

8-1-2014

# DOES RACE MATTER?: EXAMINING DIFFERENCES IN INTRACULTURAL AND INTERCULTURAL RELATIONSHIPS

Megan Marie Morrison

*Southern Illinois University Carbondale*, [mmmorrison@siu.edu](mailto:mmmorrison@siu.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/theses>

---

## Recommended Citation

Morrison, Megan Marie, "DOES RACE MATTER?: EXAMINING DIFFERENCES IN INTRACULTURAL AND INTERCULTURAL RELATIONSHIPS" (2014). *Theses*. Paper 1517.

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact [opensiuc@lib.siu.edu](mailto:opensiuc@lib.siu.edu).

DOES RACE MATTER?: EXAMINING DIFFERENCES IN INTRACULTURAL AND  
INTERCULTURAL RELATIONSHIPS

By

Megan M. Morrison

B.S., University of Southern Indiana, 2012

B.A., University of Southern Indiana, 2012

B.A., University of Southern Indiana, 2012

A Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the  
Master of Arts Degree

Department of Psychology  
in the Graduate School  
Southern Illinois University Carbondale  
August 2014

Copyright by Megan M. Morrison, 2014  
All Rights Reserved

THESIS APPROVAL

DOES RACE MATTER?: EXAMINING DIFFERENCES IN INTRACULTURAL AND  
INTERCULTURAL RELATIONSHIPS

By

Megan M. Morrison

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Masters of Art

in the field of Psychology

Approved by:

Dr. Meera Komarraju, Chair

Dr. Paul Etcheverry

Dr. Reza Habib

Graduate School  
Southern Illinois University Carbondale  
June 24, 2014

## AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

MEGAN M. MORRISON, for the Master of Arts degree in PSYCHOLOGY, presented on June 24, 2014 at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

TITLE: DOES RACE MATTER?: EXAMINING DIFFERENCES IN INTRACULTURAL AND INTERCULTURAL RELATIONSHIPS

MAJOR PROFESSOR: Dr. Meera Komarraju

The current study examined differences in intracultural and intercultural relationships. In this study, data were collected from 139 individuals currently in intracultural romantic relationships (same ethnicity and country of origin) and 120 individuals currently in intercultural romantic relationships (different ethnicity or country of origin) through MTurk. Participants completed measures for personality (20-item Mini-IPIP), individualism and collectivism (Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale), ethnic identity (Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure), implicit relationship theory (Relationship Theory Questionnaire), relationship satisfaction (DAS: Dyadic Adjustment Scale and RAS: Relationship Assessment Scale), relationship commitment (Commitment Level Items of the Investment Model Scale), one question to address whether the individuals' partners are seen as one's soul mate, and demographics. Participants were compensated \$0.85 for completing the survey. MANOVA analyses indicated that individuals in intracultural and intercultural relationships differ significantly in terms of RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Item scores, with those in intercultural relationships scoring significantly lower on all three measures. Regression analyses indicated that the significant predictors for RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level items differ for individuals in intracultural and intercultural relationships. These findings suggest the type of relationship (intracultural versus intercultural) is an important factor to consider. Research on intracultural relationships may not translate to individuals in intercultural relationships.

## DEDICATION

I wish to dedicate this thesis to my family and my church small group who provided support and encouragement through the entire process. I wish to thank my mother, Patricia Sandefur Snaden, and my father, George Morrison, for always providing encouragement and support in my studies throughout my life. I also wish to thank my twin sister, Heather Morrison, for her generosity and assistance when I needed it the most. Lastly, I would like to thank my small group who has been my family away from home. They have bolstered my spirits at the most difficult portions of this process, and for that, I will always be grateful.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take the time to thank Dr. Komarraju who served as my thesis chair. As my thesis chair, Dr. Komarraju provided support and assistance throughout the thesis process. Her guidance helped me to shape my research interests into the thesis presented here. Throughout the process, Dr. Komarraju provided reassurance and spent countless hours listening me discuss my research. It was through the time Dr. Komarraju spent listening to me discuss my research, that I was better able to understand my research overall and gain more confidence in the process. I would also like to thank Dr. Etcheverry, and Dr. Habib who served on my thesis committee, as they provided me with very valuable suggestions and advice. As a whole, my thesis committee provided encouragement and support, making the thesis process more manageable.

I would also like to take the time to thank my fellow graduate students, Sean Cameron, Crystal Steltenpohl, and Joshua Doerner who provided support and assistance. I would like to thank Sean Cameron for his assistance and guidance through the data collection process on MTurk. He provided invaluable information, which made the process less complicated and demanding. I would like to thank Crystal Steltenpohl for taking time to read my drafts throughout the thesis process and providing valuable feedback. I would like to thank all three of my colleagues, Sean Cameron, Crystal Steltenpohl, and Joshua Doerner, for the time they set aside to test my survey and provide feedback. These colleagues all provided valuable insights through the process.

I would also like express my gratitude for the funding I received through the Delyte and Dorthy Morris Doctoral Fellowship. This funding is what allowed me to conduct the research for this thesis.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ABSTRACT.....	i
DEDICATION.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTERS	
CHAPTER 1 – Introduction.....	1
CHAPTER 2 – Literature Review .....	5
CHAPTER 3 – Methods .....	29
CHAPTER 4 – Results.....	38
CHAPTER 5 – Discussion.....	49
REFERENCES .....	80
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A – Consent Form .....	89
APPENDIX B – Big Five Personality Scale.....	90
APPENDIX C – Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale .....	91
APPENDIX D – Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure.....	92
APPENDIX E – Relationship Theory Questionnaire .....	93
APPENDIX F– Relationship Assessment Scale.....	94



APPENDIX G – Dyadic Adjustment Scale .....	95
APPENDIX H – Relationship Commitment Level Items.....	98
APPENDIX I – Demographics .....	99
VITA.....	101

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Table 1.....	62
Table 2.....	63
Table 3.....	64
Table 4.....	65
Table 5.....	66
Table 6.....	67
Table 7.....	68
Table 8.....	69
Table 9.....	70
Table 10.....	71
Table 11.....	72
Table 12.....	73
Table 13.....	74
Table 14.....	75
Table 15.....	76
Table 16.....	77
Table 17.....	78
Table 18.....	79

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

As U.S. society becomes increasingly globalized, interactions between individuals of different backgrounds become more common. More individuals travel to different locations and interact with other cultures. One effect of such globalization in the U.S. is more individuals entering into intercultural relationships. In the past, there was a large stigma for individuals that chose to enter into interracial marriage. For example, laws that forbade interracial marriages were ruled as constitutional in the 1883 court case, *Pace v. Alabama*. This decision set the precedence for similar cases until the 1960's (Wallenstein, 1998). In 1901, Arizona adopted a law that prohibited whites from marrying individuals of a different race, which included "negroes, Mongolians or Indians", and in 1931 "Malays" and "Hindus" were added to the list. In 1924, Virginia passed laws that mandated that the only lawful marriage for a white person was to another white person or a white person with no mixture besides "American Indian". The law was copied by Georgia soon after. One of the most well-known court cases concerning interracial marriage is *Loving v. Virginia*, in which Richard Perry Loving and Mildred Delores Jeters traveled to Washington, D.C. to marry because their home state of Virginia did not allow marriages between white individuals and "colored" individuals. Approximately one month after returning to Virginia, the two were arrested for violating the miscegenation laws of the state. They were let free with the condition that the couple not return to Virginia for the next 25 years. A decision they later appealed (Pascoe, 1996).

With passing time, the stigma associated with interracial or intercultural marriages has lessened. One indication of the lessening of stigmas can be seen in the overturning of legal sanctions such as miscegenation laws being ruled unconstitutional in the 1967 *Loving v. Virginia*

appeal (Paccoe, 1996; Perry & Sutton, 2008). According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2012), recently, there has been an increasing trend in interracial/interethnic couples. This can be seen in married couple households as well as opposite-sex and same-sex non-married couple households. In 2000, there were 54,493,232 married couples, of which 4,040,984 were interracial/interethnic couples (7.4 percent). In 2010, the number of married couple households increased to 56,510,377 of which 5,369,035 were interracial/interethnic couples (9.5 percent). An increase in opposite-sex and same-sex non-married couple households also occurred from 2000 to 2010. In 2000, there were 4,881,377 opposite-sex couple households, of which 734,603 were interracial/interethnic couples (15.0 percent). In 2010, the figures increased to 6,842,714 opposite-sex couple households of which 1,249,406 were interracial/interethnic couples (18.3 percent). For same-sex couples, in 2000 there were 594,391 same-sex couple households, of which 83,191 were interracial/interethnic couples (14.0 percent). In 2010, there were 646,464 same-sex couple households of which 133,477 were interracial/interethnic couples (20.6 percent). These data indicate that between 2000 and 2010 there was an increase for all three categories of interracial/interethnic couples. There was a 2.1 percent increase in the number of married interracial/interethnic couple households, a 3.3 percent increase in opposite-sex non-married couple households and a 6.6 percent increase in same-sex non-married couple households. While intercultural couples are becoming more common, the amount of research that offers insights into these relationships is still limited in scope. The research that has been conducted has provided some understanding of intercultural relationships, though those insights are constrained.

Individuals entering into intercultural relationships face unique obstacles. Fontaine and Dorch (1978) have argued that these individuals have a larger source of potential problems than

do individuals that are in same culture relationships. Long-term intercultural couples report more internal and external problems in the relationship than do couples from the same country such as disapproval from their communities, friends, or family members. This disapproval often manifests in rejection, discrimination, and sometimes violence (Fontaine and Dorch, 1978). While individuals from different cultures can often be complimentary of one another, these differences can also lead to polarization, leading to conflicts in the relationship. These differences can often be expressed in terms of individualism and collectivism (Kellner, 2009). Individuals with different social perspectives appreciate different values, have varied communication styles, and ways of resolving conflict. Individuals from individualistic cultures often stress autonomy, self-realization, personal initiative and independence. In contrast, individuals from collectivistic cultures stress loyalty to the group as well as interconnectedness of family, community, and society. Collectivistic cultures tend to be more emotionally expressive, intertwine family needs with individual needs, have stricter gender roles, and have sexuality stemming from gender norms; while individualistic cultures are less emotionally expressive, have strict family and individual boundaries, have more fluid gender roles, and more freedom in sexuality. If problems that arise from these different perspectives are not seen as issues of culture it can become an issue of loyalty (Hayashi, 2010; Kellner, 2009).

These differences can lead to difficulties, which have the potential to negatively impact the relationship. Intercultural couples have a higher divorce risk than those that are from the same culture (Sanne, Ineke, & Frank van, 2012). Past research has shown that differences in degrees of individualism (measured by GDP per capita) in the origin countries of couples lead to a higher risk of divorce (Sanne, Ineke, & Frank van, 2012). Relationship satisfaction can also be impacted by how cultural differences are valued within the relationship. Gaines and Brennan

(2001) argued that relationship satisfaction is enhanced when partners genuinely appreciate rather than tolerate the differences in personalities and cultural values.

Previous research has examined intercultural relationships and focused on the obstacles that may occur within these relationships. Intercultural romantic relationships, in past research, have been defined as relationships in which the individuals are from different cultural contexts, which include religion, countries, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and education background (Hayashi 2010). However, for this study, intercultural relationships focused on differences in countries or ethnicity due to the belief that these contexts would be more associated with the different dimensions of individualism and collectivism. While individualism and collectivism, as well as relationship satisfaction, have been studied in intercultural relationships, the role of differences in partners' individualism and collectivism on relationship satisfaction and longevity has not been studied. The purpose of the present study was to determine the role of personality, implicit theories of relationships and differences in partners' horizontal and vertical collectivism and individualism in predicting relationship satisfaction and commitment in intercultural (differences in ethnicity or country) and intracultural (same ethnicity and country) relationships, and by doing so broaden the field of study.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### **Perception of Intercultural Relationships**

Intercultural couples have increased in numbers over the years (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). This increase is often seen as society progressing in terms of becoming less racist and prejudiced. However, while it is true that the number of intercultural couples has increased, this does not mean that intercultural couples no longer face prejudices. The legal sanctions that once punished intercultural couples for transgressing boundaries are no longer in place since the miscegenation laws were overturned in 1967 by the Supreme Court (Perry & Sutton, 2008). However, when examining the perceptions of intercultural couples versus intracultural couples, it becomes clear that intercultural and intracultural relationships are perceived and represented in different ways. Intercultural relationships are often assumed to be more problematic or doomed to failure. One example of this is the portrayal of intercultural relationships in popular culture.

#### **Media Perceptions**

Media can impact beliefs and behaviors as well as provide an indication of norms and beliefs that individuals and society as a whole already hold. Through popular culture, individuals often learn lessons concerning race, sex, and class. The images that appear in media are not only an indication of the culture we live in, but at the same time, contribute towards creating culture (hooks, 2013). Since popular culture is often a reflection of the beliefs and attitudes of society, examining the ways in which intercultural relationships are depicted in popular culture can aid in understanding attitudes about race and sex (Childs, 2004, 2009). At first glance, images of intercultural couples in the media may appear progressive. However, when these representations are examined more closely, it becomes clear that popular culture's depictions of intercultural

couples often reinforce and maintain the racial hierarchy (Childs, 2009). Through media, intercultural couples are depicted in such a way as to suggest intercultural relationships are inferior to intracultural relationships, especially white intracultural relationships. Analyzing and comparing the images of intercultural and intracultural couples reveals the problematic representation of intercultural relationships. Not only are images of intercultural relationships less common, but when intercultural relationships are depicted the relationships are often depicted as inferior or problematic. Examining the images that appear in films such as *Jungle Fever*, *The Bodyguard*, *Zebrahead*, and *One Night Stand*, as well as television series such as *ER*, and *Grey's Anatomy* reveal several troubling themes for intercultural relationships. These themes include the relationships bringing negative consequences, not lasting, being deviant, or being either only about sex or a marriage without sex (Childs, 2004; Washington, 2012). In comparison, intracultural couples, especially those in which both individuals are white, are able to have fulfilling relationships that exist outside of such problematic themes. The problematic representations of intercultural relationships teach that "...true love...is almost always an occurrence between those who are the same race. When love does happen across boundaries...it is doomed for no apparent reason and/or has tragic consequences..." (hooks 1996, p.113). Such a lesson further reinforces the perception that intercultural relationships are inherently more problematic than intracultural relationships.

### **Individual Perceptions**

Negative perceptions of intercultural relationships can also be seen by examining the attitudes individuals hold about intercultural relationships. Research has shown that individuals have different perceptions of marital satisfaction and relational intimacy depending on the racial composition of a couple (Perceptions of Interracial Marriages, 2011). In one study, participants



read a scenario about an interracial or intraracial couple. The scenarios included the length of the marriage and the activities in which the couple engaged. The names of the individuals and the racial composition of the couple were manipulated in the different scenarios. Across the different scenarios, intraracial relationships were perceived as having higher marital satisfaction than interracial relationships. The highest perceived marital satisfaction was reported for couples in which both partners were white, while the lowest was for the couple in which the man was black and the woman was white. In contrast to perceived marital satisfaction, it is interesting to note that perceived relational intimacy was higher for interracial couples compared to intraracial couples. Perceived relational intimacy was the highest when the couple was a black man and a white woman, which was the couple with the lowest perceived marital satisfaction. Black intraracial couples were perceived to have the lowest level of relational intimacy (Perceptions of Interracial Marriages, 2011). These differences in perceived marital satisfaction and relational intimacy show that individuals have different assumptions or attitudes towards relationships depending on the racial composition of the couple in question.

A study by Lewandowski and Jackson (2001), examined the perception of interracial and intraracial relationships. Participants read a couple description of either an interracial couple or an intraracial couple. The couple description was the same for each condition with the exception of the racial composition of the couple. The study consisted of four interracial couples (African American male-European American female, European American male-African American female, Asian American male-European American female, and European American male-Asian American female) and three intraracial couples (Asian American, European American, and African American). After reading the couple description, participants rated the compatibility of the couple; completed an adapted Social Distance scale; indicated the ease with which they could

imagine themselves in a relationship like that of the couple in the description; completed perceptions of each of the partners in the relationship (which included competence, psychological adjustment, professional success, social success, and traditionality); indicated how comfortable each partner was with same-race others; and indicated whether each partner had a strong racial identity. Findings indicated different results for interracial couples compared to intraracial couples. Interracial couples in which one partner was African American were perceived as less compatible than intraracial couples. European American men in interracial marriages compared to intraracial marriages were perceived as less likely to be professionally successful as well as having stronger racial identity and being more comfortable with same-race others. African American and Asian American men in interracial marriages were perceived differently than their intraracial counterparts. When in interracial marriages, African American men and Asian American men were perceived as being less comfortable with same-race others, less professionally competent, and having a weaker racial identity. Interracial relationships, in which one partner was Asian American, were perceived as more compatible than relationships in which one partner was African American.

Similar to Lewandowski and Jackson (2001), Garcia and colleagues (2011) examined perceptions of interracial relationships. However, Garcia and colleagues examined the perceptions of Latinos. Three different couples were examined: Latina/Latino, Latina/White, or Latina/Black. Latino participants read a couple description, then completed a measure of overall relationship quality and perception of social support. Participants also completed a measure of positive and negative emotions towards the couple in the description they read. Findings indicated that the Latina/Black relationship was perceived as having lower relationship quality than the Latina/White relationship. Additionally, the Latina/Black couple was evaluated as

having less social support compared to both the Latina/White and Latina/Latino couples. The expression of negative emotions differed by gender of participants. Latino men were more likely to express negative emotions towards the Latina/Black couple. Overall, the study showed that even a minority group (Latinos) holds different perceptions for interracial and intraracial couples.

### **The Role of Culture in Relationships**

Individuals often assume that cultural differences lead to problems in relationships, which can be seen in the negative perceptions of intercultural relationships. The question arises as to what role culture serves in relationships. Inman and colleagues (2011) examined the experiences of Asian Indian and White married couples. Structured interviews indicated that participants typically reported culture as being relevant to marital satisfaction, and being more salient for female participants. Quek and Fitzpatrick (2013) found a link between collectivism and marital satisfaction, such that collectivism was significantly associated with loyalty conflict tactics, which in turn impact marital satisfaction of husbands (though not wives). No relationship was found for collectivism or individualism and marital satisfaction of wives. Gaines and Brennan (2001) argued that satisfaction in multicultural relationships is promoted when partners genuinely appreciate, rather than merely tolerate, the differences in their personalities. Satisfaction is maintained through creating and sustaining unique relationship cultures that belong to the couple. Additionally, the authors argue that relationship satisfaction is created and maintained when the partners are open to personal growth through their association with their partner's different culture/ethnic group.

