogamous Chinese-Americans. Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertation Services.
- Orbuck, T., House, J.S., Mero, R.P., and Webster, P.S. (1996). Marital Quality Over the Life Course. Social Psychology Quarterly, 59(2), 162-171.
- Paik, F. (1996, May). Happily Ever After?. Amagazine, pp. 27-29.
- Paset, P.S., & Taylor, R.D. (1991, October). Black and White Women's Attitudes Toward Interracial Marriage. Psychological Reports. pp. 753-754.
- Plummer, K. (1992). Modern Homosexualities: Fragments of Lesbian and Gay Experiences. London: Routledge.

- Porterfield, E. (1978). Black and White Mixed Marriages. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Pozzetta, G.E. (1991). Assimilation, Acculturation, and Social Mobility. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Presthus, R. (1962). The Organizational Society. New York: Random House.
- Rogers, S.J., & Amato, P.R. (1997). Is Marital Quality Declining? The Evidence from Two Generations. Social Forces, 75(3), 1089-1100.
- Rosenblatt, P.C., Karis, T.A., & Powell, R.D. (1995). Multiracial Couples, Black and White Voices. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Schwertfeger, M.M. (1982). Interethnic Marriage and Divorce in Hawaii: A Panel Study of 1968 First Marriages. Marriage and Family Review, 49-57.
- Smith, R.B., & Brown, R.A. (1997). The Impact of Social Support on Gay Male Couples. Journal of Gays and Lesbians, 33(2), 39-61.
- Sones, D.G., & Holston, M.A. (1988). Tolerance, Sociability, Sex, And Race: Correlates of Attitudes Toward Interracial Marriage. Psychological Reports, 62, 518.
- Spickard, P.R. (1989). Mixed Blood: Intermarriage and Ethnic Identity in 20th Century America. Madison: University of Wisconsin.
- Strauss, A. (1954). Strain and Harmony in American-Japanese War-Bride Marriages. Marriage and Family Living, 16, 99-106.
- Stringer, H.C. (1991). A Comparison of Selected Marital Characteristics in Black-White Interracial Marriages and Same Race Marriages. Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertation Services.
- Tseng, W., McDermot J., & Maretzki, T.W. (1977). Adjustment in Intercultural Marriage. Hawaii: University of Hawaii.
- Thorman, G. (1980). Family Violence. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.
- Tucker, M.B., & Mitchell-Kernan, C. (1990). New Trends in Black American Interracial Marriage: The Social Structural Context. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52, 209-218.
- Turner, H.A., Hays, R.B., & Coates, T.J. (1993). Determinants of Social Support Among Gay Men: The Context of AIDS. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 34, 37-53.

- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1990). Census of the Population. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Wallace, R.A., & Wolf, A. (1991). Contemporary Sociological Theory: Continuing the Classical Tradition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Wong, M. (1989). A Look at Intermarriage Among the Chinese in the United States in 1980. Sociological Perspectives, 32(1), 87-107.

Appendix A

Survey Instruments and Consent Form

College of Social Sciences • Department of Sociology • One Washington Square • San José, California 95192-0122 • 408/924-5320

A: Sex: _____male _____female

1. How old are you?

2. What is your ethnicity?

3. What is your annual income?

4. What is your partner's age?

5. What is your partner's ethnicity?

6. What is your highest level of education completed? (Please circle last year completed)

Elementary	Junior High	High School	College	MA/MS/Tech.	Ph.D.
1 2 3 4 5 6	7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16	17 18	19 20 21

7. How many friends do you have?

8. How many gay friends do you have?

9. How many straight friends do you have?

10. Do you act differently with your straight friends than with your gay friends?

Yes, (go to question 11).

No, (go to question 12)

11. if you answered yes, please describe how your behavior differs in detail:

12. How many close friends do you have?

13. What are your closest friends' ethnicities?

14. Do you get more emotional support from your family or friends?

Family

Friends

Equal support from both

15. Please describe your social networks? (Include all people you are emotionally close to as well as describing relationships with your family members)

16. How long have you been involved in your current relationship?

17. How would you describe the nature of your relationship?

Very happy

Happy

somewhat happy

unhappy

sad

18. What are the typical problems that you experience in your relationship? Please circle the number which best describes the frequency of these problems (5=frequently 4=occasionally, 3=a few times, 2=hardly, 1=never)

Jealous	5	4	3	2	1
Drug Abuse	5	4	3	2	1
Fighting	5	4	3	2	1
Physical Abuse	5	4	3	2	1
Mental Abuse	5	4	3	2	1

19. Please give a verbal description of problems:

20. How strongly do you feel about maintaining your relationship?

Very Strongly Somewhat Strongly Strong not at all

21. What problems have you experienced in your relationship that you felt occurred because of your different ethnic backgrounds?

