



Identity, Couple and Intergroups Dynamics in Intercultural Families: Implications on Life Satisfaction of Partners

Journal:	<i>Family Process</i>
Manuscript ID	FP-18-205
Manuscript Type:	Original article
Keywords:	Intermarriage, bicultural couple, life satisfaction, discrimination, ethnic identification

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

Identity, Couple and Intergroups Dynamics in Intercultural Families: Implications on Life Satisfaction of Partners

The current study analyzed how identity, couple and intergroups dynamics are related to life satisfaction among 210 intercultural partners living in Italy. Three levels of analysis were considered: a micro level, taking into account the identity aspect of each partner in terms of self or hetero ethnic identification; a meso level, examining the passion, commitment and intimacy of the couple sphere of the partners; a macro level investigating the discrimination that partners can perceive by the community as an effect of the relationship between dominant and minority groups.

The results show that for both partners, foreign and Italian, the variables that have a predictive value on life satisfaction bring into play the couple and the intergroup dynamics, leaving out the identity one. Specifically, increased perceived discrimination as a member of a mixed couple leads to a decreased life satisfaction by partners. In turn, we can see that a strong intimacy between partners enhances their life satisfaction. These results introduce a reflection on the role of the differences about the ethnic identity, considered erroneously the main cause of dissatisfaction in the mixed couple. The implications of the study are described and suggestions for future research discussed.

Keywords: *intermarriage, bicultural couple, life satisfaction, discrimination, ethnic identification*

INTERCULTURAL COUPLE RELATIONSHIPS IN ITALY

The present study analyzed a growing phenomenon in Italy known as intercultural or mixed families.

The mixed (bicultural or intercultural) couple is the union of individuals belonging to different cultural, national or religious contexts (Waldman & Rubalcava, 2005).

The term 'mixed' (originally, *mixité* in French) is quite controversial because is a descriptor attached predominantly to individuals rather than to partnerships or households

1
2
3 and, because it is a dynamic and contextual category based on a perception of diversity in the
4 communities (Novara, Serio & Lavanco, 2017; Varro, 2003). For this reason we have
5 included 'intermarriage' and 'international' unions to define the relationships between
6 partners from different ethnic backgrounds (Caballero, Edwards & Smith, 2008), taking into
7 account both the objective components of racial differences and aspects of social construction
8 of ethnic identity (Tajfel, 1981). The mixed family is a significant social institution in which
9 social gaps are visible and these naturalise the differences in daily life (Parisi, 2015).

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 This new family pattern arises from the political and economic transformations in the
19 world, getting more frequent movements of people from one country to another. In the
20 migration process, mobility among individuals involves a direct continuous contact with
21 members of the host society that gives rise to new acculturation processes, which in turn lead
22 to changes in the original cultural setting of one or both groups (Berry, 2011).

23
24
25
26
27
28
29 Italy is a new destination of international immigration and has received significant and
30 highly flows of immigrants since the early 1990s (ILFS), a social phenomenon that slowly
31 changes linguistic, ethnic, cultural and religious setting of the city. A component strictly
32 related to this type of mobility is the formation of new intercultural families that are one
33 aspect of the changing cultural landscape of Italy (Riva, 2011).

34
35
36
37
38
39
40 To certify the relevance of the investigated phenomenon, a reference is made to the
41 official statistics according to which 24.018 marriages have been registered with at least one
42 partner of foreign nationality in 2015 (12.4% on the total number of marriages in Italy).
43
44 Among these, the mixed marriages are 74% (17.692) (where one of the couple is Italian and
45 one is a foreigner); an incidence of nearly 9.1% on the total number of marriages contracted
46 in Italy (Istat, 2016). In Italy, the mixed couples are distributed respectively in the north
47 (55.0%), in the centre (22.8%), in the south (15.3%) and in the islands (6.9%) proportionally
48 to the migratory streams in the different areas of Italy. The 2015 census marks a clear
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 prevalence of those cases in which the foreign partner is female and thus, mixed marriages
4 concerned a native Italian man married to a foreign-born woman (77.1%), mostly originating
5 from poorer countries in Eastern Europe (1 bride on 2) and, to a lesser extent, in Latin
6 America (Istat, 2016). The first 10 nationalities of the brides involved in these marriages were
7 Romania (20.0%), Ukraine (12.0%), Russia (6.2%), Moldova (5.5%), Albania (5.4%), Brazil
8 (5.1%), Poland (4.3%), Morocco (3.4%), Peru (2.3%) and Cuba (2.3%). Romania (20.6%),
9 Albania (11.1%), Ukraine (4.4%), Moldova (3.3%) and Poland (2.1%) were the first five
10 foreign European countries represented in Italy in 2015 (ivi).

11
12 To these statistics it is to be added the number of mixed couples living together which are
13 beyond the census and official statistics' control, since the Istat Multiscopus surveys not
14 report the information of the two partners' nationality, which is an unavoidable condition to
15 define the "mixity" of couple. The size of the phenomenon is more realistic when also taking
16 into consideration all those intercultural relationships where the foreign partner has taken
17 Italian nationality. The migrant-native unions, although recently, had a surprising trend,
18 arousing the interest of experts from various disciplines (Adsera & Ferrer, 2014). A part of
19 them thinks that the growth of intermarriage documented in many developed countries is
20 often regarded as an indicator of immigrants' assimilation into host societies (Alba & Nee,
21 2003). Others test the relevance of the status exchange hypothesis to accounting for mixed
22 marriages in Italy according to intermarriage is a gateway to socio-economic integration and
23 stability in the host society (Qian & Lichter, 2007; Furtado, 2012); others are concerned
24 about the number of divorces (7.160 nel 2015; Istat, 2016) involving these couples (Kalmijn,
25 2011).

26
27 Ethnicity and immigrant status are significant social conditions in the couple formation
28 because of individuals' preferences regarding their own ethnic-related culture such as
29 language, cuisine, religion and traditions and because of the distance between the majority
30

1
2
3 and certain minority groups (Potarca & Mills, 2012). Considering the above-mentioned
4
5 existence of cultural barriers to exogamy, we argue, also, that the couple affinity is relevant
6
7 for a proper examination of migrant/native marriages. In this perspective, the relationship
8
9 between public and private dimensions produces a citizenship expansion on the intimate
10
11 sphere (Oleksy 2009).
12

13
14 The main objective of this study was to explore a group of variables associated with ethnic
15
16 identity, intergroup and couple relationships, and to determine how these relate to life
17
18 satisfaction among partners in intercultural families.
19

20
21 In particular, three different dimensions were examined: identity, intergroup and couple
22
23 dynamics according to an Ecological Systems Theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1986) to provide a
24
25 glimpse into the complex interconnections between ethnic, social and romantic realms of
26
27 experience (Padilla, Hirsch, Munoz-Labor, Sember, & Parker, 2007).
28
29
30

31 **The identity dynamics: ethnic identification**

32
33
34

35
36 Regarding the relationship between different ethnic groups in multicultural contexts, Berry
37
38 (2001) has identified two main currents in recent studies. The first refers to intergroup
39
40 analysis derived from Social Identity Theory (SIT), whereas the second focuses mainly on the
41
42 acculturation process.
43

44
45 In current multicultural societies, SIT is the theoretical framework that studies
46
47 relationships between different ethnic groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Brown, 2000).
48
49 According to SIT there are social categories with different status and powers, and the identity
50
51 of people mainly depends on self-definition in terms of group membership. According to SIT,
52
53 individuals tend to differentiate between their social ingroup and outgroups, in such a way
54
55 that their membership constitutes a satisfactory and positive part of ones identity (Hindriks,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Verkuyten & Coenders, 2014). Social identity is based on three interconnected processes:
4 categorization, in which the individual builds a membership category related to different
5 factors (sex, age, social status, religion, ethnicity, etc.); identification, through which the
6 individual identifies himself with this group; and finally the social comparison process,
7 through which there is a continual comparison between the ingroup and reference outgroup.
8
9
10
11
12

13
14 Personal identity is largely determined by belonging to one or more groups and, therefore,
15 influenced by the acculturation process. In fact, according to Castro Solano (2011) and Berry
16 (2003), acculturation can be considered a process of cultural and psychological change that
17 foreigners experience as a result of intercultural contact. The psychological changes
18 experienced by the individuals involve variations in attitudes towards the acculturation
19 process and cultural identity (Phinney, 2003), as well as changes in their social behaviour in
20 relation to the groups in contact. Thus acculturation processes involve complex dynamics
21 through which individuals “negotiate” the ethnic and cultural components of identity via
22 comparisons between their own group and the group represented by the dominant culture
23 (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 Berry (1997) argues that there are two fundamental dimensions of acculturation: the
37 maintenance of original cultural identity and the maintenance of relationships with other
38 groups or people from the host society. This model classifies people on the basis of strong or
39 weak affiliation with the host culture and the culture of origin.
40
41
42
43