Cultural values not only impact satisfaction in intercultural relationships, but also play a role in what individuals consider worthwhile in a relationship. A study by Marshall (2008)

examined emotional intimacy in dating relationships of European Canadians and Chinese Canadians. Two studies were conducted to investigate the relationship of gender-role ideology and individualism-collectivism on self-disclosure and responsiveness, and in turn, intimacy. Results of the first study indicated that Chinese Canadians were lower in intimacy in comparison to European Canadians. This lower intimacy was mediated by greater gender-role traditionalism in the Chinese Canadians. The second study indicated that a higher rate of relationship termination and lower relationship satisfaction were mediated by lower intimacy in Chinese Canadians. However, in study two Chinese Canadians were not more likely to terminate their relationships.

Culture can also play a role in how an individual falls in love. Riela and colleagues (2010) investigated the precursors for falling in love for White-American and Asian-American participants. In the first study, participants wrote narratives of their experiences of falling in love. The content of the narratives were analyzed for 12 precursors (reciprocal liking, appearance, personality, similarity, familiarity, social influence, filling needs, arousal, readiness, specific cues, isolation, and mysteriousness) and speed of falling in love. Ethnic differences emerged for arousal as a precursor. There was also a significant difference in recency of love, with Chinese participants recalling more recent love experiences than White-Americans. In the second study, participants from the United States and China wrote narratives as well as completed self-ratings of the precursors. Several cultural differences emerged. Appearance, familiarity, similarity, specific cues, and readiness were mentioned more often or rated relatively more important by American participants compared to the Chinese participants. In contrast, reciprocal liking, personality, filling needs, social influence, and arousal were mentioned more often or rated more

important by Chinese participants compared to the American participants. Overall culture appears to play an important role in influencing precursors of falling in love.

Along similar lines, Sprecher and Toro-Morn (2002) compared men and women from North America and China on relationship beliefs and observed both gender and cultural differences. In the North American sample, men (compared to women) were more willing to marry without love and scored higher on idealization of a romanticism scale. Additionally North American men had different love styles than women. Men were more ludic (game-playing love) and agapic (selfless love) but less erotic (passionate love) and pragmatic (love driven by reason). American men (compared to women) were also more likely to consider emotional satisfaction an important component for maintaining marriage. The gender differences found in the Chinese sample were different from the gender differences found in the North American sample with the exception of Chinese men being more agapic than Chinese women. Compared to Chinese women, Chinese men were more romantic and storgic (affectionate love based on friendship). However, regarding love, men were less likely to believe in destiny or fate. A gender difference in physical pleasure emerged, such that Chinese men were more likely to view physical pleasure as important in maintaining marriage. Overall, in the love beliefs studies, culture explained more variance than gender with Chinese participants having a more idealistic and practical approach to love than North Americans.

A study by Hoxha and Hatala (2012) also found differences in romantic attitudes. The study examined differences between Americans and Albanians. Americans were found to be more romantic and verbally oriented in expressing their love while Albanians were more behaviorally oriented in expressing their love. A study by de Munck and colleagues (2011) found that friendship and comfort love were critical features of romantic love in participants from the

United States. However, Lithuanian and Russian participants saw romantic love as unreal, temporary, and a fairytale. Romantic love was seen as a stage that ends abruptly with the dissolution of the relationship or matures into a more real and enduring love. A similar study by Medora and colleagues (2002) examined romanticism in participants from the United States, India and Turkey. Americans scored the highest on romanticism, followed by Turkish participants. Participants from India scored the lowest.

Cultural differences in intimacy expressions have also emerged through research. A study by Stella (1991) examined cultural variability in intimacy expressions in France, Japan, and the United States. The intimacy expressions examined were love commitment, disclosure maintenance, ambivalence, and conflict. Significant effects emerged for culture and gender. Higher degrees of love commitment and disclosure maintenance occurred in the French and United States participants compared to the Japanese. Higher relational ambivalence was reported in the United States participants compared to the Japanese participants. Additionally the lowest degree of conflict expression occurred in the French participants compared to the Japanese and United States participants. Gender differences occurred for love commitment, disclosure maintenance, and interpersonal conflict expressions, such that females reported higher levels than their male counterparts.

These cultural differences in relationship beliefs, romantic attitudes, or expressions of intimacy can lead to problems in intercultural relationships. Over the course of the relationship, intercultural couples are more likely to experience adjustment problems compared to intracultural couples (Silvia, Cambell, & Wright, 2012). Despite this, research has shown that intercultural relationships can have added problems as well as added benefits. Fontaine and Dorch (1978) conducted personal interviews of 137 couples (of which 30 were intercultural

couples). The interviews indicated that interethnic couples experienced more external problems than intraethnic couples. Specifically, these problems were with their community and friends or family members. However, at the same time interethnic couples reported higher satisfaction with family life. There was also a difference in the amount of problems in terms of whether the relationship was long-term or short-term, such that long-term interethnic couples reported more severe problems. While differences may be reasons for attraction, they can also be areas for conflict in times of crisis. Some may even see intercultural relationships as having differences that are irreconcilable. Sanne, Ineke, and Frank (2012) examined the risk of divorce and reasons for divorce in a sample of 116, 745 couples from Dutch municipality registers. There were 1,250 combinations of national origins. The study was longitudinal in nature, with couples being followed for an average of eight years. Results indicated that interethnic couples have a higher divorce risk than mono-ethnic couples. The same was true for couples who had different predominate religions. Differences in degrees of individualism (measured by GDP per capita) in the origin countries of the couple also lead to a higher risk of divorce. This, however, was specific to native-immigrant couples. Immigrant group size was also related to higher divorce risks such that larger group size in the wife's immigrant group increased the risk of divorce in interethnic immigrant couples. A higher divorce rate in the wife's origin country was also related to a higher divorce risk in interethnic couples.

Intercultural couples may have different social perspectives with different values being associated with different perspectives. Individualistic and collectivistic cultures stress different values in areas such as personality characteristics, family, emotional expressiveness, gender roles, and sexuality (Kellner, 2009). Reviewing past literature suggests several correlates of individualism and collectivism. The correlates of individualism included greater emphasis on

internal processes, more emphasis on consistency, and more self enhancement; while collectivistic correlates included more focus on contexts, less concern for consistency and less self-enhancement. Other trends were found for individualism and collectivism. For example, collectivistic cultures identify as interdependent with their in-groups which lead to their personality being flexible. Individualistic cultures identify as stable, though their social environment is changeable. This means that the social environment tends to be shaped to fit their personalities. Individuals from collectivistic cultures also tend to make more situational attributions and be self-effacing compared to individualistic cultures (Triandis, 2001). If problems arising from these differing cultural perspectives are not seen as an issue of culture, the problems can become an issue of loyalty, especially in situations where family values differ. A conflict may arise in which the individual questions whether their partner's loyalty lays with his/her family or him/her (Kellner, 2009). Culture can also impact the type of conflict resolution strategy individuals use within the relationship. For instance, a dominating conflict resolution strategy was found to be positively associated with the vertical aspects of individualism and collectivism, with culture accounting for 19 percent of the variance (Ritu & Catherine, 2006). Thus, it seems that culture can play an important role in several areas of a relationship.

### **Individualism and Collectivism**

One way that cultural values are captured in psychological research is with individualism and collectivism measures. In a review of the literature on individualism and collectivism, Triandis (1995) discusses the utility of using individualism and collectivism constructs. The constructs can be applied broadly to a number of interactions. A few examples are interactions at the personal, business, and political level. Individualism and collectivism can also be applied at either the cultural or individual level. This means that while a particular culture may be



collectivistic or individualistic in nature, not every individual in that culture will hold the same social perspective. For example, an individual in an individualistic culture could be more collectivist and an individual in a collectivist culture could subscribe to more individualist values. Individualism and collectivism have specific cultural manifestations known as cultural syndromes. These cultural syndromes are patterns “characterized by shared beliefs, attitudes, norms, roles, and values that are organized around a theme and that can be found in specific geographic regions during a particular historic period” (Triandis, 1995, p. 43).

The Triandis (1995) literature review does suggest four universal dimensions of individualism and collectivism. The first dimension is the aspect of the self. Collectivists define the self in relation to the group, while individualists define themselves independent of the group. Thus, the self is interdependent for collectivists and independent for individualists (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Reykowski, 1994). The second dimension is goals. For collectivists personal and communal goals overlap. When there is a discrepancy between a personal and a communal goal, communal goals have priority. For individualists personal goals do not necessarily overlap with communal goals, though in some instances personal and communal goals may overlap. When a discrepancy does occur, personal goals take priority (Schwartz, 1990). The third dimension is social behavior. Social behavior of collectivists is largely guided by norms, obligations, and duties while the social behavior of individualists is largely guided by attitudes, personal needs, rights, and contracts (Miller, 1994; Davidson et al., 1976). The fourth dimension is relationships. Collectivists emphasize relationships even when disadvantageous, while individualists emphasize the advantages and disadvantages of maintaining relationships (Kim et al., 1994).

The literature review by Triandis (1995) discusses individualism and collectivism as four constructs instead of two by adding horizontal and vertical dimensions. Horizontal collectivists have a sense of self that is interdependent and the same such that there is a sense of social cohesion and oneness with members of the in-group. Vertical collectivists have a sense of self that is interdependent and different such that serving and sacrificing for the in-group is important, but there is also a sense of one's own duty. Horizontal individualists have a sense of self that is independent and the same such that individuals are autonomous, but there is no hierarchy in status. Vertical individualists have a sense of self that is independent and different such that individuals are autonomous, and there are differences in status. For both collectivists and individualists, the vertical dimensions have privileges depending on rank, and thus inequalities are accepted. For both collectivists and individualists, the horizontal dimensions emphasize equality, especially in status.

Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk and Gelfand (1995) created the first measure of horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism. Results of the study indicated that the distinctions of horizontal and vertical collectivism and individualism provided higher alphas as well as provided new information. Verticals and horizontals responded differently on some items even if they shared the same individualistic or collectivistic dimension. The distinction between vertical and horizontal also allowed attitudes toward inequalities to be examined, which is not the case with the two-construct approach to individualism and collectivism.

Research studies in which the horizontal and vertical individualism scale has been used offer insights into how the scale can be utilized. One study by Chiou (2001) found differences on the four scales based on the cultural group. Participants were drawn from the United States, Taiwan, and Argentina. A significant interaction was found for participant group x cultural

pattern, such that Taiwanese and Argentine participants were more vertically collectivist than the United States participants, with no statistical difference between the Taiwanese and Argentine samples. In terms of vertical individualism, the United States and Taiwanese participants were significantly higher than the Argentine participants (with no significant difference between the United States and Taiwanese participants). The United States participants were significantly higher on horizontal individualism than vertical collectivism, and vertical collectivism and horizontal collectivism compared to vertical individualism; the Taiwanese participants were significantly higher on vertical collectivism than horizontal collectivism, horizontal collectivism than horizontal individualism, and horizontal individualism than vertical individualism; and the Argentine participants were significantly higher on vertical collectivism than horizontal collectivism, horizontal collectivism than horizontal individualism, and horizontal individualism than vertical individualism.

Komaraju and Cokley (2008) also found differences between African Americans and European Americans in terms of the four dimensions of individualism and collectivism. African Americans were significantly higher on horizontal individualism, while European Americans were significantly higher on horizontal collectivism and vertical individualism. Correlations for grade point average and individualism-collectivism were significant and positive for African Americans, but there was no relationship for European Americans. These two studies show that the four dimension scale of individualism and collectivism was useful in identifying cultural differences (United States, Taiwan, and Argentina) as well as ethnic group differences (African America and European Americans).

### **Relationship Satisfaction and Longevity**

Cultural values and differences can influence how satisfied an individual is in a relationship as well as how long the relationship lasts. Other factors, such as personality and implicit theories of relationships, can also influence relationship satisfaction and longevity.

### **Personality Factors**

Several studies have shown that there is a connection between personality factors and relationship satisfaction. Watson, Hubbard, and Wiese (2000) examined relationship satisfaction and personality. Participants consisted of 74 married couples and 136 dating couples.

Participants completed measures for self-ratings and partner-ratings on trait affect and the Big Five, affectivity, and relationship satisfaction. Results indicated that the target's relationship satisfaction was correlated with the target's self-rated personality, target's partner-rated personality, partner's self-rate personality, and partner's target-rated personality. Results of personality were similar for both self-ratings and partner-ratings. In both the married and dating samples, negative and positive affectivity were consistent predictors of relationship satisfaction. Dating couples and married couples had different factors of the Big Five, which related to satisfaction. In the dating couples, conscientiousness and agreeableness were related to relationship satisfaction, while in married couples extraversion was related to relationship satisfaction. Conscientiousness, agreeableness, and extraversion jointly predicted 34 percent of the variance in relationship satisfaction for self-ratings and 26 percent for partner-ratings. Personality of the partner played a lesser role in relationship satisfaction.

A study by Dyrenforth and colleagues (2010) examined three large representative samples of married couples from Australia, the United Kingdom, and Germany to examine personality effects on relationship satisfaction and life satisfaction. Three types of personality effects were examined: actor effects, partner effects, and similarity effects. Emotional Stability,

Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness were the traits with the most consistent actor and partner effects for predicting judgments of relationship and life satisfaction. Overall, for relationship satisfaction, 6 percent of variance was explained by actor effects, 1 to 3 percent of variance was explained by partner effects, and less than 0.5 percent of variance was explained by similarity effects (after controlling for actor and partner effects). Overall, for life satisfaction, between 10 and 15 percent of variance was explained by actor effects, between 1 and 2 percent of variance was explained by partner effects, and less than 0.5 percent of variance was explained by similarity effects (after controlling for actor and partner effects).

Malouff and colleagues (2010) conducted a meta-analysis on scores on the Five-Factor Model personality factors. A total of 3,848 participants were used from 19 heterosexual relationship samples. Four of the five factors correlated significantly with level of relationship satisfaction—low neuroticism, high agreeableness, high conscientiousness, and high extraversion. There was neither a gender nor marital status difference for the correlations between the four factors and relationship satisfaction. White, Hendrick, and Hendrick (2004) also found a positive association between relationship satisfaction and extraversion and agreeableness. Marital satisfaction has also been found to be positively correlated to conscientiousness and agreeableness, and negatively correlated with neuroticism (Razeghi et al., 2011). Thus, four of the Big Five personality traits, conscientiousness, agreeableness, extraversion, and neuroticism appear to be relevant predictors of relationship satisfaction.

### **Implicit Theories**

Studies have shown that individuals' implicit theories of relationships impact relationship satisfaction and relationship longevity. Knee (1998) examined how the implicit theories of destiny and growth influence initiation, coping, and longevity of romantic relationships. Data

were collected from participants at three time points: 1 month into the fall semester, 2 months later, and a follow up call 4 months after Time 2. Participants completed items for growth and destiny beliefs at Time 1 and 2, several questions relevant to dating behaviors at Time 1, the Partners Cannot Change subscale of the Relationship Belief Inventory which assesses belief about whether partners can change themselves or their relationship at Time 1 and Time 2, storge and pragma subscales of the Love Attitudes Scale at Time 1 and Time 2, an abridged version of the Big Five at Time 1 and Time 2, the COPE inventory to measure coping with a specific stressful event at Time 2, items about romantic status at Time 1, 2, and 3; the Quality of Relationship Index (QRI) to measure relationship satisfaction at Time 1 and Time 2, and perceived closeness through the Inclusion of Other in Self (IOS) scale at Time 1.

Results indicated that growth beliefs were correlated with a more committed, long term dating approach. Destiny and growth were also associated with coping strategies such that destiny belief predicted endorsement of disengagement strategies while growth beliefs predicted endorsement of relationship maintenance strategies. The implicit theories were also related to relationship longevity, such that initial satisfaction predicted relationship longevity primarily for those who believed in destiny. Relationships lasted longer for those who were initially satisfied compared to those who were initially less satisfied (and thus their relationships ended sooner). Similarly, belief in destiny interacted with initial perceived closeness. Belief in destiny was also related to the impressions of the relationship once it had ended, with the relationship being stronger for women than men. Overall, initial relationship satisfaction and relationship longevity were more strongly correlated for those who endorsed destiny theory. Those who endorsed destiny theory were also more likely to engage in avoidance coping strategies and take more responsibility for ending the relationship. Belief in growth, on the other hand, tended to result in

long-term approaches to dating, relationship maintenance strategies, and disagreement about the relationship being wrong from the beginning once the relationship had ended.

Franiuk, Cohen, and Pomerantz (2002) also examined implicit theories of relationships. Two separate studies were conducted in order to determine if individuals' implicit theories of relationships interact to impact relationship satisfaction and longevity. In the first study, college students from a Midwestern University completed the Relationship Theories Questionnaire (RTQ) which reflected the five dimensions of the "soul mate" and "work-it-out" theories, Knee's (1998) growth and destiny scale, Mett's (1989) Romantic Beliefs Scale, a personality scale and relationship scale to measure the extent that personality and relationships are stable and unchanging, the Affect Intensity Measure to assess emotional intensity, 9 items from the Dyadic Adjustment scale to assess relationship satisfaction, beliefs about partner being their soul mate with a single item, 11 items from the Dyadic Adjustment Scale to measure agreement on relationship issues, 26-item questionnaire to determine participants' responses to interpersonal arguments focusing on four main types: giving in, compromising, avoiding, and trying to win, and demographics. At Time 2, eight months later, participants completed follow ups consisting of the RTQ and a relationship status questionnaire.

