

## Couples Negotiating Gender Roles in the United States

### Specialty Paper

Faisal Alsanea

May, 1<sup>st</sup> 2020

Committee:

Dr. Annulla Linders (Chair)

Dr. Derrick Brooms

## Introduction

Males and females roles used to be distinct from what they are now. Women have not always been treated equally, and they continue to be treated unequally today; nevertheless, gender expectations are shifting, and how couples negotiate and manage the gender environment, both individually and socially, has changed as well. Many studies have proven the significance of gender in connection to relationship dynamics and inequalities between men and women in terms of family, childrearing, divorce, work, income, promotions, and social positions.

Gender socialisation is not a criterion that is taught in childhood and implanted as a family value; rather, gender is defined as the division of humans into two distinct categories, male and female, who act differently as a result of these distinctions (Ferree et al. 1999; Glenn 1999; Lorber 1994; Ridgeway 1997; Risman 1998). Ridgeway and Correll 2004) argue that gender is analogous to other social categories like race and class in that it includes cultural beliefs and social relationships that are influenced by changes in gender roles. In terms of how men and women are expected to behave, cultural beliefs define and classify them (Ridgeway & Correll 2004). Most social institutions, including family, education, and the workplace, are marked by gender inequity. Even as gender roles have shifted, this remains true. Despite the fact that the changes have had an impact on couples' lifestyles (Hochschild & Machung 1989). Many spouses are unable to recognise themselves as co-workers in the household.

Changes in gender roles, expectations, and opportunities throughout history have far effects not only for women and men's lives, but also for men and women's relationships. I investigate the literature on how couples negotiate, interpret, and manage gender in this specialized article. I'll talk about how couples negotiate gender as individuals and as a pair, and as a team both internally and publicly. I am particularly interested in how couples deal with transitions in different gender situations.

The aim of the research is to look at the literature on how couples negotiate gender in various ways. The point of this study is to look at how couples' negotiations have changed through time and how they socially and individually negotiate gender roles. I'll look at how changes in women's gender roles and their involvement in social, political, and economic surroundings affect their presence in the framework of the relationship, based on existing research (Moen & Wethington 1992).

### **Section 1: Scholarship on Gender and Couples**

Couples and gender processes are the subject of a large corpus of literature. Gender has an impact on almost every element of a couple's life, according to numerous studies. Variations in gender ideology (Davis & Greenstein 2009), the division of household labor (Davis & Greenstein 2009), and childcare are all examples of this (Coltrane 1989). Many study shows the persistent impact of traditional gender role expectations and the difficulty couples face when attempting to manage and fulfill gender roles, despite major change in some areas (Davis & Greenstein 2009). The context inside families is one of the most important factors researchers take into account when negotiating gender and gender roles.

Many works have been written about the development of gendered personalities in women and men. Because they will become mothers, women are more likely to reproduce the intimacy of their

relationship with their mothers. on the other hand, it maintained that families are based on a division of labor in which women are the breadwinners and men are the homemakers. This demonstrates how men's personality development promotes isolation rather than connection (Chodorow 1978).

**Gender ideology in marriage, gender and how couples make decisions, gender in household labour, and gender and childcare in families are all topics that need to be addressed.**

### *Gender Ideology and Marriage*

In the mid-1960s, a survey was conducted to assess the concerns of families who were changing their perspectives on the conventional division between paid and unpaid employment. This includes men's perceptions of being breadwinners and women's perceptions of being homemakers (Cherlin & Walters 1981; Mason et al. 1976; Chodorow 1978). The labour force in the United States had changed the split of paid job and family responsibility, particularly from the 1960s through the mid-1970s (Bianchi et al. 2006). Concerns about labour force changes and how they affect mothers with young children have been expressed in public opinion polls.

The gender ideology in the survey respondents' levels of support for the allocation of paid job and family obligations showed gender ideology. In addition, the survey revealed that employers are hesitant to hire women who have young children at home. In 1964, the majority of women said that working women had a less warmer relationship with their children. Furthermore, in the mid-1990s, united States labour force suggested that mothers continued to work full and part time (Mason et al. 1976). Understanding gender ideology and why it matters in our lives is necessary to comprehend how couples manage gender roles. Individuals' support for family and work duties is characterized using a variety of terms. Gender ideology, gender role attitudes, and other

categories have been considered by researchers (Davis & Greenstein 2009). The underlying concept of a person's amount of support for paid work and family, Responsibilities and other fields, attitudes on men and women's roles, rights, and responsibilities in society is known as gender ideology (Lorber 1994). Responsibilities and other fields, attitudes on men and women's roles, rights, and responsibilities in society (Lorber 1994). Furthermore, the term 'The Second Shift' was created after women began working outside the home, but it was only in 1989 that Hochschild and Machung released their book *The Second Shift* that the concept was formally considered. Working women face the twin pressure of paid and unpaid work known as the Second Shift (Hochschild & Machung 1989).

In a marriage, there are three ideologies: traditional, transitional, and egalitarian (Day, 2015). Couples who adhere to traditional gender ideologies are more likely to believe that a woman's identity should be based on her home and a man's identity should be based on his career. In general, traditional couples are accustomed to the idea that a man has more influence over his wife (Milkie et al. 2009). Transitional couples are the second marriage ideology. As a way to develop an identity at home and at work, those couples are dual-earner couples. The major ideological challenge linked with this marital position is the discrepancy between what some individuals say and how couples run their households. A transitional woman, for example, wants to work outside the home, but her husband is regarded as the principal wage earner (Davis & Greenstein 2009). the Different couples Ideologies , such as at work or at home, influence each person's roles (Hochschild & Machung 1989), and egalitarian is the most recent relationship ideologies.

An egalitarian woman is more likely to identify as equal to her husband, especially in terms of authority inside the marriage, according to this type of ideology (Thagaard, 1997).

The predominance of the breadwinner role within a family, belief in gendered spheres, working women, motherhood, household labour, and acceptance of male privilege are all examples of gender ideology categories that may be measured (Davis & Greenstein 2009). Researchers have looked into how gender ideology shapes spouses' perceptions of marriage, and the literature suggests that gender ideology has become more common in gender roles over time (Bianchi et al. 2000; Craig 2007; Mattingly & Bianchi 2003; Milkie et al. 2009; Sayer et al. 2009), and in terms of housework division, women's gender ideology moderates the relationship between housework division and the perception of housework division fairness in how couples negotiate gender roles (Bianchi et al. 2009, Amato & Booth 1995).

### ***Gender and How Couples Make Decisions***

Another important element in understanding how couples negotiate gender roles is decision-making and power in the home (Connell) (2005). Couples must make decisions about children, housework, and finances during their marriage. To explain why power is so important in traditional families, Davis and Greenstein (2009) argue that in traditional families, marital couples balance power in terms of the relative studies that each partner contributes to the family: the spouse who contributes more has more power and influence in the decision-making process. In their family research, Fox and Murry (2000) found that even when couples saw their marriage as equal and their family responsibilities as egalitarian, husbands are likely to have more authority in decision-making. Men also utilise their authority to influence the direction of conversations in subtle ways. This indicates that they have an indirect influence on decision-making by refusing to accept some aspects of potential conflict (Ball et al. 1995; Thompson & Walker 1989; Zvonkovic et al. 1994).