44
45 Until the 1980s, it was thought that immigrants were free to choose acculturation
46 strategies. From the 1990s onwards, researchers began to investigate how the host society
47 influences the adaptation process among immigrants, finding that the dynamics of
48 acculturation follows a bidirectional model (Berry, 2001), such that perceived discrimination
49 or prejudice on either part may influence which strategies are chosen in the acculturation
50 process (Navas et al., 2004). If the acculturation process is successful, this is known as
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 adaptation and may be psychological or cultural. Psychological adaptation is associated with
4 subjective well-being due to cultural contact and is strongly influenced by social support,
5 personality factors and life changes (Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). Sociocultural adaptation
6 refers to the successful resolution of practical problems arising from interaction with
7 members of the dominant culture (Castro Solano, 2011) and is influenced by interaction with
8 the host culture, proficiency in using the host language, and discrimination (Ward, 2004).
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 Numerous studies have shown that psychological or sociocultural adjustment is linked to
17 the type of group identification that individuals develop. Thus, identification with one's
18 culture of origin is associated with a lower incidence of psychological distress (Bratter &
19 Eschbachb, 2006) and subjective well-being (Kenyon & Carter, 2011), lower levels of
20 depression (Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999), higher self-esteem (Espinosa, Freire & Ferrándiz,
21 2016), higher rates of well-being (Haslam, Jetten, Postmes, & Haslam, 2009) and increases
22 life satisfaction (Arpino & de Valk, 2018). However, strong outgroup identification has been
23 linked to lower levels of sociocultural difficulties (Ward & Kennedy, 2001).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Finally, based on Berry's acculturation model (1997), foreigners who adopt the strategy of
34 maintaining both cultures (integration) receive the greatest functional benefit. In particular, it
35 has been shown that the integration strategy is associated with lower levels of depression
36 (Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999), greater life satisfaction (Castro Solano, 2011), and greater
37 psychological and sociocultural adjustment (Berry et al., 2006).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Intergroups dynamics: the perceived discrimination**

47
48
49

50 Common assumptions about mixed relationships still tend to over-privilege stereotypical
51 conceptualisations (Caballero et al., 2008).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The social comparison process of the SIT shows not only a positive valuation of ingroup
4 but also a devaluations of other groups. This internal social comparison process drives the
5 intergroup conflict, even in the absence of explicit rivalry or competition between groups
6 (Padilla & Perez, 2003). We consider that intercultural families can be considered as a new
7 outgroup for the majority and minority group. Consequently, this social categorization
8 process reflects on perceptions, attitudes and behaviour toward exogamous relationship
9 (Rodriguez, 2004).
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 In countries where the multicultural phenomenon is more common, researchers have
19 focused on the intergroup relationships in ethnic minority contexts (Esses, Dovidio, Jackson
20 & Armstrong, 2001). These studies highlight the importance of the comparison between the
21 dominant and minority groups. These relationships evolve according to the balance of power
22 in function to the national group membership. In this way, a common representation is
23 formalized as the strongest versus the weakest, the majority versus the minority and the
24 dominant versus the dominated. For these reasons, this research takes into account the
25 relationship between groups (Panari, Mancini & Fruggeri, 2010): in fact, the foreign partner
26 has to interact with the indigenous partner's group, which is the dominant group/culture. The
27 difference between the members of the mixed couples (cultural, religious, racial, ethnic, etc)
28 assumes importance if the cultural difference between the respective groups is perceived as
29 relevant to the community context in which the couple lives. Hence, it is necessary to
30 understand the process of cultural construction of similarities and differences between groups
31 that, according to a hierarchical group model, which implicitly shared, establishes the
32 acceptance levels between groups (Bertolani, 2015). In function to the social contact
33 established with those groups that boast of greater prestige (Allport, 1935), a discriminatory
34 attitude takes shape against the foreign partner if the foreign partner is associated with
35 minority group. This level of analyses is connected to the social-constructivist model
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Gergen, 2009), where it is assumed that social construction of difference and its
4 consequential discriminative processes can obstruct the development of the foreign partner's
5 sense of belonging.
6
7

8
9 As it has been demonstrated, the perception of these feelings has a negative impact on the
10 wellbeing of foreigners (Killian, 2012). For example, the perceived discrimination due to
11 cultural differences or feelings of maladjustment are associated with low levels of self-esteem
12 and life satisfaction (Vedder, Van de Vijver, & Liebkind, 2006).
13
14
15
16

17
18 According to Schmitt & Branscombe (2002), prejudices have a negative effect on well-
19 being, increase hostility towards the dominant group and encourage minority group
20 identification. Furthermore, group identification would attenuate the negative effects of
21 perceived discrimination on psychological well-being. Research on intercultural couples has
22 shown that not only are they considered incompatible on a social level (Tognetti Bordogna,
23 1996), but they experience hostility toward your union from family and friends when they
24 announce their engagement (Carol, 2013; Mancini, Panari, & Fruggeri, 2013).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 Some studies have shown that prejudices negatively influence the well-being of mixed
35 couples, whereas others have suggested that stereotypes, together with camouflage and
36 miscommunication, are the main process that underlie discrimination against intercultural
37 couples (Molina, Burnett, & Estrada, 2004). Furthermore, in the case of interreligious and
38 interracial unions, if the extended family members or the closest members of society consider
39 the interreligious or interracial union a threat, then integration becomes yet more difficult for
40 these families (Hombrados & Moscato, 2009). A recent study conducted in Spain found that
41 the perceived discrimination due to being a member of this type of family is one of the
42 factors that has the greatest negative impact on life satisfaction (Moscato, 2012). Most of
43 these studies have focused on the problems that arise from being members of interreligious
44 families (Romano, 2008).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Couple dynamics: conjugal wellbeing

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

People from different country, with different cultural backgrounds and traditions unavoidably come together around the world and fall in love. That seems like obvious, but intercultural relationships are still a quite controversial issue. In fact, as previously mentioned, the family, friends and the community often perceive mixed union negatively. Moreover, cross-border marriages are thought to be less satisfying and more prone to failure (Gurung & Duong, 1999) and they are sometimes judged as a choice of convenience (Eggebo, 2013).

In Italy, studies converge into a structural approach abandoning the seventies pathological viewpoint according to which exogamy was an aggressive choice towards own ethnic origins (Novara & Lavanco, 2014). This non-prejudicial viewpoint, explains the increase of mixed unions with a greater social contact and openness towards the migrant population. Also other studies (Leslie & Letiecq, 2004) examined ethnic identity, social support, and experience of discrimination in predicting intermarriage quality, considering the mixed couple in a macro-social sight. However, this focus may lead to underestimate the point of view within the couple if aspects of the intimate relationship, such as falling in love and passion typical in a conjugal choice, are not taken into consideration (Leslie & Young, 2015).

Currently, the studies that have compared mixed and mono-cultural couples noticed the absence of differences in relationship quality, conflict patterns, relationship efficacy, coping style, and attachment, casting doubt on the belief that interracial relationships are burdened with more problems than intra-racial relationships (Troy et al., 2006). These evidences can be explained by the model of Yodanis & Lauer (2017) according which, in interethnic relationships, the assimilation or a breakdown of ethnic group boundaries must not

1
2
3 necessarily take place; ethnic differences can remain central as people meet, fall in love, and
4 marry across these same (ivi).
5

6
7 Therefore, intercultural like mono-cultural couples undergo challenges such as mutual
8 accommodation and adjustment for possible different habits, moods and life styles (Gaines,
9 Clark & Afful, 2015). They also both share the basic needs for affection, support, trust, and
10 respect from one another essential in maintaining a satisfying conjugal relationship
11 (Skowroński et al., 2014).
12
13
14
15
16

17
18 Based on the above, intercultural marriages might face a particular set of couple dynamics
19 - as compared to mono-cultural couples - due to their cultural differences but love that
20 characterizes romantic relationships remains central across social, cultural, and national
21 boundaries (Wieling, 2003). For this reason, Sternberg's triangular theory of love (1997) –
22 that is sufficiently general and may be applicable across cultures – was taken in exam.
23
24 Sternberg's model proposes three components of the falling in love among partners:
25 intimacy, passion, and commitment. Intimacy includes the close bonds with the loved one:
26 mutual understanding, emotional support, intimate communication, and approach in the
27 relationship based on the sharing. The second component, passion, refers to romance,
28 physical attraction, desire, belonging, and sexual satisfaction in a love relationship. The last
29 component refers to a short-term decision to love the other person establishing a long-term
30 commitment to maintain the relation.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 In this study, we take into account the potential difficulty of the couples to cope with
45 differences in the intimate family relationship using the triangular theory of love as couple
46 dynamic model (Gao, 2001) and indicator of conjugal wellbeing (Torqabeh, Firouz &
47 Haqshenas, 2006).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

RESEARCH AIM AND HYPOTHESIS

The complexity of the phenomenon of bicultural couples is reflected in involved demographic, politic and psychological factors. Only recently, in Italy studies go beyond individual motivations to deal with intergroup, family, symbolic aspects such as emerges from Fruggeri's multidimensional model (2007). Actually there are not empirical proofs to describe mutual interactions and implications of an analysis level on another; for this reason, the general aim of the research was to investigate the three levels above mentioned – cultural identification, perceived discrimination and conjugal wellbeing – considering them fundamental variables for life satisfaction of partners in binational couples.