22. How many interracial relationships have you had?

23. How many non-interracial relationships have you had?

24. What characteristics do you feel are important in a partner?

25. What is your partner's historic background? U.S. born, English first language, etc...

26. Please rate (on a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest) how often the following are typical of your relationship:

My partner and I communicate frequently.

1 2 3 4 5

We can settle disagreements well.

1 2 3 4 5

We spend time together.

1 2 3 4 5

We enjoy each other's company.

1 2 3 4 5

I would consider my relationship with my partner happy.

1 2 3 4 5

I relate well to my partner.

1 2 3 4 5

I feel like my partner listens to me.

1 2 3 4 5

My partner is sensitive to my needs.

1 2 3 4 5

My partner and I care about each other equally.

1 2 3 4 5

My partner and I frequently engage in recreational activities together with our friends.

1 2 3 4 5

College of Social Sciences • Department of Sociology • One Washington Square • San José, California 95192-0122 • 408/924-5320

a. Sex: _____ male _____ female

1. How old are you?

2. What is your ethnicity?

3. What is your annual income?

3a. What is your highest level of education completed? (Please circle last year completed)

Elementary	Junior High	High School	College	MA/MS/Tech.	Ph.D
1 2 3 4 5 6	7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16	17 18	19 20 21

4. What is your partner's age?

5. What is your partner's ethnicity?

6. How many friends do you have?

7. What are your closest friends' ethnicity?

8. Do you get more emotional support from your family or friends?

Family Friends Equal Support From Both

9. Please describe your social networks? (Include all people you are emotionally close to as well as describing relationships with your family members)

10. How long have you been involved in your current relationship?

11. How would you describe the nature of your relationship?

Very happy Happy Somewhat happy Unhappy Sad

12. What are the typical problems that you experience in your relationship? (Please circle the number which best describes the frequency of these problems) 5=often, 4=occasionally, 3=once in a while, 2=hardly, 1=never)

Jealous	5	4	3	2	1
Drug Abuse	5	4	3	2	1
Fighting	5	4	3	2	1
Physical Abuse	5	4	3	2	1
Mental Abuse	5	4	3	2	1

Please give a verbal description of problems:

13. How strongly do you feel about maintaining your relationship?

Very Strongly Somewhat Strongly Strong Not at All

14. What problems have you experienced in your relationship that you felt occurred because of your different ethnic backgrounds?

15. How many interracial relationships have you had?

16. How many non-interracial relationships have you had?

17. What characteristics do you feel are important in a partner?

18. What is your partner's historical background? U.S. born or foreign, English first language or foreign language etc.

19. Please rate (on a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest) how often the following are typical of your relationship:

My partner and I communicate frequently.

1 2 3 4 5

We can settle disagreements well.

1 2 3 4 5

We spend time together.

1 2 3 4 5

We enjoy each other's company.

1 2 3 4 5

I would consider my relationship with my partner happy.

1 2 3 4 5

I relate well to my partner.

1 2 3 4 5

I feel like my partner listens to me.

1 2 3 4 5

My partner is sensitive to my needs.

1 2 3 4 5

My partner and I care about each other equally.

1 2 3 4 5

My partner and I frequently engage in recreational activities together with our friends.

1 2 3 4 5

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCHResponsible Investigator(s): Lorraine ConverseTitle of Protocol: Happiness in Interracial Relationships

1. I have been asked to participate in a research study investigating happiness in gay and straight interracial relationships.
2. I will be asked to answer a questionnaire and give verbal answers regarding my experiences in an interracial relationship. This will occur in a confidential location. My verbal responses may be recorded by a tape recorder with my consent and kept in a confidential location.
3. There are no foreseeable risks to subjects involved in this study.
4. No discernible benefits are expected for the employees.
6. The results of this study may be published, but no information that could identify the subjects will be included.
7. There will be no compensation for involvement in the study.
8. Any questions about this research may be addressed to the principal investigator, Lorraine Converse at (408) 235-0600. Complaints about the research may be presented to Bob Gliner, Department of Sociology, Chair, 924-5320. Questions or complaints about research, subjects' rights, or research-related injury may be presented to Serena Stanford, Ph.D., associate Academic Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, at (408) 924-2480.
9. No service of any kind, to which a subject is otherwise entitled, will be lost or jeopardized if a person chooses to "not participate" in the study.
10. Consent in this study shall be given voluntarily. A subject may refuse to participate in the study or in any part of the study. If the subject decides to participate in the study, he or she is free to withdraw at any time without prejudice to the subject's relations with San Jose State University or any other participating institutions.
11. I have received, read, and signed the consent form.