When it comes to financial disagreements and women's labour force involvement, research shows that men are less likely to be happy when their spouses earn more money than they do. The income position of their partners tends to make such men feel emasculated (Schaninger & Buss 1986; Wilcox & Dew 2008). The income position of their partners tends to make such guys feel emasculated (Schaninger & Buss 1986; Wilcox & Dew 2008). Some spouses earn more than their wives, according to Schaninger and Buss (1986) and Wilcox and Dew (2008), but this does not cause tension between them. Financial troubles can sometimes devastate a relationship and affect feelings of compassion between partners.

#### **The theoretical perspectives in terms of decision-making processes.**

Men have more power in making decision in the marital relationship, according to social exchange theory, because they have more economic resources, educational advantages, and job options. According to the conflict hypothesis, marriages exist between people who are more likely to compete for power and control of resources through negotiation and conflict management (Sprey, 1971). These viewpoints show that husbands are more likely to wield decision-making authority; yet, there are signs that rising equality is altering decision-making processes (Blumstein & Schwartz 1983; Rogers & Amato 2000). Emerging developments have an impact on how men and women make marital decisions. Many husbands now regard women's rights as equally essential to their own (Davis & Greenstein 2009).

#### ***Gender and the Division of Household Labor***

This section provides an overview of research on gender roles and family labour division. How couples negotiate gender plays a big impact in the home division of labour, according to Davis and Greenstein (2009). Women's principal domain was taking care of the family and household duties, whereas men's domain was the workplace (Bartley et al. 2005). Women's participation in the workforce has limited the amount of time they have available for their families. This has an essential need for couples to find a balance between work demands and household labour. Couples have begun to share home tasks in some ways. In fact, dual-earner couples are more likely than couples where the husband is the main breadwinner to share more household work (DeMeis & Perkins 1996; Fish et al.1992; Greenstein 2000), Cleaning, cooking, and child care are just a few examples of domestic activities that can be divided between partners. Despite the fact that gender roles can be negotiated, Hochschild and Machung (1989) claim that the amount of work is related to gender roles. Traditional female or traditional male tasks are the two categories of household labour; other researchers refer to these as low-control tasks for females and high-control tasks for males (Bartley et al. 2005). Furthermore, low-control tasks like cooking and cleaning provide a service to others, and others rely on individuals who perform them to meet their basic needs, whereas high-control male task professions have little daily impact on others' basic requirements. Furthermore, delaying the completion of their tasks would have no negative consequences for others (Bartley et al. 2005).

Women and men's opinions of women's responsibility for childbearing and child care are connected with people's conceptions of women's responsibility for childbearing and child care,



especially in traditional marriages (Ann-ZofieDuvander, 2019). Some women, on the other hand, will want to participate in various aspects of life, such as returning to work, attending school, or traveling. Notwithstanding the woman's return to work, her husband is less likely to assist and share her in their marriage life, especially in traditional households (Forster & Fox 2012). According to the majority of scholarly research, sharing responsibilities with the other spouse aims to fairness rather than equality in order to achieve marital pleasure (Bartley et al. 2005)

Other couples, such as homosexual couples, must be considered in order to comprehend how couples negotiate gender roles. When studying homosexual couples and their gender roles (Risman & Schwartz 2003), there are two main questions to consider: first, do homosexual couples have to arrange their relationship according to a specific household division by considering masculine and feminine roles; and second, how do gender and power interact with homosexual couples? This comparison of same-sex and different-sex couples is critical in understanding how gender influences the stability of modern partnerships. The literature supports Talcott Parson's theory about the necessity of gender-based labor division (Parson & Bales, 1955). On the other hand, some research reveals that in a homosexual couple's relationship, division of work is vital (Blumstein & Schwartz 1983; Marecek et al. 1982; Peplau & Gordon 1982). While Sutphin (2013) claims that gender, stereotypes influence heterosexual couples' decisions and participation in gender roles, Greenstein (1996) claims that homosexual couples also negotiate gender roles within their families by considering gender stereotypes. Same-sex couples are more likely to share obligations since they are aware of every one responsibility and follow their own chore preferences (Sutphin 2013), by understanding their roles as a partnership, homosexual and heterosexual couples differ.

### ***Gender and Childcare in Families***

Women have traditionally been responsible for child care and housekeeping. This has been the case since women began working and challenged traditional gender roles (Cotter et al. 2001; International Labour Office 2009). The participation of spouses in housework and childcare is linked to family philosophy (Froste & Fox 2012). Furthermore, traditional couples who regard the man to be the breadwinner and the woman to be the homemaker are more likely to be satisfied with their family. Women's participation in the labour force has influenced not only family members, but also family satisfaction (Froste & Fox 2012). Some fathers are less motivated to help with childcare and household chores (Gaertner et al. 2007). The rapidly changing job patterns for women, on the other hand, have encouraged fathers to participate more in childcare and housekeeping (Schochet, 2019). Individuals' divisions of paid work and family responsibilities are classified by gender roles, which are based on separate gender perspectives. Fathers have been shown to be capable caretakers for their children, and their engagement is critical in achieving good societal results (Gaertner et al. 2007). Furthermore, the early development of the father's role in the community is critical, particularly in light of the crucial roles that couples play after the birth of their kid. Furthermore, according to certain studies, the majority of fathers wish to spend more time with their children in order to increase their participation with them (Masciadrelli & Pleck 2005). Fathers' gender ideology is related to how they are involved in childcare, according to studies by Aldous et al. (Gaunt (2006), and Ishii-Kuntz et al. (2004) have found that fathers' gender ideology influences how they approach childcare; yet, some studies, such as that of Marsiglio (1991), have found the opposite—that traditional men are less likely than mothers to devote more time to childcare and other activities. According to the interviews conducted for Marsiglio's (1991) study, egalitarian men believe that their children are a stronger measure of their success than their financial contribution to the family. Even while men's perceptions of success change to include a

balance of work and family life, they face challenges in putting their ideals into action, such as the traditional view that mothers should raise and care for their children while males must just work. Davis and Greenstein (Davis & Greenstein, 2009).