In particular, the research had the following specific objectives:

- Ob. 1: verifying the presence of significant differences between two sub-samples – foreign and autochthonous partners – on all considered levels; and also the differences within sub-samples in relation to sex, emigration motives, interreligious factors. In line with this objective we derive the hypothesis 1: there will be no significant differences between foreign and autochthonous partner regarding ethnic identification, perceived discrimination, conjugal wellbeing and life satisfaction.
- Ob. 2: examining the relationships between the three levels above described; in line with this objective we derive the following hypotheses:
 - hypothesis 2: we expect that the ethnic identification with own group of origin does not correlate with the life satisfaction of both partners;
 - hypothesis 3: we expect that the perceived discrimination is negatively correlated both with life satisfaction and conjugal wellbeing, for foreign and Italian partners.
- Ob. 3: analyzing whether the ethnic identification, perceived discrimination and conjugal satisfaction are predictive of the life satisfaction for foreign and Italian

1
2
3 partners. In line with this objective we derive the hypothesis 4: we suppose that the
4
5 variables concerning the ethnic identification are not good predictors of life satisfaction
6
7 for both the partners, while are so perceived discrimination and conjugal wellbeing.
8
9

10 11 **METHOD**

12 13 14 15 **Participants and Procedure**

16
17
18
19
20 Taking into account the difficulties involved in obtaining a stratified sample due to
21
22 problems in recruiting this group of individuals, we decided to use the snowball sampling
23
24 method. The participants were recruited through advertising in Italy. Those recruited were
25
26 then asked to invite any other member of mixed couples they knew to participate in the study.
27
28 The advert for participants in the study was published online on sites frequented by mixed
29
30 families. It was also posted in official buildings, such as the registration office, foreign
31
32 associations, hospitals, etc.
33

34
35 According to APA Ethical Principles, all were asked to sign informed consent letter.
36

37
38 The sample included 210 partners of 105 mixed couples residing in Italy. As shown in
39
40 Table 1, the sample is mainly composed of foreign partners with European origin (36.9%),
41
42 from EU member countries prior to 2004 or from new European member countries,
43
44 (specifically Poland and Romania), which joined after 2004; Africa (26.2%), Sud America
45
46 (14.6%), other European countries and USA and Australia (12.6%), Magreb and Middle
47
48 Eastern (9.7%).
49

50
51 The proportion of gender in the sample reflects in the population the prevalence of mixed
52
53 couples formed by a woman foreign partner and an indigenous partner (Guetto & Azzolini,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2015) with the 7.9% of total celebrated marriages in 2012 consisting of Italian man and foreign woman).

Table 1 – Demographic Variables

In the sample we included married couples (73.3%) or living together partners (26.7%) and in 51.2% of cases with children.

With regard to age and education, the sample confirms that members of minority groups with a high educational profile marry more frequently exogenously, than those with a lower degree of education. Infact, according to Furtado and Theodoropoulos (2011), highly educated immigrants have wider social contacts and are more likely to accept the cultural norms prevailing in the host country. They therefore are more interested in similarities in education than similarities in ethnicity. In our case, the hypothetical “cultural disadvantage” of the foreign partner is compensated by the variables age and title of study: the mean age of autochthonous partners is slightly higher ($\mu = 38.5$, $sd = 10.9$), and 29.8% have a degree, while foreign partners are younger ($\mu = 36.6$, $sd = 10.2$) and 34.7% of them own degree. These data confirmed other similar demographic elaborations based on the Italian Labour Force Survey (ILFS, 2005–2012): Italian men are more likely to be married to a non-Western woman than to an Italian one where he is old and low-educated and she is high-educated (Balistreri et al., 2017).

The foreign partners had lived in Italy for an average of 12.8 years ($sd = 9.6$). The majority of participants claimed they were employed. The reasons for migration to Italy, confirming other studies (Tognetti Bordogna, 2005), were for better economic circumstances (43.4%) and/or familial and emotional reasons, for example, family groups (35%).

Italian partners are for the most part (90.7%) of Christian religion, so in some cases there is a situation of interreligious couples. Regarding the level of religiosity 47.1% of Italian

1
2
3 partners declare to be “nothing” and “little” religious, and 52.9% to be “fair” and “very”,
4
5 while foreign partners are respectively 36.5% and 63.4%.
6

7 Regarding the way autochthonous have met the foreign partner, the highest percentages
8
9 are recorded on “Italian friends” (24.8%), “for study or work” (21.0%), “on vacation in
10
11 foreign countries” (15.2%), “through friends in her/his country” (11.4%).
12
13

14 15 16 MEASURES

17 18 **Independent variables**

19 20 *Ethnic Identification.*

21
22 The group identification scale (Brown, Condor, Mathews, Wade, & Williams, 1986) was
23
24 used to measure *Ingroup Identification* (below *Ingroup Id*). This scale consists of 10 items, 5
25
26 positive and 5 negative, using a 5-point Likert scoring system (1 = never, 5 = very often).
27
28 This scale was originally used in organizational contexts and measures three dimensions of
29
30 group identity (awareness, evaluation and affect). It is considered one of the most effective
31
32 scales for measuring identification with ethnic/cultural groups, as it provides direct
33
34 correlation between the attachment group and the ethnic/cultural group (Duckitt & Parra,
35
36 2004). Ingroup identification was used as an overall measure in this study (foreigners partners
37
38 $\alpha = .77$; autochthonous partners $\alpha = .87$).
39
40

41 To measure the identification with the partner’s ethnic group or *Outgroup Identification*
42
43 (below *Outgroup Id*) were used the same items taken from the group identification scale. The
44
45 scale maintains the item structure of the original instrument, but refers to the partner’s
46
47 cultural group (i.e. “I identify myself with my partner’s culture” or “I criticize my partner’s
48
49 culture”).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Discrimination perceived.*
4

5 The measure of *Discrimination perceived by the mixed couple* (below *Couple*
6 *Discrimination*) consisting of 8 items using a 4-point Likert-type scoring system (foreigners α
7 = .69; autochthons α = .79). By way of example, the items used to measure discrimination
8 towards couples in three contexts were as follows. For the social context: (1) As a result of
9 marrying/cohabiting with a foreigner man/woman I feel badly treated here in Italy; (2) On the
10 whole, Italian society views intercultural families as being different; (3) Mixed families are
11 viewed favourably in Italy. For the family context: (4) Members of my family of origin are
12 sometimes critical of my partner's culture; (5) Members of my partner's family are
13 sometimes critical of my culture; (6) Our families of origin sometimes interfere in our family
14 life (running the household, bringing up children, religion, food, etc.). For the friendship
15 context: (7) My friends have a positive view of my partner's culture; (8) My partner's friends
16 have a positive view of my culture.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 To measure the Discrimination perceived *exclusively by the foreign partner* (below
32 *Foreigner Discrimination*) was used a scale that consists of 4 items using a 5-point Likert-
33 type scoring system (1 = total disagreement; 5 = total agreement). It was constructed ad hoc
34 for foreign partners. On this scale (α = .80), discrimination is interpreted as direct experience,
35 that is, the degree of rejection experienced by the foreign partner in the host society. The
36 scale has the following items: (1) I receive few services due to being a foreigner in Italy; (2) I
37 sometimes feel excluded or ignored in Italy; (3) I sometimes feel like I am treated with little
38 respect; (4) It is difficult to find work at my level of education in Italy.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 *Conjugal Wellbeing.*
51

52 The measure of this variable was *the Triangular Love Scale* of Sternberg (1997)
53 (foreigners α = .86; autochthons α = .90). According to Torqabeh et al. (2006), Sternberg's
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 love scale components (intimacy, passion, commitment) were significantly related to scores
4
5 of relationship satisfaction. In the original version, the scale consists of 45 items (15 item for
6
7 each dimension) while we used the small version of Cassepp-Borges and Teodoro (2007)
8
9 with 18 items (6 for each dimension) using a 5-point Likert-type scoring system (1 = total
10
11 disagreement; 5 = total agreement).
12
13
14

15 16 **Dependent variable**

17 18 *Satisfaction with Life.*

19
20 To measure the *Satisfaction with Life* (below *SwL*), the unidimensional scale constructed
21
22 by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985) was used. The scale is composed of 5 items
23
24 using a 7-point Likert-type scoring system (1 = total disagreement 7 = total agreement) and
25
26 shows the subjective evaluation of the individual's own sense of satisfaction with life. The
27
28 scale has been frequently used in research related to subjective wellbeing in communities
29
30 (foreigners, $\alpha = .91$; autochthons $\alpha = .92$).
31
32
33
34

35 36 **Data analysis**

37
38
39 The analysis was carried out with the statistical package SPSS 15.0. We conducted the
40
41 analysis of variance (ANOVA between and within) to compare the mean scores obtained by
42
43 the two groups of foreigners and Italian partners. Pearson's Coefficient was used to analyze
44
45 the association between variables. Stepwise multiple regression analysis was chosen to
46
47 evaluate the effects of the variables on satisfaction with life. Specifically, for the test of each
48
49 effect, we used the sequential procedure to maintain the study-wide Type I error rate at $p =$
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 .05.

RESULTS

Differences between Italian and foreign partners

The differences found between the two groups of Italian and foreign partners on three levels of analysis are shown in the Table 2. First observation concerns the scores of *Ingroup Id* e *Outgroup Id* which appear high for both groups. Operating an ANOVA it was found a significant difference on foreigners who show a higher level of *Ingroup Id* than Italian partners ($F = 2.941, p = .05$). Instead, there are not significant differences for *Outgroup Id*; it means the double ethnic identification with own group and host group is a real possibility for foreign partners.