Subject's Signature

Date

Subject's Signature

Date

Appendix B: Frequency Tables for Age,
Income, Education, and Length of Relationship

Table 9: Frequency of Age

Age	N	%
18-19	2	2.980
20-29	30	44.778
30-39	26	38.810
40-49	5	7.462
50-59	4	5.970
Total	67	100.000

Table 10: Frequency of Income

Income	N	%
\$0-9999	16	23.880
\$10000-19999	13	19.404
\$20000-29999	7	10.449
\$30000-39999	6	8.956
\$40000-49999	5	7.462
\$50000-59999	3	4.478
\$60000-69999	3	4.478
\$70000-79999	1	1.492
\$80000-89999	2	2.985
\$90000-99999	0	0.000
\$100000-149999	2	2.985
\$150000-199999	1	1.492
\$200000-249999	1	1.492
Missing	7	10.449
Total	67	100.000

Table 11: Frequency of Years of Education

Years of Education	N	%
12	4	5.970
13	3	4.478
14	7	10.449
15	11	16.418
16	25	37.313
17	5	7.462
18	4	5.970
19	0	0.000
20	0	0.000
21	8	11.940
Total	67	100.000

Table 12: Frequency of Length of Relationship in Years

Length of Relationship (Years)	N	%
1-5	46	68.657
6-10	13	19.403
11-15	4	5.970
16-20	3	4.478
21-25	0	0.000
26-30	1	1.492
Total	67	100.000

Appendix C

Correlation Matrix of Variables Used in the Analysis

APPENDIX C

Table 13: Correlation Matrix of Variables Used in the Analysis

VARIABLES	STABILITY	AGE	SEXORIE	INCOME	FAMILY	SFRIEND
STABILITY	1.000	0.194	-0.101	0.182	0.045	-0.118
AGE	0.194	1.000	0.350**	0.381**	-0.062	0.016
SEXORIE	-0.101	0.350**	1.000	0.271*	-0.115	0.161
INCOME	0.182	0.381**	0.271*	1.000	0.063	0.006
FAMILY	0.045	-0.062	-0.115	0.063	1.000	-0.334
SFRIEND	-0.118	0.062	0.161	-0.055	-0.334*	1.000
SEX	0.100	-0.157	-0.593**	-0.147	-0.100	0.008
EDUCATE	0.129	0.139	0.056	0.194	-0.008	-0.132
LRELATE	0.128	0.428**	-0.011	0.316*	-0.033	-0.051

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

continued.

Table 13: Correlation Matrix of Variables Used in the Analysis (cont.)

VARIABLES	SEX	EDUCATE	LRELATE
STABILITY	0.100	0.129	0.128
AGE	-0.157	0.139	0.428**
SEXORIEN	-0.593**	0.056	-0.011
INCOME	-0.147	0.194	0.316*
FAMILY	-0.100	-0.008	-0.033
SFRIEND	-0.008	-0.132	0.051
SEX	1.000	0.063	0.108
EDUCATE	0.063	1.000	0.011
LRELATE	0.108	0.011	1.000

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Appendix D: Human Subjects Approval Letter

Office of the Academic Vice President • Associate Academic Vice President • Graduate Studies and Research
One Washington Square • San Jose, California 95192-0025 • 408/924-2480

TO: Lorraine Converse
1690 Belleville Way
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

FROM: Serena W. Stanford
AAVP, Graduate Studies & Research

DATE: September 19, 1996

The Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board has approved your request to use human subjects in the study entitled:

"Happiness in Interracial Relationships"

This approval is contingent upon the subjects participating in your research project being appropriately protected from risk. This includes the protection of the anonymity of the subjects' identity when they participate in your research project, and with regard to any and all data that may be collected from the subjects. The Board's approval includes continued monitoring of your research by the Board to assure that the subjects are being adequately and properly protected from such risks. If at any time a subject becomes injured or complains of injury, you must notify Serena Stanford, Ph.D., immediately. Injury includes but is not limited to bodily harm, psychological trauma and release of potentially damaging personal information.

Please also be advised that all subjects need to be fully informed and aware that their participation in your research project is voluntary, and that he or she may withdraw from the project at any time. Further, a subject's participation, refusal to participate, or withdrawal will not affect any services the subject is receiving or will receive at the institution in which the research is being conducted.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (408) 924-2480.