The evidence from previous research studies and the literature review shows that women face inequality not only in the workplace, but also in the home when it comes to the division of labour (Glynn, 2018). As Glynn (2018) suggests, the social relational context is a situation in which hegemonic cultural beliefs about gender are shared and actually impact the gender system, so that gender perceptions define women's and men's roles. Couples' attitudes are changing, according to some researchers, due to rapid changes in the gender system and men and women's roles (Ridgeway & Correll 2004). Females generally take care of their children, but their obligations as employees have grown (Rodriguez-Chamussy, 2013). As a result, fathers are more likely than mothers to participate in childcare. Negotiations between modern spouses are not the same as old negotiations. There would be a significant difference between traditional living arrangements and couples' talks if we compared them (Aldous et al. 1998). When their husbands returned home from work, women were regarded as servants, and it was their role to prepare food and care for the children (Coltrane 1996). Why males did not do more, Coltrane (1996) wondered. Men's roles were restricted at home and to specific responsibilities. Non-traditional couples, on the other hand, have it completely different: both husband and wife frequently work outside the home for long periods, and when they return home, they serve each other instead of the woman serving the man while he is resting (Wendy Klein, 2013).

Why do not they share domestic activities equally if they both work outside the home to accomplish the ideal family goals? (Coltrane 1996). Furthermore, according to Doucet (2009),

there is increasing evidence of gender roles changing through time, such as fathers being more active in child care than in the past. Most moms are more likely to feel terrible about returning to work after leaving their child (Doucet 2009). Mothers are more likely to needed to continue take care of their children, whereas fathers are more likely to sense compelled to work. The idea of habitus, as defined by Bourdieu (1990), refers to everyday activities such as thinking, talking, and gesturing; but it also includes additional dimensions, such as how people treat their bodies to demonstrate habitus disposition. This relates to how many women may feel bad about returning to work after leaving their children (Doucet 2009).

## **Section 2: Scholarship on How Men and Women Negotiate and Manage Changes in the Context of Intermarriage**

This section discusses research on how individuals and couples respond to gender-related changes. The research looks at how couples deal with intersectionality in terms of gender as well as other social factors like race, class, religion, and national origin (Lorber 1994; Risman 2004). People's perspective of gender roles is influenced by race, class, religion, sexuality, national origin, and other social factors both inside and outside of households. Those are more likely to marry people who are in their social group or have a similar position to them (Blau and Duncan 1967; Charles et al. 2013; Kalmijn 1991). However, marriages involving people from other social groups are on the rise, particularly when it comes to cross-racial and ethnic partnerships (LIVINGSTON, 2017). Intermarriages of all kinds have long been known as presenting challenges to couples, including how to negotiate the expectations of many religious rituals and cultural customs (Schwartz et al. 2016). Scholars have recently begun to look into how marriages influences gender discussions.

### ***Racial Intermarriage***

Racial and gender stereotypes have influenced certain people's life outcomes, such as work prospects, housing, education, and marriage, and cultural and social interactions have changed as a result of the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s and changes in immigration laws. Intermarriage between black and white people has been observed for a long time, and it is on the rise (Fu, 2010). Many research studies on White interracial marriages have focused on this topic. In today's marriages, the tendency indicates a growing embrace of a diverse community (Fu, 2010). Because of the variations in their personalities and traits, interracial couples are more likely to face pressures. Furthermore, interracial couples frequently maintain a connection that is similar relationship same-race couples (Canlas, 2015). Interracial couples face some situations differently than same-race couples. These can occur as a result of behavioural differences: In comparison to white husbands, African American men are more likely to spend more time doing housekeeping (Canlas, 2015). According to Orbuch and Custer (1995), African American men's participation in housework has no effect on their well-being; nevertheless, white husbands who do more housework are more likely to have greater levels of anxiety than those who do less housework (Orbuch & Custer 1995). This shows that, when compared to same-race couples, interracial couples are more inclined to interact with non-harmful housekeeping activities. To comprehend how couples negotiate gender roles, it is necessary to analyse how ethnicity influences gender arrangements (Lareau 2003).

(Killian 2001) investigates the significance of race in interracial dating. According to the findings, white and black men in interracial marriages are more likely to focus on their partner's physical attractiveness, whereas women focus on their partners' personalities and ways of relating to them as people (Killian 2001). This illustrates how couples of different races perceive their spouse in terms of race. Many interracial couples face discrimination, especially if the husband or wife is

white, the level of discrimination may differ depending on where they live. That is to say, many interracial couples face opposition from persons who do not approve of their relationship, and one of these challenges is understanding how interracial marriage is perceived by couples' families (Anderson 2014). In addition, some theories are look at what leads people to marry beyond their race in the face of these difficulties. Interracial couples marry outside their racial/ethnic group or class to rebel against their relatives, according to the ideas (Davidson 1992). According to Phillips & Sweeney (2006), multiracial couples had more marital stability. Interracial marriages are less stable than endogamous marriages, according to this study. Stress, societal rejection, and cultural differences are more likely to produce problems for interracial couples (Phillips & Sweeney 2006; Zhang & Van Hook 2009). According to Killian (2001), partners of various races negotiate different identities depending on race and gender, presenting themselves as insiders or outsiders within the prevailing society (Killian 2001). Furthermore, Latinos, American Indians, and Asian Americans are the most likely to marry Whites. African Americans, on the other hand, are the least likely to marry whites, despite the fact that cohabiting with mixed-race couples is beneficial to them (Qian & Lichter 2007). Scholars have also debated problems such as the ability to detect interracial marriages (Waters 2000). Because the US Census changed the racial classification section, estimates of the number of interracial couples have been affected. Individuals might choose to identify as belonging to more than one race in the 2000 Census. Individuals who were debating their race self-identification in a less formal way have been influenced (DaCosta 2007; Zhou 2004). When making decisions concerning their children's opportunities in society, interracial marriage also struggles with race and gender power imbalances in terms of being conscious of negative public reactions and worries. People's self-identification with race has evolved through time, and they are now more prone to blur the borders between racial

classifications. These are key elements that interracial couples face, and they define their gender perception toward each other inside a relationship (Killian 2001).

### *Class Intermarriage*

Families' social class, as well as individuals within families, must be identified because they are exposed to a variety of socioeconomic resources that influence their lifestyle in order to comprehend gender roles (Comer 1978). Furthermore, social class has been determined by taking into consideration educational attainment, income, and occupation, either alone or in combination. In terms of social interactions, Collins (1988) stated that social class was the difference between the working and middle classes. Individuals from the working class were more likely to be "order takers," but those from the middle class were more likely to be "order givers" (Collins 1988). Due to the fact that they are dual-earner couples and married, defining social status when they are married might be difficult. In the past, researchers used the husband's employment to define social status because he was usually the family's principal provider (Perry-Jenkins & Folk 1994). For husband and wife, Perry-Jenkins and Folk (1994) define socioeconomic class separately. They think about occupations that don't require any degree or income. This shows that recent studies have changed their social class measurement to look at women and husbands separately.