Table 2 - Comparison between sub-samples (Anova)

No differences are found between Italian and foreign partners inside the other dimensions analyzed. Specially, it is low for both the perception to be discriminated as a mixed couple (foreigners range = 2.09, Italians range = 2.01). About *Conjugal Wellbeing*, the situation is equivalent in both groups, Italian and foreigners, obtaining medium-high level (foreigners range = 4.42, Italians range = 4.44).

Differences within foreign partners groups

The foreign females have a major *Outgroup Id* than males ($F = 7.166, p = .009$), which while consider mixed couples as more discriminated than females ($F = 5.094, p = .026$), (Table 3). These results are confirmed by other recent researches that see immigrant femals as more inclined to assume integration strategies (Berry, 2003) and to adopt easily values of

1
2
3 the new community, nevertheless maintaining the original culture. This strategy requests a
4 specific motivation by women to adopt the basic values of receptive community, in order to
5 find new services for their needs (education, health, work, etc.).
6
7
8
9

10
11 **Table 3 - Comparison within sub-sample (foreign partner) (Anova)**
12

13
14
15 As regards to the type of emigration, *Couple Discrimination* and *Foreigner Discrimination*
16 are more perceived by who considers his/her own migration as forced (political refugees and
17 asylum seekers) compared to who considers it as volunteer (linked to economic factors or for
18 educational reasons or other) (respectively, $F = 17.825, p = .001$; $F = 5.901, p = .017$).
19 Individuals with a volunteer migratory project record also major values of *Conjugal*
20 *Wellbeing*, especially *Intimacy* ($F = 4.689, p = .033$) and *Passion* ($F = 5.836, p = .018$);
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 About sense of religiosity, this variable is confirmed as a strong ethnic element (Heller &
29 Wood, 2000) so that who claims to be “highly” religious shows higher *Ingroup Id* compared
30 to who is “enough”, “little” or “not religious at all” ($F = 5.145, p = .002$). Furthermore, the
31 context is perceived more discriminant towards mixed couples from the muslim partner
32 compared to other with a different religion ($F = 3.185, p = .017$).
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 Undeniable, the mass media prejudice towards some ethnic minorities and the role of
40 fundamentalism as watershed between acceptability and refusal of some religious practices.
41 To confirm this, in the interreligious couple we find a stronger perceived discrimination both
42 as partner of mixed couple ($F = 7.049, p = .009$) and foreigner ($F = 4.859, p = .030$); in these
43 unions, the couple dynamic is reflected in a minor *Intimacy* with the partner ($F = 3.185, p =$
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Differences within Italian partners groups

In Italian partners groups the differences are statistically significant for variables shown in Table 4.

About gender, Italian females who chose a foreign partner perceive more discrimination as partners of a mixed couple ($F = 6.127, p = .015$) compared to Italian males; on the other side, in the sub-scale *Passion*, women have high medium score ($F = 9.788, p = .002$). The result seems to confirm a disapproval in the social context to recognize to the woman the “power” to choose her partner out of her own ethnic environment.

Among Italians, who works has high scores for *Ingroup Id* ($F = 6.941, p = .010$) – maybe because job is an integration way in any life contexts – but also for *Commitment* inside the couple ($F = 4.949, p = .028$).

Table 4 - Comparison within sub-sample (Italian partners) (Anova)

Finally, the presence in the couple of a difference in religion for Italian partners affects the perception of discrimination ($F = 13.575, p = .001$) while there are no differences on the couple’s dynamic how happens for the foreign partner.

Correlations

Correlation between *Ingroup Id* and *Outgroup Id* in both groups is around zero, disconnecting the identification to its own ethnic group from the concept to belong or not to new context (Table 5). Maintaining an anchorage to one’s own culture of origin is, and should be, a private choice of individuals that does not affect the openness to new memberships.

1
2
3 The ethnic identification is affected by discriminatory process. In fact, for foreign partners,
4
5 *Outgroup Identification* is associated negatively with *Couple Discrimination* ($r = -.35, p <$
6
7 $.001$) and *Foreigner Discrimination* ($r = -.26, p < .001$).
8
9

10
11 **Table 5** - Correlations among all dimensions for Autochthonous and Foreigners partners
12
13

14
15 The identification with outgroup has a significant importance in modulating the couple
16
17 dynamic, for both partners' groups; how it shows in table 5, for foreigner partners, the
18
19 *Outgroup Id* links positively with all dimensions of the *Conjugal Wellbeing*. Only for
20
21 foreigner partners, the *Outgroup Id* affects the *SwL* ($r = .32, p < .001$).
22
23

24 Moreover, it is interesting to notice that the discriminant dynamic affects the couple
25
26 dynamic: we find that all the dimensions of *Conjugal Wellbeing* are negatively relate with the
27
28 perceived discrimination as mixed couple, specially for non-autochthonous partner;
29
30 furthermore, in the latter, more is the *Foreigner Discrimination* less is the *Intimacy* among
31
32 partners ($r = -.28, p < .001$). How we expected, the two measures of discrimination are
33
34 related each other ($r = .46, p < .001$).
35
36

37 Finally, all dimensions of *Conjugal Wellbeing* are positively related to *SwL*, for both sub-
38
39 samples.
40
41

42 43 **Predictive Model**

44
45 In order to test which among levels – identity, discriminant, couplet – may have a
46
47 predictive value on *SwL*, it was done an analysis of linear regression (Stepwise Method). In
48
49 the model, a single dependent variable was inserted for the three involved levels, with *SwL* as
50
51 dependent variable and *Outgroup Id*, *Couple Discrimination* and *Passion*, as predictive
52
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 variables. Among the *Conjugal Wellbeing* dimensions, it was chosen *Passion* because is
4
5 linked mainly with *SwL* for the foreign partners (see Tab. 5).
6

7 Following, you find the output of two models which were found statically significant for
8
9 Italian and foreign partners (Tab. 6).
10

11
12
13 **Table 6** - *Lineal regression in both sub-groups of native and foreign partners*
14
15

16
17 Specifically, for the native partners, the variables that predict *SwL* ($F= 2.101$) are *Passion*
18 ($\beta= .46$; $p<.001$) and *Couple Discrimination* ($\beta= -.30$; $p<.001$). The model explains the 30.6%
19
20 of variance ($Adj R^2= .306$). Also for foreign partners, the variables able to predict the *SwL* ($F=$
21
22 2.100) are *Passion* ($\beta= .56$; $p<.001$) and *Couple Discrimination* ($\beta= -.19$; $p<.01$). The model
23
24 explains the 41.1% of variance ($Adj R^2= .411$). However, these results show that *Outgroup Id*
25
26 does not predict *SwL*, which instead is predicted by *Passion* and *Couple Discrimination*.
27
28

29
30 The multicollinearity has been examined with Tolerance and the Variance Inflation Factor
31
32 (VIF), two collinearity diagnostic tests. The Tolerance is good and the VIF (value lies
33
34 between 1-10= no multicollinearity), measuring the impact of collinearity among the
35
36 independent variables, has been satisfied.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

44
45
46
47

48 Numerous studies tried to explain the birth of mixed couple, but continues to be scarce the
49
50 knowledge of identity processes, intergroup and intimacy dynamics of these couples, once
51
52 formed. This paper gives a contribution to this literature.
53

54 Intermarriage has been considered by some author an example of social integration (Song,
55
56 2009), but others states that it is not true that who get marry with an native has already
57
58

1
2
3 obtained a ‘structural’ integration, a residential, cultural or economic (Rodriguez-Garcia,
4 2015). Moreover, generally migrants have a low socio-economic profile and scarce
5 possibilities in ‘social mobility’, whereas mixed marriages may be seen as a tool of socio-
6 economic integration (Choi et al., 2012) instead of have been considered as effects of better
7 synergy among groups (Azzolini, & Guetto, 2017).
8
9

10
11
12
13 The rethoric on ‘arranged marriages’ has casted suspicion on this population. Mixed
14 marriages are often prone to unusual controls by public opinion in order to certificate the
15 authenticity of tie through comparisons about aesthetic, moral, age and socio-economic status
16 among spouses (Lehmiller, & Agnew, 2006). That forced mixed couples to a diffuse system
17 of ‘surveillance’ from relatives, society and State. Inevitably, in these conditions love relation
18 is not only a private fact and flags identity and social issues (Parisi, 2015).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Therefore, the paper examines if the differences socially built in the public sphere – as
27 cultural identification and perceived discrimination – are related with couple relationship and
28 if its together may affect the private satisfaction with life.
29
30
31
32

33 As we expected in the hypothesis 1, there are not significant differences between foreign and
34 autochthonous partners regarding perceived discrimination, conjugal wellbeing and life
35 satisfaction; differently, it results that the foreigners have a ingroup identification value
36 slightly higher than their partners. That evidence together with high levels of outgroup
37 identification could be the sign that each partner can both maintain an anchorage to one’s
38 own ethnic identity and opening to other’s culture. Furthermore, the identification with
39 outgroup seems to help the minority partner to feel ‘belonging’ to the dominant culture. As
40 Berry (1997) claims the integration strategy, where individuals maintain the original cultural
41 identity and at the same time become participants of the new host culture, may guarantee a
42 better process of adaptation. This double identity would seem adapt and functional when it
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 avoids a pure assimilating situation, where one of the two cultures prevails over the other and
4
5 permits the coexistence of each uniqueness (Helms et al., 2014).
6