Results of the first study found a significant effect for implicit theory depending on ethnic group, such that Latinos and Whites were more likely to have a soul mate theory than Asian or African Americans. Additionally there was a correlation such that participants who held entity beliefs about relationships were more likely to hold a soul mate theory, though the correlation was not strong which suggests that there is more to holding a soul mate theory than endorsing entity theory. The correlation between RTQ responses from Time 1 to Time 2 was significant suggesting that the implicit theories are stable. There was a significant effect for perception of

partner, such that those who reported that their present partner was their soul mate were significantly more likely to endorse a soul mate theory compared to those who did not consider their present partner their soul mate. There was a significant Relationship Theory x Beliefs About Partner interaction for predicting relationship satisfaction such that for those who said their partner was their soul mate, endorsing a soul mate theory was positively correlated with satisfaction; in contrast, for those who said their partner was not their soul mate, holding a soul mate theory was negatively associated with relationship satisfaction. Participants who held a soul mate theory were also more likely to perceive agreement on relationship issues than those who endorsed the work-it-out theory. A Relationship Theory x Beliefs about Partner interaction predicted perceived agreement with one's partner such that those who endorsed a soul mate theory and believed they were with their soul mate perceived more agreement on relationship issues than those who endorsed a work-it-out theory and believed they were with their soul mate. A significant interaction was also found for tendency to give in during arguments and implicit theory such that those who held a soul mate theory were more likely to give in, in comparison to the those holding a work-it-out theory. Examining the longitudinal data revealed a main effect such that those who reported their partner was their soul mate at Time 1 were significantly more likely to be with the same partner at Time 2 (eight months later). A Relationship Theory x Belief interaction term significantly predicted relationship longevity. For participants who did not believe their partner was their soul mate at Time 1, endorsing a soul mate theory was marginally negatively correlated with relationship longevity.

The second study was designed to examine soul mate and work-it-out theories as two separate, but related dimensions rather than on a continuum. Additionally the second study was conducted in order to examine which theory was driving the findings of the first study in terms



of relationship satisfaction. Participants were undergraduate students from a large Midwestern university. Participants completed the RTQ, 11 soul mate questions adapted from the RTQ in Study 1, 9 work-it-out theory questions adapted from the RTQ in Study 1, one question to address whether the individuals' partners were seen as one's soul mate, and 9 items from the Dyadic Adjustment scale to assess relationship satisfaction. Structural modeling was used to test a series of models of the factors for soul mate theory and work-it-out theory.

Results showed more support for the two-factor model which allowed for all soul mate indicators to load strongly on the soul mate latent trait and all work-it-out indicators to load strongly on work-it-out latent trait, while the soul mate and work-it-out indicators do not load on the opposite latent trait. A Soul mate Theory x Beliefs about Partner interaction term significantly predicted relationship satisfaction such that for those who said their partner was their soul mate, endorsing a soul mate theory was positively associated with satisfaction, while for those who said their partner was not their soul mate, holding a soul mate theory was negatively associated with satisfaction. Holding a work-it-out theory was not predictive of relationship satisfaction. There was also a significant three way interaction for soul mate theory, work-it-out theory, and belief about partner such that for those who said their present partner was not their soul mate, those high on the soul mate scale and low on work-it-out scale were less satisfied compared to those low on soul mate scale and high on work-it-out scale. Thus, when their partner was not seen as their soul mate, it was most beneficial to be high on work-it-out and low on soul mate theory scales. For those who said their partner was their soul mate, only the soul mate theory scale predicted relationship satisfaction. Those who were with their soul mate and strongly endorsed the soul mate theory were more likely to be satisfied. Results from two-way and three-way interactions suggest that both the soul mate theory and work-it-out theory are

important predictors of relationship satisfaction, though soul mate theory is more potent of a predictor. Overall, these studies show that implicit theories about relationships as well as the beliefs about the partner are related to relationship satisfaction and longevity.

### **Summary**

As the world is becoming more globalized individuals have more opportunities to interact with other individuals from different cultural backgrounds. One effect of this increase in diversity is more intercultural romantic relationships. Intercultural relationships no longer hold the stigma they once did. However, this is not to say that intercultural relationships are viewed in the same way that intracultural relationships are. There is still some stigma associated with intercultural relationships. More often than not, intercultural relationships are seen as being doomed or inherently more problematic. Media representations of intercultural relationships reinforce this problematic perception. When intercultural relationships are present in films or television, they are often depicted in such a way to suggest that the relationship will only bring problems or are doomed to failure. Studies on attitudes of intercultural relationships also show that individuals expect more problems in intercultural relationships. Negative perceptions of intercultural relationships include perceived decreased relationship satisfaction, less compatibility, more negative emotions, and individuals in the relationship being less likely to be professionally successful or professionally competent.

While research has shown that the perception of intercultural relationships is not positive or comparable to the perception of intracultural relationships that does not mean that culture serves the role individuals may think. Cultural differences have been found to play a role in several aspects of a relationship such as relationship satisfaction, intimacy, gender role traditionalism, precursors for falling in love, relationship beliefs, and other cultural values

connected to social perspectives. These differences can translate into more problems for intercultural couples, especially if differences between couples are not recognized as stemming from different cultural backgrounds. Studies have shown that intercultural relationships have more problems from external sources as well as an increased chance of divorce. Researchers such as Fontaine and Dorch (1978), however, have argued that relationship satisfaction and maintenance can be enhanced by truly appreciating the cultural differences instead of merely tolerating them.

In examining intercultural relationships, one question of interest is what factors are likely to contribute to relationship satisfaction and relationship longevity. Three factors that have emerged are culture, personality factors, and implicit theories of relationships. One way of conceptualizing cultural differences is using the constructs of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. Personality factors and implicit theories of relationship have been applied to relationships in general. While studies on personality factors do not always replicated the same correlations, several studies have shown that conscientiousness, agreeableness, and extraversion are positively relative to relationship satisfaction. Neuroticism, on the other hand, has been found to be negatively correlated to relationship satisfaction. Implicit theories of relationships can also play a role in that the theory one holds can affect how one reacts and interprets the relationship. Individuals who endorse destiny theory are more likely to engage in avoidance coping strategies and take more responsibility for ending the relationship. However, if an individual holds a growth theory, the individual is more likely to engage in long-term approaches to dating, relationship maintenance strategies, and disagreement about the relationship being wrong from the beginning once the relationship had ended. Similar to destiny and growth theories are the soul mate and work-it-out theories. Individuals holding a soul mate

theory are more likely to be less satisfied in a relationship if they do not see the individual they are with as their soul mate. When individuals do not view their partner as their soul mate, it would be most beneficial to be high on work-it-out and low on soul mate theory scales. With these different factors in mind (cultural values, personality, and implicit theories), it is important to determine how each factor impacts relationships as well as if the factors affect intercultural and intracultural relationships differently.

### **The Current Study**

Previous research has examined intercultural relationships. However, the scope of the research on intercultural relationship is limited, with several studies being qualitative in nature. Personality factors and implicit theories have been studied in past relationship research, though mostly limited to intracultural relationships. The construct of individualism and collectivism has been examined in intercultural relationships. However, research has yet to examine how discrepancies between partners' horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism affect relationship satisfaction or relationship commitment. Past research also has not compared personality and implicit theories of relationships in the context of comparing intercultural and intracultural relationships. The current study attempted to address these gaps in the literature by examining the roles of personality factors, implicit theories of relationships, and differences in horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism, on relationship satisfaction and commitment in comparative samples of intercultural couples and intracultural couples. Including the implicit theories of relationships along with the measures of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism (HVIC) is important since the implicit theory an individual holds may impact how that individual interprets differences in the HVIC dimensions. A person who endorses a soul mate theory may view the cultural value differences as an indication that the

individual is not their soul mate, while an individual who endorses a work it out theory may just view the differences as an area to work through.

In the current study, data was obtained from 139 individuals who reported being in an intracultural relationship and 120 individuals who reported being in an intercultural relationship, through Amazon MTurk. Participants completed an online survey including the 20-item Mini-IPIP personality scale, the horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism scale (HVIC), the Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM), the Relationship Theories Questionnaire (RTQ) to assess implicit theories of personality, the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) to assess relationship satisfaction, one question to address whether individuals' partners are seen as one's soul mate, the Commitment Level Items of the Investment Model Scale, and demographic items including age, gender, ethnicity, country of origin, current country of residence, and years of residence in current country for both the participants themselves and their romantic partner. Participants were asked questions on relationship status and duration, intention to stay in the relationship, whether friends and family support their current romantic relationship, and how ethnically/culturally different they perceive their partner and their partner's family to be. Participants were also asked to provide the e-mail address of their romantic partners. The partners whose e-mail addresses were provided were then invited to complete the same survey. While the aim was to collect dyadic data, only nine of the partners completed the survey after receiving the invitation, resulting in analyses only being able to be conducted on the data from the MTurk workers.

## Hypotheses

H1: In this study it is expected that couples with greater differences in vertical individualism have lower relationship satisfaction.

H2: Couples with greater differences in vertical collectivism have lower relationship satisfaction.

H3: Couples with greater differences in horizontal individualism have lower relationship satisfaction.

H4: Couples with greater differences in horizontal collectivism have lower relationship satisfaction.

H5: Conscientiousness, agreeableness, and extraversion are positively correlated to relationship satisfaction.

H6: Neuroticism is negatively correlated with relationship satisfaction.

H7: For individuals who believe their partner is their soul mate, holding a soul mate theory is positively correlated with relationship satisfaction and commitment.

Additionally, due to the low response rate and lack of dyadic data, exploratory analyses were conducted to determine if there were significant differences in relationship satisfaction, dyadic adjustment, and relationship commitment depending on whether the individual was in an intracultural or intercultural relationship. Exploratory analyses were also conducted to determine predictors for relationship satisfaction, dyadic adjustment, and relationship commitment.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODS

#### **Participants**

The population of interest for this study is individuals in intercultural (differences in ethnicity or countries of origin) romantic relationships in the United States, as well as a comparison group of individuals involved in intracultural (same ethnicity and country of origin) romantic relationships in the United States. In order to sample from this population, Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) was utilized. MTurk is an internet marketplace in which researchers or businesses can post human intelligence tasks (HITs) for individuals to complete for compensation. This marketplace has a diverse group of individuals completing the HITs (Amazon, 2012). This use of MTurk allowed for finding a large number of individuals who were currently in intercultural and intracultural relationships. Since the study was conducted online, the setting depended on where the participants were located. The time of day and location also varied depending on when and where the participants decided to access the study.

#### **Materials and Measures**

##### **Consent Form**

Participants were presented with an informed consent form (Appendix A) prior to participating in the study.

##### **Big Five-Personality Survey**

A scale measuring the Big Five traits was administered in order to assess the personality traits of participants (Appendix B). The scale used was the 20-item Mini-IPIP developed by Donnellan and colleagues (2006). The Mini-IPIP is a shorter version of the 50-item International Personality Item Pool developed by Goldberg (1999). As reported by Donnellan and colleagues

(2006) the Mini-IPIP was developed and validated across five studies resulting in consistent and acceptable internal consistencies (alphas ranging from 0.65 to .77 in study one, and .70 to .82 in study two). Coverage of the Big Five measures and the test-retest correlations were similar between the Mini-IPIP and the 50-item International Item Pool. Comparable patterns were also found for convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity between the Mini-IPIP and other Big Five measures. The Mini-IPIP has four items per Big Five factor (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, intellect/imagination). Participants rated each of the 20 statements using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (very inaccurate) to 5 (very accurate). Ten of the items are reverse scored.

### **Horizontal and Vertical Individualism Collectivism Scale**

The Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale (HVIC) was administered in order to assess participants' levels of the horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism (Appendix C). This scale was developed by Singelis and colleagues (1995). As reported by the authors, the alpha reliabilities for the scales were good (ranging from  $r = 0.67$  to  $r = 0.74$ ). Convergent validity was established when compared to the independence and interdependence subscale of the Self-Construal Scale as well as with Sinha's individualism and collectivism items (Sinha & Verma, 1994). Face validity, convergent, and divergent validity were further established in later studies (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). A modified version of the scale was examined in a Korean population. The four factors emerged in the Korean sample providing confidence in the horizontal and vertical distinction of individualism and collectivism. The four dimensions had good convergent and divergent validity such that horizontal individualism and vertical individualism were negatively correlated, while horizontal collectivism and vertical collectivism were not discriminately different. The studies



also showed that Oyserman's (1993) collectivist items, Gudykunst et al.'s (1994) interdependent and independent self-construal items, and Clark et al.'s (1994) communal relationships measure reflect only horizontal aspects of individualism and collectivism. The Cheek et al. (1994) Collective Identity scale and Altyemeyer right-wing authoritarianism scale (1981) reflect the vertical aspects of individualism and collectivism, in particular collectivism.

The HVIC consists of four dimensions: horizontal collectivism, horizontal individualism, vertical collectivism, and vertical individualism. Each dimension consists of 8 items, for a total of 32 items. Participants rated these 32 items using a Likert-type rating scale ranging from 1 (never or definitely no) to 9 (always or definitely yes).

### **Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure**

The Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) was administered in order to assess the levels of participants' ethnic identity (Appendix D). This measure was developed by Phinney (1992). In the original study, the measure was shown to have high reliability as measure by Cronbach's alpha for both a high school sample ( $r = 0.81$ ) and a college sample ( $r = 0.90$ ). Additionally, white participants scored lower in ethnic identity than the participants of three minority groups measured. The two factor structure (ethnic identity and other group orientation) of the MEIM was further supported in later studies (Worrell, 2000). Convergent and divergent validity for the MEIM with collective self-esteem and racial identity was examined by Casey-Cannon, Coleman, Knudtson, and Velazquez (2011) using a sample of diverse adolescents. The findings supported convergent validity for group membership and identity subscales ( $r = 0.31$  to  $0.46$ ).

The MEIM consists of two factors, ethnic identity and other-group orientation. Ethnic identity consists of 14 items, which can be further divided into three subscales: affirmation and

belonging, ethnic identity achievement, and ethnic behaviors. Other-group orientation consists of 6 items. For both factors, the items are 4-point, Likert-type items ranging from 4 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). Participants rated each of the twenty items, indicating their level of agreement or disagreement.

### **Perception of Partner as Soul Mate**

One question was asked to address whether the individuals' partners are seen as their soul mate which was included as part of the demographics survey (Appendix I).

### **Relationship Theories Questionnaire**

A scale measuring beliefs of the soul mate theory and the work-it-out theory was administered in order to assess participants' endorsement of the two implicit relationship theories (Appendix E). This questionnaire was developed by Draniuk, Cohen and Pomerantz (2002) and as reported by the authors, the scale is highly stable over time ( $r = 0.74$ ). The Relationship Theories Questionnaire (RTQ) has also shown convergent and discriminant validity. The RTQ is moderately correlated with other implicit relationship scales including Knee's (1998) destiny scale ( $r = 0.29$ ) and growth scale ( $r = -0.25$ ) and Sprecher and Mett's (1989) Romantic Beliefs Scale ( $r = 0.34$ ). Since the correlations were moderate, this suggests that the RTQ can be distinguished from the other implicit relationship theory measures. The soul mate theory scale was negatively correlated ( $r = -0.40$ ) with the work-it-out theory scale, suggesting that while the theories can be held simultaneously, individuals are more likely to strongly endorse one or the other theory (Franiuk et al., 2002).

The relationship theories questionnaire assesses endorsement of the soul mate theory with 11 items and the work-it-out theory with 9 items, for a total of 20 items. Participants rated each

statement using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Two of the items are reverse scored.

### **Relationship Assessment Scale**

Two scales measuring relationship satisfaction were administered. The first scale was the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) (Appendix F) developed by Hendrick (1988). As reported by the author, the scale has high reliability with an alpha of 0.86 and correlates with other relevant relationship measures establishing convergent validity. Additionally, the RAS was able to discriminate effectively between those couples who stayed together versus those couples who ended their relationships. Later studies by Hendrick and Hendrick (1998) further established the psychometric properties of the RAS. The RAS was highly correlated with the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (0.80 in one study, 0.88 in another) and the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (0.64 for men, 0.74 for women). The RAS also performed consistently across diverse age and ethnic groups. Vaughn and Baier (1999) further found support for criterion and convergent validity of the RAS. The coefficient alpha of the RAS total score was 0.91 and was significantly correlated (0.84) with the total Dyadic Adjustment score. For the RAS, participants rated 7 statements using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (low satisfaction) to 5 (high satisfaction). Two of the seven statements are reverse scored (Hendrick 1988).

### **Dyadic Adjustment Scale**

The second scale that was administered to assess relationship satisfaction is the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) (Appendix G). This scale was created by Spanier (1976). As reported by the author, the scale has content validity tested through the use of agreement on items by multiple judges and criterion-related validity based on the ability to significantly differentiate between married and divorced individuals. The scale also has construct validity. The DAS was

highly correlated (0.86 for married respondents, 0.88 for divorced respondents) with the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale (1959), which was the most frequently used marital satisfaction scale when the DAS was created. Additionally the scale has high reliability, ranging from 0.73 to 0.94 for the four subscales, and 0.96 for the total score (Spanier 1976).

The DAS consists of four subscales, dyadic satisfaction, dyadic cohesion, dyadic consensus, and affectional expression. Participants responded to 32 statements, of which, 29 were Likert-type items; 15 ranged from 5 (always agree) to 0 (always disagree), 7 ranged from 0 (all of the time) to 5 (never) (two of which are reverse coded), 1 ranged from 4 (every day) to 0 (never), 1 ranged from 4 (all of them) to 0 (none of them), 4 ranged from 0 (never) to 5 (more often), and 1 ranged from 0 (extremely unhappy) to 6 (perfect). Yes or no responses were required for 2 items and 1 item required the participant to pick the best option.