While gender studies look into many elements of family life, social class and how it affects couples' gender roles has received less attention. According to (Bartley, 2005), social class moderates the relationship between family division of labour and the marital relationship in dual-earner couples. Streib (2015) studies what happens when couples from various social classes marry and how this affects gender roles negotiation. According to theories, cultural compatibility is important when choosing a marriage partner: cross-class couples are more likely to be drawn to the other couple's



class-based cultural differences (Streib 2015). It has been suggested that marriage between a middle-class and a working-class individual can result in different points of view on decision-making, child care, financial decisions, career advancement, and how to spend free time together as a couple, and that this may affect how they negotiate gender roles (Streib 2015). Even though class variety has helped to bring cross-class couples together, it has a detrimental impact on couples by increasing conflicts, such as over money, leisure, parenting, and coping with emotions (Kanieski 2015). Furthermore, white-collar couples are more likely to take a managerial approach to their finances, such as managing their spending habits, employment choices, and leisure time. Those from the blue-collar class, on the other hand, are more prone to have a more laissez-faire approach to spending money (Kanieski 2015).

When it comes to gender roles and social status, white-collar women want to enrol their children in a variety of scheduled activities, much to the chagrin of blue-collar husbands (Streib 2015). White-collar origin men, on the other hand, are more prone to disagree on parenting issues than blue-collar origin wives. In addition, there are gender and socioeconomic connections between couples in housekeeping. Housework chores are less likely to be performed by men from both classes. In terms of dividing domestic tasks, white-collar wives have higher expectations of their spouses than blue-collar wife. When compared to women from blue-collar backgrounds, white-collar women are more likely to be annoyed by their husbands (Streib 2015).

According to another study, middle-class individuals who marry working-class spouses are more likely to adopt different career advancement models, such as encouraging their spouse to pursue additional education or encouraging them to be more self-directed, because this affects the negotiation of gender roles between partners to meet community standards (Bowles et al. 2005). Furthermore, a person's social class has an impact on how they raise their children. Middle-class



and African-American families are more likely to rely on institutions like childcare or schools to raise their children, with little or no parental participation (Lareau 2003). Interclass marriages might lead to couples making diverse gender roles decisions.

### ***Other Forms of Intermarriage***

It is critical to understand the impact of interracial and interclass marriages on gender roles, as this is a growing trend. Given the rise in interfaith marriages, and how do they affect the gender roles of couples (Onedera 2008).

The smaller community's religious group, the more probable an individual is to marry someone from a different religious group (Davidson & Widman 2002). There is a large body of evidence showing interfaith marriage is a significant determinant of the marital stability. According to numerous studies, religious heterogamete is more likely to cause destabilizing effects. The growing trend indicates how diversified and accepting society of the interfaith weddings (Verma, 2017). Interfaith couples, like past kinds of marriage such as interracial and interclass marriages, may face problems in marrying outside the group (Stritof, 2020).

Marriage between people of different religions is referred as interfaith marriage. When it comes to the majority of Americans, it appears that marrying someone with comparable demographics is the usual (Gardyn 2002; Kalmijn 1998). There is social pressure since some religious institutions discourage people from marrying people of different faiths. Many religious institutions, according to Kalmijn (1998), try to limit marrying of couples from different religions because they are afraid of losing a member to another religion. Many religious institutions, according to Kalmijn (1998), try to limit marrying of couples from different religions because they are afraid of losing a member to another religion. According to the Catholic Church and the Canon Law Society of America (1983), a dispensation is required for mixed marriages. On the other hand, Jewish biblical and

rabbinical law state that intermarrying is forbidden (Rudolph 2003). Muslim men may marry Christian women in Islam, but Muslim women may not marry Christian men until the male converts to Islam (Leeman 2009). These are just a few religious institutions' views on interfaith weddings, and it is clear that they differ in a variety of ways.

Furthermore, people who marry from different religions may face difficulties. Religious identity development (Sousa 1995), religious socialisation of children (Judd 1990; Williams & Lawler 2000), and religious practises and holiday gatherings are more likely to be challenges (Horowitz 1999; Onedera 2008). Religious intermarriage has affected the process of negotiating these challenges, according to Sherkat's (2004) research, because couples view the issues through different lenses. Spousal disagreement and domestic violence may become more prevalent, leading to divorce in some circumstances (Scott, 1995). According to (Triandis 1995), a woman from a communal culture who marries a guy from an individualistic society would experience numerous obstacles. These difficulties may result in marriage problems or, in the worst-case , therapy (Triandis 1995).

With the rise in interfaith marriages, questions about the impact of raising children in one religion or how couples negotiate this element of marriage continue to arise. This is a difficult issue for couples to make, and if they can't agree on how to raise their children religiously, it could cause problems for both the parents and their children (Gleckman & Streicher 1990; Peterson & Remsen 1988). When interfaith spouses are arguing about their children's religion, for example, the holidays are a major point of conflict. Couples are more likely to deal with this situation by avoiding an argument or reaching an agreement (Horowitz 1999). According to Mayer (1985), two out of every three children raised in Christian-Jewish marriages are unlikely to be nurtured in a formal religious context chosen by their parents. Creating a hybrid environment, in which two

religious affiliations are divided equally, or an informal religious environment are two options that interfaith couples may be considered (Gleckman & Streicher 1990; Peterson & Remsen 1988). If couples are involved in interfaith marriage, this means that they will need to negotiate gender roles for these types of decisions (Kalmijn 1998).

### **Section 3: How Couples Manage Changes to the Gender Context**

#### ***Couples, Gender, and Cultural Differences***

As societies become more diverse and international, people have been pushed to marry others who are culturally different from them (Bustamante et al. 2011). Gender negotiation refers to how couples deal with changes in the external gender context, and it concerns couples. Intercultural marriage is defined by Ho (1990) as a marriage between two persons from distinct cultural backgrounds, such as different ethnicities, races, religions, or cultures (Asante & Gudykunst 1989; Kim 2001; Perel 2000; Ting-Toomey 1999; Ting-Toomey & Oetzel 2001). While there is limited study on intercultural couples, there is evidence that cultural differences in marriage may contribute to marital distress, which might be addressed through therapy sessions (Molina et al. 2004; Root 2001; Waldman & Rubalcava 2005). According to some researchers, intercultural couples are more likely to face pressures that are different from those that influence same-culture couples (Falicov 1995; Fu & Heaton 2000; Sung 1990). To comprehend how intercultural couples negotiate gender roles, it is necessary to comprehend the challenges they face during marriage, the types of stressors they experience and how they differ from same-culture couples, as well as how intercultural couples adjust to cultural differences in order to have a successful relationship.