7 About the hypothesis 2, the results confirm that the identification with own group of origin
8
9 does not correlate with the life satisfaction for both groups' partners, while the outgroup
10
11 identification is related with all the dimensions of conjugal wellbeing and, only for
12
13 foreigners, also with the life satisfaction. That can be explained by the process of similarities'
14
15 maximization according to the SIT (Pagliaro et al. 2010), in which foreigners try to
16
17 emphasize what is common between the self and the majority group to improve their life
18
19 conditions. In the couple dimension, it is as if the partners redefine the boundaries of their
20
21 differences focusing on perceived similarities with partner's group giving birth to a
22
23 transnational identity (Faist, Fauser, & Reisenauer, 2013): a mixed identity of couple. In fact
24
25 also for the italian partners identify with the native group of the foreign partner enhances the
26
27 conjugal wellbeing: how stated above, the exogamic choice could derive from the attractive
28
29 power of the differences between partners thus contributing to the falling in love and the
30
31 couple's affinity (Yodanis & Lauer, 2017).
32
33
34

35 Going over we can add that the identification with outgroup seems to have weight positively
36
37 on partners' life and couple's satisfaction, provided that they do not perceive to be
38
39 discriminated. In fact, how formulated in the hypothesis 3, we found that the perceived
40
41 discrimination is negatively correlated both with life satisfaction and conjugal wellbeing, for
42
43 foreign and Italian partners. We found also that the discrimination as foreigner is inversely
44
45 related to the identification with the Italian partner's group but not to the identification with
46
47 own native group. This result is very interesting because it emerges the prescriptive role that
48
49 can have the host culture (Pagliaro et al., 2010). According to SIT, discriminating behaviours
50
51 underline 'cultural distance' among individuals. This is the reason why, in comparison within
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sub-sample (Tab. 3), foreign partners in inter-religious couple feel discriminated, especially
4 the Muslim (Joseph, Yun, & Teya, 2017; Riva, 2011; Heller & Wood, 2000).

5
6
7 Thus, the macro level has a key role in to promote a general wellbeing but no affects the issue
8 referring to ingroup identification.

9
10
11 For these reasons we analyzed to what extent the ethnic identification, perceived
12 discrimination and conjugal satisfaction are predictive of the life satisfaction for foreign and
13 Italian partners.

14
15
16 The predictive model – as described in the hypothesis 4 – confirms that the perceived
17 discrimination and conjugal wellbeing are good predictors of the life satisfaction, for both
18 partners' groups. Also in this case, the cultural identifications' level is not decisive.

19
20
21 Overall, the results reported here show that the identity dimension can be flexible and that
22 sense of membership in migratory contexts can be built safeguarding also the couple
23 relationship. Instead, essential condition for quality of life perception, as for monogamous
24 couples also for the partners of mixed union, is the conjugal wellbeing. On the other hand,
25 (social and legal) 'recognition' from the host community of the truthfulness of one's union
26 seems to be a priority. In fact, the data clearly suggest that the private sphere of the couple is
27 sensitive to discriminatory social looks.

28
29
30 As Varro (2003) claims, it is necessary 'to recognize the mixité as a social generalised fact'
31 (ivi, p. 229) instead of ignoring the 'Other' with the expectation that the same will disappear
32 in the assimilation process. Therefore, the mutual relation between identity, intimate and
33 macro spheres push towards new intimacy as a citizenship dimension (Oleksy, Hearn &
34 Golanska, 2011). In fact, despite the increase of borders controls, in all European territory
35 besides the Italian one (Foucher, 1998), the spontaneously relational barriers become more
36 permeable. There are multitudes of lives, cross-borders hopes, dreams and projects of more
37 satisfying life, people who love each other that ask the freedom to love without prejudices

1
2
3 (Isin, 2009). They are individuals who challenge institutional policies to make progress as
4
5 ‘intimate citizens’ (Roseneil et al., 2012).

6
7 For future reflections, we think that would be useful to carry out transnational studies to
8
9 deepen the weight of discrimination and conjugal satisfaction. It could be also interesting to
10
11 improve deeply the comprehension of mechanisms, which influence positively the life quality
12
13 of mixed couples to take into account in preventive action of marital separations and in
14
15 promoting family wellbeing (Negy, Hammons, Reig-Ferrer, & Carper 2010).

16
17
18 In this regard, despite the current study represents an important step in this direction, it can
19
20 be helpful a qualitative follow-up aimed not specifically on the foreign partner as “unique
21
22 carrier of diversity” but mainly on the dyad.
23

24 25 26 27 **REFERENCES**

- 28
29 Adsera, A. & Ferrer, A. (2014). *Immigrants and Demography: Marriage, Divorce, and Fertility, IZA*
30
31 *Discussion Paper, 7982*. Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA).
- 32
33 Alba, R., & Nee, V. (2003). *Remaking the American mainstream Assimilation and contemporary*
34
35 *immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- 36
37 Allport, G. W. (1935). Attitudes. In C. Murchison (Ed.), *A Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 798-
38
39 844). Worcester, MA: Clark University Pres.
- 40
41 Arpino, B., & de Valk, H. (2018). Comparing Life Satisfaction of Immigrants and Natives Across
42
43 Europe: The Role of Social Contacts. *Social Indicators Research*, 37(3): 1163-1184.
44
45 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-017-1629-x>
- 46
47 Azzolini, D., & Guetto, R. (2017). The impact of citizenship on intermarriage. Quasi-experimental
48
49 evidence from two European Union Eastern enlargements. *Demographic Research*, 36, 1299–
50
51 1336. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2017.36.43>
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Balistreri, K. S., Joyner, K., & Kao, G. (2017). Trading Youth for Citizenship? The Spousal Age Gap
4 in Cross-Border Marriages. *Population and Development Review*, 43(3), 443-466.
5
6 <https://doi.org/10.1111/padr.12072>
7
8
9 Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology*, 46(1), 5-68.
10
11 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1997.tb01087.x>
12
13 Berry, J. W. (2001). A psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 615-631.
14
15 <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00231>
16
17 Berry, J. W. (2003). Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In K. Chun, P. Balls Organista, & G.
18 Marin (Eds), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement and application* (pp. 17-37).
19 Washington: APA Books.
20
21
22
23 Berry, J. W. (2011). Intercultural relations in plural societies: Research derived from Canadian
24 multiculturalism policy. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 43/44(3-1), 5-18.
25
26
27 Berry, J.W. Phinney, J.S., Sam, D.L. & Vedder, P. (Eds.) (2006). *Immigrant youth in cultural*
28 *transition: acculturation, identity and adaptation across national contexts*. Mahwah: Lawrence
29 Erlbaum Associates.
30
31
32
33 Bertolani, B. (2015). Pujabis in Italy: The Role of Ethnic and Family Networks in Immigration and
34 Social Integration. In S. Irudaya Rajan, V. J. Varghese & Aswini Kumar Nanda (Eds.),
35 *Migrations, Mobility and Multiple Affiliations: Punjabis in a Transnational World* (pp. 319-337).
36 Cambridge: University Press.
37
38
39
40 Bratter, J. L., & Eschbach, K. (2006). 'What about the couple?' Interracial marriage and
41 psychological distress. *Social Science Research*, 35(4), 1025-1047.
42
43 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2005.09.001>
44
45
46 Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research
47 perspectives. *Developmental Psychology*, 22, 723-742.
48
49
50 Brown, R. (2000). Social Identity Theory: past achievements, current problems and future challenges.
51 *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 745-778.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Brown, R., Condor, S., Mathews, A., Wade, G., & Williams, J. (1986). Explaining intergroup
4 differentiation in an industrial organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 59(4), 273-286.
5 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1986.tb00230.x>
6
7
8 Caballero, C., Edwards, R. & Smith, D. (2008). Cultures of mixing: understanding partnerships
9 across ethnicity. *21st Century Society*, 3(1), 49–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450140701749171>
10
11 Carol, S. (2013). *Is Blood Thicker Than Water? The Role of Family and Gender Values for the Social*
12 *Distance between Muslim Migrants and Natives in Western Europe. Doctoral Dissertation.*
13 Berlin: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.
14
15
16
17
18 Cassepp-Borges, V. & Teodoro, M. (2007). Propriedades psicométricas da versão brasileira da escala
19 triangular do amor de Sternberg. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, 20(3), 513-522.
20 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0102-79722007000300020>
21
22
23
24 Castro Solano, A. (2011). La evaluación de las competencias culturales de los líderes mediante el
25 Inventario de Adaptación Cultural. *Anales de Psicología de la Universidad de Murcia*, 27(2), 507-
26 517.
27
28
29
30 Choi, K. H., Tienda, M., Cobb-Clark, D. & Sinning, M. (2012). Immigration and Status Exchange in
31 Australia and the United States. *Research on Social Stratification and Mobility*, 30(1): 49–62.
32 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2011.08.002>.
33
34
35
36 Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life. Scale.
37 *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
38
39
40 Duckitt, J., & Parra, C. (2004). Dimensions of Group Identification and Out-Group Attitudes in Four
41 Ethnic Groups in New Zealand. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 26(4), 237-247.
42 http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15324834basp2604_1
43
44
45
46 Eggebø, H. (2013). A Real Marriage? Applying for Marriage Migration to Norway. *Journal of Ethnic*
47 *and Migration Studies*, 39(5), 773-789. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2013.756678>
48
49
50 Espinosa, A., Freire, S., & Ferrándiz, J. (2016). Identificación colectiva y bienestar en una
51 comunidad rural de la costa norte del Perú. *Revista de Psicología*, 34(1), 201-219.
52 <http://dx.doi.org/10.18800/psico.201601.008>
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Esses, V. M., Dovidio, J. F., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (2001). The immigration dilemma: The role of perceived group competition, ethnic prejudice, and national identity. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(3), 389-412. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00220>
- Faist, T., Fauser, M., & Reisenauer, E. (2013). *Transnational Migration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Foucher, M. (1998). The Geopolitics of European Frontiers. In M. Anderson and E. Bort (Eds.), *The Frontiers of Europe*. London: Pinter.
- Fruggeri, L. (2007). Il caleidoscopio delle famiglie contemporanee. La pluralità come principio di metodo. In P. Bastianoni, & A. Taurino (Eds.), *Famiglie e genitorialità oggi* (pp. 41-67). Milano: Unicopli.
- Furtado, D. (2012). Human Capital and Interethnic Marriage Decisions. *Economic Inquiry, 50*(1): 82-93. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-7295.2010.00345.x>.
- Furtado, D. & Theodoropoulos, N. (2011). Interethnic Marriage: A Choice between Ethnic and Educational Similarities. *Journal of Population Economics, 24*, 1257-1279. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-010-0319-7>.
- Gaines, S. O., Clark, E. M., & Afful, S. E. (2015). Interethnic Marriage in the United States: An Introduction. *Journal of Social Issues, 71*(4), 647-658. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12141>
- Gao, G. (2001). Intimacy, passion, and commitment in Chinese and US American romantic relationships. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 25*(3), 329-342. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767\(01\)00007-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(01)00007-4)
- Gergen, K. J. (2009). *An invitation to social construction*. Sage Publications.
- Guetto, R., & Azzolini, D. (2015). An empirical study of status exchange through migrant/native marriages in Italy. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 41*(13), 1-24.
- Gurung, R. A. R., & Duong, T. (1999). Mixing and Matching: Assessing the Concomitants of Mixed-Ethnic Relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 16*(5), 639-657. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026540759916500>
- Haslam, S. A., Jetten, J., Postmes, T. & Haslam, C. (2009). Social Identity, Health and Well-Being: An Emerging Agenda for Applied Psychology. *Applied Psychology, 58*(1), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00379.x>