### **Commitment Level Items**

The Commitment Level Items of the Investment Model Scale (Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew, 1998) were administered to assess how committed participants were to their current romantic relationships (Appendix H). The Commitment Level Items were used as a proxy for relationship longevity due to the limited time frame of the study. Past research has shown that relationship commitment is significantly and positively associated with relationship duration (Rusbult, Martz & Agnew, 1998) and is among one of the strongest predictors for relationship dissolution (Le, Dove, Agnew, Korn, & Mutso, 2010). Rusbult, Martz, and Agnew (1998) conducted three studies in order to examine the reliability of the Investment Model Scale. In all three studies, Commitment Level Items showed good internal consistency. Studies 2 and 3 examined the associations the constructs of the Investment Model Scale had with instruments measuring relationship quality and personal dispositions. In both Study 2 and Study 3, the Commitment

Level Items were found to be significantly positively correlated with several facets of dyadic adjustment: dyadic adjustment total score, satisfaction and commitment purged score, dyadic consensus, affective expression, dyadic satisfaction, dyadic cohesion, and Time 2 dyadic adjustment. Additionally in both Study 2 and Study 3, Commitment Level Items were found to be significantly positively correlated with the duration of the relationship. In Study 2, Commitment Level Items were also found to be significantly positively correlated with several facets of relationship closeness: total closeness score, frequency of contact, diversity of contact, and strength of influence. In Study 2, commitment items were significantly positively correlated with inclusion of other in the self as well as several facets of trust level: total trust score, predictability, dependability, and faith. Findings showed significant positive correlations with both liking and loving for partner as well. The findings of Study 3 indicated that earlier measures of the constructs of the Investment Model Scale were predictive of later levels of both relationship status and dyadic adjustment.

The Commitment Level Items are seven 9-point Likert-type items ranging from 0 (do not agree at all) to 8 (agree completely). Two of the items are reversed scored. A total score is then calculated for a total commitment level. Participants indicated their level of agreement or disagreement with each of the seven items.

### **Demographic information**

Participants were given a short survey (Appendix I) asking for demographic information including age, gender, ethnicity, country of origin, current country of residence, and years of residence in current country for both themselves and their romantic partner. Participants were also asked questions on relationship status and duration, intention to stay in the relationship, whether friends and family support their current romantic relationship, and whether they

perceive their partner and their partner's family to be ethnically/culturally different than themselves and their family.

### **Procedures**

Two survey links were posted on the MTurk database through the use of two separate HITs. One HIT was limited to individuals who currently reside in the United States and who are involved in an intercultural relationship (defined as difference between partners in countries of origin or ethnicity). The other HIT was limited to individuals who currently reside in the United States and who are involved in an intracultural relationship (defined as partners having the same country of origin and ethnicity). Data was collected from February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014 through March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2014, a period of about two weeks. Those participants who choose to participate clicked on the links provided in the HIT description. Participants saw a short message informing them that by completing the survey they are giving their consent to participate in the study, and that their information would remain confidential (Appendix A). Participants were informed that they would not receive compensation unless they completed the survey and correctly completed the manipulation check. The participants then proceeded to complete the 20-item Mini-IPIP (Appendix B), the Horizontal and Vertical Individualism Collectivism Scale (HVIC) (Appendix C), the Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) (Appendix D), the Relationship Theories Questionnaire (RTQ) (Appendix E), the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) (Appendix F), the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) (Appendix G), Commitment Level Items (Appendix H), one question to address whether the individual's partner is seen as one's soul mate, and demographic information (Appendix I). A manipulation check was built into the demographic survey by asking questions about the participant's ethnicity and country of origin as well as the ethnicity and country of origin of the participant's partner to insure that those completing the HIT were in

an intercultural or intracultural relationship (depending on which link they completed). Questions about relationships status and duration were also built into the survey to make sure the participants were currently in a romantic relationship. At the end of the survey, participants were asked to provide an e-mail address for their romantic partner. A total of 91 (35.1%) participants provided their partner's e-mail address. Participants were then compensated \$0.85 for the survey, provided that the survey was fully completed, the manipulation check was correct (the individual was in an intracultural relationship or intercultural relationship), and the participants did not miss more than one of the spam check questions. Of the 309 HITs submitted, 47 (15.4%) were rejected due to prior completion or missing 2 or more spam check questions. Most participants completed the survey in approximately 20 minutes. The romantic partners of those who completed the survey were then e-mailed inviting them to complete the survey. Contact information was provided for 91 romantic partners. Of the 91 participants, 9 (9.9%) completed the survey after receiving the e-mail invitation.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS

#### **Descriptive Statistics**

Data were collected from 259 individuals currently in a romantic relationship from Amazon MTurk (see Table 2 for a breakdown of the type of relationship). In terms of gender identification, 36.2% of the sample (92) self-identified as male and 63.0% (160) identified as female (see Table 1 for demographic data). The age ranged from 18-73, with the average age of 35.2. In terms of ethnicity, 74.7% of the sample (192) identified as Caucasian, 7.8% (20) identified as African American, 5.1% (13) identified as Asian American, 5.4% (14) identified as Hispanic/Latino(a), 0.4% (1) identified as Native American, 4.7% (12) identified as bi- or multi-ethnic, and 1.9% (5) indicated that their ethnicity was not listed. A majority of participants (92.7%) indicated that the United States was their country of origin. The number of years in the United States ranged from 2-73, with an average number of years in the United States of 33.5. Relationship length ranged from 1-612 months (.08-51.0 years), with an average relationship length of 85.5 months (7.1 years). In terms of relationship status, the sample was almost equally split with 49.8% of the sample (129) indicating dating and 50.2% (130) indicating married.

In terms of partner age, the age ranged from 18-73, with an average age of 35.5 years. In terms of partner gender, 61.3% of the sample (155) indicated that their partner was male and 38.3% (97) indicated female. In terms of the partner ethnicity, 56.8% of the sample (147) indicated that their partner was Caucasian, 10.8% (28) indicated African American, 7.3% (19) indicated Asian American, 12.4% (32) indicated Hispanic/Latino(a), 1.9% (5) indicated Native American, 6.9% (18) indicated bi- or multi-ethnic, and 3.9% (10) indicated that the ethnicity of



their partner was not listed. A majority (84.2%) of participants indicated that their partners' country of origin was the United States.

### **Tests of the Hypotheses**

The original intent of the current study was to examine the various measures with dyadic data. Unfortunately, only a total of nine of the participants' partners participated in the study after receiving the invitation. Due to this low number, conducting analyses on dyadic data was not feasible. Hypotheses 1 through 4 required dyadic data, and therefore could not be tested. Hypotheses 5 through 7 were examined by conducting bivariate correlations (see Table 4 for bivariate correlation matrix).

#### **Hypothesis 5**

Hypothesis 5 stated that conscientiousness, agreeableness, and extraversion are positively correlated to relationship satisfaction. This hypothesis was largely supported. The conscientiousness subscore of the of IPIP was positively significantly correlated with the RAS total score,  $r(252) = .25, p < .001$ , and the satisfaction subscale of the DAS,  $r(246) = .21, p = .001$ . The extraversion subscale of the IPIP was positively significantly correlated with only with the RAS total,  $r(253) = .16, p = .01$ , but not the satisfaction subscore of the DAS. The agreeableness subscore of the IPIP was positively significantly correlated with the RAS total,  $r(254) = .36, p < .001$  and the satisfaction subscale of the DAS,  $r(248) = .20, p = .001$ .

#### **Hypothesis 6**

Hypothesis 6 stated that neuroticism is negatively correlated with relationship satisfaction. This hypothesis was supported. The neuroticism subscale of the IPIP was significantly negatively correlated with the RAS total,  $r(254) = -.30, p < .001$ , and the satisfaction subscale of the DAS,  $r(247) = -.28, p < .001$ .

## **Hypothesis 7**

Hypothesis 7 states that for individuals who believe their partner is their soul mate, holding a soul mate theory is positively correlated with relationship satisfaction and commitment. This hypothesis was only partially supported. For those who believed that their partner was their soul mate, holding a soul mate theory was positively significantly correlated with RAS total,  $r(188) = .20, p = .007$ , but not the satisfaction subscale of the DAS, or the Commitment Level Items total.

## **Exploratory Analyses**

### **Intracultural Versus Intercultural Differences**

Exploratory analyses were conducted using a MANOVA to examine whether individuals in intracultural versus intercultural relationships differed significantly in terms of the RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Items. A statistically significant difference was found, Wilks'  $\lambda = .97$ ,  $F(3, 231) = 2.67, p = .034; \eta^2 = 0.034, 1 - \beta = 0.65$  (see Table 7). Follow-up ANOVAs, indicated that the effect of being in an intracultural versus intercultural relationship was statistically significant for RAS,  $F(1, 233) = 6.07, p = .014; \eta^2 = 0.025, 1 - \beta = 0.69$ ; DAS,  $F(1, 233) = 4.32, p = .039; \eta^2 = 0.018, 1 - \beta = 0.54$ ; and Commitment Level Items;  $F(1, 233) = 6.75, p = .010; \eta^2 = 0.028, 1 - \beta = 0.73$  (see Table 8). Individuals in intercultural relationships scored lower on average on RAS ( $M = 28.40, SD = 5.93$ ), DAS ( $M = 105.84, SD = 19.12$ ) and Commitment Level Items ( $M = 48.52, SD = 11.32$ ) than individuals in intracultural relationship ( $M = 29.71, SD = 5.21; M = 110.65, SD = 14.78; and M = 51.19, SD = 8.09$  respectively) (see Table 9).

### **Predictors for RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Items**

Hierarchical linear regressions were conducted separately for RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Items in order to determine significant predictors. These regression analyses

were conducted in three steps: first for the entire data set, and then separately for participants in intracultural and intercultural relationships. These results are presented in the same order: overall, intracultural, and intercultural.

### **Predictors for RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Items for All Participants**

**Predictors for RAS.** A hierarchical linear regression was conducted to investigate predictors for RAS scores based on significant correlations with personality factors, cultural orientation, implicit relationship theories, friend/family support, and perception of partner and partner's family (see Table 10). Age and gender were entered in Step 1; type of relationship (intracultural or intercultural) was entered in Step 2; conscientiousness, extroversion, neuroticism, and agreeableness were entered in Step 3; horizontal collectivism was entered in Step 4; SMT total and perception of partner as a soul mate were entered in Step 5; and friend support, family support, perception of partner as different, and perception of partner's family as different were entered in Step 6. In Step 1, gender and age did not significantly predict RAS when entered alone,  $F(2, 224) = .39, p = .678$ , adjusted  $R^2 = -.005$ . In Step 2, adding type of relationship (intracultural versus intercultural) significantly improved the prediction,  $R^2$  change = .017,  $F(1, 223) = 3.92, p = .049$ . In Step 3, Adding personality factors significantly improved the prediction,  $R^2$  change = .230,  $F(4, 219) = 16.82, p < .001$ . In Step 4, adding horizontal collectivism did not significantly improve prediction,  $R^2$  change = .000,  $F(1, 218) = .040, p = .842$ . In Step 5, adding SMT total and perception of a partner as soul mate significantly improved prediction,  $R^2$  change = .115,  $F(2, 216) = 19.53, p < .001$ . In Step 5, adding friend support, family support, perception of partner, and perception of partner's family significantly improved prediction,  $R^2$  change = .148,  $F(4, 212) = 16.13, p < .001$ . The entire group of variables significantly predicted RAS scores,  $F(14, 212) = 15.99, p < .001$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .48$ , indicating

that 48% of the variance in RAS scores. In the final model, neuroticism, agreeableness, perception of partner as soul mate, and friend support contributed significantly to predicting RAS scores.

**Predictors for DAS.** A hierarchical linear regression was conducted to investigate predictors for DAS scores based on significant correlations with personality factors, cultural orientation, implicit relationship theories, friend/family support, and perception of partner and partner's family (see Table 11). Age and gender were entered in Step 1; type of relationship (intracultural or intercultural) was entered in Step 2; conscientiousness, extroversion, neuroticism, and agreeableness were entered in Step 3; horizontal collectivism was entered in Step 4; perception of partner as a soul mate was entered in Step 5; and friend support, family support, perception of partner as different, and perception of partner's family as different were entered in Step 6. In Step 1, gender and age did not significantly predict DAS when entered alone,  $F(2, 211) = 2.07, p = .128$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .010$ . In Step 2, adding type of relationship (intracultural versus intercultural) significantly improved the prediction,  $R^2$  change = .027,  $F(1, 210) = 5.84, p = .017$ . In Step 3, Adding personality factors significantly improved the prediction,  $R^2$  change = .22,  $F(4, 206) = 15.61, p < .001$ . In Step 4, adding horizontal collectivism did not significantly improve prediction,  $R^2$  change = .003,  $F(1, 205) = .98, p = .32$ . In Step 5, adding perception of a partner as a soul mate significantly improved prediction,  $R^2$  change = .038,  $F(1, 204) = 11.07, p = .001$ . In Step 6, adding friend support, family support, perception of partner, and perception of partner's family significantly improved prediction,  $R^2$  change = .150,  $F(4, 200) = 13.86, p < .001$ . The entire group of variables significantly predicted 42% of the variance in DAS scores,  $F(13, 200) = 13.04, p < .001$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .42$ . In the final

model, age, neuroticism, agreeableness, and friend support contributed significantly to predicting DAS scores.

**Predictors for Commitment Level Items.** A hierarchical linear regression was conducted to investigate predictors for commitment level item scores based on significant correlations with personality factors, cultural orientation, implicit relationship theories, friend/family support, and perception of partner and partner's family (see Table 12). Age and gender were entered in Step 1; type of relationship (intracultural or intercultural) was entered in Step 2; conscientiousness, neuroticism, and agreeableness were entered in Step 3; horizontal collectivism was entered in Step 4; SMT total and perception of partner as a soul mate was entered in Step 5; and friend support, family support, perception of partner as different, and perception of partner's family as different were entered in Step 6. In Step 1, gender and age did not significantly predict commitment level item totals when entered alone,  $F(2, 222) = 1.26, p = .286$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .002$ . In Step 2, adding type of relationship (intracultural versus intercultural) significantly improved the prediction,  $R^2$  change = .022,  $F(1, 221) = 5.02, p = .026$ . In Step 3, Adding personality factors significantly improved the prediction,  $R^2$  change = .16,  $F(3, 218) = 14.46, p < .001$ . In Step 4, adding horizontal collectivism did not significantly improve prediction,  $R^2$  change = .008,  $F(1, 215) = 2.12, p = .15$ . In Step 5, adding SMT total and perception of a partner as a soul mate significantly improved prediction,  $R^2$  change = .150,  $F(2, 215) = 24.92, p < .001$ . In Step 5, adding friend support, family support, perception of partner, and perception of partner's family significantly improved prediction,  $R^2$  change = .058,  $F(4, 211) = 5.17, p = .001$ . The entire group of variables significantly predicted 37% of the variance in commitment level item scores,  $F(13, 211) = 11.26, p < .001$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .37$ . In the final

model, conscientiousness, agreeableness, perception of partner as soul mate, and friend support contributed significantly to predicting commitment level item scores.

### **Predictors for RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level in Intracultural Relationships**

Hierarchical linear regressions were conducted separately for RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Items for intracultural relationships in order to determine significant predictors (see Table 5 for a bivariate correlation matrix for individuals in intracultural relationships).

**Predictors for RAS in intracultural relationships.** A hierarchical linear regression was conducted to investigate predictors for RAS scores based on significant correlations with personality factors, cultural orientation, implicit relationship theories, friend/family support, and perception of partner and partner's family (see Table 13). Age and gender were entered in Step 1; conscientiousness, neuroticism, and agreeableness were entered in Step 2; horizontal collectivism was entered in Step 3; SMT total and perception of partner as a soul mate were entered in Step 4; and friend support and family support were entered in Step 5. In Step 1, gender and age did not significantly predict RAS when entered alone,  $F(2, 115) = 1.26, p = .288$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .004$ . In Step 2, Adding personality factors significantly improved the prediction,  $R^2$  change = .274,  $F(3, 112) = 14.53, p < .001$ . In Step 3, adding horizontal collectivism did not significantly improve prediction,  $R^2$  change = .000,  $F(1, 111) = .040, p = .791$ . In Step 4, adding SMT total and perception of a partner significantly improved prediction,  $R^2$  change = .040,  $F(2, 109) = 3.28, p = .042$ . In Step 5, adding friend support and family support significantly improved prediction,  $R^2$  change = .105,  $F(2, 107) = 10.04, p < .001$ . The entire group of variables significantly predicted 39% of the variance in RAS scores,  $F(10, 107) = 8.44, p < .001$ , adjusted

$R^2 = .39$ . In the final model, neuroticism, agreeableness, and friend support contributed significantly to predicting RAS scores.

**Predictors for DAS for intracultural relationships.** A hierarchical linear regression was conducted to investigate predictors for DAS scores based on significant correlations with personality factors, cultural orientation, implicit relationship theories, friend/family support, and perception of partner and partner's family (see Table 14). Age and gender were entered in Step 1; conscientiousness, extroversion, neuroticism, and agreeableness were entered in Step 2; horizontal collectivism and horizontal individualism were entered in Step 3; and friend support and family support were entered in Step 4. In Step 1, gender and age did not significantly predict DAS when entered alone,  $F(2, 109) = 2.31, p = .105$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .023$ . In Step 2, Adding personality factors significantly improved the prediction,  $R^2$  change = .31,  $F(4, 105) = 12.62, p < .001$ . In Step 3, adding horizontal collectivism and horizontal individualism did not significantly improve prediction,  $R^2$  change = .013,  $F(2, 103) = .036, p = .350$ . In Step 4, adding friend support and family support significantly improved prediction,  $R^2$  change = .036,  $F(2, 101) = 3.08, p = .050$ . The entire group of variables significantly predicted 34% of the variance in DAS scores,  $F(10, 101) = 6.78, p < .001$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .34$ . In the final model, age, conscientiousness, and agreeableness contributed significantly to predicting DAS scores.

**Predictors for Commitment Level Items for intracultural relationships.** A hierarchical linear regression was conducted to investigate predictors for commitment level scores based on significant correlations with personality factors, cultural orientation, implicit relationship theories, friend/family support, and perception of partner and partner's family (see Table 15). Age and gender were entered in Step 1; conscientiousness, neuroticism, and agreeableness were entered in Step 2; horizontal collectivism was entered in Step 3; SMT total

and perception of partner as a soul mate were entered in Step 4; and friend support, family support, and perception of partner as different were entered in Step 5. In Step 1, gender and age did not significantly predict commitment level scores when entered alone,  $F(2, 113) = 1.65, p = .20$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .011$ . In Step 2, Adding personality factors significantly improved the prediction,  $R^2$  change = .24,  $F(3, 110) = 12.17, p < .001$ . In Step 3, adding horizontal collectivism did not significantly improve prediction,  $R^2$  change = .002,  $F(1, 109) = .32, p = .57$ . In Step 4, adding SMT total and perception of a partner as soul mate significantly improved prediction,  $R^2$  change = .079  $F(2, 107) = 6.55, p = .002$ . In Step 5, adding friend support, family support, and perception of partner as different significantly improved prediction,  $R^2$  change = .096,  $F(3, 104) = 6.01, p = .001$ . The entire group of variables significantly predicted 39% of the variance in commitment level scores,  $F(11, 104) 7.67, p < .001$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .39$ . In the final model, agreeableness, friend support, and perception of partner as different contributed significantly to predicting commitment level scores.