When couples from different cultures migrate to a different culture, their marriages experience many challenges (Ridgeway & Smith-Lovin 1999). The acceptance of different cultures has expanded because of globalization; nonetheless, cross-cultural couples face challenges in

maintaining their cultural identities. Because intercultural couples have different values, traditions, and habits than couples from the same culture, they are more likely to have conflicts (Hsu 2001). The risk of misunderstanding is another factor that is increasingly hurting multicultural partnerships. Couples that are intercultural must also learn coping strategies. Although some researchers believe that intercultural marriages present difficulties, others believe that intercultural marriages provide an opportunity for couples to learn from each other or move forward without focusing on cultural differences (Heller & Wood 2007; Romano 2001). These researchers show how intercultural couples deal with cultural stressors in order to have a happy relationship. Furthermore, intercultural couples, according to Falicov (1995), have balanced or unbalanced opinions on their cultural differences. Couples with imbalanced perceptions of one other are more likely to be unhappy, whereas couples with balanced views of each other are more likely to integrate rather than ignore the two cultures. One of the most frequent issues that international couples experience is a lack of self-awareness of cultural differences, which can limit their ability to interact culturally (Falicov 1995). Another study looked at white women's attitudes of interracial marriages and concluded that intercultural couples are more likely to marry for the same reasons as other couples, such as love, common goals, and compatibility (Watts & Henriksen 1999). According to the findings, multicultural couples are more similar than different in their motivations and values (Bustamante et al. 2011).

Kellner (2009) also claims that married men and women in individualistic societies like the United States are more likely to be flexible in their roles. Gender roles are highly distinct in collective cultures such as Asian and Middle Eastern countries, and women are more likely to be defined by their allegiance to men (Stewart & Ting-Toomey 1987). Furthermore, the influence of distinct cultural values and identities on a couple's interactions can form and organize their interactions.

This emphasizes the significance of couples discussing their cultural backgrounds and gender norms (Kellner 2009).

### ***International Migration***

International migration has become a trend, similar to other growing marriage patterns such as interracial, interfaith, and intercultural marriages. Immigration legislation, foreign labor, and gender roles in the nation of origin are all variables that have contributed to this tendency (Castles & Miller 2003). When it comes to international migration couples, women's duties aren't taken into account because they either follow their husbands or act like males when it comes to migration (Kofman 1999). Furthermore, studies show that women are not just a fraction of migrants, but they can also be the major migrants. This shows that women are more likely than males to have different migration experiences (Kofman 1999; Mahler 1998).

The adaptation to the new country is the first challenge that global migration couples experience (Arias 2013). Getting employment for both partners in the same city is a challenge. Furthermore, Junge et al. (2014) claim that couples with or without children are more likely to emigrate if both are pursuing a high-level education. According to the research sample, another study by Hyman et al. (2008) reveals that international migration results in changes in gender roles for participants coming from Ethiopia to Toronto. When it comes to the gender roles of international migrant couples, if the man is the primary earner in the family, emigration is more likely, whereas if the female is the primary earner in the family, the chances are smaller. The results indicate that couples with both male and female primary earners, there is a considerable self-selection into return migration based on primary earner's income.

Non-Nordic countries have the strongest self-selection patterns. (1987, Borjas) Self-selection into return migration, according to the argument, emphasizes selection patterns in the initial migratory

flow between two countries. In this regard, Denmark, with its narrow income distribution, would attract a higher proportion of immigrants from the lowest income group (Jensen, 2007) Furthermore, the degree of choice between spouses is influenced by gender. For example, in many cases when deciding to migrate, both partners make the decision, and the entire family migrates together. This implies that in some situations, women may not have complete control over their decisions (Boyd 1989; Hugo, 1995). The experience of migration is also influenced by gender. Furthermore, international migration is more than just a move: it is a personal experience that people go through (Chell 1997; Lazaridis 2000). In fact, women and men who move may have different experiences with discrimination and harassment. Female international migrants are frequently sexually assaulted harassment based on their background (Estrada-Claudio 1992; Lazaridis 2000).

Men and women's gender relations might be affected by international migration. Many researches have looked into whether female migrants have a better social position as a result of their migration (Brochmann 1990; Tienda & Booth 1991). When it comes to women's position, when their husbands are working abroad, they are more likely to be more independent as a migrant or as the head of the household (Vasquez 1992). Furthermore, the impacts of migration on foreign migrants' gender roles are conflicting. According to Tienda & Booth (1991), the outcomes could be repaired asymmetries.

The Philippine migration is one of the gendered migration situations that many researchers have looked into. The connection between gender relations and migration has been studied in depth. Since the mid-1970s, temporary foreign employment has been an important aspect of the Philippine economy and of the Filipino families. Furthermore, about 1994, the number of people

working in other countries rose. The proportion of female workers in abroad employment increased from 30% in 1975 to 60% in 1994, indicating that gender employment options have altered to incorporate more females (Gonzalez 1998; Lim and Oishi 1996). Because males work in construction and production industries in the Middle East and women work in service and entertainment jobs, there is a division of labour among Filipino migrants.

Domestic workers are the most common occupation for female Filipino migrants in the Middle East (Tyner 1997). Furthermore, much of the material highlights the suffering of migratory female Filipinos. The majority of their misery comes from the terrible working conditions they are forced to endure for the sake of their families (Gonzalez 1998). They must embrace international career chances with their difficult conditions in order to offer a better lifestyle for their family. Overall, migration can be seen as a problem in all communities because it compels traditional gender roles to shift (Kanaiaupuni, 2000). Not only can they have to put up with an abusive work conditions in order to provide for their families, but they also have to deal with the emotional distress of thinking about their husbands or family members. In fact, some husbands force their wives to send them their allowances in order to meet the family's needs for food and other necessities.

Gender roles are more likely to differ dependent on the primary reasons for their migration when studying the international migrant couples and what they go through. Couples that migrate internationally tend to negotiate gender roles in order to accept better chances and improve their lifestyle (Junge et al. 2014). Some couples who live in different countries may have a harder time comprehending gender roles, which might influence their ability to negotiate gender roles as a partnership.

## **Conclusion**

This research aimed to achieve a better knowledge of how couples individually and socially negotiate and manage the gender environment. First, I discussed gender and couples scholarship. In that section, I talked about gender ideology and marriage, gender and how couples make decisions, gender and household work division, and gender and childcare in family beliefs. Second, I looked at research on how men and women deal with change in the context of intermarriage. Racial intermarriage, class intermarriage, and other forms of intermarriage involving individuals of different religions, tribes, castes, nationalities, or racial groups, such as a white person and a Black person or a Christian and a Muslim, were all included in this section.

The final part is looked at how couples dealt with changes in their gender roles. I discussed how couples deal with cultural differences in that section. In addition, I have highlighted how foreign couples negotiate gender roles and gender ideology, as well as the negotiations and techniques used by two-income couples to deal with the demand for housework. I looked at how changes in women's gender roles and their involvement in social, political, and economic surroundings affect their presence in the framework of the relationship through a review of the literature. My goal is for readers to gain a better understanding of how couples negotiate gender roles in a variety of ways by examining particular variables that influence the negotiation process. In this paper, gender differences in couples were discussed, as well as variations in responsibilities in the home and at work.



- Amato R, Booth A. 1995. Changes in gender role attitudes and perceived marital quality. *American Sociological Review* 60: 58–66.
- Aldous J, Mulligan GM, Bjarnason T. 1998. Fathering over time: what makes the difference? *Journal of Marriage and Family* 4: 809–820. doi:10.2307/353626
- Aldous J, Mulligan GM, Bjarnason T. 1998. Fathering over time: what makes the difference? *Journal of Marriage and Family* 4: 809–820. doi:10.2307/353626
- Arias P. 2013. International migration and familial change in communities of origin: transformation and resistance. *Annual Review of Psychology* 39: 429–450.