- 1
2
3 Heller, P. E., & Wood, B. (2000). The influence of religious and ethnic differences on marital
4 intimacy: intermarriage versus intramarriage. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 26(2), 241-
5 252. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2000.tb00293.x>
6
7
8 Helms, H. M., Supple, A. J., Su, J., Rodriguez, Y., Cavanaugh, A. M., & Hengstebeck, N. D. (2014).
9 Economic pressure, cultural adaptation stress, and marital quality among Mexican-origin couples.
10 *Journal of Family Psychology*, 28(1), 77-87. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0035738>
11
12
13 Hindriks, P., Verkuyten, M., & Coenders, M. (2014). Interminority Attitudes. The Roles of Ethnic
14 and National Identification, Contact, and Multiculturalism. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 77(1),
15 54–74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272513511469>
16
17
18 Hombrados, M.I., & Moscato, G. (2009). Interculturalità e senso di comunità. In G. Lavanco, M.I.
19 Hombrados (Eds.), *Lavoro di comunità e intervento sociale interculturale*. Milano: Franco Agnelli.
20
21
22 ISTAT. (2016). *Matrimoni, Separazione e Divorzi, Anno 2015*. Roma: Statistiche Report. Retrieved
23 at www.istat.it.
24
25
26 ILFS (Italian Labour Force Survey). *Metadata from 2005 to 2012*. Retrieved at
27 <https://www.istat.it/en/archive/36394>
28
29
30 Isin, E. F. (2009). Citizenship in flux: The figure of the activist citizen. *Subjectivity*, 29(1), 367–388.
31
32
33 <https://doi.org/10.1057/sub.2009.25>
34
35
36 Joseph, T. K., Yun, S. Q., & Teya, K. (2017). The Influence of Religion on Mixed Marriages among
37 Africans and Chinese in China: A Case Study of Inter Ethnic Marriages in Yiwu. *Journal of*
38 *Sociology and Social Work*, 5(1), 122-130. <https://doi.org/10.15640/jssw.v5n1a12>
39
40
41 Kalmijn, M. (2011). Country differences in the effects of divorce on well-being: The role of norms,
42 support, and selectivity. *European Sociological Review*, 26, 137–153.
43
44
45 Kenyon, D. B. & Carter, J. S. (2011). Ethnic identity, sense of community, and psychological well-
46 being among northern plains American Indian youth. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 39(1), 1-
47 9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20412>
48
49
50 Killian, K. (2012). Resisting and complying with homogamy: Interracial couple's narratives about
51 partner differences. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 25(2), 125–135.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Lehmiller, J. J. & Agnew C. R. (2006). Marginalized Relationships: The Impact of Social
4 Disapproval on Romantic Relationship Commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*,
5 32(1), 40-51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167205278710>
6
7
8
9 Leslie, L. A., & Young, J. L. (2015). Interracial Couples in Therapy: Common Themes and Issues.
10 *Social Issues*, 71(4), 788-803. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12149>
11
12
13 Mancini, T., Panari, C., & Fruggeri, L. (2013). Intercultural families between definitions and social
14 change. *Psicologia di comunità*, 1, 11-19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3280/PSC2013-001002>
15
16
17 Merton, R. K. (1941). Intermarriage and the Social Structure: Fact and Theory. *Psychiatry*, 4, 361–
18 374.
19
20
21 Molina, B., Burnett, J. A., & Estrada, D. (2004). Cultural communities: Challenges and opportunities
22 in the creation of happily ever after stories of intercultural couplehood. *The Family Journal:*
23 *Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 1(2), 139–147.
24
25
26
27 Moscato, G. (2012). Familias interculturales en Espana: análisis de la satisfacción vital. *Portularia*,
28 12, 35–43.
29
30
31 Navas, M., Pumares, P., Sánchez, J., García, M. C., Rojas, A. J., & Cuadrado, I. (2004). Las actitudes
32 de aculturación de autóctonos e inmigrantes en Almería a través del modelo ampliado de
33 aculturación relative. In D. Uclés, & J. F. Giménez (Eds.), *Informe económico de la provincia de*
34 *Almería, 2003. El reto de la inmigración* (pp. 120–140). Almería: Cámara de Comercio, Industria
35 y Navegación de Almería.
36
37
38
39
40
41 Negy, C., Hammons, M. E., Reig-Ferrer, A., & Carper, T. M. (2010). The importance of addressing
42 acculturative stress in marital therapy with Hispanic immigrant women. *International Journal of*
43 *Clinical and Health Psychology*, 10(1), 5-21.
44
45
46
47 Novara, C., & Lavanco, G. (2014). Bicultural Couples from Family to Community: Educational
48 Styles and Place Identity. In E. Di Giovanni (Ed.), *Facets of Women's Migration* (pp. 49-68).
49 Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. ISBN 978-1-4438-6138-0.
50
51
52
53 Novara, C., Serio, C. & Lavanco G. (2017). Teachers' Representations on Adoptive Families and
54 Educational Practices: New Challenges in Teachers' Preparation. *Adoption Quarterly*, 20(2), 135-
55 154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926755.2016.1201707>
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Oleksy, E. H., Hearn, J., & Golanska, D. (Eds.) (2011). *The Limits of Gendered Citizenship: Contexts*
4 *and Complexities*. New York: Routledge.
5
6
7 Padilla, A., & Perez, W. (2003). Acculturation, social identity, and social cognition: A new
8
9 perspective. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Science*, 25, 35-55.
10
11 Padilla, M. B., Hirsch, J. S., Munoz-Laboy, M., Sember, R., & Parker, R. G. (Eds.) (2007). *Love and*
12 *globalization: Transformations of intimacy in the contemporary world*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt
13
14 University Press.
15
16
17 Pagliaro, S., Ellemers, N., Barreto, M., & Leach, C. W. (2010). Strategie (individuali vs. collettive) di
18
19 gestione dell'identità sociale: Il ruolo delle norme di gruppo e del profitto personale. *Psicologia*
20 *Sociale*, 3, 387-401.
21
22
23 Panari, C., Mancini, T., & Fruggeri, L. (2010). The intercultural families' challenges: A "cultural"
24
25 question? The cultural psychology perspective. *Rivista di Studi Familiari*, 2, 42-59.
26
27
28 Parisi, R. (2015) Practices and rhetoric of migrants' social exclusion in Italy: intermarriage, work and
29
30 citizenship as devices for the production of social inequalities. *Identities*, 22(6), 739-756.
31 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2014.950967>
32
33
34 Phinney, J. (2003). Ethnic identity and acculturation. In K. Chun, P. Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.),
35
36 *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. 63-81). Washington,
37
38 DC: American Psychological Association.
39
40
41 Potarca, G., & Mills, M. (2012). *Racial homophily and exclusion in online dating preferences: a*
42 *cross-national comparison*. Paper presented at European Population Conference, Stockholm,
43
44 Sweden.
45
46
47 Qian, Z., & Lichter, D. (2007). Changing Patterns of Interracial Marriage in a Multiracial Society.
48
49 *Journal of Marriage and Family* 73(5), 1065-1084. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00866.x)
50
51 3737.2011.00866.x
52
53
54 Riva, E. F. M. (2011). Interreligious and Intercultural Families in Italy: An Analysis of North African-
55
56 Italian Marriages. *Journal of Muslim Mental Health*, 5(3), 301-
57
58 326, DOI: 10.1080/15564908.2010.551277
59
60