### **Predictors for RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level in Intercultural Relationships**

Hierarchical linear regressions were conducted separately for RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Items for intracultural relationships in order to determine significant predictors (see Table 6 for a bivariate correlation matrix for individuals in intercultural relationships).

**Predictors for RAS in intercultural relationships.** A hierarchical linear regression was conducted to investigate predictors for RAS scores based on significant correlations with personality factors, cultural orientation, implicit relationship theories, friend/family support, and perception of partner and partner's family (see Table 16). Age and gender were entered in Step 1; conscientiousness, extroversion, neuroticism, and agreeableness were entered in Step 2;



perception of partner as a soul mate was entered in Step 3; and friend support and family support were entered in Step 4. In Step 1, gender and age did not significantly predict RAS when entered alone,  $F(2, 111) = 1.90, p = .154$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .016$ . In Step 2, Adding personality factors significantly improved the prediction,  $R^2$  change = .18,  $F(4, 107) = 6.27, p < .001$ . In Step 3, adding perception of a partner as soul mate significantly improved prediction,  $R^2$  change = .23,  $F(1, 106) = 43.64, p < .001$ . In Step 4, adding friend support and family support significantly improved prediction,  $R^2$  change = .16,  $F(2, 104) = 20.35, p < .001$ . The entire group of variables significantly predicted 57% of the variance in RAS scores,  $F(9, 104) = 17.42, p < .001$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .57$ . In the final model, neuroticism, agreeableness, perception of partner as soul mate, and friend support contributed significantly to predicting RAS scores.

**Predictors for DAS for intercultural relationships.** A hierarchical linear regression was conducted to investigate predictors for DAS scores based on significant correlations with personality factors, cultural orientation, implicit relationship theories, friend/family support, and perception of partner and partner's family (see Table 17). Age and gender were entered in Step 1; neuroticism, and agreeableness were entered in Step 2; horizontal collectivism was entered in Step 3; perception of partner as soul mate was entered in Step 4, and friend support, family support, and perception of partner as different were entered in Step 5. In Step 1, gender and age did not significantly predict DAS when entered alone,  $F(2, 100) = 1.53, p = .22$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .010$ . In Step 2, Adding personality factors significantly improved the prediction,  $R^2$  change = .19,  $F(2, 98) = 12.25, p < .001$ . In Step 3, adding horizontal collectivism did not significantly improve prediction,  $R^2$  change = .019,  $F(1, 97) = 2.50, p = .117$ . In Step 4, adding perception of partner as soul mate significantly improved prediction,  $R^2$  change = .13,  $F(1, 96) = 19.69, p < .001$ . In Step 5 adding friend support, family support, and perception of partner as different

significantly improved prediction,  $R^2$  change = .19,  $F(3, 93) = 13.72$ ,  $p < .001$ . The entire group of variables significantly predicted 52% of the variance in DAS scores,  $F(9, 93) = 13.40$ ,  $p < .001$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .52$ . In the final model, age, neuroticism, agreeableness, horizontal collectivism, perception of partner as soul mate, and friend support contributed significantly to predicting DAS scores.

#### **Predictors for Commitment Level Items for intercultural relationships. A**

hierarchical linear regression was conducted to investigate predictors for commitment level scores based on significant correlations with personality factors, cultural orientation, implicit relationship theories, friend/family support, and perception of partner and partner's family (see Table 18). Age and gender were entered in Step 1; conscientiousness and agreeableness were entered in Step 2; horizontal collectivism was entered in Step 3; perception of partner as a soul mate was entered in Step 4; and friend support and family support were entered in Step 5. In Step 1, gender and age did not significantly predict commitment level scores when entered alone,  $F(2, 107) = .901$ ,  $p = .41$ , adjusted  $R^2 = -.002$ . In Step 2, Adding personality factors significantly improved the prediction,  $R^2$  change = .13,  $F(2, 105) = 8.25$ ,  $p < .001$ . In Step 3, adding horizontal collectivism did not significantly improve prediction,  $R^2$  change = .008,  $F(1, 104) = .98$ ,  $p = .33$ . In Step 4, adding perception of a partner as soul mate significantly improved prediction,  $R^2$  change = .19  $F(1, 103) = 30.83$ ,  $p < .001$ . In Step 5, adding friend support and family support significantly improved prediction,  $R^2$  change = .051,  $F(2, 101) = 4.35$ ,  $p = .015$ . The entire group of variables significantly predicted 36% of the variance in commitment level scores,  $F(8, 101) = 8.54$ ,  $p < .001$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .36$ . In the final model, perception of partner as soul mate contributed significantly to predicting commitment level scores.

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION

#### **Hypotheses**

Hypotheses 1 through 4 could not be tested due to a lack of dyadic data. However, for the data that were obtained, it was expected that the collectivistic dimensions of the HVIC would have a positive relationship with relationship satisfaction and commitment. This was partially supported. The horizontal collectivism subscale was positively and significantly correlated with RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Items, but not the satisfaction subscale of the DAS. Vertical collectivism was positively and significantly correlated with Commitment Level Items, but not RAS, DAS, or the satisfaction subscale of the DAS. This indicates that individuals who emphasize equality as well as communal relationships, norms, and in-group goals are likely to be more satisfied, have higher relationship adjustment, and be more committed to their relationship. On the other hand, individuals who emphasize hierarchy as well as communal relationships, norms, and in-group goals are likely to be more committed to their romantic relationships. This suggests that regardless of whether an individual emphasizes equality or hierarchy, emphasizing communal relationships, norms, and in-group goals tends to be related to higher relationship commitment.

These associations were slightly different when looking at the data by type of relationship. For individuals who indicated that they were in an intracultural relationship, horizontal collectivism was positively and significantly correlated with DAS and Commitment Level Items and negatively and significantly correlated with RAS, but not the satisfaction subscale of the DAS. Vertical collectivism was not significantly correlated with RAS, DAS,

Commitment Level Items, or the satisfaction subscale of the DAS. These results indicate that for individuals in intracultural relationships, those who emphasize equality while also emphasizing communal relationships, norms, and in-group goals are more likely to have higher relationship adjustment, and be more committed to their romantic relationship, but less likely to be satisfied in their romantic relationship.

For individuals who indicated that they were in an intercultural relationship, horizontal collectivism was positively and significantly correlated with DAS and Commitment Level Items, but not RAS or the satisfaction subscale of the DAS. Vertical collectivism was not significantly correlated with RAS, DAS, Commitment Level Items, or the satisfaction subscale of the DAS. These findings suggest that individuals in intercultural relationships who emphasize equality as well as communal relationships, norms, and in-group goals are more likely to have higher relationship adjustment and be more committed to their romantic relationships. The difference in the relationship between RAS and horizontal collectivism for individuals in intracultural and intercultural relationships, suggests that emphasizing interdependence and equality functions differently within these relationships. For individuals in an intracultural relationship, those who emphasize interdependence and equality are less likely to be satisfied in their relationship. However, for those who are in an intercultural relationship, emphasizing interdependence and equality has a positively (though not significant) association with relationship satisfaction.

### **Hypothesis 5**

Hypothesis 5 was largely supported in that conscientiousness, agreeableness, and extroversion were positively correlated with relationship satisfaction measures. The conscientiousness subscore of the IPIP was positively and significantly correlated with the RAS total score and the satisfaction subscore of the DAS. The extroversion subscale was positively

and significantly correlated the RAS total, but not the satisfaction DAS subscale. The agreeableness subscore was positively and significantly correlated with the RAS total and the satisfaction DAS subscale. These results are largely consistent with past research (Watson, Hubbard, & Wiese, 2000; Drenforth et al., 2010; Malouff et al., 2010; Hendrick & Hendrick, 2004; Razeghi et al., 2011) and indicate that individuals who are responsible, organized, and disciplined as well as trusting, cooperative, warm, outgoing, and talkative are likely to be more satisfied in their romantic relationships.

### **Hypothesis 6**

Hypothesis 6 was supported. The neuroticism subscale of the IPIP was significantly and negatively correlated with both the RAS total and the satisfaction DAS subscale. This is consistent with past research (Malouff et al., 2010; Razeghi et al., 2011) and indicates that partners who are more anxious and worried tend to report being less satisfied in their romantic relationships.

### **Hypothesis 7**

Hypothesis 7 was partially supported. For those who indicated that their current partner was their soul mate, endorsing a soul mate theory was positively and significantly correlated with the RAS total, but not the satisfaction DAS subscale, or the Commitment Level Item total. This is partially consistent with past research (Franiuk, Cohen, & Pomerantz, 2002). While commitment can act as a proxy for longevity, the results of this study suggests that a different relationship may exist between commitment and soul mate theory scores for those individuals who believe their current partner is their soul mate. For those who believe their partner is their soul mate, endorsing a soul mate theory has an important relationship with a general measure of relationship satisfaction, though not a more nuanced measure. Perhaps this difference is due to

how individuals who endorse a soul mate theory perceive problems within a relationship. Individuals who endorse a soul mate theory tend to perceive agreement in their relationship and are more likely to give in during arguments (Franiuk, Cohen, & Pomerantz, 2002). These individuals tend to believe that there is a “right” person, a perfect match. The questions on the satisfaction subscale of the DAS address whether there are problems or arguments within the relationship, while the RAS addresses general satisfaction in different areas of the relationship. Since individuals who endorse a soul mate theory tend to perceive agreement in their relationship, the satisfaction subscale of the DAS may not be an accurate measure. These individuals may not perceive the items as being applicable to their relationships.

### **Exploratory Analyses**

#### **Intracultural Versus Intercultural Relationships**

RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Item scores differed significantly between individuals in intracultural and intercultural relationships. Individuals in intercultural relationships tended to have lower scores for the RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Items suggesting that participants who were in romantic relationships with someone from a different national or ethnic origin reported being less satisfied and less committed relative to participants in romantic relationships with partners from similar national/ethnic backgrounds. These differences could be due to the additional obstacles that participants in intercultural relationships often face (Fontaine & Dorch, 1978). Individuals in intercultural relationships were more likely to indicate that they perceived their partner and/or their partner’s family to be ethnic/culturally different compared to individuals in intracultural relationships (97.5 % versus 10.8%; 95.0 % versus 15.1% respectively). This could potentially contribute to issues within the relationship. For this sample, the differences in RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Item scores could also be

due to the duration of the relationship. Individuals in the intracultural relationships tended to have been in their current relationship for a greater number of months ( $M = 98.47$ ,  $SD = 113.45$ ) compared to individuals in intercultural relationships ( $M = 70.51$ ,  $SD = 102.81$ ). Though this seems unlikely since duration of relationship was not significantly correlated with RAS, DAS, or Commitment Level Item scores.

### **Predictors for RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Items**

Hierarchical linear regressions indicated significant predictors for RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Items. The final RAS model accounted for 48.0% of the variance and included age, gender, conscientiousness, extroversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, horizontal collectivism, SMT, perception of partner as a soul mate, friend support, family support, perception of partner as different, and perception of partner's family as different. However, the significant predictors were agreeableness, neuroticism, perception of partner as soul mate, and friend support. The final DAS model accounted for 42.0% of the variance and included: age, gender, conscientiousness, extroversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, horizontal collectivism, perception of partner as a soul mate, friend support, family support, perception of partner as different, and perception of partner's family as different. However, the significant predictors were age, agreeableness, neuroticism, and friend support. The final Commitment Level Item model accounted for 37.0% of the variance and included: age, gender, conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, horizontal collectivism, SMT, perception of partner as a soul mate, friend support, family support, perception of partner as different, and perception of partner's family as different. However, the significant predictors were conscientiousness, agreeableness, perception of partner as soul mate, and friend support. These findings suggest that relationship satisfaction (RAS), dyadic adjustment (DAS), and relationship commitment (Commitment Level

Items) have some facets in common while also remaining unique from one another. Being a compassionate, cooperative, and well-tempered person along with friends being supportive of the current romantic relationship tends to be related to higher relationship satisfaction, better adjustment in the relationship, and being more committed to the relationship.

### **Predictors for RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level in Intracultural and Intercultural Relationships**

Hierarchical linear regressions indicated significant predictors for RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Items in intracultural relationships and intercultural relationships separately.

**Intracultural relationship predictors.** The final RAS model for intracultural relationships accounted for 39.0% of the variance and included: age, gender, conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, horizontal collectivism, SMT, perception of partner as a soul mate, friend support, and family support. However, the significant predictors were agreeableness, neuroticism, and friend support. The final DAS model for intracultural relationships accounted for 34.0% of the variance and included: age, gender conscientiousness, extroversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, horizontal individualism, horizontal collectivism, friend support, and family support. The significant predictors were age, conscientiousness, and agreeableness. The final Commitment Level Items model for intracultural relationships accounted for 39.0% of the variance and included: conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, horizontal collectivism, SMT, perception of partner as soul mate, friend support, family support, and perception of partner as different. The significant predictors were agreeableness, friend support, and perception of partner as different. Agreeableness was a significant predictor for RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Items. For individuals in an intracultural relationships being compassionate,



cooperative, and well-tempered was associated with more relationship satisfaction, better relationship adjustment, and greater commitment to their current relationship.

**Intercultural relationship predictors.** The final RAS model for intercultural relationships accounted for 57.0% of the variance and included: conscientiousness, extroversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, perception of partner as soul mate, friend support, and family support. The significant predictors were agreeableness, neuroticism, perception of partner as soul mate, and friend support. The final DAS model for intercultural relationships accounted for 52.0% of the variance and included: agreeableness, neuroticism, horizontal collectivism, perception of partner as soul mate, friend support, family support, and perception of partner as different. The significant predictors were age, agreeableness, neuroticisms, horizontal collectivism, perception of partner as soul mate, and friend support. The final Commitment Level Items model for intercultural relationships accounted for 36.0% of the variance and included: conscientiousness, agreeableness, horizontal collectivism, perception of partner as soul mate, friend support, and family support. The significant predictor was perception of partner as soul mate. For RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Items perception of partner as soul mate was a significant predictor. Individuals who considered their current partner to be their soul mate tended to be more satisfied with the relationship, better adjusted to the relationship, and more committed to the relationship.

**Intracultural versus intercultural predictors.** When the predictors of RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Items are examined differences emerge depending on the type of relationship (intracultural versus intercultural). There are some similarities in terms of personality factors and friend support being important for both types of relationships. Having a cooperative and well-tempered personality tended to result in higher relationship satisfaction, greater relationship

adjustment, and more commitment to the current relationship. This was also true for friend support. Individuals who felt that their friends were supportive of their romantic relationship tended to be more satisfied, have greater relationship adjustment, and be more committed to the relationship, regardless of whether the relationship was intracultural or intercultural. However, perception of partner as soul mate emerges as a significant predictor for RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Items in intercultural relationships, but not intracultural relationships. In intercultural relationships, considering their current partners as their soul mate tended to be related to higher relationship satisfaction, greater relationship adjustment, and more commitment. However, in intracultural relationships, whether individuals viewed their current partner as their soul mate was not related to relationship satisfaction, relationship adjustment, or commitment to the relationship. This suggests relationships satisfaction (RAS), dyadic adjustment (DAS), and relationship commitment (Commitment Level Items) are expressed differently in intercultural relationships compared to intracultural relationships. What affects relationship satisfaction, dyadic adjustment, and relationship commitment differ depending on whether an individual is in an intracultural or intercultural relationship. This means that research based on intracultural relationships may not hold true for intercultural relationships. Further research needs to be conducted in order to understand the similarities and differences between intracultural and intercultural relationships. Factors that may be important in one may not be so in the other.

### **Limitations**

#### **MANOVA Analysis**

**Violating assumptions.** The MANOVA conducted to examine differences between intracultural and intercultural relationships on RAS, DAS, and commitment Level Items violated

the normality assumption and the homogeneity variance/covariance matrices assumption. However, the MANOVA results were retained as this analysis is robust to violations of multivariate normality and homogeneity of variance/covariance matrices when groups are nearly even (Leech, Barrett, & Morgan, 2011), as was the case in this study. However, it should be noted that when transformed variables were used there was a slight change in the results with the level of significance increasing from .048 to .061, with Wilks'  $\lambda = .966$ ,  $F(3, 231) = 2.673$ ,  $p = .048$ ;  $\eta^2 = 0.034$ ,  $1 - \beta = 0.647$  changing to Wilks'  $\lambda = .969$ ,  $F(3, 231) = 2.493$ ,  $p = .061$ ;  $\eta^2 = 0.031$ ,  $1 - \beta = 0.613$ .

**Correlations among dependent variables.** For MANOVA analyses, the recommendation is that there be medium-strength correlation among dependent variables, close to  $r = |0.60|$ . While this condition is met for RAS with DAS and Commitment Level Items, the correlation between DAS and RAS could be improved slightly since  $r(237) = .517$ ,  $p < .001$ .

### **Multicollinearity**

Collinearity statistics indicate issues with multicollinearity for the RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level models for the full data set as well as the RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level models for only the individuals in intracultural relationships. For the full data set, there were multicollinearity issues with perception of partner and partner's family in the RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Item analyses. There were also multicollinearity issues with type of relationship, friend support, and family support in the Commitment Level Item analysis. For individuals who indicated that they were in an intracultural relationship, there were multicollinearity issues with agreeableness, horizontal collectivism, friend support, and family support in the RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Item analyses. Multicollinearity could be obscuring the relationship between the predictors and the criterion variables. One way in which

multicollinearity issues were addressed was to conduct hierarchical regression analyses and identify incremental changes in unique variance explained by each of the predictors.

### **Reliability of Measures**

While most of the measures had good reliability ( $\alpha$  ranging from .76-.91), the satisfaction subscale of the DAS used to test some of the hypotheses only had acceptable reliability ( $\alpha = .61$ ). This lower level of reliability could potentially explain why neuroticism was negatively and significantly correlated with RAS scores, but not with the satisfaction subscale of the DAS.