- Asante MK, Gudykunst WB. 1989. *Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ball, J., Cowan, P., & Cowan, P. 1995. Who's got the power? Gender differences in partners' perceptions of influence during marital problem-solving discussions. *Family Process*, 34,303-321.
- Bartley S, Balnton P, Gilliard J. 2005. Husbands and Wives in Dual-Earner Marriages; Decision -Making, Gender Role attitudes, Division of Household Labor, and Equity. *Marriage and Family Review*.
- Ball, J., Cowan, P., & Cowan, P. (1995). Who's got the power? Gender differences in partners' perceptions of influence during marital problem-solving discussions. *Family Process*, 34, 303-321.
- Bianchi SM, Milkie MA, Sayer LC, Robinson JP. 2000. Is anyone doing the housework: trends in the gender division of household labor. *Soc. Forces* 79:191–228
- Bianchi SM, Robinson JP, Milkie MA. 2006. *Changing Rhythms of American Family Life*. New York: Russell Sage Found.
- Blau P, Duncan OD. 1967. *The American Occupational Structure*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Blumstein P, Schwatz P. 1983. *American couples; Money, work, sex*. New York; William Morrow.
- Bourdieu P. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bowles S, Gintis H, Groves M. 2005. *Unequal Chances: Family Background and Economic Success*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Boyd M. 1989. Family and personal networks in international migration: recent developments and new agendas. *International Migration Review* 23(3): 638–670.
- Brochmann G. 1990. *The Middle East Avenue: Female Migration from Sri Lanka to the Gulf*. Oslo: Institutt for Samfunnsforskning.
- Bustamante RM, et al. 2011. Intercultural couples: coping with culture-related stressors. *The Family Journal* 19(2): 154–164. doi:10.1177/1066480711399723
- Castles S, Miller MJ. 2003. *The Age of Migration. International Population Movements in the Modern World*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Catholic Church and Canon Law Society of America. 1983. *Code of Canon Law: Latin English Edition*. Catholic Church and Canon Law Society of America.
- Charles K, Hurst E, Killewald A. 2013. Marital Sorting and Parental Wealth. *Demography* 50 (1):51-70.
- Chell V. 1997. Gender-selective migration: Somalian and Filipina women in Rome. Southern Europe and the new immigrations. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press. 75-92.
- Cherlin A, Walters PB. 1981. Trends in United States men's and women's sex-role attitudes: 1972–1978. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 46:453–60
- Chodorow N. 1978. The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender.
- Collins R. 1988. Women and men in the class structure. *Journal of Family Issues* 9(1): 27–50. doi:10.1177/019251388009001003

- Coltrane S. 1989. Household labor and the routine production of gender. *Social Problems* 36: 473–449.
- Coltrane S. 1996. *Family Man: Fatherhood, Housework, and Gender Equity*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Comer L. 1978. The question of women and class. *Women's Studies International Quarterly* 1: 165–173.
- Cotter D.A., Hermsen, J.M., & R. Vanneman. 2001. Women's Work and Working Women: The Demand for Female Labor. *Gender & Society* 15(3):429-452
- Craig, L. 2007. Is There a Second Shift, and if so, Who Does it? A Time- Diary Investigation. *Feminist Review* 86: 149-170.
- DaCosta KM. 2007. *Making Multiracial: State, Family, and Market in the Redrawing of the Color Line*. Stanford, CA; Stanford University Press.
- Davidson JD, Widman T. 2002. The effect of group size on interfaith marriage among Catholics. *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5906.00126>
- Davidson JR.1992 . Theories about Black-White interracial marriage: A clinical perspective. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 20(4), 150–157. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161->
- Davis S, Greenstein T. 2009. Gender ideology: components, predictors, and consequences. *Annual Review of Sociology* 35: 87–105.
- DeMeis DK, Perkins HW. 1996.” Supermoms” of the nineties; Homemaker and employed mothers’ performance and perceptions of the motherhood role. *Journal of Family Issues*.

- Doucet A. 2009. Gender equality and gender differences: parenting, habitus, and embodiment. *Canadian Review of Sociology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-618X.2009.01206.x>
- Estrada-Claudio S. 1992. Unequal exchanges. International tourism and overseas employment. *Community Development Journal* 27(4): 402–410.
- Falicov CJ. 1995. Cross-cultural marriages. In *Clinical Handbook of Couple Therapy*, ed. N Jacobson, A Gurman, pp. 231–246. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Ferree MM. 1987. Family and job for working class women: gender and class systems seen from below. In *Families and Work*, ed. N Getstel, H Gross, pp. 289–301. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ferree MM. 1990. Beyond separate spheres: feminism and family research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 52: 886–894.
- Ferree MM, Lorber J, Hess B. 1999. Revisioning gender. *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* 27(1): Article 16.
- Fish, L. S., New, R. S., & Van Cleave, N. J. (1992). Shared parenting in dual-income families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 62, 83-92
- Forster R, Fox K. 2012. Household labor, gender roles, and family satisfaction: a cross-national comparison. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 43(5): 613–631.
- Fox G, Murry, V. 2000. Gender and Families: Feminist Perspectives and Family Research. *Journal of Marriage and Family*.62.1160-1172.10.1111/j.1741-3737. 2000. 01160.
- Froste R, Fox K. 2012. Household Labor, Gender Roles, and Family Satisfaction: A Cross-National Comparison. *Journal of Comparitve Family Studies*. 43. 613-631.

- Gaertner B, Spinrad T, Eisenberg N, Greving K. 2007. Parental Childrearing Attitudes as Correlates of Father Involvement During Infancy. *Journal of Marriage and the family*. 69.962-976. 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00424.
- Gardyn R. 2002. Breaking the rules of engagement. *American Demographics*. 24(7), 35-37.
- Gaunt R. 2006. Biological essentialism, gender ideologies, and role attitudes: what determines parents involvement in child care. *Sex Roles* 55(7): 523–533.
- Gleckman AD, Streicher PJ. 1990. The potential for difficulties: interventions and implications for the mental health counselor. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling* 12: 480–494.
- Glenn EN. 1999. The social construction and institutionalization of gender and race. In *Revisioning Gender*, ed. MM Feree, J Lorber, BB Hess, pp. 3–43. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Glenn EN. 2002. *Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gonzalez JL. 1998. *Philippine Labour Migration: Critical Dimensions of Public Policy*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Greenstein T. 1996. Husbands' participation in domestic labor: interactive effects of wives' and husbands' gender ideologies. *J. Marriage Fam.* 58: 585–595.
- Greenstein T. 2000. Economic dependence, gender, and the division of labor in the home; A replication and extension. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*.