- Rodríguez-García, D. (2015). Intermarriage and integration revisited international experiences and cross-disciplinary approaches. *Annals American Academy Political Science and Social Sciences*, 662(1), 8–36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0002716215601397>
- Romano, D. (2008). *Intercultural marriages: Promises and pitfalls* (Ed.). Boston, MA: Intercultural Press.
- Roseneil S., Crowhurst I., Hellesund T., Santos A.C., Stoilova M. (2012). Remaking Intimate Citizenship in Multicultural Europe: Experiences Outside the Conventional Family. In B. Halsaa, S. Roseneil, S. Sümer (Eds), *Remaking Citizenship in Multicultural Europe. Citizenship, Gender and Diversity*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137272>
- Schmitt, M. T., & Branscombe, N. R. (2002). The meaning and consequences of perceived discrimination in advantaged and privileged social groups. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 12(1), 167–199. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14792772143000058>
- Skowroński, D. P., Danx, F. T., Ho Wen Wan, D. J., Ying Cherie, T. S., Fernandez, T. M. Waszyńska, K. (2014). Introductory Analysis of Factors Affecting Intercultural Couples in the Context of Singapore. *Studia Edukacyjne*, 30, 263-268. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14746/se.2014.30.15>
- Song, M. (2009). Is Intermarriage a Good Indicator of Integration? *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35(2), 331–348. DOI: 10.1080/13691830802586476
- Sternberg, R. J. (1997). Construct validation of a triangular love scale. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27(3), 313-335. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0992\(199705\)27:3<313::AID-EJSP824>3.0.CO;2-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199705)27:3<313::AID-EJSP824>3.0.CO;2-4)
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austine, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks Cole.
- Tognetti Bordogna, M. (2005). *Ricongiungere la famiglia altrove*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Tognetti Bordogna, M. (Ed.) (1996). *Legami familiari e migrazione: I matrimoni misti*. Torino: Harmattan.

- 1
2
3 Torqabeh, H. M., Firouz Abadi, A., & Haqshenas, H. (2006). Relations between love styles and
4 marital satisfaction. *The Journal of Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences*, 16(54), 99-109.
5
6
7 Troy, A. B., Lewis-Smith, J., & Laurenceau, J. (2006). Interracial and intraracial romantic
8 relationships: The search for differences in satisfaction, conflict, and attachment style. *Journal of*
9
10
11 *Social and Personal Relation-ships*, 23(1), 65-80.
12
13 Varro, G. (2003). *Sociologie de la mixité. De la mixité amoureuse aux mixités sociales et culturelles*.
14 Paris: Berlin.
15
16
17 Vedder, P. H., Van de Vijver, V. F., & Liebkind, K. (2006). Predicting immigrant youth's adaptation
18 across countries and ethnocultural groups. In J. Berry, J. Phinney, D. Sam, & P. H. Vedder (Eds.),
19 *Immigrant youth in cultural transition: Acculturation, identity and adaptation across national*
20 *contexts* (pp. 143-166). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
21
22
23
24 Waldman, K., & Rubalcava, L. (2005). Psychotherapy with intercultural couples: A contemporary
25 psychodynamic approach. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 59(3), 227-246.
26
27
28
29 Ward, C. (2004). Psychological theories of culture contact and their implications for intercultural
30 training and interventions. In D. Landis, J. Bennet, & M. Bennett (Eds.), *Hand book of*
31 *intercultural training* (pp. 185-216). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
32
33
34
35 Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (2001). Coping with Cross-Cultural Transition. *Journal of Cross-Cultural*
36 *Psychology*, 32(5), 636-642. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022101032005007>
37
38
39 Ward, C., & Rana-Deuba, A. (1999). Acculturation and adaptation revisited. *Journal of Cross-*
40 *Cultural Psychology*, 30(4), 422-442. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022199030004003>
41
42
43 Wieling, E. (2003). Latino/a and white marriages: A pilot study investigating the experiences of
44 interethnic couples in the United States. *Journal of Couple and Relationship Therapy*, 2, 41-
45
46
47 5. https://doi.org/10.1300/J398v02n02_04
48
49 Yodanis, C., & Lauer, S. (2017). Multiculturalism in interethnic intimate relationships. *Families,*
50 *Relationships, and Societies*, 6(1), 125-140. <https://doi.org/10.1332/204674315X14479283205364>
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 – Demographic Variables

	Couple's Variables	Foreign partner		Autochthonous partner	
		μ (<i>sd</i>)	%	μ (<i>sd</i>)	%
Married	73.3%				
Living together	26.7%				
Age		36.63 (10.21)		38.5 (10.9)	
Children (Yes)	52.9%				
Men			41.9		58.1
Women			58.1		41.9
With employment			77.7		81.7
Years since migration		12.81 (9.6)			
Religions					
Christian			53.5		90.7
Muslim			28.7		3.1
Orthodox			11.9		1.0
Other			5.9		5.1
Geographical Origin					
UE (before 2004)			22.3		
UE (after 2004)			14.6		
Africa			26.2		
South-America			14.6		
Other European countries +USA+Australia			12.6		
Magreb & Middle East			9.7		
Migration Type					
Forced migration			11.5		
Voluntary migration			88.5		
Migration Motives					
To improve economic condition			43.4		
Claiming asylum or refugee status			1.9		
Studies or training			9.6		
Family reunification and/ or affective motives			35.0		
Others			10.1		

Table 2 - Comparison between sub-samples (Anova)

	Partner	N	Means	S.D.	F	p
Ingroup Identification	Italian	105	3.84	.80	2.941	.05
	Foreign	104	4.00	.60		
Outgroup Identification	Italian	105	3.17	.59		NS
	Foreign	104	3.30	.69		
Couple Discrimination	Italian	103	2.01	.49		NS
	Foreign	104	2.09	.49		
Conjugal Satisfaction	Italian	104	4.44	.67		NS
	Foreign	104	4.42	.69		
Satisfaction with life	Italian	105	5.21	1.26		NS
	Foreign	104	5.06	1.38		

Table 3 - Comparison within sub-sample (foreign partner) (Anova)

	Sex	N	Means	S.D.	F	p
Outgroup Identification	Male	43	3.10	.70	7.166	.009
	Female	61	3.46	.65		
	Total	104	3.30	.69		
Couple Discrimination	Male	43	2.47	.55	5.094	.026
	Female	61	2.20	.63		
	Total	104	2.31	.61		
Kind of migration						
Couple Discrimination	Forced	12	2.62	.41	17.825	.001
	Voluntary	91	2.02	.46		
	Total	102	2.09	.49		
Foreigner Discrimination	Forced	11	3.56	1.04	5.901	.017
	Voluntary	91	2.85	.90		
	Total	102	2.92	.94		
Intimacy	Forced	11	4.01	.68	4.689	.033
	Voluntary	92	4.42	.57		
	Total	103	4.37	.59		
Passion	Forced	11	3.78	.77	5.836	.018
	Voluntary	92	4.29	.64		
	Total	103	4.23	.67		

Sense of Religion						
	None	17	3.79	.43		
	Low	21	3.80	.74		
Ingroup Identification	Medium	46	4.00	.55	5.145	.002
	High	19	4.43	.48		
	Total	103	4.01	.60		
Religion						
	Christian	54	1.96	.44		
	Muslim	29	2.34	.52		
Couple Discrimination	Orthodox	12	2.02	.53	3.019	.022
	Other	6	2.10	.56		
	Total	101	2.09	.50		
	Christian	53	2.27	.85		
	Muslim	28	3.36	.94		
Foreigner Discrimination	Orthodox	12	2.50	.88	3.185	.017
	Other	6	2.80	1.16		
	Total	99	2.73	.93		
Interreligious couple						
	Yes	43	2.24	.54		
Couple Discrimination	No	56	1.98	.45	7.049	.009
	Total	99	2.09	.50		
	Yes	42	3.15	.99		
Foreigner Discrimination	No	55	2.74	.84	4.859	.030
	Total	97	2.92	.93		
	Yes	42	4.24	.69		
Intimacy	No	56	4.49	.48	4.410	.038
	Total	98	4.38	.59		

Table 4 - Comparison within sub-sample (Italian partners) (Anova)