### **Further Directions**

While the current study offers insights into intercultural and intracultural relationships, there are several ways to build upon these findings. Replication is needed in populations obtained via mechanisms other than MTurk. For instance, conducting the current study with a student population would be of interest as these participants may be younger and the predictors determining their relationship satisfaction may be different from individuals who are older and may have had multiple relationship experiences. Additionally, it would be beneficial to sample individuals who have more recently entered their romantic relationship (for example less than a year). The current sample consisted largely of individuals who had been in their romantic relationships for quite some time.

While the current study indicates that there were differences in predictors for RAS, DAS, and Commitment Level Items depending on type of relationships, this could be further explored in a more quantitative way by testing interaction terms with type of relationship and the predictors in regression analyses. For those predictors that did not differ between the individuals in intracultural relationships and those in intercultural relationships, it would be expected that the

interaction terms between type of relationship and those predictors would not be significant. However, for those predictors that did differ between individuals in intracultural and intercultural relationships, it would be expected that the interaction term would be significant.

Another factor to examine further is the type of intercultural relationship. The current study could be expanded to examine individuals with the same race/ethnicity and same country of origin, same race/ethnicity and different country of origin, different race/ethnicity and same country of origin, and different race/ethnicity and different country of origin. Correlations from the current study suggest that the associations between the measures may differ among the different types of intercultural relationships, not just intracultural relationships versus intercultural relationships. Effects of race/ethnicity could be explored to see if the racial composition of the intercultural couple influences measures of relationship assessment.

This study could also be expanded by having both partners complete the same survey and analyzing the dyadic data. While MTurk does not seem to be a feasible option for gathering dyadic data, collecting from a student sample would more easily allow for data to be collected from both partners. This would especially be the case if efforts were made to recruit couples initially so that both members complete the survey at the same time. Differences between the partners' responses to the measures can offer insights into which differences most impact relationship satisfaction, dyadic adjustment, and relationship commitment. Future studies could also examine if individuals in intracultural and intercultural relationships differ in terms of their reasons for entering a relationship with their current partner as well as the factors that influence their commitment to their current partner.

## **Conclusions and Implications**

The data found in the current study provided varying levels of support for the hypotheses concerning personality traits and relationship satisfaction. Conscientiousness, extraversion, and agreeableness were positively associated with relationship satisfaction while neuroticism was negatively associated with relationship satisfaction. The findings suggest that the RAS and satisfaction subscale of the DAS may be tapping into slightly different concepts since extroversion was significantly correlated with RAS scores, but not the satisfaction subscale of the DAS.

The current study provides partial support for the hypothesis concerning the relationship between endorsing a soul mate theory, relationship satisfaction, and relationship commitment for those individuals who believe their current partner is their soul mate. While soul mate theory scores were positively associated with the RAS scores, the relationship with the satisfaction subscale of the DAS and Commitment Level Items was nonsignificant. This again suggests that the RAS and DAS satisfaction subscale may be tapping into different concepts. Additionally, while commitment has been shown to be a strong predictor for relationship longevity, the results of this study indicate that for those who believe their current partner is their soul mate, endorsing a soul mate theory has a different association with relationship commitment than as would be predicted with relationship longevity from previous research.

The data found in the current study offers important insights into relationship research with individuals in intracultural and intercultural relationships. The current study suggests that the type of relationship (intracultural or intercultural) can result in differences in scores of relationship satisfaction (RAS), dyadic adjustment (DAS), and relationship commitment (Commitment Level Items). Additionally, the data suggests that what is associated with these scores differ depending of the type of relationship. For both intracultural and intercultural

relationships being a cooperative and well-tempered person was associated with greater relationship satisfaction and relationship adjustment. For both type of relationships individuals who indicated that their friends were supportive of the relationship also tended to have higher relationship satisfaction, while individuals who were anxious and worried tended to report lower relationship satisfaction. However, viewing partners as their soul mate was only an important factor for individuals who indicate that they were in an intercultural relationship. For individuals in an intercultural relationship, individuals who indicate that they considered their partner their soul mate tended to have higher relationship satisfaction, relationship adjustment, and commitment to the relationship. This has important implications for the future. These findings suggest that research conducted on intracultural relationships will not necessarily translate to intercultural relationships. While some of the predictors were similar for intracultural and intercultural relationships, there were also differences between the two groups suggesting a need for future relationship research to take the type of relationship into account.

Table 1

*Demographic Data for MTurk Sample*

<b>Category</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Type of Relationship	Intracultural	139	53.7
	Intercultural	120	46.3
Participant Gender	Male	92	36.2
	Female	160	61.8
	Not listed	2	.80
Participant Ethnicity	Caucasian	192	74.7
	African American	20	7.8
	Asian American	13	5.1
	Hispanic/Latino (a)	14	5.4
	Native American	1	.40
	Bi- or multi-ethnic	12	4.7
	Not listed	5	1.9
Relationship Status	Dating	129	49.8
	Married	130	50.2
Partner Gender	Male	155	61.3
	Female	97	38.3
	Not listed	1	.40
Partner Ethnicity	Caucasian	147	56.8
	African American	28	10.8
	Asian American	19	7.3
	Hispanic/Latino (a)	32	12.4
	Native American	5	1.9
	Bi- or multi-ethnic	18	6.9
	Not listed	10	3.9
Perception of Partner as Soul Mate	Yes	193	74.8
	No	65	25.2
Friend Supportive of Relationship	Yes	220	85.9
	Somewhat	30	11.7
	Not really	6	2.3
Family Supportive of Relationship	Yes	202	79.2
	Somewhat	41	16.1
	Not really	12	4.7
Perception of Partner as Different	Yes	104	40.2
	Somewhat	28	10.8
	Not really	127	49.0
Perception of Partner's Family as Different	Yes	109	42.1
	Somewhat	26	10.0
	Not really	124	47.9



Table 2

*Breakdown of Type of Relationship*

<b>Category</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<u>Intracultural</u>	Same race/ethnicity and same country of origin	139	53.7
<u>Intercultural</u>	Different race/ethnicity and different country of origin	60	23.2
	Same race/ethnicity and different country of origin	7	2.7
	Different race/ethnicity and different country of origin	53	20.5

Table 3

*Sample size, range of scores, mean, standard deviation, and Cronbach alpha values for all variables*

<b>Variable</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Alpha</b>
*Perception of partner as soul mate	258	1	1-2	1.25	.435	-
*Friend Support	256	1	1-3	1.16	.430	-
*Family Support	255	1	1-3	1.25	.534	-
*Perception of partner as different	259	1	1-3	2.09	.942	-
*Perception of partner's family as different	259	1	1-3	2.06	.949	-
<b><i>IPIP subscales</i></b>						
Conscientiousness	256	4	1-5	14.3	3.4	.77
Extroversion	257	4	1-5	11.1	4.1	.85
Agreeableness	258	4	1-5	15.4	3.3	.83
Imagination/Intellect	258	4	1-5	15.6	3.2	.76
Neuroticism	257	4	1-5	10.7	3.8	.80
<b><i>HVIC subscales</i></b>						
Horizontal Individualism	257	8	1-9	55.2	8.4	.76
Vertical Individualism	252	8	1-9	37.7	13.2	.87
Horizontal Collectivism	253	8	1-9	47.5	10.5	.81
Vertical Collectivism	255	8	1-9	42.4	11.8	.79
<b><i>Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure</i></b>	253	14	1-4	2.8	.60	.90
<b><i>Relationship Theories Questionnaire</i></b>						
Soul Mate Theory Total	254	11	1-7	53.7	10.9	.83
Work It Out Theory Total	257	9	1-7	42.9	8.1	.78
<b><i>Relationship Assessment Scale</i></b>	257	7	1-5	29.1	5.6	.91
<b><i>Dyadic Adjustment Scale Total</i></b>	239	32	0-1, 0-4, 0-5	108.5	17.0	.92
<b><i>Dyadic Adjustment Subscales</i></b>						
Affection Expression	257	4	0-1, 0-5	8.9	2.5	.73
Cohesion	259	5	0-4,0-5	17.4	3.9	.81
Consensus	247	13	0-5	48.9	9.3	.91
Satisfaction	251	10	0-4, 0-5	32.9	4.8	.61
<b><i>Commitment Level Items Total</i></b>	255	7	0-8	50.0	9.8	.82

*Note:* \* Higher scores indicate lower endorsement

Table 4

*Intercorrelations among all variables*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	
1. Soul mate	-																								
2. Friend Support	.34**	-																							
3. Family Support	.29**	.54**	-																						
4. Perception of Partner	-.17**	-.10	-.17**	-																					
5. Perception of Partner's Family	-.13*	-.08	-.15*	.91**	-																				
6. MEIM	-.04	.02	.001	-.13*	-.12*	-																			
7. RAS total	-.43**	-.53**	-.38**	-.17**	-.13*	.07	-																		
8. DAS total	-.29**	-.46**	-.33**	.21**	.15*	.10	.82**	-																	
9. Commitment Level Items Total	-.48**	-.40**	-.33**	.21**	.17**	.10	.62**	.52**	-																
<b><i>IPIP Subscales</i></b>																									
10. Conscientiousness	-.21**	-.13*	-.12	.06	.07	.25**	.25**	.25**	.26**	-															
11. Extroversion	-.04	-.04	-.05	-.07	-.10	.20**	.16*	.15*	.06	.05	-														
12. Agreeableness	-.12*	-.11	-.09	.09	.07	.15*	.36**	.33**	.34**	.13*	.23*	-													
13. Imagination/Intellect	.08	.02	.15*	-.10	-.07	.07	.02	.06	.01	-.07	.18**	.22**	-												
14. Neuroticism	.14*	.05	.21**	-.13*	-.11	-.11	-.30**	-.30**	-.13*	-.26**	-.23**	-.04	-.05	-											
<b><i>HVIC subscales</i></b>																									
15. HI	.06	.07	.09	-.16**	-.14*	.28**	.04	.06	.01	.14*	.16*	.14*	.32**	-.16**	-										
16. VI	.08	.02	-.03	.01	.02	.14*	-.06	-.03	-.06	.03	.23**	-.10	-.06	.06	.09	-									
17. HC	-.10	-.01	.02	-.06	-.07	.33**	.22**	.24**	.25**	.13*	.29**	.51**	-.02	-.18**	.22**	.01	-								
18. VC	-.24**	.00	-.02	-.02	-.01	.38**	.04	.05	.16*	.17**	.02	.21**	-.22**	-.05	.00	.12	.60**	-							
<b><i>RTQ Subscales</i></b>																									
19. Soul Mate Theory	-.29**	.04	.02	-.06	-.03	.26**	.21**	.13	.14*	.21**	.18**	.20**	-.01	-.16**	.26**	.17**	.33**	.34**	-						
20. Work It Out Theory	.01	-.04	.01	-.09	-.10	.40**	.02	.10	.10	.22**	.14*	.12	-.07	-.15*	.23**	.18**	.37**	.49**	.10	-					
<b><i>DAS subscales</i></b>																									
21. Affection Expression	-.20**	-.30**	-.19**	.07	.06	.10	.59**	.73**	.31**	.17**	.15*	.23**	.05	-.27**	.13*	-.10	.24**	.01	.16*	.02	-				
22. Cohesion	-.34**	-.34**	-.20**	.05	.00	.13*	.65**	.73**	.41**	.16**	.22**	.34**	.11	-.14*	.06	.06	.26**	.13**	.26**	.10	.45**	-			
23. Consensus	-.24**	-.50**	-.35**	.19**	.13*	.10	.74**	.94**	.47**	.20**	.14*	.37*	.02	-.24**	.06	-.05	.28**	.09	.13*	.10	.61**	.59**	-		
24. Satisfaction	-.27**	-.50**	-.35**	.20**	.18**	-.02	.75**	.84**	.48**	.21**	.06	.20**	-.02	-.28**	-.03	-.04	.09	.01	.07	.06	.61**	.50**	.66**	-	

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

Table 5

*Intercorrelations among all variables for individuals in intracultural relationships*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	
1. Soul mate	-																								
2. Friend Support	.38**	-																							
3. Family Support	.33**	.61**	-																						
4. Perception of Partner	-.15	.01	.02	-																					
5. Perception of Partner's Family	-.11	.01	.03	.75**	-																				
6. MEIM	-.15	-.09	-.11	-.02	-.02	-																			
7. RAS total	-.30**	-.49**	-.41**	.17	.06	.15	-																		
8. DAS total	-.11	-.34**	-.27**	.09	-.02	.15	.82**	-																	
9. Commitment Level Items Total	-.41**	-.44**	-.42**	.24**	.13	.13	.63**	.47**	-																
<b><i>IPIP Subscales</i></b>																									
10. Conscientiousness	-.15	-.23**	-.12	.08	.04	.23**	.31**	.40**	.26**	-															
11. Extroversion	-.05	-.14	-.16	-.00	-.02	.28**	.11	.18**	.06	.11	-														
12. Agreeableness	-.13	-.27**	-.26**	.10	.05	.16	.40**	.32**	.42**	.09	.25**	-													
13. Imagination/Intellect	.09	.07	.13	.13	.13	.07	-.02	.08	.04	-.08	.09	.21*	-												
14. Neuroticism	.20**	-.01	.14	-.19*	-.16	-.11	-.30**	-.28**	-.26**	-.33**	-.17	-.06	-.06	-											
<b><i>HVIC subscales</i></b>																									
15. HI	.01	-.01	.01	-.03	-.00	.21*	.11	.18*	.10	.18*	.16	.11	.21*	-.19*	-										
16. VI	.00	-.12	-.01	.01	-.03	.13	-.04	-.08	-.12	-.08	.24**	-.13	-.11	.24**	-.03	-									
17. HC	-.12	-.07	-.09	-.06	-.08	.37**	-.27**	.21*	.32**	.12	.32**	.58**	-.05	-.28**	.20*	-.11	-								
18. VC	-.32**	-.02	-.08	-.16	-.12	.45**	.03	-.06	.14	.10	.09	.24**	-.25**	-.12	-.09	.09	.60**	-							
<b><i>RTQ Subscales</i></b>																									
19. Soul Mate Theory	-.40**	-.12	-.14	.05	.11	.25**	.26**	.14	.30**	.19*	.11	.13	-.23**	-.20*	.11	.16	.33**	.43**	-						
20. Work It Out Theory	-.01	-.07	-.08	-.12	-.19*	.36**	.03	.00	.02	.17*	.11	.07	-.05	-.15	.24**	.10	.28**	.38**	.01	-					
<b><i>DAS subscales</i></b>																									
21. Affection Expression	-.13	-.23**	-.31**	.08	.08	.10	.65**	.75**	.34**	.27**	.15	.23**	.01	-.30**	.12	-.22**	.24**	.01	.19*	-.04	-				
22. Cohesion	-.18**	-.32**	-.31**	.03	-.07	.19*	.65**	.68**	.35**	.18	.25**	.40**	.10	-.16	.07	.02	.30**	.07	.21**	-.01	.44**	-			
23. Consensus	-.16	-.37**	-.34**	.07	-.08	.12	.76**	.93**	.47**	.31**	.18*	.40**	.03	-.23**	.11	-.06	.29**	.03	.20*	.01	.63**	.60**	-		
24. Satisfaction	-.14	-.42**	-.31**	.05	.04	.07	.72**	.82**	.48**	.34**	.11	.24**	.00	-.27**	.11	-.10	.06	-.07	.09	-.01	.69**	.40**	.62**	-	

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

Table 6

*Intercorrelations among all variables for individuals in intercultural relationships*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	
1. Soul mate	-																								
2. Friend Support	.29**	-																							
3. Family Support	.25**	.47**	-																						
4. Perception of Partner	-.18	-.05	-.18	-																					
5. Perception of Partner's Family	-.05	-.01	-.13	.62**	-																				
6. MEIM	.04	.09	.08	-.23*	-.19*	-																			
7. RAS total	-.53**	-.55**	-.33**	.11	.04	.01	-																		
8. DAS total	-.40**	-.52**	-.34**	.24*	.14	.07	.82**	-																	
9. Commitment Level Items Total	-.52**	-.36**	-.25**	.13	.08	.11	.60**	.53**	-																
<b><i>IPIP Subscales</i></b>																									
10. Conscientiousness	-.27**	-.04	-.11	.03	.09	.28**	.20*	.13	.26**	-															
11. Extroversion	-.04	.03	.03	-.03	-.12	.10	.22*	.16	.08	.01	-														
12. Agreeableness	-.11	.03	.08	.05	.02	.16	.31**	.32**	.27**	.16	.23*	-													
13. Imagination/Intellect	.05	-.05	.13	-.06	.01	.05	.09	.08	.03	-.04	.26**	.26**	-												
14. Neuroticism	.07	.09	.25**	-.06	.00	-.12	-.29**	-.30**	-.02	-.20*	-.30**	-.01	-.06	-											
<b><i>HVIC subscales</i></b>																									
15. HI	.07	.12	.12	-.13	-.08	.33**	.01	.00	-.02	.12	.15	.19*	.41**	-.17	-										
16. VI	.15	.14	-.04	.01	.08	.15	-.08	.02	-.01	.15	.21*	-.07	.00	-.10	.20*	-									
17. HC	-.10	.05	.13	-.01	-.00	.27**	.17	.30**	.23*	.15	.25**	.43**	.01	-.08	.24*	.18	-								
18. VC	-.16	.02	.05	-.06	-.04	.32**	.05	.12	.17	.25**	-.06	.18*	-.18*	.02	.10	.16	.61**	-							
<b><i>RTQ Subscales</i></b>																									
19. Soul Mate Theory	-.20*	.18	.15	-.07	-.02	.25**	.17	.13	.04	.23*	.25**	.28**	.22*	-.14	.40**	.18*	.34**	.24**	-						
20. Work It Out Theory	.02	-.02	.07	-.13	-.06	.44**	.01	.18	.15	.27**	.17	.17	-.11	-.15	.22*	.25**	.48**	.61**	.19*	-					
<b><i>DAS subscales</i></b>																									
21. Affection Expression	-.28**	-.37**	-.11	.12	.06	.10	.54**	.72**	.29**	.07	.15	.22*	.11	-.24**	.15	.04	.24*	.02	.13	.08	-				
22. Cohesion	-.49**	-.36**	-.11	.15	.06	.08	.66**	.76**	.47**	.16	.20*	.29**	.13	-.12	.06	.10	.21*	.18	.30**	.21*	.47**	-			
23. Consensus	-.31**	-.45**	-.34**	.22*	.13	.11	.70**	.94**	.46**	.08	.13	.32**	.04	-.25**	.05	-.05	.30**	.14	.08	.19*	.60**	.59**	-		
24. Satisfaction	-.36**	-.55**	-.35**	.22*	.17	-.06	.77**	.85**	.45**	.11	.04	.16	.00	-.28**	-.10	.02	.14	.07	.06	.13	.55**	.58**	.69**	-	

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

Table 7

*MANOVA results for Differences in Intracultural and Intercultural Relationships*

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.021	3588.616	3.000	231.000	.000	.979	1.000
Type of Relationship	Wilks' Lambda	.966	2.673	3.000	231.000	.048	.034	.647

Table 8

*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Type of Relationship*

Source	Dependent Variable	Df	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Type of Relationship	DAS	1	4.322	.039	.018	.544
	Commitment Level Items	1	6.745	.010	.028	.734
	RAS	1	6.070	.014	.025	.689

Table 9

*Descriptive Statistics for DAS, Commitment Level Items, and RAS as a function of type of relationship*

		Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Intracultural	DAS	110.65	14.78	130
	Commitment Level	51.19	8.09	137
	RAS	29.71	5.21	138
Intercultural	DAS	105.84	19.12	109
	Commitment Level	48.52	11.32	118
	RAS	28.40	5.93	119



Table 10

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis with personality factors, HVIC subscales, soul mate theory, perception of partner as soul mate, friend and family support, and perception of partner and partner's family as the predictors of RAS when controlling for age, gender, and type of relationship*

Outcome	Step	Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>
RAS	1	Age	-.032	.026	-.061	.003	-.005
		Gender	-1.019	.636	-.087		
	2	Type or Relationship	.760	1.217	.067	.021	.007
	3	Conscientiousness	.116	.085	.070	.251	.227
		Extroversion	.010	.076	.007		
		Neuroticism	-.257	.081	-.172**		
		Agreeableness	.443	.103	.260***		
	4	Horizontal Collectivism	.008	.032	.014	.251	.223
	5	Soul Mate Theory	.035	.029	.067	.366	.336
		Perception of partner as soul mate	-.2561	.744	-.193**		
	6	Friend support	-4.919	.782	-.384***	.514	.482
		Family support	-.605	.668	-.056		
		Perception of partner	1.272	.841	.211		
		Perception of partner's family	-.644	.727	-.107		

Note: \**p* < .05, \*\**p* < .01, \*\*\**p* < .001.