- Heller PE, Wood B. 2007. The influence of religious and ethnic differences on marital intimacy: intermarriage versus intramarriage. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy* 26: 241–252.
- ochschild A, Machung A. 1989. *The Second Shift*. New York, NY: Viking.
- Horowitz JA. 1999. Negotiating couplehood: the process of resolving the December dilemma among interfaith couples. *Family Process* 38: 303–323.
- Hsu J. 2001. Marital therapy for intercultural couples. In *Culture and Psychotherapy: A Guide to Clinical Practice*, ed. WS Tseng, J Streltzer, pp. 225–242. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- Hyman I, Guruge S, Mason R. 2008. The impact of migration on marital relationships: a study of Ethiopian immigrants in Toronto. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 39(2): 149.
- International Labour Office. 2009. *Global Employment Trends for Women*, March 2009. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Office.
- Ishii-Kuntz M, Makino K, Kato K, Tsuchiya M. 2004. Japanese fathers of preschoolers and their involvement in childcare. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66(3): 779–791.
- Judd EP. 1990. Intermarriage and the maintenance of religio-ethnic identity: A case study: The Denver Jewish community. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 21(2): 251–268.
- Junge M, Martin M, Poutvaara P. 2014. *International migration of couples*. CESifo Working Paper Series No. 4927. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2483721>
- Kalmijn M. 1991. Status homogamy in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology* 97(3). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2781777>

- Kalmijn M. 1998. Intermarriage and homogamy: causes, patterns, trends. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 1998(24): 395–421.
- Kalmijn, M. 1993. Trends in black/white intermarriage. *Social Forces*, 72, 119-146. doi:10.2307/2580162
- Kanieski MA. 2015. Review of *The Power of the Past: Understanding Cross-Class Marriages*. Jessi Streib. Reviewed by Mary Ann Kanieski. *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* 42(3): Article 12.
- Kellner J. 2009. Gender perspective in cross-cultural couples. *Clinical Social Work Journal* 37: 224–229.
- Killian K. 2001. Crossing borders. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy* 13(1): 1–31.
- Kim YY. 2001. Mapping the domain of intercultural communication: an overview. *Communication Yearbook* 24: 139–157.
- Kofman E. 1999. Female 'birds of passage' a decade later: gender and immigration in the European Union. *International Migration Review* 33(2): 269–299.
- Lareau A. 2003. *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lazaridis G. 2000. Filipino and Albanian women migrant workers in Greece: multiple layers of oppression. In *Gender and Migration in Southern Europe*, ed. F Anthias, G Lazaridis, Oxford: Berg.
- Leeman A. 2009. Interfaith marriage in Islam: an examination of the legal theory behind the traditional and reformist positions. *Indiana Law Journal* 84: 743–771.
- Lorber J. 1994. *Paradoxes of Gender*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.



- Mahler SJ. 1998. Theoretical and empirical contributions toward a research agenda for transnationalism. in *Transnationalism from Below*, ed. MP Smith, LE Guarnizo, pp. 64–100. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Mason KO, Czajka JL, Arber S. 1976. Change in U.S. women's sex-role attitudes: 1964–1974. *Am. Social. Rev.* 41:573–96
- Mattingly, MJ, Suzanne B. 2003. Gender Differences in the Quantity and Quality of Free Time: The U.S. Experience. *Social Forces* 81(3): 999-1030.
- Marecek, J., Finn, E. S., Cardell, M. 1982. Gender roles in the relationships of lesbians and gay men. *J. Homosexual.* 8(2):45-49
- Marsiglio W. 1991. Paternal engagement activities with minor children. *J. Marriage Fam.* 53:973–86
- Masciadrelli, B., & Pleck, J. H. (2003, November). Men, generativity, and fathering: What experiences are necessary? Presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Vancouver.
- Mayer E. 1985. *Love and Tradition: Marriage Between Jews and Christians*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Milkie, M., Raley, S., & Bianchi, S. 2009. Taking on the Second Shift: Time Allocations and Time Pressures of U.S. Parents with Preschoolers. *Social Forces*, 88(2), 487-517. Retrieved April 30, 2020, from [www.jstor.org/stable/40645814](http://www.jstor.org/stable/40645814)
- Moen P, Wethington E. 1992. The concept of family adaptive strategies. *Annual Review of Sociology* 18: 233–251.

- Molina B, Estrada D, Burnett JA. 2004. Cultural communities: challenges and opportunities in the creation of 'happily ever after' stories of intercultural couplehood. *Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families* 12: 139–147.
- Onedera JD. 2008. *The Role of Religion in Marriage and Family Counseling. The Family Therapy and Counseling Series*. Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Orbuch TL, Custer L. 1995. The social context of married women's work and its impact on Black husbands and White husbands. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 57: 333–345.
- Orbuch TL, Eyster SL. 1997. Division of household labor among Black couples and White couples. *Social Forces* 76: 201–333.
- Peplau, A. L., Gordon, S. L. 1982. The intimate relationships of lesbians and gay men. In *Gender Roles and Sexual Behavior*, ed. E. R. Allgeier, N. B. McCormick, Palo Alto, Cal: Mayfield
- Perel E. 2000. A tourist's view of marriage. In *Couples on the Fault Line*, ed. P Papp, pp. 178–204. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Perry-Jenkins M, Folk K. 1994. Class, couples, and conflict: effects of the division of labor on assessments of marriage in dual-earner families. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 56(1): 165–180.
- Petsonk J, Remsen J. 1988. *The Intermarriage Handbook: A Guide for Jews and Christians*. New York, NY: William Morrow.
- Pina DL, Bengtson VL. 1993. The division of household labor and wives' happiness: Ideology, employment, and perceptions of support. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*.

- Phillips J, Sweeney M. 2006. Can differential exposure to risk factors explain recent racial and ethnic variation in marital disruption? *Social Science Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2005.04.002>
- Qian Z, Lichter DT. 2007. Social boundaries and marital assimilation: interpreting trends in racial and ethnic intermarriage. *American Sociological Review* 72(1): 68–94.
- Ridgeway C. 1997. Interaction and the conservation of gender inequality: considering employment. *American Sociological Review* 62(2): 218–235.
- Ridgeway C, Correll S. 2004. Unpacking the gender system: a theoretical perspective on gender beliefs and social relations. *Gender & Society* 18(4): 510–531.
- Ridgeway C, Smith-Lovin L. 1999. The gender system and interaction. *Annual Review of Sociology* 25: 191–216.
- Risman J, Schwartz P. 1989. *Gender in inmate relationships*. Belmont, CA; Wadsworth.
- Risman BJ. 1998. *Gender Vertigo: American Families in Transition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Risman BJ. 2004. Gender as a social structure: theory wrestling with activism. *Gender and Society* 18(4): 429–450.
- Romano D. 2001. *Intercultural Marriage*. Yarmouth, MA: Intercultural Press. 2nd ed.
- Rogers SJ, Amato PR. 2000. *Have changes in gender relations affected marital quality?* *Social Forces*, 79, 731-753.
- Rudolph DJ. 2003. *Growing your Olive Tree Marriage: A Guide for Couples from Two Traditions*. Baltimore, MD: Lederer Books.