	Sex	N	Means	S.D.	F	p
Couple Discrimination	Male	59	1.91	.50	6.127	.015
	Female	44	2.15	.44		
	Total	103	2.01	.49		
Passion	Male	61	4.08	.66	9.788	.002
	Female	43	4.45	.50		
	Total	104	4.23	.62		
Religiosity						
Ingroup Id	None	15	3.35	.97	4.106	.009
	Low	34	4.08	.72		
	Medium	45	3.92	.69		
	High	10	3.45	.86		
	Total	104	3.84	.80		
Interreligious couple						
Couple Discrimination	Yes	42	2.21	.51	13.575	.001
	No	55	1.86	.42		
	Total	97	2.01	.49		
Job						
Ingroup Id	No	19	3.42	.73	6.941	.010
	Yes	85	3.94	.78		
	Total	104	3.84	.80		
Commitment	No	18	4.46	.69	4.949	.028
	Yes	85	4.76	.47		
	Total	103	4.71	.53		

Table 5 - Correlations among all dimensions for autochthonous and foreigners partners

Autochthonous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 Ingroup Id.	_____							
2 Outgroup Id.	.04	_____						
3 Couple Discrimination	-.02	-.08	_____					
4 Intimacy	.07	.23*	-.33**	_____				
5 Passion	-.08	.18	-.05	.70**	_____			
6 Commitment	.01	.20*	-.35**	.65**	.62**	_____		
7 SwL	-.09	.14	-.31**	.58**	.47**	.40**	_____	
Foreigners								
1 Ingroup Id.	_____							
2 Outgroup Id.	.02	_____						
3 Couple Discrimination	-.14	-.35**	_____					
4 Intimacy	-.08	.41**	-.42**	_____				
5 Passion	-.11	.26**	-.30**	.73**	_____			
6 Commitment	.09	.28**	-.24*	.62**	.61**	_____		
7 SwL	.04	.32**	-.36**	.61**	.62**	.51**	_____	
8 Foreigner Discrimination	.04	-.26**	.46**	-.28**	-.12	-.01	-.23*	_____

* $p < .01$, ** $p < .001$ **Table 6** - Lineal regression in both sub-groups of native and foreign partners

Model	β	p	t	R^2	$Adj R^2$	$F (d,f)$	Tolerance	VIF
Native partner				.319	.306	23.2 (2,101)		
Passion	.46	.001**	5.56				.89	1.12
Couple Discrimination	-.30	.001**	-				.81	1.23
Outgroup Id.	.041	.63	.48				.96	1.24
Foreign partner				.423	.411	35.8 (2,100)		
Passion	.56	.001**	7.05				.73	1.37
Couple Discrimination	-.19	.017*	-				.74	1.35
Outgroup Id.	.13	.12	1.5				.84	1.60

Dependant variables: Satisfaction with Life**Predictor variables:** Outgroup identification, Discrimination of couple, Passion.* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$.

Table 1 – Demographic Variables

	Couple's Variables	Foreign partner		Autochthonous partner	
		μ (<i>sd</i>)	%	μ (<i>sd</i>)	%
Married	73.3%				
Living together	26.7%				
Age		36.63 (10.21)		38.5 (10.9)	
Children (Yes)	52.9%				
Men			41.9		58.1
Women			58.1		41.9
With employment			77.7		81.7
Years since migration		12.81 (9.6)			
Religions					
Christian			53.5		90.7
Muslim			28.7		3.1
Orthodox			11.9		1.0
Other			5.9		5.1
Geographical Origin					
UE (before 2004)			22.3		
UE (after 2004)			14.6		
Africa			26.2		
South-America			14.6		
Other European countries +USA+Australia			12.6		
Magreb & Middle East			9.7		
Migration Type					
Forced migration			11.5		
Voluntary migration			88.5		
Migration Motives					
To improve economic condition			43.4		
Claiming asylum or refugee status			1.9		
Studies or training			9.6		
Family reunification and/ or affective motives			35.0		
Others			10.1		

Table 2 - Comparison between sub-samples (Anova)

	Partner	N	Means	S.D.	F	p
Ingroup Identification	Italian	105	3.84	.80	2.941	.05
	Foreign	104	4.00	.60		
Outgroup Identification	Italian	105	3.17	.59		NS
	Foreign	104	3.30	.69		
Couple Discrimination	Italian	103	2.01	.49		NS
	Foreign	104	2.09	.49		
Conjugal Satisfaction	Italian	104	4.44	.67		NS
	Foreign	104	4.42	.69		
Satisfaction with life	Italian	105	5.21	1.26		NS
	Foreign	104	5.06	1.38		

Table 3 - Comparison within sub-sample (foreign partner) (Anova)

	Sex	N	Means	S.D.	F	p
Outgroup Identification	Male	43	3.10	.70	7.166	.009
	Female	61	3.46	.65		
	Total	104	3.30	.69		
Couple Discrimination	Male	43	2.47	.55	5.094	.026
	Female	61	2.20	.63		
	Total	104	2.31	.61		
Kind of migration						
Couple Discrimination	Forced	12	2.62	.41	17.825	.001
	Voluntary	91	2.02	.46		
	Total	102	2.09	.49		
Foreigner Discrimination	Forced	11	3.56	1.04	5.901	.017
	Voluntary	91	2.85	.90		
	Total	102	2.92	.94		
Intimacy	Forced	11	4.01	.68	4.689	.033
	Voluntary	92	4.42	.57		
	Total	103	4.37	.59		
Passion	Forced	11	3.78	.77	5.836	.018
	Voluntary	92	4.29	.64		
	Total	103	4.23	.67		
Sense of Religion						
Ingroup Identification	None	17	3.79	.43	5.145	.002
	Low	21	3.80	.74		
	Medium	46	4.00	.55		
	High	19	4.43	.48		
	Total	103	4.01	.60		
Religion						
Couple Discrimination	Christian	54	1.96	.44	3.019	.022
	Muslim	29	2.34	.52		
	Orthodox	12	2.02	.53		
	Other	6	2.10	.56		
	Total	101	2.09	.50		
Foreigner Discrimination	Christian	53	2.27	.85	3.185	.017
	Muslim	28	3.36	.94		
	Orthodox	12	2.50	.88		
	Other	6	2.80	1.16		
	Total	99	2.73	.93		

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Interreligious couple						
Couple Discrimination	Yes	43	2.24	.54		
	No	56	1.98	.45	7.049	.009
	Total	99	2.09	.50		
Foreigner Discrimination	Yes	42	3.15	.99		
	No	55	2.74	.84	4.859	.030
	Total	97	2.92	.93		
Intimacy	Yes	42	4.24	.69		
	No	56	4.49	.48	4.410	.038
	Total	98	4.38	.59		

For Peer Review

Table 4 - Comparison within sub-sample (Italian partners) (Anova)

	Sex	N	Means	S.D.	F	p
Couple Discrimination	Male	59	1.91	.50	6.127	.015
	Female	44	2.15	.44		
	Total	103	2.01	.49		
Passion	Male	61	4.08	.66	9.788	.002
	Female	43	4.45	.50		
	Total	104	4.23	.62		
Religiosity						
Ingroup Id	None	15	3.35	.97	4.106	.009
	Low	34	4.08	.72		
	Medium	45	3.92	.69		
	High	10	3.45	.86		
	Total	104	3.84	.80		
Interreligious couple						
Couple Discrimination	Yes	42	2.21	.51	13.575	.001
	No	55	1.86	.42		
	Total	97	2.01	.49		
Job						
Ingroup Id	No	19	3.42	.73	6.941	.010
	Yes	85	3.94	.78		
	Total	104	3.84	.80		
Commitment	No	18	4.46	.69	4.949	.028
	Yes	85	4.76	.47		
	Total	103	4.71	.53		

Table 5 - Correlations among all dimensions for autochthonous and foreigners partners

Autochthonous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 Ingroup Id.	_____							
2 Outgroup Id.	.04	_____						
3 Couple Discrimination	-.02	-.08	_____					
4 Intimacy	.07	.23*	-.33**	_____				
5 Passion	-.08	.18	-.05	.70**	_____			
6 Commitment	.01	.20*	-.35**	.65**	.62**	_____		
7 SwL	-.09	.14	-.31**	.58**	.47**	.40**	_____	
Foreigners								
1 Ingroup Id.	_____							
2 Outgroup Id.	.02	_____						
3 Couple Discrimination	-.14	-.35**	_____					
4 Intimacy	-.08	.41**	-.42**	_____				
5 Passion	-.11	.26**	-.30**	.73**	_____			
6 Commitment	.09	.28**	-.24*	.62**	.61**	_____		
7 SwL	.04	.32**	-.36**	.61**	.62**	.51**	_____	
8 Foreigner Discrimination	.04	-.26**	.46**	-.28**	-.12	-.01	-.23*	_____

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

Table 6 - Lineal regression in both sub-groups of native and foreign partners

Model	β	p	t	R^2	$Adj R^2$	F (d,f)	Tolerance	VIF
Native partner				.319	.306	23.2 (2,101)		
Passion	.46	.001**	5.56				.89	1.12
Couple Discrimination	-.30	.001**	- 3.67				.81	1.23
Outgroup Id.	.041	.63	.48				.96	1.24
Foreign partner				.423	.411	35.8 (2,100)		
Passion	.56	.001**	7.05				.73	1.37
Couple Discrimination	-.19	.017*	- 2.42				.74	1.35
Outgroup Id.	.13	.12	1.5				.84	1.60

Dependant variables: Satisfaction with Life

Predictor variables: Outgroup identification, Discrimination of couple, Passion.

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