Note: Beta weights are reported for the final model, *R*<sup>2</sup> and Adjusted *R*<sup>2</sup> are reported per step

Table 11

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis with personality factors, HVIC subscales, perception of partner as soul mate, friend and family support, perception of partner and partner's family as the predictors of DAS when controlling for age, gender, and type of relationship*

Outcome	Step	Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>
DAS	1	Age	-.256	.088	-.158**	.019	.010
		Gender	-3.520	2.129	-.097		
	2	Type or Relationship	4.164	3.951	.118	.046	.032
	3	Conscientiousness	.528	.289	.102	.268	.243
		Extroversion	.001	.251	.000		
		Neuroticism	-.755	.270	-.165**		
		Agreeableness	1.176	.349	.220**		
	4	Horizontal Collectivism	.202	.106	.120	.271	.243
	5	Perception of partner as soul mate	-3.362	2.295	-.083	.309	.278
	6	Friend support	-14.257	2.688	-.339***	.459	.424
		Family support	-3.624	2.326	-.100		
		Perception of partner	5.120	2.727	.271		
		Perception of partner's family	-1.193	2.353	-.064		

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

Note: Beta weights are reported for the final model,  $R^2$  and Adjusted  $R^2$  are reported per step

Table 12

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis with personality factors, HVIC subscales, soul mate theory, perception of partner as soul mate, friend and family support, and perception of partner and partner's family as the predictors of Commitment Level Items when controlling for age, gender, and type of relationship*

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Step</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>β</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></b>
Commitment Level	1	Age	.046	.051	.051	.011	.002
		Gender	-.385	1.195	-.019		
	2	Type or Relationship	2.180	2.334	.110	.033	.020
	3	Conscientiousness	.351	.164	.121*	.194	.171
		Neuroticism	.071	.154	.027		
		Agreeableness	.601	.198	.202**		
	4	Horizontal Collectivism	.123	.062	.131	.201	.176
	5	Soul Mate Theory	-.051	.055	-.057	.352	.325
		Perception of partner as soul mate	-7.181	1.414	-.310***		
	6	Friend support	-4.173	1.522	-.186**	.410	.373
		Family support	-1.632	1.291	-.086		
		Perception of partner	2.542	1.612	.241		
		Perception of partner's family	-.374	1.389	-.036		

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

Note: Beta weights are reported for the final model, R<sup>2</sup> and Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> are reported per step

Table 13

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis for individuals in intracultural relationships with personality factors, HVIC subscales, soul mate theory, perception of partner as soul mate, and friend and family support as the predictors of RAS when controlling for age and gender.*

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Step</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>β</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></b>
RAS	1	Age	-.033	.036	-.068	.021	.004
		Gender	-.542	.882	-.050		
	2	Conscientiousness	.205	.134	.126	.296	.264
		Neuroticism	-.275	.123	-.186*		
		Agreeableness	.407	.160	.255*		
	3	Horizontal Collectivism	.018	.047	.039	.296	.258
	4	Soul Mate Theory	.028	.040	.060	.336	.287
		Perception of partner as soul mate	-.523	1.152	-.039		
	5	Friend support	-4.481	1.464	-.329**	.441	.389
		Family support	.879	1.131	-.079		

*Note: \*p < .05, \*\*p < .01, \*\*\*p < .001.*

*Note: Beta weights are reported for the final model, R<sup>2</sup> and Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> are reported per step*

Table 14

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis for individuals in intracultural relationships with personality factors, HVIC subscales, and friend and family support as the predictors of DAS when controlling for age and gender.*

Outcome	Step	Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>
DAS	1	Age	-.274	.115	-.189*	.041	.023
		Gender	-1.317	2.852	-.041		
	2	Conscientiousness	1.223	.424	.266**	.352	.315
		Extroversion	.105	.352	.026		
		Neuroticism	-.671	.372	-.159		
		Agreeableness	1.244	.490	.252*		
	3	Horizontal Individualism	.242	.170	.117	.365	.316
		Horizontal Collectivism	-.011	.139	-.008		
	4	Friend support	-7.818	4.780	-.172	.402	.342
		Family support	-2.100	3.654	-.057		

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

*Note:* Beta weights are reported for the final model,  $R^2$  and Adjusted  $R^2$  are reported per step

Table 15

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis for individuals in intracultural relationships with personality factors, HVIC subscales, soul mate theory, perception of partner as soul mate, friend and family support, and perception of partner as the predictors of Commitment Level Items when controlling for age and gender.*

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Step</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>β</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></b>
Commitment Level	1	Age	.005	.055	.007	.028	.011
		Gender	.180	1.338	.011		
	2	Conscientiousness	.203	.204	.084	.271	.237
		Neuroticism	-.279	.186	-.127		
		Agreeableness	.545	.244	.230*		
	3	Horizontal Collectivism	.053	.071	.077	.273	.233
	4	Soul Mate Theory	.025	.060	.035	.352	.304
		Perception of partner as soul mate	-3.171	1.742	-.160		
	5	Friend support	-5.031	2.226	-.244*	.448	.389
		Family support	-1.948	1.699	-.116		
		Perception of partner	3.226	1.445	.167**		

*Note: \*p < .05, \*\*p < .01, \*\*\*p < .001.*

*Note: Beta weights are reported for the final model, R<sup>2</sup> and Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> are reported per step*

Table 16

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis for individuals in intercultural relationships with personality factors, perception of partner as soul mate, and friend and family support as the predictors of RAS when controlling for age and gender.*

Outcome	Step	Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	$R^2$	Adjusted $R^2$
RAS	1	Age	-.053	.037	-.092	.033	.016
		Gender	-.705	.875	-.057		
	2	Conscientiousness	.055	.112	.033	.217	.173
		Extroversion	.096	.099	.067		
		Neuroticism	-.279	.107	-.188*		
		Agreeableness	.433	.121	.238**		
	3	Perception of partner as soul mate	-4.748	.908	-.360***	.445	.408
	4	Friend support	-4.854	.919	-.398***	.601	.567
		Family support	-.660	.797	-.061		

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

*Note: Beta weights are reported for the final model,  $R^2$  and Adjusted  $R^2$  are reported per step*

Table 17

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis for individuals in intercultural relationships with personality factors, HVIC subscales, perception of partner as soul mate, friend and family support, and perception of partner as different as the predictors of DAS when controlling for age and gender.*

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Step</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b><math>\beta</math></b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></b>
DAS	1	Age	-.278	.134	-.153*	.030	.010
		Gender	-1.815	3.101	-.046		
	2	Neuroticism	-.887	.364	-.184*	.224	.192
		Agreeableness	1.043	.459	.183*		
	3	Horizontal Collectivism	.418	.159	.206*	.243	.204
	4	Perception of partner as soul mate	-9.592	3.170	-.228**	.372	.333
	5	Friend support	-14.800	3.267	-.371***	.565	.523
		Family support	-5.522	3.058	-.153		
		Perception of partner	2.988	3.089	.074		

*Note: \*p < .05, \*\*p < .01, \*\*\*p < .001.*

*Note: Beta weights are reported for the final model, R<sup>2</sup> and Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> are reported per step*



Table 18

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis for individuals in intercultural relationships with personality factors, HVIC subscales, perception of partner as soul mate, and friend and family support as the predictors of Commitment Level Items when controlling for age and gender.*

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Step</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE B</b>	<b>β</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></b>
Commitment Level	1	Age	.062	.087	.057	.017	-.002
		Gender	.184	1.956	.008		
	2	Conscientiousness	.312	.259	.097	.150	.118
		Agreeableness	.551	.311	.160		
	3	Horizontal Collectivism	.164	.106	.137	.158	.118
	4	Perception of partner as soul mate	-9.895	2.114	-.392***	.352	.314
	5	Friend support	-4.126	2.158	-.177	.403	.356
		Family support	-2.098	1.893	-.101		

*Note: \*p < .05, \*\*p < .01, \*\*\*p < .001.*

*Note: Beta weights are reported for the final model, R<sup>2</sup> and Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> are reported per step*

## REFERENCES

- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Amazon. (2012). Amazon mechanical turk faq. Retrieved from <https://www.mturk.com/mturk/help?helpPage=overview>
- Casey-Cannon, S. L., Coleman, H. K., Knudtson, L. F., & Velazquez, C. C. (2011). Three ethnic and racial identity measures: concurrent and divergent validity for diverse adolescents. *Identity, 11*(1), 64. doi:10.1080/15283488.2011.540739
- Cheek, J. M., Tropp, L. R., & Chen, L. C. (1994, August). *Identity orientations: Personal, social and collective aspects of identity*. Paper presented at the 102nd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles.
- Childs, E. (2004). *Interracial images: Popular culture depictions of black-white couples*. Conference Papers -- American Sociological Association, 1-35. doi:asa\_proceeding\_36142.PDF
- Childs, E. (2009). *Fade to black and white: interracial images in popular culture / Erica Chito Childs*. Lanham, Md. : Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, c2009.
- Chiou, J. (2001). Horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism among college students in the United States, Taiwan, and Argentina. *Journal of Social Psychology, 141*(5), 667-678.
- Clark, M., Ouellette, R., Powell, M. C., & Milberg, S. (1987). Recipient's mood, relationship type and helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 94-103.
- Davidson, A.R., Jaccard, J.J., Triandis, H.C., Morales, M.L., & Diaz-Guerreor, R. (1976). Cross-Cultural model testing: Toward a solution of the etic-emic dilemma. *International Journal of Psychology, 11*, 1-13.

- de Munck, V. C., Korotayev, A., de Munck, J., & Khaltourina, D. (2011). Cross-cultural analysis of models of romantic love among U.S. residents, Russians, and Lithuanians. *Cross-Cultural Research: The Journal of Comparative Social Science*, *45*(2), 128-154. doi:10.1177/1069397110393313
- Dinkel, A., & Balck, F. (2005). An evaluation of the German relationship assessment scale. *Swiss Journal of Psychology/Schweizerische Zeitschrift Für Psychologie/Revue Suisse De Psychologie*, *64*(4), 259-263. doi:10.1024/1421-0185.64.4.259
- Donnellan, M., Oswald, F., Baird, B., & Lucas, R. (2006). The Mini-IPIP scales: Tiny-yet-effective measures of the big five factors of personality. *Psychological Assessment*, *18*(2), 192-203.
- Dyrenforth, P. S., Kashy, D. A., Donnellan, M., & Lucas, R. E. (2010). Predicting relationship and life satisfaction from personality in nationally representative samples from three countries: The relative importance of actor, partner, and similarity effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *99*(4), 690-702. doi:10.1037/a0020385
- Fontaine, G., & Dorch, E. (1978). Problems and benefits of close intercultural relationships. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *4*, 329-337. doi:10.1016/0147-1767(80)90008-5
- Franiuk, R., Cohen, D., & Pomerantz, E. (2002). Implicit theories of relationships: Implications for relationship satisfaction and longevity. *Personal Relationships*, *9*(4), 345-367.
- Gaines, S. R., & Brennan, K. A. (2001). Establishing and maintaining satisfaction in multicultural relationships. In J. Harvey, A. Wenzel (Eds.), *Close romantic relationships: Maintenance and enhancement* (pp. 237-253). Mahwah, NJ US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

- Garcia, A. L., Riggio, H. R., Palavinelu, S., & Culpepper, L. (2012). Latinos' perceptions of interethnic couples. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 34(2), 349.  
doi:10.1177/0739986311435974
- Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public-domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde, I. J. Deary, F. De Fruyt, and F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality psychology in Europe* (Vol. 7, pp. 7–28). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.
- Graham, J. M., Diebels, K. J., & Barnow, Z. B. (2011). The reliability of relationship satisfaction: A reliability generalization meta-analysis. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 25(1), 39-48. doi:10.1037/a0022441
- Gudykunst, W. B., Matsumoto, Y., Ting-Toomey, S., Nishida, T., & Karimi, H. (1994, July). *Measuring self construals across cultures: A derived etic analysis*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Sydney, Australia.
- Hayashi, K. (2010). Conflict resolution in international couples: Encounter of individualism and collectivism / by Kayoko Hayashi. 2010.
- Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, (1), 93. doi:10.2307/352430
- Hendrick, S., Dicke, A., & Hendrick, C. (1998). The relationship assessment scale. *Journal of Social And Personal Relationships*, 15(1), 137-142.
- Hendrick, S.S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 50(1), 93-98.
- hooks, b. (1996). *Killing Rage : Ending Racism / Bell hooks*. New York : H. Holt and Co., 1996.

- hooks, b. (2013). *Writing beyond race : living theory and practice* / bell hooks. New York : Routledge, 2013.
- Hoxha, E., & Hatala, M. N. (2012). A cross-cultural study of differences in romantic attitudes between American and Albanian college students. *College Student Journal*, *46*(3), 467-469.
- Huang, R., Yao, S., & Zou, T. (2006). Reliability and validity of the individualism and collectivism scale in Chinese students. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *14*(6), 564-565.
- Inman, A. G., Altman, A., Kaduvetoor-Davidson, A., Carr, A., & Walker, J. A. (2011). Cultural intersections: A qualitative inquiry into the experience of Asian Indian-white interracial couples. *Family Process*, *50*(2), 248-266. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.2011.01358.x
- Jyh-Shen, C. (2001). Horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism among college students in the United States, Taiwan, and Argentina. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *141*(5), 667.
- Kellner, J. (2009). Gender perspective in cross-cultural couples. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, *37*(3), 224-229. doi:10.1007/s10615-009-0214-4
- Kim, U, Triandis, H.C., Kagitcibasi, C., & Yoon, G. (Eds.) (1994). *Individualism and collectivism: Theoretical and methodological issues*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Knee, C. (1998). Implicit theories of relationships: Assessment and prediction of romantic relationship initiation, coping, and longevity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*(2), 360-370. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.2.360
- Komarraju, M., & Cokley, K. O. (2008). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism-collectivism: A comparison of African Americans and European Americans. *Cultural*

- Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 14(4), 336-343. doi:10.1037/1099-9809.14.4.336
- Le, B., Dove, N. L., Agnew, C. R., Korn, M. S., & Mutso, A. A. (2010). Predicting nonmarital romantic relationship dissolution: A meta-analytic synthesis. *Personal Relationships*, 17(3), 377-390. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2010.01285.x
- Leech, N. L., Barrett, K., Morgan, G. A., & Leech, N. L. (2011). *IBM SPSS for intermediate statistics : use and interpretation / Nancy L. Leech, Karen C. Barrett, George A. Morgan*. New York : Routledge, 2011.
- Lewandowski, D. A., & Jackson, L. A. (2001). Perceptions of interracial couples: Prejudice at the dyadic level. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 27(3), 288-303. doi:10.1177/0095798401027003003
- Locke, H. J. & Wallace K. M. (1959). Marital adjustment test. *Marriage and Family Living*, 21(3), 251-255.
- Malouff, J., Thorsteinsson, E., Schutte, N., Bhullar, N., & Rooke, S. (2010). The Five-Factor Model of personality and relationship satisfaction of intimate partners: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research In Personality*, 44(1), 124-127.
- Markus, H.R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and self: Implications for cognition, emotions and motivation. *Psychological Review* 98, 224-253.
- Marshall, T. (2008). Cultural differences in intimacy: The influence of gender-role ideology and individualism-collectivism. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 25(1), 143-168.