- Sayer, LC., England P, Bittman M, and Bianchi S. 2009. “How Long is the Second (Plus First) Shift? Gender Differences in Paid, Unpaid, and Total Work Time in Australia and the United States.” *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 40: 523-545.
- Schaninger C, Buss C. 1986. A longitudinal comparison of consumption and finance handling between happily married and divorced couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 48(1): 129–136.
- Schwartz CR, Zeng Z, Xie Y. 2016. Marrying up by marrying down: status exchange between social origin and education in the United States. *Sociological Science* 3: 1003–1027. doi:10.15195/v3.a44
- Sousa L.A. 1995. Interfaith Marriage and the individual and Family Life Cycle. *Family Therapy: The Journal of the California Graduate School of Family Psychology*, 22(2),97-104.
- Stewart L, Ting-Toomey S. 1987. *Communication, Gender, and Sex Roles in Diverse Interaction Contexts*. New York, NY: Ablex Publishing Corp.
- Streib J. 2015. *The Power of the Past: Understanding Cross-Class Marriages*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Sung K. 1990. A new look at filial piety: ideals and practices of family-centered parent care in Korea. *Gerontologist* 30: 610–617.
- Sutphin S. 2013. The division of child care tasks in same-sex couples. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies* 9(5): 474–491.
- Thompson L, Walker AJ. 1989. Gender in families: Women and men in marriage, work and parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51, 845-871.
- Thompson L. 1991. Family work. *Journal of Family Issues*, 12, 181-196.

- Tienda M, Booth K. 1991. Gender, migration and social change. *International Sociology* 6(1): 51–72.
- Ting-Toomey S. 1999. *Communicating Across Cultures*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Ting-Toomey S, Oetzel J. 2001. *Managing Intercultural Conflict Effectively*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Triandis HC. 1995. *New Directions in Social Psychology. Individualism & Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Tyner JA. 1997. Constructing images, constructing policy: the case of Filipina migrant performing artists. *Gender, Place and Culture* 4(1):19–35.
- Vasquez N. 1992. Economic and social impact of labor migration. In *Philippine Labor Migration*, ed. G Battistella, A Paganoni, Quezon City, Philippines: Scalabrini Migration Center.
- Waldman K, Rubalcava L. 2005. Psychotherapy with intercultural couples: a contemporary psychodynamic approach. *American Journal of Psychotherapy* 59: 227–245.
- Waters MC. 2000. Immigration, intermarriage, and the challenges of measuring racial/ethnic identities. *American Journal of Public Health*. 90(11): 1735–1737.
- Watts RE, Henriksen RC Jr. 1999. Perceptions of a White female in an interracial relationship. *The Family Journal* 7: 68–70.
- Wilcox B, Dew J. 2008. *No one best way: work-family strategies, the gendered division of parenting, and the contemporary marriages of mothers and fathers*. Paper presented at a conference at the University of Virginia. Charlottesville, VA.
- Williams LM, Lawler MG. 2000. The challenges and rewards of interchurch marriages. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* 19: 205–218.

- Zhang Y, Van Hook J. 2009. *Marital Dissolution Among Interracial Couples*. Wiley Online Library. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00582.x>
- Zhou M. 2004. *Are Asian Americans becoming White?* Contexts 2: 29–37.
- Zvonkovic AM, Schmiede CJ, Hall LD. 1994. *Influence strategies used when couples make work-family decisions and their importance for marital satisfaction*. Family Relations, 43, 182-188.
- Ann-ZofieDuvander. (2019, April 02). *Who makes the decision to have children? Couples' childbearing intentions and actual childbearing*. Retrieved from sciencedirect: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1040260818300790>
- Bartley, S. J. (2005). *Husbands and Wives in Dual-Earner Marriages: Decision-Making, Gender Role Attitudes, Division of Household Labor, and Equity*.
- Borjas, G. (1987). *Self-Selection and the earnings of immigrants*. American Economic Review.
- Canlas, J. M. (2015, June 1). *Same-Race and Interracial Asian-White Couples: Relational and Social Contexts and Relationship Outcomes*. Retrieved from researchgate: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287490097\\_Same-Race\\_and\\_Interracial\\_Asian-White\\_Couples\\_Relational\\_and\\_Social\\_Contexts\\_and\\_Relationship\\_Outcomes](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287490097_Same-Race_and_Interracial_Asian-White_Couples_Relational_and_Social_Contexts_and_Relationship_Outcomes)
- Day, M. V. (2015). *Why people defend relationship ideology*. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships.
- Fu, V. K. (2010, october 5). *Remarriage, Delayed Marriage, and Black/White Inter-marriage*, . Retrieved from jstor: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40835614>

- Glynn, S. J. (2018, MAY 18). *An Unequal Division of Labor How Equitable Workplace Policies Would Benefit Working Mothers*. Retrieved from americanprogress: <https://americanprogress.org/article/unequal-division-labor/>
- Jensen, P. a. (2007). *To Stay or Not to Stay? Out-migration of Immigrants from*. 45(5): 87-113, .
- Kanaiaupuni, S. M. (2000, january 4). *Reframing the Migration Question: An Analysis of Men, Women, and Gender in Mexico*. Retrieved from jstor: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3006176>
- LIVINGSTON, G. (2017, MAY 18). *Intermarriage in the U.S. 50 Years After Loving v. Virginia*. Retrieved from pewresearch: <https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2017/05/18/intermarriage-in-the-u-s-50-years-after-loving-v-virginia/>
- Rodriguez-Chamussy, L. (2013 ). *Childcare and Women's Labor Participation*.
- Schochet, L. (2019, March 28). *The Child Care Crisis Is Keeping Women Out of the Workforce*. Retrieved from americanprogress: <https://americanprogress.org/article/child-care-crisis-keeping-women-workforce/>
- Scott, S. B. (2013 , January 2). *Reasons for Divorce and Recollections of Premarital Intervention: Implications for Improving Relationship Education*. Retrieved from ncbi: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4012696/>
- Sprey, J. (1971). *On the Management of Conflict in Families*. National Council on Family Relations.
- Stritof, S. (2020, June 20). *Challenges of an Interracial Marriage From Society*. Retrieved from verywellmind: <https://www.verywellmind.com/interracial-marriage-challenges-2303129>

- Thagaard, T. (1997, november 1). *Gender, Power, and Love: A Study of Interaction between Spouses*. Retrieved from jstor: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4201049>
- Verma, S. (2017). *Interfaith Marriages and Negotiated Spaces*.
- Wendy Klein, C. I. (2013, march 1). *The Difference Between a Happy Marriage and Miserable One*:. Retrieved from theatlantic: <https://www.theatlantic.com/sexes/archive/2013/03/the-difference-between-a-happy-marriage-and-miserable-one-chores/273615/>