- Medora, N. P., Larson, J. H., Hortačsu, N., & Dave, P. (2002). Perceived attitudes towards romanticism: A cross-cultural study of American, Asian-Indian, and Turkish young adults. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 33(2), 155-178.
- Miller, J.G. (1994). Cultural diversity in the morality of caring: Individual-oriented versus duty-based interpersonal moral codes. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 28, 3-39.
- Oyserman, D. (1993). The lens of personhood: Viewing the self, and others, in a multicultural society. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 993-1009.
- Pascoe, P. (1996). Miscegenation law, court cases, and ideologies of 'race' in twentieth-century america. *The Journal of American History*, (1), 44. doi:10.2307/2945474
- Perceptions of interracial marriages. (2011). *Conference Papers -- International Communication Association*, 1-35
- Perry, B., & Sutton, M. (2006). Seeing red over black and white: Popular media representations of inter-racial relationships as precursors to racial violence. *Canadian Journal of Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 48(6), 887-904.
- Perry, B., & Sutton, M. (2008). Policing the colour line violence against those in intimate interracial relationships. *Race, Gender & Class*, 15(3/4), 240-261.
- Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7(2), 156-176. doi:10.1177/074355489272003
- Quek, K., & Fitzpatrick, J. (2013). Cultural values, self-disclosure, and conflict tactics as predictors of marital satisfaction among Singaporean husbands and wives. *The Family Journal*, 21(2), 208-216.

- Rask, M., Malm, D., Kristofferzon, M., Roxberg, Å., Svedberg, P., Arenhall, E., & ... Benzein, E. (2010). Validity and reliability of a Swedish version of the relationship assessment scale (RAS): a pilot study. *Canadian Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing, 20*(1), 16-21.
- Razeghi, N., Nikiju, M., Mujembari, A., & Masihi, A. (2011). Relationship between Big Five Personality Factors and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Iranian Psychologists, 7*(27), 269-278.
- Reykowski, J. (1994). Collectivism and individualism as dimensions of social change. In U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (eds.). *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, methods, and applications* (pp. 276-292). Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Riela, S., Rodriguez, G., Aron, A., Xu, X., & Acevedo, B. (2010). Experiences of falling in love: Investigating culture, ethnicity, gender, and speed. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 27*(4), 473-493.
- Ritu, K., & Catherine T., K. (2006). The role of culture and personality in choice of conflict management strategy. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30*, 579-603.  
doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2006.01.001
- Rusbult, C. E., Martz, J. M., & Agnew, C. R. (1998). The Investment Model Scale: Measuring commitment level, satisfaction level, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Personal Relationships, 5*(4), 357-391. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.1998.tb00177.x
- Sanne, S., Ineke, M., & Frank van, T. (2012). Irreconcilable differences? Ethnic intermarriage and divorce in the Netherlands, 1995–2008. *Social Science Research, 41*, 1126-1137.  
doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2012.02.004



- Schwartz, S.H. (1990). Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21*, 139-157.
- Silva, L. C., Campbell, K., & Wright, D. W. (2012). Intercultural Relationships: Entry, adjustment, and cultural negotiations. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 43*(6), 857-870.
- Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D. S., & Gelfand, M. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research, 29*, 240-275
- Sinha, J.B.P, & Verma, J. (1994). Social support as a moderator of the relationship between allocentrism and psychological well-being. In U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C, Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 267-275). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Spanier, G. B., & Spanier, G. B. (1976). Dyadic adjustment scale. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38*(1), 15-28.
- Sprecher, S., & Metts, S. (1989). Development of the 'romantic beliefs scale' and examination of the effects of gender and gender-role orientation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 6*, 387-411.
- Sprecher, S., & Toro-Morn, M. (2002). A study of men and women from different sides of earth to determine if men are from Mars and women are from Venus in their beliefs about love and romantic relationships. *Sex Roles, 46*(5-6), 131-147. doi:10.1023/A:1019780801500
- Stella, T. (1991). Intimacy expressions in three cultures: France, Japan, and the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15*, 29-46. doi:10.1016/0147-1767(91)90072-O

- Triandis, H. C. (2001). Individualism-Collectivism and Personality. *Journal of Personality*, 69(6), 907-924.
- Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(1), 118-128. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.1.118
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). Households and families: 2010 Census brief. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/cen2010/briefs/tables/appendix.pdf>
- Vaughn, M. E. (1999). Reliability and validity of the relationship assessment scale. *American Journal Of Family Therapy*, 27(2), 137-147
- Vaughn, M., & Baier, M. (n.d). Reliability and validity of the relationship assessment scale. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 27(2), 137-147.
- Wallenstein, P. (1998). Race, marriage, and the supreme court from 'Pace v. Alabama' (1883) to 'Loving v. Virginia' (1967).
- Watson, D., Hubbard, B., & Wiese, D. (2000). General traits of personality and affectivity as predictors of satisfaction in intimate relationships: Evidence from self- and partner-ratings. *Journal of Personality*, 68(3), 413-449. doi:10.1111/1467-6494.00102
- White, J. K., Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (2004). Big five personality variables and relationship constructs. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37(7), 1519-1530. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2004.02.019
- Worrell, F. C. (2000). A validity study of scores on the multigroup ethnic identity measure based on a sample of academically talented adolescents. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 60(3), 439.

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

### Consent Form

#### **DEAR PARTICIPANT:**

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research. The purpose of this survey is to understand various attitudes of individuals in romantic relationships. It should take you about 35-45 minutes to complete. However, we ask you to take as much time as you need to complete the project completely and accurately.

#### **INFORMED CONSENT:**

This survey is open to all participants and your participation is completely voluntary. If at any time you wish to stop participating, you reserve the right to do so without explanation or penalty. There are no foreseeable personal risks and only a potential for slight discomfort involved with participating in this study.

#### **CONFIDENTIALITY:**

This survey is carried out for academic research purposes only. The data will be collected and analyzed by the researchers. Although anonymity cannot be guaranteed, as with any academic research, your answers are strictly confidential and any information reported to others will not contain any information that can be used to uniquely identify you or your individual responses. Furthermore, your data will only be viewed by the researchers and will be stored electronically on a secure server. Electronic data will be destroyed after 5 years.

#### **CONTACT:**

This research is being conducted by Megan Morrison, a graduate student in Applied Psychology at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, under the supervision of Dr. Meera Komarraju, Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University Carbondale. If you have any questions, comments, or concerns regarding the content or administration of this research, please contact Megan Morrison (mmmorrison@siu.edu).

**This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Sponsored Projects and Administration, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu**

**BY CLICKING THE “I CONSENT – PROCEED WITH THE SURVEY” BUTTON BELOW, YOU ARE GRANTING YOUR CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY.**

**X – I CONSENT – PROCEED WITH THE SURVEY**

## APPENDIX B

### Big Five Personality Scale: 20-Item Mini-IPIP

On the following page, there are phrases describing people's behaviors. Please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes *you*. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your same age. So that you can describe yourself in an honest manner, your responses will be kept in absolute confidence. Please read each statement carefully, and then fill in the bubble that corresponds to the number on the scale.

#### Response Options

- 1: Very Inaccurate
- 2: Moderately Inaccurate
- 3: Neither Inaccurate nor Accurate
- 4: Moderately Accurate
- 5: Very Accurate

- 1. Am the life of the party.
- 2. Sympathize with others' feelings.
- 3. Get chores done right away.
- 4. Have frequent mood swings.
- 5. Have a vivid imagination.
- 6. Don't talk a lot (R)
- 7. Am not interested in other people's problems. (R)
- 8. Often forget to put things back in their proper place. (R)
- 9. Am relaxed most of the time. (R)
- 10. Am not interested in abstract ideas. (R)
- 11. Talk to a lot of different people at parties.
- 12. Feel others' emotions.
- 13. Like order.
- 14. Get upset easily.
- 15. Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas. (R)
- 16. Keep in the background. (R)
- 17. Am not really interested in others. (R)
- 18. Make a mess of things. (R)
- 19. Seldom feel blue. (R)
- 20. Do not have a good imagination. (R)

## APPENDIX C

### Vertical and Horizontal Individualism and Collectivism Scale

Please rate how accurate each item describes you from 1 (never or definitely no) to 9 (always or definitely yes).

#### Horizontal Individualism (H-I)

1. I often do “my own thing”.
2. One should live one’s life independently of others.
3. I like my privacy.
4. I prefer to be direct and forthright when discussing with people.
5. I am a unique individual.
6. What happens to me is my own doing.
7. When I succeed, it is usually because of my abilities.
8. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways.

#### Vertical Individualism (V-I)

1. It annoys me when other people perform better than I do.
2. Competition is the law of nature.
3. When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused.
4. Without competition, it is not possible to have a good society.
5. Winning is everything.
6. It is important that I do my job better than others.
7. I enjoy working in situations involving competition with others.
8. Some people emphasize winning; I’m not one of them.

#### Horizontal Collectivism (H-C)

1. The well-being of my co-workers is important to me.
2. If a co-worker gets a prize, I feel proud.
3. If a relative were in financial difficulty, I would help within my means.
4. It is important to maintain harmony within my group.
5. I like sharing little things with my neighbors.
6. I feel good when I cooperate with others.
7. My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me.
8. To me, pleasure is spending time with others.

#### Vertical Collectivism (V-C)

1. I would sacrifice an activity that I enjoy very much if my family did not approve of it.
2. I would do what would please my family, even if I detested that activity.
3. Before taking a major trip, I consult with most members of my family and many of my friends.
4. I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group.
5. Children should be taught to place duty before pleasure.
6. I hate to disagree with others in my group.
7. We should keep our aging parents with us at home.
8. Children should feel honored if their parents receive a distinguished reward.

APPENDIX D

**Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure**

**Please fill in:**

In terms of ethnic/cultural group, I consider myself to be \_\_\_\_\_

**Use the numbers given below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement:**

1- Strongly Disagree    2- Somewhat Disagree    3- Somewhat Agree    4- Strongly Agree

1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my own ethnic/cultural group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.	
2. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic/cultural group.	
3. I have a clear sense of my ethnic/cultural background and what it means for me.	
4. I like meeting and getting to know people from ethnic/cultural groups other than my own.	
5. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic/cultural group membership.	
6. I am happy that I am a member for the group I belong to.	
7. I sometimes feel it would be better if different ethnic/cultural groups didn't try to mix together.	
8. I am not very clear about the role of my ethnicity/cultural background in my life.	
9. I often spend time with people from ethnic/cultural groups other than my own.	
10. I really have not spent much time trying to learn more about the culture and history of my ethnic/cultural group.	
11. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic/cultural group.	
12. I understand pretty well what my ethnic/cultural group membership means to me, in terms of how to relate to my own group and other groups.	
13. In order to learn more about my ethnic/cultural background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic/cultural group.	
14. I have a lot of pride in my ethnic/cultural group and its accomplishments.	
15. I don't try to become friends with people from other ethnic/cultural groups.	
16. I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special foods, music, or customs.	
17. I am involved in activities with people from other ethnic/cultural groups.	
18. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic/cultural group.	
19. I enjoy being around people from ethnic/cultural groups other than my own.	
20. I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.	

## APPENDIX E

### Relationship Theories Questionnaire

Please indicate your agreement with each item from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

#### Soul mate theory scale

1. Success in a romantic relationship is based mostly on whether the people are “right” for each other.
2. There is a person out there who is perfect (or close to perfect) for me.
3. In marriages, many people discover (vs. build) a deep intimate connection to their spouse.
4. It is extremely important that my spouse and I be passionately in love with each other after we are married.
5. I couldn't marry someone unless I was passionately in love with him or her.
6. There is no such thing as “Mr. Right” or “Ms. Right.” (R)
7. I expect my future husband or wife to be the most amazing person I have ever met.
8. People who are searching for a perfect match are wasting their time. (R)
9. The reason most marriages fail is that people aren't right for each other.
10. Bonds between people are usually there before you meet them.
11. For you personally, how important do you think passion is as a reason to marry?

#### Work-it-out theory scale

1. Success in a romantic relationship is based mostly on how much people try to make the relationship work.
2. In marriage, effort is more important than compatibility.
3. In a relationship, love grows (vs. love is found).
4. If people would just put in the effort, most marriages would work.
5. I could be happily married to most people, if they were reasonable.
6. The reason most marriages fail is that people don't put in the effort.
7. How well you know someone depends on how long you have known him or her.
8. If you were to marry a random person of the opposite sex, how satisfied do you think you would be with that relationship?
9. Only over time can you really learn about your partner.



## APPENDIX F

### Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS)

Please indicate your level of satisfaction in the following areas.

	Low				High
1. How well does your partner meet your needs?	1	2	3	4	5
2. In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How good is your relationship compared to most?	1	2	3	4	5
4. How often do you wish you hadn't gotten into this relationship? (R)	1	2	3	4	5
5. To what extent has your relationship met your original expectations?	1	2	3	4	5
6. How much do you love your partner?	1	2	3	4	5
7. How many problems are there in your relationship? (R)	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX G

**Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS)**

Most persons have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item of the following list.

	Always Agree	Almost Always Agree	Occasionally Disagree	Frequently Disagree	Almost Always Disagree	Always Disagree
1. Handling family finances	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Matters of recreation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Religious matters	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Demonstrations of affection	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Friends	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Sex relations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Philosophy of life	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Ways of dealing with parents or in-laws	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Aims, goals, and things believed important	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Amount of time spent together	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Making major decisions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. Household tasks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Leisure time interests and activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Career decisions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	All of the time	Most of the time	More often than not	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
16. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation or terminating your relationship?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. How often do you or your mate leave the house after a fight?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

18. In general, how often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Do you confide in your mate?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. Do you ever regret that you married? (or lived together)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. How often do you and your partner quarrel?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. How often do you and your mate "get on each other's nerves?"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Every Day	Almost Every Day	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
23. Do you kiss your mate?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	All of them	Most of them	Some of them	Very few of them	None of them
24. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

How often would you say the following events occur between you and your mate?

	Never	Less than a month	Once or twice a month	Once or twice a week	Once a day	More often
25. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
26. Laugh together	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
27. Calmly discuss something	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
28. Work together on a project	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

These are some things about which couples sometimes agree and sometime disagree. Indicate if either item below caused differences of opinions or were problems in your relationship during the past few weeks (check yes or no)

	Yes	No	
29.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Being too tired for sex
30.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Not showing love

---

31. The circles on the following line represent different degrees of happiness in your relationship. The middle point, "happy," represents the degree of happiness of most relationships. Please indicate the circle which best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship

---

○                      ○                      ○                      ○                      ○                      ○                      ○

---

Extremely <u>Un</u> happy	Fairly <u>Un</u> happy	A little <u>Un</u> happy	Happy	Very Happy	Extremely Happy	Perfect
------------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------	-------	------------	--------------------	---------

---

32. Which of the following statements best describes how you feel about the future of your relationship?

- 
- I want desperately for my relationship to succeed, and *would go to almost any length* to see that it does.

---

  - I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and *will do all I can* to see that it does.

---

  - I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and *will do my fair share* to see that it does.

---

  - It would be nice if my relationship succeeded, but *I can't do much more than I am doing* now to help it succeed.

---

  - It would be nice if it succeeded, but *I refuse to do any more than I am doing* now to keep the relationship going.

---

  - My relationship will never succeed, and *there is no more that I can do* to keep the relationship going.
-

APPENDIX H

**Relationship Commitment Level Items**

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

1. I want our relationship to last for a very long time.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Do Not Agree at All				Agree Somewhat				Agree Completely

2. I am committed to maintaining my relationship with my partner.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Do Not Agree at All				Agree Somewhat				Agree Completely

3. I would not feel very upset if our relationship were to end in the near future.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Do Not Agree at All				Agree Somewhat				Agree Completely

4. It is likely that I will date someone other than my partner within the next year.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Do Not Agree at All				Agree Somewhat				Agree Completely

5. I feel very attached to our relationship—very strongly linked to my partner.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Do Not Agree at All				Agree Somewhat				Agree Completely

6. I want our relationship to last forever.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Do Not Agree at All				Agree Somewhat				Agree Completely

7. I am oriented toward the long-term future of my relationship (for example, I imagine being with my partner several years from now).

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Do Not Agree at All				Agree Somewhat				Agree Completely

## APPENDIX I

### Demographic Survey

Please answer the following demographic questions. Your answers will be used to compile a demographic profile of participants in the study. All responses will remain confidential.

Please answer these questions as they pertain to *you*:

1. Age (in years): \_\_\_\_\_
2. Gender:
  - a. Male
  - b. Female
3. Ethnicity
  - a. Caucasian
  - b. African American
  - c. Asian American
  - d. Hispanic/Latino(a)
  - e. Native American
  - f. Bi- or multi ethnic (please list \_\_\_\_\_)
  - g. Other (please list \_\_\_\_\_)
4. Country of Origin: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Current country of residence: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Number of Years in current country: \_\_\_\_\_
7. Are you currently in a relationship? Yes No
8. If you are currently in a relationship, how long have you been in it?
  - a. Number of months: \_\_\_\_\_
9. What is your relationship status?
  - a. Single
  - b. Dating
  - c. Married
10. Do you consider your current partner to be your soul mate? Yes, No
11. Do you plan to remain in this relationship over the coming year? Yes, Maybe, Not Likely
12. Are your friends supportive of your relationship? Yes, Somewhat, Not Really
13. Is your family supportive of your relationship? Yes, Somewhat, Not Really
14. Do you perceive your partner to be ethnic/culturally different than you? Yes, Somewhat, Not Really
15. Do you perceive your family and the family of your partner to be ethnic/culturally different? Yes, Somewhat, Not Really

Please answer these questions as they pertain to *your romantic partner*

1. Age (in years): \_\_\_\_\_
2. Gender:
  - a. Male
  - b. Female

3. Ethnicity
  - a. Caucasian
  - b. African American
  - c. Asian American
  - d. Hispanic/Latino(a)
  - e. Native America
  - f. Bi- or multi ethnic (please list \_\_\_\_\_)
  - g. Other (please list \_\_\_\_\_)
4. Country of Origin: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Current country of residence: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Number of Years in current country: \_\_\_\_\_

VITA

Graduate School  
Southern Illinois University

Megan M. Morrison

mmmorrison@siu.edu

University of Southern Indiana  
Bachelor of Science, Psychology, May 2012  
Bachelor of Arts, Philosophy, May 2012  
Bachelor of Arts, English, May 2012

Special Honors and Awards:  
Delyte and Dorthy Morris Doctoral Fellowship

Thesis Title:  
Does Race Matter?: Examining Differences in Intracultural and Intercultural Relationships.

Major Professor: Dr. Meera Komarraju